

I

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE



The Westminster Confession of Faith Chapter 1: Of the Holy Scripture

Sec. 1. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased.

Sec. 2. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these,

THE TRIUNE GOD

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	I. Kings.	Ecclesiastes.	Amos.
Exodus.	II. Kings.	The Song of	Obadiah.
Leviticus.	I. Chronicles.	Songs.	Jonah.
Numbers.	II. Chronicles.	Isaiah.	Micah.
Deuteronomy.	Ezra.	Jeremiah.	Nahum.
Joshua.	Nehemiah.	Lamentations.	Habakkuk.
Judges.	Esther.	Ezekiel.	Zephaniah.
Ruth.	Job.	Daniel.	Haggai.
I. Samuel.	Psalms.	Hosea.	Zechariah.
II. Samuel.	Proverbs.	Joel.	Malachi.

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospels according to	Corinthians II.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Matthew.	Galatians.	The Epistle of James.
Mark.	Ephesians.	The first and second
Luke.	Philippians.	Epistles of Peter.
John.	Colossians.	The first, second, and
The Acts of the Apos- tles.	Thessalonians I.	third Epistles of
Paul's Epistles to the	Thessalonians II.	John.
Romans.	To Timothy I.	The Epistle of Jude.
Corinthians I.	To Timothy II.	The Revelation of
	To Titus.	John.
	To Philemon.	

All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.

Sec. 3. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

Sec. 4. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any

The Holy Scripture

man, or Church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.

Sec. 5. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture. And the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is, to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God: yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

Sec. 6. The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word: and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

Sec. 7. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all: yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation, are so clearly propounded, and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that

THE TRIUNE GOD

not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

Sec. 8. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But, because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that, the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner; and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.

Sec. 9. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself: and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

Sec. 10. The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.



The Westminster Confession of Faith is one of the most important Protestant confessions, for it gave substantial definition to Re-

The Holy Scripture

formed theology in the seventeenth century. It is often compared with similar confessions of faith, such as the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Scots Confession, and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.

There was an internal debate as to where to begin a study of Reformed theology: with the doctrine of God or with the doctrine of Scripture. It is significant that the Westminster divines began their confessional statement with sacred Scripture. They were concerned about two principles. One, which is at the very heart of Christianity, is the concept of divine revelation. Christianity is a revealed religion, constructed not on the basis of speculative philosophy, but in response to what God himself has made manifest. Second is the principle of *sola Scriptura*, established by the Reformers. It acknowledges that the final authority in all matters of theology and in all controversies of faith and life is not the decrees or traditions of the church, but sacred Scripture itself. The Westminster Confession affirms the central importance and sufficiency of Scripture—a Reformational concept.

Sec. 1. Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing: which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased.

The first sentence distinguishes between the divine revelation that is sufficient for salvation and the divine revelation that is not

THE TRIUNE GOD

sufficient for salvation. **The light of nature** refers to Paul's teaching about general revelation (Rom. 1). Classic Reformed theology distinguishes between general (or natural) revelation and special revelation.

God's general revelation is his revelation of himself principally through nature and also through history, the ministry of his providence to his people, and his works of creation. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament shows His handiwork" (Ps. 19:1). Paul teaches that all men, by nature, know something of the existence, character, power, and deity of God, because God so clearly manifests himself in general revelation (Rom. 1:18–20).

God's general revelation can be either "immediate" or "mediate." *Immediate* means "direct, without any medium or intervening agency." Paul talks about God's revealing his law inwardly through the human heart, so that every person is born with a conscience (Rom. 2:14–15). God plants a sense of himself immediately in the soul of his creatures. John Calvin calls this the *sensus divinitatis*, "the sense of the divine." As fallen creatures we suppress the knowledge of right and wrong that God plants within us. But try as we may, we can never extinguish it. It is still present in the soul. That is immediate general revelation.

Mediate general revelation has to do with the way in which God manifests himself through the creation itself. Nature points beyond itself to its Maker and Creator. Paul speaks of mediate revelation when he says that the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and deity, are understood through the created order. That knowledge also is squelched, repressed, and unacknowledged by fallen creatures. The indictment of the whole human race is that while we know God by virtue of general revelation, we refuse to honor him as God and are not grateful to him (Rom. 1:20–21).

General revelation, unlike special revelation, comes to us basically through nature and is called general for two reasons. First, the audience is general; God gives knowledge of himself universally,

The Holy Scripture

so that every human has this revelation, which is built into nature. Second, the content of general revelation gives us a knowledge of God in general. It reveals that he is eternal; it reveals his power, deity, and holiness. General revelation, however, does not disclose God's way of salvation. The stars do not reveal the ministry of Christ. In fact, general revelation reveals just enough knowledge of God to damn us, to render us without excuse. Christ came into a world that was already under the judgment of God because we had already rejected the Father. Revelation is general, then, in terms of both audience and content.

The term *special revelation* refers essentially to the revelation inscripturated in the Bible. It is also special with respect to audience and content. There have been and still are many people who have never heard the story of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, or even Jesus. The Word of God has not yet gone everywhere. People are exposed to special revelation when someone tells it to them or when they read it in Scripture. The term *special* also describes the content of the revelation, for it opens up to us God's plan of salvation, specifically the person and work of Christ.

Clearly in view in chapter 1 of the confession is the distinction between general and special revelation, and between sufficiency and insufficiency. General revelation is not sufficient to give us the knowledge necessary for salvation; special revelation is sufficient for that purpose.

Some people attack the doctrine of Scripture's sufficiency by pointing out that Scripture does not teach all that we need to know about everything. For example, we know nothing about the body's circulatory system from the Bible. But that is not what the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture means. This doctrine means that Scripture reveals what is necessary to know for salvation. It is not necessary to know about the circulatory system in order to understand what is needed to be saved, but we do need to know the gospel that is revealed in Scripture.

THE TRIUNE GOD

Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing. God, “who at various times and in different ways” revealed himself “in time past,” has now in these last days given us the culmination of his revelation in the person of his Son, Jesus Christ (Heb. 1:1–2). The confession echoes the teaching of Scripture that God has, in various ways, revealed himself in the past. But now, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth and for the more sure edification, establishment, and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh and the malice of Satan and the world, God has committed his revelation **wholly unto writing**.

In the early days of the apostolic church, the life and teachings of Christ had not yet been set down in writing. This information was transmitted orally from person to person. But it pleased God, in his providence, to have that special revelation inscripturated, or put into written form. For this redemptive purpose we have the Bible.

Which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God’s revealing His will unto His people being now ceased. Scripture is necessary for our comfort and strength. Having been written in final form, it supersedes the various ways in which God revealed himself in former days. God formerly revealed himself through the Urim and Thummim for the priest, through dreams, and in other ways. The confession points out that the culmination of revelation has been preserved for us in Holy Scripture, and that God’s special revelation, having been inscripturated, no longer continues.

Sec. 2. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these,

The Holy Scripture

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	I. Kings.	Ecclesiastes.	Amos.
Exodus.	II. Kings.	The Song of	Obadiah.
Leviticus.	I. Chronicles.	Songs.	Jonah.
Numbers.	II. Chronicles.	Isaiah.	Micah.
Deuteronomy.	Ezra.	Jeremiah.	Nahum.
Joshua.	Nehemiah.	Lamentations.	Habakkuk.
Judges.	Esther.	Ezekiel.	Zephaniah.
Ruth.	Job.	Daniel.	Haggai.
I. Samuel.	Psalms.	Hosea.	Zechariah.
II. Samuel.	Proverbs.	Joel.	Malachi.

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospels according to	Corinthians II.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Matthew.	Galatians.	The Epistle of James.
Mark.	Ephesians.	The first and second
Luke.	Philippians.	Epistles of Peter.
John.	Colossians.	The first, second, and
The Acts of the Apos- tles.	Thessalonians I.	third Epistles of
Paul's Epistles to the	Thessalonians II.	John.
Romans.	To Timothy I.	The Epistle of Jude.
Corinthians I.	To Timothy II.	The Revelation of
	To Titus.	John.
	To Philemon.	

All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.

An ongoing controversy exists concerning which books should be included in the canon of Scripture, especially the books known as the Apocrypha. The apocryphal books were written primarily during the intertestamental period, between the end of the Old Testament canon (the book of Malachi) and the opening of the New Testament. The Roman Catholic Church holds to the canonical status of the Apoc-

THE TRIUNE GOD

rypha, while for the most part Protestant bodies do not. These books are recognized as interesting historical sources of a secondary level, but lacking the authority of Scripture itself.

There is also debate over the extent of the Jewish canon. The New Testament refers back to the Old Testament. Paul wrote to Timothy, for example, that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. 3:16). Paul was referring to a body of literature that was well known to Timothy and every pious Jew. What were the sacred Scriptures of the Jews?

The great library of Alexandria, where Philo and others worked, was a cultural center for Hellenistic (Greek-speaking) Jews. The canon of the Alexandrian Jews included the Apocrypha. Historical evidence indicates that the Palestinian canon, used by the Jews in Israel, did not contain the Apocrypha. From the Reformers’ perspective, the original Jewish canon was the Palestinian canon, not the Alexandrian canon. Interestingly enough, in the latter twentieth century some evidence emerged to indicate that even among the Alexandrian Jews the Apocrypha was accorded only deuterocanonical (secondary-level) status. More and more the evidence seems to confirm the Protestant conclusion that the original books of sacred Scripture were the sixty-six books currently in the Protestant Bible. Section 2 ends with this comprehensive statement: **All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.**

Sec. 3. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

Although the Apocrypha are not part of the canon of the Scripture, these books need not be completely ignored or discarded. We do not throw away the letters of Clement, Ignatius, or other church fathers, which are

The Holy Scripture

of historical interest. The confession makes the point only that the books of the Apocrypha are not inspired and therefore do not belong in the canon.

The idea of inspiration finds its root in the teaching of the apostle Paul, who wrote, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness” (2 Tim. 3:16). *Inspiration* translates the Greek word *theopneustos*—a combination of *theos*, meaning “God,” and *pneō*, meaning “to breathe, blow”—which literally means “God-breathed.” Paul is saying that sacred Scripture is God-breathed.

In both Roman Catholic and Protestant circles, the theory of inspiration is that, though the documents of sacred Scripture were written by human authors, they were not merely recording their own opinions or recollections. They were performing their task as agents of revelation under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit, who inspired them. We do not know how the Holy Spirit inspired them. The writers were not reduced to automatons, with God moving their hands. The books of the Bible are clearly written in different styles, with different vocabularies and grammatical structures. When we contrast the writings of Paul with those of John or Peter or Jeremiah, we see their different styles. God obviously worked through their individual styles and mannerisms. The doctrine of inspiration, as mysterious as it is, declares that while humans were writing, God the Holy Spirit ensured that what they wrote was without error and was actually *verbum Dei*, “the Word of God” itself.

When Paul says that all Scripture is inspired, or God-breathed, he is technically saying that Scripture is breathed *out* of the mouth of God, where it originates. The term *breathing in* refers to the secret operation of the Holy Spirit by which he produces the Word of God from the word of men, yet without human invention. The accent is on its origin and consequently its authority. All Scripture, Paul says, is breathed out by God, and is nothing less than the Word of God, which has binding authority upon us.

THE TRIUNE GOD

Sec. 4. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man, or church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.

Here we read a phrase that is important to Protestantism: **the authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed.** The confession asserts that the Bible's authority is so strong, so supreme, that it imposes on us a moral obligation to believe it. If we do not believe it, we have sinned. It is not so much an intellectual as a moral issue.

Perhaps you have seen the bumper sticker that reads, "God said it; I believe it; that settles it." It is indicative of our man-centered culture, which says that nothing is settled until or unless I believe it. The bumper sticker should say instead, "God said it; that settles it." If the Lord God Almighty opens his mouth, there is no room for debate and no excuse for unbelief. It is the word of God, and everyone is duty-bound to submit to its authority.

Satan beguiled Eve with the question, "Has God indeed said . . . ?" (Gen. 3:1), calling God's authority into question. When Satan tempted Jesus in the wilderness, all three temptations centered on whether Christ would trust and live by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God (Matt. 4:1–11). Throughout church history, the supreme attack of the world, the flesh, and the devil against godliness has been an attack on the authority of God's Word. Fierce assaults on the authority of Scripture, which came out of the Enlightenment, made their way into the universities and seminaries. They also came from within the church, in the name of biblical criticism or higher criticism.

At the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, Abraham Kuyper, prime minister of the Netherlands and founder of the Free University of Amsterdam, observed that biblical criticism had become biblical vandalism. Once, when I was in the old city of Athens, I observed people spray-painting graffiti on two-thou-

The Holy Scripture

sand-year-old ruins. “Is nothing sacred today?” I thought. No treasure has been more subject to malicious attack than Scripture itself.

Section 4 is a concise and theologically precise statement. The Westminster divines use the word *received* purposely. In the controversy with the Roman Catholic Church, then and now, the question is this: does final authority reside in the church or in the Bible? This is what *sola Scriptura* was all about in the sixteenth century. Rome strongly contended that the Bible ultimately gets its authority from the church. Martin Luther, Calvin, and the other Reformers debated this regularly in the sixteenth century. The Westminster divines studied the early centuries of church history to arrive at the word *received*.

When the early church settled on the books of the canon, it spoke of *receiving* these books as canonical. The church fathers were humbly recognizing the authority of these books, not presuming to give them authority, when they stated, “We receive these apostolic writings as the sacred Scriptures, as the authoritative Word of God.” The church did not need to declare this truth in order for it to be so. The authority of Scripture does not depend on the testimony of any man or of the church; its authority depends and rests wholly on God, the supreme author of the Bible. Scripture should be received, not so that it can *become* the Word of God, but because it already *is* the Word of God.

Sec. 5. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture. And the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is, to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man’s salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God: yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

THE TRIUNE GOD

This section introduces a concept that was central to the teaching of Calvin. The ideas in his famous *Institutes of the Christian Religion* are brought almost verbatim into the Westminster Confession at this point. This concept is what we call the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Previously the confession stated that Scripture's authority comes from God, not from any man or from the church. Section 5 now acknowledges that, though Scripture does not receive its authority from the church, we are to respect the testimony and teaching of the church. The Reformers, though denying tradition as a source of truth equal to the Scriptures, nevertheless esteemed the teaching office of the church down through the ages. Apart from the Bible, the source most quoted by Calvin was Augustine. Luther also quoted Augustine frequently, as well as other church fathers. Church councils and gifted teachers have had great insight and are to be taken seriously.

We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture. In our day and age, even within the church, we often find anything but a high view of sacred Scripture. Throughout church history, however, virtually every confession of faith, whether Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, or something else, has strongly affirmed Scripture's divine authority. The confession says that the testimony of the church may influence us to hold Scripture in high esteem.

In his *Institutes*, Calvin wrote of the internal indicators or evidence that the Bible is the word of God, sometimes called the *autopistae*, "the self-authentication of Scripture." When one immerses oneself in sacred Scripture, one encounters certain ideas that are most impressive and that bear witness to its divine source. Calvin called this the *indicia*, "the evidences." They ought to be sufficient to prove to every human being that the Bible is the word of God. Human reason is such, however, that these indicators or internal evidences do not give people a full measure of confidence that the Bible is the word of God.

The Holy Scripture

Calvin then distinguished between proof and persuasion. The proof is objective; the evidence leaves no room for reasonable doubt. But people may refuse to accept that evidence because they have a strong bias against what it affirms. Scripture's portrait of the fallen character of the human race reveals that, by nature, we do not want God in our thinking, preferring darkness to light. Because we have rejected his revelation, God has given us over to reprobate minds, darkened by unbelief.

The fall is so deep, and its impact on the mind is so strong, that the best reasoning one human can offer for the Bible's truth will not convince another, no matter how sound, valid, and compelling it may be. The confession lists various aspects of the internal evidence of Scripture.

And the heavenliness of the matter. C. S. Lewis, who immersed himself in the great literature of Western civilization, once observed that he could not read Scripture without recognizing a transcendent quality missing from all other literature. I was trained in philosophy to take nothing for granted and to analyze critically the affirmations and assertions in every document. But I found when reading Scripture that in a very real sense I, rather than the text, was the object of criticism. The Bible was criticizing me more than I was able to criticize it. One is confronted with the heavenliness of the matter.

The efficacy of the doctrine. This phrase reminds us of Paul's statement to Timothy that all Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable, useful, and efficacious for reproof, conviction, and instruction in righteousness, able to make one complete as a person of God (2 Tim. 3:16–17). The doctrine found in Scripture is effective and powerful. The apostle Paul further writes that the power is of God for salvation (Rom. 1:16) and is not found in the eloquence or knowledge of the preacher. The power of God for salvation is in the message. The doctrine of the gospel has impact and is efficient and effective; thus, we speak of the efficacy of the doctrine.

THE TRIUNE GOD

The majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts. Is that not an interesting affirmation to make in the seventeenth century? When the Enlightenment philosophers laid an ax to the root of the tree of biblical authority, they intended to chop down all the alleged inconsistencies and contradictions. Even in light of the higher criticism to which I was exposed in my academic background, I have been most impressed by Scripture's incredible symmetry. The most infinitesimal details in Jeremiah or Ezekiel fit together so perfectly with what was proclaimed centuries later by James, John, or Paul. This harmony of Scripture is a beautiful melding and merging together in a unified proclamation of truth. This confession, like other Protestant and Roman Catholic confessions, cites the unity and coherence of Scripture ("the consent of all the parts") as a testimony to its divine origin.

The scope of the whole (which is, to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God. The arguments (indicators, internal evidences) do not just hint at the divine origin of Scripture, but abundantly affirm it. Calvin would say that the *indicia*, the evidence, is so abundant that it should stop the mouth of every skeptic! But this phrase from the confession ends with a colon.

Yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts. This is the doctrine of the internal testimony. A person will not be fully persuaded or assured that the Bible is the word of God unless or until God the Holy Spirit does a work in his heart, which is called the internal testimony of the Spirit.

This could sound like a defense of Scripture that, in the final analysis, is sheer subjectivism. If an appeal for truth is based on some inner light such as "The Holy Spirit spoke to me" or "I had this intense feeling," this cannot be tested objectively and either verified or

The Holy Scripture

falsified. The unspoken argument for flight into subjectivism is “It’s true because I believe it.” This formula assumes that anything I believe must, in fact, be the truth. This is not what the doctrine of internal testimony teaches.

The Spirit’s internal testimony does not give the believer private, esoteric knowledge or information that is unavailable to anyone else. In fact, this testimony communicates no new content. Rather, the Holy Spirit works on your obstinate will to overcome your natural antipathy toward the Word of God. In simple terms, the Spirit melts your heart so that you are willing to surrender to the objective truth that is there. Calvin used the word *acquiesce*, “to submit or surrender to.” Calvin said that the Spirit causes us to acquiesce in the *indicia*.

In a watershed sermon early in his ministry, “A Divine and Supernatural Light,” Jonathan Edwards preached about the Spirit’s work of changing the obstinate, recalcitrant hearts of sinners by inwardly changing the disposition of their souls. That is what the confession is talking about here: God melts our hearts and makes us fully persuaded and assured of Scripture’s infallible truth and divine authority.

Is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts. The Reformers strongly believed in the importance of the ministry and operation of God the Holy Spirit. Calvin was called the theologian of the Holy Spirit. Yet the Reformers were clearly distinct from the radical spiritualists, who sought private revelations from God beyond the content of sacred Scripture. Around us today are people claiming new revelation, which may or may not conform to the Word of God. I have encountered people who were taking actions that were clearly opposed to the teaching of Scripture. They claimed that when they prayed about it, the Lord told them it was fine. The Holy Spirit does not speak with a forked tongue. He never grants us the right to disobey what his inspired Scriptures instruct us regarding our duty. The Spirit works with and through the Word, never apart from or against it.

THE TRIUNE GOD

When Gordon Seminary and Conwell Seminary merged, I was on the faculty at Conwell. After declining the invitation to teach at the merged seminary, I was without a job and had no prospects. It was a frightening situation. My wife and I prayed seriously for God's providential guidance for our family. I had some Christian friends who were aware of our struggle and our desire to be where God wanted us to be. While we looked at job possibilities, some of those friends told me in all earnestness that God had revealed to them that I should take job number one. Another advised me to take job number two. I received five different reports as to where God desired me to be employed. Finally I pointed out that unless God wanted me to work in five different cities at the same time, some of my friends were not being led by the Holy Spirit. As it turned out, I took a sixth job offer, about which none of my friends had had a private revelation. I made the decision by following scriptural principles, soberly analyzing my gifts and talents and the needs and opportunities available. Claims of private revelations must be tested by the Word.

Sec. 6. The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word: and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

We see here an affirmation of the sufficiency of Scripture with respect to **the whole counsel of God**, a phrase that is sometimes used

The Holy Scripture

in the church in a cavalier manner. Pastors are enjoined to preach the whole counsel of God—not just the part they like, not just what is comfortable or what the people in the pew want to hear, but the whole counsel of God. In preaching through a book of the Bible, staying with the text, a pastor has to preach whatever comes next. Sometimes I look at what's next and think, "Oh, my, this is a church-emptier."

One text in John, for example, unavoidably, plainly, and clearly teaches the doctrine of definite atonement, which is probably the single most unpopular concept of historic Reformed theology. This text teaches that Christ died specifically for the elect and only for the elect. From all eternity, God had a plan to save some, and to accomplish that plan he sent his Son into the world. God gave to his Son a certain number of people, and Christ laid down his life for them. The atonement is efficacious only for those whom the Father gives to the Son. That text (John 6:35–40) is very unpopular because contemporary evangelicalism assumes that Christ died for everybody's sins. The text teaches that Christ died only for believers, and the only ones who believe are the elect. Atonement was not made for unbelievers' sins. Had they been atoned for, God would be unjust to punish unbelievers. This is a very difficult doctrine, over which people often stumble. A preacher's mandate, however, is to be faithful to the text and to the whole counsel of God. Since this text is part of the whole counsel of God, there is no choice but to proclaim it.

Concerning all things necessary for His own glory. That is the *solī Deo gloria* of the Reformation. What we do will be measured by how faithfully we have manifested the glory of God and exalted him. The whole counsel of God concerning **all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture.** Some believe that logic is the enemy of Christianity, an intrusion into spiritual things derived from Aristotle and Greek thinking. In my experience, however, the vast majority of errors in biblical interpretation occur because a person is not using logic properly, not

THE TRIUNE GOD

deducing by good and necessary consequence. The whole counsel of God is known not only by what Scripture teaches explicitly, but also by what it teaches implicitly, which can be learned by clear and necessary deduction. If God calls us to honor our fathers and mothers, does he not also call us, by good and necessary consequence, not to dishonor them? When the law prohibits something, it implicitly, by good and necessary consequence, commands the opposite.

The Reformers knew that once the church's authority as the supreme interpreter of the Bible was set aside in favor of the individual's right to "private interpretation," a floodgate would be opened. It is not enough simply to agree that the Bible is the supreme authority. One must determine what that authority teaches and requires. In its fourth session, the Council of Trent decided that no man has the right to distort the Scriptures by private interpretation. With the right and privilege of private interpretation always comes the burden of responsibility for correct interpretation. For this reason, the Westminster Confession says that all deductions are to be by good and necessary consequence. Interpretations can be tested objectively to determine whether they comply with what the Bible actually teaches.

Unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men. The canon of Scripture is closed in the sense that it cannot be amplified or added to by church tradition or private revelation. We have inscripturated divine revelation to govern the life of the Christian and the church.

Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word. Some charismatics believe that they receive new revelation—revelation not found in Scripture. Reformed theology declares that there is no new revelation. This is not to deny new activity by the Holy Spirit, for there is a sharp distinction between revelation and illumination. In revelation, the Spirit works to reveal divine content as is found in the Bible. Therefore, when Paul wrote Romans, it was inscripturated divine revelation.

The Holy Scripture

How do we penetrate the meaning of Scripture? Paul wrote:

As it is written:

“Eye has not seen, nor ear heard,
Nor have entered into the heart of man
The things which God has prepared for those who love
Him.”

But God has revealed them to us through His Spirit. For the Spirit searches all things, yes, the deep things of God. For what man knows the things of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God. (1 Cor. 2:9–11)

Paul is speaking here not only of revelation, but also of illumination. The Holy Spirit is not a seeker. When Paul uses the metaphor of the Spirit's searching, he means, not that the Spirit is searching the truth of God for himself, but that the Spirit is putting a searchlight on the Word of God for us.

As we read and study Scripture, the Spirit opens our eyes, not to add anything to what is already there, but to clarify what is there and to apply it to our life. Reformed theology does not deny the importance of divine illumination, in which the Spirit casts light on the content that he first revealed through apostles and prophets. He helps our infirmities, counteracts our biases and fallenness, and convinces us of the truth through his work of illumination. We acknowledge the illumination of the Spirit to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word.

Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word: and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be or-

THE TRIUNE GOD

dered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

This qualifying section elucidates the previous sentence. The confession acknowledges another source of revelation, which we touched on in section 1: general revelation, God's revelation of himself in and through nature.

Is general revelation infallible? Some reply that infallibility belongs only to special revelation, the Bible, because it is revelation from God, who cannot fail or err. If his special revelation is infallible because he is infallible, however, would it not follow that his general revelation is also infallible? The church of all ages has answered yes. We tend to think that, while special revelation is infallible, general revelation in nature is not, so science and intellectual inquiry may be mistaken. Scientists may err when they interpret the data of nature, but their imperfect interpretations do not vitiate general revelation itself. Just as theologians can distort biblical revelation, so scientists can distort general revelation. We sometimes assume that the theologian is right and the scientist is wrong, or the converse. The confession acknowledges that the church learns things, not only from the Bible, but also from nature: **There are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence.**

Christian prudence refers to wisdom. For example, in some denominations, when deliberations take place at the session, presbytery, or general assembly, they follow *Robert's Rules of Order*. These rules for discussion, debate, and hearings are not found in the Bible, but are broadly used in church life because they have stood the test of time. This is an example of general, natural law that has emerged. We talk about the *jus gentium*, the "law of nations." Virtually every nation in the world follows certain bedrock principles of ethics, to which the church also pays attention. We call this the *lex naturalis*, the "natural law," which, though not specifically spelled out in Scripture, may

The Holy Scripture

be examined and known from a study of the church's corporate activity throughout history. This may benefit church life because it reflects Christian prudence. We might subsume this idea under the concept of tradition. From a biblical perspective, human tradition must never be elevated to a position above the law of God, supplanting that law or binding the consciences of people. But tradition can be a valuable purveyor of the church's cumulative wisdom. Even though tradition is not infallible, we would be foolish to ignore this corporate wisdom.

Sec. 7. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all: yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation, are so clearly propounded, and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

The propriety of private interpretation was hotly debated during the sixteenth century. The Roman Catholic Church had taken the position (and reinforced it in the fourth session of the Council of Trent) that scriptural interpretation belongs to the teaching office of the church, and that no one has the right to interpret Scripture in a way contrary to the interpretation of Holy Mother Church. Luther, however, argued for the right and responsibility of Christians to read the Scriptures for themselves and for the right of private interpretation.

Luther also warned against reading into Scripture things that are not there. He affirmed the doctrine of the perspicuity (or clarity) of Scripture. This doctrine does not mean that every part of the Bible is equally clear. Luther acknowledged that biblical doctrine can be exceedingly complex and difficult, confounding the minds of the church's best scholars. Interpreting the book of Revelation has been difficult for the church throughout the ages, and to this day we have no consensus on the proper interpretation of it. What Luther affirmed was

THE TRIUNE GOD

that Scripture is clear enough in its basic message, that is, in communicating what is necessary for salvation. The gospel does not require a Ph.D. in theology or New Testament studies in order to be grasped. To Luther, the importance of getting the message of salvation to every person in the world far outweighs the dangers of corruption from private interpretations.

The Catholic hierarchy feared that if people were left to interpret the Bible for themselves, sects, denominations, and splinter groups would arise, and that is exactly what happened. Luther thought that if the Bible were in the hands of the common people, their misinterpretations would be dwarfed by the gospel knowledge they would gain. We take for granted that we can purchase a Bible in our language and read it without being arrested or tortured. But that was not the case for much of church history, during which the Bible was literally chained to the lectern and only the priests were allowed to read it. At the heart of the concept of the private interpretation of Scripture is the concept of its clarity or perspicuity.

Embedded in this discussion is an important principle of hermeneutics. The word *hermeneutics* comes from the name of the Greek god Hermes, who corresponded to the Roman god Mercury. Hermes was the messenger of the gods. From the notion of Hermes as divine messenger comes the concept of hermeneutics, which refers to the proper rules of interpreting the Bible. One basic principle is that the implicit is always to be interpreted in light of the explicit, not vice versa.

John 3:16 gives us an example of this: “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.” This text teaches explicitly that all who “believe” will not “perish” and will have “everlasting life.” The text does not say who has the moral power or ability to believe, yet many people assume that everyone has this natural ability. But that is only implicit in the text, if there at all. Three chapters later, John quotes Jesus as saying, “No one can come to Me unless it has

The Holy Scripture

been granted to him by My Father” (John 6:65). This is an explicit statement about our natural inability to come to Christ. But when people embrace the implicit idea from 3:16 that anyone is able to come to Christ, they have to bury the explicit teaching of 6:65 under it.

The framers of the Westminster Confession spelled out the same principle when they wrote: **Those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation, are so clearly propounded, and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.** Here the principle in view is that the obscure must be interpreted in light of the plain, which is similar to interpreting the implicit in light of the explicit. If the Bible clearly teaches something in one passage, while another passage uses arcane and mysterious symbols, we interpret the symbols in light of the clear and plain teaching. If we use unclear or difficult passages to formulate our teaching and then distort the meaning of plain passages accordingly, we go astray. Always interpret the implicit in light of the explicit, the obscure in light of the clear. These underlying principles in the Reformed doctrine of hermeneutics presuppose that the Bible is the word of God. The Holy Spirit is not an author of confusion, nor does God speak with lies or contradictions. Therefore, God is not going to say one thing in one place and a contradictory thing in another. Coherence and unity are present in the revelation that comes from God.

Sec. 8. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But, because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have right unto, and interest

THE TRIUNE GOD

in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that, the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner; and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.

The Reformation affirmed, in addition to the clarity of the Scriptures and the right of private interpretation, the right to translate the Bible into the vernacular, the language of the people. The fact that today we can read the Scriptures in English came with a price tag. The original translators of the Bible into English and other languages often paid for it with their lives. One of the first things that Luther undertook following the Diet of Worms in 1521, after fleeing to Wartburg Castle, was to translate the Bible into German. God has preserved his original message intact, and the confession affirms that it is proper and appropriate to translate the Bible into various human languages.

Reformed theology teaches the infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture. That affirmation applies only to the autographs—the original manuscripts created by those who wrote the Bible. The process of copying these manuscripts and of translating them into other languages is not inspired by God, as was the process of writing the original documents. Some people believe that the only viable English translation is the King James Version, but the church does not hold to the infallibility of translations. Different English translations sometimes translate the same verse in incompatible ways, and so at least one must be in error. We acknowledge errors in copying and translating, but the original message that came from God himself is infallible. The confession affirms in section 8 the right to translate the Bible into the languages of the people, because the truth to be learned from those translations far exceeds the occasional error.

The Holy Scripture

Sec. 9. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself: and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

In section 9 the authors come to the Reformed principle of hermeneutics: *analogia fide*, “the analogy of faith.” This means that the primary rule of biblical interpretation is that Scripture is its own interpreter. The supreme interpreter of Holy Writ is the Holy Spirit, who inspired the text and who illumines and guides the believer in interpreting it. Serious dangers mark this process of interpretation. Throughout church history there have been instances of so-called pneumatic exegesis or “spiritual interpretation” of the Bible. People claiming to have direct illumination from the Spirit have propounded bizarre interpretations of Scripture that cannot be objectively discerned in the text itself. They claim that the Holy Spirit has revealed to them the text’s “real meaning.” Others do what we call “lucky dipping.” When a problem arises in their life, they say a prayer, open the Bible at random, and put their finger on the open page. The verse so identified is presumed to be their Spirit-given answer, even though the text may have absolutely nothing to do with the problem at hand. All such “spiritual interpretation” is unsupported by the confession. What the Holy Spirit inspired in one passage helps us understand what he inspired in another. We must interpret Scripture by Scripture.

A different kind of biblical interpretation has emerged in our day and worked its way deeply into the evangelical world: atomistic exegesis. In both philosophy and theology, an antipathy to any philosophical or theological system has arisen. Much of the scholarship in the last two centuries has been influenced, knowingly or unknowingly, by an existential approach to truth that abhors any systematic approach. Existential philosophy uses its opposition to systematics like a Procrustean bed. The Greek myth recounts that in order to fit travelers into his bed, Procrustes either stretched their bodies or cut off

THE TRIUNE GOD

their legs. In this case, where the Bible does not fit the preferred philosophy, it is trimmed and forced to conform to it. This faulty way of interpreting Scripture is a subtle step away from rejecting the system of doctrine contained in it.

Theological education has historically revolved around biblical studies, historical studies, and systematic theology. Systematic theology examines related passages of Scripture and comes to a unified knowledge of the whole. For example, classical systematic theologians study what Paul wrote on the subject of justification in Ephesians, Galatians, Colossians, and Romans, in order to determine the various aspects of his teaching. They assume that Paul's doctrine of justification does not change from Galatians to Ephesians, since God is the author of it. But in our day there is so little confidence in Scripture's inspiration that some prefer to approach the Bible atomistically, studying specific bits of data in isolation, without comparing them to each other. These scholars are so preoccupied with the particulars that they feel no obligation to see how the particulars stand with the universal.

This atomistic approach violates the principle of interpreting Scripture by Scripture. In the Reformed analogy of faith, we trust the Word of God. We trust that what Paul teaches the church in Ephesus and what he teaches the churches in Galatia are coherent, unified, and consistent. If there seem to be two alternative interpretations of a given passage, one of which is compatible and consistent with everything else the author says and one of which seems to be contradictory, common courtesy dictates that the author be allowed to speak coherently through the whole of his writings. It is bad hermeneutics to violate this standard with any author, but particularly so when the author is God himself.

The full sense of any Scripture, according to section 9, is not manifold, but one. A professor once assigned his students one verse of Scripture, asking them to write down fifty things they had learned from it and turn in the assignment the next day. The students groaned,

The Holy Scripture

stayed up late that night, compared notes, and came dragging in the next day with their lists of fifty. The assignment for the next day was to prepare a list of fifty more. What the professor was endeavoring to inculcate in his students was that a single text of Scripture may have a thousand possible applications, but only one correct meaning. Discerning the original, intended meaning is called *grammatico-historical exegesis*. We do not have any right to look at a biblical text from the perspective of the twenty-first century and change its meaning.

Sec. 10. The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.

Recapitulated in this final section of chapter 1 is the principle of *sola Scriptura*, which means that “Scripture alone” is the final, supreme arbiter of all theological controversies, all disputes and debates among Christians. It alone is the infallible rule of faith and life.

With the rise of neo-orthodox theology in the first half of the twentieth century came a strong rejection of propositional revelation. The advocates of neo-orthodoxy contended that the Bible is not an objective body of propositional truth, but instead a witness to truth. Karl Barth, for example, popularized the idea that the Bible *becomes* the Word of God if and when the Spirit speaks through it—although in and of itself the Bible is not the Word of God. Barth claimed that the Bible’s words somehow become transformed into the Word of God when the Spirit uses that text to speak to us. This was a radical form of existentializing the biblical record, and it caused far-reaching consequences in the life of the church.

Others today are departing from the confession’s teaching that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. They claim that the Bible is infallible only when it speaks on matters of faith and

THE TRIUNE GOD

practice, not when it talks about history, science, or anything else not directly related to religious faith or practice. But section 10 affirms that the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures is infallible in the whole of our lives—in everything he teaches and everything he touches. He is supreme.