

The following are direct quotes from Bruxy Cavey in various teachings on three topics: Penal Substitutionary Atonement, Nicene Orthodoxy, and The Doctrine of Scripture

Penal Substitutionary Atonement

"We do live at a time in history where many people identify Penal Substitutionary Atonement theory as the gospel. Penal Substitutionary Atonement is a theory about how the gospel works. I happen to think it's the wrong theory." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Gospel Proclamation in the Book of Acts* <https://youtu.be/eapFwKgsQNM> (9:24)

"When it comes to the actual act of killing and wrathing - the only wrath that is expressed at the cross is the wrath of us against Christ, not the wrath of the Father upon Christ. There is wrath poured out on Jesus and that is the wrath of the religious leaders and the wrath of the Roman soldiers, it is the wrath of humanity in sin. God comes in and raises Jesus from the dead." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Gospel Proclamation in the Book of Acts* <https://youtu.be/eapFwKgsQNM> (11:02)

"I'd love to convert everyone away from Penal Substitutionary Atonement as a theory of atonement, but if I didn't that's fine. But what I can say is just don't preach it." *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Gospel Proclamation in the Book of Acts* <https://youtu.be/eapFwKgsQNM> (10:08)

"How do you forgive somebody? You just forgive them! You don't say 'wait wait wait, I'll get back to you, first I gotta go kill something!' You are made in his image and how do you forgive? You just forgive. How does God forgive? He just forgives." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Theories of Atonement* <https://youtu.be/xA-TLWLVFVA>

"You say 'you mean he didn't need Jesus to die and go through all of that so that he could forgive?' No no, he's omnipotent, he can do anything he wants and he can just forgive. He didn't have to die on the cross so he could finally say 'oh good! Now I can forgive!' Jesus died on the cross as God's choice to reveal his love for us." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Theories of Atonement* <https://youtu.be/xA-TLWLVFVA>

Using the parable of the prodigal son to demonstrate no Penal Substitutionary Atonement "But when the son returns what kind of a father does he find? (makes angry grunt) - No, the father would run toward him to embrace him and not a father who says 'before I can embrace you, somebody's gotta die! There must be justice before there can be mercy! If there has to be justice then why do you need mercy? In fact isn't grace, isn't mercy, aren't those concepts that move beyond justice? In fact they are at odds because there's something about grace that isn't fair. There's something about mercy that's not fair. If it's all about making things fair then about making things gracious the two concepts don't fit together. " - *Why Did Jesus Die? #1 - To Show Us God's Love* (24:38)

"Jesus takes our our sin, and we are given his righteousness. Our sin is killed with Christ, but there's no mention of wrath being poured out on Christ, in fact what is mentioned here is that God is - you see verse 19 - God was in Christ reconciling. God was in Christ reconciling. If you think spacially at the cross where was God? God was not hovering above Jesus pouring out his wrath, God was in Christ pouring out his love." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #1 - To Show Us God's Love* (27:15)

"Notice it says here (2 Corinthians 5:17-21) that the world, that we were reconciled to him. God didn't have to be reconciled to us, it's not like God said 'I've got all this anger, I'm not ready for these guys, I gotta do something with it so I am ready to play nice! I'll put it on Jesus!' It's not God who had to be

reconciled to anybody. The father was always ready for the prodigal's return. But it says clearly we were reconciled to him - we're the ones who needed to be changed and that happens through the crucifixion says verse 21." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #1 - To Show Us God's Love (28:13)*

"Calvin felt that we had to account for where God's wrath went and Jesus became the answer to that mystery. Again, it's an interesting theory, it's mechanically perfect, you know he balances the books well. But it says more than scripture says. What scripture says is Jesus became sin for us and gave us his righteousness therefore our future wrath on judgment day ceases to exist - it's just not there anymore - we are no longer under wrath. To take that the next step and say 'well where'd that wrath go? How did God vent that wrath or get rid of that wrath?' is to ask a question that scripture doesn't answer. So we could theorize and say 'well I guess God vented it toward Jesus instead of towards us' but is it also not possible that when Jesus took away our sin there was just no more wrath for that sin? God says 'I'm going to punish you for your sin' but now your sin is taken away and you are infused with Christ's righteousness and God says 'okay I'm not going to punish you for sin that has already been taken away from you'. So he doesn't have to try and balance his own internal metaphysical books. Can't God just say 'alright, I'm not going to punish you'?... If a judge believes someone is guilty and then finds out actually no, they're not guilty, they're innocent then the judge says 'oh, then there's no sentence for you'. He doesn't have to then say 'but I had a sentence stored up to give somebody, where am I gonna put it?' - there's just no sentence anymore. Our wrath is removed through the death of Christ but not because God had to pour out wrath on Jesus but because he became our sin, took away our sin, so there's just no more wrath left over for us. There's no need for it to go anywhere." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #1 - To Show Us God's Love: Drive Home (19:32)*

"When we look at the cross we look at the cross with almost a confused view. Is the cross a picture of God loving us through Jesus? Or is it a picture of God wrathing against Jesus and then we call that love? I would say that that latter view goes beyond scripture." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #1 - To Show Us God's Love: Drive Home (23:28)*

Teaching in Mark 8 "In verse 31 it says right after that that he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed and after 3 days rise again. When there is wrath, when there is violence at the cross as Jesus teaches it, it is what people would be doing to him, not suffering at the hands of God, but suffering at the hands of others.

Why Did Jesus Die? #6 (38:09)

NOTE: The following quotes are taken from "Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home". This entire podcast is just an argument against Penal Substitutionary Atonement

"Let's not rally around a theory that is scripturally nebulous that the church didn't even hold onto until the protestant reformation in anyway. That was a completely novel way of thinking. Lets not make that our hill to die on. Which, for many people it is assumed that penal substitutionary atonement just simply is the gospel. We need to challenge that, and say no, that turns faith into a work, it says once you have this particular doctrine figured out, then you can be saved by it. I'd say this goes way beyond scripture. And at some point becomes contradictory to it." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home (4:27)*

"Penal substitutionary atonement would say I want to forgive these people says the Father. Therefore, I will kill my Son and pour my judgement out on him, then I can forgive these people and that is the Father crushing his Son. And another way of looking at it though is the Father saying I want to forgive those people, I want to love these people, I want to forgive these people. I know in the process they will

reject my Son, but I even want to use that to bring about their salvation. So, I am sending my Son to them, knowing that this whole process will crush him, knowing he will die at their hands, knowing I am killing my Son by sending my Son to his death at their hands. But my Son and I together will use his death to absorb their sin and bring about their salvation. This seems to be more in line with the teachings of Jesus, the teachings of epistles, and the teaching of the New Testament. God sends his Son and he is loving us through the sacrifice of his Son, our rejection kills him, that does remove God's wrath, but that's not because God was pouring out his wrath on his Son, we were pouring out our wrath on his Son. I think that second analogy fits with scripture than a father actively killing his own son. I'd say that fits better with Isaiah 53:10." - *Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home (14:55)*

"It almost seems as though Isaiah 53 is a corrective to penal substitutionary atonement"- *Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home (18:22)*

"It seems that the context would teach against penal substitutionary atonement, it seems like we find penal substitutionary atonement within Isaiah 53 as the wrong view people have of the suffering servant."- *Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home (18:44)*

" I do believe for some people, not for everyone, but for some people who've been wrestling with the idea of an angry God, and look to the cross and say I have a hard time seeing God's love there because I've just been told that really God's justice and wrath being poured on Christ, maybe for some people, what I think is a more scriptural understanding of atonement, will help them purify their image of God as a God of love, a God who is Father to us."- *Why Did Jesus Die? #2: Drive Home (36:19)*

"Why is this important?... There are some who write today as if the theory of substitutionary atonement is the gospel even though it's a relatively late development from the mind of Calvin... But even though it's a late development in Christian history it becomes the gospel within certain circles and that, that is divisive and that itself, I think, is a misunderstanding of the gospel. We have to protect what is the gospel and what is not the gospel. Theories about how the gospel works are not the same thing as the good news of Jesus. You are not saved by figuring out your penal substitutionary atonement theory. That's not the gospel, it confuses theology about the gospel with the gospel itself. So, I think anything that attacks the gospel, that confuses the gospel, pollutes the purity of the gospel does need to be highlighted. Secondly, it protects our understanding of who God is. At the point of crucifixion when we look at the cross of Christ we should see God loving us through Jesus, not God wrathing upon Christ. As I said before God is in Christ pouring out his love in that moment not hovering above Christ pouring down his wrath." - *Q&Eh? If God didn't pour out his wrath on Jesus, where did it go?* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QJ4MqvBC0HY> (5:12)

Nicene Orthodoxy and Immutability

"God is so committed to you and loves you and loves us and loves the world that through Jesus God forever alters his own essence and his own experience for eternity to bond with his creation and now God is part human. That's freaky! It's just basic Christian theology actually." - *God Bonded Himself To Us* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qv9k-P7B03E>

""but God can't become something, God simply is, he's immutable'. At least the Greeks say he's immutable, but who came up with the word 'immutable'? 'well he's immutable so that doesn't fit into our systematic theology' well then change your systematic theology!" - *God Bonded Himself To Us* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qv9k-P7B03E>

"Just stick to scripture and the scripture says God BECAME - that means you actually change into something you've never been! He becomes something, he didn't just put on, he became, and then he didn't cease to be the thing he became." - *God Bonded Himself To Us* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qv9k-P7B03E>

"He's planned the rest of his life around us and changed who he is to be bonded with us. That's a lot of love there, it's beautiful." - *God Bonded Himself To Us* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qv9k-P7B03E>

"God, through Jesus became something. That word 'became' is mind blowing. God alters his existence and his experience to become flesh - one with us" - *Did God have to become human in order to save us?* https://youtu.be/whbHxcZDg_M (0:18)

Scripture

Speaking of Mark 1:2 "By the way that was the verse that Bart Ehrman says crumbled his Christianity. Just that one thing because he had been taught the inerrancy of scriptures, the inerrancy of scriptures, the inerrancy of scriptures. Bart Ehrman tells the story of being at seminary and looking at this passage where Mark says 'this is what Isaiah says' and then he goes on to quote Malachi. Simple mistake, anyone could make it, doesn't discredit his testimony we just go 'Oh! He made a mistake' but if you've been taught the inerrancy of scriptures that he can't make a mistake it does become a problem. It's a house of cards, it begins to fall down. By the way he quotes Malachi and then goes on to quote Isaiah, so you realize 'Oh, okay, I see why he even had Isaiah in mind, because he was going to quote Isaiah but first he quoted Malachi and he quoted the whole thing like it was Isaiah' I get that! Not a big deal. And we move on. Unless your faith is built upon the concept of the inerrancy of scriptures, it doesn't allow for that kind of hiccup. That's why I'm fond of always saying that we believe in the authoritative, inerrant, infallible word of God, and his name is Jesus." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Scriptural Inerrancy - You Tube* <https://youtu.be/Anf06bcOhyQ>(0:53)

"The whole concept of the authority of scripture is unscriptural. God has authority, Jesus has authority. He says in the great commission 'all authority has been given to me', not to the scriptures. The authority of the scriptures as scripture is just a weird way of talking that Protestants made up to fight the Catholics! You guys say the Pope has authority, we say only the scriptures have authority and then we started talking about the Bible as though it's an authoritative thing just because we wanted to have a different source of authority than the Catholics. That's why the Catholics called the Protestants 'the people who follow the paper pope'. Because all they had done is imbued what the Catholics said about the Pope in the Bible. And so we went out of the frying pan and into the fire - Protestants were just as confused." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Scriptural Inerrancy - You Tube* <https://youtu.be/Anf06bcOhyQ>(2:05)

"So, when we talk about Sola Scriptura, when we talk about the authority of scripture, ah, it sounds good and I know what you're trying to say but you can set yourself up for a problem. When you talk about the inerrancy of scripture you're actually just starting to make an argument about something that the Bible doesn't even want you to argue about. Paul says to Timothy quite clearly that all scripture is, what? God-breathed or inspired and is - what's the next word - and is (*class says 'useful'*) There ya go! It comes from God and it's useful! You should use it, it's really useful! Try it sometime, really useful book! Use it! (*class laughs*) That's what he says! Comes from God and it's useful! And when you

believe it's from God and you use it that's enough. Then when you build another theology about it's inerrancy what you basically say to the world is 'I double triple dog dare you to find one simple mistake and if you do my whole theology falls to pieces.' So I think why do we even initiate that argument with people? Jesus is the inerrant word of God, in other words he is sinless and he is perfect." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Scriptural Inerrancy - You Tube <https://youtu.be/Anf06bcOhyQ>(2:50)*

Speaking of 1 Corinthians 1:13-17 where Bruxy Cavey accuses Paul of error - "I love that, that's beautiful and brilliant and human and God partners with our fallible memories and to me that doesn't make me question anything because I never expected Paul to be perfect, I expected Jesus to be perfect and Paul's his apostle and I know that God's working with Paul to write scripture and so if his imperfections come out that's great. What do I do with a doctrine of inerrancy over a passage like this? That verse that says 'I thank God I did not baptize any of you' - is that right? 'Well except Crispus and Gaius' - is that right? Or is this right? Or is it this? Which part of it is inerrant? Well it's actually showing errancy! It's showing Paul's errancy and I love that. And I don't have to try and figure that out because Jesus is the authoritative, infallible word of God. How about - oh there's that - no, okay, sorry I could just keep going but that's not my main point here. But it is fun (class laughs)." - *Bruxy Cavey Teaching on Scriptural Inerrancy - You Tube <https://youtu.be/Anf06bcOhyQ>(5:50)*

"Gospel of Thomas, I love Gospel of Thomas. It's written second century and it's just probably too late to have actually been written by Thomas or be directly historical. It may contain some sayings of Jesus, we're not sure, but it's too late to be included. It's the next closest potential candidate for being included in the canon, Gospel of Thomas. Too late, but just missed the mark. I love it, so I read it, I enjoy it, but I don't treat it as scripture. But if it had been included, or if Shepherd of Hermas had been included it would have created a few more discussions - would not have watered down the truth of Jesus. Take out a couple of books, still get to see clearly the truth of Jesus. This is the flexibility of the fact that it's not the specific magical words that you have to quote to make truth happen, it is the over-arching message that survives no matter what. It really does."-*Inspired #1 Drive Home- (35:25) Q&A period at the end*

"It hinders our evangelism to say our faith is based on the authoritative and infallible word of God and say that's the Bible instead of Jesus. It discredits Christ by taking qualities of Christ - his sinless perfection - and trying to attribute those to scripture. And it also sets up Christians for a downfall. Especially young adult Christians who will then head off to university, they take a religious studies class, they learn about some of the basic mistakes that academics are all aware of but pastor's just don't talk about in the church, they've been protected from that. And then when it's talked about plainly in an academic setting their faith is rocked, they're shocked and they feel like their faith is built on a house of cards. Well, it IS if your faith is built on scripture as inerrant it is a house of cards. If it's built on Christ, the solid rock on which we stand then it's based on something sure and perfect and beautiful and powerful and authoritative. So, I want us to excel in evangelism - inerrancy gets in the way. I want us to promote Christ as central, authoritative and perfect - inerrancy gets in the way. And I also want to take care of those Christians who are growing and are going to go into the world and learn about scripture from different voices. I want them to be prepared for that and not to see their faith crumble. Inerrancy is unhelpful rather than helpful as a word, and as a concept." - *Inspired #3 Drive Home- (17:20)*

"So, now some examples of inerrancy, or a lack of inerrancy in the New Testament. We'll stick to the New Testament, there's just so many throughout Scripture but uh, here are three in the New Testament. And this is the stuff that academics are aware of, and talk about, and from an Anabaptist perspective they do not throw us off for a moment but from an Evangelical perspective this can be challenging to someone's faith and it shouldn't be." *Bruxy goes on to point out supposed errors in Mark 1:2, 1*

*Corinthians 1:14-17, and Titus 1:12-13. About Titus 1:12-13 Bruxy Cavey says "So now he (Paul) quotes a secular saying 'Cretans are always liars, evil brutes, lazy gluttons' and then Paul validates it 'clearly this saying is true'. He not only validates what really amounts to a racist slur of an entire people group, he validates it as true and then goes on to give pastoral advice based on that racist slur. 'This saying is true, therefore...' Therefore, in light of the truth of this saying 'rebuke them sharply so they will be sound in the faith.' Now, I think if you pushed Paul to the wall he would admit 'okay maybe not every Cretan is ALWAYS a liar and an evil brute and a lazy glutton' um, I guess that was an overstatement, I get that. And we say 'Paul, should we really base our discipleship on that assumption every time we come across someone who's from Crete? So I have a young woman in my congregation who's from Crete and she's very sensitive and can be easily discouraged but you're saying I should still be sharp with her because she's from Crete?' 'Well, no maybe I over-spoke there' and in fact Paul here is teaching something that is contrary to what he himself teaches in other places. He teaches that in Christ we shouldn't relate to one another according to our ethnicity in Galatians 3. Ethnicity just shouldn't be a factor in our identity within the church. He teaches that we should always think on what is good and what is lovely and what is pure in Philippians. That we should always hold up what is best. He teaches that love believes all things and hopes all things, that is gives the benefit of the doubt in 1 Corinthians 13. Love moves into a situation believing and hoping the best in someone, not assuming the worst before they even get a chance to open their mouth just based on their ethnicity. On multiple points the totality of scripture, just restricting ourselves to the writings of Paul, corrects ourselves. So I'm not thrown off by this. I think Paul, after he had a chance to step back would look at what he wrote here and say 'Wow, I don't even believe this! This is an example of me getting carried away, over-simplifying based on perhaps some very recent experience I've had with some Cretans and I didn't need to say that'. And yet I'm glad it's recorded in scripture - why? - because it encourages me that God uses imperfect people. And even as I listen to the Apostle Paul long enough, I'm not going to judge him! I'm not gonna judge him as someone who is a write-off, I am going to judge this saying as inappropriate, and I am gonna thank God that He has left it in scripture because even through the continued thinking of the Apostle Paul I'm led to see 'oh, I'm glad I didn't write Paul off because Paul sees better than this, Paul himself knows better than this, the Spirit is working through him and is teaching me things about Christ'.-*Inspired #3 Drive Home- (19:03)**

"You know it's interesting we get very magical when we think of the written text of scripture. We treat it like a magical talisman. Like it's words, when quoted, when used have this kind of supernatural quality in and of themselves. Again imbuing it with the power that really is in Christ - the living word of God. But it's interesting because when Paul would speak verbally we wouldn't attribute the same quality to his verbal teaching. You know if I was to ask you the question 'was the Apostle Paul perfect?' you would say 'well no, obviously'. If I were to ask you the question 'Well did everything that the Apostle Paul ever say - was that always perfect? Was everything that he ever said perfect?' you could say 'No, no, obviously not'. Okay, well then how about everything he ever wrote? Do we have to believe that everything he wrote was perfect? Or can we say he was inspired by God to write it down, his imperfections come through but the Holy Spirit was so involved in the process that He uses even the errors, even the imperfections to bring us to the perfect truth of Christ? And that, my friends, is a beautiful thing! Again, some will say 'sounds like liberalism!' and I will say 'no, it sounds scriptural'. So I want to free us up from trying to defend a doctrine that really has its history in the late 1800s, at least according to the word of 'inerrancy' - that word doesn't come into popular existence until about 1880."-*Inspired #3 Drive Home- (27:18)*

"The Bible is the word of God in a penultimate way. Not in an ultimate way. Ultimately the Bible points to Jesus as the ultimate word of God. In a secondary sense the Bible is the word of God." -*Inspired #3 (17:54)*

"We have often tended to turn to scripture as though it is central to our faith, and Jesus should be central to our faith." *Inspired #3 (18:22)*

"So you've got your Bibles open to Colossians 2:17. In context Paul has just raised the issue of religious rules in the Bible. Rules about what day of the week you should worship. Rules about what festivals of the year you should keep. There's all kinds of rules that will come up - dietary laws and other things. So in light of these things Paul says in verse 17 'These' - that is biblical commands, biblical teaching - 'These are a' - what does your text say? 'A shadow of the things that were to come, the reality however, is found in Christ.' Scripture is a shadow of Jesus! It's not the substance of Christ, it's the shadow of Christ. He says these things - and he's talking about Bible teaching, Bible commands - are the shadow that point to Jesus." -*Inspired #3 (20:12)*

"Paul says that's how it is with scripture, it's not the fullness of the revelation, Jesus is. 'OK, Jesus is, how do I get to know Jesus?' - through scripture. But I read scripture now with a christocentric lens, put him at the center of everything. When we fail to do this we'll tend toward biblicism. Biblicism is one step toward bibliolatry. Bibliolatry is becoming an idol worshipper of the Bible, using the Bible like it's an idol. Biblicism is the first steps toward bibliolatry. In biblicism we just subtly begin to use terminology and attitudes and phrases about scripture that really we should be saying about Jesus. Biblicism happens when we imbue the shadow with the qualities of the substance. And we start to relate to the Bible like it has the character of Christ. So we will say things about the bible that really we should be saying about Jesus. What are some examples? Well, we treat the Bible like it's Jesus in three ways. We give it centrality - 'my faith is rooted on scripture, the bible is the center of my life' - well, Jesus should be at the center of your life. The bible will help that happen, but it should be Jesus. We submit to it's authority - 'the authority of scripture!' - well authority, scripturally is a personal concept, it applied to persons, not things. Jesus has all authority. I understand what people mean it's just a misnomer and it breeds a kind of biblicism that can move us off center of Christ. And if we over-emphasize its inerrancy. Notice - 'it, it, it' - these are 'it' things whereas Jesus is a 'he, he, he' thing. It should all be about Jesus." -*Inspired #3 (22:10)*

"I'll say one thing about authority. Again, as we pointed out earlier, to just say the Bible is authoritative can lead to confusion because the Bible does not speak with a univocal voice on many issues. A univocal voice - a one direct voice. Unless you allow the Bible to point you to Jesus just saying the Bible is my authority, well first of all gives credit to a book that belongs to a person. Jesus says 'all authority in heaven and on earth has been given unto me.' Authority in scripture is always referring to the authority of God or the authority that is then vested in Christ. And so when we have questions, I mean, earlier we talked about should I have long hair or short hair? The Bible does not speak in a univocal voice on that. One place says you should have long hair another says you should have short. How about this - should we kill animals to obtain God's forgiveness? Should we kill people who oppose our faith? Should we kill our children when they blaspheme? You can answer these questions yes and no depending on where in the Bible you turn. Who can be a priest? Can women be a leader of God's people? Must we worship God on Saturday? Should all God's people have the Holy Spirit or is it just for some? Does God's blessing mean you will be healthy and wealthy, is that what blessing looks like? Must men be circumcised to please God? We'll stop there before it gets more uncomfortable. The Bible's authority on those subjects is mixed depending on what you turn to! Jesus is the center of authority - that's what it means to be a Christian. The Apostle Paul said in 2 Corinthians 3:6 'He made us confident as ministers of a new covenant, not of the LETTER but of the Spirit. For the letter' - what does the letter do? - 'KILLS'. He didn't say 'for the letter is neutral and not as helpful as the Spirit. The LETTER - 'We will now see what the Bible says because it is my authority' - it'll KILL you, it'll destroy

your spiritual life. It'll lead to a kind of hypocrisy that has done damage to the church for two thousand years. The letter, even the letter of scripture - kills. You will choke on the shell. But the Spirit, the Spirit gives life, and Jesus is at the center of what the Spirit is saying to us." -*Inspired #3 (25:00)*

"To a young leader in the early church, the apostle Paul wrote, All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that all God's people may be thoroughly equipped for every good work. (2 Timothy 3:16-17, TNIV). And there you have it – the apostle Paul's summary theology of the authority of Scripture. What does Paul emphasize about Scripture? He says, "It's... useful." Inerrant? Where is that mentioned? Infallible? In what version? Authoritative? That's not Paul's emphasis. Instead he keeps it simple. The Bible comes to us from God through his people and, therefore, we should use it. To go beyond that is to go beyond Scripture itself. Let me take a moment here to say thank you to the Brethren in Christ for side-stepping Evangelical Christianity's great distraction – the inerrancy debate. What an amazing amount of energy has been invested into a hypothetical doctrine about documents we don't have, that themselves are already a translation of the very words of Jesus. I'm not saying inerrancy is right or wrong, biblical or unbiblical. I simply appreciate that the Brethren In Christ have stayed fast in their conviction that the whole debate is non-biblical. It is not a debate that the Bible itself invites us into. Paul doesn't talk about inerrancy and argue for the letter of the word. In fact he says that kind of argument kills (see 2 Corinthians 3:6 and 2 Timothy 2:14). And remember, when Paul says the letter kills, he is talking about the letter of Scripture. A wrong focus can turn the Bible into a killer. Paul says Scripture is inspired by God, and knowing that should be enough for us to use it." - *The Authority of the Word of God in Print and in Person (Page*

9):http://www.themeetinghouse.com/resources/tmh/teaching_resources/Authority_of_God_in_Word.pdf