

History and Authenticity of the Bible
Lesson 10
The Apocrypha and the Bible

By
Dr. David Hocking

Brought to you by
[The Blue Letter Bible Institute](http://www.blbi.org)
<http://www.blbi.org>

A ministry of
The Blue Letter Bible
<http://www.blueletterbible.org>

The Apocrypha, it was not a part of the Bible of Jesus or the early church. Never once is the Apocrypha so recognized, ever. Almost the sure thing that condemned it is that the Puritans said, "Why isn't it ever quoted in the Bible?" Now that opens Pandora's Box. Is it quoted in the Bible? That's a good question. Don't answer yes or no until you really know. Go to the book of Jude for one example. [Jude 14-15](#).

Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." [Then the commentary of Jude continues.]
These are murmurers, complainers...

Now [Jude 14-15](#) has a fascinating connection to 1 Enoch 1:9, in which something very similar is said. Now contrary to what some people say that this is a quote from the Apocrypha, we don't know that at all. It is possible that the apocryphal book is quoting a well known fact among Jews. First of all, the Apocrypha didn't come up with Enoch being the seventh from Adam, but the Bible does. And where is that fact found?—in the book of [Genesis 5:1-19](#). You see, you have to be careful of what you're saying.

Jude, how did he get the information that Enoch prophesied the Lord's coming with ten thousands of his saints? Well, he got it directly from the Lord. The Lord told him that's what Enoch said. Now every time you see a quotation like that in somebody else's writing, the question always comes up, "Who authored it?" So is this a quotation from the Book of Enoch? If it's literal, the answer is no because it's not exact, but it's very similar. So now what do we do?

Well, let me give you another one. Do you believe that the story of Noah and the Flood is a compilation of what happened and a group of quotations from forty different flood stories in

forty different cultures and languages in the ancient world that we believe existed before the Bible? Why not? For the same reason! In my book, *Rise and Fall of Civilization*, I list what are the common facts between all the flood stories in mythology and the Bible's account. And I list the similarities. There's a key man whom God chooses. There's a boat. There's the salvation of eight people. There's a worldwide flood. There's the death of everything. You know, there are a lot of similarities. But a lot of them are wildly mythological. So does the Bible simply pull them all together, streamline the story and make it sound more plausible? And the Bible is simply quoting all of these apocryphal, hidden documents about the Flood. Or listen carefully, or is the truth that there was a Flood? And that forty different cultures remind us that there was a flood? And that the only accurate account of that is in the Bible?

Do you see now how easily you can become a skeptic and a critic of the Bible? You can see the reason from an apologetic point of view, why someone would attack the story of the Flood from the Bible. "Oh, that's just an ancient myth," and so forth. Wait a minute! Why would it be in forty different cultures and languages if it did not occur? See the fact that it occurred is proven by that, not that the Bible "cleaned up the account" and made it more plausible for modern man to read—and "modern man" meaning four or five hundred years before Christ.

Is it not also plausible that this is not a quotation from the Apocrypha at all, but that Enoch actually did say that? Is it also possible that Enoch was well known to have been a preacher of prophecy? Was it also possible that the heart and soul of his message was that unless you repent, the Lord's going to come, not with the Second Coming of Christ but with ten thousand of his saints, his angels, to destroy the world? It was a message of judgment as is clear from verse 15.

Now, isn't it also interesting that Enoch named his son, Methuselah? The oldest man who ever lived. *Muth* means: when he dies. *Selah*, which you have a lot in the Psalms, kind of means like: "It's done, Praise God!" There are reasons for saying *selah*. I'm not going to give all those to you right now, but simply to say a primary idea is like: amen! and right on! So be it and let's

praise God because of it! "Methuselah: when he dies, it shall come." Now what's going to come when he dies? The Flood. You see the answer to the prophecy is the Flood. All of that you find in the Bible. You don't find anywhere else, including the Book of Enoch.

So now when people tell you that the Bible quotes the Apocrypha, now you have a little bit more knowledge. Whether it does or not, we don't know. By the way, I'm not troubled if it does. Why?—because if it's an accurate fact, God could take an accurate fact in history and record it also in the Bible. This is a very important issue.

Well let me give you a more troublesome one. Go to Hebrews 11. Now in Hebrews 11, it is claimed the Apocrypha is quoted twice. Now we will see whether that's true or not here in a moment. Now in [Hebrews 11:35](#), you notice right after the first phrase that: "women received their dead raised to life again." The next words say "and others." Do you see that? Now in Greek you have "others of the same kind" and you have "others of a different kind" indicated by the different Greek word. It is interesting right here, in fact, a lot of Bible teachers who notice it are fascinated the way the passage is organized. Because up until this verse, notice that all of the great leaders who suffered that are listed, all were victorious, every last one of them. "Through faith they subdued kingdoms, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, waxed valiant, turned to flight the armies, women received dead raised alive"—all victorious!

The next word said "and others" [of a different kind] and now none of them are victorious. "Tortured, trials of cruel mocking..." The only victory there is awaiting the future resurrection, but in this life, nothing. "Stoned, sawn asunder...and since we are encompassed with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run a race with endurance" ([Hebrews 12:1](#)). "For you have forgotten the exhortation to you, the Lord chastens His children" ([Hebrews 12:5](#)). See, His issue is going to be suffering in this present life and sometimes you never get an answer to it, until you die. Will you still be faithful to the Lord? You see, a lot of people miss that context in Hebrews.

Now the Apocrypha fans say that there are two facts here that can only be explained by the Apocrypha. First, in [Hebrews 11:35](#), the very first thing says, "others [of a different kind] were tortured not accepting deliverance." The word torture in Greek, *tympanum*, it's a large drum, but it was also a wheel. What they did was people were stretched on that, beaten, often dismembered, their bodies torn apart. Now why do people believe that is a quote from the Apocrypha? Because in the second Book of Maccabees it mentions that victims of the Maccabean wars, which takes you down to the second century, A.D. 167 - 164 primarily, when Antiochus Epiphanes came in and Judas Maccabeus and his family got a great victory, but eventually lost and the Maccabeans then were publicly tortured on these wheel-like drums. Their bodies stretched out and their arms and legs pulled apart. So they say that's specifically referring to that story in the Maccabees.

My answer to that—is it not possible that there were many people tortured in the same way because that particular method was used for several hundred years? Is it not possible that there were many believers who were tortured that way? Now, did it really refer to Judas Maccabeus? I don't know. Many people thought he was the Messiah. Was he a true believer like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? I don't know any of that. I'm trusting he was, I don't know. We get our Feast of Hanukkah from that event, by the way. And Jesus attended one in the Gospel of John, called the Feast of Dedication. Now it does not say that it was Judas Maccabeus who was tortured, does it? So to say that this is a quotation from the Apocrypha is a little misleading. We have no evidence of that. Were they also tortured in this way, on the tympanum? Yes they were. Were others tortured that way? Yes they were. I'll leave it up to you to judge.

Let me give you the other one, down in [Hebrews 11:37](#) it says, "They were stoned and they were sawn asunder." Now there is no Old Testament passage that talks about sawing somebody in two—none. But in the apocryphal writing called the Ascension of Isaiah in 5:1-14, it talks about Isaiah being sawn in two by the false prophets of Manasseh. It's a thrilling story by the way and it may in fact be true. But I'm asking you, if Isaiah's name mentioned there? No.

Were there other people who were sawn asunder? Yes. In other words, all these things, do they represent individual Old Testament or apocryphal stories? No, I don't think that's the point at all. Why say "others" without mentioning them? Why even have it like that? "Others had trial, mocking, scourging, bonds, stoned, sawn asunder, tempted, slain, wandered about in sheep's skins and goat skins." Now we have to say, which person was it in history that wore goat skin rather than sheep skins? Do you understand? It's nonsense doing this. All it's telling us is that lots of people suffered for their faith without naming any particular story.

So, is it in fact true that people were sawn in two in the past? Yes. Is it a fact that they were put on this drum-like wheel, like the tympanum? Is it a fact that they were tortured in that manner? Yes. Are these quotations from the Apocrypha? That is a huge leap and a leap into the dark.

So, does your teacher believe that there are quotations from the Apocrypha in the Bible? The answer is flat out no. I support the Puritans and I believe that there is no quotation from the Apocrypha found in God's word.

And by the way, don't think the Apocrypha hasn't been touched up. The Council of Trent did a number on that to make sure we'd have all the doctrines that Luther said were not in the Bible would be there. If you have not read the Maccabees on purgatory, you might question where the Catholics get their doctrine of purgatory. Well, it comes right out of Maccabees. And Luther said "isn't it interesting, he who made an edition to the German Bible and put the Apocrypha in a separate section from it, argued publicly in court that the Roman doctrine of purgatory was not found in the Bible yet it's clearly found in the Book of Maccabees," which was the answer of the Roman Church. He said, "But the Roman Church has never made those books canonical." Well, guess what they did?—from 1540 to 1547 they made them canonical! They became a part of the Bible. So did the Roman Catholic Church add them? Or have we taken them away? See how the argument goes? And they said, "Well even though we didn't have a church

decision to make them canonical, they were in many Bibles throughout history." And that is true.

Is everybody still with me?

All the Church Fathers, early Church leaders before the time of Constantine, what we call pre-Nicene Fathers, all separated them from what they thought was canonical Scriptures, what was actually the word of God. They never made them a part of the word of God. And as I said, it's not included as Scripture until the Council of Trent.

Student: In [Acts 20:35](#) there is a direct quote from First Clement.

You mean, "It's more blessed to give than to receive"? If you don't know, that simple remark could have been said by multitudes of people, you're indeed naïve. I could see our Lord saying that numerous times. Does that truly reflect God? All it says is, "the words of our Lord." Paul said that he received all of his writings by direct revelation. Do you understand the attempt to find that quote? I can find that quote in books today. Is there anything more simple or sublime than to say, "It's more blessed to give than to receive"? You see, this is a number that people are doing on you. Back up and think. It isn't a quotation from that. Paul says it's a quotation from the lips of the Lord Jesus. And he says in Galatians 1 that Jesus directly told him all these things. You have the same problem in 1 Corinthians 7. They claim that out of the Apocrypha is where you get the divorce laws, from the Wisdom of Sirach. Remember when it says, "I say this by permission and not by commandment." All he means is that the Lord did not have anything to say about this; but he, through the direct revelation of God, has given us the information about such things as the unbeliever married to the believer issue, which the Lord never spoke about.

Yes?

Student: So what you're saying is that instead of the Bible quoting another work, both of these works are equally recording a common saying or a common event.

David: Or a truth. Let's just look at it another way. Yes or no. Is there a Bible truth in secular books before the time of Christ? Of course there's Bible truth! Truth is truth! Are they Scripture? No. Do they contain statements that are also in the Bible? Yes. Let me put it to you

another way. Are there passages in the Talmud which are reflected in the Bible? Oh yeah, many of them. Does that mean that the Bible got it off of the Talmud? No. In fact, from my point of view, it deals with the dating of the Scripture itself. It proves the dating of the Scripture, that the Scriptures were not composed at the time of Christ and so they fit in all the prophecies so that He would fulfill them all. It proves it, not only the Dead Sea Scrolls but also the Talmud's usage of things. The Babylonian Talmud especially is from the time of Babylon, which means these events had to occur before that they're writing about. I mean, I could go on and on. It just gets mind boggling.

The point is that you are hearing something in this class that probably is going across the grain of what a lot of guys like to say when they teach. They think these things are from the Apocrypha, try to prove a point from it and they go to all kinds of gymnastics about it. I think the total job on us in this area is totally unnecessary. I don't think there's any proof of it whatsoever.

I have mentioned that there is a story in the Ascension of Isaiah about Isaiah being sawn in half by the false prophets of Manasseh. Whether it happened I do not know. Since it is not Scripture, I cannot guarantee the accuracy of it.

The Apocrypha has similar language in it. But once again, where did Jude get his information? Was he reading the Apocrypha and said, "That's a nice note, I'll put that in here"? That is exactly the opposite. You see, when we get in the issue of canon, we are going to discuss whether or not something is Scripture or canon. And that's very crucial to this whole argument of our Bible and how we know what is Scripture or not.

Class, let's say that nothing is clear in this discussion. Would it be true that the discussion proves my point about the need of understanding how we got our Bible? Could you not see that the same facts presented by a different teacher, let's say, could literally undermine your confidence in the Scripture? Can't you see that? That's why this issue is so vital and so important. That's why we have to deal with it. But these views—you know, it's been true in evangelicalism,

I hate to admit it—we have accommodated ourselves to the world. We try to compromise with it, which is what they do on this issue, they try to compromise.

The Puritans would say, “no compromise.” It all came by direct revelation, the instruction of the Holy Spirit guiding these men. They were never left up to deciding for themselves, ever. And yet we have a host of evangelicals who say, “Well we see different personalities, different vocabulary and so forth. So you know, I mean. Maybe the Lord just kind of protected it, but you know, they gave their own opinion.” Now if you haven’t read that, it’s everywhere. And one of our purposes is that you understand what the Bible says about itself also. Of course we haven’t gotten to any of this subject yet.

If you’re going to be a Bible teacher there are four areas that you ought to know. First would be the area of biblical studies, learning as much Bible as you can. There’s also the area of theological studies, the doctrine of God, doctrine of Christ...learning systematic theology. Third area is biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek. And the fourth area is ancient history. History parallels the Bible.

There are many historical and geographical inaccuracies in the Apocrypha. I don’t treat history and geography lightly. When people say there are contradictions in the Bible, I say, name one! One thing you need to understand, the most accurate account of ancient history, the most clear-cut teaching of geography is found in the Bible. There isn’t a history book in the past that equals it.

Now mind you, before the ability to have satellite photos or maps or whatever, this is a proof to me of divine revelation. You see, God had to tell these people. There’s no way they could have known. He had to give them the exact information about geography and locations they had never been to. And there was no history book to open and look at the map. So, that’s another issue that I think is very, very fundamental to the issue of the Bible’s accuracy. We know that geographically the Bible is right on target. We know when they said “they went up to Jerusalem,”

we know now why, because it's at 3,000 feet elevation. We know why you go "down" to Jericho, because it's below sea level.

Let me give you another one, how important it is seen in even the technicalities of rolling a stone in front of the grave of the Lord Jesus. The Greek indicates that it was on an incline. I think that's very fascinating, because in the garden tomb—if in fact that is the tomb of Jesus—there's a trough in front of it where these giant stones rolled and it is on an incline. That's how they get ten to twenty guys behind that thing and push it with their backs and everything just to get it to roll. Then it would roll down and there's a brace at the end and it locks it in front of the door. And no one is going to be able to push it up the incline. The angel rolled away the stone. He rolled it up. Those are things that people say, "Oh that's just a little detail." But you see, my view of inspiration is so tight and so detailed that I believe every detail related to geography, history, whatever, is exactly on target. I don't think there's any question.

Herodotus is filled with inaccuracies. If I told you to read Xenophanes, it's filled with inaccuracies. The truth of the matter is the Bible is the only accurate account. Why is ancient history filled with inaccuracies? Because they didn't have maps, satellite photos, anything else. There is a lot of guess work there. But there's no guess work in the Bible. So scientists are always amazed at how the Bible seems to have accurate remarks. How did this happen, these good guesses? Terrific guesses! But that doesn't turn you off from reading history.

I was being asked about that obelisk stone I mentioned and about the Assyrian list of kings. It is in the Oriental Museum in Chicago and on that list there is no mention of the name Sargon. And at the time I went to seminary and they'd found that, they made a big issue over that being the first known contradiction of the Bible that they could prove because the Bible mentions Sargon as one of the great Assyrian kings. So, everybody's panicking because here is the Assyrian list of kings on this obelisk stone and Sargon's name is not there. Now that problem, you'll be happy to know, has all been resolved because we not only found the ruins of Sargon's palace, but we found his name engraved in every brick. And added to that, we also found why his

name is not on the Assyrian list of kings. Because the king who followed him knew about his popularity and so he blotted his name off the list of the kings, so nobody would pay attention to him (Sargon). You've got a lot of that kind of stuff in Egypt. They knocked the idols down. "Get rid of that guy. I don't want to hear about him again. I'm king!" I mean, you have all kinds of stuff like that.

Does the Nile River really flow from heaven to the earth? "Oh, if you go upstream you discover its original source is way in the sky." No! If you go up-river you would find out, it is just a river. But since they had never been up there...you understand what I'm saying? So, are there inaccuracies in mythological literature? Oh yeah, lots of them. Does that mean we shouldn't study them? No! You study because there are lots of interesting things. We need to be "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," you know (cf. [Matthew 10:16](#)).

One of the interesting things about the Apocrypha is that it has what we call a lack of prophetic spirit. You know, you read the Bible and there is a punch there. "Thus saith the Lord!" And it's lacking in the Apocrypha, it's not there. In fact, the more you read the Apocrypha the more aware you are. If you have read the Bible quite a bit, then you read the Apocrypha, these two are not the same. And there is a lower level of writing, especially in the Old Testament. You have some of the most beautifully-worded sentences in all the world. I don't care if it was in Hebrew and translated into English or what language. God has a way of expressing, especially about His own character and attributes, just gorgeous ways! "Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised and His greatness is unsearchable" ([Psalm 145:3](#)).

And then to read a verse that says, "Hey, God's cool." It lacks. You understand?

You say, "But we use that word today."

"No. It just doesn't match it, see. His glory and majesty fills the universe."

"Hey, God's everywhere."

Well, true, but... Do you understand what I'm saying? You are missing in the Apocrypha the level of writing that you read in the Scriptures.

By the way, I also believe that is true about the Book of Mormon. If you were a Mormon, I'm sorry, I don't want to offend you, but it is not the word of God. If you're talking about an individual saint trusting God to open his heart to it, I mean it lacks! Even when these guys are translating the Bible, they often confess that they didn't quite capture it. I think there is an infinite majesty to God's wonderful word. Well, more about that later. But the New Testament refers to what is in the Apocrypha, [Jude 14](#), [Hebrews 11:35](#), but does not site it as Holy Scripture. It sites it in the same way that Paul referred to heathen poets, if in fact, it is reciting it.

That's what I would call the heart of this course—I don't want you just to know all these interesting facts about the manuscripts and all of that—I want you to know why we believe this is the word of God. That is what I want you to know. I want you to stand on it so much that you feel guilty if you haven't consulted it for wisdom in your life because you know this is from God.

Let's start with the definition of inspiration. No doctrine has suffered more in the last half of the twentieth century than the doctrine of inspiration. And there are a lot of doctrines that are suffering, that's for sure, from sloppy teaching. But there's nothing more serious in our time than the doctrine of inspiration. Isn't it interesting that it parallels the attempt to have a modern English translation? Since 1950, especially with the introduction of the Revised Version in 1952, there have been a plethora of translations. They were just coming out right and left. It is interesting to me that the struggle over the meaning of inspiration is occurring at the same time that we have all these many attempts to translate the Bible more in the language of the people.

Now, I'm for any translation that will help us understand the original text. Don't misunderstand! I just think the strategy of Satan is somehow involved here; if you wanted to undermine people's confidence in the Bible, boy that would be one way to do it! Just keep telling them that "No, the new Bible we have is better than the old one, because the old one doesn't really say it right. This new one is the one that is really going to help you now." Do you understand? If you keep doing that, where does it lead? So everybody who buys the one this year,

then hears about another one. "Oh no, they did a pretty good job, but wait until you read the next one!"

The King James Version, though beautiful, it uses many monosyllabic words. Which is easier, if you're not acquainted with English, to say *know*? Or to say *comprehend*? Well, of course, "to know." The Bible is very simple in the King James. But you know what we do? We run to the archaic word. So, I experimented with my new friend. I thought "I'm going to turn him to Daniel and see what he thinks about the sackbut and the psaltery, to see what he says about that. So, I turned to it and he read that and I said, "What do you think?"

He says, "Well, they're obviously musical instruments."

"Well, you're right. How do you know that?"

He said, "I don't know."

I said, "Well, maybe they are just guitars."

"No, that doesn't sound 'Bible' to me."

This guy's never seen a Bible! "How do you know if it sounds 'Bible' or not if you've never read it?"

"I don't know. I just expect it to be like God-talk or something."

Let me tell you something, we need a little reality in this class. You know what all this stuff is doing? It is confusing Mister Average Christian out there. It is confusing him. Then to have the preacher get up and correct the King James all the time. "Well, you know what it really says is...." What it really says? What gives you the right to say what it really says? That's different than saying "the original meaning of this word is...but what it really means is...." How do you know what it really means?

Are you following what I'm trying to tell you? We are undermining people's confidence in the Bible and we don't even know that it's happening. So consequently, the average Christian today doesn't really know what the meaning of inspiration is at all. They don't understand it.

They think you're talking about, you know, Shakespeare was inspired and he wrote his stuff. And it must be the same thing. "To be or not to be, that is the question" you know. No, it's not that!

I've given you a definition that I hope you will think about. It's simple, but I want you to know it.

Course Definition of Inspiration

"Inspiration is the act of God
by which *His* revelation is
communicated, in written form,
to the very creatures from whom
He wanted a response."

"The act of God,"—boy, is that important! This isn't an act of man. We are going to walk through this, but this is the definition. "The act of God, by which *His* revelation" not somebody else's, *His* revelation, what He intended for the creatures that He created to know and understand about Himself and what He has done. It is the act of God by which *His* revelation is what?—"communicated." The whole thing is that God who made us certainly has the intelligence since He made us, to communicate with the very creatures that He Himself wanted a response from. How did He do that?

Well, the Bible records that the heavens declare something about Him, "the glory of God." But according to the Bible itself, it is His communication in written form. Interesting isn't

it that the Bible was never given to us until man was writing? Why? Because it's been God's intention from eternity past to give us His revelation in written form. That is what we mean by inspiration.

Now class if I ask you on a test, there are two passages that I want you to know. And in the future, twenty years from now, if you are trying to help somebody understand how the Bible was given or whatever, these two passages tell it to us.

[2 Timothy 3:16-17](#) and [2 Peter 1:19-21](#). So turn in your Bibles because all we are going to be able to do is just read them or just get started here. The last book that Paul wrote of fourteen epistles, [2 Timothy 3:16-17](#).

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

The key phrase, "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," is three words in Greek, three words in Greek. The word "all" or "every"; the word "scripture," *graphe*, writing, every writing, and a compound word, "God-breathed." That's what we call an action noun. It's a predicate nominative really. All Scripture is God-breathed.

Now go to 2 Peter 1. We will break down these passages later. [2 Peter 1:19-21](#). "We have also a more sure word of prophecy." More sure than what? This is interesting. If you look at the verses preceding it, there was a direct revelation from God on the Mount of Transfiguration that Peter's referring to.

When he heard a voice that said, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." "We were with Him," he says, "in the holy mount." And now for him to say, "we have a more sure word of prophecy." The only way that could be interpreted is if it was written, so that we then could still have it, not based on hearsay, of somebody who heard it 1900 years ago.

It says, "Whereunto you do well, that you take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place." You want the light to come on? You go to the sure word of prophecy we've got. "Until the day dawn and the day star rises in your hearts." Until that sweet day God calls you home or you meet the Lord, God gave you something He expects you to pay attention to. And it will turn the lights on in your life. "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture," what does Scripture mean, class? Writing. That's all it means. Writing. *Graphe*. "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the writing." Apparently there is something that is *the writing*.

It says, "Is of any private interpretation." Yet, there are evangelical teachers telling folks all the time, that what happened was they were privately interpreting events they saw and God was kind of guiding them. But the Bible says none of it is of any private interpretation: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man."

"Well they were kind of, you know, evaluating what they saw, heard from Christ and wrote down their opinion of it." No. No, the Bible says, "it did not come by the will of man, but holy men of God ([2 Peter 1:21](#))." Were they pure? Sinless? No! Holy means separate, they were separated for the task. That's why they become holy men of God. The same thing is said in [Ephesians 2:20](#). "The holy apostles and prophets laid the foundation of the church, which is the Scripture."

"No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but [these men who were separated for this process] these holy men of God, spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" ([2 Peter 1:21](#)). Did the Holy Ghost come in and clean up their act so that whatever was wrong then? No. It said that they never even spoke except by His superintending work. Until He guided them, they never even spoke. That's what it says, which is reversed from what some people teach in the Christian colleges and seminaries of our country.

So folks, we are on a hot subject here and it's going to be fun. Let's pray.

Father in heaven, thank You so much for Your wonderful love to us and thank You that we do have a sure word of prophecy and we do have a word that is profitable for everything in life and will make us equipped for every good work. May we trust You more, Lord. May we adhere to Your word more and more each day. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.