

## Evidence/Indicators that God has manifested Himself via Biblical Inspiration/Preservation.

1. There is evidence for inspiration; however, evidence enough must be coupled with faith, which biblically is not a blind leap in the dark, but going toward the unseen God based upon the evidence moving you that way, which can come in various forms. "faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen." Ultimately faith is a gift of God, coming from God's Word itself (Romans 10:17, Ephesians 2:8), but God couples it with evidential indicators as we draw nigh to him, seeking him in spirit and truth. These evidential indicators are insufficient to bring one to faith in Christ, since one may not seek them and/or be blind to their value; they merely are God's confirmatory manner in providing his people with reasonable grounds for trusting in him via his Word. A sinful heart rejecting and rebelling against God will not be convinced or converted based upon these evidential indicators alone but will need transforming, forgiving supernatural grace, which is available upon a humble heart. The individual's response to the desire of his heart is of prime importance in coming to spiritual truth about God, salvation, and his Word. God does promise "and ye shall seek me and find me, if ye shall search for me with all thine heart." "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble." "A broken and contrite heart, thou wilt not despise." Intellectual objections are often formulated and sustained via deeper intrinsic core heart issues. Only when it changes, will there be means to dethrone the intellectual barriers often accompanying it. I suggest one Pray and seek the possibility of spiritual awakening if they are to be truly genuine and objective. If not, they have dismissed such before they ever began and shut out and down a possibility for real change due to sinful preference of wanting to live in spiritual idolatry, which they are deceived is better, or that isn't real, or they aren't in it, but is exactly the blinded spiritual condition that is keeping them from seeing it. Grace is necessary, but individual free will allows grace in or shuts it out. Based on your response will determine your earthly and eternal destiny. I pray you make the right one, towards rather than against God's Will for you in your life. Here are the points for consideration of the objective seeker. If you aren't, you may stop now, but I ask you not to comment as an unbeliever unless you read a significant portion of the post. Otherwise, you would be speaking from ignorance and wasting time. The post is lengthy, but you can read it in spurts in your own time.
2. There are good reasons for accepting a monotheistic God, including teleological, ontological, moral, and cosmological arguments (attested in different posts). For example, there is much evidence of real design via biological information, which has qualities of design and whose origins cannot be explained away via the Selection/mutation process imagined by GTE advocates (see my posts on genetics and entropy). Additionally, finetuning is also suggestive of design since neither random chance nor physical necessity can explain it, leaving only the 3<sup>rd</sup> option of design (see my post on finetuning). Further, design is attested by multiple symbiotic relationships, which could never all come about at the same time by the proposed naturalistic mechanisms, but indeed clearly bespeak of designing intelligence to bring them all about in all of their complexities at the same time to allow for lifeforms to exist with such finetuned/balanced/interdependent relationships. Moreover, objective aesthetic beauty would not exist in a randomly produced universe but fits well in a designed one. In addition, it is reasonable that there is an ultimately objective real moral right and wrong suggesting a moral lawgiver, as well as conscious existence, which is utterly incomprehensible on a materialistic view of origins. Furthermore, a true beginning testified by science and philosophy, renders a beginner most certain, since nothing that began to exist is uncaused; for if it were, science would cease, since science deals with a search for causes. This cause must be uncaused to avoid infinite regress, thus singular bespeaking of monotheism. Eternal matter/energy would never be the eternal first cause, since it has a change of states, and change suggests time, and with time there is a beginning making whatever physical states that may have hypothetically existed in the past, not truly eternal, but with a true beginning. Only an immaterial reality not consisting of physical parts/elements would be sufficient to be eternal, or timeless without a beginning as it would not be subject to the laws of chemistry/physics that physical properties are. So any proposed beginning by naturalists in any hypothetical model fails (multiverse, oscillating, quantum vacuum, gravitational, standard, and so forth), since on all models natural states of change can't avoid the time, thus avoiding a beginning. Further, implying a beginning is due to the entropic nature of energy, which the 2<sup>nd</sup> law of thermodynamics indicates that all energy-producing different states, yielding work outputs, undergo changes that involve loss of information, tending toward randomness. This law implies that energy output decreases with time, thus having a beginning, as changing states involve loss of information, so could not

be eternal. An immaterial first cause would avoid this problem since it is not subject to the physics of energy states of change and loss toward randomness. On another point, the truth would not be knowable, nor important in such a naturalistic/materialistic randomly produced universe that came from nothing for no reason at all and returns to nothing for no reason at all, where humans and other organisms would be mere moist robots, chemically/electrically reacting along tissue via deterministic naturalistic causal relations, thus there would be no true reasoning going on at all, as all reality than would be perception internally locked in the matrix of the skull. But on theism, where immateriality is real and a designing intelligent mind exists, then immaterial minds exist independently of material matter/tissue, allowing for transcendence of materialistic moist chemical reactions for true reasoning to happen and epistemological truth is possible, having been caused by an ultimate material mind imposing immaterial minds as ours with such capabilities, translated along material means of brain output, which renders the brain a vehicle and transmitter of thought in our physical world, not the essence and source of thought to start with as materialists falsely associate. If it were the source of thought, which it is not, thought would be nothing more than brain gas from chemical/electrical reactions/processes, which there could hardly be any true reasoning taking place, thus the thought/reasoning/evidence process we use would be utterly untrustworthy. Theism explains rationality/logic/immaterial due to an eternal mind, which is immaterial; therefore, it allows for immaterial existence, but in a no-God worldview, there isn't sufficient justification or source for immaterial existence. It seems clear that thoughts/reason/laws of logic, morality, and math exist, and concepts of justice, truth, and love are real, so immateriality is real. On a materialistically originated universe, there is no cause for such immaterial essence, thus our existence consisting of material and immaterial realities fits far better on theism, which allows such immaterial essences to exist than atheism/materialism/naturalism, which can't comfortably explain their origin, thus theism more comprehensively explains the whole of existence, but atheism can hardly explain any of it. For these and other reasons, at minimum, we have sufficient justification to warrant a monotheistic God's existence plausibly more probable than not for the cause of reality.

3. Even if one wasn't personally convinced by these types of arguments, the logic of them rightly discerned yields God as necessary; however, even the possibility of God's existence alone would render God's existence a certainty as argued in the ontological argument of maximal being (see my post on Maximal Greatness).
4. Even rejecting tenet 2 of possibility's foregone conclusion for certainty of a maximally great being, the possibility of God, should cause us to seriously consider that there is a revelation from God and question what revelation may be from this possible God since that possibility would mean that the subject is not merely academic trivially important, but yours' and one's eternity may and probably would be at stake. So casual dismissal is utterly unwise and intellectually lazy, thus one should seriously consider the following points objectively, since if you are wrong, you potentially end up under wrath eternally. But if atheism were hypothetically true, an impossibility, then you end up in annihilation, as does everybody and everything else, rendering any beliefs/causes/actions we have/do ultimately meaningless, since it all ends in nothingness, coming from nothing aimless randomness, with nothing to show for it, as existence would be an utter exercise of futility, making everything and everyone, and every debate we have is utterly moot; there would be no right/wrong/true/false/good/bad/reasonable/unreasonable, just absurdity of meaninglessness on such a no God worldview as many atheistic existential thinkers have astutely pointed out. So a fight against the bible or God, morality or anything else, mundane, secular or religious comes to nothing, since there are no winners in such a worldview. However, a fight against it is to stay out of hell if it is true since if it is, one goes there if one isn't saved, and this is a major catalyst for atheists rigorously wanting it to be false and God not to be true, but to no avail, because God does exist, and as we shall see the Bible is true.
5. The major premises (1. Independent of God there is no ultimate right and wrong. 2. There is an ultimate right and wrong, leading to the conclusion, 3. There is a God) for moral argument for God is well supported (see my posts on morality), suggesting that God is the ultimate objective standard or source for morality, which means he is the ultimate moral lawgiver, thus all good and right reside in God as the moral first cause for all true effects of our moral consciousness. As such, God must be ultimately good, with no evil, immorality or wrong, or unfaithfulness, apathy, indifference, lack of love, or justice against evil to his existence. It logically is impossible that the moral first cause would have immorality to him. So whatever true good is, the moral first cause would have it, and we would share this to a lesser degree as an effect of

his causing it, imposed upon us by God via conscience, the Word, and the Holy Spirit and creation (see my post 4 mechanisms). We then could not have a superior morality on any point than the moral first cause, God himself, which violates principles of causality, a logical impossibility.

6. Love is the most supreme quality of morality, thus the ultimate standard of morality, God himself would have this quality to its utmost degree, thus being maximally loving in the maximal greatness of his maximal morality. This means God and love would be inseparable. Hence, any religious viewpoint that does not have a loving God would be false. Interestingly, the Islamic God is not relationally loving, but the biblical God is as the bible says, "God is love," "For God so loved the world..." "But God commendeth his love toward us..." and so forth. Love doesn't mean God wouldn't be just since justice flows from love of good, thus God would disdain evil, which is the opposite of love, hence meaning God would justly punish evil, that which opposes good and love. So God's justice as exhibited in the Bible in judging sinners via death (physical, spiritual) would not be a defeater to his love, but an indicator of it. God being loving would mean he wouldn't leave us without guidance, truth, care, help, etc. Therefore, his love implies a means of guidance and direction for those who would avail themselves of such and be willing to be under God's provision. Therefore, there must be an adequate vehicle for this guidance. Communication is necessary from God, hence there must be two-way access, we to God, God to us as logically necessary for a loving God. Therefore, prayer and the Word of God are mandatory if God is lovingly providing guidance to those who would choose to be under his provision and protective care. Without the Word of God, God could not be loving. So any religious doctrines that deny a Word of God, inherently leave an unloving God. This renders much of deism logically indefensible. Interestingly the Bible itself says God will guide us via his Word. "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him and he shall direct thy paths." How? "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Through? "All scripture is given by inspiration of God..." These verses are logically consistent with what we would expect of a loving God, so we have good reason to believe them.
7. God is truly and ultimately good with no evil or unfaithfulness as supported by the moral argument for God as mentioned in point 2 would mean that God could not be uncaring, unloving, callous, insensitive, indifferent, apathetic, unfaithful, unholy in any way whatsoever. This means he would not leave his prime creation without a means of knowing him, his ways, truth, laws, morality, salvation, and so forth. If he did, he would not be ultimate goodness, this wouldn't be the moral first cause for morality, which would then lead to a logical absurdity. Fittingly the Bible claims such good qualities of God. These claims don't make it such, but they fit with exactly what we would expect based upon the logic of a guiding, loving, faithful, caring God who is not indifferent, unkind, or apathetic, which logic demands of the morally maximally great first cause for objective morality. "Great is thy faithfulness," "thy mercies fail not," "Truly God is good" "Good and upright is the Lord," "God is not willing that any should perish" "And the LORD shall guide thee continually" "holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty..." "God cannot lie," "thou hast considered my trouble; thou hast known my soul in adversities;"
8. Faithfulness is an attribute of moral goodness, thus the first uncaused cause of morality would have this quality of faithfulness, but faithfulness could not exist unless there is a word to be faithful to. Hence, spouses faithful to each other are faithful to vows (words). Without vows, there is nothing to be faithful to since there is no pledged allegiance to anything. Similarly, without a Word of God, God would have nothing to be faithful to, thus couldn't be faithful to us, but as suggested no faithfulness, implies no goodness, which would then make it impossible for the moral first cause to fail on. This makes the Word of God logically necessary to a good/faithful God. Thus, we must as a human race have an accurate Word of God that is accessible to us in some publically accessible manner. Whether we avail ourselves of it, is on us and a matter of free will, but God would not be remiss on his responsibilities to us as faithful for having given it to those who would so desire it, whether or not we partake is completely our responsibility. Logically, a true Word from God would claim God is faithful and the Bible is consistent on this point too as it says, "Know therefore that the LORD thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations;" "O LORD God of hosts, who is a strong LORD like unto thee? or to thy faithfulness round about thee?" "Write: for these words are true and faithful."
9. We are creatures of communication, and so heavily rely on it, that the first uncaused God, God himself would have the ability of communication to the utmost manner, since we, the effect, have it as a byproduct of this cause. So God has the power of communication via language.

10. God is truly good, as made in previous points, he would have the motivation to communicate with us, which would be evidence of a caring, loving, guiding God, hence logically must be motivated to provide a vehicle of communication via words/language, which is our primary means of communication. The Bible too is consistent on this logical point. "Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom."
11. Since one-liners, occasional or intermittent oral revelation is not a sustainable means of continual revelation of God, without adequate tests to know it is truly reliable in and of itself, this is not an adequate permanent means of revelation, hence a written revelation is necessary, which potentially provides, permanence, testability, deeper analysis, meditation, application in a manner that non written communication can't do, thus is the most suitable means for God to reveal himself to the most people in the most efficient manner available for a time in which there are large numbers of people living on the planet. Therefore, a written revelation is the best means of communication of God, who would be motivated and capable of communicating in this manner, making it logically warranted for such a revelation to be manifested. The Bible too points this out in its own right. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:"
12. If God did not provide such written revealed guidance he would be a deadbeat father, being remiss on his faithful responsibilities to his children or creation, showing indifference, apathy, and unconcern, thus, not be good, a logical impossibility, leaving those who would want to know him, his ways, ways to live right, morality and other vital things to meaningful existence without a means for doing so. This means God will provide revealed guidance as a good father, not remitting his faithfulness to us since the moral first cause can't fail on faithfulness/goodness/guidance. The Bible also makes this point explicit, once again showing it is in line with logical expectations from morally maximally great being demanded from the first cause. "I will guide thee with mine eye." How? "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."
13. God would not only have to have a means to inspire a written revelation to prove his goodness, but a means to preserve a perfect line somewhere for public access to those who want to know him, since what good is inspiration without preservation? If it is not preserved, then those beyond a few generations would not have access to all of God's perfect revelation, thus God would either not be powerful enough to preserve it, or good enough, since whatever the means we don't wouldn't have it (him not giving it to us originally, or him not preserving it for us) we still wouldn't have it, which then means God has not revealed himself and provided the perfect moral guidance a good utmost moral powerful being would or a good father would, hence would be showing apathy, indifference or lack of power; however, as already mentioned, this is a logical impossibility for a perfectly good uncaused cause for morality and our immensely massive, energy filled universe to exhibit such negative qualities. This means that both inspiration and preservation for all earthly generations are necessary. This then means there is a perfect line of revealed written truth inspired by God that is publically available for anybody who seeks God to access in some form. This makes it impossible for the effect of men to corrupt some perfect line of God's word, lest effect can outdo and frustrate the cause's purposes, power, faithfulness, and goodness, an impossibility. Both Jesus and the bible itself testify to this most logical fact we would expect God to do as a faithful God. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."
14. Here are good reasons textually the bible has been preserved for us. This textual evidence is also good reason to believe it is truly the Word of God. A. There are embarrassingly and exceedingly far more New Testament documents than any ancient documents of history, including 24,000 to the next best, Homer's Iliad at over 5,000. The original Greek is also far outweighed by its rivaling next best, Demosthenes at 200, Sophocles at 193 to close to 6,000 with the New Testament, while the Iliad only fares at 43. Other competitors even fare much worse than the Bible, even Plato's Annals at 20 and total words 28, and Caesar at only 10. This is important because the more copies we have, the easier it is to compare

differences, which then allows us to get closer to the originals. Originals would be destroyed due to use and age, and no ancient source, and even many later non-ancient sources originals survive, so demand for such would be highly unreasonable, leaving us with no way of knowing hardly any history. B. As far as gaps between the original events and the writings and the originals and the earliest extant copies, the New Testament tramples its opponents once again. For example, Paul's letter in the 50's-early 60s AD to Jesus's ending of his life around 30-40 AD is considered a negligible gap historically, the synoptic gospels ranging from '40s to early 80s, with there being better evidence for the earlier dates are very exceedingly minimal for ancient history. So to reject the New Testament on this basis, we must reject all ancient history, since there were hundreds to over a thousand years of space on such secular histories, compared to the minimum of 10 to the latest 60 years, if we consider John's gospel being written in 90 AD, a date that actually is probably a lot earlier. C. As far as the gap from writing to copies, the New Testament also wins over ancient history hands down, ranging from a minimum of 35-55 or so years with John Ryland's documents of John's gospel (125 AD), to much of the New Testament in the Chester Beatty documents around 200 AD, with a range gap of 160 years or so to 110 years pending on dates of the original writings. Compare this to Caesar. 1,000, Plato's works 900 to 1200 years, Sophocles 1400 years, and so forth. D. Scholarly consensus for preservation. F.F Peters "On the basis of manuscript tradition alone, the works that made up the Christians' New Testament were the most frequently copied and widely circulated books of antiquity." John Warwick Montgomery says, "To be skeptical of the resultant text of the New Testament books is to allow all classical antiquity to slip into obscurity, for no documents of the ancient period are as well attested bibliographically as the New Testament." Sir Frederick G. Kenyon, of the British Museum library stated, "besides the number, the manuscripts of the New Testament different from those of the classical authors, and this time the difference is clear again. In no other case is the interval time between the composition of the book and the date of the earliest extant manuscripts so far as in that of the New Testament. Kenyon once again, "The interval then between the dates of the original composition and the earliest extant evidence becomes so small as to be in fact negligible, and the last foundation for any doubt that the scriptures have come down to us substantially as they were written has now been removed. Both the authenticity and the general integrity of the books of the New Testament may be regarded as finally established." F.J.A. Hort mentions, "in the variety and fullness of the evidence on which it rests the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachable alone among ancient prose writings." J. Harold Greenlee says, "...the number of available MSS of the New Testament is overwhelmingly greater than those of any other work of ancient literature. In the third place, the earliest extant MSS of the N.T. were written much closer to the date of the original writing than is the case in almost any other piece of ancient literature." " Benjamin Warfield, Metzger's predecessor said, "If we compare the present state of the New Testament text with that of any other ancient writing, we must.. declare it to be marvelously correct. Scholars have been the care with which the New Testament has been copied,-a care which has doubtless grown out of true reverence of its holy words. The New Testament [is] unrivaled among ancient writing in the purity of its text as actually transmitted and kept in use" E. Variants are of little consequence. There are numerous variations, but most are of mechanics or conventions, spelling, grammar, or of word order due to Greek which lies less upon sequence than English, thus variations in our English translations are often based upon this. But often fluctuations of sequence don't mean distortion of the meaning of original content according to Bruce M. Metzger. When asked if any of this affects any particular New Testament doctrine, to bring it into question, he responded a firm "no." There are far fewer verses in doubt of the textual certainty of the N.T. than in the Iliad (764 to 40 lines). The abundance of copies allows us to get closer to the originals more accurately so most variants can be ruled out, even as others from obvious spelling errors. Of 150,000 variants, only 400 changed the meaning, only 50 were of significance, and not one put any doctrine of the church in dispute according to Philip Shaff. Hinduism's Mahabharata has 90% accuracy, the Iliad 95%, the N.T. 99.5%, and half a percent affect no doctrine. Fredric Kenyon said, "It cannot be too strongly asserted that the substance of the text of the Bible is certain: Especially in the case of the New Testament. The number of manuscripts of the New Testament of early translations from it, and quotations from it in the oldest writers of the church, is so large that it is practically certain that the true reading of every doubtful passage is preserved in some one or other of these ancient authorities. This can be said of no other ancient book in the world." If we factor out variants from less pure lines, we get even less variation, and finally factor in God's preserving guidance, we can get absolute perfection, even in translation.

15. Since natural revelation demands that a monotheistic God exists, this would mean only scriptures from a monotheistic God would be potential candidates for being truly inspired by God, systematically eliminating all so-called scriptures from polytheism, pantheism, and deism. Naturalism is eliminated because there are no scriptures and it is false based on point 1 of this post. The Bible and Koran only are consistent with a monotheistic God. The Bible says, in the 10 Commandments introduction, "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:" This is exactly what we would expect of a revelation from God to report about God, since our universe demands a singular first uncaused eternal cause of agency, hence monotheistic.
16. There are only really 3 main monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, all of which depend on the Bible to a degree, for even the Koran frequently alludes to biblical ideals, thus making the bible a strong candidate to be this inspired revelation. Judaism uses the OT, Christianity OT, and NT.
17. The revelation that is truly inspired by God would adequately have evidence for being such for the following reasons. If there isn't enough evidence for it being inspired then we wouldn't know for sure it is, then couldn't reasonably be expected to follow it. If we couldn't know what truly was the Word without adequate evidence we may follow the wrong scriptures, doctrines, philosophies, and worldviews and we would not have any means of knowing what the right and wrong one(s) were. This then offsets biblical inspiration and preservation since even if there was a line inspired and preserved by God, without evidence to know what it is, we wouldn't know to follow it. This means that irrespective of God's inspiration and preservation, God would not be faithful, good, caring, and loving in giving us an adequate evidential means to follow the scriptures he inspired and preserved, putting us back at the same problem we had in point 7 and offsetting the logic of the previous points that suggests God simply would reveal himself to us via a written revelation. To put it simply, inspiration and preservation do nothing in terms of God faithfully revealing himself to those who want to know him, if there is no means to know the scriptures he revealed are truly from him. This then implies that there would be internal evidence or markers for his true scriptures or revelation being truly from him, with benchmarks or earmarks or evidence of inspiration.
18. A scripture that is truly from God, would bear evidence of such, but a prerequisite indicator must be a declaration within itself that it is the Word of God; otherwise, how should we know it? Clear definitive statements to this end would absolutely be a prerequisite for a scriptures being inspired by God, but that wouldn't be sufficient evidence in itself that it was, but merely be a prerequisite for any potential candidate to have. The Bible and Koran make this claim, so fulfill this requirement. For example besides the obvious and most frequently alluded to on this point in 2 Peter 1:20-21 and 2 Timothy 3:16 which I already quoted, the Bible says, "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe."
19. The Bible and Koran do have these prerequisite statements and are from a monotheistic God, so one of these two is probably the scriptures from God; however, the bible has an added caveat in that it is attested by the Koran, but the Koran is not attested by the Bible, making the bible a more probable means of revelation. Islam which uses the Koran, claims the Bible was God's Word but got corrupted and for hundreds up to thousands of years was lost, so that God had to start a new book, completely abandoning the old one he preserved. This is an illogical impossibility for reasons 6-8, as this would mean that God was either not powerful enough to preserve his Word since man would be more able than God to permanently corrupt a Word he started, or God wasn't faithful or good enough to preserve it, thus showing a lack of care/concern/love/goodness. He allowed his whole Word to get corrupted, not just some parts that could be regained so that he had to start with a new book. This would seem to be impossible for God to allow such a massive corruption of this sort regarding his perfect holy loving Word. Many biblical verses promise preservation. Would those verses simply be a corruption too, some of which I quoted like Psalms 12:6-7? Not likely, for why would a later editor write that when he knew he would be changing it, which would condemn him for making the changes? A later corrupter would not add such verses which would be adding condemnation to himself and seem to be completely unnecessary to put in. This means they were likely the original, which means those biblical verses that promise preservation were truly inspired by God, but if they were then there is no way they could not be preserved, which would make God a liar, thus is not a logical possibility for the perfectly moral first uncaused cause to do. So the whole thesis of Islam, that God's Word got corrupted is illogical from the get-go, making the Koran a less

likely candidate to be the truly inspired Word of God, even though it like the bible claims to be. Since the bible and Koran have contrasting views, both can't be right. When we examine the content, it is the bible that truly upon objective analysis bears the true marks of authentic revelation as we shall examine.

20. Also, God is love as the morally maximally great being demanded by logic, so as an eternal being he must be eternal love, but love is inherently relational as you need at least 2 or more parties, a lover and love at minimum. On Judaism and Islam's view of a monad (1 person deity), there can't be a fulfillment of that requirement, since eternal God would have no other personal to love, thus not eternally relationally love, but on biblical Christianity, a trinity (3 person Godhead), fulfills that requirement, satisfying the logic for an eternally loving being to exist relationally. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." "For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel... That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "But that the world may know that I [Jesus] love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence."
21. Since English is the primary language of the world, and in our present day, the world is massively filled with numerous people, then English would be a definite language that a wise intelligent revealer of truth would use to preserve his Word. Therefore, we could expect a perfect line preserved in our English language, and our English translation could be used as a basis for translation to other languages. When we examine the lines of text that have been the most reliable, it is the received text, started in Antioch where they were first called Christians, so that we have a preserved line in our AV KJV, which uses this received text line. We also see internal chronometers that suggest this is God's perfect translation (this needs further analysis in a different post). However, when God translates something by moving men to do so, he enhances or improves it to be more timely. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:" Nevertheless, the point here is that God would preserve a line in a common language accessible to most people and a great candidate would be English, which then means we should easily expect at least one perfect translation in this era, that has not been corrupted in any way.
22. A scripture truly inspired would have good evidence for being so as mentioned in previous points. But what would that look like? There would have to be some reasonable criteria for what might be expected from the supernatural causation of such scriptures. The following criteria could be used as reasonable expectations for suggestions of being inspired. In other words, there have to be some means of reasonable criteria, and only if we can counter how the criteria are unreasonable for evidence of inspiration would we readily be able to not be valid. If it logically can hold up as reasonable to showing evidence of divine revelation, and the scriptures suggested meet those criteria, we would have a good reason for believing that the proposed scriptures are truly inspired by God. When a bible critic claims ignorantly that there is no evidence that the Bible is inspired, this is a blind assertion for the following reason. The critic has often not defined any reasonable criteria for evidence of inspiration, so one can ask, there is no evidence to what, or to what type of evidence would be reasonable as evidence for inspiration? Without any reasonable criteria, the critic is making a meaningless assertion. One must provide reasonable criteria as to what evidence for the inspiration of God would be and then examine the content of the scriptures under analysis to see if it fits into it and if it does we would have reasonable evidence for inspiration. I have done precisely this in this post.
23. Here is some background that sets the stage for thinking we have good reason to expect a revealed inspired Word of God, that circles back to the first few points, the actual criteria expected, and then sets forth the actual criteria being fulfilled in the Bible.

Why should we expect there to be a revelation from God?

Evidence from causality and cosmology points to a monotheistic God who is moral and good. The first cause argument is the only logical inference that works to explain our universe. God's existence is certain from logical

inference as the universe has a true beginning, known philosophically from infinite regress contradictions and modern science. Conservation shows no natural material matter/energy creates itself and pops up from nothing; hence, a true beginning coupled with the inability to create itself, implies a singular Creator who is above/beyond the universe/nature, thus supernatural. The universal and historical moral compass of humanity is evidence the first cause is also moral. The supreme ethic of the highest morality is love. Goodness implies guidance from a divine being since lack thereof is conducive to apathy and indifference contradicting goodness and love. Without a revelation, God is apathetic and indifferent. Deism is implausible for a good God. Theism is the only explanation if God is good. This means divine revelation is consistent with a monotheistic good God, anything short of that provides a logical incoherence of a truly moral first cause.

24. Here are some criteria I deem reasonable for suggesting adequate criteria that the Bible is those scriptures that give benchmarks/earmarks of being truly inspired by this monotheistic God.

What would be expected for literature truly revealed from God ?

1. A literary setup conducive to displaying its inspiration in a discernible manner.
2. Unity amid diversity
3. A theme conducive to a good God redeeming mankind
4. A comprehensive explanation to explain the sum of our present experiences and earthly reality
5. An explanation for who we are, why we are, where we came from, where we are going, how to get there, and purpose and instructions for living.
6. Amazing and unique practical insights
7. A unique plan of salvation or at least something in which God does something great for man
8. Record of God's interactions with humanity historically
9. Unique elements are hard to be explained by ordinary natural writers
10. Historically reliable data confirmed by archeology and means of historical verification, such as early testimony, eyewitness testimony, extra (outside) source testimony, elaborate testimony, excruciating testimony, embarrassing testimony, dissimilarity, multiple and independent testimony, cultural milieu and linguistics, and so forth.
11. Scientific integrity
12. A high moral standard
13. A high moral justice
14. A declaration and display of God's high righteous nature
15. Amazing Characters that grab one's attention
16. A prominent figure, a hero to point to God's greatness
17. A universal and historical appeal
18. A universal and historically cultural appeal
19. Transforming power for individuals and societies
20. An ability to appeal cross-culturally and, transcending a particular culture and time
21. Preservation for long periods
22. An effect that causes people to sell out for the principles, including even martyrdom.
23. Substantive and elaborate analytical depth beyond mere superficiality
24. A consistency with causality and cosmological principles.
25. Based upon causality and cosmological principles monotheism is the best explanation for our universe, thus a revelation based upon a monotheistic God.
26. A God who declares and demonstrates qualities of the first uncaused cause, an externality, and external characteristics
27. A God whose moral fabric and eternal principle are consistent with the highest moral ethic of eternal love.
28. A book that addresses and adequately has the solution for man's moral dilemmas
29. Evidence of God interacting with man in a clear discernible manner, namely miraculous, so we would expect the literature to be replete with God's miraculous intervention.
30. Historical reliability of some of the miraculous events.
31. A declaration of the literature is the Word of God
32. A method of creation consistent with true genuine scientific principles of conservation, thermodynamics, causality, and so forth.
33. A symbolism that surpasses all others that reveals God's plan.
34. Due to the nature of real evil in the world, we would expect a good vs. evil theme and thus attacks from evil upon good and God and the Bible, and his Word.
34. The ability to withstand critical attacks, without any insuperable difficulties that can't be reconciled.
35. Principles consistent with good philosophy, thus ontological coherence
36. Predictions and prophecies and fulfilled ones, thus future knowledge and fulfillment.

25. This is just a summary of how the bible meets all of these principles, although each would require further explanation for another read. For these principles only the Bible meets all of these criteria; the Koran is the only other monotheistic-based revelation possible, but it does not fulfill many of the criteria. The Koran doesn't have miracles, but the Bible does, the bible shows interactions of God with humanity; there is a clear purpose in the Bible of God's reasons for our existence, clear outcomes, and clear guidance principles. There is a unique salvation program that is not based upon human merit, like all other religions of the world. There are great long lasting ethically and spiritually revealed characters who are instructive to our living. There is a unique long-lasting influential person in Jesus, who provides salvation for the world. There is historical testimony of this unique person and his accomplishment of salvation and resurrection, a miraculous event. The Bible has lasted for thousands of years and thus has been preserved. There is a declaration the Bible is the Word of God, which is a prerequisite for it being so. There is a

mechanism of creation consistent with known principles of science, such as thermodynamics, conservation, and invisible aspects of visible phenomena. There is a comprehensive explanation for our existence, and who we are in relationship to God. There is a literary setup conducive to displaying evidence for it being the declared Word of God, including much diversity of genre, style, content, authors, books, testaments, periods and so forth; yet though that diversity, in the natural it would nearly be impossible to harmonize, yet though diligence, we see an amazing unity and unique theme of a King restoring his kingdom via a redemption plan that starts at man's beginning or moral fall and ends with the accomplishment of salvation through the work of God's messiah, Jesus. A depth since there are 66 books for 1 whole book, with hermeneutical principles that allow us to taste the depth of its wisdom, guidance principles, salvation plan, God's nature, and so forth. We also see high moral standards, swift judgments, an explanation of man's immorality due to his sinful corruption, and an understanding of why man is judged both in the bible and beyond the bible. Despite objections, none stand up to scrutiny; for example, the slavery objection is not insuperable and still shows God is just. We see many attacks on the Bible, expected if the theme of good vs. evil is true, which seems to be since all cultures play on that theme, thus the attacks are fitting that it is truly God's Word; otherwise, why would anybody bother? We see a tremendous symbolism in the Bible from beginning to end that allows us in very unique ways to see an unfolding of God's plan of salvation for fallen sinful man. There is good historical corroboration for Jesus and his resurrection, via early testimony (short gaps), eyewitness testimony (the writers claim such), elaborate testimony (undersigned coincidences), excruciating testimony (the desire to suffer, get persecuted, and even die for something they claimed to have witnessed), embarrassing testimony (the characters in the Bible are presented honestly with all their faults, even its hero Jesus is presented with certain human limitations. People don't lie or exaggerate to make themselves or their movement or religion look bad, yet we see many examples of this honest relay in the Bible, particularly the NT with the disciples of Jesus. There is linguistics consistent with 1st-century writing, as well as a cultural milieu towards it, in regards to the Semitic vocabulary, and knowledge of 1st-century politics as well. There are recorded miracles, thus God's interactions in a unique way, expected if something is of God. There is good reason to accept the resurrection as historically probable based upon historical NT scholars' accepted facts about Jesus's end life events, which are all consistent with the resurrection hypothesis, but inconsistent with alternative, naturalistic explanations such as hallucination, myth, conspiracy, wrong tomb, swoon, necromancy, stolen body, etc. We see principles like the hydraulic cycle, the spherical nature of the earth, the idea of the separation of continents, the declaration of God running the universe generally by scientific principles, the mention of false science, thermodynamics, conservation principles, and so forth. We see many ontologically good arguments for God's existence and nature derived from philosophically logical inferences consistent with the biblical God. There are many others, but this is just a brief synopsis to show the bible has evidence of what it claims, inspiration of God by expectations of a good personal theistic God, demanded by causality and conservation and philosophical and ontological considerations. Of course there are predictions and prophecies fulfilled in and out of the bible's context in manners that sometimes are consistent with undersigned coincidence, hence no intentional interpolations do maneuver such.

26. Since there are clear evidential indicators of fulfilled criteria of what reasonable would be expected of scripture inspired by God, we can now engage with its purpose, which is God's communication vehicle to us, so that we may know him in a relationship, which God sets forth in his Word, is through knowing his Son, since the gospel message is that his son paid the penalty for all our immortality or sin by dying physically, spiritually for us, so we wouldn't have, satisfying God's justice. We may become saved from the penalty of eternal damnation (2<sup>nd</sup> death) when we by faith receive Christ as Savior (trusting his atoning death, burial, and resurrection alone, without our good works/deeds/religiosity), and Lord (new master, king of our lives in repentance away from sin toward God). God pardons our sin judicially and takes our sinful internal corrupt heart or nature from us and gives us a transformed heart of regeneration upon a spiritual birth, produced by the Holy Spirit, made possible by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Once, we ask Christ to save us and he does, we are new inside and have new desires to communicate with him and his Word becomes valuable to us, so we begin to learn, read, meditate, pray over, and interact with it, which all are the outpouring of true salvation in the heart, not just the head. "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of

regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”