

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Book of Enoch****Book of Enoch - posted by RogerB (), on: 2017/7/7 13:11**

Why is it not included today? I thought it was found in the dead sea scrolls.

**Re: Book of Enoch - posted by RogerB (), on: 2017/7/7 15:51**

Noah was a preacher of righteousness. He had no Old testament but he had a copy of his grandfathers parables.

I just saw that today. Evidently the Book of Enoch went through the flood.

68:1 After that, he gave me instructions in all the secret things found in the book of my grandfather, Enoch, and in the parables which were given to him; and he put them together for me in the words of the book which is with me.

I just found it interesting.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2017/7/7 17:22**

Jude actually quotes Enoch in Jude 14-15. Even I thinking why it is not included in Bible.

<https://www.christiancourier.com/articles/562-did-jude-quote-from-the-book-of-enoah>

This link explains why the book of Enoch was not included.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/7 17:59**

I believe 2 Peter lifts info from a similar work- "the assumption of Moses."

The book of Enoch is interesting on its own merits. Not scripture, but interesting.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/7/7 19:27**

Saints,

we have the 'book of enoch' on SermonIndex that you can read here: <https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=category&cid=509>

There is very strong and fearful wordings in this document about the coming judgment and especially fallen angels. It clearly references that God will judge the "watchers" those fallen angels who mingled with mankind in Genesis 6 and thus God had to destroy all creatures through the flood. This will happen again at the end of the age.

Though it is not scripture there seems to be truths shared that the early church kept to as the interoperation of Genesis 6 being fallen angels perverting the human seed (perhaps trying to stop Christ from coming into the world).

It is not scripture but it is well worth reading.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/7 19:49**

It does address the fallen angels issue which is what makes it interesting- if accurate it fills in some gaps.

**Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2017/7/7 21:33**

The book of enoch is heresy. It talks about 450 foot tall people. The author clearly lifted bits and pieces of Scripture and inserted them into the book of enoch to make it look authentic.

" 7 And I heard the fourth voice fending off the Satans and forbidding them to come before the Lord  
8 of Spirits to accuse them who dwell on the earth. After that I asked the angel of peace who went with me, who showed me everything that is hidden: "Who are these four presences which I have  
9 seen and whose words I have heard and written down?" And he said to me: "This first is Michael, the merciful and long-suffering; and the second, who is set over all the diseases and all the wounds of the children of men, is Raphael: and the third, who is set over all the powers, is Gabriel: and the fourth, who is set over the repentance unto hope of those who inherit eternal life, is named Phanuel."  
10 And these are the four angels of the Lord of Spirits and the four voices I heard in those days.

The Bible never mentions an angel named Phanuel, let alone an angel who is set over the repentance of those who inherit eternal life. What blasphemy! That statement in itself contradicts everything the Word of God teaches. We read in 1st Timothy 2:5 that Jesus Christ is the ONLY Mediator between God and men, not some angel named Phanuel... "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

Are you really gullible enough to believe that fallen angels had physical intimacy with earthly women that produced offspring 450-feet tall? I don't think so! We read in chapter 7:12-15 of the Book of Enoch...

7:12 Whose stature was each three hundred cubits. These devoured all which the labor of men produced; until it became impossible to feed them;  
7:13 When they turned themselves against men, in order to devour them;  
7:14 And began to injure birds, beasts, reptiles, and fishes, to eat their flesh one after another, and to drink their blood  
7:15 Then the earth reproved the unrighteous.

[http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Wolves/book\\_of\\_enoch.htm](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Wolves/book_of_enoch.htm)

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/7 22:21**

How can a book that is not scripture be heresy? It's like calling War and Peace heresy.

I must say a 450 ft giant would be pretty awesome. That's about 45 stories.

**Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/7/7 23:23**

Drifter I get your point but have you looked at that website you posted from? It's a hate site, the man believes everyone except Jack Hyles and Billy Sunday are false prophets.

**Re: book of enoch, on: 2017/7/8 1:09**

I agree with you drifter. Thank you for sharing. I often wonder why God's holy word is not enough for some Christians...

but remember whatever you express there is an enemy lurking on this site and will be in opposition anytime you speak up for God's holy precious word.

**Book of Enoch, on: 2017/7/8 11:46**

Brother Greg,

Thank you for providing the book of Enoch!

I did not know that there is that book here...

Now, I will start reading this book...

**Re: Book of Enoch - posted by RogerB (), on: 2017/7/8 12:16**

There were giants before the flood. When they went in to spy out the land, The report was that they were as grasshoppers. The messed up line went through the ark in Noah's sons wives.

I have raised the question in my head; are these the ones not written in the book of life from the foundation of the earth? From what I read, all of Adam's children are in the book of life.

Enoch fills in some missing pieces.

**Re: - posted by followthelamb (), on: 2017/7/8 12:43**

Seeing this thread brought these Bible verses to mind

Genesis 6:1, 3-8 NKJV:

1 Now it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, 2 that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose...

There were giants on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men and they bore to them. Those the mighty men who of old, men of renown. 5 Then the LORD saw that the wickedness of man great in the earth, and every intent of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually. 6 And the LORD was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart. 7 So the LORD said, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast, creeping thing and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them." 8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD.

2 Peter 2:4-5 NKJV:

4 For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast down to hell and delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment; 5 and did not spare the ancient world, but saved Noah, eight, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood on the world of the ungodly;

Jude 1:6-7 NKJV:

6 And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day; 7 as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them \*\*\*in a similar manner to these, having given themselves over to sexual immorality and gone after strange flesh\*\*\*, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

Numbers 13:32-33 NKJV:

32 ..."The land through which we have gone as spies a land that devours its inhabitants, and all the people whom we saw in it men of stature. 33 "There we saw the giants (the descendants of Anak came from the giants); and we were like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight."

Numbers 13:32-33 NKJV:

4 Og king of Bashan and his territory, of the remnant of the giants, who dwelt at Ashtaroth and at Edrei, 5 and reigned over Mount Hermon...

**Re: - posted by SHMILY, on: 2017/7/8 14:06**

Brandy, that passage from Numbers 13 always makes me think of these from Joshua 14,15:

Joshua 14:9-12 NASB  
(Caleb is speaking to Joshua)

So Moses swore on that day, saying, "Surely the land on which your foot has trodden will be an inheritance to you and to your children forever, because you have followed the LORD my God fully." Now behold, the LORD has let me live, just as He spoke, these forty-five years, from the time that the LORD spoke this word to Moses, when Israel walked in the wilderness; and now behold, I am eighty-five years old today. I am still as strong today as I was in the day Moses sent me; as my strength was then, so my strength is now, for war and for going out and coming in. Now then, give me this hill country about which the LORD spoke on that day, for you heard on that day that Anakim were there, with great fortified cities; perhaps the LORD will be with me, and I will drive them out as the LORD has spoken.

Joshua 15:13-14 NASB

Now he gave to Caleb the son of Jephunneh a portion among the sons of Judah, according to the command of the LORD to Joshua, namely, Kiriath-arba, Arba being the father of Anak (that is, Hebron). Caleb drove out from there the three sons of Anak: Sheshai and Ahiman and Talmi, the children of Anak.

With God nothing is impossible. ... even if you are 85. ;)

Don't want to send the thread down a rabbit hole. Just wanted to share this.

REJOICE! =)

---

Mary

**Re: , on: 2017/7/8 14:20**

Archaeological remains seem to bear witness of the Nephilim. Around the world skeletons of humans reaching as tall as 12 or more feet have been found. Many of these skeletons, at least found in America, were carted off to the Smithsonian Institution. Only to be hidden away probably in some warehouse. (Probably next to the Ark of the Covenant found by Indiana Jones. :) Anyway the Smithsonian says they do not have such skeletons. Despite the fact of photographs and newspaper articles that were written about the Smithsonian taking away such. Much of these reports come from the mid to the late 19th century. And even the early 20th century.

Again not to go down a rabbit trail. But the fact that there have been photographed remains of individuals that were reaching an unheard-of height that the Bible speaks of. I don't know about 450 ft tall giants. But there have been reports that Nephilim could have reached as much of a height as 20 ft. I believe Goliath was around nine or ten feet tall. And to the average Israelite that is pretty tall.

Bro Blaine

**Re: brother Bear - posted by JFW (), on: 2017/7/8 15:47**

Goliath would, at 10' ft tall, make Shaq look like a midget!

Just for scale- imagine Shaq at 7'1 330lbs standing beside a 4' ft 90lb person.... and that would be the equivalent of a 10' 500+lb Goliath standing next to a 7' Shaq!!

But faith in the God of Israel made that giant look oh so small ;)

**Re: Post Flood Appearances of the Nephilim, on: 2017/7/8 15:59**

<https://youtu.be/pby2Vh6AM48>

<https://youtu.be/Hy33LUDZ-2w>

2 videos above where a brother describes the post flood appearances of the Nephilim and how they got there.

Bro Blaine

**Re: Bro Fletcher , on: 2017/7/8 16:02**

But faith in the God of Israel made that giant look oh so small ;)

The taller they are the harder they fall. At least in God's eyes brother.

Bro Blaine

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/8 16:50**

I just wanted to throw out there that the viral photos on the internet of giant skeletons being unearthed in places like Saudi Arabia and Greece are proven fakes.

I do believe there were giants in the Bible, within reason. Certainly not 450 ft.

**Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/7/8 23:58**

The book of Enoch was obviously read by Jude and accepted, as was the Assumption of Moses by Peter, as was the book of Wisdom and Sirach by Jesus and Paul. Sort of makes the evangelical interpretation of "sola scriptura 66 books only" seem silly.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2017/7/9 6:30**

Just because Jude quotes from the Book of Enoch, does not mean the book should be accepted. It is a failed logic. If we go by this failed logic then we should also include the book written by Crete's prophet because Paul quoted him so and also said that his testimony is True!

Titus 1-12 As one of their own prophets has said, "Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons." This testimony is true.

Enoch could have really said such a line about judgment and the Holy Spirit could have revealed it to Jude. If all scriptures are divinely inspired then why do we believe that everything should be quoted from some other book?

There is a clear reason why the book of Enoch cannot be considered as authentic. Definitely it was not written by Enoch himself because there was no way to write things in those days. It said to be written some 200 years before Christ.

I would not promote such books and even encourage others to read them. There are enough books in the Bible to challenge and edify us. We do not need such extra Biblical book to be read as a Biblical account. If someone has the maturity to read such content without considering them as Word of God then they can read to get some historical perspective. But I do not believe everyone has it.

For example I read few Calvinistic writers but deep inside me I know that their theology is unacceptable to me. I will never be inspired by their theology and nor do I believe that everything they write is Word of God. If we can read the book of Enoch not truly inspired by God then we can read them.

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2017/7/9 8:21**

Quote:  
----- Just because Jude quotes from the Book of Enoch, does not mean the book should be accepted. It is a failed logic. If we go by this failed logic then we should also include the book written by Crete's prophet because Paul quoted him so and also said that his testimony is True!  
-----

I believe Sree is right here. We cannot canonize an entire book simply because one of the apostles quoted a sentence from it.

Quote:  
----- There is a clear reason why the book of Enoch cannot be considered as authentic. Definitely it was not written by Enoch himself because there was no way to write things in those days. It said to be written some 200 years before Christ.  
-----

There is no reason, in my mind, to think that Enoch did not write the book of Enoch. He may have, and perhaps he did not, but there is no reason to doubt it simply because he lived some 4000 years ago. There is no logical reason to believe that Noah did not have his own personal library on board the ark and that these books did not survive the journey. Writing certainly existed. Noah built a massive ship that required some pretty amazing engineering and construction techniques and equipment. Without doubt Noah drafted drawings and plans of the design God gave him so that those who he had helping him build knew what was going on. I actually believe that Moses probably read and compiled some of the material from Noah's library in order to write the first part of the book of Genesis. "This is the book of the generations (history) of Adam".

**Re: , on: 2017/7/9 17:27**

Heartbreaking topic.  
We should not use "human" logic here. What do I mean?  
God is Almighty and He alone is wise. He knows that Enoch is not in His Holy Word  
But He didn't make a mistake or miss anything !!  
If we question the 66 books then we question God and His Wisdom and His Power .

If we now use our own logic we debate Scripture rather than proclaiming it. If we don't spend our time proclaiming the Good news and to build each other up then we don't advance the Kingdom of God.  
And who likes it most if we don't proclaim and advance God's Kingdom ??

Romans 16v27 to God, alone wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever. Amen

Jude 1v25  
To God our Savior,  
Who alone is wise,  
Be glory and majesty,  
Dominion and power,  
*Both now and forever.*  
*Amen. (NKJV)*

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/9 17:36**

Markus I don't see anyone here saying Enoch or other similar works should be scripture. I find it interesting like I might find the epic of Gilgamesh or the histories of Josephus interesting.

Peter and Jude obviously found them interesting- so much so they lifted information from them in writing their epistles. If we believe these books were inspired then we must conclude that God WANTED them to reference these writings.

Now that is something to chew on.

**Re: , on: 2017/7/9 17:55**

TMK - Quote: "Sort of makes the evangelical interpretation of "sola scriptura 66 books only" seem silly."

Sad that "Enoch" is even on SI

Over and out - blessings !

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/9 18:38**

Markus/ not sure why you are quoting me- I never said that and I don't have any issue at all with SS.

**Re: , on: 2017/7/9 19:24**

Thanks Todd - to clarify here is what you said: "I don't see anyone here saying Enoch or other similar works should be scripture."

Here is what I saw: "Sort of makes the evangelical interpretation of "sola scriptura 66 books only" seem silly." You are right - we just looked and interpreted some posts differently ;)

I don't think it is appropriate to think we are all "silly" who believe we should only use those 66 books.

The more extra-biblical stuff is on SI the more time we spend debating rather than praying and proclaiming the Good News and it causes less and less unity.

**Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2017/7/9 19:39**

Jesus never quoted from any apocryphal books. He would never quote a book that says something like this: "For alms deliver from all sin, and from death, and will not suffer the soul to go into darkness." Tobit 4:11

It may appear that He quoted from the apocrypha: dig a little deeper and you'll see He was clarifying the Law and the prophets. All Satan can ever do is counterfeit, and that's all the apocrypha is, a cheap counterfeit, like the book of Enoch or the "gospel" of Thomas.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/9 21:06**

Markus- I agree.

**Re: - posted by RogerB (), on: 2017/7/9 21:21**

I imagine all of you have a library of other books from other writers. Probably for sure a promise Keeper book, Maybe a book of Mormon, etc. Doesn't mean you write all of Enoch off or these books either. How many versions of the Bible do each of you have?

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/7/10 0:10**

If we do not have faith that the Lord in His Sovereignty call's, lead's and guard's not only the original giving of the Scriptures but also the Translation process.

Then logic would naturally question other things such as the canon.

But if we believe that the Lord has specifically purposed certain translations, then we have no question/doubt that He faithfully purposed also the Canon of those Scriptures.

clarity

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/7/10 6:56**

Saints,

I believe there is great value in writings that surround the scriptures, that does not mean we should read them as scriptures. The early church in AD 300 compiled the canon, they had MANY texts that they considered, these other texts were not evil or wrong and were so godly and used in churches that some of them were considered for the scriptures. So why would we not want to read some of those texts.

Just because something does not make it into the canon does not mean it is spurious, it is just not inspired. But there were lots of accounts of good writings that have historical and oral traditions of sayings, accounts, names, etc that have value.

I believe every believer should read the writings of Clement who wrote to the Corinthian Church that Paul wrote to. Also "Ignatius and Polycarp" who were disciples of the Apostle John himself.

Many believers do not know that the "apocrypha" was in the KJV bible translations until the 1850's I believe. These 14 books were written between (the period between 450 BC and 50 AD).

Martin Luther considered them valuable enough to keep them in the Scripture translation he made, he put them at the end of the Old Testament before the New Testament.

I agree with this quote and think that there is value in reading these: "We should therefore approach the Apocrypha with a discerning mind and heart, and carefully discriminate between that which is in harmony with the essentials of the Christian faith and that which deviates from what is taught in the 66 books of the canon."

**Re: , on: 2017/7/10 20:22**

Brother Greg, please allow me a quick reply

"The early church in AD 300 compiled the canon..."

but God's Hand was in the process and He didn't miss anything

"Martin Luther considered them valuable enough..." so what? He wasn't an Apostle

"it is just not inspired..." are you saying there is "just" a minor difference between what is inspired and what is not?

Something that God Himself inspired is of infinite value and it is His Holy Word. We should not even compare it with other writings.

"We should therefore approach the Apocrypha with a discerning mind ..."

Where do we now draw the line then? Why not approach the book of Mormons, or all those Novels etc. with a discerning mind? Can't you see where this is all leading to? Endless debates and less and less unity.

And who likes that most?

Ephesians 3v8 Though I am less than the least of all the saints, this grace was given me: to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to illuminate for everyone the stewardship of this mystery, which for ages past was hidden in God, who created all things.â€

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/7/10 21:11**

It has been repeated and repeated that Enoch is not scripture. It is therefore just literature, perhaps historical literature. I didn't say true or inspired, I said historical. Some of it may be true, perhaps none is.

It seems there are those arguing it should not be read even as a historical document as if there is something to fear.

There are lots of ancient early Christian writings that are fruitful to read, like the Didache or Shepherd of Hermes.

Of course scripture is the only inspired word of God. That does not mean that everything else is taboo to read.

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2017/7/10 21:43**

You are correct in my opinion Todd. I have been blessed by reading much of the Antenicene Father's writings. But I read them much as I would read a book by a modern Christian author. Great history. Wonderful for understanding the climate and thinking of the early church. But what I read is weighted carefully against what I know to be scripture and accepted or rejected based upon that comparison. The same is true with the book of Enoch. Whether we believe it was actually written by Enoch and preserved on the ark by Noah (my personal opinion), or whether we believe it was written later, we can still read it and gain some insight. Apparently the apostles did.

**Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/7/10 21:51**

quote: Brother Greg, please allow me a quick reply

"The early church in AD 300 compiled the canon..."

but God's Hand was in the process and He didn't miss anything

"Martin Luther considered them valuable enough..." so what? He wasn't an Apostle

"it is just not inspired..." are you saying there is "just" a minor difference between what is inspired and what is not?

Something that God Himself inspired is of infinite value and it is His Holy Word. We should not even compare it with other writings.

The determination of the canon was not determined by the apostles. It was determined by the roman catholic church at the council of carthage:

"It was also determined that besides the Canonical Scriptures nothing be read in the Church under the title of divine Scriptures. The Canonical Scriptures are these: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two books of Paraleipomena, Job, the Psalter, five books of Solomon, the books of the twelve prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Esther, two books of Esdras, two Books of the Maccabees. Of the New Testament: four books of the Gospels, one book of the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, one epistle of the same to the Hebrews, two Epistles of the Apostle Peter, three of John, one of James, one of Jude, one book of the Apocalypse of John. Let this be made known also to our brother and fellow-priest Boniface, or to other bishops of those parts, for the purpose of confirming that Canon. Because we have received from our fathers that those books must be read in the Church. Let it also be allowed that the Passions of Martyrs be read when their festivals are kept."

Why do you now discard their decision? Do you guys not realize that these men determined what books were in the bible by their LOGIC and reasoning of what seemed right or wrong? If you say you trust God was leading them I ask why you discard the apocrypha. Jesus quoted from the apocrypha:

Hebrews 5:12/Wisdom 7:24

1 Corinthians 15:50/Wisdom 7:25b

John 5:19/Wisdom 7:26a

Romans 9:20-21/Wisdom 15:7

2 Corinthians 5:4a/Wisdom 9:15b

James 3:17/Wisdom 7:22

Luke 12:19-21/Sirach 5:7-9

Matthew 6:7/Sirach 7:14

Romans 12:15/Sirach 7:34

2 Corinthians 6:14-15/Sirach 13:16-18

James 1:13/Sirach 15:11-12

Matthew 6:14a/Sirach 28:2

Neither Jesus or the apostles quoted from Ruth, Judges, or Esther and yet we consider them canonical.

If you really want to believe God is a protestant and led all of history to finally give them a perfect 66 book bible then I'll leave you in your absurdity and pride. God is bigger than us and maybe, just maybe, our way of thinking has been influenced by men from the past who weren't necessarily right.

For the record I do not think the book of Enoch is inspired. Why? It doesn't sit right. Go ahead and criticize but something in my spirit irks me about it and I will go by that because I trust the Lord and have an open heart to His truth wherever it may be found. If I am wrong he will show me, if not then I am okay.

**Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/7/10 22:04**

TMK: Of course scripture is the only inspired word of God. That does not mean that everything else is taboo to read.

And what scriptures are those? The recent 66 book version? I don't mean to poke fun I simply want to point out that you are standing on thin ground. You are submitting to one authority that says 66 but that authority rebelled against THEIR authority and removed the books (Catholic to protestantism). Check your foundation brother.

Many church fathers considered the Shepherd inspired. Are they heretics to have preached that book as scripture? Maybe believing in a 66 book bible is not as necessary towards salvation as the protestant reformation would have us believe. Maybe belief in the scriptures isn't necessary at all for salvation but only belief in the WORD of God, Christ is. Maybe then He will lead us and guide us into all truth as we openly and truthfully search for Him with no outside walls telling us where we can. Scary isn't it? Wheres the authority? Whats keeping us from gaining "heretical" thoughts? But when there are no walls then there is none of that, just open honesty with the Spirit of God and His freedom to mold and shape us as he sees fit.

I am not against the authority of the church. The church is supposed to be a body of people who God has raised and modeled to lead His people. Unfortunately He's only able to do so within the confines of protestantism (or even catholicism) because people have drawn lines, we accepted those lines and our growth can only extend to them but never beyond them because then we might be a heretic.

God help us.

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/7/10 22:18**

case in point.

At least Tyler's logic is consistent

**Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/7/10 22:23**

Proud papa: You expressed fear in your last post of getting to the point of questioning the canon. Who told you to fear that? The bible says nothing about it. It is not listed as a sin. It is not forbidden. Far as I can tell there's nothing wrong with it unless you are trying to preserve certain beliefs and outlooks that can only be maintained with a certain view of what the bible is and says. Then it's a problem

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/7/10 22:37**

Tyler,

The fear is for other people.

**Re: , on: 2017/7/11 0:21**

"You are submitting to one authority that says 66 but that authority rebelled against THEIR authority and removed the books."

GOD is my authority and HE alone knows best why not more books are included.

What I was trying to say about Martin Luther: not much point quoting him to support our views, what he said was just his opinion, nothing more.

Quote: "it is just not inspired..." meaning they are good just not from God.

Then we have a very low view of God and His Word which I already mentioned is of infinite value.

We keep going round in circles here, instead of advancing God's Kingdom. That's my last comment on this thread, heart broken...

May the Lord God Almighty give all of us wisdom and direction and discernment.

"Your Kingdom come..." Blessings