† Blessed is our God always, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. ... in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Through the prayers of our holy Fathers and Mothers, Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us and save us. Amen. Glory to You, our God, glory to You.

O Heavenly King, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, You are everywhere and fill all things, Treasury of blessings, and Giver of life: come and abide in us, and cleanse us from every impurity, and save our souls, O Good One.

† Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us (three times).

† Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

An Attempt to Formulate an NPOV
Working Hypothesis of
Biblical Inerrancy

*Introduction*

There are many claims or statements of Biblical Inerrancy, some good, some bad. We could tour a collection of these; rather, we have chosen to propose a working hypothesis: an hypothesis open to your investigation, your approval or disapproval, which might then form the basis for proof or disproof, depending on the discovery of additional evidence. Such an hypothesis will be constructed, as far as humanly possible, from the neutral point of view (NPOV); which, is to say that all evidence will be considered, without placing undue weight on any single piece of evidence. We will also attempt to examine things which are true evidence, and reject any unmasked false evidence. You, of course, are the final jurors.

*The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*, which we have been studying, is particularly offensive; it lacks consistency, jumping around from one main idea to another: so, we’re never quite sure if the topic is authority, inerrancy, infallibility, or something entirely other. The Chicago solution suggests that the facts are so firmly fixed, the evidences so surely incontrovertible, that we no longer need to study them, all our solutions are error free: such an head-in-the-sand approach to life is untenable. Finally, Chicago states a canon; which, if we’re not careful, threatens to condemn us all. That being said, we have not concluded that every statement of Biblical Inerrancy is incorrect; some are rather well stated and precisely accurate: this is dangerous ground, where we do well to tread lightly.

*Evidence*

True evidence comes from science, particularly archaeology: much of which comes in the form of manuscripts, monuments, and clay tablets: such evidence precedes the biblical evidence by millennia; much of it has never been decoded.

Other true evidence is found in the Bible, which is every bit as much an archaeological artifact as any other; that evidence has a necessary, even if unknown, history and provenance going far before and beyond our earliest manuscripts: this does not make the weighing of that evidence a simple task.

True evidence may also be found in many other forms, which are impossible to evaluate scientifically: art, history, literature, mathematics, music, poetry, and the like. With most of these science is nothing more than a handmaid, useful only for examining minor aspects. In the main, such topics defy the rigorously replicated experimentation required by the scientific method: these require establishing their own rules of Truth. Can you imagine an experiment to establish “good” art or music? Can you imagine rebuilding an experiment large enough to repeat any major event of history?

True evidence requires the discovery of provenance, maintaining the chain of evidence; as well as the discovery of the raw evidence itself. Once provenance is lost and cannot be reestablished, the raw evidence may become virtually useless. The beauty of the Bible is that it comes with its own built-in provenance; this is generally true of historical records, which may be crosschecked against each other for linkages and verification.

*False Evidence*

False evidence is found in opinions; opinions are only the evidence of one person’s thinking: they have no special value. One especially devious form of opinions, are those put forth by “expert authorities”; these are often received as fact, depending only on the fame of the “expert authority”; these are not true evidence, and have no special value either: this includes all the various forms of the Documentary Hypotheses, as well as *The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*; which are nothing more than mere opinions, often stated without any supporting evidence whatsoever. The “conservative” opinion is just as damaging to Truth as the “liberal” opinion: we do not know, what we do not know.

Pejorative terms such as “conservative” and “liberal” are frequently meaningless in any examination of evidence; they may even reverse roles in the passion of heated and irrational argument: so, that which is truly “conservative” is made “liberal”, and vice versa. At this point, argument has lost its value as a rational instrument, having become completely irrational: it is now the epitome of false evidence.

Hypotheses are not evidence either. Our proposal of a working hypothesis is not a statement of evidence or fact; it is a place from which to start further examination and exploration. When any working hypothesis is disproved or fails; a better new working hypothesis is formulated, incorporating, as much as possible, all the new evidence; so, that the work of further examination and exploration may continue in an improved direction: thus, the quest for God’s Truth continues in all directions and fields… Scripture and science; linguistics and history; music and art; as well as many others. The task that God set before Adam of identifying and naming all the creatures never ends: among human purposes is the never ending study of the whole universe in all its many aspects. One God, One Truth: a difficult task for humanity to untangle. When contradictions seem to arise, the fault lies with us: it is we who are not yet wise enough to understand the evidence which God has set before us. We can never cease the task of building better working hypotheses; but, these, in and of themselves, can never be considered as evidence: hypotheses are markers or milestones of where we are stymied in our ignorance.

Claims of authority, inerrancy, infallibility, or something else are not evidence either. To date we have found no evidence for any physical inerrancy; the autographa have not been discovered and/or do not exist in physical form anywhere on earth. Proponents of authority, inerrancy, infallibility, and other hypotheses consistently fail to provide evidence for their claims.

There is no evidence to show that those rejecting any, or even all forms of Biblical Inerrancy face “grave consequences”, this is just so much mindless fear mongering; again, without any evidence.

*Autographa*

Revelation 5:1-14 is a kind of evidence: we just cannot be completely sure what kind of evidence it might be.

* John could refer to a literal book.[[1]](#endnote-1)
* John could be talking about a figurative book of some sort, a record in a format presently unknown to living human beings and impossible to understand at this time.
* John might be indicating that the works of Moses, Prophets, and Psalms, were carried to heaven with the Ark when God abandoned Solomon’s temple.[[2]](#endnote-2)
* John might be referencing the apocalyptic vision of Ezekiel, where the son of man (Ezekiel) is commanded to eat the book written on both sides.[[3]](#endnote-3)
* Possibly, all the books of the Bible are typologies of the heavenly reality, John is merely citing the heavenly reality: in which case, we are reading about some, possibly ethereal, description of the autograph above all autographs.
* John is possibly talking about something entirely different.

Nor do all of us see this evidence in the same light. With some Christians, this evidence would be absolutely compelling; other Christians would see this evidence as too intangible to see as completely compelling; some non-Christians would see this evidence as not at all compelling.

With this wide variety of possibilities, we attempt to formulate one part of our NPOV working hypothesis:

Revelation 5 may provide some sort of evidence for the existence of Biblical Inerrancy in the form of a super-natural autographa.

* If compelling, this potential super-natural autographa, is the only autographa presently known to man.
* Since this super-natural autographa exists only in the hands of the Father and of the Son, there is a high probability that it is inerrant, by definition.
* Those rejecting any idea of inerrant Deity will not find this hypothesis worth pursuing; we respect their viewpoint: we concede that we have no physical evidence to prove them wrong.
* However, we believe that there can be evidences which are not physical.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Similarly, Revelation 10:1-11 is a kind of evidence, the nature of which is not perfectly clear. We further hypothesize:

Revelation 10 seems to provide for a portion of the hypothesized super-natural autographa to be transmitted to John in the figure of a sweet tasting, yet bitterly digestible meal.[[5]](#endnote-5)

* The figure of eating a meal, though graphic, is not necessarily literal; probably not literal. One does not generally write on honeycomb or sugar cookies. However, this could be a veiled reference to Holy Communion, the Eucharist, which would then be seen as inseparable from the super-natural autographa.
* We think we grasp the idea of devouring or eating, rather than carelessly reading; that the fire in the belly most likely refers to compelling and passionate devotion to the topic at hand.
* This transfer of information in the form of edible substance, appears to be a delegation of Authority from the angel to John; thus being a potential indicator of Apostolic authority.
* Since John is defiled, and not at all inerrant, we conclude that once John takes the book and eats it, it cannot be inerrant any longer.
* Whatever John may say or write as a consequence of this book-eating, may be True, limited by human abilities to discern truth; yet, cannot be inerrant: especially since we have no means of knowing how to define inerrant, or with what precision inerrant must be measured.
* The problem with inerrant is that it appears to require absolute perfection in every detail: the sort of perfection of which, only God is capable.
* We concede that other views are possible.

Since no physical autographa are presently known to exist, we will not hypothesize about their existence or nature until further evidence is forthcoming.

* If a physical autograph were discovered, say something John himself wrote, it could not be inerrant.
* If a physical autograph were discovered, we could not identify it without its provenance.[[6]](#endnote-6)

*Archetype*

Since no known readable physical autographa exist we cannot find an archetype that is the known physical descendent of the autograph. We are compelled to search backwards for an archetype by analyzing, and organizing known manuscript evidence: first as families, then as families organized in a tree, then finding the root or archetype of the tree. This is supposedly done without any known provenance for most manuscripts; the construction of a hypothetical provenance is the function of the tree. This whole quest for the archetype generally falls under the field known as Text Criticism.

Some details of Old Testament manuscript or text evidence are:

* The internal evidence of the Masoretic Text (MT) places Moses and the Exodus around 1446-1406 BC.
* The internal evidence of the Septuagint (LXX) places Moses and the Exodus around 1406-1366 BC, 40 years later.[[7]](#endnote-7)
* The Septuagint evidence appears to be superior, because it is older, and preserves a witness of Hebrew in its earlier condition.[[8]](#endnote-8) The Septuagint evidence also appears to mesh more accurately with the Egyptian chronological history as it is presently understood.
* Paleo-Hebrew has no evidence for its existence prior to 1200 BC.
* There is no evidence of any alphabetic language prior to 1200 BC. Examination of earlier claims of alphabetic language appear to be highly pictographic, not really alphabetic; furthermore, these claims are located in places where contact with the Israelite peoples seems unlikely.
* There is compelling evidence of the widespread use of Akkadian Cuneiform as the lingua franca circa 1200 BC and before in the Amarna Letters.

Our working hypothesis proposes that Moses wrote around 1406-1366 BC in some language other than paleo-Hebrew; most likely in Akkadian Cuneiform. We concede that there are several other possibilities: but, none of them is compelling without the discovery of additional evidence, and the chain of evidence, or provenance as we prefer to call it.

* Necessary evidence must discover a manuscript or tablet, preferably datable to the late fifteenth century or early fourteenth century BC, in an identifiable language, with provably direct quotation(s) from Torah.
* It appears remote that we are looking for a paleo-Hebrew manuscript or tablet.
* Hypothetically, our best bet is to look for an Akkadian Cuneiform artifact.
* We cannot begin to discuss the evidentiary errancy or inerrancy of pre-Davidic, biblical literature until such a manuscript or tablet is found. We may speculate until hell freezes over: but, without such artifacts, we are left with nothing more than useless opinions.
* The dating must be above reproach; as well as the provenance.

*Text Criticism*

Along the way, students will begin to realize that the Greek Bible developed along differing lines in different major cultural areas. Perhaps the first such area was Alexandria, Egypt, which once had the best library in the Greek empire. This is probably why the Old Testament is thought to be first translated into Greek in Alexandria. Representatives of the Sanhedrin went to Alexandria to work because of the quality of research that could be done there. Later, Byzantium became a great center of culture and scholarship. Of course, Rome eventually became a leading city. Other centers include Jerusalem, Antioch, and Ephesus. Greek study cannot advance without a good detailed understanding of the cultural development of these places. Alexandria and Byzantium are especially important: for these are the places with sufficient funding and resources to pursue Greek language research and studies. Trees of reconstructed provenance closely parallel such historic cultural development: it cannot possibly be otherwise.

From such a cultural base we can begin the study of Text Criticism. The usual approach to Text Criticism is eclectic: 1881 Westcott-Hort New Testament (WHNU) for example.[[9]](#endnote-9) What is the eclectic approach? It is as if someone cut the pictures in a picture album apart, then proceeded to guess at what the real people looked like by attempting to form a composite, so the “experts” voted to select the “best” ears, eyes, lips, noses, and other features to construct the best person: any relationship to the original would be purely accidental. So this is the method that eclectic “experts” use to construct an “original” New Testament. No scientist would tolerate such destruction of evidence. Recently scholars like Robinson and Pierpont have battled against such foolishness, yet their work is not widely enough known.

Most pastors are still working from an eclectic version, such as Westcott-Hort. We have access to one of these eclectic versions in Bible Gateway; yet there are at least a half dozen other eclectic versions and editions, several of which are still in print. Needless to say, we do not have enough competent scholars to check this work.

*The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*, Article 10, boldly claims “that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they faithfully represent the original.” How many copies and translations using the eclectic method faithfully represent the original? None. Bible students are just starting to wake up to the fact that we have been sold a liberal bill of goods. Copies and translations are notoriously unreliable. The newer translations are often worse than the old ones. Instead we are following blindly where no man has ever gone before. We do not have nearly enough qualified people to check and perfect this work. So, you see, we are on a very difficult path, and we have been sold a lie convincing us that this is easy, that lay people do not need to learn Greek, do not need to understand the pitfalls of Text Criticism, do not need mastery of the cultural historical setting, etc. etc. etc.

*Greek*

We have yet to really discuss the Greek Old Testament which came into existence around 200-100 BC or earlier. Of course, it is a translation from Hebrew/Aramaic. Still, it is a better representative of the Hebrew Old Testament than the MT Hebrew Old Testament versions that would not develop for nearly one thousand years. The situation is more complicated than this; this is just to convince you that there are not enough laborers to complete the work: we must always pray to the Lord of the harvest for more competent laborers.[[10]](#endnote-10) This, of course, speaks of evangelism; yet, how will we conduct decent evangelism when everybody is convinced that the work is all done, and done well?

*Hebrew*

We would advise that you stay away from Hebrew until you are fluent in Greek, have some mastery of Text Criticism, and are well grounded in early church history.

Then you could start with the Greek Old Testament. Here is one place to find a copy:

http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/default.asp

You will also need an, *Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint*.

After you learn to swim in Greek, you may be ready to get your feet wet in Hebrew. We can find Hebrew under the Bible Gateway “drop down” arrow: The Westminster Leningrad Codex (WLC) is found immediately after the Greek. The Leningrad Codex (1008-1009 AD) is the oldest surviving “complete” MT manuscript; only a very few other fragments remain. It must be tested against Greek, Latin, and other versions for accuracy.

*Archaeology*

Archaeology has uncovered vast quantities of ancient documents: Egyptian, Akkadian, and several others. Reading these documents is critical to correct understanding of the Bible record. We do not even know how to translate some of these documents: the code has never been broken. This work requires other experts: epigraphers, ink and writing material experts, pottery and radiocarbon dating experts, students of ancient cultures, and several others. An expert epigrapher like Kenneth Kitchen takes decades to develop. Manfred Bietak’s employment of ground-penetrating radar is cosmic.

When we have developed the skill-set to spot a palimpsest from across the street, or smell a fake manuscript from across the room, we may have developed sufficient skills to begin.

*Summary*

The work cannot be done without developing a highly competent and qualified work force, and without adequate funding. Statements like, “We further affirm that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they faithfully represent the original,” or, “the autographic text of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy,” only serve to trivialize the problem and convince the rest of us not to look into it. As a result, the work does not always faithfully represent the original. Much of this work has fallen to individuals who do not share our world and life view, and whose methods are highly suspect.

If we want a good English language translation of the Bible, many of us are going to have to learn this difficult material, with a view to producing our own Bible. The work needs to be done voluntarily so that such a Bible can be offered to the world without copyright or other use restrictions. This Bible needs to be a living translation, so that as new discoveries are affirmed, appropriate revisions can be made without a lot of fuss; so that new students can make their own notations, some of which may be worthy of inclusion.

It is frustrating to continue a work with one qualified laborer[[11]](#endnote-11), where one hundred, possibly one thousand are necessary. Again, our intention is not to terrify you. We are not in as good a place as *The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy* might lead us to believe; yet we are not in a hopeless place either. We are in a place that simply requires a lot of highly skilled work, without enough highly skilled workers, and no means of supporting them financially.

*Conclusions*

No quest for the archetype can begin before we have mastery of Greek and several other skills; this may require teams of experts working together in close coordination.

No archetype for pre-Davidic literature can be formed without exact evidence for the pre-Davidic language, the Moses to David language.[[12]](#endnote-12)

Without an archetype, as well as the provenance for that archetype, it is utter foolishness to speak of inerrancy in absolutist terms.

At this time, the best evidence we have for the existence of a possibly inerrant potential super-natural autographa is found in Revelation 5 and 10; Revelation 10 provides an additional provenance possibly linking God to John to the Church.

Our working hypotheses is, in its final form: Revelation 5 and 10 provide possible evidence for the existence of a possibly inerrant potential super-natural autographa; further, they provide possible evidence for the existence of a probably errant archetype or physical autographa (Apostolic Authority), handed down within the cultural custody of the Church (Church Authority).

Well, we gave it our best shot. Now, dear reader, the ball is in your court, it’s all up to you. You must find the new evidence, you must determine better ways of looking at existing evidence, you must become the generation that formulates the next new and better working hypothesis. We only ask that you be fair minded in your work; do not allow your prejudicial biases to override your capacity to think fresh thoughts.[[13]](#endnote-13)

[[14]](#endnote-14)

1. The key word in play is, βιβλίον (book), not codex, not scroll: it could be in either format. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Ezekiel 9:3; 10:4, 18-19; 11:23 [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Ezekiel 2:8-10 [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Alvin Plantinga discusses the problem of philosophical Warrant:

<https://philpapers.org/rec/PLAPAD-4>

<http://hettingern.people.cofc.edu/Intro_to_Philosophy_Sp_06/Plantinga_Religious_Exclusivism.htm>

<http://carnivalsage.com/articles/Biographies/21st-century-luminaries/alvin-plantinga-philosopher/plantinga-alvin-pluralism-defense-of-religious-exclusivism.html> [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. Which is possibly a direct reference to Ezekiel 2:8-10 [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. In cruder terms, even if it were a snake and bit us, we would still have considerable difficulty in learning and proving that it was, in fact, an autograph. We would, most likely, be staring directly at the evidence, and still fail to recognize what it truly is. We are just not that smart. We do believe in Murphy’s law. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Please note that in comparing MT with Septuagint, or equally with Vulgate, and many other versions, we have discovered an errant, not an inerrant text. Similarly, manuscript variation, requiring sorting, as well as tree construction, argues for errancy, not for inerrancy. There are always great possibilities of additional error associated with such text critical work. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. LXX, a work of the Jews, predates MT by roughly 1000 years. Since, by this time Hebrew has long since lapsed into being a dead language, the toy of scholars, the Hebrew language has become an unstable and mostly nonexistent authority. 1000 years is a very significant lapse: Hebrew has lost contact with all but the most minute trace of its provenance. Hebrew provenance and text criticism can mainly be done from the LXX family variations; it is no longer possible to do credible text criticism on Hebrew manuscripts, because they no longer exist. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Eclecticism does not refer merely to the gathering of as many copies, opinions, or voices as possible. It refers, rather, to the attempt to organize and sort all known copies on the basis of clearly observable variation, into distinct groups. Ostensibly, documents with identical additions, errors, and omissions would belong to the same group; it would be highly unlikely that these identical additions, errors, and omissions would accidentally cross-pollinate another group. Consequently, we hope, by a process of diligent sorting to identify these distinct groups, their priority, and their relationship with each other.

Eclecticism then attempts to arrive at the Archetype by combining the several witnesses to produce a text that may not actually exist in any known manuscript.

“Since the mid-19th century, eclecticism, in which there is no a priori bias to favor a single manuscript, has been the dominant method of editing the Greek text of the New Testament (currently, the United Bible Society, 4th ed. and Nestle-Aland, 27th ed.). Even so, the oldest manuscripts, being of the Alexandrian text-type, are the most favored, and the critical text has an Alexandrian disposition.” — ibid.

Eclecticism is supposedly performed without bias. However, current work has tended to favor the Alexandrian text-type with considerable bias. — ibid

This method also carries the real statistical risk of producing a manuscript that is worse than any of its parent manuscripts.

Example one: Say we begin with 1000 known true exact copies of the Autographa (an absurd assumption). An evil person has mixed 10 fraudulent copies with the good ones. Our inspection accuracy is 99%, which is exceptionally good. We correctly identify frauds as frauds, and trues as trues 99% of the time. We only err 1% of the time. The resultant examination identifies 9.9 fraudulent documents as frauds, and only 0.1 fraudulent document as true. 990 true manuscripts are verified to be true, but only 10 are mistakenly designated to be frauds. Now we regroup and find that we have identified a total of 19.9 documents as frauds and 990.1 documents as trues. We seem to have gotten worse, not better. Why? Moreover, our 19.9 manuscripts identified as frauds, actually condemn 10, more than half of the documents falsely. Meanwhile, our set of trues actually contains .1 fraud. We started with a set including 10 frauds, or 10 Byzantines, or 10 Westerns, and 1000 known Alexandrians: a 0.99% fraudulent set. Now we only have a 0.01% fraudulent set. However, this improvement cost us the loss of 10 good document manuscripts. Repeated sorting may actually make the outcome better, but at a steadily increasing cost.

Example two: Suppose we begin with 1000 known true exact copies of the Autographa. This time an evil person has mixed 1000 fraudulent copies with the good ones. Our inspection accuracy is still 99%. The resultant examination identifies 990 fraudulent documents as frauds, and only 10 fraudulent document as true. 990 true manuscripts are verified to be true, but only 10 are mistakenly designated to be frauds. Now we regroup and find that we have identified a total of 1000 documents as frauds and 1000 documents as trues. Our 1000 manuscripts identified as frauds, still condemn 10 true documents falsely. Meanwhile, our set of trues actually contains 10 frauds. We started with a set including 1000 frauds, or 1000 Byzantines, or 1000 Westerns, and 1000 known Alexandrians: a 50% fraudulent set. Now we only have a 1% fraudulent set, or misidentified Alexandrian set. However, this improvement still cost us the loss of 10 good manuscripts.

It is even possible to sort the set and make it worse. Such sorting cannot be trusted to the hands of sloppy workers. It is a high risk venture that must be committed to the most meticulous and skilled. The better the original set, the harder it is to improve it. It is entirely possible to mistakenly identify Byzantine documents as Alexandrian or Western. It is not out of the question that even the group names Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Western are in error.

I have no experience with sorting ancient documents. I have a great deal of experience with the nearly identical process of inspecting industrial parts. It is a costly and often worthless enterprise. Once errors are introduced into any system it becomes unbelievably difficult to weed them out. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Matthew 9:38; Luke 10:2 [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Kitchen, for example. The word esoteric comes to mind. The breadth of our esotericism needs to ne increased. We need to make thousands of clones of Dr. Kitchen: rather, we need thousands of individuals with Kitchen like hearts and skills who are able to think for themselves. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. This broad gap between fundamentalist opinions and the extant evidence is part of the reason wildly speculative opinions like the various Documentary Hypotheses survive. Without much, much more evidence we will not be able to reduce this knowledge gap, let alone, construct a credible archetype from it. Proof must show a pre-Davidic paleo-Hebrew corpus dating at least as far as 1406 BC; or, it must show another biblical language record (for example: Akkadian Cuneiform) consistent with this timespan from Moses to David. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Much of what I learned about inerrancy came from refuting the Documentary Hypothesis. As I was forced to confront the Documentary Hypothesis, one word at a time, I eventually discovered the point that there is no evidence of much prior to David; even David is hotly (if foolishly) contested in the field of Archaeology.

In giving credence to the fact that there is no evidence for the birth of alphabetic language prior to 1200 BC, I was forced to consider and propose other solutions: this eventually lead to the discovery that it was possible for a literal man named Moses to live and write in the period from 1406-1366 BC in another language, possibly Akkadian Cuneiform.

Once we free ourselves from the chains of our own prejudices, we begin to think outside of the box: only then do we begin to make rational progress.

I had to un-think much of what I had been taught, even about the Bible, to be able to rethink, to even see the Bible and the universe in their own lights.

Hypotheses are always formed to fail, never to survive; we only advance when we discover contradiction, when the old hypotheses fail: then, and only then, are we forced to set aside the old hypotheses and forge new ones. It is in the very willingness to cast aside, old hypotheses found wrong, old prejudices in error, that we begin to look for better solutions.

We have to become wrong, to admit and face failure, to become right (at least more correct than we were before). [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)