

# UNIT 3: God's Revealing Work

## Section 3: Infallibility & Inerrancy

→ Read *Explaining Inerrancy* by RC Sproul

*Theological Works:*  
Calvin, Enns, Elwell, Erickson,  
Grudem, Hodge, Ryrie, Turretin

### INTRODUCTION:

Having established our belief in the Inspiration of God's Word, we now can move on to associated doctrines. To affirm "verbal plenary inspiration" has the necessary consequence of believing several other things regarding scripture, which would seemingly be affirmed by all. But as we mentioned in closing our previous section, there is an ever-increasing need to clarify our beliefs in the midst of those who "claim to hold to our same beliefs" and yet mean something completely different in their affirmation of "inspiration." **Charles Ryrie** explained, "Each addition to the basic statement [of inspiration] arose because of an erroneous teaching." We're going to center our time on the doctrines of infallibility and inerrancy in these next few weeks – providing definitions, clarifications, theological bases, and significances to these two doctrines. We'll also look at some of the objections voiced against inerrancy as well as some quotations from those who have upheld this doctrine historically (centering in on some famous Baptists who stood for this crucial doctrine). We saw in our last section that **Charles Hodge** explains, "The object or design of revelation is the communication of knowledge. The object or design of inspiration is to secure infallibility in teaching... The effect of revelation was to render its recipient wiser. The effect of inspiration was to preserve him from error in teaching." The only way that teaching can be preserved and error avoided is to be certain that the foundation of our teaching presents only truth and is free from error... This is why this discussion is no "small, inconsequential" matter – huge implications here!

*Q1: What is the difference between infallibility and inerrancy?*

*Q2: Why is this an important issue? Why is there so much discussion over this issue?*

*Q3: How do we handle objections to inerrancy?*

## I. Definitions & Clarifications

### A. Inerrancy

1. The term 'inerrancy' literally means "without error, free from error, not mistaken, or not false" and is applied to the Scriptures to communicate that the OT and NT are free from error in the autographs (the original manuscripts of the biblical writers).
2. **Enns**, "In the past it was sufficient to state that the Bible was inspired; however, it has now become necessary to define the evangelical position more precisely."
3. This is borne out in the fact that older systematic theology books do not handle this as a separate issue... it was assumed under the topic of inspiration.
4. **Boice**, "Inerrancy means that when all the facts are known, the Scriptures in their original autographs and properly interpreted will be shown to be wholly true in everything they teach, whether that teaching has to do with doctrine, history, science, geography, geology, or other disciplines or knowledge."
5. **Ryrie**, "the inerrancy of the Bible means simply that the Bible tells the truth. Truth can and does include approximations, free quotations, language of appearances, and different accounts of the same event as long as these do not contradict."
6. Clarifications:
  - a. Inerrancy applies to the Scriptures, not interpretations of them.
  - b. Inerrancy applies to the autographs.

- c. Inerrancy applies to the statements of the Scripture – there is accuracy in its reporting. So, the lies of Satan (for example) are written accurately.
- d. Inerrancy does not require strict adherence to certain grammatical rules, and allows for general, phenomenological, metaphorical, and poetic assertions.
- e. Inerrancy does not require direct quotation... indirect quotation and paraphrase may be used by the Biblical writers (esp. NT citations of the OT).
- f. Inerrancy does not require an answer to every “problem passage” but instead affirms that these “problems” could be solved with sufficient information and no logical contradiction exists in the Scriptures.

## *B. Infallibility*

1. While “infallibility” can serve as a rough synonym for “inerrancy” in theological discourse it has taken on a “nuanced” meaning...
  - a. Today there have been some theologians who come from a conservative background who want to hold to a “high view” of scripture and meanwhile not affirm inerrancy.
  - b. These affirm that the Bible is consistent and trustworthy, and not misleading, but they believe the bible might contain errors of a historical, factual, or scientific nature.
  - c. While admitting errors in the Scripture, they argue that these “alleged errors” are trivial in nature and therefore take nothing away from the value of the word of God.
  - d. **Example:** A guy who affirms infallibility but denies inerrancy...his idea, as with many, is that “infallibility” means that the Bible “does not fail” to accomplish its purpose, which is salvation...“The Bible is infallible, as I define that term, but not inerrant. There are historical and scientific errors in the Bible, but I have found none on matters of faith practice.”
  - e. So they affirm “infallibility” but reject “inerrancy” –beware of these gymnastics!
2. What is the problem with this sort of distinction?
  - a. It really is an “improper” usage of the term infallibility...
  - b. The historic, technical distinction between infallibility and inerrancy is a matter of possibility versus actuality.
    - Something that is “infallible” is UNABLE to make mistakes and err...
    - Something that is “inerrant” is in fact without error...
    - The difference is between hypothetical and real, theoretical and actual.
    - Therefore, it is possible for someone to be fallible and yet inerrant. In other words, for someone who has the potential to err, who in some instance does not.
    - But, the reverse is not possible. Someone who is infallible is not able to err. To say someone/something is infallible and yet errant is to distort the meanings of infallible and/or errant. If something errs, it proves that it is capable of erring and therefore not infallible.
  - c. So infallibility in its original, technical sense is a “higher” affirmation than “inerrancy”

## *C. Various Conceptions of Inerrancy (Erickson):*

1. Absolute Inerrancy – The Bible, which includes rather detailed treatment of matters both scientific and historical, is fully true. The impression is conveyed that the Biblical writers intended to give a considerable amount of exact scientific and historical data...
2. Full Inerrancy – Also holds the Bible to be completely true. While the Bible does not primarily aim to give scientific data, such scientific and historical assertions as it does

make are fully true. Scientific and historical references can be understood as “popular descriptions” – phenomenal accounting & use of approximations.

3. Limited Inerrancy – The Bible is inerrant and infallible in its salvific doctrinal references, but biblical writers were subject to limitations of their time, and consequently the Bible may well contain what we would term errors in areas of science and history.
4. Inerrancy of Purpose – The Bible inerrantly accomplishes its purpose (brining people into fellowship with Christ, not necessarily communicating truths). Truth is not so much a quality descriptive of propositions as a means to accomplish an end...
5. Accommodated Revelation – Proponents of this position do not claim or desire to use the term “inerrancy” at all. These people claim that errors have infiltrated the scriptures at all subjects (including spiritual ones).
6. Neo-orthodox Position – Revelation is “non-propositional” – the function of scripture is merely to point us to an “encounter” with God. The whole question of “true/false” does not apply... The presence of “errors” in no way stands against the Bible’s functional usefulness.
7. Inerrancy as Irrelevant – Some believe the discussion doesn’t matter at all. Either on the basis of the neo-orthodox position, or on the basis of being unable to prove it so...

## II. Theological Basis & Significance

### A. *Basis*

1. The doctrine of inerrancy is closely tied to the doctrine of inspiration.
2. Since God is true (and does not lie) and the Scriptures are breathed out by His Superintendence, then they carry the same quality – being truthful without error.
3. **Enns**, “To suggest there are errors in the Bible is to impugn the character of God.”
4. **Grudem**, “If we have mistakes in the copies (as we do), then these are only the mistakes of men. But if we have mistakes in the original manuscripts, then we are forced to say not only that men made mistakes, but that God Himself made a mistake and spoke falsely. This we cannot do.”

### B. *Significance*

1. One’s affirmation of inerrancy is NOT an essential of the Christian Faith, but it is largely impactful... In other words, to deny inerrancy does not, of itself, make one a non-Christian, but it does have huge implications...
2. One’s denial of inerrancy seems to highlight other doctrinal problems:
  - a. Inspiration – it’s hard to understand how someone can deny inerrancy and still hold to “verbal, plenary inspiration” ... there seems to be a contradiction here!
  - b. Providence – If one denies God’s ability to superintend the Scriptures in such a way as to prevent them from error in the original writings, this might be linked to a deficient view of God’s Sovereignty/Governance of the World in general.
  - c. Christology – If one denies inerrancy on the basis of it’s “human and divine” origin, there seems to be no reason for affirming the incarnation (dual natures of Christ). Also if the bible has errors, who is to say that our understanding of Christ is correct?
  - d. Any denial of inerrancy due to suspicion of error in certain texts opens up suspicion to every other text as well...
    - Belief Examples: Denial of the historical fall of Adam, Denial of the facts surrounding Jonah the prophet, Denial of the miracles of the OT and NT...

- Behavior Examples: Loss of calling immorality sin – like adultery, homosexuality, abortion, etc...
3. One's affirmation of inerrancy carries with it a couple important implications:
    - a. Theological Study: Scripture is looked to as the ultimate standard for theological development, and all of it must be considered. Not only the straightforward statements, but also the implications of those statements must be considered.
    - b. Exegetical Method: Inerrancy gives value to the discipline of textual criticism, commits the church to an ongoing exegetical process, and does not allow "problem passages" to be simply dismissed (they must be dealt with and examined seriously).
    - c. Exegetical/Expository Preaching: Inerrancy provides the foundation for preaching word by word, verse by verse through the Scriptures. We care about every word because we believe every word to be true and accurate, in no way misleading!

### III. Objections to Inerrancy

#### A. "Problem" Passages

1. Guidelines for dealing w/ supposed errors:
  - a. Prayer – this should always be our approach to scripture and exegesis
  - b. Interpret the passage in light of the rest of Scripture –
    - *Sola Scriptura* – lit. "The Scriptures alone"
    - *Analogia fide* – lit. "the analogy of the faith" – the Reformation principle of comparing Scripture with Scripture and *interpreting* Scripture with Scripture...
    - *Tota Scriptura* – lit. "the totality of Scripture" *all the Scripture must be considered*
  - c. Be honest with the difficulty and realize that many problems that have been labeled "errors" in the past have been given interpretive solutions that are satisfactory to Christians and non-Christians alike.
2. Common Solutions to the *problems*:
  - a. Note the literary genre and make allowances for literary devices.
  - b. Allow for phenomenal language
  - c. Realize that quotations do not have to be literal to be true/accurate
  - d. Recognize that numbers can be rounded and still true
  - e. Understand that "different perspectives" can be employed such that certain details are left out from certain accounts...
  - f. Realize that you could be dealing with a bad translation or a "copyist error"

#### B. Refuting Arguments Against Inerrancy

1. Objections to the *term* Inerrancy
  - a. *Inerrancy fails to recognize the variety of genres that make up the Bible*
    - But this is simply not true. As a matter of fact this is an important fact appealed to by "inerrantists" – this objection manifests a failure to recognize what inerrancy is.
  - b. *Inerrancy depicts a bookish view of Christianity, devoid of living relationship w/ God*
    - While inerrancy upholds a high view of Scripture (it is normative for faith and practice), it does not deny experience completely! It affirms that experience must be tested in light of the Scriptures. Actually, inerrancy affirms a dynamic relationship w/ God by the work of the H. S. through the living Word of God.
  - c. *Inerrancy is not a "Biblical" term*

- Just because the term is not specifically used in the bible does not mean it is unbiblical... Nowhere does the Bible use the term “trinity” but the doctrine is clearly taught in the Scriptures! It is the straightforward explanation upholding biblical testimony that there is One God in Three Persons.
  - Biblical Defense of this doctrine:
    - Jesus affirmed inerrancy –
      - Matt 4:4 lives by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God
      - Matt 5:17-18 Law fulfilled to the jot (yodh) and tittle  
→ ex) beth [ב] vs kaph [כ] **OR** daleth [ד] vs resh [ר] (small extension)
      - *Also remember Scriptures we utilized in explain and defending inspiration: **Jn 10:31-38, Matt 22:23-33, 41-46***
      - Christ acknowledged Adam & Eve created by God -marriage (Matt 19:3-5)
      - Christ verified Noah, the Ark, and the Flood (Matt 24:38-39)
      - Christ spoke of God’s destruction of Sodom (Matt 10:15, Lk 17:28-29)
      - **Ryrie** points out that He also spoke of Jonah (Matt 12:40), Isaiah (12:17), Elijah (17:11-12), Daniel (24:15), Abel (23:35), Zechariah (23:35), David (22:45), Moses and his writings (8:4), Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (8:11).”
    - All of our arguments for “inspiration” apply here...II Tim 3:16, II Peter 1
    - As well as the following references:
      - **Prov 30:5** Every word of God is tested [ESV: “proves true”]; He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him.
      - **Ps 12:6** The words of the LORD are pure words; As silver tried in a furnace on the earth, refined seven times.
      - **Num 23:19** "God is not a man, that He should lie, Nor a son of man, that He should repent; Has He said, and will He not do it? Or has He spoken, and will He not make it good?"
  - d. *Inerrancy is a very recent term – not used for 1<sup>st</sup> 1800 yr in church history*
    - This term was not utilized until recently because it was assumed by all biblical scholars until just recently. And just because the term isn’t utilized, does not mean that the teaching behind the term was absent.
    - **Chicago Statement Article XVI: Church History We affirm that the doctrine of inerrancy has been integral to the church’s faith throughout its history. We deny that inerrancy is a doctrine invented by scholastic Protestantism, or is a reactionary position postulated in response to negative higher criticism.**
    - A good example is found in **Martin Luther**. While he didn’t use the term inerrancy, Luther argued that the Scriptures never “err.”
    - **Sproul**, “We find the doctrine [of inerrancy] taught, embraced, and espoused by men such as St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, and a host of Christian scholars and teachers throughout the history of the church... It is not the affirmation of inerrancy that is of recent vintage; it is its denial.”
2. Objections arising from the limitations of language
- a. Some believe the “creatureliness” of language renders it inherently errant when speaking of God because He is infinitely greater than our expressions about Him.

- b. While we must admit that our language (especially in reference to God) is never comprehensive and exhaustive in its ability to capture eternal truths, it is capable of communicating truth w/o error.
  - c. Ex) To say: “God is good” – is a true statement even though it is not exhaustive!
  - d. God created man in His own image and built communication into creation by design.
  - e. Surely, the God who made us and gave us language can work in such a way as to prevent corruption, distortion, and falsehood from entering the Scriptures..
  - f. **Chicago Statement Article IV: Human Language** *We affirm that God who made mankind in His image has used language as a means of revelation. We deny that human language is so limited by our creatureliness that it is rendered inadequate as a vehicle for divine revelation. We further deny that the corruption of human culture and language through sin has thwarted God’s work of inspiration.*
3. Objections arising from the *human element* in inscripturation
- a. Rests on an INVALID logical argument:
    - Premise #1: Human beings are fallible.
    - Premise #2: The Bible was written by human beings.
    - Conclusion: Therefore, The Bible must be fallible.
  - b. Here is a valid argument:
    - Premise #1: Human beings are fallible.
    - Premise #2: The Bible was written by human beings.
    - Conclusion: Therefore, the Bible may be fallible.
  - c. The difference: The “necessity of fallibility is removed. To be fallible means that it is possible for one to make a mistake, but it is not required... Inerrancy is still possible even if fallible beings produce it.”
  - d. But we might also take exception with the 1<sup>st</sup> premise – “To be human, is one required to be fallible?” (i.e. Is it true that “to err is human”)?
    - Were Adam and Eve in the state of “innocence” human? YES! But it is true that they were “capable” of sinning (since they did)! **By the way**, this is a great argument for what we spoke of above... Adam and Eve before the Fall were “inerrant” but not “infallible” – for they had the possibility of falling but didn’t actually do so until they sinned...
    - But it is true that they were fallible (able to err) even while not errant (having erred). So perhaps a better example is the state of “glorification.” The Scriptures speak of the church’s final state as one in which we will be no longer capable of sinning... Are we still human? YES (albeit a glorified humanity!)
    - Also, one other “perfect example” – JESUS... Was Jesus fully man and fully God? YES! Did Jesus sin? NO! (He was inerrant)... Was Jesus capable of error? (this is a question that can be handled all by itself) My conclusion is that he was NOT capable of error... but meanwhile He was fully human as well as fully God!
    - The mistake is to assume that Jesus is *merely* human. He was also God. Likewise, the Bible is not merely a human book; it is also the Word of God. Like Jesus, they are divine and cannot err. There can no more be an error in God’s written Word than there was a sin in God’s living Word.
    - **Ryrie**, “There is an orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, and there is an orthodox doctrine of the Bible. Both involve God and man, and each results in a sinless product.”

- e. So we can uphold the human and divine element of Scripture in such a way that God “superintended the process whereby every word was kept free from error.”
  - f. **Sproul**, “If it is possible for an uninspired person to speak the truth without error, how much more will it be the case for one who is under the influence of inspiration.”
  - g. **Chicago Statement Article IX: Inerrancy** *We affirm that inspiration, though not conferring omniscience, guaranteed true and trustworthy utterance on all matters of which the biblical authors were moved to speak and write. We deny that the finitude or fallenness of these writers, by necessity or otherwise, introduced distortion or falsehood into God’s Word.*
  - h. **Spurgeon**, “One might suppose that believers in Plenary Inspiration were all idiots; for their opponents are most benevolently anxious to remind them of facts which none but half-witted persons could ever forget. Over and over they cry, ‘But there is a human side to inspiration.’ Of course there is; there must be the man to be inspired as well as the God to inspire him. Whoever doubted this? The inference which is supposed to be inevitable is that imperfection is, therefore, to be found in the Bible, since man is imperfect. But the inference is not true. God can come into the nearest union with manhood, and he can use men for His purposes, and yet their acts may not in the least degree restrain His purposes with moral obliquity... The human side has communicated no taint whatever to the Holy Spirit. Every Word of God is pure and sure, whether viewed as the utterance of man or as the thought of God.”
4. Objections charging “inerrantists” with being “unscholarly”
    - a. Usually this sort of objection comes from scholars who charge those who hold to inerrancy as lacking objectivity. They explain that the doctrine of inerrancy requires certain presuppositions the preclude the interpreter from being objective, and therefore those who believe such are not “authentic scholars.”
    - b. But what makes someone an “authentic scholar?” Whose definition of “objectivity” is being utilized? What is absolute objectivity? Who can claim it?
    - c. It also must be admitted that EVERYONE has presuppositions and expectations, including “higher critics” who disbelieve the divine character of the Scriptures.
  5. Objections based upon “actual errors” in the Bible
    - a. Many times these errors are pointed out with the purpose of then explaining that the Bible while containing errors in certain “areas” is free from error when it comes to “spiritual matters” ... this sort of thought is combined with the problem of denying inerrancy and affirming infallibility (cited above).
    - b. But once the Scripture is held to be “errant” what guarantee does one have that “the spiritual matters” are absolutely true?
      - Jesus asks Nicodemus in **Jn 3:12** “that if can’t believe Me in earthly things, how can you believe Me in heavenly things?”
      - Here Jesus sets forth a common principle – if you aren’t trustworthy in “commonly held things” then what assurance is there that you will be in “unique statements?”
      - **Enns**, “If the Bible cannot be trusted in matters of chronology, history, and geography, it cannot be trusted in the message of salvation.”
      - **Erickson**, “If the Bible should prove to be in error in those realms where its claims can be checked, on what possible basis would we logically continue to hold to its dependability in areas where we cannot verify what it says?”

- *Once credibility is compromised, it is not easily regained or preserved in other matters – ex) if a lecturer makes erroneous statements on a subject which you are familiar, you will question comments made on a subject you are not familiar with.*
- c. **Chicago Statement Article XII: Inerrancy of the Whole We affirm that Scripture in its entirety is inerrant, being free from all falsehood, fraud, or deceit. We deny that biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious or redemptive themes, exclusive of assertions in the fields of history and science. We further deny that scientific hypotheses about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on creation and the flood.**
  - d. These “errors” are only “apparent.” Many of the former so-called errors have been explained/resolved to the satisfaction of virtually all scholars. (see above)
  - e. **Chicago Statement Article XIV: Consistency We affirm the unity and internal consistency of Scripture. We deny that alleged errors and discrepancies that have not yet been resolved vitiate the truth claims of the Bible.**
    - **Sproul**, “New knowledge acquired about the ancient texts and the meaning of language in the biblical age as well as new discoveries coming from manuscripts and parchments uncovered by archaeology have given substantial help in resolving problems and have provided a solid basis for optimism with respect to future resolution of the remaining difficulties.”
    - **\*Read p70-85 in Francis Turretin’s Institutes of Elenctic Theology**
6. Objections due to fear of “bibliolatry”
    - a. This is an utter misrepresentation... Evangelicals don’t worship the Bible. We hold to inerrancy because we see it as revelation of the God who we worship.
    - b. This argument really is away from the issue at hand, too... the question is regarding the truthfulness of the biblical text.
  7. Objections charging this doctrine irrelevant
    - a. The objection of irrelevancy usually comes on the basis of the “qualifications” given regarding the affirmation that is made... especially in connection with the autographs.
    - b. **Feinberg** in Elwell explains, “It has been objected that since the original autographs no longer exist and since the doctrine applies only to them, inerrancy is meaningless.”
    - c. **Chicago Statement Article X: The Autographs We affirm that inspiration, strictly speaking, applies only to the autographic text of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy. We further affirm that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they faithfully represent the original. We deny that any essential element of the Christian faith is affected by the absence of the autographs. We further deny that this absence renders the assertion of biblical inerrancy invalid or irrelevant.**
    - d. **This statement is important in that it clearly affirms the trustworthiness of the scripture – and makes plain that “being God’s Word” the Scriptures are true and not misleading, being authoritative!**
    - e. It serves as the basis for the science of textual criticism which seeks to reconstruct an original text by careful study of extant (presently existing) manuscripts.
    - f. **Sproul**, “For more than 99% of the cases, the original text can be reconstructed to a practical certainty. Even in the few cases where some perplexity remains, this does not impinge on the meaning of Scripture to the point of clouding a tenet of the faith or a mandate of life... In those minuscule segments of existing manuscripts where

textual criticism has not been able to ascertain with absolute certainty what the original reading was, no essential article of the Christian faith is affected.”

## IV. The Battle over Inerrancy

### A. What is at stake?

1. **Chicago Statement Article XIX: The Health of the Church** *We affirm that a confession of the full authority, infallibility, and inerrancy of Scripture is vital to a sound understanding of the whole of the Christian faith. We further affirm that such confession should lead to increasing conformity to the image of Christ. We deny that such confession is necessary for salvation. However, we further deny that inerrancy can be rejected without grave consequences, both to the individual and to the church.*
2. **Sproul**, “Confession of belief in the inerrancy of Scripture is not an essential of the Christian faith necessary for salvation... However, severe consequences... may befall the individual or church which casually and easily rejects inerrancy... When the church loses its confidence in the authority of sacred Scripture the church inevitably looks to human opinion as its guiding light. When that happens, the purity of the church is directly threatened.”
3. **Grudem provides four serious problems that arise from denying inerrancy:**
  - (1) If we deny inerrancy, a serious moral problem confronts us: May we imitate God and intentionally lie in small matters also?
  - (2) If inerrancy is denied, we begin to wonder if we can really trust God in anything He says.
  - (3) If we deny inerrancy, we essentially make our own human minds a higher standard of truth than God’s Word itself.
  - (4) If we deny inerrancy, then we must also say that the Bible is wrong not only in minor details but in some of its doctrines as well... the teaching of the Bible on itself is called into question, which calls into question other doctrines!
  - (5) **Erickson**, “History is the laboratory in which theology tests its ideas, we must conclude that the departure from belief in complete trustworthiness of the Bible is a very serious step, not only in terms of what it does to this one doctrine, but even more in terms of what happens to other doctrines as a result.”

### B. What has been said?

1. **Augustine**, “Most disastrous consequences must follow upon our believing that anything false is found in the sacred books. That is to say that the men by whom the Scripture has been given to us and committed to writing put down in these books anything false. If you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority one false statement, there will not be left a single sentence of those books, which, if appearing to anyone difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away as a statement, in which intentionally, the author declared what was not true.” – *domino theory!*
2. **Thomas Aquinas**, “Nothing false can underlie the literal sense of Scripture.”
3. **Martin Luther**, “The Scriptures have never erred... The Scriptures cannot err... It is certain that Scripture would not contradict itself; it only appears so to the senseless and obdurate hypocrites.”
4. **John Wesley**, “Nay, if there be any mistakes in the Bible there may well be a thousand. If there is one falsehood in that Book it did not come from the God of truth.”

5. **Basil Manly**, “The doctrine which we hold is that commonly styled Plenary Inspiration, or Full Inspiration. It is that the Bible as a whole is the Word of God, so that in every part of Scripture there is both infallible truth and divine authority.” In another place Manly states, “The difference between an inspired and an uninspired Bible is of a momentous character... An uninspired Bible, whatever excellence might be, would have three serious defects: (1) It would furnish no infallible standard of truth (2) It would present no authoritative rule for obedience and no ground for confident and everlasting hopes (3) It would offer no suitable means for testing and cultivating the docile spirit.”
6. **Erickson**, “In a world in which there are so many erroneous conceptions and so many opinions, the Bible is a sure source of guidance. For when correctly interpreted, it can be fully relied on in all that it teaches. It is a sure, dependable, and trustworthy authority.”