

reliance for truth is on his own mind, Scripture notwithstanding." That kind of infallibility we do not need!

"Infallibility" is a good word. However, whenever we see it or use it, we should realize that, in the present climate of discussion it can mean, on the one hand that the Bible is "incapable of error," or on the other hand that the Bible "will not fail to achieve the goals and purposes which God intended for it." The first definition affirms inerrancy; the second does not deny inerrancy but does not require it.

James Montgomery Boice, in the preface to *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*, sounds a warning note. He says:

other persons will argue that infallibility is a better word than inerrancy for describing the soundest evangelical position on Scripture .... Unfortunately, the majority of those who choose infallible rather than inerrant do so because they want to affirm something less than total inerrancy, suggesting erroneously that the Bible is dependable in some areas (such as faith and morals) while not being fully dependable in others (such as matters of history and science).

But whose word shall we believe -- the word of twentieth-century scholars admittedly writing without benefit of inspiration, or the word of a first century apostle writing by divine inspiration and carried along by the Holy Spirit? The twentieth-century scholars express their opinion that the Bible is not fully dependable in some areas. The first-century apostle, speaking from God, says "All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable." Whose word shall we believe? The question is obviously rhetorical!

### **Inerrancy**

In his paper, "The Meaning of Inerrancy," Paul Feinberg proposes a definition of this term. He says:

Inerrancy means that when all facts are known, the Scriptures in their original autographs and properly interpreted will be shown to be wholly true in everything that they affirm, whether that has to do with doctrine or