

the writer).

7. Inerrancy does not guarantee the exhaustive comprehensiveness of any single account or of combined accounts where those are involved.
8. Inerrancy does not demand the infallibility or inerrancy of the non-inspired sources used by biblical writers.

However, in spite of these important qualifications, Clark Pinnock, in an article in *Biblical Authority*, edited by Jack Rogers and published in 1977, states that he is not comfortable with the term inerrancy, although he says that he still holds it. But the manner in which he qualifies the term seems to dilute it considerably. For example, he asks seven questions about inerrancy, as follows:

"Question One: Is inerrancy scriptural?" He says that inerrancy is a possible inference from the Bible, but not the only one. We may "choose to draw" the inference or not.

"Question Two: Is inerrancy a logical corollary of inspiration?" (i.e., does inspiration logically require inerrancy?). Pinnock says that it does not.

"Question Three: Is inerrancy meaningful?" He says it is not very meaningful and often misleading to many evangelicals.

"Question Four: Is inerrancy as epistemological necessity?" (i.e., must the Bible be inerrant in order for us to know that its teachings are true?). He says that such an argument weakens the evangelical view.

"Question Five: Is inerrancy theologically decisive?" Pinnock claims that our focus should be "upon the saving truth of the Bible to bear witness to Christ," not upon "the precise accuracy of minor details." The emphasis, he says, should be upon "the self-evident authority of Scripture, preached in the power of the Spirit."

"Question Six: Is inerrancy critically honest?" He claims that preoccupation with artificial attempts to harmonize stock problems has prevented evangelicals from handling "newer issues" and from "getting ahead in biblical interpretation."

"Question Seven: Ought inerrancy to be the test of evangelical