

the alternative claim that God is not able inerrantly to communicate His thoughts to man, we must ask, "What man is that who dares to presume to say what God can and cannot do, apart from revelation?" It is clear in Scripture that there are some things which God cannot do, but His revelation of truth to man is never mentioned as one of them! In fact, one of the things which God is said not to be able to do is specifically related to this claim -- "God cannot lie" (Tit 1:2). Thus we must reject this alternative. If God, who created man's mind, can communicate one truth to man, then in principle there is no reason why He cannot communicate any finite number of truths to man.

And it will not do to ask, "But what does man really *need* for the knowledge of salvation?" and answer, "Not an inerrant, but only an essentially trustworthy revelation." We do not decide the nature of *what God revealed* by the measure of what man needs; but rather by the measure of *what God purposed to do, and did* in His revelation to man. And there is no other source of knowledge as to what God purposed to do, than the statements of Scripture themselves! The norm of the content of revelation must be the content of the inscripturated revelation. There is no other objective norm!

### **Step Two: Inscripturation**

The second step in the transmission of God's Word is that of the inscripturation of revelation. Here we must ask the question, "Has God caused His revelation to be *truly inscripturated*?" To this question we must reply that either revelation has been truly (i.e., inerrant, for truth by definition must exclude error) inscripturated, or human finiteness and fallibility have conditioned (at least to some degree) the inscripturation of revelation. If the latter is true, then either we need an absolute principle external to Scripture in order to distinguish divine truth from human error; or, lacking such a principle, we cannot know what is true and what is false, and thus cannot help being reduced to agnosticism or skepticism with regard to any absolute truth in Scripture.

If the *kerygma* (the message, or proclamation) of Christ be claimed as the absolute principle by which truth can be distinguished from error, then it should be pointed out that by definition the *kerygma* itself is conditioned as to its inscripturation by human finiteness and fallibility. Thus the *kerygma* cannot escape the possibility of error, and therefore cannot be the