

paraphrases drift away from the text of the autographs, to that degree is "inspiredness" diminished.

Of course, we do not possess the autographs. But we can discover through textual criticism the words of Scripture that are attested by the best textual evidence. And then we may ask: "Can the apographs drift so far from the best attested text that they no longer retain the quality of "inspiredness"? This could be possible, particularly as specific points where apographs have deliberately emended the text, or have selected a dubious reading in order to support a theological bias. However, unless the apograph as a whole has corrupted the content of the best-attested text so badly that the text is no longer recognizable, some degree of "inspiredness" would probably remain in the apograph. But even then, a distinction would need to be made between an essentially trustworthy copy of Scripture and an essentially untrustworthy one; the difference being that an essentially trustworthy copy would be one which, with confidence, we could commend almost indiscriminately, and an essentially untrustworthy copy would be one which we could not commend at all, or about which we would have strong reservations.

The second important implication that flows from this proposal is that we can have a tremendous confidence in the fact that we possess not only copies of Scripture that are as provably close in accuracy to the originals as the copies of the Old Testament that the apostles had, but also that what we have is the inspired, true, authoritative, trustworthy, and powerful Word of the living God!

### 3. The infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture

G. C. Berkouwer, in his book *Holy Scripture*, defines inerrancy to mean "an accuracy of all matters discussed in Scripture." He rejects this concept of inerrancy, yet he strongly affirms infallibility.

Clark H. Pinnock, in his monograph *A Defense of Biblical Infallibility*, defines "infallible" as "incapable of teaching deception." He says that "Inspiration involved infallibility as an essential property, and infallibility in turn implies inerrancy." He also states that "Infallibility is a necessary, not merely an optional, inference from the Biblical teaching about inspiration. It is an intrinsic property and essential characteristic of the inspired text." More recently Pinnock has raised serious questions about his own views of inerrancy and its relationship to infallibility, and no longer links infallibility with inerrancy.

Paul D. Feinberg, in his paper, "The Meaning of Inerrancy", delivered at the Chicago Summit Conference on Inerrancy (October 1978), states that according to the definition in the Oxford English Dictionary, "infallibility" means "the quality or fact of being infallible or exempt from liability to err," or "the quality of being unfailing or not liable to fail; unfailing certainty." Feinberg asserts that from the