

Version that Dr DeKoster has on his table is *not* the infallible, inerrant Word of God. And no translation of the Bible is without error -- not even the best of them all, the New International Version! All translations without exception have errors in them." (Dr Palmer wrote these words in an article defending Harold Lindsell's *Battle for the Bible* against criticisms by Dr DeKoster). Dr DeKoster subsequently sent a letter to the editor of *The Outlook*, which appeared in the June, 1977, issue, together with Dr Palmer's reply. Dr DeKoster asked four questions, and Dr Palmer addressed three of them. Permit me to quote the exchange:

1. 'Can Dr Palmer be serious?'

Answer: Yes, I am. I will say again what I believe: The Bible which Dr DeKoster has on his table is not, I repeat, not, the infallible, inerrant Word of God. And it is most important to realize this. Yes, I am serious.

2. 'Does the Christian Reformed Church base its synodical decisions, sermonizing, consistorial decisions, and Christian life on an errant and fallible Bible?'

Answer: No, it does not. It bases them on the inerrant, infallible Word of God -- the originals. It has always distinguished between the autographa and the apographa, between the original writings that the Holy Spirit inspired and the countless copies and translations that are based on the original Only what was written by the men inspired by the Holy Spirit is infallible. Only what Jeremiah, David, Paul and Peter actually wrote is inspired.

3. When the Belgic Confession characterizes Scripture as 'this infallible rule' (Art. VII) does it really mean, that infallible original now lost?

Answer: Yes. It cannot be the King James that added to the original and now says 'nephews' when 'grandchildren' are meant (1 Tim 5:4).

Dr DeKoster reported and commented on this exchange in the August 19, 1977, issue of *The Banner* in an editorial entitled "Really Incredible?". In the August 26 issue he set Dr Lindsell in opposition to Dr Palmer by several quotations from *The Battle for the Bible*. On p.36, Dr Lindsell states: "Any student of Lower Criticism admits there have been copyist's mistakes, but a copyist's mistake is something entirely different from an error in Scripture. A misspelled or a misplaced word is a far cry from error, by which is meant a misstatement or something that is contrary to act." And on p.37 Dr Lindsell adds: "Textual problems today in no way make the doctrine of biblical inerrancy impossible." In the September 2, 1977, issue of *The Banner*, Dr DeKoster addressed an Open Letter to the Reformed Fellowship (the publishers of *The Outlook*), applying Dr Palmer's view to the task of preaching. He wrote:

I set this open question to you, Brethren, in the context of Preaching. For the doctrine of Scripture is tested by the doctrine of Preaching.

Is Preaching Possible?

Only, if the Bible open on the pulpit is the Word of God, and thus inspired, infallible, inerrant.

Yes, there are only two choices: either, (1) the Bible on our pulpits, and elsewhere, is the inspired Word of God, or (2) it is the uninspired word of man.

If you deny the first choice, as *The Outlook* does, then you are stuck with the second. But the second choice makes true Preaching impossible -- as the tragic history of Liberalism so clearly demonstrates.

The Church, as we believe it, stands or falls with true Preaching. And true Preaching stands or falls with the belief that an inspired Bible lies open on the pulpit. How else shall the Word go forth: *Thus saith the Lord!*...

Meanwhile, Brethren, *The Outlook* is your magazine. Does it here speak for