

To the question, "Can God reveal truth concerning himself?" We must answer: "Not only is there the possibility of such revelation, there is the actuality!" As the writer to the Hebrews puts it: "God, after he spoke long ago to the fathers by the prophets in many portions and in many ways, in these last days has spoken to us by his Son" (Heb 1:1-2).

However, there are those who would claim, "Yes, God can reveal truth concerning himself, but what he has revealed is not inerrant, but only generally trustworthy." In this answer we must understand the concept of "general trustworthiness" as implying that God's revelation includes *error*. This answer calls for analysis.

If God revealed error, then either he must have done so *deliberately*, or he *could not help* doing so. If he deliberately revealed error, we must ask, "Why would, and how could the God of truth reveal error to man?" Scripture itself tells us that "God is not a man, that he should lie." (Num 23:19), and that God "cannot lie" (Titus 1:2). There is no hint of such error in the teachings of the prophets, of Christ, or of the apostles. And there is no evidence that there were errors in revelation itself, either as originally communicated or originally inscripturated. There is abundant evidence of errors in transcription, but what evidence is there of errors in revelation, especially since neither side of the question possesses the original manuscripts of Scripture! Thus we must reject the concept that God deliberately revealed error, on two counts: (1) It is antithetical to his nature and (2) There is no evidence to substantiate it.

If, on the other hand, God could not help revealing error, then either he is *not omniscient* (i.e., he was ignorant of the fact that he was revealing error), or he is *not omnipotent* (i.e., he simply could not inerrantly communicate His thoughts and words to men). That God is omniscient is so clearly taught in Scripture that we must reject the first alternative. To the alternative claim that God is not able inerrantly to communicate His thoughts to man, we must ask, "What man is that who dares 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." (Titus 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 and did, 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!

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