

Although written by so many different people from such different backgrounds, the Bible's teaching is remarkably consistent. Alleged contradictions often fail to reckon with the possibility that the same thing is not affirmed and denied at the same time. The relationship is frequently one of subcontraries (some of the things are, and some of the things are not) or just plainly of different things or persons. If the same thing is in view, the alleged contradictions may be referring to two different times or to the same thing at the same times, but in two different respects.

A biblical hypothesis also fits the data given in human experience. Many Christian evidences texts have displayed the remarkable empirical fit.²⁵ In regard to the internal data of human experience, however, it is difficult to find anything comparable to Carnell. The claim is that the hypothesis of the God revealed in Christ and Scripture consistently accounts for the greatest number of converging lines of data with the fewest difficulties. One does not need omniscience but does need humility before all types of evidence including data of values, morality and psychology. In contrast, the Latter-Day Saint revelation-claims are beset by numbers of contradictions and discrepancies with fact.²⁶

At best, however, one can only claim confirmation of the Christian hypothesis (or any other) to a high degree of probability. As in a court of law, the most secure case is established beyond reasonable doubt. The case for the Christian view, in my judgment, is based upon so many lines of converging evidence as to be beyond reasonable doubt. Although the case is developed by a finite, fallen regenerate knower, it is about the infinite God's disclosure in incarnation and inscripturation.

How can an apologetic relative to all the variables distinctive of the apologist establish our special revelation? Can a probable apologetic, James Daane asked in reviewing my *Testing Christianity's Truth Claims*, support an inerrant Bible?²⁷ That question invites several considerations in response.

(1) Daane echoed my objection to pure empiricism in which one starts with a blank mind, examines evidence and can logically have in the conclusion only what the evidence supports. Unfortunately Daane seems to have missed the major emphasis of the book that, more realistically, we start with a hypothesis and in the hypothesis is the Deity of Christ and the full authority of Scripture in all that it teaches. Those truth claims most consistently fit the facts with the fewest problems. This hypothesis has the same kind of support any hypothesis has about gravity, atoms or lung cancer has. The power of the atom is not as weak as the case you may be able to make for its reality.

(2) If the Bible alone is God's inspired Word, then it would be quite inappropriate for any uninspired apologist to claim to have constructed an inerrant case in support of it. In no way, my apologetics text shows, have Gordon Clark, Earl Barrett or Cornelius Van Til provided an absolute apologetic.

Since *ex hypothesi* the Bible alone has this inspired absoluteness in the principles it affirms, it would be inappropriate for any apologist to claim, even in terms of the witness of the Spirit, an inerrant apologetics system. Spirit-illuminated people have been known to be wrong. And Daane