denominations held in the past to the idea that the Bible expresses the very mind of God, and is therefore infallible and free from error. This is what Christians mean by inspiration. McCarthy's presentation is unfair for many reason. We shall have time only to look at two of these. These two which become more and more clear as we go further in the book, are apparent from the few words that I have already quoted.

The first reason why it is unfair, is that he gives as his first alternative a view that never has been held by any leading Christian thinkers of the past. What he calls the urge to write has really nothing in common with Biblical inspiration. A man can have an urge to write and yet be entirely mistaken in everything he says. To define inspiration this way is to completely disregard the Biblical idea of inspiration and to reduce the Bible to a merely human Book to express merely human ideas in human words.

Such a view is clearly contradicted by many Biblical statements. We shall merely quote 2 Pet. 1:21. That one verse alone should be sufficient to show how utterly contrary McCarthy first definition is to the Biblical idea of inspiration. This verse reads "For the prophecy came not in the old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." McCarthy's first definition makes the Bible merely a human book. Such books are often good and helpful, but it would be absurd to designate any of them as the word of the Lord.

A second very great unfairness of McCarthy's approach is the false and misleading terminology that he uses to characterize the truely Biblical idea of inspiration. He calls this second theory--the one he rejects--the verbal dictation theory of inspiration. These are loaded words, and suggest that the Bible was