

say, This is Matthew's personal prejudice. This is something that developed as a theory, etc. But he would find that the attitude that was taken by the apostles and by Christ toward the OT is something on which the evidence is so great there is no question.

Question: (indistinct)

Answer: No, it does not have to be. Of course they did. But it does not have to be to prove that Christ set His approval upon it. We're not arguing like we are if we argue Paul was an apostle because he said he was, and we know that what he said was true because he was an apostle.

Question: Can we infer from this that whatever the church has always held a consensus on, that we have an infallible church?

Answer: No. The church might conceivably be in error on any point. The only thing we can depend upon is the Scripture. That's the only thing we know is free from error. The church on any particular point might have been wrong. I don't think it was wrong in most instances, but it could be. But on this point we had this remarkable thing of this consensus. One place where we would not expect a consensus, then we have Christ's approval definitely placed upon it. That gives us the validity of our acceptance of the Bible as a whole and as a unit.

But on anything else I don't believe the church has all been wrong, but theoretically it could.

Question: (indistinct)

Answer: No, I would not say that. I would say that the NT as an historical record is something that anyone might accept except he is terribly terribly prejudiced, and takes an attitude that could throw aside any evidence -- evidence of G. Washington. But taking the NT as a historical record, we find that on the authority of Christ that the OT as a unit is dependable; it's inerrant, it's God's Word. That was Christ's attitude toward the Old.

Now it's much harder to prove the NT than the OT. Much harder. He did not specifically state that about the NT as he has about the OT. But your Christian world never questions -- if they believe the OT was inspired, they believe the NT was too. We are justified in extending these -- expanding these passages to the NT. But all the passages in the NT about inspiration taken exactly as they stand are talking about the OT, not specifically talking about the NT. But we are justified in expanding them. But we do make a little bit of a logical jump in extending them to the NT. We don't make any in extending them to the OT because that's what they teach. Taking the NT purely as a historical document you have your evidence for these. We're not guilty of. Though it could be so we have to be careful we don't say it in such a way. Perhaps I did but I surely didn't mean to.

Question: (Indistinct)

Answer: Yes it does.

Question: (indistinct)

Answer: The OT people had to be individually too.

Question: (indistinct)

Answer: No. John said in the Book of Revelation, if anyone shall take from these prophecies God will take away his part from