

different sense, and therefore it is hard to agree on a *pre-* precise term. And also because there are the enemies of inerrancy who are ready to grab on to a statement that is made and to interpret it and say it in such a way as to ridicule the organization that uses it.

I was sent about a year ago a statement that it intended to publish, and one of them, I thought, was a very good definition of what I believe by inerrancy except that it could easily be interpreted as meaning that God had distated every word of Scripture. I don't see anything wrong with dictation. I can dictate a letter to my secretary and nobody will criticize me for it. It's my word, provided it's typed correctly. It's my work. It's what I said. I dictated it, and I alone am responsible for its contents. God could do that if He chose.

God leaves evidence in Scripture of the human personality, the different types of vocabulary, of different writers ~~and~~ is so clear that it makes it very easy for people to say, O, they believe in dictation! As though that was a terrible thing. So it is vital to have a statement that will avoid that misunderstanding. So the organization planned to have a meeting this October, and they sent me a list of about several hundred people, some of whom I knew very well, many of whom I had never heard of. They said, Please mark this list who you want to have invited, who you definitely think we should not invite, who you don't know about, who you have *questions* about. I looked through it and marked it. Then they said at the bottom, Please add on the next sheet the names of any people you think should be invited. I wrote the names of all our Board and all our Faculty as people whom I thought would be