

other early MSS agreeing with it was the wrong one. Then they would say it is a Western text. And the one that stood absolutely alone, that was the original! That struck me as rather foolish at that time. I believe that Westcott and Hort made some advances in our study. I believe it is useful to get whatever light we can on what are the earliest statements. But to build too much on two or three MSS I think is a great mistake.

Some people spend their time arguing about whether Westcott and Hort were real Christians or not. I think that is rather aside from the point, here. I think the important thing is that God has preserved His Word. And we have a Bible that we can depend upon. But inerrancy does not mean we have certain magical words. It does not mean we have any translation that is free from error. It does not mean we have any particular Greek text that is free from error. It does not mean that we today have a Hebrew text that is free from error. I don't think that is what inerrancy means.

Inerrancy does not mean you can take one verse and squeeze it and squeeze it and squeeze it until you are constantly getting more truth out of it! That's not the nature of language. I believe we have to compare Scripture with Scripture and that there is danger of a false attitude of taking one verse by itself and putting too much attention to the particular words of that one verse. I think that is a false view of inerrancy.

I believe inerrancy applies to the Bible as a whole. Comparing Scripture with Scripture and that we can learn from it the ideas that God wants us to have. I think the proof text method of study is a dangerous method. A Scripture verse may summarize a passage. But one verse by itself does not necessarily give us the truth. When we read about the people on the road to Emmaus. There were two disciples. Were there two men? Was there a man and a woman? We don't know. There's no way on earth we can find out. Inerrancy means that the verse tells us what it says but it does not tell us more than what can reasonably be deduced from it. So I believe it's important that we carefully avoid this misunderstanding of what we mean by inerrancy.

Now there are cases--I believe that God superintended the writing of Scripture even though it was individuals who wrote each with his own style and each often telling things they had seen, and heard, and observed and thought. I believe that God revealed much but that He directed them, led them and cause to give them the ideas that he wanted put there. But the most vital thing about inerrancy is that they were kept free from error of fact, of doctrine, or of judgment. The word inerrancy is a negative word. There is no error there.

When somebody says, I believe in the authority of the Bible in spiritual matters, but not in historical matters then he is certainly giving up inerrancy! I don't believe we are competent to decide what is historical, what is geographical,--whatever the Bible deals with is true, but we mustn't read into it than it deals with. That is not to say that God has not very definitely led in many cases in the particular words that were used and sometimes placed truth there which was not understood by the men perhaps