

Enns, P. P. (1997, c1989). *The Moody handbook of theology*.

Inspiration of the Bible

NECESSITY OF INSPIRATION

Inspiration is necessary to preserve the revelation of God. If God has revealed Himself but the record of that revelation is not accurately recorded, then the revelation of God is subject to question. Hence, inspiration guarantees the accuracy of the revelation.

DEFINITION OF INSPIRATION

Inspiration may be defined as the Holy Spirit's superintending over the writers so that while writing according to their own styles and personalities, the result was God's Word written—authoritative, trustworthy, and free from error in the original autographs. Some definitions by prominent evangelical theologians are as follows.

Benjamin B. Warfield: "Inspiration is, therefore, usually defined as a supernatural influence exerted on the sacred writers by the Spirit of God, by virtue of which their writings are given Divine trustworthiness." □ [11](#)

Edward J. Young: "Inspiration is a superintendence of God the Holy Spirit over the writers of the Scriptures, as a result of which these Scriptures possess Divine authority and trustworthiness and, possessing such Divine authority and trustworthiness, are free from error." □ [12](#)

Charles C. Ryrie: "Inspiration is...God's superintendence of the human authors so that, using their own individual personalities, they composed and recorded without error His revelation to man in the words of the original autographs." □ [13](#)

There are several important elements that belong in a proper definition of inspiration: (1) the divine element—God the Holy Spirit superintended the writers, ensuring the accuracy of the writing; (2) the human element—human authors wrote according to their individual styles and personalities; (3) the result of the divine-human authorship is the recording of God's truth without error; (4) inspiration extends to the selection of words by the writers; (5) inspiration relates to the original manuscripts.

The English word *inspiration* in its theological usage is derived from the Latin Vulgate Bible in which the verb *inspiro* appears in both 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:21. The word *inspiration* is used to translate *theopneustos*, a hapax legomenon (meaning it appears only once in the Greek New Testament) found in 2 Timothy 3:16. *Theopneustos* means "God-breathed" and emphasizes the exhalation of God, hence, *inspiration* would be more accurate since it emphasizes that Scripture is the product of the breath of God. The Scriptures are not something breathed into by God, rather, the Scriptures have been *breathed out* by God.

FALSE VIEWS OF INSPIRATION

Natural inspiration. This view teaches that there is nothing supernatural about biblical inspiration; the writers of Scripture were simply men of unusual ability who wrote the books of

the Bible in the same way that an individual would write any other book. ¹⁴ The writers were men of unusual religious insight, writing on religious subjects in the same way men like Shakespeare or Schiller wrote literature.

Spiritual illumination. The illumination view suggests that some Christians may have spiritual insight that although similar to other Christians is greater in degree. In this view any devout Christian, illuminated by the Holy Spirit, can be the author of inspired Scripture. Adherents to this view suggest it is not the writings that are inspired, rather it is the *writers* who are inspired. Schleiermacher taught this view on the Continent while Coleridge propounded it in England. ¹⁵

Partial or dynamic inspiration. The partial inspiration theory teaches that the parts of the Bible related to matters of faith and practice are inspired whereas matters related to history, science, chronology, or other non-faith matters may be in error. In this view God preserves the message of salvation amid other material that may be in error. The partial theory rejects both verbal inspiration (that inspiration extends to the words of Scripture) and plenary inspiration (that inspiration extends to the entirety of Scripture). Despite the presence of errors in Scripture, partial theorists teach that an imperfect medium is a sufficient guide to salvation. A. H. Strong was a proponent of this view. ¹⁶

Problematic questions may be posed to adherents of this view: what parts of the Bible are inspired and what parts contain errors? Who determines what parts of the Bible are trustworthy and what parts contain errors? (Errantists differ with one another on their listings of errors.) How can doctrine be separated from history? (For example, the narratives about Jesus' virgin birth contain both history and doctrine.) How can the Bible be trustworthy in one area while in error in another area?

Conceptual inspiration. This view suggests that only the concepts or ideas of the writers are inspired but not the words. In this view God gave an idea or concept to the writer who then penned the idea in his own words. According to this view there can be errors in Scripture because the choice of words is left to the writer and is not superintended by God. In response, however, it is noted that Jesus (Matt. 5:18) and Paul (1 Thess. 2:13) both affirmed verbal inspiration. Pache rightly concludes, "ideas can be conceived of and transmitted only by means of words. If the thought communicated to man is divine and of the nature of a revelation, the form in which it is expressed is of prime significance. It is impossible to dissociate the one from the other." ¹⁷

Divine dictation. The dictation view states that God dictated the words of Scripture and the men wrote them down in a passive manner, being mere amanuenses (secretaries) who wrote only the words they were told to write. This claim would render the Bible similar to the Koran which supposedly was dictated in Arabic from heaven. Although some parts of the Bible were given by dictation (cf. Ex. 20:1, "Then God spoke all these words"), the books of the Bible reveal a distinct contrast in style and vocabulary, suggesting the authors were not mere automatons. The beginning student in Greek will quickly discover the difference in style between the gospel of John and the gospel of Luke. John wrote in a simple style with a limited vocabulary, whereas Luke wrote with an expanded vocabulary and a more sophisticated style. If the dictation theory were true, the style of the books of the Bible should be uniform.

Neo-orthodox opinion. The neo-orthodox view emphasizes that the Bible is not to be exactly

equated with the Word of God because God does not speak in mere propositions. God does not reveal mere *facts* about Himself; He reveals *Himself*. The Bible is not the *substance* of the Word of God, but rather the *witness* to the Word of God. It *becomes* the Word of God as the reader encounters Christ in his own subjective experience. Moreover, the Bible is enshrouded in myth necessitating a demythologizing of the Bible to discover what actually took place. The historicity of the events is unimportant. For example, whether or not Christ actually rose from the dead in time and space is unimportant to the neo-orthodox adherent. The important thing is the experiential encounter that is possible even though the Bible is tainted with factual errors. In this view the authority is the subjective experience of the individual rather than the Scriptures themselves.

To these views the evangelical Christian responds with contrasting points. The Bible is the objective and authoritative Word of God whether or not a person responds to it (John 8:47; 12:48). Furthermore, there are no objective criteria for evaluating what would constitute a “legitimate” encounter with God. Additionally, who would be capable of distinguishing myth from truth?

BIBLICAL VIEW OF INSPIRATION: VERBAL PLENARY

Christ’s view of the Bible. □¹⁸ In determining the nature of biblical inspiration, nothing could be more significant than determining the view Christ held regarding the Scriptures. Certainly no one ought to hold a lower view of Scripture than He held; His view of the Scriptures ought to be the determinant and the norm for other persons’ views. That is the foundational argument of R. Laird Harris. In defending the inspiration of the Scriptures he does not use 2 Timothy 3:16 or 2 Peter 1:21 as the primary argument (although he recognizes their validity); he instead argues from the standpoint of Christ’s view of the Scriptures. □¹⁹

(1) Inspiration of the whole. In His use of the Old Testament Christ gave credence to the inspiration of the entire Old Testament. In Matthew 5:17–18 Christ affirmed that not the smallest letter or stroke would pass from the law until it would be fulfilled. In v. 17 He referred to the law or the prophets, a common phrase designating the entire Old Testament. In this rather strong statement, Jesus affirmed the inviolability of the entire Old Testament and thereby affirmed the inspiration of the entire Old Testament.

In Luke 24:44 Jesus reminded the disciples that all the things written about Him in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms *must* be fulfilled. The disciples had failed to understand the teachings concerning the death and resurrection of Christ in the Old Testament, but because of the inspiration of the Old Testament, those prophesied events *had* to take place. By His threefold designation of the Old Testament, Christ was affirming the inspiration and authority of the entire Old Testament.

When Jesus debated with the unbelieving Jews concerning His right to be called the Son of God He referred them to Psalm 82:6 and reminded them “the Scripture cannot be broken” (John 10:35). “It means that Scripture cannot be emptied of its force by being shown to be erroneous.” □²⁰ It is noteworthy that Jesus referred to a rather insignificant passage from the Old Testament and indicated that the Scripture could not be set aside or annulled. □²¹

(2) Inspiration of the parts. Christ quoted from the Old Testament profusely and frequently. His arguments hinged on the integrity of the Old Testament passage He was quoting. By this

method of argumentation, Christ was affirming the inspiration of the individual texts or books of the Old Testament. A few examples will suffice. In Jesus' encounter with Satan at the time of His temptation, He refuted the arguments of Satan by a reference to Deuteronomy. In Matthew 4:4, 7, 10 Jesus quoted from Deuteronomy 8:3; 6:13, 16, indicating Satan was wrong and emphasizing that these words written in Deuteronomy had to be fulfilled. In Matthew 21:42 Jesus quoted from Psalm 118:22, which teaches that the Messiah would be rejected. In Matthew 12:18–21 Jesus quoted from Isaiah 42:1–4, showing that His peaceable, gentle disposition and His inclusion of the Gentiles had all been foretold in the prophetic writings.

These are only selected examples, revealing that Christ quoted from various parts of the Old Testament, affirming their inspiration and authority.

(3) Inspiration of the words. In defending the doctrine of the resurrection to the Sadducees, Jesus quoted from Exodus 3:6 (significant because the Sadducees held only to the Pentateuch), “*I am* the God of Abraham.” In this response Jesus' entire argument hinged on the words “*I am*.” Jesus was apparently supplying the verb which the Hebrew text only implies. Thus He supported the Septuagint (Greek) version which includes the verb. That version was so highly regarded by many of the Lord's contemporaries that it was practically equated with the original Scriptures.

In affirming the resurrection Jesus reminded the Sadducees that Exodus 3:6 said “*I am*.” He elaborated: “God is not the God of the dead but of the living.” If the words of the Old Testament were not inspired, His argument was useless; but if the very words of the Old Testament were actually inspired, then His argument carried enormous weight. In fact, Jesus' argument hinges on the *present tense* of the statement. Because it was written in Exodus 3:6, “*I am*...”, the doctrine of the resurrection could be affirmed; God is the God of the living patriarchs.

A similar example is found in Matthew 22:44 where Jesus, in debating the Pharisees, explained that their concept of Messiah was wrong. The Pharisees thought of Messiah as a political redeemer but Jesus shows them in His quotation from Psalm 110:1 that David, Israel's greatest king, saw Messiah as greater than himself, calling Him Lord. The entire argument of Christ rests on the phrase “my Lord.” In quoting Psalm 110:1, Jesus rested His argument on the inspiration of the precise words “my Lord.” If Psalm 110:1 did not read exactly “my Lord” then Christ's argument was in vain. An additional example is Christ's use of Psalm 82:6 in John 10:34 where His entire argument rests on the word “gods.”

(4) Inspiration of the letters. In a number of His statements Christ reveals that He believed the letters of Scripture were inspired. In Matthew 5:18 Jesus declared, “not the smallest letter or stroke shall pass away from the Law, until all is accomplished.” The term “smallest letter” refers to the Hebrew letter *yodh*, which looks like an apostrophe ('). The “stroke” refers to the minute distinction between two Hebrew letters. An equivalent would be the distinction between an O and a Q. Only the little “tail” distinguishes the Q from the O. Jesus emphasized that all the details of the Old Testament writings would be fulfilled down to the very letter.

(5) Inspiration of the New Testament. In the Upper Room discourse Christ made a significant statement that seems to point to the ultimate, accurate recording of the New Testament writings. In John 14:26 Jesus indicated that the Holy Spirit would provide accurate recall for the apostles as they penned the words of Scripture, thus guaranteeing their accuracy (cf. John 16:12–15). This may explain how an old man such as John, when penning the life of Christ, could accurately describe the details of the events that occurred years earlier. The Holy Spirit gave John and the other writers accurate recall of the events. Hence, Jesus affirmed not only the inspiration of the

Old Testament but also the New Testament. □²²

An obvious conclusion is that Jesus Christ held a very high view of Scripture, affirming its inspiration in the entire Old Testament—the various books of the Old Testament, the precise words, the actual letters—and He pointed to the inspiration of the New Testament. Surely those who hold to only conceptual inspiration or other variants need to reconsider the attitude of Jesus to the Scriptures. Ought His view of the Bible not to be the standard? Is it legitimate to hold a *lower* view of Scripture than He held?

Paul’s view of the Bible. (1) Inspiration of the Old and New Testaments. In 1 Timothy 5:18, Paul prefaced his remarks with “the Scripture says.” Then he quoted from Deuteronomy 25:4 and Luke 10:7, thereby ascribing the status of Scripture to both the Old and New Testaments. Paul was saying that the New Testament is as much the inspired Word of God as the Old Testament.

(2) Inspiration of the words. In Paul’s classic statement found in 2 Timothy 3:16, the apostle reminds the reader that all Scripture is “inspired by God.” As indicated earlier, “inspired by God” is the Greek word *theopneustos*, meaning “God-breathed.” This indeed is an important verse to consider in the entire subject of inspiration and inerrancy and, properly understood, resolves the problem.

Several things should be noted. First, since Scripture is God-breathed, it emphasizes that the origin of Scripture is God. This is consistent with the Old Testament prophets who received their messages from the mouth of God and so indicated by their frequent statements, “Thus says the Lord.” Thus, the message spoken by the prophets was the message given to them by the Lord (cf. Ex. 4:15; 7:1–2; Jer. 1:9, etc.). Therefore, just as the word given to the prophets was trustworthy and reliable, so the Scriptures, which are God-breathed, are trustworthy and accurate because both communications come from the mouth of God. Paul’s emphasis, then, is on the *origin* of the Scriptures: that which is God-breathed is “produced by the creative breath of the Almighty.” □²³ The fact that *theopneustos* occurs in the passive voice, and not the active, further emphasizes that God is the origin of the Scriptures, not man. □²⁴

(3) The entire Scriptures are God-breathed. Young clarifies: “If Paul means ‘every Scripture,’ he is looking at the various parts of the Bible, that is, he is considering Scripture distributively. He is then saying that whatever Scripture we consider, it is inspired of God. On the other hand, if he means ‘all scripture,’ it is clear that his reference is to the Scripture in its entirety. In either case he is saying that whatever may be called ‘scripture’ is inspired of God.” □²⁵

In addition, all that is God-breathed is also designated Scripture. While the designation “Scripture” in v. 16 is sometimes understood to refer only to the Old Testament, it can be argued that Paul was using the designation “Scripture” not only for the Old Testament but also for the portions of the New Testament that had been written by that time (e.g., Paul must have considered the gospel of Luke canonical [1 Tim. 5:18]), and perhaps even the entire New Testament, some of which would be written in the future. □²⁶

Paul concludes that the Old and New Testaments are God-breathed, having their origin with God, not man. Paul thus affirms his belief in verbal inspiration.

Peter’s view of the Bible. Peter’s teaching concerning the Scriptures coincides with Paul’s teaching. In 2 Peter 1:21 Peter emphasizes that no Scripture is produced as a result of human

will; rather, it is the product of the superintending power of the Holy Spirit. Peter identifies the Scriptures as “the prophetic word” (v. 19), “prophecy of Scripture” (v. 20) and “prophecy” (v. 21); he declares that the Scripture is “something altogether reliable.”²⁷ In verse 21 Peter explains why the Scripture is reliable. Like Paul, Peter affirms that Scripture has its origin with God. Although men penned the words of Scripture, they did so as they were carried along [Gk. *pheromenoi*] by the Holy Spirit.²⁸ Peter therefore acknowledges his belief in verbal inspiration inasmuch as it was the Holy Spirit who guided the writers of Scripture in their selection of words. This truth could be illustrated by a man who goes to the department store in a shopping center. Because he is in a hurry to get to the second floor he walks up the escalator. Although he is walking, the escalator is carrying him along, bringing him to the second floor. Similarly, although the writers of Scripture penned the words according to their educational abilities and their own distinctive styles, the Holy Spirit was carrying them along, ensuring the accuracy of all they were writing.

In 2 Peter 3:16 Peter refers to Paul’s writings and indicates that the false teachers distort Paul’s writings as they do *the rest of the Scriptures*. In this rather unique statement Peter places Paul’s writings on a par with the Old Testament Scriptures.

Conclusion. The strongest defense for the verbal plenary inspiration of the Scriptures is the testimony of Jesus Christ. He testified to the inspiration of the entire Scriptures, the various books of the Old Testament and the actual words of Scripture as they had been originally recorded. The fact that He based His arguments on the precise wording of Scripture testifies to His exalted view of Scripture. In addition, Paul acknowledged that all Scripture was God-breathed; man was a passive instrument, being guided by God in the writing of Scripture. Peter’s statement was similar in emphasizing that, in their passivity, men were carried along by the Holy Spirit in the writing of Scripture. The testimony of each of these witnesses draws attention to the verbal plenary inspiration of Scripture.

Inerrancy of the Bible

DEFINITION OF INERRANCY

In the past it was sufficient to state that the Bible was inspired; however, it has now become necessary to define the evangelical position more precisely. The result, as Charles Ryrie has shown, has necessitated the inclusion of additional verbiage. To state the orthodox view it is now necessary to include the terms “verbal, plenary, infallible, inerrant, unlimited inspiration!”²⁹ All this has been necessitated because of those who have retained words like *inspiration*, *infallible*, and even *inerrant* while denying that the Bible is free from error.

E. J. Young provides a suitable definition of inerrancy: “By this word we mean that the Scriptures possess the quality of freedom from error. They are exempt from the liability to mistake, incapable of error. In all their teachings they are in perfect accord with the truth”³⁰ Ryrie provides a syllogism for logically concluding the biblical teaching of inerrancy: “God is true (Rom. 3:4); the Scriptures were breathed out by God (2 Tim. 3:16); therefore, the Scriptures are true (since they came from the breath of God who is true).”³¹

In defining inerrancy it is also important to state what it does not mean. It does not demand

rigidity of style and verbatim quotations from the Old Testament. “The inerrancy of the Bible means simply that the Bible tells the truth. Truth can and does include approximations, free quotations, language of appearances, and different accounts of the same event as long as those do not contradict.” □³² At the Chicago meeting in October 1978, the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy issued the following statement on inerrancy: “Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God’s acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to God’s saving grace in individual lives.” □³³

In a final definition it is noted that inerrancy extends to the original manuscripts: “Inerrancy means that when all the facts are known, the Scriptures in their original autographs and properly interpreted will be shown to be wholly true in everything they teach, whether that teaching has to do with doctrine, history, science, geography, geology, or other disciplines or knowledge.” □³⁴

To suggest there are errors in the Bible is to impugn the character of God. If the Bible has errors it is the same as suggesting that God can fail, that He can make a mistake. “To assume that God could speak a Word that was contrary to fact is to assume that God Himself cannot operate without error. The very nature of God is at stake.” □³⁵

EXPLANATION OF INERRANCY

Inerrancy allows for variety in style. The gospel of John was written in the simple style one might expect of an unlearned fisherman; Luke was written with a more sophisticated vocabulary of an educated person; Paul’s epistles reflect the logic of a philosopher. All of these variations are entirely compatible with inerrancy.

Inerrancy allows for variety in details in explaining the same event. This phenomenon is particularly observed in the synoptic gospels. It is important to remember that Jesus spoke in Aramaic and the writers of Scripture wrote their accounts in Greek, meaning they had to translate the original words into Greek. One writer would use slightly different words to describe the same incident, yet both would give the same meaning, albeit

with different words. There is an additional reason for variety in details. One writer might have viewed the event from one standpoint while the other gospel writer viewed it from another standpoint. This would make the details appear different, yet both would be accurate.

Inerrancy does not demand verbatim reporting of events. “In times of antiquity it was not the practice to give a verbatim repetition every time something was written out.” □³⁶ A verbatim quote could not be demanded for several reasons. First, as already mentioned, the writer had to translate from Aramaic to Greek in recording Jesus’ words. Second, in making reference to Old Testament texts it would have been impossible to unroll the lengthy scrolls each time to produce a verbatim quote; furthermore, the scrolls were not readily available, hence, the freedom in Old Testament quotes. □³⁷

Inerrancy allows for departure from standard forms of grammar. Obviously it is wrong to force English rules of grammar upon the Scriptures. For example, in John 10:9 Jesus declares, “I am the door,” whereas in verse 11 He states, “I am the Good Shepherd.” In English this is considered mixing metaphors, but this is not a problem to Greek grammar or Hebrew language. In John 14:26 Jesus refers to the Spirit (*pneuma* = neuter) and then refers to the Spirit as “He”

(*ekeinos* = masculine). This may raise an English grammarian's eyebrows, but it is not a problem of Greek grammar.

Inerrancy allows for problem passages. Even with so vast a work as the Holy Scriptures it is impossible to provide solutions to all the problems. In some cases the solution awaits the findings of the archaeologist's spade; in another case it awaits the linguist's research; in other cases the solution may never be discovered for other reasons. The solution to some problems must be held in abeyance. The answer, however, is never to suggest there are contradictions or errors in Scripture. If the Scriptures are God-breathed they are entirely without error.

Inerrancy demands the account does not teach error or contradiction. In the statements of Scripture, whatever is written is in accord with things as they are. Details may vary but it may still reflect things as they are. For example, in Matthew 8:5–13 it is noted that the centurion came to Jesus and said, "I am not qualified." In the parallel passage in Luke 7:1–10 it is noted that the elders came and said concerning the centurion, "He is worthy." It appears the elders first came and spoke to Jesus, and later the centurion himself came. Both accounts are in accord with things as they are.

11 11. B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948), p. 131.

12 12. Edward J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 27.

13 13. Charles C. Ryrie, *A Survey of Bible Doctrine* (Chicago: Moody, 1972), p. 38.

14 14. Alan Richardson, *Christian Apologetics* (New York: Harper, 1948), p. 207. Richardson suggests there have been Christian books written from the second to the twentieth century that are inspired in precisely the same way as the Bible.

15 15. For an expanded discussion see A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson, 1907), pp. 204–8.

16 16. *Ibid.*, pp. 211–22.

17 17. Rene Pache, *The Inspiration & Authority of Scripture* (Chicago: Moody, 1980), p. 58. Pache goes on to say that underlying the conceptual view is the refusal to "give credence to the authority of the sacred text" (p. 59).

18 18. See the excellent work of Jesus' view of the Bible by Robert P. Lightner, *The Saviour and the Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1966), pp. 60–73.

19 19. R. Laird Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969), p. 45ff.

20 20. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 527.

21 21. See the excellent discussion on John 10:35 in B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1948), p. 138ff.

22 22. For additional discussions see Robert P. Lightner, *The Saviour and the Scriptures*, pp. 60–73; and Charles C. Ryrie, *What You Should Know About Inerrancy* (Chicago: Moody, 1981), pp. 57–78.

23 23. B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1948), p. 296.

24 24. See E. J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, pp. 20–21 as well as B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, p. 272.

25 25. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

26 26. H. Wayne House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 137 (January–March, 1980):56–57.

[27](#)27. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* 2nd ed., revised by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1979), p. 138.

[28](#)28. Young states: “The men who spake from God are said to have been borne by the Holy Spirit. That is, the Spirit actually lifted them up and carried them along, and thus they spake. They were borne or carried along under the power of the Spirit and not by their own power. If a person picks up something and bears it, he does it by his own power. That which is picked up and borne, however, is absolutely passive. It was the Spirit of God who bore them. It was He who was active, and they who were passive. Thus He bore them to the goal of His own desiring,” (E. J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, p. 25).

[29](#)29. Charles C. Ryrie, *What You Should Know About Inerrancy*, p. 16.

[30](#)30. E. J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, p. 113.

[31](#)31. Charles C. Ryrie, “Some Important Aspects of Biblical Inerrancy” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (January–March, 1979):17.

[32](#)32. Charles C. Ryrie, *What You Should Know About Inerrancy*, p. 30. Note also the helpful illustrations Ryrie employs, pp. 31–32.

[33](#)33. James Montgomery Boice, *Does Inerrancy Matter?* (Oakland: International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1979), p. 13.

[34](#)34. *Ibid.*

[35](#)35. E. J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, p. 165.

[36](#)36. *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[37](#)37. William R. Eichhorst, *The Issue of Biblical Inerrancy: In Definition and Defence* (Winnipeg, Man.: Winnipeg Bible College, n.d.), p. 9.