

interpretation we make of a verse is necessarily inerrant! But the interpretation intended by God of that verse is inerrant. We get back into the interpretation area very quickly. I would want to be very careful about climbing on very thin limbs on our deciding what constitutes an error in certain areas that the Bible doesn't address itself to.

MacRae: I'd say it was an error of idea; there is not an erroneous idea taught in the Bible. If there's a point which it's possible to take in two or three different ways, let's find what the rest of Scripture says and what's the right way to take it. In the case of this one--"if the foundations be destroyed....." there are 2 4 ways, 4 or 6 ways to take it and they are all correct as it happens. So it really makes not the slightest difference which one was intended for this particular verse.

Question: It would seem that being concerned with inerrancy and inspiration ? ??? a very concrete way so that they have some basis for saying that their teachings are drawn from an inerrant source Yet to be able to say that the original documents were mechanically perfect or were transmitted perfectly down to As Scripture teaches we see through a glass darkly. There are so many things that limit us from seeing the truth. As you were saying a while ago about some cultural things that a few centuries ago because of the cultural things the people would be insensitive to that we have become callous to now and we might be sensitive to some things which at that time they were unable to see because of the narrowness of their perspective. We have a great deal of material . . . I don't know anything about the original languages, very little, so I don't have access to the original languages of the MSS myself . . . but I think some in a small language group may have had one person who translated on their own that language and that's the only access they had to the Scripture in that that one translator would not do a reliable job There are some many limitations on our grasping the ideas God is presenting but I like your idea of the inerrancy of the ideas. . . The Lord promised that we will know the truth. The Lord's Spirit working with us is able to give us the understanding whatever our limited perspective is. The reliability is in the Spirit working. . . .

MacRae . . . and in comparing Scripture with Scripture and not building on just one verse. I think that's very vital too.

Peterson: I don't know exactly how to express my ideas. I'm still thinking of these things. As you take your proposal as something you are working through, take my remarks in the same way. It seems like the way inerrancy has traditionally been understood and the way you are proposing are different in many ways. First of all I would say I don't know of some of the mistaken ideas that have been attached to the traditional understanding of inerrancy are necessary. For example insisting upon spelling with grammatical precision or something or taking a verse out of context, etc. I don't know if that is part of that. I'm just working through. . . . For example, it seems to me that inerrancy