

"Biblical Inerrancy: What Is at Stake?" by John Warwick Montgomery
in God's Inerrant Word ed by J. W. Montgomery. Bethany Fellowship, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minn.

p. 29 "Logically, if the Bible is not inerrant, though Jesus thought it was, He can hardly be the incarnate God He claimed to be and for whom the same claims are made by His Apostles. Had He been mistaken on this point, the church could well ask whether any single teaching of Jesus on any subject (including the way of salvation) might not also reflect His sincere misunderstanding. A "God" of this kind (even if He were indeed divine) would do us no more good than a non-God, for in neither case could we ever confidently rely on his teachings.

If - to avoid the force of this argument - the liberal evangelical says that Jesus did know that the Bible wasn't inerrant, but dealt with it in terms of the mind-set of His day, "so as not to create unnecessary barriers to faith," we must emphasize that such a Jesus would be no more worthy of an attribution of deity than the Jesus who was mistaken about the Bible's reliability. For a Jesus who would let the end justify the means, allow His followers to be deceived on such a vital religious question (the extent of revelational reliability), and promote confusion and unnecessary strife in the subsequent history of the church through His equivocation, could hardly stand as a divine model for man's ethical emulation."

Handwritten notes:
I agree that Jesus was mistaken about the Bible's inerrancy. However, this does not mean that Jesus was mistaken about His own deity. The Bible's inerrancy is a matter of fact, not of opinion. Jesus' teaching on the Bible's inerrancy is a matter of fact, not of opinion. Jesus' teaching on His own deity is a matter of fact, not of opinion. Jesus' teaching on the Bible's inerrancy and His own deity are both matters of fact, not of opinion.

Handwritten notes:
I agree that Jesus was mistaken about the Bible's inerrancy.

Handwritten notes:
A-12
G. W. Montgomery