

that the thoughts of the original cannot be exactly translated into some other language. And the words of the original were without error but were not the complete presentation of all there was on any particular subject. Therefore it helps ~~us~~ to drive us so that everything that can be properly deduced from the Biblical statement can be assepted as true.

I have a statement that was issued to the alumni of a theological seminary by its president in 1970. In this statement he tells why his seminary does not stand for inerrancy. He says this does not believe in errancy. Now if they don't believe in errancy why are they unwilling to say they believe in inerrancy? I think we get this attitude in one paragraph -- "there are those who in defining inerrancy bring philosophical questions and perspectives to the Bible. Sometimes we are asked what this seminary believes as compared with that great Princeton theologian B. B. Warfield. Many of us feel that Dr. Warfield was a masterful defender of the Bible in but ~~XXXXXX~~ felt that it was theological trap (?) when it came to his approach to inerrancy. And there are those today who go beyond anything Dr. Warfield ever said when they insist that Biblical inerrancy would apply to every scientific historical geographical fact of Scripture." They even go beyond Dr. Warfield. I can't imagine how Dr. Warfield could have said anything less than that! That inspiration applies to every scientific, historical, and geographical factual and theological statement of Scripture. His statement seems to say that whenever we can agree with any scientific, historical and geographical factual or theological (statement) we are free to do so. But many of the statements in this -- like where he says, We don't believe in ~~inerrancy~~ sound very good, but when you get a sentence like this it makes you wonder what does he really believe? Is man the judge? Do we say what the Bible teaches? Do we say what the truth is, or do we look at the Bible and where it is clear this is what it says, we stand on it. That is what God has taught comparing Scripture with Scripture whether it is scientific, historical or what.

Of course the English Bible says that the sun came up. We don't believe the sun came up. The Hebrews does not say the sun came up. The Heb. says the sun came out and the sun went in. But in most cases in English and in Hebrew, it is perfectly clear that what is meant is that that ~~XXXXXX~~ occurred is what we see every day when the sun goes below the horizon. We do not have here the basis for building a scientific understanding of the universe. But neither do we have an unscientific statement. We have general popular language used for most ordinary phenomena which we all see and which we say in the particular ~~terminology~~ terminology, This is characteristic of our day. We read in the OT that Abraham was well stricken in years. That's a good old 17th-16th century phrase. I don't ever heard anybody say that about someone they knew that he was well stricken in years! But that's not in the Heb. Hebrew says, He was going into the days. WE don't say that either but it's perfectly clear what it means. We'd say perhaps he was advanced in days or just he was getting old. There are many ways you can say different things.