Many years ago when I was preparing for my ordination into the Gospel Ministry, I consulted some of my college classmates who had gone through the process. Among other theological issues they told me to be prepared to discuss was my view of the Bible. One’s belief about the Bible is a very important doctrinal issue that needs to be raised at every ordination today. Southern Baptists and many other evangelical groups went through a “battle for the Bible” during much of the last half of the twentieth century. In Southern Baptist life, this battle resulted in the conservative resurgence which now dominates most of our agencies and seminaries. One’s view of the Bible is still of great importance. We should not take for granted that it is a settled issue with candidates for ordination.

Views of Inspiration

Many views of the inspiration of the Bible have been espoused in the history of Christian thought. In his classic, *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, Basil Manly, Jr. listed six principal views of inspiration. More recently, David S. Dockery has proposed nine specific views. While each of these categories may contain distinctive nuances, all the various approaches may be classified under three views.

*The Naturalistic or Rationalistic View*

The naturalistic or rationalistic view of the Bible contends Scripture is inspired to *no* extent. In this view, the Bible is a purely human book consisting of differing qualities of literature. Some parts are inspiring and noble, but others are outdated and errant. Falling under this category is the *illumination* view. In this view the human authors of the Bible are inspired like all other writers of great literature, such as Homer, Plato, Milton, Shakespeare, Byron,
Shelly and others. Inspiration is an inward moving of the human spirit that causes a person to rise above his normal abilities and produce inspiring writings. This view of Scripture has its origins in the romanticism and rationalism of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The view of J. G. Herder (1744-1803), who suggested that the best way to view biblical inspiration was that of a work of art, became widely held.\(^4\) Alister E. McGrath described Herder’s view and many who have followed him since: “Just as one might speak of a great novel, poem or painting as ‘inspired,’ so the same idea can be applied to Scripture. Inspiration is thus seen as a human achievement, rather than a gift of God.”\(^5\)

**Partial Inspiration**

Many views of inspiration embraced today are various forms of a *partial* inspiration. While a range of viewpoints exist among those opinions falling within this category, all are characterized by one common denominator—inspiration is partial or limited in some way. The following minimal limitations would be held by most persons holding this view: (1) Inspiration is conceptional, not verbal. They believe inspiration extends only to the thoughts and contents of the Bible, not to words themselves. (2) Inspiration extends to the spiritual and salvation matters of the Bible, but not necessarily to the historical and scientific matters. Clifton J. Alien sums up this view very well:

> According to this view, the inspiration of the Bible is much more its completeness and adequacy as the written record of God's self-revelation and as the guide for man in all matters of faith and practice than it is a matter of inerrancy in wording and analogy and certain details about persons and events. Inspiration is more a matter of the message of God's salvation than the method or process by which it was reduced to written form. The authority of the Bible is in its wholeness unity in the light of the truth of God in Christ.\(^6\)

Thus all things pertaining to and necessary for salvation are said to be of divine origin in a way that other matters such as historical, geographical, and scientific details are not. Persons
who hold such a view do not want to use the term *inerrant* to refer to Scripture, but prefer the term *infallible*. The contention is that one may insist that the Bible never misinforms or misleads without insisting that it has no errors in the above mentioned details. People who have this view of inspiration sometimes refer to it as *dynamic inspiration*.

*Plenary Verbal Inspiration*

The *plenary verbal inspiration* view holds that the Bible is fully inspired and the inspiration touches the very words of Scripture themselves. This concept is not to be confused with a *dictation* view, although the *dictation* view would be a form of *plenary verbal inspiration*. *Plenary verbal inspiration* simply means that God so superintended the writers of Scripture that their words actually were the words God wanted them to write. Consequently, the words of Scripture are the words of God. Loraine Boettner gives this extended definition:

By "plenary inspiration" we mean that a full and sufficient influence of the Holy Spirit extended to all parts of Scripture, rendering it an authoritative revelation from God, so that while the revelations come to us through the minds and wills of men they are nevertheless in the strictest sense the Word of God. By "verbal inspiration" we mean that the Divine influence which surrounded the sacred writers extended not only to the general thoughts, but also to the very words they employed, so that the thoughts which God intended to reveal to us have been conveyed with infallible accuracy— that the writers were the organs of God in such a sense that what they said, God said.

*The Importance of One's View of the Bible*

Considering the many differing views of the Bible held by sincere Christian scholars, the question may be asked, “What difference does it make?” The so called “battle for the Bible” has been going on among Evangelicals for many years now. Some people have grown weary in the battle and are calling for a truce. “Let us stop arguing over the Bible and get on to more important tasks,” they urge. In the midst of this battle, Clark Pinnock warned of the danger of compromise:
Obviously some well-meaning Christians have decided to surrender an element of Biblical truth, namely, complete inerrancy, in the mistaken belief that it is a peripheral and has no vital bearing on essential Christian truth. Whatever the intentions, the effects of this concession are disastrous. The almost inevitable result is further concessions as a weakening of the foundations. We need to voice our concern before the full implications of this theory work themselves out in theology and life.⁹

Sadly, Pinnock later joined persons who were calling for a truce. When Harold Lindsell’s book, *The Battle for the Bible*, was published in 1976, Pinnock immediately turned his pen against Lindsell for being divisive. Pinnock believed inerrancy had become an issue which should no longer divide evangelicals. He thought the evangelical community had room for believers who hold to errancy and believers who hold to inerrancy.¹⁰

Coming back to the question, “Does it make any difference what view of the Bible one holds?” The position taken in this paper is that it most assuredly does. One's view of the Bible is important for the same reasons it has always been. Pinnock and others who have retreated from their former insistence on the importance of a proper doctrine of inspiration were right the first time in pointing out the consequences of forsaking the historic Christian position. Things have not changed. These consequences are being sadly observed by some of us today.

*Related To Christian Doctrine*

What people believes about the Bible ultimately determines their beliefs about other doctrinal matters. It may be granted that agreement on the nature of biblical inspiration does not guarantee agreement on other doctrines, as the diversity among evangelicals will demonstrate. Some evangelicals have adopted a view of the Bible which allows for errors in what they call incidentals, yet they still hold to the major historic Christian doctrines. On the other hand, it is easily demonstrable that when one drifts from a high view of inspiration he generally drifts in other historic beliefs. Some evangelicals hotly deny this "domino theory," as they call it, but history is against them! Lindsell has not overstated the case in saying:
that once anyone departs from a commitment to Biblical inerrancy he opens the door to a disavowal either in principle or in practice of other important doctrines of the Christian faith. In other words, it is virtually impossible for anyone who, in the beginning, limits Biblical inerrancy or infallibility to matters of faith and practice, to hold this consistently or persistently over a period of time.\footnote{11}

**Related to Christian Conduct**

What one believes about the Bible will ultimately determine his conduct. The widespread acceptance of relativity in morals is due largely to a departure from the historic position of biblical inspiration. If the Bible is not trustworthy in scientific and historical matters, how can it be thought to contain absolute moral laws? Indeed, human behavior is an area of scientific interest today. If present day textbooks on physics and biology are more reliable in telling us about the origin of man and his universe, perhaps modern textbooks on psychology, sociology, and ethics are more reliable guides for personal morality than the Bible.

**Related to Christian Mission**

What one believes about the Bible will eventually affect his understanding of the Christian mission.\footnote{12} It is very clear that the central commission Jesus left his churches is to evangelize the world. Invariably, when one loses a sense of the absolute authority of Scripture, he begins to redefine that mission. The loss of enthusiasm for missions and the decline in evangelistic involvement within most major mainline protestant denominations are directly related to a rejection of the historic doctrine of inspiration. The appeal is often made, "Let us quit arguing about the Bible and get on with missions and evangelism." This statement precisely makes the point. The Bible is not only our authority for missions and evangelism, it defines for us what that mission is. If the issue of Biblical inspiration and authority is not settled, there can be no agreement on what we are to do or proclaim as Christians.
Methods for Forming a View of Scripture

How should one go about forming a view of Scripture? Three methods have been commonly used.

**Personal Experience**

This method simply means that one should choose a view of Scripture that makes the Bible most meaningful to the reader. After discussing the different views of inspiration, Clifton Allen concluded: “Persons of earnest purpose toward God and of strong conviction about this revelation in the Scriptures will have different views about inspiration. Each person may well seek for fuller understandings about the Bible as the basis for the view that makes the Bible more meaningful in his own experience.”

**Phenomena of Scripture**

A second method involves letting the phenomena of Scripture determine one’s view of Scripture. This idea contends the Bible contains obvious errors, such as outdated science, historical errors, factual discrepancies, and even moral blemishes. Whatever view of Scripture one decides must accommodate these phenomena. Most persons who insist that this point is the starting place for forming a doctrine of Scripture conclude that one’s view of inspiration cannot include inerrancy. Such was the conclusion of Dewey M. Beegle in his controversial books, *The Inspiration of Scripture* (1963) and *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* (1973). After identifying and discussing a number of phenomenal inconsistencies of various kinds, Beegle concluded with three alternate conclusions:

(1) Scripture teaches the doctrine of inerrancy, but the phenomena of Scripture disproves this claim, (2) Scripture teaches the doctrine of inerrancy, therefore any contradictions or errors are in appearance only; and (3) Scripture does not teach a doctrine of inerrancy, therefore the phenomena of Scripture are to be accepted as an important factor in
determining a biblical view of inspiration.\textsuperscript{15}

Beegle’s personal conclusion was the third alternate. As noted above, this position is largely held by most of the persons who say the phenomena of Scripture is the method to be employed to determine one’s view of inspiration. Although they do not state it, this method is used by James Fleming and John R. Claypool in their contributions to \textit{Is the Bible a Human Book} in which both deny the perfection or inerrancy of the Bible based on the humanity of the Bible and the phenomena found therein.\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{Exegetical Method}

E. J. Young, following in the footsteps of Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield, rejected the idea that the starting point for forming a doctrine of Scripture should be the phenomena of Scripture. He proposed that the proper starting point should be the self-witness of Scripture (i.e., Scripture's own teaching about itself).\textsuperscript{17} In other words, the proper method for determining a doctrine of Scripture is to examine the Bible itself to determine a clear teaching of Scripture on the matter.

Some persons object to this method of forming a doctrine of Scripture on the grounds that it is circular reasoning to use the Bible to prove the Bible to be inspired. Perhaps this objection is legitimate to people outside of faith, but it should not be to believers who have embraced the Christian faith, and particularly to us Baptists who profess that our sole authority for faith and practice is the Bible. All of our doctrinal beliefs should be based on the teachings of the Bible itself. What we believe about God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, Salvation, the Church, and the end times should come from the Bible. As Millard Erickson stated, “The method used in constructing the doctrine of inspiration should parallel the method used to formulate other doctrines.”\textsuperscript{18} He goes on to state his own position:
Thus, our major basis for the doctrine of inspiration will be the didactic material. The actual phenomena of Scripture will be used to help determine the meaning of the didactic material. A parallel example is the doctrine that Jesus was without sin. Passages like Hebrews 4:15 establish the doctrine, the narratives of Jesus’ life help us understand just what is consistent with and what is excluded by the concept of sinlessness. Both aspects are needed, but one must carry greater emphasis, and consistency of theological methodology dictates beginning with the teachings rather than the phenomena. The teachings will give us the formal nature of the doctrine, while the phenomena help fill out the content.¹⁹

This methodology is advocated here. The Christian need only ask, “What was the view Jesus and the Apostles?” If that view can be determined through an exegetical examination, then it should be the view of Christians today.

_The Teaching of Jesus_

Granting the general reliability of the gospels, Jesus’ view of Scripture can easily be determined. References to Christ’s use of Scripture, his attitude toward it, and his explicit statements about it are abundant. It is not possible, nor necessary, here to give a detailed examination of all the evidence for our Lord’s teaching. This task has been ably done by others.²⁰ It will suffice to sum up some of the salient features.

Divine In Origin

There can be no question that Jesus considered the Scriptures to be of divine origin. The evidence for this conclusion hardly needs demonstration. It may be seen in the designations He used for the Old Testament. For example, He specifically calls it "the Word of God" (Mk. 7:13; Jn. 10:35), a term which very clearly centers attention on the fact that He considered the Old Testament as a communication from God. The very term _Scripture_ was already in common use in Judaism to refer to the sacred books of the Old Testament held to be of divine origin. Jesus used the term frequently and there is no reason to believe He used it in any other sense than that which was understood by the Jewish mind.
The statements Jesus made about the Scripture also indicated He considered it to have its origin in God. He contrasted Scripture as the "commandment of God" (Mk. 7:8,9) with the teaching of the Jews as the "traditions of men." Scripture is the product of the Holy Spirit (Mk. 12:36). It has an eternal character (Mt. 5:17, 18). It must be fulfilled (Mt. 26:56; Jn. 17:12). It cannot be abrogated (Jn. 10:35). In some cases certain portions of the Old Testament are identified as the speaking of God (Mt. 19:4-5; 22:31-32).

Confluent In Authorship

Jesus recognized human instrumentality in the writing of Scripture. In citing the Old Testament, He did not hesitate in some cases to attribute the passage to the human author (e.g. Isaiah, Mk. 7:6; Jn. 12:38-41; Daniel, Mk. 13:14; David, Mk. 12:36). However, beyond the human author was always the unquestioned divine inspiration. This dual authorship is most clearly expressed by Jesus in Mk. 12:36 where he prefaced a quotation from Ps. 110 with the words, "For David himself said by the Holy Ghost." Jesus recognized the text of Psalm 110 was a combination of man's writing and the Spirit of God.

Absolute in Authority

Jesus looked upon the Scriptures as having absolute authority. This conclusion naturally arises from his view of its divine origin. Jesus' commitment to the authority of the Old Testament may be seen in the following observations. First is his use of the formula, "It is written" (Mk. 9:12; 11:17; Jn. 19:34). This expression signifies the Scriptures possess authority over the thoughts and consciences of men. It carries the idea that Scripture in all its parts is clothed with the authority of God Himself. Thus, for Jesus, the simple statement, "It is written," was enough
to settle any debate or moral question.

Second, Jesus' use of the Scripture demonstrates His acceptance of its absolute authority. He used it to express His faith (Lk. 23:46), to defend His views and actions (Mt. 12:1-8; 19:5), to sustain the claims He made for Himself (Mt. 22:41-45), to oppose His enemies (Mk. 7:6-7), and to defeat the Devil (Mt. 4:1-11).

Third, Jesus totally submitted himself to the authority of Scripture. Jesus Himself possessed all authority in heaven and earth (Mt. 18:18), yet He avowed to obey what was written (Mt. 4:1ff.; 16:22-23). He specifically stated that His purpose was not to substitute His own authority for the authority of Scripture (Mt. 5:17ff.).

The clearest didactic statement of Jesus concerning the authority of Scripture is found in John 10:35. The declaration was made in responding to the objection by the Jewish officials to Jesus’s claim to be one with God (Jn. 10:30). He cited Psalm 82:6 as a Scriptural basis for his claim, and then commented: “The Scripture cannot be broken.” Jesus is not referring to a subjective Jewish evaluation of the Scripture to be taken in the sense of "you know it is not lawful to break your scripture." This contention is not an *argumentum ad hominem*, as some have supposed, but rather is, as B. B. Warfield stated, an *argumentum e concessu*. This position was Jesus’s own view, but it was also a view held in common with his opponents.

This use and comment about Scripture is brief, but very revealing concerning Jesus’s view of Scripture. In the first place, Jesus refers to this passage as “law” even though it is found outside the section of the Jewish Scriptures called The Law. This usage means Jesus considered all Scripture to have the legal binding authority of law, whether it is found in The Law, The Prophets, or The Writings.

A second fact to be noted is that Jesus cites a passage which may not be regarded as a key
passage of the Old Testament, but rather a somewhat obscure passage, or, as Leon Morris respectfully described it, “a rather run-of-the-mill passage.”²³ The significance of this fact is obvious and of great consequence. It means that Jesus believed the legal authority of Scripture extends to every expression of Scripture, even to the most casual words and phrases.

The third observation to be made from Jesus’s use of Scripture in this setting is that Scripture “cannot be broken.” This statement is the crux of the whole matter concerning Jesus’s view of the authority of Scripture. “Broken” is the verb luthēnai which is the aorist passive infinitive of luō. The basic meaning of luō is “to loose, unbind, release.” It sometimes has the meaning of “breaking destructively.”²⁴ This term is the common word used for breaking the law or the Sabbath (cf. Jn. 5:18; 7:23; Mt. 5:19).

Warfield stated that the “declaration is that it is impossible for the Scripture to be annulled, its authority to be withstood, or denied.”²⁵ Likewise, Edward J. Young summed up its importance for Jesus’ view of Scripture. This statement indicates that Jesus believed “Scripture possesses an authority so absolute in character that it cannot be broken.”²⁶ Morris also noted that the phrase indicated that Jesus viewed Scripture as having a very high authority. He added: “It means that Scripture cannot be emptied of its force by being shown to be erroneous.”²⁷ R. C. H. Lenski points out that this axiom is objective and absolute. It has the sense of:

”'the Scripture cannot possibly be broken,” no word of it dissolved; compare 7:23; Mt. 5:19. Every statement in its verity, unaffected by denial, human ignorance or criticism, charges of errancy or other subjective attacks. Thus in the present case no power or ingenuity of man can alter Ps. 82:6, and the fact that Yahweh called his judges Elohim.”²⁸

Complete In Trustworthiness

Jesus considered Scripture to be completely trustworthy. Scripture is true; it will not lie or mislead. This trustworthiness extends to the details of Scripture as well as the general content.
For example, Jesus was confident the Old Testament contained no mistakes concerning prophetic events for not one jot or tittle will pass without being fulfilled (Mt. 5:17-18). If something was prophesied, it had to be fulfilled (Mk. 8:31; 14:21; Lk. 2:49; 18:31).

Jesus also placed confidence in the historical reliability of Scripture. In no instance did Jesus question the historical accuracy of the Old Testament. All the historical narratives were treated as straightforward records of fact. John W. Wenham gives the following summary of historical facts to which Jesus refers and accepts as reliable:


Two observations need to be made about these historical facts referenced by Jesus. First, many of these references just happen to be those facts least acceptable by modern critics today (e.g., He assumes the historicity of Adam and Eve, Abel, Noah, the miracle of the manna, Jonah, Daniel, etc.). Second, Jesus made reference to these historical facts to prove or illustrate important Christian truths. While it is quite possible to illustrate spiritual truths with avowed legends and allegories, the truths which Jesus sought to teach by these Old Testament events and personalities depended upon their factuality.

For forming a view of Scripture, the real significance of these truths is that one’s view of Scripture is closely related to one’s view of Christ. In debates over the Bible, persons who
oppose the strict view of the authority of the Bible often claim Christ is their ultimate authority and not the Bible. They claim to appeal to the Living Word and not to a written word. However, if one recognizes the authority of the Living Word, one should submit to His view of Scripture. As Jesus submitted to the absolute authority and trustworthiness of the Scripture so should those who claim Him as Lord of their lives. Ultimately, one’s view of Scripture reflects on his Christology.

**Apostolic Teaching**

The primitive church "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine" (Acts 2:42). This doctrine contained a very definite view of Scripture. An examination of the major statements about Scripture and the apostolic use of Scripture will demonstrate the apostles had essentially the same view of Scripture as Jesus.

**Major Statements**

2 Tim. 3:16.

The *classicus locus* of the doctrine of inspiration is II Tim. 3:16. In this passage Paul affirms two very clear truths about Scripture. One, Scripture has a *divine origin*. The phrase "is given by inspiration of God" is a translation of the one Greek word, *theopneustos*. This verbal adjective, though denied by a few, is clearly used in the passive sense. The KJV has correctly rendered it as a passive, but the word *inspiration* does not convey the exact thought intended. Warfield has conclusively demonstrated that the idea conveyed by the term is that the Scripture is “breathed out” by God and not that of "inbreathed" by God. He stated: “The Greek term has, however, nothing to say of inspiring or inspiration: it speaks only of a ‘spirng,’ or ‘spiration.’ What it says of Scripture is, not that it is ‘breathed into by God’ or is the product of the Divine ‘inbreathing’ into the human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, ‘God breathed,’ the
Thus, Paul was affirming in the strongest terms possible that Scripture is a divine product. It did not originate in the ingenuity of man but is a product of the creative activity of God.

The second truth taught about Scripture is that the *Scripture in its entirety is God-breathed*. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." Some question exists concerning the proper translation of the Greek construction of this declaration. The question is over whether *pasa graphe* should be translated "all Scripture" or "every Scripture." Both interpretations are possible and, thus, are defended. Actually, it makes very little difference as to the resultant meaning. If the sense is "every Scripture," then the apostle is affirming that the Sacred Scriptures are in all their parts God-breathed. If the sense is "all Scripture," then he is saying the Scriptures in their whole extent are God-breathed. Either way he is saying that the entire fabric of Scripture is of divine origin.

11 Peter 1:19-21

The second explicit statement revealing the apostolic view of Scripture is found in 2 Peter 1:19-20. In this passage, Peter affirms three clear truths about Scripture. First, the apostle declares the *absolute trustworthiness* of the Old Testament Scripture. He refers to the Old Testament as a "more sure word of prophecy." While the statement may be understood in more than one sense, the context indicates Peter is using the Old Testament Scriptures to confirm his personal witness to the coming of Christ. He was seeking to give his readers assurance that his preaching about the second coming of Christ was not based on "cunningly devised fables."

Referring to the transfiguration, and understanding it as a preview of the return of Christ, Peter states that he and others were eyewitnesses of Christ's majestic coming. However, if that is not proof enough, he offers "a more sure word of prophecy." In other words, the Old Testament
is a more trustworthy testimony to the coming of Christ than an eyewitness account. The second truth affirmed here by Peter is that the Scriptures have a divine origin. The divine source of Scripture is affirmed first by a negative statement, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of 'man;" then with a positive statement, "but holy men of God spoke as they were moved of the Holy Ghost" (v. 21). The force of the full statement is that attention is drawn away from the human authors to the divine act of inspiration.

The third truth expressed in this passage is that the Scriptures came through human instrumentality. Even though the emphasis is clearly on the divine authorship, the text makes no suggestion that the human authors are without importance. "Holy men of God spake." (v. 21).

Other Data.

In addition to the above two direct assertions about Scripture, an abundance of indirect evidence exists for the apostolic view of Scripture. Scripture is the speaking of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:16; Heb. 3:7). In some passages God and Scripture are so closely connected that God is spoken of as if He were the Scriptures (Heb. 3:7; Acts 4:25; Acts 13:34) and the Scriptures are spoken of as God (Rom 9:17; Gal 3:8). Paul clearly considered the very words of Scripture to be inspired since he based an argument on the grammatical form of a word (Gal. 3:16). In short, there can be little doubt that in the mind of the apostles that what Scripture says, God says.

Conclusion

Based upon the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, the following affirmations must be included in a biblical doctrine of Scripture:

1. Scripture has a divine origin.
2. All that is called Scripture has a divine origin. This statement quite clearly includes all the canonical books of the Old Testament. Much internal evidence exists that the New
Testament writings possess the same quality (Jn. 16:13; 1 Thess. 2:13; II Peter. 3:15-16).

3. The words of Scripture, not simply the thoughts and intents, are God-given.

4. Because of its divine origin, Scripture possesses absolute authority.

5. Because of its divine origin, Scripture is completely trustworthy — religiously, historically, and scientifically,

In light of the above affirmations the term *plenary verbal inspiration* expresses a very biblical view of inspiration. The terms *inerrancy* and *infallibility* are also needed to express the very important result of biblical inspiration.
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