morality or with the social, physical, or life sciences.

This definition is more positive and comprehensive than the statement on Scripture found in the Lausanne Covenant, which asserts that the Bible is "without error in all that it affirms." As such I believe Feinberg's definition has distinct advantages.

However, once we have confessed that the Scriptures are inerrant, i.e., wholly true and without error in everything that they affirm, we must make some qualifications. Kenneth S. Kantzer, in his article in *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*, points out that some people draw unnecessary implications from inerrancy. He says:

> The word inerrancy is ... by no means free from ... abuse and ambiguity. As applied to biblical inspiration, it is used by some to mean: a) exact and precise language throughout the whole of Scripture, b) literal interpretation of Scripture, or c) dictation methodology for the production of Scripture.

Kantzer asserts that inerrancy does not include these concepts in its meaning.

Paul Feinberg also mentions some misunderstandings of inerrancy. He enumerates eight qualifications of the concept:

1. Inerrancy does not demand strict adherence to the rules of grammar.
2. Inerrancy does not exclude the use of either figures of speech or literary genre.
3. Inerrancy does not demand historical or semantic precision.
4. Inerrancy does not demand the technical or observational language of modem science.
5. Inerrancy does not require verbal exactness in the citation of the Old Testament by the New.
6. Inerrancy does not demand that the sayings of Jesus contain the exact words of Jesus, only the exact voice (i.e., sometimes we find direct quotations, sometimes indirect discourse, and sometimes free renderings, but the meaning of our Lord's words is captured in the words of