

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.

Paul D. 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 modern 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 quotation, sometimes indirect discourse, and sometimes free renderings, but the meaning of our Lord's words is captured in the words of the writer).
7. Inerrancy does not guarantee the exhaustive comprehensiveness of any single account or of combined accounts where those are involved.
8. Inerrancy does not demand the infallibility or inerrancy of the non-inspired sources used by biblical writers.

However, in spite of these important qualifications, Clark, Pinnock, in an article in *Biblical Authority*, edited by Jack Rogers and published in 1977, states that he is not comfortable with the term inerrancy, although he says that he still holds it. But the manner in which he qualifies the term seems to dilute it considerably. For example, he asks seven questions about inerrancy, and comments on each one, as follows:

"Question One: Is inerrancy scriptural?., He says that inerrancy is a possible inference from the Bible, but not the only one. We may "choose to draw' the inference or not.