

standpoint of definition only "it would be difficult to maintain a clear distinction between this term and inerrancy." He notes that more recently, however, infallibility has been "a term championed by those who would support what has been called limited inspiration or what today we might better call limited inerrancy." He says, "those who often advance this word to the exclusion of inerrancy would at least defend the inerrancy of the Scriptures in areas that are 'revelational', 'soteriological', or 'matters of faith and doctrine'."

As an example of this use of infallible in combination with a doctrine of limited inerrancy, Feinberg cites Stephen C. Davis, and his book *The Debate About the Bible*, in which Davis says that infallibility means that the Bible is not false, or will not mislead us on matters of faith and practice. However, John H. Gerstner, in his article in *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*, states that "Davis' own infallibilist position self-destructs, for he admits that his Bible may even err on any crucial doctrine (though he hopes not and thinks it will not), and he admits that ultimate reliance for truth is on his own mind, Scripture notwithstanding." What a strange concept of infallibility!

"Infallibility" is a good word. However, whenever we see it or use it we should realize that in the present climate of discussion it can mean on the one hand that the Bible is "incapable of error," or on the other hand that the Bible "will not fail to achieve the goals and purposes which God intended for it." The first definition affirms inerrancy; the second does not deny inerrancy but does not require it.

James Montgomery Boice, in the Preface to *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*, sounds a warning note. He says:

... other persons will argue that infallibility is a better word than inerrancy for describing the soundest evangelical position on Scripture... Unfortunately, the majority of those who choose infallible rather than inerrant do so because they want to affirm something less than total inerrancy, suggesting erroneously that the Bible is dependable in some areas (such as faith and morals) while not being fully dependable in others (such as matters of history and science).

Paul D. Feinberg, in his paper, "The Meaning of Inerrancy", proposes a definition of inerrancy. He says:

Inerrancy means that when all facts are known, the Scriptures in their original autographs and properly interpreted will be shown to be wholly true in everything that they affirm, whether that has to do with doctrine or morality or with the social, physical, or life sciences.

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