

EDITOR'S NOTE

By way of clarification of my March editorial, when writing that “even some on the executive committee (specifically, the most recent and the current ETS president) find that ‘inerrancy’ lacked teeth at least in the Sanders case,” the intended reference was to the affirmation of inerrancy in the ETS Doctrinal Basis, not inerrancy as a concept. In fact, both Drs. Howard and Beale affirm this concept as traditionally defined; they both fully endorse, for example, the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy.

In my editorial I also mentioned Russ Buth’s motion to “consider and recommend to the Society appropriate ways to clarify our Society’s understanding of our doctrinal basis,” and that the 63% who voted against Sanders can take “solace” in that motion. This was not meant to imply that those who did not support revoking Sanders’ membership on the grounds of the current Doctrinal Basis are not in support of Bush’s motion. To the contrary, many, if not most, of those who voted against revoking Dr. Sanders’ membership, including Drs. Howard and Beale, are strongly in favor of it.

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER