

**THE WORD OF GOD AND THE TURNING OF THE TIDES:
FROM CLOTHES TO FASHIONS**

**A Paper Presented to
The 18th Annual Meeting of the
DEAN BURGON SOCIETY**

by

Dr. Gary E. La More, Ph.D., D.D.

Pastor of GRACE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

**President of HISTORIC BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE AND
SEMINARY**

Scarborough, Ontario, Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
THE WORD OF GOD	4
CONCLUSION	54
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND PERSONALITIES	70
APPENDIX I	100
APPENDIX II	114
APPENDIX III	121
APPENDIX IV	123
APPENDIX V	127
APPENDIX VI	129
APPENDIX VII	138
APPENDIX VIII	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	148

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this paper would like to first of all thank Dr. D.A. Waite, Dean Burgon Society, for the opportunity to present this paper at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Society, hosted by the Grace Baptist Church, Franklin, Massachusetts. He would also like to thank his mentor, Dr. M. James Hollowood, of Watertown, Wisconsin, and his good friend, Mr. Robert Shaker, of the Reformation Book Service, Toronto, Canada, for challenging him to read the works of Dr. Eta Linnemann. The author would also thank Dr. Linnemann for writing her works and permitting him to quote extensively from them. His church family is to be thanked for their words of encouragement during the writing of this paper and for their financial assistance in making the trip to Massachusetts possible. Finally, he would like to thank his family for all their help and input during the author's time of doing this paper. A personal thank you is extended to Miss Jennifer La More who made this paper possible because of her knowledge of the computer. Any mistakes, however, in how the work is written or documented is the fault of the author exclusively and not any of the persons mentioned in this acknowledgement.

**THE WORD OF GOD AND THE TURNING OF THE TIDES:
FROM CLOTHES TO FASHIONS**

THE WORD OF GOD

God's Word Is Inspired

According to Dr. Eta Linnemann, Holy Scripture testifies explicitly to its origin in God in two passages. The first is 2 Timothy 3:16-17: All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. The second testimony is 2 Peter 1:19-21: We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.¹ What she has just said here is not a fashion statement. Even though Dr. Linnemann is a scholar, she has not fallen into the trap of modernity.

However, now listen to a contemporary American

¹Eta Linnemann, Historical Criticism of the Bible (Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1990), 142.

evangelical scholar when he says [that] all evangelicals believe the Scriptures are inspired by God and that they constitute divine revelation. Although some continue to press texts like 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:21 in the effort to define exactly the nature of inspiration, evangelical scholars since A.A. Hodge and B.B. Warfield in the late nineteenth century have largely resisted this temptation. That God inspired Scripture is a fundamental datum. How it was done-through what combination of direct communication, extraordinary insight, tribal or oral histories, or use of documents-is much less important than that it occurred.² Dr. Noll

² Mark A. Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, Second edition (Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1991), 149. It is interesting to note that [Warfield] fully sanctioned the widest possible use of available scholarship to discover authorial intent, even if it called into question traditional evangelical interpretations of specific passages. (Noll, 175) Noll continues, While the conservatives made no effort to hide their traditionalism, they nonetheless professed a willingness to be swayed by new facts concerning the Scriptures. As Hodge and Warfield put it at the start of the exchange, The writers of this article are sincerely convinced of the perfect soundness of the great Catholic doctrine of Biblical Inspiration, i.e., that the Scriptures not only contain, but ARE, THE WORD OF GOD, and hence that all their elements and all their affirmations are absolutely errorless, and binding the faith and obedience of men. Nevertheless we admit that the question between ourselves and the advocates of [modern criticism], is one of fact, to be decided only by an exhaustive and impartial examination of all the sources of evidence, i.e., the claims and the phenomena of the Scriptures themselves. [Noll, 18] [A.A.] Hodge and Warfield...profess more willingness to let 'induction' take its course and (perhaps) to doubt what merely appears to be 'the plain implication' of biblical passages. For them, the recovery of the texts 'in all their real affirmations' is the key. They stress that the books of the Bible 'were not designed to teach philosophy, science, or human history as such,' and that the writers depended on 'sources and methods in themselves fallible.' All of this does not mean the Bible errs

when its writers speak on history or literary origins. It simply means that 'the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds' are true when 'ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense.' [Noll, 26] It is also interesting to note that Warfield could countenance a conservative version of theistic evolution. [Noll, 38] B.B. Warfield also led the way in stripping concepts of 'inerrancy' [from] mechanical or dualistic connotations, and..., to affirm the right of critical, scientific study of the Bible within reasonable confessional guidelines. [Noll, 29] Warfield, went on to develop...a concept of **concursum** which he felt made it possible to study one and the same phenomenon from different, but coherent perspectives. This principle encouraged Warfield to pursue seriously the authorial intent of the biblical writers. To engage in the historical study necessary for determining that intent was not superfluous or sacrilegious, but rather an intellectual and spiritual necessity. Through this means scholars could grasp the human meaning of Scripture, a meaning which, because of **concursum**, was the portal to its religious significance. **Concursum** also allowed Warfield, within his constitutional limits, a breathing space for the exercise of academic creativity. The concept, for instance, enabled him to adjust his Calvinism to a conservative form of evolution. [Noll, 177-178] Finally, at least two strategies can move evangelicals beyond the formal concern for inerrancy to the material apprehension of the Bible. One, taken by a few evangelicals, is to conclude that it is not necessary to defend the errorless character of Scripture in order to rely upon its authority. In 1881, B.B. Warfield and A.A. Hodge concluded the opposite, that since 'no organism can be stronger than its weakest part,...if error be found in any one element, or in any class of [biblical] statements, certainty as to any portion could rise no higher than belongs to that exercise of human reason to which it will be left to discriminate the infallible from the fallible.' Twenty years earlier, however, F.J.A. Hort had faced the same question and come to a slightly different conclusion. Hort felt that inconsequential mistakes in Scripture did not carry such dire consequences. As he put it in a letter to B.F. Westcott, I do most fully recognize the special 'Providence' which controlled the formation of the canonical books.... But I am not able to go as far as you in asserting the absolute infallibility of a canonical writing. I may see a certain fitness and probability in such a view, but I cannot set up an **a priori** assumption against the (supposed) results of criticism.... I shall rejoice on fuller investigation to find that imperfect knowledge is a sufficient explanation of **all** apparent errors, but I do not expect to be so fortunate. If I am ultimately driven to admit occasional errors, I shall be sorry; but it will not shake my conviction of the

is making a fashion statement here.

[2 Timothy 3:16-17 and 2 Peter 1:19-21]...do not assert merely 'that God's Spirit, God's wisdom, has gone into these writings.' They can also not be restricted to mean only that the writers of Scripture experienced Romans 8:14 and that accordingly God's Spirit stood by and helped with the composition of the New Testament documents in the same way that [H]e is with all believers in all of life. The Greek Word **theopneustos** used in 2 Timothy 3:16 does not mean 'breathing God's spirit' but rather 'breathed into by God.' There is a vast difference. What the verse states is that God is the originator of the Scriptures.

The biblical writers did not become 'error-free and infallible persons,' not even 'during the period of the composition of their writings,' but rather they '**spoke from God** as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.'

God's Word itself clearly declares God's Holy Spirit to

providential ordering of human elements in the Bible. Hort's conclusion-that the Bible may be authoritatively inspired even with inconsequential errors-was the foundation for his own productive study of the Bible, as it has been for other evangelicals since. [Noll, 196] Dr. Noll has made many fashionable statements here from the writings of B.B. Warfield, A.A. Hodge and F.J.A. Hort. The author of this paper can only hope that the readers of this work do not have a tin ear. The plea here is to listen carefully to what is being said. [For more on B.B. Warfield's views on the Scriptures and providential preservation, see, The Influence of Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield on Acceptance of Naturalistic Text Criticism in America, by Dr. James H. Sighthler, M.D. For additional information on providential preservation, **see also**, Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version, by Dr. Thomas M. Strouse, Ph.D.].

be the originator of the Scriptures. The inspiration of Scripture is asserted by Scripture itself. The doctrine of inspiration is therefore no 'unnecessary protective wall around the Bible,' but rather the normative summary statement of what God's Word says about itself. This is not derived 'from Rom[ans] 8:14 and related passages' but rather primarily from 2 Timothy 3:16-17 and 2 Peter 1:19-21. There 'a special leading of the Spirit for the purpose of writing the Biblical books' is explicitly claimed to have been at work. One stands in contradiction to the Holy Scripture, therefore, if one declares this claim to be 'unnecessary and dubious from a Biblical and theological point of view.'³

In this day of [so-called biblical] fashions and modernity, the genuine believer needs to realize that the Bible [as] the [W]ord of God is under attack. Hegel [, a German philosopher of **idealism**,] presupposed that science is more reliable than the Bible. Voltaire [, a French **naturalist** and 18th century **atheistic** Enlightenment philosopher,] attempted to make man's intelligence independent of God, capable of creating a science which depends upon man alone. Together they contributed to the thesis of liberalism that the Bible is but a human book, to be studied critically like any other book. In physics Mach tried to unify science by emphasizing that the world is built up of perceptions. He tried to define existence in terms of the

³Linnemann, 142-143.

subjective perceptions of men. Albright [, Dean of American Archaeologists from John Hopkins University,] set about to establish the Bible firmly on the foundation of archaeology buttressed by verifiable data, but even this effort assumed that the Bible needed to be supported by science. [It must be added, however, that] archaeology has helped to undermine many of the liberal ideas of the nineteenth century.

Though liberalism was largely discredited by two world wars, its thesis influenced German theologian Karl Barth, the father of Neo-Orthodoxy. Friedrich Schleiermacher was the master builder of liberal theology and a pantheist. He in turn became one of the channels by which the emphasis on the subjective in defining existence came down to Barth.

Barth employed Kant, Hegel, and Schleiermacher's emphasis on human perceptions when he stressed the interpretations of the reader over the divine inspiration of the Bible. To do this, in the preface to his commentary on the **Epistle to the Romans**, he first approved the historical-critical method of liberal theology; the presupposition of this method being that the Bible is a merely human book. Then he went beyond liberalism, writing that 'the doctrine of inspiration is concerned with the labour of apprehending.' By thus approving Kant's subjectivism in the interpretation of the Bible to the doctrines of the Scriptures, he fathered Neo-Orthodoxy. He made inspiration equivalent to the

reader's personal attempt to interpret. From that point on Neo-Orthodoxy has not needed to negate the Bible as the Word of God. Rather they have affirmed it while undermining its divine authority by shifting the emphasis from its words to the subjective interpretations of the reader.

According to his theory of knowledge, anything which involves man, who is finite and limited, must of necessity be limited and hence relative. This then becomes the criterion by which Barth evaluates the Bible, a book, according to him, replete with 'offenses' and subject to 'human fallibility' and 'vulnerability.'

In his systematic theology Barth pursues what he calls 'the event' and 'the freedom of God.' By 'the event' he means the impingement of the word of God (Christ himself) upon the life of a person. This is a subjective, mystical view of faith which contrasts with the emphasis in Scripture on faith as a response to the objective content of the Bible. By 'the freedom of God' Barth referred to the personal, non-objective way in which he supposed God communicates with His followers. Barth believed that a person cannot take the Bible in his hands and say, 'I have the Word of God,' because this would be attributing to the Bible what Barth believed could be attributed only to Christ. Historically, Christians have understood from hundreds of biblical texts that there are two completely consistent divine Words, the Living Word

(Christ) and the written Word (the Bible).

Barth placed his presupposition that anything which involves man must be limited and hence relative above the basic statements of the Bible about its own nature. For instance 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21 clearly state that all of the Bible is God-breathed and not a matter of one's own interpretation or a product of human will. The difficulty here is that Barth is testing the basic biblical passages (by which we understand the nature of the Bible) by **his presupposition**, rather than testing his presupposition **by the biblical passages**. His presupposition (that the Bible is inevitably fallible and errant) is at odds with the biblical passages which he is treating. In this way, he destroys the authority of the Bible.

Neo-Orthodoxy has consistently maintained Barth's view of truth, a view which has in recent years been repackaged as the New Hermeneutic. In evaluating the thought of Hans-Georg Gadamer, a key New Hermeneutic theologian, Royce Gruenler argues that 'there is for Gadamer no objective revelation from outside history.' By thus maintaining liberalism's basic premise, Neo-Orthodoxy and the New Hermeneutic negate all the claims that the Bible makes concerning itself. This 'new' theology and its 'new' view of truth is really nothing new at all. It joins the modern hermeneutical movement in other disciplines such as psychology and linguistics, in order to infuse liberalism's view of Scripture into our

culture.⁴

Having talked about Karl Barth, how do other evangelicals view him and his work today? As one reads contemporary theologians today, he will discover that they are making fashionable statements about Dr. Barth and his theology. For example, [Dr. Bernard] Ramm's 1983 book, After Fundamentalism, called upon his fellow

⁴Richard L. Heldenbrand, Christianity and New Evangelical Philosophies (Winona Lake, IN.: Richard L. Heldenbrand, 1989), 23-25. For more on Schleiermacher's subjectivism, **see**, Dr. Gary E. La More's paper, Subjectivism in Religion: Eleven Theological Personalities, 11-22; for an excellent evangelical evaluation of Barthianism, see Dr. Charles Caldwell Ryrie's NEOORTHODOXY, 1-64. The Presbyterian Journal has this to say about Dr. Ryrie's book: "To many, the recent theological movement called Neoorthodoxy, Barthianism, or Crisis Theology has seemed to be a return from liberalism to conservative faith. It stresses the Word of God, the sovereignty of God, the sinfulness of man, and the centrality of Christ. 'The system must either be something very good or terribly deceiving,' the author asserts, 'and we must know which.' The purpose of this book, he says, is 'to show as simply as possible something of the system and its errors.' Beginning with the historical and theological background of the movement, Dr. Ryrie analyzes the positions of Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr, three of the leading exponents of neoorthodoxy. Next, he summarizes the basic doctrines of the movement and then offers a critique of its internal inconsistencies and its departures from biblical principles. 'From reading Neoorthodoxy, one will be reminded that the Reformed doctrine must be one that is God-centred-not man; that the Bible is the Word of God-not that it becomes the Word; that the cross is to be preached-but not without the blood; and that salvation is for all-but only those who believe are saved.'" This material from the Presbyterian Journal came from the back cover of Dr. Ryrie's book NEOORTHODOXY.

evangelicals to learn from Karl Barth how to be both genuinely Christian and genuinely honest about the 'humanity' of Scripture. Ramm was especially distressed at the 'obscurantism' which he felt had beset evangelical efforts to incorporate modern Western learning into the study of Scripture. Here was the primary problem, as Ramm saw it, complete with his own italics and an unflattering comparison to Barth: *there is no genuine, valid working hypothesis for most evangelicals to interact with the humanity of Scripture in general and biblical criticism in particular.* There are only ad hoc or desultory attempts to resolve particular problems. Barth's method of coming to terms with the humanity of the Scripture and biblical criticism is at least a clearly stated program.... To date, evangelicals have not announced such a clear working program. If Barth's paradigm does not please them, they are still under obligation to propose a program that does enable an evangelical to live creatively with evangelical theology and biblical criticism.⁵ One reviewer of

⁵Noll, 178-179. According to Dr. Noll, Dr. Ramm is one of the leaders in the postwar renewal of evangelical thought. One needs to realize that Dr. Ramm is not alone in making fashionable statements about Dr. Barth for the sake of modernity. Dr. Donald G. Bloesch, professor of theology, University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, has the following to say about Gregory Bolich's Karl Barth & Evangelicalism: "Gregory Bolich has given a penetrating and challenging reassessment of Karl Barth which will benefit not only concerned evangelicals but all who are seeking the renewal and reform of the church in our time." The publisher of Bolich's book goes on to say that few theologians have sparked as much controversy among evangelicals as Karl Barth. On the one hand, he has been pilloried as champion of the new modernism and

enemy of historic Christianity. On the other, he has been heralded as pioneer in a return to truly biblical theology. Further, the publisher states that Gregory Bolich (M.Div., Western Evangelical Seminary) offers a fresh assessment of Barth and his impact on modern evangelicals—the most detailed account of evangelical response to Barth to date. He contends that evangelicals have much to learn from Barth, particularly in abandoning a purely defensive posture and in developing a positive evangelical theology. The stress is not on adopting Barth's theology uncritically, but on following his model of how to develop a theology that brings scriptural truth to bear on the contemporary world. Here is a book for all who wish to be informed, stretched and challenged in their thinking. Reader Beware! "A LITTLE LEAVEN LEAVENETH THE WHOLE LUMP [Galatians 6:9]." The information just given about Bolich's book comes from the back cover. What Bolich says in his volume about Barth is very fashionable. Modernity is ruling the day. What about Donald G. Bloesch? Is he selling clothes or fashions. He has written a volume in the Christian Foundations series entitled, Holy Scripture. In chapter two of this work, "The Crisis in Biblical Authority," he makes the following statements: "...the word *inerrancy* comes to us freighted with cultural and theological baggage that is questionable in the light of our expanded knowledge of the literature and history of the Bible,.... [p. 36] "...not everything reported in the Bible may be in exact correspondence with historical and scientific fact as we know it today." [p. 37] "...we must avoid the hermeneutics of biblical literalism, which leads us into both scientific creationism with its young earth theory and dispensationalism—based on the literal fulfillment of all biblical prophecy. Inerrancy has too often been the cloak for biblical obscurantism,...." [p. 37] "...Like the term *inerrancy*, however, infallibility when applied to Scripture cannot be affirmed without qualification. It is not simply the words of Scripture that make it infallible but the way in which these words are used by the Spirit of God." [p. 37] "The true humanity of Scripture involves a vulnerability to error and a limited cultural horizon because the writers lived in a particular time and place in history." [p. 39] "...My sentiments concur with Barth's: 'We know what we say when we call the Bible the Word of God only when we recognize its human imperfection in face of its divine perfection, and its divine perfection in spite of its human imperfection.'" [p. 39] Both Bolich's and Bloesch's volumes are published by InterVarsity Press. Is InterVarsity Press making a fashion statement for the sake of modernity by publishing both of these volumes? The reader may want to read two essays in Perspectives on Theology in the Contemporary World Essays in Honor of Bernard Ramm. One essay, entitled "Bernard Ramm: Postfundamentalist Coming to

Ramm's book says that his book will not serve to stir the fundamentalist's soul, but rather to bristle the hair on the back of his neck. [He says] After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology has been authored by the infamous new evangelical Bernard Ramm. Dr. Ramm [was] Professor of Christian

Terms with Modernity," was written by Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity School, and the other essay was written by R. Albert Mohler, The Christian Index, entitled, "Bernard Ramm: Karl Barth and the Future of American Evangelicalism." Is every contemporary "evangelical" theologian today making fashionable statements about Barth for the sake of modernity? No. Dr. John Warwick Montgomery is not. Professor John W. Wade for **Standard Publishing Co.** says "Professor Montgomery certainly ranks as one of the most competent of the conservative theologians today. The breadth of his scholarship is at times rather astounding. Yet he writes in a most readable style, the simplicity of which at times almost belies his scholarship. While most of his essays are written on a popular, rather than a technical level, yet ample footnotes are provided so that one can pursue his studies more thoroughly should he choose to do so. We heartily recommend this volume [The Suicide of Christian Theology] for anyone desiring a good cross section of what is happening on today's theological scene." In The Suicide of Christian Theology [we have] a forceful, scholarly call to the liberal church leaders to return from the morass of theological relativism to the solid ground of the ancient creeds of Christianity. Dr. Montgomery's incisive observations on Barth, Bultmann, Tillich, de Chardin, Pike and others may rankle some readers on occasion. But there can never be any question about the mental acumen he brings to bear upon his subject or the skill with which he pens his views. Montgomery is so obviously at home in the area of the theological, and so conversant with the convictions of his fellow theologians that he certainly must be reckoned with. These observations about The Suicide of Christian Theology have been taken from the back cover of the book. Dr. Montgomery is not going to make fashionable statements in his work for the sake of modernity. This volume is a must read for anyone who wants to bring forth clothes instead of fashions in today's world of theological modernity. **WITHOUT A DOUBT A TURNING OF THE TIDES IS TAKING PLACE TODAY WHEN IT COMES TO THE WORD OF GOD.**

Theology at American Baptist Seminary of the West. The thrust of the book appears to be to present Karl Barth's reasoning approach to theology as a model for today's evangelical. [With this book we have a turning of the tides in favour of modernity and fashions.] *Christianity Today* (December 16, 1983) ...enlisted two prominent theologians to review the book. Robert K. Johnston of North Park Theological Seminary [wrote], 'Ramm raises two central issues in theology: the relationship of modern thought to orthodox Christianity, and the significance of Barth for Evangelicalism.' After commending Ramm for his contribution, Johnston express[ed] this reservation, '...Ramm has hurt his argument by being too undialectic in both his derision of fundamentalism and his praise of Barth.' Donald G. Bloesch, Professor of Theology at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary was also asked to comment on After Fundamentalism. He conclud[ed], 'Bernard Ramm has furnished us with an enlightening and provocative analysis of Karl Barth's theology from an evangelical perspective. He reveals his own pilgrimage from a rigid fundamentalism to a postfundamentalist evangelical theology that is willing to learn from modernity without succumbing to its spell.' [This is certainly a fashion statement on the part of Dr. Bloesch. Ramm definitely helped to turn the tide from clothes to fashions when it comes to the Word of God.]⁶

⁶The Projector (January-February, 1984), 6.

Since the word evangelical has been used numerous times in this work thus far, how is one to understand this word? Dr. David Wells in his award winning book, No Place For Truth Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?, has this to say about the word "evangelical": As evangelicalism has continued to grow numerically, it has seeped through its older structures and now spills out in all directions, producing a family of hybrids whose theological connections are quite baffling: evangelical Catholics, evangelicals who are Catholic, evangelical liberationists, evangelical feminists, evangelical ecumenists, ecumenists who are evangelical, young evangelicals, orthodox evangelicals, radical evangelicals, liberal evangelicals, Liberals who are evangelical, and charismatic evangelicals. The word *evangelical*, precisely because it has lost its confessional dimension, has become descriptively anemic. To say that someone is an evangelical says little about what they are likely to believe (although it says more if they are older and less if they are younger). And so the term is forced to compensate for its theological weakness by borrowing meaning from adjectives the very presence of which signals the fragmentation and disintegration of the movement. What is now primary is not what is evangelical but what is adjectivally distinctive, whether Catholic, liberationist, feminist, ecumenist, young, orthodox, radical, liberal, or charismatic. It is, I believe, the dark prelude to death, when parasites have

finally succeeded in bringing down their host. Amid the clamor of all these new models of evangelical faith there is the sound of a death rattle.⁷

⁷David F. Wells, No Place For Truth or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology? (Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), p. 134. There is one adjective that Dr. Wells missed in his list of adjectives associated with the word "evangelical." One would like to believe that this was not deliberate on the part of Professor Wells, who teaches at Gordon-Conwell Seminary. If one professes to be an evangelical *and* a professional researcher, then he dare not leave one stone unturned in his search for truth wherever it might be found. One has Harvard and Oxford trained Richard Quebedeaux, a young evangelical himself, to thank for his book entitled The Young Evangelicals. This book was written in 1974 and was published by Harper & Row, Publishers. This is what the back of the book says about The Young Evangelicals. There is a new wind blowing through the sometimes musty halls of American Christian churches, and it is sweeping away the hypocrisy, lack of social concern, and unnecessary cultural baggage accumulated by the mainstream churches through the years. Thousands of people, young in spirit, are turning away from the anti-intellectuality of separatist fundamentalism and from mainstream ecumenical liberalism, which too often fails to provide solid biblical authority for its teachings. The Young Evangelicals documents this 'third way,' which can only be described as a revolution in orthodoxy. With penetrating insight Richard Quebedeaux examines the roots of the present crisis and explores all aspects of a burgeoning new evangelical movement: its intellectual origins, its struggle with the mainstream branches of Christianity, and, perhaps most exciting, its developing social gospel. What is revealed is a vital, open, and truly revolutionary answer to Christ's call to 'go and teach all nations.' The Young Evangelicals is a book for those interested in a revitalized Christianity, those wanting to pump new life into their congregations, and those seeking a biblically based, intellectually responsible answer to the universal problems of man. In 1978 Dr. Quebedeaux wrote The Worldly Evangelicals. This volume was also published by Harper & Row. Dr. Mark A. Noll should like this volume since he is concerned about fashions and modernity. However, in his book, Between Faith and Criticism, he does not refer to nor reference in his bibliography any of Quebedeaux's volumes. Dr. Noll professes to be a creditable research historian *and* believing critic and yet he does nothing with the Oxford don, Dr. Quebedeaux. Certainly Dr. Quebedeaux would have impeccable

credentials according to Dr. Noll's standards. Dr. Quebedeaux is a young and worldly evangelical who should have found a place in Dr. Noll's book. Perhaps a Vanderbilt Ph.D. is above an Oxford Ph.D. For Dr. Noll's sake, since he missed this volume, and for others, who may be researching the subject of fashions and modernity today, here is what the publisher says about The Worldly Evangelicals: Evangelical Christians have finally arrived, smack in the middle of the American dream. Celebrities who only a few years ago were laughing at the term now unabashedly declare that they too are 'born again.' Dr. Gallup finds that one person in three has had a born again experience. After years of being alternately ignored, patronized, and ridiculed, evangelicals are now said to be the dominant force in American religious life. Yet most Americans know surprisingly little about this energized wave of religious fervor that shapes American evangelical Christianity today. This book is a complete 'who's who and what's what' guide to the world of today's born again Christians, written from the unique perspective of an insider in the movement. Here are the movers, the shakers, the publications, the colleges-and the finances-that make U.S. evangelicalism go. But where? To the boardrooms and exclusive clubs of America's affluent tier? To control of great publishing and communications networks? And if America's evangelicals scale heights like these, what will happen to the faith and witness that began it all? Richard Quebedeaux (the title of whose first book, The Young Evangelicals, immediately became a part of our religious language) writes with wit, liveliness, and intelligence of the dangers inherent in 'too much too soon' acceptance for born again Christians. Piquant and convincing, The Worldly Evangelicals clearly situates where the movement is now and possible future directions. And evangelicals themselves will have to look seriously to its critique if they are to avoid gaining the world-only to lose their soul. Well said. One can only hope that Dr. Noll and others of his contemporaries are listening to what Dr. Quebedeaux is saying. One final note about Dr. Quebedeaux. In 1976 Doubleday & Company, Inc., published a revised version of Quebedeaux's D.Phil. thesis, submitted to the Board of the Faculty of Modern History, Oxford University, during the Trinity Term 1975, under the title, The New Charismatics: The Origins, Development, And Significance Of Neo-Pentecostalism. For the sake of fashions and modernity, the very thing that Dr. Quebedeaux has achieved is now also desired by Dr. Noll and those identified with Noll's position on modern evangelicalism and culture. Thus far the dream of being fashionable has not totally eluded the evangelicals of Dr. Noll's persuasion. The tide is definitely turning for them toward their goal of modernity. Therefore, in the light of what has just been said by Wells concerning the word evangelical, how is one to

Verbal and Personal Inspiration

In testifying to its inspired status, Holy Scripture extends this status simultaneously to both the words (verbal inspiration) and the authors (personal inspiration). The evidence for **verbal inspiration** is 2 Timothy 3:16-17. This passage speaks of the **result** of inspiration. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof,

understand Noll's statement on page 196 of Between Faith And Criticism? On this page he declares Dr. F.J.A. Hort to be an evangelical. But what kind of evangelical? Is Hort an evangelical occultist? Surely the research historian and professor of church history at Wheaton College, would have known that Hort, along with B.F. Westcott, gave himself to the occult. He has read all of their writings. Has he not? For confirmation of this fact (the occult connections of Hort and Westcott) all he would need to do is read the writings of Dr. D.A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D., of The Bible For Today and the Dean Burgon Society or Mrs. Gail A. Riplinger, M.A., M.F.A., of AV Publications. In order to be a creditable research historian, all sides of an issue must be looked at. If a research historian patronizes his own colleagues, he is not to be trusted. He must do a thorough job of historical research if he is to be considered a professional historian. He cannot allow his own climate of opinions and his own frame of reference to colour or cloud his research in any area. He must be honest with the facts and not pick and choose what suits his particular thesis or idea. He must not invent the facts as did Dr. Carl Lotus Becker [1873-1945] for his Ph.D. dissertation. To confirm this fact, all one needs to do is read Dr. Robert E. Brown's Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution. For the sake of fashions and modernity, Dr. Noll has failed to look at the work of "true biblical scholars." He has rather chosen to reference those scholars whose works are suspect since these scholars have helped to turn the tide from clothes to fashions in their so-called "biblical" research relating to the Word of God. Proof for this statement will be given later in the paper.

for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Nothing is excluded; there is not one word in all of Scripture to which inspiration does not apply.

The evidence for **personal inspiration** is found in 2 Peter 1:19-21. This passage has in view the **manner** of inspiration, ["but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."] Inspiration occurred as they were directed by the Holy Spirit from within, not according to mechanical dictation.

Verbal inspiration is, therefore, not an idea that sprang up in the sixteenth century. It is attested by the Holy Scriptures and for that reason advocated by the church fathers. Verbal inspiration and personal inspiration are not competing doctrinal theories between which [one] must choose; they are, rather, two aspects of the same fact which God's Word conveys to [an individual].

One needs to distinguish verbal inspiration from the verbal dictation theory that did arise in the sixteenth century. This was an unsuccessful human attempt to explain the doctrine of verbal inspiration. The correct doctrine of personal inspiration stands in conflict with the mechanical dictation theory but not with verbal inspiration. When a conception of personal inspiration conflicts with verbal inspiration, the doctrine of inspiration has been misunderstood and is out of line with Scripture.

Denials of Inspiration

Loyalty to God's Word also rules out the contention that Scripture 'is not identical with God's word, for God's word is eternal, while Scripture is temporal.' By means of inspiration God has taken the Word spoken and written by men out of temporality.

In addition to the two chief witnesses (2 Tim. 3:16-17 and 2 Pet. 1:19-21), [one] finds on almost every page of the Bible the assertion that it is God's Word, or Holy Scripture. When [one] does not extend [his] faith to what the Bible says about itself, [he] is not only contradicting God's Word; [he] is also declaring God himself, the originator of Scripture, to be a liar. [One] also stands in opposition to the one who is [H]imself the Word (John 1:1-14) and who is called 'Faithful and True' (Rev. 19:11). He is 'the way, the truth, and the life' (John 14:6). He is accordingly also the standard for what truth is: 'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice' (John 18:37).

Should [one] be a professor, a pastor, or a high church official and not place [his] faith in God? Can [one] serve [H]im when [he] does not believe what [H]e says? That would be to treat [H]im like a father whom he reminds at every turn: 'You're old; I've lost my respect for you; I am not bound by what you say.' God is [his] Creator, and [he] lives because of that grace in which [H]e gave Jesus for [him]. Anyone who supposes that he can take such disrespectful liberties with God's Word should heed the warning: 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked:' (Gal. 6:7).

Perhaps there are [those] whose eyes have now been opened. [They] did not realize what [they] were doing; [they] were just handling God's Word as [they] had been taught. This is a great day for [them]. [They] can turn aside from [their] perverse ways. God is merciful and gracious. He waits with open arms for everyone who will turn to [H]im. [H]e forgives readily for Jesus' sake.

Historical-critical theology says, '[One] cannot regard the Bible as Holy Scripture. Rather, at best [one] can only regard it as a book which claims to be Holy Scripture. There are other books which make the same claim, among them the Koran and the Vedas. Let [one], then, disregard this claim and approach the Bible like any other book.'

It is true that other books make such claims. Does this compel [one] to see the Bible as one scripture among many? Shall [one] compare it with the Veda or the Koran in order to determine whether the Bible is perhaps here and there just a bit superior? That is what historical-critical theology does. This is, however, a perverse procedure. In the same way that the 'gods' of all the nations are not gods at all (1 Chron. 16:26; Ps. 96:5 and 97:7 and Jer. 2:11, 5:7), the sacred scriptures of other religions which claim to be revelatory are not Scripture at all. [One] knows that [his] urbane upbringing which prizes tolerance above all else rebels against such a position. [One] respects, loves, and values

highly those around [them], and what they regard as holy [one] wishes to honor, too. But [one] stands by [his] statement, for it is true. If, according to God's Word, the gods of the nations are not gods at all, then the conclusion is inescapable that their sacred scriptures, which make revelatory claims, are not Scripture. For they do not reveal the one true God, who is not only the Creator of heaven and earth but also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who moreover, together with the Son and the Holy Spirit, comprises the one triune God. Other scriptures cannot point the way to salvation.

When [one] permits [himself] to be pulled down to the level that [one] compares all the 'Holy Scriptures' with each other so that [one] can perhaps grant that the Bible has a relative preeminence, then [one] is guilty of worshiping false gods. Let [one] learn from God's Word how mighty [his] God is and how contemptible and foolish this sort of false worship.

Isaiah 40:12-17 gives [one] an informative portrait of [his] God: Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of

understanding? Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.

The same passage places the foolishness of worshiping false gods before [one's] eyes. In the context 'gods' are being worshiped which man himself has made: To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains. He that is so impoverished that he hath no oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to prepare a graven image, that shall not be moved (Isa. 40:18-20).

How can anyone compare the living God with the sorry imitations of men? He is not only the Creator; [H]e is also the Lord ... God, the Almighty, who reigns. He sustains the entire cosmos at every moment and guides all that takes place in it: Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in:

That bringeth the princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity. Yea, they shall not be planted; yea, they shall not be sown: yea, their stock shall not take root in the earth: and he shall also blow upon them, and they shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble. To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One. Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth. [Isa. 40:21-26]

Moreover, it is only [one's] God who guides the course of the future, and it is accordingly only [H]e who is in a position to proclaim that which lies in the future. In this respect, as well, the gods of the nations turn out to be no gods at all: Produce your cause, saith the LORD; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen: let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together. Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought: an abomination is he that chooseth you. (Isa. 41:21-24)

Whoever holds the Word of God-the Word of the Creator of

heaven and earth, the Lord ... God, the Almighty, who reigns, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ-whoever holds God's Word as basically comparable to the 'sacred scriptures' of other religions is guilty of the worship of false gods. He pulls God down to the level of the false gods.

[One] sees, then, that comparing God's Word to other 'scriptures' using this sort of comparative approach-which is fundamental to historical-critical theology-amounts to an abominable worship of false gods. Such a comparison tolerates other gods in addition to God and confers on them the same honor.

Freedom from Error

As the inspired Word of God, holy Scripture is free from error, not only in the area of faith and life but also in all other areas. At a point where some problem arises God's Word is valid and not [one's] presumed insight.

God [H]imself states: Then said the LORD unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it (Jer. 1:12). Would he not also have watched over his Word as it was written down and the various writings collected? God's Word also states: The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will (Prov. 21:1). Would [H]e not have protected the hearts of those he inspired from inserting error or misstatement into Holy Scripture as a result of limited human knowledge and insight? Who dares to impute

powerlessness or neglect to God in this matter?

In 2 Timothy 3:16-17 it is asserted clearly that Holy Scripture contains nothing erroneous or false. Otherwise it could hardly be said that **All scripture** is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. Error and falsehood could not serve such a purpose. How can [one] dare to allege that there are errors in God's Word in some area of natural science, or history, or some other discipline-[one's], whose scientific findings of yesterday and the day before are already outdated today? Woe to [him] if [he] possesses such audacity! Should [one] not be thoroughly ashamed to say, 'Here is an error in God' Word?' How does [one] intend to endure the flaming eyes of Jesus one day when [his] learned books which propagate such things are consumed like chaff? Let [him] turn back from such a disastrous course and take refuge in [the] Savior Jesus Christ.

God's Word saw through contemporary theology long ago. Isaiah 32:5 alludes to a situation in which the common person (literally 'the fool,' which refers not to someone who lacks intelligence but rather to someone who rejects God's authority) is called noble and the worst of scoundrels and deceivers is highly respected. Are [they themselves] not godless fools when [they] handle God's Word as if there were no God? Yet that is exactly what historical-critical theology does! [Is one] not [a] malicious

deceiver when [he] falsifies God's Word by [his] approach to Scripture so that the congregation no longer receives it as flawless and pure? Those theologians, however, who fraudulently alter the Word of God, so that church members get stones instead of bread and poison instead of water, are today hailed as noble; they are regarded as honorable scientists; they find recognition in the church and in the world. They are accorded high status. They receive titles. They become doctors and professors and are often even named as bishops.⁸ They are also declared to be fashionable "scholars". Further, they are applauded by their colleagues for turning the tide away from the true Word of God for the sake of modernity.

But God's Word says of such individuals, For the vile person will speak villany, and his heart will work iniquity, to practise hypocrisy, and to utter error against the LORD, to make empty the soul of the hungry, and he will cause the drink of the thirsty to fail. The instruments also of the churl are evil: he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, even when the needy speaketh right (Isa. 32:6-7).

The present situation offers an exact analogy: God's Word, adulterated by historical criticism, leaves the souls of the hungry empty. The drink of life-giving water, of the living Word of God, is withheld from the thirsty. When a meek person who has

⁸Linnemann, 143-148.

been humbly instructed by God's Word sets forth what he has every right to, he is utterly opposed-in the name of science. As far as credentials go he is a pauper: He has not completed formal study, possesses no title, and can produce no proof of passing examinations before a human authority.

But things do not have to remain this way, for [the] Savior Jesus has appeared: Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. And a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ears of them that hear shall hearken. The heart also of the rash shall understand knowledge, and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly. The vile person shall be no more called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful (Isa. 32:1-5).

Let [one], by God's grace, acquire knowledge and become [a] truly noble person who makes noble plans and stands by noble deeds (Isa. 32:8). Then the souls of the hungry will not remain empty. Water will not be withheld from the thirsty. The meek will no longer be destroyed by lies.⁹

⁹Linnemann, 148-149. Speaking of lies, would scholars lie? The reader has already been introduced to a prominent and preeminent American historian, Dr. Carl Lotus Becker, who invented the evidence to support his Ph.D. thesis. If an American historian would lie about his evidence, would "biblical scholars" do the same? The answer is yes. One such "biblical scholar who has lied is Dr. Bruce M. Metzger. However, one will not detect this from

reading Dr. Noll's treatment of Dr. Metzger in Between Faith and Criticism. Dr. Noll says, "...At Princeton Seminary...Bruce M. Metzger (b. 1914) exemplifie[s] an evangelical scholarship.... [Speaking of evangelical, is Dr. Metzger an evangelical? What kind of evangelical is he? Is he an evangelical modernist? Or is he an evangelical apostate?] Metzger, who graduated from Lebanon Valley College in Pennsylvania, Princeton Seminary, and Princeton University (Ph.D. in classics), began teaching at Princeton Seminary in 1938. [This was nine years after the modernists had captured Princeton for themselves. Princeton Seminary, by the way, was the last bastion of fundamentalism to fall to the modernists. All the other mainline denominational seminaries had already fallen. (For more on how the modernists did this, the reader is encouraged to read The Leaven of the Sadducees by Ernest Gordon. Ernest Gordon was the long time editor of The Sunday School Times (1922-1956) and the son of A.J. Gordon.) [For more on Ernest Gordon and A.J. Gordon, **see**, Glossary of Terms and Personalities] By 1938 the fundamentalists on the Princeton faculty had already left and started Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. As a matter of record, in 1929, Dr. David Otis Fuller and Dr. Merchant A. King, the author's Greek professor in Seminary, had graduated from Princeton Seminary. Dr. Fuller stayed in the fundamentalist camp and carried on the battle for the Bible. Dr. Herbert V. Hotchkiss, the author's English Bible professor in seminary (Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary-1965-1969), left Princeton Seminary in 1929, along with Dr. William Commons, now president emeritus of the Association of Baptist for World Evangelism (A.B.W.E.) and both would finish their theological work at Westminster in Philadelphia. Dr. Charles Woodbridge in the summer of 1929 told both these gentlemen, as they were traveling on the train, that a new seminary was starting in Philadelphia and they said for him to sign them up. Thus they transferred from the then modernist Princeton Seminary.] More than any contemporary evangelical, Metzger has recapitulated the balanced **virtues** of the Cambridge Triumvirate [Fenton A.J. Hort, J.B. Lightfoot and B.F. Westcott]. (Emphasis, GEL) Like these scholars, he is **cautious** in **reasoning** and **careful** in **research**. (Emphasis, GEL) His work most resembles Hort's in its concentration on textual criticism. (If this is so, one must wonder if Dr. Metzger would agree with Hort when "At the age of 23, in late 1851, [Fenton John Anthony] Hort wrote to a friend: I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous **Textus Receptus**....Think of that vile **Textus Receptus** leaning entirely on late MSS; it is a blessing there are such early ones." This quote is taken from Wilber N. Pickering's The Identity of the New Testament Text, 31. So much

for scholarship and modernity on the part of Dr. Metzger. He knows so little of the **real truth** of the issues surrounding the text.) Metzger's Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, first published by the Clarendon Press in 1964, has gone through several editions and has been translated into German, Japanese, and Chinese. It is a standard. (A standard for what? - for scholarly liars) Beyond this and many other works on the establishment of the New Testament text, however, Metzger has also served as an editor of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, participant and eventually chairman of committees to revise the Revised Standard Version (a version, by the way, published by the National Council of the Churches of Christ - this is an apostate organization), and member of countless boards and councils for publishing projects on biblical and classical texts. In addition, as a painstaking and winsome historian of the early church, **he partakes also of the legacy of Lightfoot and Westcott.** (Emphasis, GEL)

Metzger has written for a vast number of publications and worked with many different groups. Although he has displayed much more interest in textual problems than in theological controversy, his **evangelical** convictions have provided the foundations for his work. These convictions have led to close relations with many **evangelical** organizations. He has written for Eerdmans, Baker, and Zondervan, as well as for Oxford, Abingdon, and the University of Chicago; published in *Christianity Today* and *Eternity* as well as in academic journals; lectured at Asbury, Bethel, Dallas, Eastern Baptist, Houghton College, Southwestern Baptist, Westminster (how ironic-remember **1929**), and Wheaton, (For the apostasy at Wheaton College, **see**, Wilhelm Ernst Schmitt's Steps Toward Apostasy At Wheaton College, 1966), as well as in the great seminaries and universities of the world. For **conservative** students at Princeton Seminary and for younger **evangelicals** with a taste for textual criticism, Metzger has provided counsel and above all an indication of the contributions an **evangelical** can bring to the academic study of the Scripture.

Metzger typically states conclusions with learned caution. His presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature [**SEE** Appendix V: The Society of Biblical Literature] in 1971 illustrated well the nature of his contribution. His subject, 'Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha,' at first glance appears to be directed at conservatives. After carefully weighing a wide variety of evidence, Metzger offered these conclusions: Instead of beginning with declarations of what is licit and what is illicit, one is likely to make more progress by considering the theological problem from a historical and literary point of view. It must be

God's Word Is Homogeneous

The Word of God is homogenous and unified; it is entirely and totally God's Word. To classify its various parts according to our own evaluation system is insolence. It is, nevertheless, standard procedure in historical-critical theology to accord different levels of validity to different portions of God's Word. A few portions of Holy Scripture are made into a yardstick to assess and devalue the rest. In this way one searches for a 'canon within the canon' and uses the critical method referred to as **Sachkritik**.

[The author] will cite two examples of this: In the first, the so-called **realized eschatology** in John's Gospel is

acknowledged that the inspiration of the Scriptures is consistent with any kind of form of literary composition that was in keeping with the character and habits of the speaker or writer.... If, indeed, an entire book should appear to have been composed in order to present vividly the thoughts and feelings of an important person, there would not seem to be in this circumstance any reason to say that it could not be divinely inspired.... In short, since the use of the literary form of pseudepigraphy need not be regarded as necessarily involving fraudulent intent, it cannot be argued that the character of inspiration excludes the possibility of pseudepigraphy among the canonical writings. *THE MESSAGE TO EVANGELICALS WAS PLAIN*: A doctrine of inspiration does not necessarily require traditional ascriptions concerning the authorship of New Testament books. The message to the academic world was more subtle, but for that very reason more impressive: It is no detriment to research for a scholar, even the president of the Society of Biblical Literature, to presuppose the inspiration of Scripture before setting to work on the text. (Noll, 109-110) (Emphasis, GEL) [For more on Dr. Bruce M. Metzger, **see**, Appendices I and II of this paper]

played off against the **futuristic eschatology** in the three other Gospels, the so-called synoptics.¹⁰ But in order to do this one has to account for the presence of statements in John's gospel which do not fit in with the alleged realized eschatology. This requires a hypothetical 'ecclesiastical redactor' who is supposed to have inserted verses that conflict with John's own outlook.

In the second example, the christological statements in Romans are played off against the so-called **cosmic christology** of Ephesians and Colossians. This allows Ephesians and Colossians to be set aside as non-Pauline and therefore inferior since Paul's own writings rank higher than what is **deuteropauline**.

When the enemy cannot divert us totally from the Word, he

¹⁰For an excellent study on the so-called synoptics, **see**, Dr. Eta Linnemann's Is There A Synoptic Problem? Rethinking the Literary Dependence of the First Three Gospels. This volume is published by Baker Book House. The publisher has this to say about this volume: Scholars who rely on the literary interdependency of Matthew, Mark, and Luke as naturally as they depend on the law of gravity will find Eta Linnemann's premises astonishing: [First] what is called the 'Synoptic problem' has never been impartially investigated. [Second] it cannot be proven. [And third] in fact, the Synoptic problem does not exist. Linnemann, a student of Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Fuchs, broke with higher-critical scholarship and wrote Historical Criticism of the Bible to rebuke its abuse of Scripture. Is There a Synoptic Problem? offers a specific example. 'I am shocked,' she says, 'when I look at the books of my former colleagues and examine the justification for their position. Instead of proof I find only assertions. Instead of arguments there is only circular reasoning.' The author walks readers through technical studies, illustrated with charts, graphs, and tables, that take into account historical, form, and redaction critical hypotheses. She applies her own explanation of the origin of three unique Synoptic witnesses to Jesus' words and acts. This book was published in 1992. [For more on Rudolf Bultmann, **see**, Appendices VI, VII, VIII of this paper.]

attempts to trick us using the presumptuousness of our own evaluation. He succeeded in this even with Martin Luther, who devalued James by calling it 'an epistle of straw' and has been made the star witness for historical-critical theology. Let us be alert, for our adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour (1 Peter 5:8).

Whoever uses **Sachkritik** to select from God's Word what he regards as normative is like the person who builds an idol. He creates for himself that which he worships. What foolishness—a mere human, who requires meat and drink for subsistence, undertakes to create a god. He creates this god in his own image, reflecting human limitations, using, of course, the raw material of the God who made heaven and earth and even the person as well. The same material needed for the satisfaction of bodily needs is used to create a god to worship: They that make a graven image are all of them vanity; and their delectable things shall not profit; and they are their own witnesses; they see not, nor know; that they may be ashamed. Who hath formed a god, or molten a graven image that is profitable for nothing? Behold, all his fellows shall be ashamed: and the workmen, they are of men: let them all be gathered together, let them stand up; yet they shall fear, and they shall be ashamed together. The smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms: yea, he is hungry, and his strength faileth:

he drinketh no water, and is faint. The carpenter stretcheth out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in the house. He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak, which he strengtheneth for himself among the trees of the forest: he planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it. Then shall it be for a man to burn: for he will take thereof, and warm himself; yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread; yea, he maketh a god, and worshippeth it; he maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto. He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied: yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire: And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god [Isa. 44:9-17].

[Is one] not just an idolater if [he] form[s] [his] God from earth or stone or wood? [Is one] not also an idolater if [he] use[s] God's Word like a vein of ore, or a stone quarry, or a stand of timber to cut down? When [one] take[s] from God's Word what seems good to [him] and depend[s] on [his] human reason to assemble a god in the image of [his] own limited insight, is this not idolatry?

The same understanding with which a person chooses a car

to buy, finances a house, decides whether to install gas or electric heat, and earns his living must suffice to create a god. But God says, I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images (Isa. 42:8). Or again: They shall be turned back, they shall be greatly ashamed, that trust in graven images, that say to the molten images, Ye are our gods (Isa. 42:17). Is it likely that one can depend on such a homemade god when divine deliverance is really needed? Certainly not! May anyone who handles God's Word in this fashion ponder whether he is really trusting God, or whether he is not rather seeking security in the things of this world.

May it shock and frighten [the reader] that such idolatry is so widespread today among God's people. Let [the reader] heed God's lament: Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit. Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the LORD. For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water (Jer. 2:11-13).

Let [one] reverse course if [he is] headed in the wrong direction.¹¹ It is often through very small beginnings that [one]

¹¹One could only wish that Charles Augustus Briggs and Philip Schaff had reversed their course but they continued going in the wrong direction until the end of their lives. For more on these

get[s] off track. The error can at first be minor indeed, but it gradually comes to light that [one has] struck out in the wrong direction—here a couple of statements crossed out in God's Word, there a shrug of the shoulders, now a reservation, the acceptance of a few critical thoughts which suggest themselves as answers to problems which [one has] or [one has] been talked into having. Suddenly the Bible is for [him] no longer entirely the sacred Word of the living God.

Let [one] go to the cross if [he has] erred. [The] Lord Jesus shed [H]is blood for this sin, too.

God's inspired Word, which has many human authors but ultimately only one divine originator, exhibits a wonderful unity. As soon as [one] accept[s] by faith the self-testimony of the Word of God regarding the inspiration, [he] begin[s] to realize this wondrous unity. How glorious is the framework of promises relating to [one's] Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and the fulfillment of those promises. How precious is the agreement between Ezekiel 16 and Luke 15, between John 10:1-18 and Ezekiel 34:11-16. How wonderful is all that is brought together in Revelation, much of it already foretold in advance by the Old Testament prophets. A veil obscures the vision of some to all this, so that [one] cannot see it (see 2 Cor 3:14-15), but the Holy Spirit opens up God's Word to him who is no longer disobedient to it.

two "biblical scholars", **see**, Appendices III and IV.

The person who does not wish to see God's Word as a unity having one originator, in which each part complements the other, but rather views it as an anthology of disparate writers whose profiles one must toil to work out-that person cannot apprehend the unity of God's Word. He attempts to pit the New Testament against the Old Testament, Paul against James, Genesis 1 against Genesis 2, 1 Corinthians 15 against John 5. He alleges that Genesis 2 has a different concept of God than 1 Kings 18 and that the God of which Jesus spoke was not the same as the God of the Old Testament.

As already stated, the reason for such erroneous judgments is that one starts out with a conceptualization of God which, as a product of the human imagination, is too small to contain the entire fullness of the self-revelation of God in [H]is Word. In addition, there is quite often a lack of thorough awareness of the entire Word of God due to the extreme specialization which is an established feature of theological and biblical criticism. For anyone who truly know the Old Testament and does not just have some haphazard conception of it, it is quite impossible to pit it against the New Testament and vice versa.

God's Word Is Consistent

The Word of God is consistent in its message through the ages. One of the great lies of the enemy, one he uses to drive persons away from God's Word, is the doctrine that humanity is historically determined. It is claimed that human fate is wrapped

up in whatever time period is at hand. Faith conceptions for one generation are quite different from those for the previous generations, since the external circumstances have altered and technological progress has occurred. In this view it matters little whether the progress is from crude knife to sickle for grain harvesting, or from mowing machine to combine. It is simply maintained that every generation must discover its own access to God, its own interpretation of Scripture, and its own doctrine of Christ. It is maintained that God's Word requires ongoing reinterpretation in the light of this state of affairs. What was once valid is regarded as obsolete, and this includes the Word of God. There used to be other means of production and other societal conditions; [one] can therefore not take God's Word literally as it stands before [one's] eyes on the page. [One] can accept it, rather, only by an interpretive process which highlights that which (still) holds relevance for [him].¹²

¹²What Dr. Linnemann has been saying here reminds the author of this paper, who is an historian by training, of what Dr. Frederick Jackson Turner said in 1891: Avoid as the very unpardonable sin any one-sidedness, any partisan, any partial treatment of history. Do not misinterpret the past for the sake of the present. Turner...[also] introduced the notions that each generation must rewrite history in the light of its own milieu, that there was the objective fact and the subjective historian, that dull facts could be used to solve fascinating human problems, that the historian must create a past that is the product of all the present, and that progress for the common man was a desirable philosophy of history. [Could every man become his own historian or could every evangelical become his own biblical scholar?] In his 1931 presidential address before the American Historical Association, Dr. Carl Lotus Becker reached the high point of his

God's Word, however, says the same thing to persons of

[own] historical philosophy of presentism, pragmatism, and subjective relativism when he gave his address entitled "Everyman His Own Historian." In this address three threads are clearly discernible—a skeptical attitude toward the abilities of the common man [This attitude is held by certain biblical scholars and certain charismatics today], confused thinking about early American history, and by far the most important of all, a complete surrender to subjective relativism. The quotes in this footnote to this point have been taken from Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution, 1, 13, 150, 137. For more on subjectivism and relativism in modern biblical scholarship, **see**, Dr. Gary E. La More's paper on Dr. Kenneth Taylor's Search for THE LIVING BIBLE. On the abilities of the common man, one charismatic, Earl Paulk, has this to say: Another cloak of spirituality is when pastors say that every Christian needs to take his Bible and judge the truth for himself. This is not the instruction of God's Word. God gives the five-fold ministry for the 'equipping of the saints' and the 'edifying of the body' (Ephesians 4:12). Man has no right to private interpretation of the Word of God apart from those whom God sets in the Church as spiritual teachers and elders. Are all Christians to become kings unto themselves? Many Christians are encouraged to be their own biblical authorities. But how will the body of Christ ever be 'fitly joined together' with such independence of spirit? Jesus said, 'You have ears, but do not hear....' Christians seek teachers to confirm their own options. This liberty is not given to individuals in the Church apart from anointed teachers called within the body. Men of old were moved upon by the Holy Spirit to record God's Word in manuscripts. Even so, God speaks today through those whom He has called to open the mysteries of His Word. ...The medieval church said that believers could interpret the Bible as long as they abided by the teachings of the infallible [Roman Catholic] church. Paulk appears to be backsliding to medieval Rome, where the laity were arrayed beneath the clergy in mass ranks of inferiority in submission to their supposedly inspired scriptural interpretations. ... The new charismatics are headed back to the Middle Ages.... ...[Like the Bereans of old], believers...are encouraged to investigate the Word of God for themselves. ...All believers have the right to interpret the Bible for themselves and should not be made to feel guilty because they do not agree with everything a self-styled [biblical scholar] or modern apostle or prophet teaches.... These observations have been taken from Michael G. Moriarty's The New Charismatics, 194-195. For more on this subject, **see**, pp.25 - 26 of Dr. Roy B. Zuck's Basic Bible Interpretation.

the twentieth century as it did to those of the first. Man stands before God today in no other way than he did a couple of thousand years ago. The means of production of the technological age have not altered man's essential makeup. As it was in the days of Lot and Noah, so it is still today: people eat, they drink, they buy, they plant, they marry and are given in marriage (see Luke 17:27-30). It is said that one cannot expect the modern person to believe in resurrection from the dead and miracles, in angels and demons, for this is the age of technology, of radio and the refrigerator, of electric lights and autos. Yet precisely this same modern person now succumbs to superstitions the likes of which we have not seen in centuries. Many trust in amulets and horoscopes and seek direction from seers. Involvement with satanic cults is definitely on the rise.¹³

¹³Like Westcott and Hort before him, J.B. Phillips was involved in the occult. Listen to the translators own testimony: Many of us who believe in what is technically known as the Communion of Saints, must have experienced the sense of nearness, for a fairly short time, of those whom we love soon after they have died. This has certainly, happened to me **several** times. But the late **C.S. Lewis**, whom I did not know very well, and had only seen in the flesh once, but with whom I had corresponded a fair amount, gave me an unusual experience. A few days after his death, while I was watching television, he '**appeared**' sitting in a chair within a few feet of me, and **spoke** a few words which were particularly relevant to the difficult circumstances through which I was passing. He was ruddier in complexion than ever, grinning all over his face and, as the old-fashioned saying has it, positively glowing with health. The interesting thing to me was that I had not been thinking about him at all. I was neither alarmed nor surprised nor, to satisfy the Bishop of Woolwich, did I look up to see the hole in the ceiling that he might have made on arrival. He was just **there** - 'large as life and twice as natural'! A week later, this time when

God's Word knows man, yes, even contemporary man. And God has already prophesied in [H]is Word the sense in which contemporary man differs from man of bygone eras: This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith [2 Tim. 3:1-8].

The thesis that God's Word is dependent on interpretation

I was in bed reading before going to sleep, he appeared again, even more rosily radiant than before, and repeated to me the same message, which was very important to me at the time. I was a little puzzled by this, and I mentioned it to a certain saintly Bishop who was then living in retirement here in Dorset. His reply was, 'My dear J....., this sort of thing is happening all the time'. J.B. Phillips' Ring of Truth A Translators Testimony, 117. For more on Westcott and Hort's occultism, **see**, Chapter 30 of New Age Bible Versions by G.A. Riplinger. How could anyone use a Bible based on the Westcott and Hort's Critical Greek Text knowing their occultic connections? Reader, beware, of modernity! Do not exchange your clothes (K.J.V.) for fashions (N.A.S.B., N.I.V., R.S.V., N.R.S.V., J.B., N.K.J.V., or the N.A.B.).

and that every generation needs its own interpretation stands in opposition to the truth. The necessity of interpreting God's Word is an artifice of historical-critical theology, which does not want to accept the Word as it stands and therefore must expend much effort. Since this theology also does not wish to view God's Word as a unity, it cannot make use of the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. [How many times has the author of this paper said to his students in Hermeneutics, "The best commentary on the Bible is the Bible." Amen!] And since it does not regard the Holy Spirit as the originator of Scripture, it cannot experience [H]im as [I]nterpreter. In addition, historical-critical theology is hindered by **ignorance**, since the theologian generally is only aware of those small parts of the Bible which he regularly studies in keeping with the widespread tendency to specialize. As a rule he knows numerous books that deal with his area of interest, but he does not know his Bible. (Emphasis, GEL)

[One does] not wish to neglect to mention, however, that teachers who are **true** to the Bible, who instruct [one] in God's Word, are a gift of God's grace (Eph. 4:11). [One does] not want to scorn their service and the assistance which their books offer. (Emphasis, GEL)

God's Word Was Revealed

God's Word is the product of progressive revelation. Abraham and Noah did not yet have the law, and [the] Lord Jesus

said of the prophets and righteous persons of the Old Covenant: For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them (Matt. 13:17). For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect (Heb. 10:1). Earthly and heavenly Jerusalem must be distinguished from each other (Gal. 4:25-27), and one must observe what is written for the descendents of Abraham according to the flesh, on the one hand, and what for the children of promise, on the other (Rom. 4:16, Gal. 4:28). God's Word must be handled accurately (2 Tim. 2:15). [One] must keep God's overarching redemptive scheme in view.

God's Word itself gives [one] instructions so that [he] can read it aright: All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. 3:16). It teaches [one] how [he is] to understand the accounts contained in the Old Testament: Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock

that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come [1 Cor. 10:1-11)

[One is] also instructed to seek Christ in the Scriptures. 'That rock was Christ,' says 1 Corinthians 10:4. Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me (John 5:39).

God's Word makes it plain enough what it is there for and how [one] may make proper use of it: For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope (Rom. 15:4). If [one] follow[s] these instructions [he] will handle God's Word aright and the diligent study of Scripture will be fruitful.

God's Word Is Sufficient

God's Word is enough; it is completely and entirely sufficient for every person, for every age, for every situation. Thou visitest the earth, and waterest it: thou greatly enrichest it with **the river of God, which is full of water:** thou preparest them corn, when thou hast so provided for it (Ps. 65:9). (Emphasis, GEL) [One] can never exhaust God's Word. Situations of which the writers of the Word of God could have known nothing were taken into consideration by God's Spirit. Things of which [one] still had no knowledge a few years back were already written down two or three thousand years ago. As was said in Daniel 12:8-9: And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

The Word of God requires no supplementation, either through psychology or depth psychology or through modern educational theory. God's Word knows man better than either psychology or depth psychology is able to know him. Where the findings of these disciplines contain elements of truth, these were already accessible long ago in God's Word. For the most part, however, psychology and depth psychology possess an anti-Christian character and stand in opposition to God's Word.

In instances where someone has felt compelled to contradict god's Word due to having better insight and greater mercy-for example in the question of premarital [sex], or of

marriage and divorce—all that has ultimately resulted is [sic.] (in) untold misery. The same goes for modern educational theory. Many have supposed they could help children by turning away from the principles of child-rearing which God's Word teaches [them]. Meanwhile, the products of such education make it clear enough that God knows better what benefits society. God's Word says, for example: Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him (Prov. 22:15). Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell (Prov. 23:13-14). He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes (Prov. 13:24).

Modern educational theory claims to know better than this. It says children must not undergo corporal punishment, certainly not with 'the rod.' Today some even go so far as to maintain that it is better not to discipline children at all, but rather to let them develop however they please.¹⁴ But look at what

¹⁴Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) would love this. He said "Reading is the scourge of childhood. I teach the art of being ignorant." He recommended that children be allowed to grow up like the original Lord of the Flies. He advocated—no books, no verbal lessons. In his didactic novel *Émile* (1762), he "suggested that education should build on a child's natural interests and sympathies, gradually developing its potential." Rousseau was a Swiss-born French writer, philosopher and political theorist. He was also a moral reprobate. He fathered five children on the wrong side of the bed and then put them all in an orphanage. Some of the material in this footnote has been taken from The New American Desk

a generation of young fools [has] already [been] produced, young people who are incapable of assuming responsibility and leading a normal human life. They cannot resist giving in to whatever feeling of carnal pleasure, or displeasure, they experience. Many fall prey to drugs and alcohol, some even dying from overdose and others finally landing in asylums.

God's Word also does not need supplementation from sociology.¹⁵ God knows more about man and his various social

Encyclopedia, 1082.

¹⁵The author of this paper is amazed how many so-called "Christian" colleges teach sociology. Obviously these colleges have not studied the "historical roots" of sociology. Christian colleges and universities are making fashion statements today, just like the so-called biblical scholars, by teaching courses whose roots are suspect. "Auguste Comte (1798-1857) [was a] French philosopher [and] the founder of **POSITIVISM** and a pioneer of **SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY**. His thinking was essentially evolutionary; he recognized a progression in the development of the sciences: starting from mathematics and progressing through astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology towards the ultimate goal of sociology. He saw this progression reflected in man's mental development. This had proceeded from a theological stage to a metaphysical one. Comte then sought to help inaugurate the final scientific or positivistic era. His social thinking reflected that of Henri de Saint-Simon and in turn his own works, particularly the *Philosophies positive* (1830-42), became widely influential in both France and England." The New American Desk Encyclopedia, 298. (Emphasis, GEL) While in university, the author of this paper had to take both psychology and sociology. His wife, years later, had to take both psychology and sociology at a Christian college in the mid-west using the same textbooks that he used only later editions. He questioned the wisdom of this. Eventually the president of the college did away with the sociology course. Fundamental Baptists need to beware of modernity and making fashion statements by the courses they allow to be taught in their fundamental Baptist colleges and universities. May the readers of this paper heed what Dr. Linnemann is saying concerning the various academic disciplines being looked to today for answers. These disciplines do not have

relations than [one's] rational deductions can fathom. Neither does God's Word stand in need of correction from the natural sciences. It turns out that the views of natural science which formerly were used to discredit the Bible have now been proven invalid by more recent scientific developments.

Let [one], like the young Daniel, dispense with the diet offered by the world as a side dish to God's Word. [One] will surely not be malnourished compared to those to [sic] (who) eat from the king's diet of worldly wisdom (Dan. 1:10). [He] will rather be superior to the learned in matters of insight and wisdom (Dan. 1:20). Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar (Prov. 30:5) [sic.] (Prov. 30:5, 6).

God's Word also needs no augmenting from [one's] experience. Experiences which have no precedent *in* the Word of God have no business trying to legitimate themselves *from* the Word of God. Even the exercise of the gifts of the Holy Spirit is to be rejected if it adds something to the Word of God by claiming to generate revelatory prophecies equal in authority to it.

the answers that the Bible has. One only needs to look to the Word of God as it has been preserved in the Authorized Version of 1611.

God's Word Is Effective

For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast (Ps. 33:9). But this effectiveness manifests itself only where the Word as it stands is simply accepted in faith. That is why so many miracles happen in places where the age-old, cynical '...Yea, hath God said,....?' (Gen 3:1), generated today by theological, psychological, sociological, and historical-critical skepticism, has not yet penetrated. That is why persons who simply place faith in God's Word experience miracles even here in the West.

Two mistakes are to be avoided. Both are alluded to in James 4:2-3: Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.

The precondition for petition is being taught by and familiar with God's Word. [One] must know what God wishes to grant so that [he] can make request. Every impairment of God's Word through theological theories (for example, that God no longer wishes to work in certain ways today; that was only for the time of the apostles) or through critical assessment based on everyday experience has wide-ranging implications; '...Ye have not, because ye ask not [God].' Even giving room to doubt whether God wishes to grant something has fateful consequences. God's Word says: But let

him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. A double minded man is unstable in all his ways (James 1:6-8). By lack of expectancy [one] hinder[s] God from giving [him] what [H]e would like to bestow and what [H]e has accordingly promised in [H]is Word. [One] hinder[s] [H]is Word so that it does not have the effect God would wish.

The other mistake consists in asking 'with wrong motives.' This is when [one] make[s] demands of God as if [he] could sue [H]im in order to collect on the promises [H]e has made. When [one] stands before God like defiant, ill-mannered children who demand that [they] get what [they] want, longing first of all for the fulfillment of self-serving wishes rather than for [H]is kingdom, then [they] force God to deny [them] that which [H]e has promised in [H]is Word. Once again [they] hinder [H]is Word so that it does not have the effect [H]e would wish.

God's Word Mirrors God

In [H]is Word [one] can recognize God's heart and the principles that guide [H]is actions. Here are two examples of this:

[One] can recognize how great are God's mercy and [H]is saving love by noting how [H]e dealt with Ahab. It had been said of Ahab: But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself

to work wickedness in the sight of the LORD, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up (1 Kings 21:25). When Ahab inspected the vineyard which he acquired by murdering Naboth, the prophet Elijah confronted him to pronounce God's judgment on him and his house: And it came to pass, when Ahab heard those words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly. And the word of the LORD came to Elijah the Tishbite, saying, Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days: but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house [1 Kings 21:27-29].

Truly, when God calls [one] to be 'slow to anger' (James 1:19), [H]e is first that way [H]imself.

The most overwhelming picture of God's character is seen in the mirror of 1 Corinthians 13:4-7: Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

Let [one] search the Scriptures, and let [him] respond in such a way that [he] find[s] in them the way to God's heart. True knowledge of Scripture leads to worship in spirit and truth.¹⁶

¹⁶Linnemann, 149-159.

CONCLUSION

Without a doubt, modern man is concerned with up-to-dateness. A modern idea should be preferred to an ancient one simply because it is modern. This way of thinking has a long pedigree, going back at least to the Athenians of St. Paul's day who 'liked to spend all their time telling and hearing the latest new thing (Acts 17:21).' Pressure to be up-to-date, as the reader has seen, is stronger now than it has ever been. Oh, to be modern. Oh, to be fashionable. The results from this pressure is to be seen everywhere. Clothing stores in the West no longer sell clothes. Now they sell fashions. In the days when they sold clothes, the garments were designed to last for many years. But fashions change from year to year and from season to season.

Fashions influence what people believe as well as what they wear. G. K. Chesterton's character, Lord Beaumont of Foxwood, was a man whose beliefs were determined by fashion. He thought anything new must be an advance. The reader will be told today by fashionable biblical scholars that the Critical Greek Text is more advanced than the Textus Receptus. Returning to Chesterton, Lord Beaumont, if [one] went to him and proposed to eat [his] grandmother, he would agree with [him], so long as [he] put it on hygienic and public grounds, as a cheap alternative to cremation. So long as [one] progressed fast enough, he did not mind whether [he was] progressing to the stars or to the devil.

Karl Popper has called this way of thinking 'progressivism.' When Popper was a young man in Vienna, this was the attitude towards much of Schönberg and his circle. They started as disciples of Wagner, but then were concerned to supersede Wagner, to remain ahead of everyone else, and even to supersede themselves. Yet Popper observed that those great artists who were blessed with the gift of originality, such as Bach, Mozart, and Schubert, never tried to be leaders of fashion or to create a new 'style' in music. He was therefore skeptical of fashion following in other fields: Even in philosophy one hears of a new style of philosophizing, or of a 'Philosophy in a New Key'-as if it were the key that mattered rather than the tune played, and as if it mattered whether the key was old or new.'

In study of the New Testament, as the reader has seen, moderate up-to-dateness means adopting those opinions that, in the course of the twentieth century, have acquired a kind of orthodox status. People talk of a 'consensus of modern scholarship' (in Latin, *quod nuper, quod ubique*), or of 'the assured results of modern criticism.' The reader is challenged to read both of Dr. Linnemann's books. She will tell the reader what she thinks of the assured results of modern criticism. Remember, while doing her Ph.D. work she studied under Dr. Rudolf Bultmann and she has seen through the work of Bultmann and his followers. He is not a creditable theologian to be followed today by anyone. Why? Because

Bultmann's work is suspect. For more on Dr. Bultmann, see, appendices VI, VII and VIII. Continuing, while it is recognized that these assured results may be **revised** by scholars in the future, the orthodoxy of the present is still felt to be, at the very least, an improvement on the orthodoxies of the past-of the primitive, prescientific days of the early church, the Dark Ages, and the Reformation.

This paper has tried to illustrate that there are biblical revisionists at work. However this is not the only field that is experiencing the pressure of modernity and fashions. Like the true Word of God, America's true history is under attack and is being revised. One American has said that if Americans are to reclaim their beloved nation from the destructive forces of humanism, secularism, atheism and false religions, they must first retrieve their true history from those who have almost hidden it beneath an avalanche of lies, distortions and misinterpretations. Would historians lie? Would they falsify their evidence in order to support their historical thesis? The reader has already been introduced to one well-known American historian who lied. And if the reader will take time to read Appendix I and II of this paper, he will discover a well-known biblical scholar who lied. Why would any thinking person knowingly submit themselves to known liars? If they have to lie to bring forward their particular theory, whether it be in history or the Bible, then these individuals are not to be

trusted. It matters not whether they have a Ph.D. or not. If God is being systematically removed from the foundational truths undergirding America, it is also happening with the new fashionable translations of the Bible. All one has to do is study Mrs. Riplinger's New Age Bible Versions for confirmation of this fact.

In all areas of life-and study of the New Testament is no exception-there is a psychological pressure to accept *current* [or modern] orthodoxy. The nature of this pressure has been analyzed by Peter Berger. Modern man is a social being and what he knows is taken on the authority of others. If [his] knowledge is shared by others around [him] [he] feel[s] confident. If [his] knowledge is not socially shared it becomes difficult to believe, not only for others, but also for [himself]. In Berger's words, 'At best, a minority viewpoint is forced to be defensive. At worst, it ceases to be plausible to anyone.' Anyone who holds to the Authorized Version of 1611 is on the defensive today because it is not a fashionable position today. However this individual is not alone. He not like Elijah. There are thousands today who have not bowed their knee to the Baal of modern scholarship and textual criticism. Brother David Cloud shows this to be so in his book For Love of the Bible. There is a cause and there is a battle to be fought and a victory to be won.

Returning to the argument from up-to-dateness, it follows..., whether or not the results of modern criticism are

'assured' in any objective sense, accepting them brings a feeling of assurance to [one's] mind. Even if [he] is wrong, [he] is wrong in good company. As A.E. Housman put it, 'the disciple resorts to the teacher, and the request he makes of him is not *tell me how to get rid of error*, but *tell me how to get rid of doubt*.'¹⁷

¹⁷David R. Hall, The Seven Pillories of Wisdom (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1990), 1-3. The reader is also encouraged to read Catherine Millard's The Rewriting of America's History. Some of the thoughts just presented in the paper have also been taken from the back cover of Mrs. Millard's book. Lest the reader think that America's history is the only history being rewritten, he should listen to this. A reader of *Christian History* faxed the following: "I must say I have not seen such a piece of **revisionist** historical writing for quite some time. First, Roman Catholicism is not 'Christian.' Certainly you understand the doctrine of justification by faith! Such Reformation slogans as *sola fide* and *sola gratia* dramatically contrast that which you so glibly call 'Christian.' Second, much of the so-called unity you write about was fostered by popes and councils through various forms of coercion: if pleading did not work, then perhaps confiscations, tortures, murders, and interdict! You really glossed over the dark side of Catholicism. I wonder, if they could come back, what all the martyred Huguenots, English, Waldensians, and Germans would say to you about the 'loving kindness' of the church of Rome? (Emphasis, GEL) Is *Christian History's* "Everyday Faith in the Middle Ages" issue preparing its readership for Catholics and Evangelicals coming together? [America's history is not the only area being revised by so-called scholars, so are the Bibles one reads. The author of this paper attended a meeting in Toronto in March with another pastor where Mr. Mark Taylor of Tyndale House Publishers unveiled the **New Living Translation** of the Bible. This **new** Bible will be out in July. The revisions of America's history and of the Bible are so many that one now has revisions in need of revising. This is where subjective relativism leads the so-called historical and biblical scholars. May the Lord deliver the reader from them all.] Many books today are also glossing over the occultic connections of Westcott and Hort. They are also declaring certain biblical scholars to be evangelicals. But what kind of evangelicals are they? The reader is challenged to go back and reread what Dr. David Wells has to say about the word evangelical.

Without a doubt the reader has to be careful today concerning certain biblical scholars. His attention has already been drawn to Westcott, Hort, Phillips and Metzger. Now the author is drawing his attention to another biblical scholar who is currently research professor of theology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas. His name is Dr. Millard J. Erickson, formerly of Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN. In a recent book, God In Three Persons A Contemporary Interpretation of the Trinity, Dr. Erickson says "...[the Trinity] is not clearly or explicitly taught anywhere in Scripture,...." (p. 12) Under the section "The Challenge of Current Forms of Religion", Dr. Erickson says, "The other major source is the **Christian** sects, especially Jehovah's Witnesses, who vehemently reject the biblical doctrine of the Trinity...." (p. 24) (Emphasis, GEL) Since when have Jehovah's Witnesses been Christians? Has the definition of a Christian been changed by this research professor of theology? Is Dr. Erickson saying what he is saying here for the sake of modernity and fashions? Unless a biblical scholar is genuinely Christian, he can not be trusted. For sure Dr. Erickson is not a good research professor of theology if he can say what he is saying here and not be challenged for his statements.

Another example of poor Christian scholarship is to be found in Historians of the Christian Tradition. Since when have

F.C. Baur, John Henry Newman, Catholic Tübingen Church Historians, Philip Schaff, Adolf von Harnack and Martin E. Marty been Christians? The author may have missed some of the others listed in this book as being Christians. This book was published by Broadman. Here is another piece of historical research that is not to be trusted. Remember Carl Lotus Becker and what he did.

Has the world of scholarship sold its soul to the devil and his workshop? As the author well knows, secular universities are the devil's workshop. They have been responsible for the turning of the tides in education and government. The reader of this paper may disagree but the author of this work challenges him to read Shafer and Snow's The Turning of the Tides. Without question the reader cannot trust the world of modern scholarship. This has been illustrated over and over again in this paper.

Does one's frame of reference influence how and what he writes? The author believes it does. Remember Carl Lotus Becker and his frame of reference. Randall Balmer's Mine Eyes Have Seen The Glory, Clayton Sullivan's Called To Preach Condemned To Survive, and John Van Seters' In Search Of History all have an undercurrent of criticism and bitterness in them when it comes to true New Testament Christianity. All three of these modern-day scholars at one time professed to be Christians. However when one reads their works, one begins to question their Christianity. The reader can feel sorry for them but he also needs to be made aware

of their lack of true Christian faith based upon the Word of God. Remember not everyone who claims to be a **biblical scholar** or a **Bible expert** is one.¹⁸ These modern-day biblical scholars are not

¹⁸The author of this paper would have the reader give heed to the following testimonies regarding **The Trustworthiness of the Scriptures** from the pens of two Biblical **experts**. One of the greatest and most respected scholars of Oriental studies was William [Foxwell] Albright. The list of his earned doctorate degrees would remind us of our government's alphabetical organizations we have today. He wrote the following concerning the Bible and historical findings-"*The reader may rest assured that nothing has been found [by archaeologists] to disturb a reasonable faith, and nothing has been discovered which can disprove a single theological doctrine. We no longer trouble ourselves with attempts to 'harmonize' religion and science, or to 'prove' the Bible. The Bible can stand for itself.*" Probably the most qualified Old Testament linguist of all time was Robert Dick Wilson. His skill as a linguist is phenomenal, unsurpassed. Born in 1856, he took his undergraduate work at Princeton University. He then completed both the M.A. and Ph.D., and completed further postgraduate studies in Berlin, Germany. He taught Old Testament courses at Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and returned to Princeton where he received international fame as a Hebrew scholar without peer. He was at home in over forty ancient Semitic languages! Dr. Wilson wrote the following about himself-"*If a man is called an expert, the first thing to be done is to establish the fact that he is such. One expert may be worth more than a million other witnesses that are not experts. Before a man has the right to speak about the history and the language of the Old Testament, the Christian Church has the right to demand that a man should establish his ability to do so. For forty-five years continuously, since I left college, I have devoted myself to the one great study of the Old Testament, in all its languages, in all its archaeology, in all its translations, and as far as possible in everything bearing upon its text and history. I tell you this so that you may see why I can and do speak as an expert. I may add that the result of my forty-five years of study of the Bible has led me all the time to a firmer faith that in the Old Testament we have a true historical account of the Israelite people; and I have a right to commend this to some of those bright men and women who think they can laugh at the old-time Christian and believer in the Word of God. "I have claimed to be an expert. Have I the right to do so? Well, when I was in Seminary, I used to read my New Testament in*

allowing the real truth of God's Word to speak to their hearts. How sad. May the Lord have mercy on their souls.

James Emery White's What Is Truth? examines the concepts of truth as held by five Twentieth Century theologians. Since the author of this paper has read some of the writings of the five theologians referenced in White's volume, he can accept some of the thoughts from the writings of Van Til, Schaeffer and Henry but he has a hard time with Erickson and Bloesch. Both Erickson and Bloesch profess to be evangelicals but their writings, as has already been illustrated, are suspect. Unfortunately White makes many fashionable statements in his book that lend themselves to modernity. Since White's book would require another whole paper to be written on the subject of What Is Truth?, the reader is encouraged to read White's book for himself.

nine different languages. I learned my Hebrew by heart, so that I could recite it without the intermission of a syllable. As soon as I graduated from the Seminary, I became a teacher of Hebrew for a year and then went to Heidelberg, Germany. There I made a decision, and I did it with prayer-to dedicate my life to the study of the Old Testament. The first fifteen years I devoted myself to the study of the language necessary. The second fifteen years I devoted myself to the study of the text of the Old Testament, and I reserved the last fifteen years for the work of writing the results of my previous studies and investigations, so as to give them to the world. The Lord has enabled me to carry out this plan." Thus did Dr. Robert Dick Wilson testify. One of the stirring moments with his students occurred when, after a dissertation on the complete trustworthiness of the Scriptures, the renowned scholar said with tears in his eyes: Young men, there are many mysteries in this life I do not pretend to understand, many things hard to explain. But I can tell you today with the fullest assurance that-'Jesus loves me, this I know For the Bible tells me so.'" Boyd's Bible Handbook, v.

The ordinary Christian in the pew is at a great disadvantage in [the] church [today]. He is kept in the dark about many things that affect his faith and life, even by those who have the responsibility for teaching him. One of the examples of this is textual criticism. For a little over a century scholars have been making new translations of the Bible, and encouraging laymen to buy and use them. These new translations, [one is] told, are more accurate than the old. For nineteen hundred years the church [has] limped along with defective Bibles, but modern scholarship has [supposedly] improved the Bibles [one] read[s].

In a little booklet, Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism, Dr. Gordon [H.] Clark illustrates the errors of the **liberal** critics of the New Testament texts. [In this volume, Dr. Clark calls Dr. Bruce Metzger a liberal. Again, for more on Dr. Bruce M. Metzger, **see**, Appendices I & II.] A scholar himself, Dr. Clark has the audacity to point out that the reigning textual critics have no **clothes**. [The modern textual critic has gone from **clothes** to **fashions**. And all this for the sake of **modernity**. How sad.] Their misleading footnotes, their incorrect translations, the **whimsical** way in which **they** decide what to include and what to eliminate from the Bible—all are exposed in this essay on textual criticism.¹⁹ [Dr. Clark shows in this volume the subjectivism of

¹⁹What has just been said has been taken from the back cover of Dr. Clark's Logical Criticisms Of Textual Criticism. Dr.

the modern-day biblical scholar. These so-called biblical scholars view everything as being relative-subject to change. They believe that somewhere in outer space, they will find the Word of God and bring it down to man. Not so. God will not allow this to happen.] (Emphasis, GEL)

[There is] a religious fad [for the sake of modernity] going about North America today [and it] is the idea that [one] can understand the Bible by comparing various versions. There is no value nor true scholarship [however] in 'comparing translations' in an attempt to arrive at the truth. The foolishness of such misguided endeavo[u]r can be seen in the parody of the Amplified Bible which was all the rage a few years ago. 'Twinkle twinkle (shine intermittently, sparkle, glow) little (small, less in size, insignificant) star (heavenly body, luminary). How (to what extent or cause) I (me, myself) wonder (meditate, cogitate, think) what you are (be, consist of, are composed of), etc. ad nauseam. Is such a comparison of words, giving the reader his or her choice of words thought to be scholarship? Such comparison of words as is done by some from different translations and passes for Bible study and scholarship in certain circles, but really makes the reader the final authority rather than the Bible. He or she can choose whichever word or translation they like best at the moment! Thus,

Clark's book is published by The Trinity Foundation, Jefferson, Maryland.

the authority is not God nor His Word, but personal preference and the mind of the reader. [The author of this paper has been saying these same things throughout this paper. What the reader needs is God's objective Word, which is not a collection of decaying documents that need new revelation to elucidate its primitive contents, but the only infallible manual that is useful for teaching (what is right), for rebuking (what is not right), for correcting (how to get right), and for training in righteousness (how to stay right)-2Ti 3:16.²⁰]

Baptists would be quick to condemn the Roman Catholics for their 'tradition' and 'church authority' in matters of doctrine. [They] vilify the popes for their claim to speaking 'ex cathedra' and yet some would make the preacher or the **scholar** the final authority rather than **God** in His Word! Beware of any position which denigrates the King James Bible! Beware of any position from which [one] cannot honestly stand and hold aloft before the people the King James Bible and tell them this is the Word of God! It is a faithful translation of the Word of God. It has been blessed by God as has been no other translation of the Scriptures known to man today! [The author] would ask those who detract from the King James Bible one question: With what would [they] replace the King James Bible? Will [they] replace it with the findings of [the occultists] Westcott and Hort and the modern

²⁰Moriarty, The New Charismatics, 151.

translations based on Sinaticus and Vaticanus? Are [they] content to present to people the modern translations of lesbians [like the NIV] and liberals [like the RSV and NRSV]? Or would [they] replace the King James Bible with 'king preacher' or 'king **Greek** scholar'? Shall the Protestants Vine, Vincent, Thayer, etc., or the universal church 'Baptist,' Robertson speak 'ex cathedra' for [them] today? The words of Protestant Louis Berkhof come to mind when [one] think[s] of those who pretend to great scholarship by going to the 'Greek.' He wrote, 'It is necessary to bear in mind that the Lexicons are not absolutely reliable, and that they are least so, when they descend to particulars. They merely embody those results of the exegetical labours of various interpreters that commended themselves to the discriminating judgment of the lexicographer, and often reveal a difference of opinion. It is quite possible, and in some cases perfectly evident, that the choice of a meaning was determined by **dogmatical bias....**' (*Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1950, pp. 68, 69).²¹

(Emphasis, GEL)

The author of this paper gives the following quote from Isaac Backus: If we cannot know certainly that the Bible is true

²¹Curtis Pugh, "God's Blessings on the King James Bible," The Berea Baptist Banner, XVII, No. 6 (June 5, 1996), 107. The phrase, **dogmatical bias**, refers to one's climate of opinions or frame of reference. The author of this work has been pointing out this truth all the way through this paper. One's dogmatical bias does influence what one thinks and writes about. This has been illustrated time and again in this paper. (Emphasis, GEL)

without understanding **Hebrew, Greek, and Latin** then alas, alas, we are in a woeful case indeed. This quote is taken from William G. McLoughlin's New England Dissent, 1630-1833: The Baptists and the Separation of Church and State, Volume 1, 338. This two volume work was published by Harvard University Press in 1971.²²

(Emphasis, GEL)

Why have modern-day biblical scholars said what they have said in this paper? These modern "*evangelical*" biblical scholars and theologians have said what they have said for the sake of modernity and fashions *and* because they need to keep their jobs. They would never come out in favour of a Dean John William Burgon (1813-1888) [**See**, Appendix II] and the clothes that he brought forth. His favourable statements and books about the King James Version and his statements and writings against Westcott and Hort and **their** Critical Greek Text were not fashionable in his day. The brilliant Dean Burgon was not concerned about **modernity** like Westcott and Hort and their entourage. He was however concerned about being right with God. If modern-day evangelical biblical scholars sided with Dean Burgon and his views on the King James Bible and the Critical Greek Text, they would be fired. Since they live in fear of losing their jobs and not being accepted in the "*professional*" world of "*believing criticism*", they have voted for

²²The author has Dr. James H. Sightler, M.D., to thank for this quote.

fashions and not for clothes and thus they are known today for their modernity and turning the tide away from the true Word of God for a word that is false and pagan and satanic in origin.

What must the reader do then in the light of all that he has read in this paper? He must proclaim his biblical faith [through the true Word of God (King James Version)] and ignore the scorn of the 'worldly wise.' The world of modern biblical scholarship dismisses the true biblical Christian as a fool. They are declared to be fools for holding to the King James Version as the only preserved Word of God in the English language today. If the true biblical Christian is a fool then he is a fool for Christ's sake. If the whole modern world of biblical scholarship is against the true biblical Christian then, like Athanasius of old, the true biblical Christian needs to stand against the whole world of biblical scholarship. If God be for them, who can be against them?

The worldly wise biblical scholar does not believe in the King James Version of the Bible. It is really quite absurd to them. The worldly wise biblical scholar does not investigate such silliness. They do not believe that God could preserve His divinely inspired Word in one version and one version only. And yet God has written only one Bible. However Satan has written many translations and he has a coterie of worldly wise biblical scholars to help him.

And what **must** the true Christian do? He must pray for the courage to endure the scorn of the sophisticated world of the worldly wise biblical scholar. And having done all, he **must** stand for the only Word of God in the English language today-*THE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES VERSION OF THE BIBLE-1611*. And all of God's true people said, **AMEN!**²³

²³Antonin Scalia, "We Are Fools For Christ's Sake," Intercessors For America Newsletter, XXIII, No. 6 (June 1996), 3.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND PERSONALITIES

1. **APOSTASY**

From the Greek **apostasia** meaning "to desert a post or responsibility." In the Authorized Version it is translated "falling away" (II Thess. 2:3). The context indicates that it means a departure from the correct doctrinal position and, thereupon, a readiness to receive and accept the person and teaching of the man of sin. Today the term refers to the worldwide departure from the authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith and practice.

2. **ASTRUC, JEAN (1684-1766)**

Scholarly Bible critic. Divided the first five books of the Bible (Pentateuch) according to the names for God (Jehovah and Elohim) and claimed there were many sources, editors, and writers in addition to Moses; attacked the authenticity and authority of the Bible.

3. **ATONEMENT**

The work of our Lord Jesus Christ in the salvation of fallen mankind. The three key ideas embodied in the term are **redemption** (the price paid for man's salvation), **propitiation** (that work of Christ on the cross which satisfied the wrath of God toward sin and justly enables Him to deal in mercy and grace with the sinner), and **reconciliation** (that work of Christ on the cross

directed manward whereby the sinner is restored to a place of fellowship with God from his former place as an alien and enemy of God).

4. **AUGUSTINE (Aurelius Augustinus) (354-430)**

Outstanding Church Father. Converted when 32; known for his **Confessions** and **The City of God**; wrote many theological works. Ardent churchman, sacramentarian. Helped prepare for the rise of Roman Catholicism in the Middle Ages. Bishop of Hippo, North Africa.

5. **BARTH, KARL (1886-1968)**

Swiss theologian. Giant in Protestant thought since 1920s. A founder of crisis theology or Neo-Orthodoxy which reaffirmed many Reformation doctrines with new meanings. Did not hold to verbal inspiration. Professor, Bonn until expelled by Nazis in 1935. Professor, Basel 1935-68. Wrote **Romans**, a commentary, and **Church Dogmatics**.

One of the most influential voices of 20th-century Protestantism. He taught in Germany 1921-35, was expelled by the Nazis and spent the rest of his life in Basle. In his "crisis theology," Barth stressed revelation and grace and reemphasized the principles of the Reformation, initiating a movement away from theological "liberalism."

6. **BARTHIANISM**

A movement of theological thought which is associated

with Karl Barth (1886 - born in Basle, Switzerland)-aiming to be a re-birth of historic Protestantism and a reaction from theological liberalism. Associated with this general revival were Friedrich Gogarten, Eduward Thurneysen, Heinrich Barth and H. Emil Brunner. Barth and Brunner belong to the Calvinistic tradition, Gogarten to the Lutheran. Justification by faith, the Scriptures **containing** (emphasis, GEL) the Word of God, the sovereignty of God and original sin are emphasized, avoiding the doctrine of predestination to damnation and disavowing the modern trend of theology which combined with philosophy, comparative religions, the new psychology, etc. Faith is made to rest upon God's Word. Christ is the Divine Logos. Grace is the work of God for salvation, a gift of the Holy Spirit. God's transcendence is stressed: "the finite is not capable of the infinite" (against immanentism); man is separated from God and Christ (man's nature and endeavo[u]r).

"Theology of Crisis" and "Dialectical Theology" are terms characterising the Barthian theology. Crisis means judgment, separation-a crisis coming to man at the hearing of God's Word at which point his existence is at stake. He realizes the gulf between him and God. Man realizes he cannot ascend to God but that God must descend to him. The Dialectic is the method of reasoning by which the doctrine of the crisis is worked out. If God speaks to man it must be through human speech. But how? It is only by

means of contradiction between two ideas-the eternal entering time, God vs. man, grace vs. responsibility, etc.-that man can apprehend the contradictory truth that sinful man become just before God It is a kind of faith-knowledge wherein the transcendent becomes immanent, the spiritual becoming manifest in the material, God overcoming the gulf. Man is at a cross-road between the eternal and the temporal. This theology has had widespread influence in England and the U.S.A.

7. **BAUR, F.C. (1792-1860)**

Professor: U. of Blaubeurgen 1817-26; U. of Tubingen 1826-60. German historian and writer. Rejected the miracles of the Bible; dated many N.T. books as written in the second century. A gifted radical.

8. **BULTMANN, Rudolf (1884-1976)**

German theologian. Professor: Marburg 1912-16, 1921-51; Breslau 1916-20; Giessen 1920-21. Retired in 1951. Claimed the Bible contained many myths. A modern, radical liberal spokesman.

German theologian who advocated "demythologizing" the New Testament and reinterpreting it in existentialist terms. He developed a critical approach to the Gospels, studying the oral tradition behind them. His books include History of the Synoptic Tradition (1921; tr. 1963) and the five-volume Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate (1948-55; tr. 1953-62).

9. **BUSHNELL, HORACE (1802-76)**

Tutor, Yale U. 1829-31. Pastor, North Church, Hartford, Conn., 1833-59. Denied many essential doctrines of the Bible; taught the moral-influence theory of the death of Christ; taught that children should be brought up to become Christian through a process of learning; tried for heresy by Congregational pastors in 1850. [**HERESY**: A teaching deviating from the clear expression of Scripture.]

10. **CALVIN, JOHN (1509-64)**

Great theologian. Reformer of Geneva 1536-64. Author, **The Institutes of the Christian Religion**. Unequaled influence on Reformed and Presbyterian churches. [Calvin is also identified with **COVENANT THEOLOGY**. (Covenant Theology is) a system of Biblical interpretation which adheres to the following basic tenets: salvation is founded in the sovereign and elective decree of God; the promise of salvation is also for the children of elect parents, since they are in the covenant relationship; saints of the Old Testament, particularly Israel, are essentially one with the Church of the New Testament, which shares in their promises of blessing and their future; the promises to Israel are not meant to be fulfilled in an earthly millennium but rather have a spiritual fulfillment in Heaven.]

11. **CARNELL, EDWARD J. (1919-67)**

Baptist educator. Professor: Gordon College; Fuller Seminary, and its president 1955-59. Talented apologist of new-

evangelical theology. Prolific writer. An aid to Fuller's compromise. [In 1955 Dr. Carnell said in his presidential address that "we must systematically inculcate into the thinking of our students an attitude of toleration toward those who hold an heretical position."]

12. **CHARISMATIC**

From the Greek **charis** meaning "grace or favor." In the modern charismatic movement, the special gifts are usually restricted to speaking in tongues and healing. Whereas these gifts in the early church met a distinct need for furthering the testimony of the Gospel, today they are all too frequently sought after as an end in themselves. When these gifts are employed today by those who deny the Fundamentals of the Faith, it is evident that the spirit at work is not the Spirit of the Lord but rather an evil spirit. It is clear from Scripture that miracles can be performed through the power of the Evil One (Ex. 7:10-12; Rev. 13:11-15).

13. **CONSTANTINE (280-337)**

Roman Emperor. Issued the Edict of Milan giving religious freedom 313; built first St. Peter's on the present site; set aside December 25 as the birthday of Christ (old Feast of Saturnalia); not baptized until old, as he believed all sins could be washed away at one time.

14. **COOPERATIVE EVANGELISM**

Formerly, an interdenominational union of churches,

groups, and individuals of Fundamental, but otherwise divergent, doctrinal persuasion and practice in an evangelistic effort. Now, the inclusivistic evangelism of Billy Graham and others in which liberal churches and churchmen are invited to participate with Fundamental groups in evangelistic efforts. Frequently the message preached is sound enough, but the false impression is conveyed that the participating churches and individuals have the same Fundamental beliefs and purposes. Converts are referred to the cooperating churches irrespective of their soundness of belief.

15. **DARBY, JOHN N. (1800-82)**

Early teacher and Bible scholar of the Plymouth Brethren movement. Stressed prophecy and the imminent coming of the Lord; published many books on Bible studies.

16. **DARWIN, CHARLES (1809-82)**

English naturalist. Promoted the theory of evolution to explain the origin of all forms of organic life; wrote **The Origin of Species**; turned himself and others from a belief in the Bible to agnosticism.

17. **DIALECTIC**

A term with different meanings for different philosophers. It derives from the Greek word meaning "to converse" and is used to describe Socrates' method of teaching by question-and-answer technique. Plato used the word to mean the study of the Forms. In Kant, it refers to a method of criticizing claims of

knowledge going beyond experience. Hegel means by it the necessary pattern of thinking.

18. **DIALECTICAL THEOLOGY:** see **Barthianism**

19. **DISPENSATIONALISM**

A system of Biblical interpretation adhering to literalism in interpretation and distinguishing a series of periods in God's dealings with man in which God introduced a succession of tests of responsibilities. In each of these tests of responsibilities man has proved an utter failure when left to himself and so has been thrust upon the grace of God for salvation. The commonly taught dividing points of the dispensations are the Fall, the flood, the call of Abraham, the giving of the Law at Sinai, the Cross, the rapture of the Church, and the return of Christ.

11. **ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT**

A movement worldwide in scope. In the religious sense it is the moving together of religious bodies. This is accomplished by dialogue (emphasizing the points of agreement and de-emphasizing the points of doctrinal divergence) and gradualism. The ultimate aim is for all religious groups to be one.

12. **ESCHATOLOGY**

From the Greek **eschatos**, "last," and **logos**, "word"; thus, last things. The declarations of Scripture concerning the future, especially the end time.

13. **EVANGELICAL**

From the New Testament word **euangellion** which means "gospel" or "good news." Historically, the term describes those who hold that man is a lost sinner and must be saved by the grace of God through faith in the Son of God. As a designation, it has included all groups that have accepted the truths of the Bible as they support the Gospel.

14. **EVOLUTION**

The concept that within all matter and life is a principle which impels development from the simple and undefined to that which is ever more complex and sophisticated.

Frequently used to designate any sort of simple variation or change. The Theory of Evolution, however, is a philosophical model that refers technically to the specific hypothesis that higher and more complex life-forms originated in and developed from lower and less complex forms. In its most common usage among western secularists, evolution is the hypothesis that all life originated spontaneously from inorganic matter, and that life developed over a period of millions of years by "natural selection" from single-cell creatures into the great variety and complexity of the biological world today.

Though originally the theory of evolution applied only to biological systems, it soon became accepted in the secular scientific community as a general explanation of all reality. Thus

astronomers propound theories of stellar evolution; chemists suggest patterns of evolutionary development for the periodic chart; sociologists develop theories of social evolution; philosophers explain historical and cultural changes in terms of overall evolutionary criteria.

The biological theory of evolution faces a serious challenge today from known facts and experimental data relating to the second law of thermodynamics, the law of biogenesis, and the laws of genetics. The evidences supporting the theory are open to alternative explanations and thus are circumstantial.

15. **EXISTENTIALISM**

A philosophy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The dogma holds that since there are no universal values, man's essence is not predetermined but is based only on free choice; man is in a state of anxiety because of his realization of free will; and there is no objective truth. Major existentialists were Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Sartre, Heidegger, Karl Jaspers (1883-1969), and the religious existentialists Martin Buber and Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973)

16. **EWALD, HEINRICH (1803-75)**

German scholar. O.T. authority. Professor, U. of Gottingen. Rejected the conservative approach to the Bible; arrogantly promoted Liberalism; stressed liberal concept of progressive revelation.

17. **FATHERHOOD OF GOD**

The teaching that since God is the Father of all men and loves all men He would not send any of His children to Hell. The term used along with this is **the brotherhood of man**. In the sense that God is the Creator of mankind He is the Father of all. But sin brought alienation from God, and man can claim Him as Father only after the new birth. Those who deny or minimize the doctrine of the new birth take comfort in this liberal teaching.

18. **FLETCHER, JOSEPH (1905-)**

Church of England minister. Dean, Graduate School of Applied Religion, Cincinnati, 1936-44. Professor, Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass., 1944-70. Visiting professor, U. of Va. since 1970. Known for his radical views in promoting "situation ethics," which justifies present changes in morals.

19. **FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON (1878-1969)**

Pastor, Montclair Baptist, Montclair, N.J., 1904-15. Professor, Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C., 1908-46. Pastor, Park Avenue Baptist, N.Y.C., 1924-30; Riverside Church, N.Y.C., 1930-48. Popular liberal preacher. Radio speaker, "National Vespers." Author, many books.

20. **FULLER, CHARLES E. (1887-1968)**

Baptist pastor. Founder, Old-Fashioned Revival Hour in 1925 which grew to over 500 stations and was broadcast from Long

Beach Auditorium, Calif. Founder, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif., 1947, which, along with Fuller himself, joined the new-evangelical movement.

21. **FULLER, DAVID OTIS (1903-)**

Pastor: Chelsea Baptist, Atlantic City, N.J., 1924-1934; Wealthy Street Baptist, Grand Rapids, Mich., since 1934. Strong Fundamentalist defender. Has served within the GARB; has served on the trustee board, Wheaton College.

22. **GERMAN RATIONALISTS**

German philosophers of the nineteenth century who contended that truth and knowledge are established by reason and not by empirical (experiential) means or by supernatural revelation such as the Scriptures.

23. **GLASSER, ARTHUR F. (1914-)**

U.S. Navy chaplain 1942-45. Missionary under China Inland Mission (now Overseas Fellowship) 1946-51. Professor, Columbia Bible College 1951-55. Served in the home office of China Inland Mission 1955-69. Professor, Fuller Seminary and one of the leaders in new-evangelical missions since 1969.

24. **GORDON, ADONIRAM JUDSON (A.J.) (1836-95)**

Outstanding Baptist pastor and Fundamentalist. Pastor: Jamaica Plain, Mass., 1863-69; Clarendon Street Baptist, Boston, Mass., 1869-95. Founder Boston Missionary Training School (now Gordon College and Gordon Divinity School) 1889. Founder, Boston

Industrial Home. Hymnwriter, "My Jesus, I Love Thee." Author, **Ecce Venit (Behold He Cometh)** and **The Ministry of the Spirit**. Once of the founders of the early prophetic conferences.

25. **GORDON, ERNEST (1867-1956)**

Excellent linguist and able student of the causes and nature of apostasy. Contributor, **Sunday School Times** for 30 years. Wrote the column "Religious Survey" 1922-56. Son of A.J. Gordon. Author, 22 books, best known of which was **The Leaven of the Sadducees**.

26. **GRAHAM, WILLIAM FRANK (Billy) (1918-)**

Baptist evangelist and world renowned speaker in public rallies, on radio, and on TV. President, Northwestern Schools 1947-51. Worldwide evangelist since 1951. Spokesman for New Evangelicalism. Author, several books.

27. **GROUNDS, VERNON C. (1914-)**

Baptist pastor and educator. Pastor, The Gospel Tabernacle, Paterson, N.J., for 10 years. Dean, Baptist Bible Seminary, Johnson City, N.Y., 1945-51. Professor, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colo.; its president since 1956. Author, several books and articles. One of the more articulate of new-evangelical thinkers.

28. **HEGEL, GEORGE WILLIAM FREDERICK (1770-1831)**

German philosopher, absolute idealist, whose influence in Protestant thinking has been enormous. The dialectic of thesis-

antithesis-synthesis is not only a description of thought but of the modes of Reality. God is the Absolute Spirit, the Absolute Truth. The real world is rational. Christianity is the Absolute Religion confirming the dialectic (even in the Trinity). For reaction against Hegelianism, see existentialism.

Professor: U. of Jena; Heidelberg, 1816-18; Berlin 1818-31. Influential in the study of the philosophy of the tension between man and his world (thesis, antithesis, synthesis); identified God with the world process; provided background for both Marxism and German Liberalism.

29. **HENRY, CARL F. (1913-)**

Baptist pastor, teacher, and writer. Professor: Northern Baptist Seminary 1940-47; Fuller Seminary 1947-56; now at Eastern Baptist Seminary. First editor, **Christianity Today** 1956-68. Open supporter of New Evangelicalism. Has helped plan Explo 72 and Key 73.

30. **HIGHER CRITICISM**

An approach to the Bible taken by nineteenth-century German Biblical scholars and theologians who were strongly influenced by the German rationalism of the times. To a large degree it ruled out the supernatural elements in the Bible and denied the early authorship of the Pentateuch (first five books of the Bible) by Moses and of the prophetic books. It ascribed only human authorship to the Bible and rejected its divine inspiration.

It provided the foundation of the Liberalism and Modernism of the twentieth century.

31. **HUMANISM**

In a religious context, an attitude that emphasizes the importance of human capabilities (especially, reason) and earthly values in opposition to the Christian view of man and the importance of the supernatural.

Any philosophic view that holds that mankind's well-being and happiness in this lifetime are primary and that the good of all humanity is the highest ethical goal. Twentieth-century humanists tend to reject all beliefs in the supernatural, relying instead on scientific methods and reason. The term is also used to refer to Renaissance thinkers, especially in the fifteenth century in Italy, who emphasized knowledge and learning not based on religious sources.

Any view or system in which interest in human welfare is central. As such it would seem compatible with or even essential to Christianity. However, in philosophical usage the term refers specifically to a doctrine or life-style that centers upon human values rather than upon God. "Secular" (as opposed to "Christian") humanism rejects all forms of supernaturalism and attempts to establish the dignity of man on a naturalistic base through reason and the scientific method alone. Humanity replaces God as the supreme fact of reality.

Humanism properly describes any system that tries to find coherent and unified meaning to life by starting with humanity alone. Humanism is usually optimistic and hopeful in its outlook because man is thought to be basically good.

32. **INCLUSIVIST POLICY**

In religion, the inclusion in a body or denomination of individuals who hold opposing convictions, yet maintain tolerant attitudes toward each other. Many Conservatives have remained within liberal denominations, hoping to rescue some that would otherwise be lost. However, this approach gives the appearance of an endorsement of a system of error.

33. **INTERDENOMINATIONALISM**

A spirit of willingness to overlook minor differences of doctrine or practice in order to achieve some Christian purpose.

34. **JASPERS, KARL (1883-1969)**

German philosopher. Professor, U. of Heidelberg. Dismissed by the Nazis in 1937. Professor, Basel 1937-69. Defended existentialism; wrote vaguely about the "being-object" and "being-I."

35. **KANT, IMMANUEL (1724-1804)**

German philosopher. Professor, U. of Konigsberg, East Prussia. Based all ideas on reason and all knowledge on experience; rejected revelation. Major book, **The Critique of Pure Reason**. An open enemy of the Bible, though a great thinker.

36. **KIERKEGAARD, Sören (1813-1855)**

Danish thinker who has only in this generation come to a place of momentous influence. His physical deformity, his melancholy, his weird love-affair are considerations which play into his theology of despair. His analysis of human nature has been hailed by his admirers as most penetrating. A vast literature has grown up about him. His own works (under pseudonyms of authorship) are many, e.g., Philosophical Fragments, The Present Age, Fear and Trembling, Stages on Life's Way, The Sickness Unto Death, Concluding Unscientific Postscript, etc., (now in English translations). See **Existentialism**.

Danish philosopher, religious thinker, and extraordinarily influential founder of existentialism. Kierkegaard held that "truth is subjectivity," that religion is an individual matter, and that man's relationship to God requires suffering.

37. **LADD, GEORGE E. (1911-)**

Baptist pastor and educator. Pastor: Montpelier, Vt., and Boston, Mass. Professor, Gordon College 1946-50. Professor of N.T., Fuller Seminary, Pasadena, Calif., since 1950. Strong posttribulational teacher and writer. A leader in new-evangelical thought.

38. **LIBERALISM**

Religious Liberalism has varied somewhat from country to country. In America it is inseparably identified with the social

gospel, which addresses itself to the social needs rather than the heart needs of man. It is derived from the **GERMAN RATIONALISTS** and **HIGHER CRITICISM**. It rejected miracles and the inspiration of the Bible. It sought to harmonize the Scriptures with science. Those who, at the turn of the century, actively contended for these ideas may be designated as Modernists, though in belief they would be classified as Liberals.

39. **LINDSELL, HAROLD (1913-)**

Professor: Columbia Bible College 1942-44; Northern Baptist Seminary 1944-51; Fuller Seminary 1951-64. Editor, **Christianity Today** since 1964, a national voice of New Evangelicalism.

40. **MCGEE, J. VERNON (1904-)**

Presbyterian pastor: Decatur, Ga.; Nashville, Tenn.; Cleburne, Tex.; The Church of the Open Door, Los Angeles, 1949-70. Bible conference speaker. Radio Bible teacher. Sound in doctrine, but openly supports new-evangelical movements.

41. **MACHEN, J. GRESHAM (1881-1937)**

Presbyterian minister, teacher, writer, defender of the Faith. Professor: Princeton Seminary 1906-29; Westminster Seminary 1929-37 which he helped found in 1929. A founder, Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Great Greek N.T. scholar. Able writer in theology and the Reformed faith. Known widely for **The Virgin Birth of Christ, Christianity and Liberalism**, and **The**

Origin of Paul's Religion.

42. MATHEWS, SHAILER (1863-1941)

Professor: Colby College 1887-94; U. of Chicago 1894-1933, teaching N.T. and systematic theology. A leading Modernist of his generation. Great figure in the sellout of the NBC to apostasy. (**NBC=NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION**)

43. MODERNISM

See **LIBERALISM**

44. MYSTICISM

The attempt to find truth in sources other than sensory perception and written revelation.

Any philosophy whose roots are in mystical experiences, intuitions, or direct experiences of the divine. In such experiences, the mystic believes that his or her soul has temporarily achieved union with God. Mystics believe reality can be known only in this manner, not through reasoning or everyday experience.

45. NEO-ORTHODOXY

A theological position halfway between Conservatism and Liberalism. Because it contains truth along with error, it is more insidious and dangerous than an open espousal of error. The following are its positions on major doctrines. (1) It regards Jesus as the revelation of God, being the Word of God. The written word is human and therefore to a greater or lesser degree contains

error. Thus it cannot fully give the revelation of God. (2) It is existential in method. It contends that one must have an experience (divine-human encounter) with God that transcends rational explanation. (3) It does not take the fall of Adam literally; instead it holds that Adam is a figure of all men who fall. (4) It presents nebulous views of the atonement of Christ. (5) It strongly emphasizes the social welfare of man, insisting that the church must give itself to the needs of society rather than merely rescuing individuals out of the muck of society. (6) It considers matters of eschatology to be beyond human analysis; and, consequently, it does not consider the events of Daniel and Revelation to have a literal fulfillment.

46. **NEW EVANGELICALISM**

An attitude or position which professes to adhere to the Fundamentals of the Faith but advocates a spirit of re-examination of the basic doctrines, an attitude of tolerance toward the Liberals and an entering into "dialogue" with them, and an emphasis on the love and mercy of God rather than on His holiness and righteousness.

47. **NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY (1801-90)**

English scholar and churchman who left the Church of England to join the Roman Catholic Church. Led 200 Anglican priests to follow him into Catholicism; wrote the famous hymn "Lead, Kindly Light"; elected a cardinal in the Roman church.

48. **NIEBUHR, H. RICHARD (1894-1962)**

Evangelical Reformed scholar and writer. Joined the faculty, Yale Divinity School in 1931. His major field, social ethics and the work of building the "Kingdom" through Christian activities.

49. **NIEBUHR, REINHOLD (1892-1971)**

Minister of the Evangelical Synod of the Lutheran Church. Pastor, Bethlehem Evangelical Church, Detroit, 1917-30. Professor, Union Seminary, N.Y.C., 1930-60. His field, applied Christianity. Author, many books. Acknowledged neo-orthodox scholar.

50. **NIETZSCHE, F.W. (1844-1900)**

German philosopher, heretic, and critic of Christian truth. Avid disciple of German radicalism. Taught that the German race was superior. Professor, Basel U. An atheist. Helped prepare for German socialism.

51. **OCKENGA, HAROLD JOHN (1905-)**

Presbyterian minister, educator, New Evangelical leader. Pastor: Pittsburgh, 1930-36; Park Street Church, Boston, Mass., 1936-69. President, Gordon College and Gordon-Conwell Divinity School, Wenham, Mass., since 1969. Chairman of the trustees of Fuller Seminary when it opened in 1947. Coined the name "New Evangelicalism" and in 1957 clearly defined it. Strong supporter of new-evangelical movements and men.

52. **ORTHODOXY**

From the Greek **orthos**, "right," and **doxa**, "opinion"; thus "right belief" as opposed to heresy. In this sense the term began to be used in the second century. In a more specific sense, the term refers to an adherence to the central doctrines affirmed by the churches descending from the Reformation and expressed in their creeds.

53. **PEALE, NORMAN VINCENT (1898-)**

Methodist minister and pastor, Marble Collegiate Church, N.Y.C., since 1932. Widely known for his books on positive thinking and self-rescue. Three characteristics of his writing: humor, humility and humanity.

54. **PIKE, JAMES A. (1913-69)**

Modernist bishop of the Church of England with an office in San Francisco. A sarcastic critic of everything believed by Fundamentalists. Dean: St. John's N.Y.C., 1952-58; Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, 1958-69. Founder, Foundation for Religious Transition. Influential apostate.

55. **POSITIVE THINKING**

An approach to spiritual health, popularized by Norman Vincent Peale, which stresses the importance of mental attitudes to the achievement of proper and desirable modes of life.

56. **PUSEY, E.B. (1800-82)**

English Bible scholar, especially of the O.T. Belonged to the High Church which is much like the Roman Catholic. Open-

minded when apostasy ruined the Church of England.

57. **RAMM, BERNARD (1916-)**

Professor: Bethel Seminary; Baylor U. 1954-59; California Baptist Seminary in systematic theology since 1959. Author, 10 books, one of the best-known being **The Christian View of Science and the Scriptures**. Defender of new-evangelical concepts.

58. **RATIONALISM**

The philosophic approach that holds that reality is knowable by the use of reason or thinking alone, without recourse to observation or experience....

59. **RAUSCHENBUSCH, WALTER (1861-1918)**

Baptist pastor and educator. Pastor of a German Baptist church in N.Y. Professor, Rochester Seminary 1902-1918. One of the leading figures in the social gospel. His book **The Theology of the Social Gospel** is a blueprint for reforming society to make it the Kingdom of God. An apostate Baptist.

60. **REFORMED THEOLOGY**

The system of theology developed by the Reformers, the most notable of whom was John Calvin. Calvinism adheres to the doctrines of total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and perseverance of the saints. Reformed theology also includes covenant teaching. Evangelicals have appreciated Calvinism's insistence on the inspiration of the Bible and the doctrines of sin and grace. Many evangelicals have

differed with the Reformed systems on the issues of election and the human will.

61. **RELATIVE**

The state of being contingent. A thing is relative if it is connected in a necessary way to something else. To be relative means not to be absolute or independent. In some contexts to be relative is to be unstable and changeable. A philosopher speaking of the relativity of truth frequently implies that all knowledge is in flux, and that there is no assurance possible in any conceptual realm (except, of course, in the sense of something being true by definition, as in mathematics or pure logic).

In historiography the dominant modern view is **relativism**. It is not that there is no agreement about any events of history, but it is believed that no events can be known apart from interpretation, and thus all history is inevitably tied up with fallible human opinion. But it is not clear why all interpretations must be false. Truth can be truly true without being exhaustively true. **Relativism** is a threat to orthodox Christianity (which depends upon certain doctrines being absolutely true. [**RELATIVISM** - The precept that people's ideas of right and wrong vary considerably from place to place and time to time; therefore, there are no universally valid ethical standards.]

62. **RITSCHL, ALBRECHT (1822-89)**

Influential German Modernist. Scholar, writer, and

teacher. Accepted critical views of the Bible, denying most sound doctrines and stressing the Kingdom of God as the religious community based on the love of God. In our response to that love, we form "value judgments."

63. **ROCKEFELLER, JOHN D. (1839-1937)**

Capitalist and philanthropist. Went into the oil business in 1867; organized Standard Oil (later, Standard Oil of New Jersey) in 1870; retired in 1911. It is estimated that he gave 500 million dollars to schools and charities. Close friend of Harry Emerson Fosdick.

64. **SARTRE, JEAN PAUL (1905-)**

French existentialist. A follower of Hegel and Freud. Very mystical and vague in his thinking and writing. Believes God to be the Unapproachable Absolute; bases religion on our dealing with Being, Nothingness, and Becoming.

65. **SCHLEIERMACHER, FRIEDRICH DANIEL ERNST (1768-1834)**

Chaplain at a hospital, Berlin, 1796-1802. Pastor, Stolp 1802-04. Professor: Halle U. 1804-09; Berlin 1809-34. Theologian and philosopher. Religion was based on feelings and not the facts of the Bible. Based truth on emotions and the responses of the souls of men; said Jesus was an ideal man.

Influenced early by the Moravians and the piety of his parental home, a father and grandfather ministers of the gospel, Schleiermacher was trained in conservative Reformed theology and

later at Halle where critical learning including philosophy stimulated his questing mind. After a period of varied assignments he returned to Halle in 1804 as University preacher and professor of theology; five years later he assumed the nationally important pulpit of Trinity Church in Berlin. There he helped to establish the University of Berlin (1810), and became a professor of theology and engaged in public and national affairs. He opposed sectarian Lutheranism, defending an Evangelical Church with a presbyterian system to include both Lutherans and the Reformed. His conception of theology as grounded in **feeling** launched him as the protagonist of the modern school of **religious empiricism**. Religion like art, he insisted, is based upon an **inner experience**, not upon a scaffolding of theology. As such, religion is a natural phenomenon. Religion, he said, is the **feeling of absolute dependence**. His Speeches on Religion (1799) was thus directed to the so-called "cultured despisers" of religion. In his Soliloquies (1800) Schleiermacher upheld morality also as the flowering of the **inner life** and not as a **system of rules** imposed upon men from without (as e.g., **by a revelation**). In historical criticism Schleiermacher's scholarship was established in a critical study of the Pauline authorship of I Timothy which he **disavowed**. As a Plato scholar, an ethical philosopher and theologian his reputation continued to mount. Christianity as a living historic experience was to him the highest expression of religion. Jesus Christ is the

perfect

God-conscious man and central to a living church. The universe for him was essentially harmonious, God being its explanatory principle. Christian doctrines are to be understood as revealing significant human experiences, the latter the touch-stone of their worth or disvalue.

66. **SCOFIELD, CYRUS INGRAM (C.I.) (1843-1921)**

Pastor, Bible teacher, and writer. Editor, **The Scofield Reference Bible**. Pastor: Moody Memorial, Chicago, 1895-1902; First Congregational, Dallas, Tex. (now, Scofield Memorial). Careful dispensational teacher, but never involved in the battles of Fundamentalism though he supplied preaching materials for militant Fundamentalists.

67. **SEPARATION**

The system of theology developed by the Reformers, the most notable of whom was John Calvin. Calvinism adheres to the doctrines of total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and perseverance of the saints. Reformed theology also includes covenant teaching. Evangelicals have appreciated Calvinism's insistence on the inspiration of the Bible and the doctrines of sin and grace. Many evangelicals have differed with the Reformed systems on the issues of election and the human will.

The Biblical principle that the believer is to keep

himself unspotted from the world is called personal separation. Ecclesiastical separation refers either to an individual's separating himself from a church that endorses or condones apostasy or to a local church's separating itself from a denomination or association that endorses or condones apostasy. First-degree separation is the refusal of Christian fellowship to a person or group of persons who condone or practice wrongdoing. Second-degree separation is the refusal of Christian fellowship to a person or group of persons who, though standing for what is right, nevertheless continues fellowship with one who walks in error.

68. **STRAUSS, DAVID (1808-74)**

German philosopher and writer. Wrote a **Life of Jesus** in which he denied the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, and the miracles of the Bible.

69. **STRONG, AUGUSTUS H. (1836-1921)**

Baptist pastor and educator. Pastor: First Baptist, Haverhill, Mass., 1861-65; First, Cleveland, Ohio, 1865-72. President, Rochester Seminary 1872-1912. A conservative theologian, but tolerant and thereby prepared the way for the downfall of his seminary. Author, 7 books including **Outline of Systematic Theology**.

70. **SUBJECTIVISM**

The theory that all moral values are completely dependent on the personal tastes, feelings, or inclinations of the individual

and have no source of validity outside of such human subjective states of mind.

71. **SYNCRETISM**

Literally "combination." In a religious context, the efforts of various bodies of Christendom to merge into ever larger bodies, with a one-world church as the ultimate goal. **Syncretism** also may refer to efforts to harmonize Christian and non-Christian thought.

72. **TILLICH, PAUL J. (1886-1965)**

Professor: 4 German universities; Union Seminary, N.Y.C., 1933-55; Harvard U. 1955-62; U. of Chicago 1962-65. Keen liberal thinker. American interpreter of Barth. Neo-orthodox writer.

73. **VAN DUSEN, HENRY P. (1897-)**

Presbyterian minister and educator. Professor, Union Seminary, N.Y.C., 1926-63. Liberal spokesman. A favorite Modernist among intellectuals and churchmen. Strong promoter of the ecumenical movement.

74. **UNITARIANISM**

The view which rejects the trinitarian view of God as being in three persons yet one in essence. It is characterized by freedom of thought and a humanistic view of man.

NOTE: Any emphasis within each entry has been done by the author of this handout.

APPENDIX I

BRUCE M. METZGER: A PRINCETON APOSTATE

Another of the editors of the united Bible Societies' Greek New Testament is **BRUCE M. METZGER** (1914-). Metzger is George L. Collord Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Princeton Theological Seminary, and he serves on the board of the American Bible Society. Metzger is the head of the continuing RSV translation committee of the apostate National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The Revised Standard Version was soundly condemned of its modernism when it first appeared in 1952. Today its chief editor sometimes is invited to speak at Evangelical forums. The RSV hasn't changed, but Evangelicalism certainly has!

Metzger was the chairman for the *Reader's Digest Condensed Bible* and wrote the introductions to each book in the butchered version of the Scriptures. The Preface claims that "Dr. Metzger was actively involved at every stage of the work, from the initial studies on each of the sixty-six books through all the subsequent editorial reviews. The finished condensation has received his full approval." The *Condensed Bible* removed 40% of the Bible text, including the warning of Revelation 22:18-19! In the introductions to the books of the *Reader's Digest Bible*, Metzger question the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, and Peter, and in many other ways reveals his liberal, unbelieving heart. Consider some examples:

Genesis: "Nearly all modern scholars agree that, like the other books of the Pentateuch, [Genesis] is a composite of several sources, embodying traditions that go back in some cases to Moses."

Exodus: "As with Genesis, several strands of literary tradition, some very ancient, some as late as the sixth century B.C., were combined in the makeup of the books" (Introduction to Exodus).

Deuteronomy: "It's compilation is generally assigned to the seventh century B.C., though it rests upon much older tradition, some of it from Moses' time."

Daniel: "Most scholars hold that the book was compiled during the persecutions (168-165 B.C.) of the Jewish people by Antiochus Epiphanes."

John: "Whether the book was written directly by John, or indirectly (his teachings may have been edited by another), the church has accepted it as an authoritative supplement to the story of Jesus' ministry given by the other evangelists."

1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus: "Judging by differences in style and vocabulary from Paul's other letters, **many modern scholars think that the Pastorals were not written by Paul.**"

James: "Tradition ascribes the letter to James, the Lord's brother, writing about A.D. 45, but **modern opinion is uncertain,** and differs widely on both origin and date."

2 Peter: "Because the author refers to the letter of Paul as 'scripture,' a term apparently not applied to them until long after Paul's death, **most modern scholars think that this letter was drawn up in Peter's name** sometime between A.D. 100 and 150."

Metzger's modernism was also made plain in the notes to the *New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV* (1973). Metzger co-edited this volume with Herbert May. It first appeared in 1962 as the *Oxford Annotated Bible* and was the first Protestant annotated edition of the Bible to be approved by a Roman authority. It was given an imprimatur in 1966 by Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts. Metzger wrote many of the rationalistic notes in this volume and put his editorial stamp of approval on the rest. Consider some excerpts from the notes:

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT: "The Old Testament may be described as the literary expression of the religious life of ancient Israel. ...The Israelites were more history-conscious than any other people in the ancient world. Probably as early as the time of David and Solomon, **out of a matrix of myth, legend, and history,** there had appeared the earliest written form of the story of the saving acts of God from Creation to the conquest of the Promised Land, an account which later in modified form became a part of Scripture. But it was to be a long time before the idea of Scripture arose and the old

Testament took its present form. ...The process by which the Jews became 'the people of the Book' was gradual, **and the development is shrouded in the mists of history and tradition.**

...The date of the final compilation of the Pentateuch or Law, which was the first corpus or larger body of literature that came to be regarded by the Jews as authoritative Scripture, is uncertain, although some have conservatively dated it at the time of the Exile in the sixth. ...Before the adoption of the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses, there had been compiled and edited in the spirit and diction of the Deuteronomic 'school' the group of books consisting of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, in much their present form. ...**Thus the Pentateuch took shape over a long period of time.**"

NOTES ON GENESIS: "[Genesis] 2.4b-3..24 ... is a different tradition form that in 1.1-2,4a, as evidenced by the flowing style and the different order of events, e.g. man is created before vegetation, animals, and woman. ...7:16b: The Lord shut him in, a note from the early tradition, which delight in anthropomorphic touches. 7:18-20: The waters covered all the high mountains, thus threatening a confluence of the upper and lower waters (1.6). Archaeological evidence suggests that **traditions of a prehistoric flood covering the whole earth are heightened versions of local inundations, e.g. in the Tigris-Euphrates basin.**"

NOTES ON JOB: "The **ancient folktale** of a patient Job (1.1-2.13; 42.7-17; Jas. 5.11) circulated orally among oriental sages in the second millennium B.C. and was probably written down in Hebrew at the time of David and Solomon or a century later (about 1000-800 B.C.)."

NOTES ON PSALM 22: "22:12-13: ...the meaning of the third line [they have pierced my hands and feet] is obscure."
[Editor: No, it is not obscure; it is a prophecy of Christ's crucifixion!]

NOTES ON ISAIAH: "Only chs. 1-39 can be assigned to Isaiah's time; it is generally accepted that chs. 40-66 come from the time of Cyrus of Persia (539 B.C.) and later, as shown by the differences in historical background, literary style, and theological emphases. ...The contents of this section [chs. 56-66] (sometimes called **Third Isaiah**) suggest a date between 530 and 510 B.C., perhaps contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah (520-518); chapters 60-62 may be later."

NOTES ON JONAH: "The book is didactic narrative which has taken older material from the realm of **popular legend** and put it to a new, more consequential use."

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT: "Jesus himself left no literary remains; information regarding his word and works comes from his immediate followers (the apostles) and their disciples. At first this information was circulated orally."

As far as we know today, the first attempt to produce a written Gospel was made by John Mark, who according to tradition was a disciples of the Apostle Peter. This Gospel, along with a collection of sayings of Jesus and several other special sources, formed the basis of the Gospels attributed to Matthew and Luke." [Editor: The Gospels, like every part of the new Testament, were written by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This nonsense of trying to find 'the original source' for the Gospels is unbelieving heresy.]

NOTES ON 2 PETER: "The tradition that this letter is the work of the apostle Peter was questioned in early times, and internal indications are almost decisive against it. ...Most scholars therefore regard the letter as the work of one who was deeply indebted to Peter and who published it under his master's name early in the second century." [Editor: Those who believe this nonsense must think the early Christians were fools and the Holy Spirit on vacation.]

NOTES FROM "HOW TO READ THE BIBLE WITH UNDERSTANDING": "The opening chapters of the Old Testament deal with human origins. They are not to be read as history...These chapters are followed by the stories of the patriarchs, which preserve ancient traditions now known to reflect the conditions of the times of which they tell, though they cannot be treated strictly as historical. ...it is not for history but for

religion that they are preserved...When we come to the books of Samuel and Kings...Not all in these books is of the same historical value, and especially in the stories of Elijah and Elisha there **are legendary elements.** ...We should always remember the variety of literary forms found in the Bible, and should read a passage in the light of its own particular literary character. **Legend should be read as legend,** and poetry as poetry, and **not with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind."**

This is the same type of rationalistic wickedness that appears in Metzger's notes in the *Reader's Digest Condensed Bible*. This modernistic foolishness, of course, is a lie. The Pentateuch was written by the hand of God and Moses and completed during the 40 years of wilderness wandering hundreds of years before Samuel and the kings. The Old Testament did not arise gradually from a matrix of myth and history, but is inspired revelation delivered to holy men of old by Almighty God. The Jews were a "people of the book" from the beginning. The Jewish nation did not form the Bible; the Bible formed the Jewish nation! In Metzger's "introduction to the New Testament" in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible*, he completely ignores the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and claims that the Gospels are composed of material gathered from oral tradition. The Bible says nothing about this, but Jesus Christ plainly tells us that the Holy Spirit would guide the Apostles into all truth (John

16:7-15). The Gospels are the product of divine revelation, not some happenstance editing of oral tradition.

Bruce Metzger is a Liberal. He piously claims on one hand that the Bible is the inspired Word of God; but out of the other side of the mouth he claims the Bible is filled with myth and lies. He denies the Bible's history, its miracles, and its authorship, while, in true liberal style, declaring that this denial does not do injustice to the Word of God, for the Bible is not "written for history but for religion" and is not to be read "with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind"!

Metzger has been called an Evangelical by some who should know better, but upon the authority of the man's own writings, I declare that Bruce Metzger is an unbeliever. He is a false teacher. He is apostate. He is a heretic. Those are all Bible terms. Having studied many of the man's works, I am convinced those are the terms which must be applied to him. One Baptist writer partially defended Metzger to me with these words--"he did write a superb pamphlet in 1953 refuting the Jehovah's Witnesses and defending the full and absolute deity of Christ." Even the Pope of Rome defends the full and absolute deity of Christ. A man can defend the deity of Christ and still be a false teacher. A man who denies the written Word also denies the Living Word. They stand or fall together. If the Bible contains error, Christ was a liar. If Christ is perfect Truth, so is the Bible.

In *The New Testament, Its Background, Growth and Content*, which appeared in 1965, Metzger claims that "the discipline of form criticism has enlarged our understanding of the conditions which prevailed during the years when the gospel materials circulated by word of mouth" (p. 86). Not so. Form criticism is that unbelieving disciples which claims that the Gospels were gradually formed out a matrix of tradition and myth. Form critics hold a wide variety of views (reflecting the unsettled and relativistic nature of the rationalism upon which they stand), but all of them deny that the Gospels are the perfect, verbally inspired, divinely-given, absolutely infallible Word of God. Metzger says, "What each evangelist has preserved, therefore, is not a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus, but an interpretative portrait delineated in accord with the special needs of the early church" (Ibid.) Metzger is wrong. The Gospel writers have indeed given us, by divine revelation, a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus Christ. Praise God for it!

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 39-44

Scholars lie. They absolutely, unequivocally, unambiguously lie. So I started on a quest to find out what was going on.

I wrote a letter to Dr. Bruce Metzger, and I have here the response to my letter. Dr. Metzger is supposed to be the leading textual scholar in America. I said to him, 'Dr. Metzger, in a certain place you put a note that there was a rough breathing mark instead of a soft breathing mark on a word. Why, then, would you leave out 11 words without any kind of footnote?' He said, 'We only put in things that would make a translational difference.' That's a real interesting statement! [As if eleven words do not make a translational difference.]

As a consequence of that, I started some research. I am one of those people who loves to count things and look at things and investigate things. I was reading again in my Greek New Testament and recognized something that was very interesting to me. I wrote again to Dr. Metzger and said, 'Dr. Metzger, I've been working on a Greek New Testament, and as I've gone through it I have found out that not one time did you ever capitalize the word for God; not one time did you ever capitalize the word for Holy Spirit; not one time, if you could get away with it, did you ever capitalize the word for Lord. Was there a reason for that?' Dr. Metzger said, 'In the original manuscripts that we have there is no size difference indicating deity. To have introduced any capitalizations would have been an editorial comment.' I thought,

that's interesting. I looked down the page. Here's the word for Devil; here's the word for Satan; and they are both capitalized. Interesting.

I found out that scholars lie.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 326-327

...Scholars such as Bruce M. Metzger and Kurt Aland discredit the value of the Reformation Greek texts and subsequently the English Bibles on Textual grounds. Metzger, giving a standard reply writes,

'Partly because of this catchword [Textus Receptus] the form of the Greek text is incorporated in the editions that Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs had published succeeded in establishing itself as 'the only true text' of the New Testament, and was slavishly reprinted in hundreds of subsequent editions. It lies at the basis of the King James Version and of all the principal Protestant translations in the languages of Europe prior to 1881. so superstitious has been the reverence accorded the Textus Receptus that in some cases attempts to criticize or emend it have been regarded as akin to sacrilege' (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 106).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 351

How widely this text has prevailed in the actual use of the church, Bruce M. Metzger, himself no advocate of the TT [Traditional Text], indicates. It 'spread widely throughout Greek speaking lands.' It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into Teutonic language, by Ulfilas, 'apostle to the Goths,' in the second half of the fourth century. It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into a Slavic language, thus forming 'the basis of the New Testament...for millions of Slavic peoples.' Metzger concludes:

"As regards the history of the printed form of the Greek New Testament, the so-called Textus Receptus, which was based chiefly on manuscripts of the Antiochian recension [Metzger here repeats the Westcott-Hort myth that the Received Text was created in the fourth century], has been reprinted, with only minor modifications, in almost one thousand editions from 1514 down to the twentieth century. When one considers how many translations into the vernaculars of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America have been based on the Greek Textus Receptus of the New Testament (such as the King James version or Luther's translation), it will be appreciated how enormous has been the influence of Lucian's recension [again he refers to the Westcott-Hort myth], made in Antioch about the turn of the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era" (Bruce Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1963, pp. 19,20).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist
Church, 1995. 377

APPENDIX II

METZGER ON DEAN JOHN WILLIAM BURGON (1813-1888)

Those students who read works such as Miller's *General Biblical Introduction* or Metzger's *The Text of the New Testament* (said by many to be "the standard in the field") or Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* or Kurt Aland's *The Text of the New Testament* are given the impression that there has been no serious scholarly rejection of the theories underlying the modern Greek text. This is plainly a deception. Metzger does mention Burgon and Salmon, but he tells us nothing of consequence of their work apart from shallow caricatures. The same can be said for Kenyon. Aland summarizes the defense of the Received Text as mere "clamorous rhetoric" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 19).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 74

Bruce Metzger (1914-) also gives the typically insufficient overview of Burgon's work:

"During the closing decades of the nineteenth century the traditional text found a doughty defender in the person of John W. Burgon...he has been described as 'a High-churchman of the old school' who became notorious as 'a leading champion of lost causes and impossible beliefs; but the vehemence of his advocacy somewhat impaired its effect.' His conservatism can be gauged from a sermon he preached at Oxford in 1884 in which he denounced the higher education of 'young women as young men' as 'a thing inexpedient and immodest'; the occasion was the admission of women to university examinations! ...Burgon used every rhetorical device at his disposal to attack both the English Revision and the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort. Burgon's argument was basically theological and speculative" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 135).

This is an incredibly shallow survey of Burgon's opposition to the Revised Version. Metzger sets the stage for his review of Burgon by labelling him a champion of lost causes. We could put the same label on the Old Testament prophets. They championed causes which certainly appeared to have been lost in their own day. Israel did not respond to their pleas and did not return from

apostasy. Most defenders of the truth throughout history, in fact, have been champions of what appear to have been lost causes. The problem here is that the end has not yet come, and there are many causes which appear to be lost but which will be victorious in the end.

And what of the supposed "impossible beliefs" of Burgon? One of the hallmarks of his ministry was his defense of the perfect inspiration of Holy Scripture against the Modernism which was sweeping into the Church of England. Was that an impossible belief? (Of course, it is impossible to Metzger, as we saw in Chapter One.)

Metzger overlooks the great things in Burgon, does not even mention his hallmark work on Inspiration, and selects an irrelevant incident to illustrate for his readers Burgon's life and position. Burgon opposed the opening of the university of Oxford to total intermingling of men and women and to complete co-education which did not distinguish between the sexes. Metzger approvingly quotes the *Dictionary of National Biography* which refers to the title of a sermon Burgon preached on Oxford on June 8, 1884, but this *Dictionary* (and Metzger does not set the record straight) leaves out an important part of the title, which was, "To educate Young Women like Young Man AND WITH YOUNG MEN--a thing inexpedient and immodest." The omission of the words "and with Young Men" significantly changes the thrust of Burgon's position. Burgon was

not opposed to women being trained institutions of higher education. He was supportive of the situation which existed prior to 1884, in which women lived in private dwelling houses while pursuing their education. "He is careful to explain that his censure does not touch the Halls already established for young Ladies in Oxford ('Lady Margaret Hall' and 'Somerville Hall')" (Edward Goulburn, *Life of Dean Burgon*, p. 235). Burgon was opposed to the close, constant, unsupervised intermingling of unmarried men and women, and he was opposed to the changes which were overtaking his times. We believe Burgon was right. There can be no doubt that the contemporary practice of coeducation has resulted in a tremendous increase in immorality in the institutions of "higher" education. Consider an excerpt from Burgon's sermon:

"You are the prime ornament of God's creation; and we men are, to speak plainly, just what you make us. ...If you set about becoming Man's rival, or rather if you try to be, what you never can become, Man's equal...you have in a manner unsexed yourselves, and must needs put up with the bitter consequence" (Goulburn, pp. 236,37).

We are convinced that Burgon's sermon, far from being obscurantist, would be very appropriate in the latter half of the twentieth century. We would like to hear it preached in pulpits across the land! Of course, Bruce Metzger, who headed up a committee which applied feministic "inclusive language" concepts to

the Word of God in his New Revised Standard Version, might not appreciate Burgon's biblical view of womanhood. Metzger also fails to remind his readers that a great many of Burgon's contemporaries, probably the majority, in fact, held the same view as Burgon. What about Metzger's hero F.J.A. Hort? Since this type of thing is important, of so it would appear, why does he fail to tell his readers that *Hort* opposed women's suffrage in 1850? Or that *Hort* was a racist for writing in 1862 of the black man, "As yet everywhere (not in slavery only) they have surely shown themselves only as an immeasurably inferior race, just human and no more, their religion frothy and sensuous, their highest virtues those of a good Newfoundland dog" (Arthur Hort, *Life and Letter of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. 1, p. 458)? Why does Metzger not label *Hort* a champion of lost causes? Why does Metzger pick out an example like this while failing to detail Burgon's amazing and in some ways unexcelled credentials in textual scholarship, and while failing to cite Burgon's wonderful defense of the perfect inspiration of Scripture against the rationalism of his day? The answer lies, we believe, in the fact that Metzger himself is a Rationalist, as we have seen earlier in Chapter One.

Metzger summarizes the 1,500 or so pages of John Burgon's incredibly well researched, carefully-reasoned, biblically-based defense of the Traditional Text as "theological and speculative." This is amazing. To say that Burgon's defense of the Bible text

was *speculative* is simply a lie. To use any other term would be inaccurate. But wait a minute. What in the world is wrong with a *theological* defense of the Bible! Theology is merely the teaching of the Word of God. There is no other proper way for the text of Scripture to be examined than theologically.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 160-162

...We have already considered Bruce Metzger's unbelief in Chapter One. With his rationalistic biases, it is no surprise to me that he would quickly pass over Burgon's defense of the Traditional Text. Burgon's powerful writings are devastating to Metzger's own position on biblical inspiration as well as to his position on the Bible text.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 164

APPENDIX III

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS (1841-1913)

Biblical scholar and Presbyterian minister. A native of New York City, Briggs was educated at the University of Virginia (1857-1860), Union Theological Seminary in New York (1861-1863) and the University of Berlin (1866-1869). In 1874, after brief service as a Presbyterian pastor, he accepted a call to Union Theological Seminary in New York where, in 1876, he assumed the chair of Hebrew and Cognate languages.

In 1880 Briggs became co-editor, with Archibald A. Hodge of Princeton Seminary, of the newly founded *Presbyterian Review*. Before long the *Review* proved to be a source of profound tension as Briggs's higher-critical views conflicted sharply with the more traditional Princeton doctrine of Scripture. This, combined with differences over proposed Presbyterian confessional revision, led to the dissolution of the journal in 1889.

Throughout the 1880s Briggs published works which championed the higher-critical method and questioned the orthodoxy of Princeton Theology. Despite strong opposition to these positions in the church, it was Briggs's inaugural address, "The Authority of Holy Scripture" (1891), delivered upon his induction into the chair of biblical studies at Union, which precipitated one of the most famous heresy trials in American religious history.

In a polemical tone Briggs denied the verbal inspiration,

inerrancy and authenticity of Scripture, appeared to place the authority of reason and the church on a par with the Bible and defended the doctrine of progressive sanctification after death. As a result, the 1891 General Assembly vetoed Briggs's professorial appointment, the 1892 Assembly specifically endorsed the doctrine of biblical inerrancy and the 1893 Assembly suspended Briggs from the ministry. In addition the controversy occasioned the divorce of Union Seminary and the Presbyterian Church.

Briggs retained his position at Union and, in 1898, entered the priesthood of the Episcopal Church. A growing concern for church union led him to resign his chair in 1904 to teach symbolics and irenics. Briggs authored over twenty books, including *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899). Together with F. Brown and S. R. Driver he edited *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (1906), which is still in use today, and served as one of the original editors of the prestigious *International Critical Commentary*.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in
America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990. 188

APPENDIX IV

PHILIP SCHAFF (1819-1893)

German Reformed church historian and ecumenist. Born in Chur, Switzerland, Schaff received his education at the Universities of Tübingen (1837-1839), Halle (1839-1840) and Berlin (1840-1842), where he came under the influence of such notable scholars as Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860), Friedrich A. G. Tholuck (1799-1877) and Johann A. Neander (1789-1850). Upon completing his studies in 1842, Schaff became *privatdocent* at the University of Berlin. The next year Schaff accepted an invitation by representatives of the newly organized German Reformed Seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, to become a professor there. He arrived to take up his duties in August of 1844, and so began a career of nearly a half-century of scholarship at the forefront of the study of church history. Schaff taught at Mercersburg until 1865, lecturing occasionally at Drew and Hartford seminaries between 1868 and 1871, and in 1870 he accepted a professorship at Union Theological Seminary in New York, where he remained until his death.

In addition to his pioneering work in church history, Schaff served as secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee and was influential in the reorganization of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance in 1866, serving as its corresponding secretary until 1873, and spending hundreds of hours and traveling

thousands of miles to organize the World Conference of the Alliance held in New York City, October 2-12, 1873. From 1870 to 1885, Schaff was involved with the committee for the American Revised Bible translation project and served as president to that committee (1872-1885). He founded the American Society of Church History in 1888 and served as president of that organization until his death in 1893.

In addition to these many commitments, Schaff published an astounding number of books and articles. He edited *Der Deutsch Kirchenfreund* (1884-1854), wrote regularly for the *Mercersburg Review*, serving as its co-editor (1857-1861), and founded the German periodical *Evangelische Zeugnisse aus den Deutschen Kirchen in Amerika*, which was issued from 1863 to 1865. His first major work in America was *The Principle of Protestantism* (1845), an expansion of his inaugural address at Mercersburg Seminary. This work, which brought upon Schaff charges of heresy and Romanism, traced the development of the Christian church through history and emphasized the value of the church in every age. Schaff's assertion that the Reformation was "the legitimate offspring, the greatest act of the Catholic Church" provoked strong protest among the militantly Protestant wing of the German Reformed clergy. Then next year, Schaff published *What Is Church History?*, a summary of his theology of the history of the Christian church.

After a decade in Mercersburg, Schaff took a sabbatical leave

and returned to Europe, where he presented a series of addresses about his "adopted fatherland." Published in German as *Amerika* (1854), they appeared in English the following year. There Schaff attempted to explain and defend the American system in which church and state were separated and complete religious liberty enjoyed. In 1858 Schaff published the first volume of his most ambitious work, his *History of the Christian Church*, which ultimately grew to eight volumes (the two on the Middle Ages were written by his son, David, after Schaff's death). On the centennial of the United States Constitution, he issued an interpretation of the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty entitled *Church and State in the United States*.

As an editor, he presided over the translation of Johann Peter Lange's (1802-1884) massive *Bibelwork*, a project finally completed in 1880 when the last of twenty-five volumes was published. From 1880-1886 Schaff edited the first series of fourteen volumes of *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, co-editing with Henry Wace the first two volumes of the second series. In 1877 the first edition of Schaff's three-volume *Creeds of Christendom* appeared. The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* was published in three volumes (1882-1884). Finally, he originated and organized the American Society of Church History's thirteen-volume American Church History Series. Inspiring all of his prodigious labors was Schaff's

ultimate goal to heal the wounds caused by divisions in the church.
His epitaph is apt: "He advocated the reunion of Christendom."

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in
America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
1051-1052

APPENDIX V

THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

A North American association of Biblical scholars. founded in 1880, during a period in which several other scholarly societies were being founded, in view of American interest in the Scriptures it is not surprising that the first major scholarly religious society focused on the Bible. Instrumental in the founding were Frederic Gardiner, Charles A. Briggs and Philip Schaff. There were thirty-two male charter members, mostly seminary and college professors; all were Protestants from the Northeast. By the turn of the century, Jews, Catholics and women had been inducted. The purpose of the society as it was stated in 1884 has remained essentially unchanged: "The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on biblical topics."

Papers at the annual meetings, later published in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, focused on philology, exegesis, archaeology, text and translation, and literary criticism. Most of the articles were moderate in regard to criticism and non-polemical, with controversies over higher criticism appearing in church-related journals. Since 1910 the papers have reflected trends and positions in international critical scholarship.

The Society has expanded by establishing regional sections; publishing monographs, dissertations, texts and translation, an

additional journal entitled *Semeia* and cooperating in placement and other services under the umbrella of Scholars Press. The members of the Society represent the full diversity of those teaching the Judeo-Christian Scriptures in seminaries, universities, colleges and biblical institutes, as well as those serving churches and synagogues in North America. In the last 1980s there were approximately seven thousand members, with the Society's offices located in Decatur, Georgia.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

1108

APPENDIX VI

RUDOLF KARL BULTMANN (1884-1976)

German biblical scholar and theologian. Born in Wiefelstede, Bultmann graduated from the *Gymnasium* of Oldenburg in 1903 and did undergraduate work at the universities of Tübingen, Berlin and Marburg under the distinguished theologians and biblical scholars of his day (1903-1906). Encouraged to pursue further studies, Bultmann completed his doctoral degree at the University of Marburg (1910) and later served as an instructor at the university (1912-1916). He was then assistant professor at Breslau (1916-1920) and in 1920 became full professor at Giessen but stayed only one year. In 1921 he returned to Marburg to serve the rest of his career as professor of New Testament and early Christian history (1921-1951). After retiring he remained in Marburg until his death twenty-five years later.

Bultmann is most widely known for his program for "demythologizing" the New Testament. Defining myth as the attempt to objectify powers that cannot be objectified, as in the case of angels, demons, heaven and a heavenly redeemer, Bultmann called for a hermeneutic that would interpret the mythically conveyed truth of the New Testament into terms meaningful to modern people. In this sense he distinguished himself from nineteenth-century liberal theologians who attempted to find the historical Jesus behind what they believed were the eschatological and mythical trappings of the

Gospels--a Jesus whose moral teachings could give shape and substance to liberal Christianity.

Bultmann's own investigation of the New Testament was guided by form criticism, a method he was instrumental in developing. His research into the synoptic Gospels yielded little reliable information about the historical Jesus and much that reflected the faith of the early Christians as it grew out of their subjective and visionary experiences of the resurrected Christ. Jesus, the Jewish eschatological teacher, had been transformed by the early church into the heavenly Lord, modeled after the gnostic heavenly redeemer.

But this paucity of reliable information about the historical Jesus did not trouble Bultmann. Heavily influenced by the existentialism of his Marburg colleague Martin Heidegger (1899-1976), Bultmann interpreted the Christian message in terms of the Word of God that addresses moderns in their scientific and technological quest for security. To seek a historical Jesus was to abandon faith and engage in a quest for security and freedom apart from God. Reflective of an inauthentic existence at best, theologically speaking, it was a quest for knowledge of Christ after the flesh (2 Cor 5:16) rather than an encounter with the Word that calls men and women to meaningful existence. Thus he wedded a call to existential freedom with a modern rendition of the

Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone.

This perspective was profoundly human-centered rather than God-centered. Bultmann was not only able to give a fresh alternative to the dilemma of the liberal quest for the historical Jesus, but also to provide a recasting of the Christian message that was attractive to many modern intellectuals who were troubled by the erosion of the foundations of their faith in the face of biblical criticism and lived in an age that raised new and troubling questions about the meaning of human existence.

Bultmann's influence in America spread largely through his writings, which in turn attracted students to Marburg from the U.S. Bultmann's *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921) did not appear in English translation until 1963, though its influence was felt in the scholarly world long before then. *Jesus and the Word* (1926) appeared in English in 1934 and helped introduce his method and thought to America. In 1951 he traveled to the U.S. and gave the Shaffer Lectures at Yale Divinity School and the Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University, as well as lecturing at several other leading American divinity schools. These lectures were published in the popular introduction to his thought, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (1958). A number of other significant works eventually found their way into English, including *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (1941; ET 1971); *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols. (1948-1953; ET 1951, 1955) and the partially translated *Kerygma and*

Myth (1948-1955; ET 1953-1962). In addition, some of his American students became leading New Testament scholars and further promoted his views.

Bultmann's influence among biblical scholars and theologians of the latter half of the twentieth century has been second to none. Yet his synthesis of literary-critical method, religious-historical approach and philosophical interpretation has gradually eroded. New discoveries and insights into the world of Judaism and Hellenistic religion have severely undercut Bultmann's view of the shape of Hellenistic religion and its influence on New Testament writers. By the 1980s a new generation of scholars was more optimistic about clarifying its picture of the historical Jesus against the background of a newly enhanced understanding of first-century Judaism. Moreover, Bultmann's individualistic existential interpretation of the New Testament lost much of its impact during the 1960s, when societal upheaval turned the attention of the churches to social issues and a world-formative Christianity.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

200-201

Prominent twentieth-century German theologian and New Testament scholar; known primarily for his theological method of "demythologizing" the New Testament.

Bultmann was born in Wiefelstede and educated at Tübingen, Berlin, and Marburg universities. He taught at Marburg (1912-1916), Breslau (1916-1920), and Giessen (1920-1921), and then returned to Marburg (1921-1951). In 1951 he was appointed professor emeritus at Marburg and thereafter made several lecture tours to Scandinavia, Holland, and the United States. He delivered the Shaffer lectures at Yale University (1951), which became his book *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (1958). His 1955 Gifford lectures at Edinburgh University (Scotland) were published as *The Presence of Eternity* (1957).

Bultmann's theological thinking stemmed partly from his family heritage. His father, born to missionary parents in Sierra Leone (Africa), was clergyman in the Evangelical Lutheran Church; his maternal grandfather was also a minister. The political events of twentieth-century Europe also contributed to his thought. One of his brothers was killed in World War I, the other in a concentration camp in World War II. Bultmann was a supporter of the German "Confessing Church" in the 1930s and a signer of the Barmen Declaration, that movement's statement of opposition to Nazism's growing control over church affairs.

Theological debate in the universities helped to shape

Bultmann's systematic thought. Various German theologians and biblical scholars (among them Hermann Gunkel, Adolf Harnack, Johannes Weiss, and Adolf Julicher) influenced the young Bultmann. He was also impressed by the teachings of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), often called the "father of liberalism." Two contemporaries, Karl Barth and Friedrich Gogarten, both shared with Bultmann an existentialist outlook on life, although Barth eventually renounced his early philosophical zeal. Especially influential was Bultmann's Marburg colleague, existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). Such influences and Bultmann's own originality created a unique modern theology of New Testament interpretation.

Bultmann's first book, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921), was based on an interpretative method known as "form criticism." The material of the Gospels supposedly existed first as an oral tradition in various "forms" conditioned by different circumstances. Bultmann contended that the forms of New Testament tradition were rarely intended as historical reports, but were shaped by preaching and teaching. Thus he concluded that the Gospels were not reliable sources for a history of the life of Jesus; they were theological, but not factual.

Bultmann's later thought further developed a division between theological truth and historical fact. His 1941 essay "The New Testament and Mythology" set forth his own ideas and laid the

foundation for a significant symposium on biblical interpretation published in English as *Kerygma and Myth* (1953). He understood the historical elements of the New Testament to reflect a "myth" or worldview that is unacceptable to a modern scientific outlook. Hence that old worldview must be reinterpreted (demythologized) in order for the truth contained in the Gospels to become clear to the modern mind.

Building on Heidegger's existentialism, Bultmann closely associated theological truth and present human experience. For Bultmann, the truth of the Gospels can be grasped only through an act of decision in response to the "proclaimed Word of God" (*kerygma* in Greek). Such decision is not based on reasonable historical evidence (Bultmann denied that possibility), but on an experience of Christ's eternal presence.

According to Bultmann, the New Testament authors were not trying write facts about God and the world. Rather, they were expressing in inadequate human terms their encounter with the kerygmatic Christ. God had acted and spoken in Jesus, but humans wrote the Bible as their reaction to God's Word. Bultmann rejected the Bible's three-storied universe (heaven, earth, and hell) and its view of history as spiritually controlled; he believed those concepts were derived from Jewish apocalypticism (prophetic, visionary writing) or gnostic redemption stories. He also disqualified such doctrines as the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and

the Resurrection. The modern worldview and sense of morality, said Bultmann, prohibit blind acceptance of such material as factual stories. For Bultmann, a loss of belief in Jesus' historicity is a benefit for true faith; to locate Jesus in a world of facts and "objectivity" would miss the present meaning of Christ, the object of faith.

However, the inadequacy of biblical language and doctrine does not mean that nothing significant happened in biblical history. In Jesus, God confronted the Bible's writers; today he confronts the readers of the Bible. The "myths" are not to be dismissed but interpreted, or demythologized, for clear communication of their meaning for faith. By demythologizing the New Testament, Bultmann believed he was recovering Christianity's essence and making it accessible to the modern mind.

The basic focus of interpretation for Bultmann's theology was human existence as a complex of anxieties and decisions. He saw authentic life as full of risks, offering a person no guarantees. For Bultmann, Christian faith is similar to other human choices, resting on unseen realities expressed in the story of Jesus Christ rather than on factual certainties. Theology, to Bultmann, must also lack easy guarantees and be dialectical in character. Christian theology proclaims that God has acted for people's good in Christ. Such a faith replaces anxiety and guilt with love and confidence toward God, who makes life's risks worthwhile.

Bultmann's views provoked a debate that has not ended. Some critics have objected to his selective use of an existentialist philosophy in his theological work; theologians and philosophers alike suspect that he inadequately united the two disciplines. His views of history have also been challenged as a threat to faith rather than a help. Demythologizing could logically lead to belief that Jesus never lived and that factual history has no bearing at all on the content of faith. Bultmann's use of the term *myth* has also been criticized; all kinds of symbolic or analogical language might be included in his definition, leaving no possibility for any way to speak about God. His theology thus could lead to a godless worldview, or at least one in which nothing about God could be known.

In addition to works already mentioned, Bultmann's important writings include *Jesus and the Word* (1926), *The Gospel of John* (1941), *Essays, Philosophical and Theological* (1954), and a three-volume *Theology of the New Testament* (1948, 1951, 1953).

Douglas, J.D., Ed., et. al. Who's Who In Christian History.

Wheaton, IL.: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992. 116-117

APPENDIX VII

DEMYTHOLOGIZATION

Rudolf Bultmann's 1941 essay, "New Testament and Mythology," spoke of demythologization (German, *Entmythologisierung*) as a method of interpreting the New Testament. His concern was to communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ to modern men and women who no longer believe in literal phenomena such as angels, demons and a heavenly redeemer, but regard them as mythical images from a pre-scientific world view. Bultmann argued that biblical myths are not to be ignored, as was done by many nineteenth-century liberals, but interpreted as portrayals of a self-understanding. Biblical interpreters must ask what this mythology points toward, what it says about God, the world and human existence. To explain the message of the Christian myth, Bultmann drew upon existential philosophy, especially that of his colleague Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). Bultmann maintained that only when texts are demythologized can one come to a faith decision and commitment to Christ who redeems individuals from self-centeredness and calls them to authentic existence in reliance on God's grace.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

349-350

APPENDIX VIII

A REAPPRAISAL OF RUDOLF BULTMANN IN THE LIGHT OF FORM CRITICISM

The second half of the twenty-first century has seen a revival of "form criticism." This method of criticism was widely used by New Testament scholars in the twentieth century. They would take a story or saying in the gospels, analyze the "form" in which it was written, and deduce from that analysis how and why the story or saying was passed on and modified in the early church.

By the end of the twentieth century, form criticism of the gospels was no longer practiced. Scholars had come to realize how little was known about the period with which gospel form criticism was concerned--the years between the resurrection of Jesus and the writing of the gospels. The form critics were seen to have worked largely by guesswork. Form criticism became discredited as a scholarly technique.

In recent years, however, form criticism has been revived in a different area. It is now used as a tool for analyzing, not the New Testament itself, but the writings of twentieth-century New Testament scholars. This is a more fruitful use of the tool because we know a great deal about the "life situation" (*Sitz im Leben*) of twentieth-century scholars. We have, for example, the recent study by Professor Dee in which he analyzes that most characteristic of twentieth-century scholarly art forms, the doctoral dissertation. In this article I wish to contribute to

this developing area of research by means of a form-critical analysis of a passage from *The Gospel of John* by Rudolf Bultmann.

The subject matter of this passage is the miracle of changing water into wine as recorded in John 2:1-11. Bultmann believed the gospel writer took this story from a previous source:

The source [*Quelle*] counted this as the first miracle. It is easy to see why it put it at the beginning of its collection; for it is an epiphany miracle. There are no analogies with it in the old tradition of Jesus-stories, and in comparison with them it appears strange and alien to us. There can be no doubt that the story has been taken over from heathen legend and ascribed to Jesus. In fact the motif of the story, the changing of the water into wine, is a typical motif of the Dionysus legend. In the legend this miracle is the miracle of the epiphany of the god, and was therefore dated on the day of the Dionysus Feast, that is on the night of the 5th to 6th of January. This relationship was still understood in the Early Church, which saw the Feast of Christ's Baptism as his epiphany and celebrated it on the 6th of January. Equally it held that the 6th of January was the date of the marriage at Cana.

The key sentence in this passage is, "There can be no doubt that the story has been taken over from heathen legend and ascribed

to Jesus." Professor Crochipp has classified this sentence as a DS (Dogmatic Statement). Crochipp lists three categories of the DS: the DS^p, Dogmatic Statement Based on Presupposition; the DS^g, Dogmatic Statement Based on Guesswork; and the DS^{ie}, Dogmatic Statement Based on Insufficient Evidence. Common to all three categories are two characteristics of the DS, namely,

- a. an introductory formula stating there can be no other interpretation, and
- b. failure to mention the other interpretations that were available.

These two characteristics are clearly present in the key sentence:

- a. the introductory formula--"there can be no doubt that..."
- b. failure to mention the other interpretations which could be found in commentaries on the same story in contemporary authors.

Scholars disagree as to which category of DS this Key sentence represents. Some classify it as a DS^p. They point out that Bultmann's rejection of one possible explanation of the story (namely, that the miracle actually happened) was a result of his presupposition about miracles. As is well known, Bultmann was under the influence of the twentieth-century "modern man" mythology. He therefore rejected the possibility of any miracle that could not be explained by the limited scientific knowledge of his day.

Others classify the sentence as a DS^{ie}. They claim that Bultmann did bring forward evidence, though not sufficient to prove his point. This evidence was fourfold: (a) the miracle story differed from the miracle stories in the Synoptic Gospels; (2) the story appeared strange and alien to twentieth-century Europeans; (3) the motif of the story appeared also in legends about the Greek god Dionysus; and (4) the early church observed the night of the feast of Dionysus as the Feast of the Epiphany and as the date of the marriage at Cana.

None of these statements, however, can properly be called evidence for the origin of the story. Certainly there is a parallel between the gospel story and the Dionysus legend; but a parallel proves nothing about origins. Bultmann's DS was, it would seem, a guess. Of the many possible ways of explaining the origin of the story, this was the one that appealed to him. We should therefore classify it as a DS^g.

In the course of the twenty-first century there has been much discussion of the Bultmannian DS as a literary form. Scholars have understood the significance of the form in three ways.

1. *The literal interpretation.* According to the literal interpretation all Bultmann's statements were intended as statements of fact. When he wrote "there can be no doubt" he literally meant *there can be no doubt*. The problem with this interpretation is that in Bultmann's day there both could be and

was doubt.

Consider, for example, the commentary of C. K. Barrett. Barrett, like Bultmann, referred to the legendary power of Dionysus to change water into wine, but he also pointed out that the Jewish writer Philo referred to the Logos as the winegiver. In Barrett's opinion, John might have followed the Jewish precedent of Philo; or "it is even conceivable that the miracle story had a non-Christian origin" (157); or again, the story could be related to the synoptic tradition, with its references to wine and wedding feasts. "The Johannine narrative may have simply been made up out of these elements, or John may have taken an already existing story and...used it to bring out these points" (157-58).

Barrett's comments exemplify the normal "form" of a twentieth-century scholarly commentary. The characteristics of this form were (a) an examination of various possible interpretations and (b) a refusal to dogmatize where the evidence was inconclusive. By contrast, Bultmann's commentary contains only a Dogmatic Statement of one possible hypothesis. It seems incredible that a scientific twentieth-century scholar should have intended literally a statement of this kind.

2. *The existential interpretation.* The existential interpretation is based on the distinction that Bultmann drew elsewhere between "Historie" (the bare facts of history) and "Geschichte" (*meaningful* history). According to this

interpretation, Bultmann's Dogmatic Statement was "Geschichte" and could be paraphrased as follows.

The assumption that this story has been taken over from heathen legend gives us today a basis for existential decision making about which we can have no doubt.

Professor Ampelophilos has suggested that the decision making Bultmann had in mind concerned the wine industry, so vital to the economy of Germany in the twentieth century. Ampelophilos thinks the wine industry may have been under threat at that period, because of social problems connected with alcoholism. If the church of Bultmann's day were to recognize that the gospel story was dependent on a pagan wine festival, it could then make an existential decision to support more actively the traditional wine festivals of Germany, many of which had similar pagan origins.

However true this may be, most scholars regard the views of Professor Ampelophilos as eccentric. but it is not easy to think of any other existential decision that could have been in Bultmann's mind when he made his Dogmatic Statement.

3. *The criminological interpretation.* Advocates of the criminological interpretation point out the many similarities between twentieth-century New Testament scholars and the heroes of the detective stories so popular at that period. Like the fictional detectives, the scholars spoke with great authority. They were able to show up other investigators for the fools they

were. They alone could discern, amid the mass of evidence, those clues that were significant. They had disciples who wrote theses under their direction, just as detectives had disciples (often called "Watsons") who admired and reported their methods of detection. Many critics therefore regard the work of Bultmann as belonging to the *Gattung* of the detective fiction.

We should not underestimate the psychological importance of the detective story for Christians in the twentieth century. At a time when the traditional sources of infallibility, the church and the Bible, were under increasing attack, the illusion of infallibility created by the great fictional detectives was very comforting. It is significant that many detective stories were written by leading religious authors, such as G. K. Chesterton and Dorothy Sayers. For Christians in need of reassurance, the Bultmannian Dogmatic Statement may well have performed a psychological function similar to that of the detective story.

Nevertheless, there was one decisive difference between Bultmann and the detectives. The best detectives always based their conclusions upon sound evidence. If they did resort to guesswork, their guesses were not made public until they had been objectively confirmed. Their pronouncements were thus quite unlike the DS which, in its characteristic Bultmannian form, was based either on insufficient evidence or on none at all.

4. *The gelotological interpretation.* Previous attempts to

analyze the form of the Bultmannian Dogmatic Statement have proved unconvincing, I wish to adduce a twentieth-century parallel that, I believe, can throw new light on this problem. It forms part of an essay by a latter contemporary of Bultmann, Frank Muir.

In my opinion the decline of the British nation as a great power is directly connected with the decline in our consumption of boiled pudding.

It is an undeniable fact that our nation began to lose its preeminence at the same time as the good, old-fashioned steamed suet pudding fell into desuetude.

Professor Ernest Chuckle, Professor of Risible Science at Aberdeen University, in his study of humorous writing in the twentieth century, puts Frank Muir in the category of "sit-down comics." These were comedians who appeared on television and took part in intellectual games. One of the requirements of a sit-down comic was to keep what was known as a "straight face"--to make statements purporting to be statements of fact without betraying their falsity by facial expression. This style of speaking and writing, which belonged originally to the playing of intellectual games, was then extended to other fields.

The twentieth century is often called "the age of sport." sport was the major preoccupation of many people in that century. More pages in newspapers were devoted to sport than to any other subject. It would therefore be natural for an academic writer of

that period, who wished to present his material in a form the general public would understand, to employ the "sporting" style of sit-down comedy. The problem for us in the twenty-first century is that we do not instinctively appreciate this style of writing. Only when the literary form of a twentieth-century work has been determined can the modern reader discern whether its statements are intended literally or humorously.

In my opinion, the parallel between the method of argument of Bultmann and that of Muir is so close that we must regard their writings as belonging to the same literary genre. I hope that, when this is recognized, the works of Bultmann, which are now little read except by researchers in twentieth-century studies, will be appreciated for what they are--masterpieces of twentieth-century comedy.

Hall, David R. The Seven Pillories of Wisdom. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1990. 121-126

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balmer, Randall. Mine Eyes Have Seen The Glory. A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture of America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Bauman, Michael and Martin I. Klauber. Historians of the Christian Tradition. Their Methodology And Influence On Western Thought. Nashville, TN.: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995.
- Becker, Carl L. Everyman His Own Historian. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966.
- Bloesch, Donald G. Holy Scripture. Revelation, Inspiration & Interpretation. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Bolich, Gregory G. Karl Barth & Evangelicalism. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1980.
- Boyd, Robert T. Boyd's Bible Handbook. Eugene, OR.: Harvest House Publishers, 1983.
- Brown, Robert E. Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution. East Lansing, MI.: The Spartan Press, 1970.
- Christian History. Vol. XV, No. 2, 1996.
- Clark, Gordon H. Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism. Jefferson, MD.: The Trinity Foundation, 1986.
- Cloud, David W. For Love of the Bible. Revised and enlarged. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995.
- Douglas, J.D., ed., et. al. Who's Who In Christian History. Wheaton, IL.: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992.
- Erickson, Millard J. God in Three Persons. A Contemporary Interpretation of the Trinity. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Books, 1995.
- George, Timothy and David S. Dockery. Baptist Theologians. Nashville, TN.: Broadman Press, 1990.
- Gordon, Ernest. The Leaven of the Sadducees. Wheaton, IL.: Church League of America, 1973.

- Graham, Stephen R. Cosmos in the Chaos. Philip Schaff's Interpretation of Nineteenth-Century American Religion. Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Grenz, Stanley. Isaac Backus-Puritan and Baptist. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Grenz, Stanley, ed. Perspectives on Theology in the Contemporary World. Essays in Honor of Bernard Ramm. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1990.
- Hall, David R. The Seven Pillories of Wisdom. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1990.
- Heldenbrand, Richard L. Christianity and New Evangelical Philosophies. Winona Lake, IN.: Richard L. Heldenbrand, 1989.
- La More, Gary E. Dr. Kenneth Taylor's Search For The Living Bible. Scarborough, ON.: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 1992.
- _____. Following in the Footsteps of a Liberal: The Life and Work of Dr. Philip Schaff. Scarborough, ON.: Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 1993.
- _____. Subjectivism in Religion: Eleven Theological Personalities. Watertown, WI.: Maranatha Baptist Bible College, 1979.
- Linnemann, Eta. Historical Criticism of the Bible. Methodology or Ideology? Reflections of a Bultmannian turned evangelical. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1990.
- _____. Is There A Synoptic Problem? Rethinking the Literary Dependence of the First Three Gospels. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Millard, Catherine. The Rewriting of America's History. Camp Hill, PA.: Horizon House Publishers, 1991.
- Montgomery, John Warwick. The Suicide of Christian Theology. Minneapolis, MN.: Bethany Fellowship Inc., 1970.
- Moriarty, Michael G. The New Charismatics. A Concerned Voice Responds To Dangerous New Trends. Grand Rapids, MI.: Z o n d e r v a n Publishing House, 1992.

- Noll, Mark A. Between Faith and Criticism. Second edition. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Book House, 1991.
- Penzel, Klaus, ed. Philip Schaff. Historian and Ambassador of the Universal Church. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1991.
- Phillips, J.B. Ring of Truth. A Translator's Testimony. Wheaton, IL.: Harold Shaw Publishers, 1967.
- Pickering, Wilbur N. The Identity of the New Testament Text. Revised Edition. Nashville, TN.: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980.
- Pugh, Curtis. "God's Blessings on the King James Bible," The Berea Baptist Banner, XVII, Number 6 (June 5, 1996).
- Quebedeaux, Richard. The New Charismatics. The Origins, Development, and Significance of Neo-Pentecostalism. Garden City, NY.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976.
- _____. The Worldly Evangelicals. Has success spoiled America's born again Christians? New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978.
- _____. The Young Evangelicals. The Story of The Emergence Of A New Generation Of Evangelicals. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Ramm, Bernard. After Fundamentalism. The Future of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco, CA.: Harper & Row, 1983.
- Reid, Daniel G., ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. Neoorthodoxy. An Evangelical Evaluation of Barthianism. Chicago: Moody Press, 1956.
- Scalia, Antonin. "We Are Fools For Christ's Sake," Intercessors For American Newsletter, XXIII, Number 6 (June 1996).
- Schmitt, Wilhelm Ernst. Steps Toward Apostasy At Wheaton College. Wheaton, IL.: Wilhelm Ernst Schmitt, 1966.
- Shafer, Paul W. and John Howland Snow. The Turning of the Tides. New Canaan, CT.: The LONG HOUSE, Inc., 1962.
- Shriver, George H., ed. American Religious Heretics. Formal and

- Informal Trials In American Protestantism. Nashville, TN.: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Shriver, George. Philip Schaff. Christian Scholar and Ecumenical Prophet. Centennial Biography For The American Society Of Church History. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Sightler, James H., M.D. Tabernacle Essays on Bible Translation. Greenville, SC.: Tabernacle Baptist Church, 1993.
- Strouse, Thomas M. Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version. Virginia Beach, VA.: Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary, 1996.
- Sullivan, Clayton. Called To Preach Condemned To Survive. The Education of Clayton Sullivan. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- The New American Desk Encyclopedia. New York: NAL Penguin Inc., 1989.
- Turabian, Kate L. A Manual For Writers of term papers, theses and dissertations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. The Frontier In American History. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Van Seters, John. In Search of History. Historiography In The Ancient World And The Origins Of Biblical History. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Wells, David F. No Place For Truth. Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology? Grand Rapids, MI.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- White, James Emery. What Is Truth? A Comparative Study of the Positions of Cornelius Van Til, Francis Schaeffer, Carl F.H. Henry, Donald Bloesch and Millard Erickson. Nashville, TN.: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Zuck, Roy B. Basic Bible Interpretation. A Practical Guide To Discovering Biblical Truth. Wheaton, IL.: Victor Books, 1991.