

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSF

BULLETIN

APRIL 1981

TSF BULLETIN

VOL. 4 No. 5

Formerly *TSF News & Reviews*
Published by Theological Students
Fellowship, 233 Langdon, Madison WI
53703. ISSN No. 0272-3913

Editor: **Mark Lau Branson**
(TSF General Secretary)

Advisory Editors: **Clark H. Plinck**
(Toronto School of Theology)
Paul A. Mickey
(Lake Divinity School, on leave '80-'81)

Managing Editor: **John Duff**
(TSF Administrative Assistant)

Associate Editors:
Stephen T. Davis (Claremont Men's
College) Philosophy; **Robert E.
Wykenberg** (University of Wisconsin)
World Religions; **Robert L. Hubbard**
(Denver Seminary) Old Testament;
Richard J. Mouw (Calvin College) Ethics;
Thomas C. Oden (Drew University
Theological School) Pastoral Theology;
Grant R. Osborne (Trinity Evangelical
Divinity School) New Testament; **Donald
Ponder** (New College, Berkeley) Church
History; **David L. Watson** (Perkins School
of Theology) Evangelism/Missions; **Keith
Windell** (University of Wisconsin) World
Religions.

Contributing Editors (Professors):
Donald Bloesch (University of Dubuque
Theological Seminary); **Russell Burck**
(Lush-Presbyterian-St. Lukes Medical
Center, Chicago); **Donald Buteyn** (San
Francisco Theological Seminary); **Charles
Hlenbaum** (College of DuPage); **Larry
Lurtado** (University of Manitoba); **Bernard
Lamm** (American Baptist Seminary of the
West); **James Parker, III** (Eastern Baptist
Theological Seminary); **Stanley Riegel**
(Trinity Western College, B.C.); **Gerald
Sheppard** (Union Theological Seminary,
New York); **R. Edward Turner** (Andrews
University Theological School).

Contributing Editors (Students):
Douglas Anderson (Graduate Theological
Union, Berkeley); **Vaughn Baker** (Perkins
School of Theology); **Terry Donaldson**
(Toronto School of Theology); **Kapp
Johnson** (Claremont Graduate School);
Susanne Johnson (Princeton Theological
Seminary); **David N. Jones** (Vanderbilt
University); **Hal Miller** (Boston College);
Kenneth Morris (University of Georgia);
Ian Padgett (Drew University Theological
School); **John Simpson** (Fuller Theological
Seminary).

Editorial Assistants:
John Hobbins, Terri Olson.

FOUNDATIONS *(Doing theology on the basics of classical faith)*

Notations on a Theology of the Holy Spirit Ray S. Anderson 2

ACADEME *(Reports from seminary classrooms, special events, and TSF chapters)*

Psychological Perspectives on Conversion Lewis R. Rambo 4

INQUIRY *(Questions, proposals, discussions, and research reports on theological and biblical issues)*

Response to John Woodbridge Donald K. McKim 6

Old Testament Textual Criticism: Some Recent Proposals
A. J. Petrotta 9

INTERSECTION *(The integration of theological studies with ethics, academic disciplines, and ecclesiastical institutions)*

Evangelical Women's Caucus Ann Ramsey Moore 10

SPIRITUAL FORMATION *(Probing questions, suggestions, and encouragement in areas of personal and spiritual growth)*

Tough and Tender—A Word to Graduating Seminarians
Donald K. McKim 11

Henri Nouwen: Spiritual Guide for a Church in Transition
Robert Durback 11

REVIEWS *(Notes and critiques on recent books and periodicals)*

Review Essay on Theiselton's *The Two Horizons* 16

Book Reviews (Itemized on back cover)

Noteworthy Articles 24

ing to the biblical concept of conversion, various authors have argued that the entire Christian pilgrimage is one of turning and/or returning to God.⁵ Moreover, conversion is not merely an emotional experience which benefits the individual alone, but is a process in which God makes us vulnerable to the transcendent which constantly makes us break out of comfortable situations. Conversion is thus seen as a lifelong process of breaking away from selfishness and pride and turning to the Living God and to the needs of our fellow human beings.⁶

These seven stages of the conversion process characterize many of the people I have interviewed over the last year of research. Another way of viewing the process is the five themes of patterns discovered by Theodore Sarbin and Nathan Adler in their studies of radical personality change.⁷ These are not a sequence of events like my stages, but rather a cluster of processes which take place in the dramatic change of an individual. The core of their understanding is the modification of a person's view of the self. The answers to the questions "Who am I?" and "What am I?" are significantly different after a person has experienced a conversion. The first theme is that of *symbolic death and rebirth*. The old self may be seen as part of the dark and evil world, and the new self as transferred into the kingdom of light. The second theme is the relationship of the self to a group. The social dimension is crucial in providing a new interpretation of life, new models for behavior, and new sources of affirmation and support. The third and fourth themes are closely related. They involve ritual and what Sarbin and Adler call "proprioceptive stimuli." In other words, a significant learning takes place in ways other than the merely intellectual. Physical alterations, such as fasting, elimination of drug consumption, etc., intensify the learning that the *self* is being transformed. Sarbin and Adler's fifth theme is that of "triggers." Their research demonstrates, and mine would agree, that there are critical events which the convert sees as the turning point of his/her life. In an intense moment, the person perceives that new life is an option and a break with the old life in imperative. Some may express it as "meeting the Lord Jesus and surrendering to his will," while others may sense that they have been forced by circumstances to acknowledge the sovereignty and mercy of God. One person I interviewed had such an experience after many days in solitary confinement in a prison. These five themes and patterns interact at many points in the seven stage process outlined previously.

Conversion is ultimately the encounter of the person with God in Christ. This happens in many different ways for many different people. The above stages are not to be seen as normative, but as a model for assimilating the data from many converts whose experiences have been rather dramatic and sudden.

Although the focus has been on the individual, the conversion experience is not for the pleasure of the individual. Rather, conversion is the radical alteration of a person's life: from self to God and from self to the service of others. The validity of a conversion must be questioned if it is merely a spiritual trip for a private individual. Transformation is made possible through the gift of God's transcendent grace which is mediated through the multifarious forms of the Christian tradition.

REFERENCES

⁵Issues involving the cults and their alleged "coercive" persuasion are very complex. For an extensive annotated bibliography on the topic, see Thomas Robbins, "Civil Liberties, 'Brainwashing,' and 'Cults.'" This document may be purchased for \$3.00 from the Program for the Study of New Religious Movements in America. Graduate Theological Union, 2465 Le Conte Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94709.

⁶The relationship of nurture and conversion is explored by Rosemary Haughton in *The Transformation of Man: A Study of Conversion and Community* (New York: Paulist Press, 1967).

⁷For a good study of some of the problems involved in the study of conversion see James R. Scroggs and William G. T. Douglas, "Issues in the Psychology of Religious Conversion," *Journal of Religion and Health*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1967), 204-216.

⁸Obviously this brief article cannot provide full coverage of each of the dimensions of the conversion process. Indeed, even the psychological aspect of the process cannot be completely explicated. Currently I am working on a manuscript, with the tentative title of *Conversion: Tradition, Transformation, and Transcendence*, which will attempt adequate study of each dimension and the interaction between them.

⁹This theme is developed well in Walter E. Conn (Editor), *Conversion* (Staten Island, NY: Seaver House, 1978). I highly recommend this book because it contains a fine selection of article conversion from people such as Karl Barth, William James, Karl Rahner, A.D. Nock, etc. "This point is powerfully made by Sallie McFague, "Conversion: Life on the Edge of the Rite Interpretation, Vol. 32, No. 3 (July, 1978), 255-268.

¹⁰Theodore R. Sarbin and Nathan Adler, "Self-Reconstitution Processes," *The Psychoana Review*, Vol. 57, No. 44 (Winter, 1970), 599-616.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS NEEDED

Each year TSF accepts student applications for Contributors to *TSF Bulletin*. For 1981-82, the job description includes, (1) monitoring two periodicals in your academic field and keeping the Editor informed of the most worthwhile articles and reviews in that publication, and (2) submitting at least one book review as arranged in cooperation with an Associate Editor.

Letters of application must include current degree program, area of concentration, a sample of your writing, and summer and fall addresses. All applications should be received by May 30, 1981. Send to Editor, *TSF Bulletin*, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703.

INQUIRY

(Questions, proposals, discussions, and research reports on theological and biblical issues)

AN EVALUATION OF AN EVALUATION: RESPONSE TO JOHN WOODBRIDGE By Donald K. McKim, Lecturer at Westminster College.

This is the final article in a series by TSF Bulletin. In November, 1980, we published two reviews of The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible by Jack Rogers and Donald McKim (Heper and Row, 1980). In the March, 1981 issue, an extensive summary of a critical work by John Woodbridge was published (The original 80 page article in the Trinity Journal will be expanded for a Zondervan book for 1982). We asked McKim if I would write a response, thus this article.

TSF members can benefit not only from the particulars of this dialogue, but also from methodological concerns. Students and graduates seek to improve their skills as readers of history and commentators on contemporary issues. Guidelines and examples in these articles can improve such interpretive pursuits.

Thanks go to authors Jack Rogers and Don McKim, reviewers Robert Johnston and Gerald Shepperd, and article writers John Woodbridge and, again, Don McKim.

In the "Preface" to our *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach (AIB)*, Jack Rogers and I stated that we have "no illusions that we have provided a definitive statement" of our subject. We intended not to close but to open dialogue. Professor John Woodbridge has now honored us by taking our proposal seriously. He has produced the most extensive examination to date of our work. While he does not agree with us (nor we with him), he has set some questions from a sharp perspective. The differences between us can be instructive for all engaged in scholarly tasks.

By questioning our way of "doing history," and our theological judgments, Professor Woodbridge himself has provided a clear example of one of the reasons Jack Rogers and I felt our book had to be written. Namely, in the recent debates over the nature of biblical authority, with Harold Lindell and other

Woodbridge has claimed that the theory of inerrancy has been the historic teaching of the Christian church. Our study questioned this assertion. We believe we have shown this not to be the case. It now belongs to the "inerrantists" to produce a study as comprehensive as ours to justify their proposition. Yet what we see is that the kinds of criticisms in rebuttal offered by Woodbridge reflect precisely the same problems we found with those who would read the modern inerrancy theory back into the church's more ancient traditions. Woodbridge perpetuates the same arguments and the same shortcomings as his fellow-inerrantists have done in the past.

What is at stake here is the more appropriate way to do history and read theological documents. I would point to two general considerations we find to be problems with Woodbridge's methods.

Inerrancy or Infallibility

One problem is the false equation of "infallibility" with "inerrancy." We tried to make a strong distinction between these two terms in our book. This reflected what our studies of the theological documents revealed. We found it was more accurate historically to describe the view of Scripture held by Origen, Augustine, Calvin and the Westminster Divines, for example, as being that the Scriptures are "infallible" rather than "inerrant." These people believed the Scriptures were given by God for the purpose of instruction in salvation and the life of faith. Scripture was not intended to speak "inerrantly" on questions of science, history, medicine, etc. We found that what the adherents of "inerrancy" define as inerrancy arose only after modern science began asking questions which led some theologians to defend the notion that God in Scripture is the accurate dispenser of modern scientific information.

What the inerrantists and Woodbridge fail to do is to make this crucial distinction. They fail because they *tacitly assume* and *never prove* that the refined theory of inerrancy as defined by A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield in their 1881 article was also what the early church, the Reformers, the Reformed Confessions, and the Westminster Divines meant by "infallibility." The reason this is important, confusing, and misleading is that Woodbridge repeatedly charges us with making assumptions leading to the conclusion that a certain writer (the Fathers or Calvin, for example) did not believe in "complete biblical infallibility." What Woodbridge really means is we do not believe a writer believed in "inerrancy" as Woodbridge and contemporary inerrantists define the term. But by using the phrase "complete biblical infallibility" (for whatever reason), Woodbridge clouds the issue. We want to say there is a definite distinction between the two terms. Woodbridge merely *assumes* here is no distinction and then goes on to use the term we use (infallibility) as a charge against us! We can quite confidently say that the Fathers and Calvin believed in "complete biblical infallibility." We say it with the knowledge that they did not mean by that what Woodbridge and others now mean by "inerrancy." If we have shown a valid distinction of terms, the task for others is to show why our distinction is invalid. It is not simply to assume no distinction and then to use the terms interchangeably. In Woodbridge's right concern for proper historical method, surely he must grant that he himself has failed in both logic and sound historical procedure at this point.

Historical Contexts

A second problem (of which the false equation of "inerrancy" and "infallibility" is only a symptom) is the basic question of whether we really need to read our theological sources in an historical context or not. This was one of the features of our book which we believed was absolutely essential. Nowhere can one find as detailed a treatment, not only of the sources relating to the Scripture question, but also of the backgrounds, contests, and influences — historical, cultural, and philosophical — that shaped various views of Scripture.

Our perception is that the inerrantists (including Woodbridge despite his penchants for pointing out our historical foibles) do not at all seek to establish these contexts as they read the

INTERPRETING AN AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURE

Fuller Theological Seminary and the Institute for Christian Studies are co-sponsoring this conference designed for persons who accept the authority of the Scriptures and struggle to work it out in the practice of life. From a variety of perspectives, a group of fifteen invited scholars will interact with conference participants in an atmosphere of mutual discussion and learning. Each morning there will be a main paper and two responses; afternoons will be devoted to small group discussion and interchange. Jack Rogers of Fuller and James Olthuis of ICS are the co-directors of the conference.

Program:

Historical Theology:	Jack Rogers, John Vander Stelt, and Ian Rennie.
Biblical Studies:	Carl Armerding, Richard Gaffin, and Gerald Sheppard.
Philosophical Questions:	James Olthuis, Clark Pinnock, and Donald Bloesch.
Ethics:	Lewis Smedes, Stephen Mott, and Pheme Perkins.
New Directions:	Robert Johnston and Paul Hiebert.

The conference will be held June 22-26, 1981, at the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto. The advisory committee for TSF will also be meeting during this week. If any TSF members are planning to attend, we would appreciate it if you would let us know.

For more information, write the Institute for Christian Studies, 229 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5T 1R4.

sources. Instead, they turn only to the face value, "common sense" reading of the quotes and to the "laws" of logic and English grammar. This seems their constant "historical method." They assume the fundamental congruity of their categories and vocabularies with those from the early church to the Reformation and beyond.

This was what Jack Rogers found as he did his doctoral dissertation on *Scripture in the Westminster Confession* (Eerdmans, 1967). In the 19th century, A. A. Hodge of Princeton Seminary wrote what he purported to be an "historical" commentary on the Westminster Confession. Yet Hodge (and later inerrantists) set no background theologically, philosophically, or historically for their study. They took the statements of the Confession and explicated them using their "Nineteenth-century Webster's Unabridged Dictionary" so to speak and "logically deduced what the Westminster authors meant. When further supports were needed, the inerrantists turned to later Puritan and Protestant scholastic theologians and by using their categories said they had found what the Westminster writers meant.

This was the line followed by John Gerstner in his review of Rogers' dissertation. Gerstner "reasoned": Puritans believed in inerrancy; the Westminster Divines were Puritans; therefore the Westminster Confession teaches inerrancy. Now John Woodbridge follows precisely this ahistorical and fallacious approach when he turns to the Puritan Ramist William Ames and uses him to "prove" that Westminster taught inerrancy. Woodbridge "reasons" this way: Ames was a Ramist; Rogers and McKim see the influence of Ramism on the Westminster Divines; therefore Ames is an appropriate person to use to see what the Westminster Divines taught regarding inerrancy. Since Woodbridge believes Ames taught inerrancy, his view of the Westminster Confession's doctrine of Scripture is assured!

On the other hand, Jack Rogers discovered who the actual authors of the section on Scriptures in the Westminster Confession were. He studied their writings. He probed the kinds of backgrounds mentioned above. He came to his conclusion: the

Westminster Confession does not teach "inerrancy" in the way that later Protestant scholastic theologians did.

Now who is following the more nearly valid historical method at this point? At stake here is not who is being more "logical"; but who is dealing with the documents in a more appropriate historical fashion.

Repeatedly inerrantists insist on taking what at times are legitimately ambiguous statements, lift them out of the full context of the theologian's writings, pay no heed to the writer's heritage in terms of history, philosophy, or culture, apply "immutable laws of logic" (including grammar), and then come up with what was "really meant." At various places in our footnotes when we interact with scholarly opinion on the person studied, we note how some have neglected important backgrounds and contexts so that writers are made to appear to support views that do not at all follow from a wider reading and exploration. We found, for instance, that Origen's statements about biblical authority must be read in light of his exegetical practices of allegory and typology. Augustine's statements about "faith and reason" must be read in light of his Platonic background rather than in light of later Aristotelian Thomists (p. 61, n. 93). Calvin needs to be set in the context of his humanistic studies and the theories of language and communication imbibed from the classical rhetorical tradition (pp. 96ff.). We tried to provide these contexts up through the present day, especially now in showing how dependent contemporary inerrantists are upon the Scottish common sense realism that fortified Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield.

Our concern in *A/B* was to examine theological statements about Scripture in light of these backgrounds. It simply will not do historically to isolate statements and read quotes through the lenses of theological categories that were sharpened in a later historical period.

Methodological Challenges

Some attention can now be given to the general "methodological problems" Woodbridge finds with our work.

1. The Volume's Title. We did not choose the title. That was done by our publisher. Our original proposal called for a title indicating we were dealing essentially with the Reformed tradition. Also due to publishing and marketing considerations, we had to drop 125 pages of our original manuscript.

2. The Apologetic Cast of the Study. Clearly our work is presented in a form that seeks to provide as we stated in our "Preface," "a new model, perspective, or paradigm by which to view the Bible." Yet we were trying to present what we found in the central Christian tradition. We dealt with the Princeton theologians so extensively since they were so influential in America. Scholars are always open to the charge that they have not dealt with *all* the evidence. What must be shown, however, is that new evidence can substantially alter or contradict the position already drawn. We tried to interact with those scholars who did not conclude what we concluded. But why should we be charged by Professor Woodbridge with "minimizing the value of scholarly work which decisively countermand their conclusions" just from the fact that we did not frankly agree with certain other scholars?

3. The Arbitrary Selection of Data. We grant again that we were selective. We were tracing a particular line. What we've said in essence is that some — early Fathers such as Origen, Chrysostom, and Augustine; Anselm in the Middle Ages; Luther, Calvin and the Reformed Confessions, the Westminster Confession, and later figures such as Lindsay, Orr, Kuyper, Bavinck, and Berkouwer—have followed the same theological method for approaching Scripture. They came to Scripture with "faith seeking understanding." Other figures have *stressed* only one dimension of this. "Mystics" and "Pietists," for example, stressed faith leading to experience. "Scholastics" have put reason before faith and said basically that understanding leads to faith. In the "scholastic" tradition stands Abelard, the Socinians, Turretin, and the old Princeton theologians. While Woodbridge may characterize these as "arbitrary selections,"

RATIONALITY IN THE CALVINIAN TRADITION

This conference, sponsored by Calvin College, the Free University, Amsterdam, and the Institute for Christian Studies, is intended to explore the implications of Calvinism for the status of human rationality and the nature of philosophy. Calvinism's overt and explicit link with philosophy was late in coming and appears to have been significant and lasting in only two philosophical traditions, that of Scottish "common sense" thinking and later of Dutch "reformational" thinking. How important is this link in these two cases? What can we learn from it? The conference explores this link historically and then discusses present positions on some of the key problems involved. The conference will be held August 3-8, 1981, at the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto. For more information, write Ms. Rosanne Sweetman, Coordinator, Institute for Christian Studies, 229 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5T 1R4.

he does not apparently question the accuracy of our perceptions of these fundamental differences in theological *method*. While this is an area not unrelated to the "inerrancy" question, it is nevertheless separate from it.

4. The Doubtful Documentation, and —

5. The Limiting Optic Concerns about documentation can be dealt with individually. Woodbridge's charge that we do not sort out all of the complex philosophical presuppositions of seventeenth century Calvinists, for example, can only be answered by saying that we wrote of what seemed to us the most important. How would one be sure *ever* to have sorted out *all* the "complex philosophical currents"? We're well aware that no one's thought is "without mixtures" of other thought. We wrote of where the stresses were put and how these influenced ways of viewing and interpreting the Scriptures.

6. The Propensity for Facile Labeling. We used "labels" to be sure. But how could we do without them? After all, Woodbridge and the inerrantists claim that this term "inerrancy" (as they define it) is an accurate "label" for describing the church's view of Scripture through the ages. Why then should we be faulted for using a term like "scholastic" to describe people of various historical periods?

Further, Woodbridge himself is fond of "facile labeling." He claims, for example, that our analysis of Calvin is based on "a neo-protestant historiography (including the studies of Ford Lewis Battles, John McNeill [sic], T. H. L. Parker, and Francois Wendel and others." For Woodbridge, "neo-protestant" or "neoorthodox" is certainly "bad" — as when he writes of our supposed "great debt to the neo-orthodox categories of Barth." Yet why should Woodbridge be permitted *facilely* to label Battles, McNeill and Wendel as "neo-protestants"? Not only is this inconsistent of him to charge us with facile labeling and then to do it himself, but it is at times downright incorrect. As a student and friend of the late Ford Lewis Battles, I can testify that he in no way considered himself a "neo-Protestant." Dr. Battles was a classicist and Calvin scholar without peer and cannot *possibly* be charged with reading Calvin through the eyes of Barth.

Woodbridge does not approve of our using so-called "neo-Protestant historiography." Yet whom does he himself cite as a "very knowledgeable Calvin scholar" in support of a particular Woodbridge contention? Woodbridge quotes none other than Edward A. Dowey, Jr., of Princeton Seminary, certainly someone Woodbridge would see as a "neo-Protestant." So, even if Jack and I did use "neo-Protestant" sources (among a host of others), it is heartening to see that Dr. Woodbridge is not averse to using them also—especially when they appear to make his point! Woodbridge also speaks approvingly of Wendel as providing one of "the finest analyses of Calvin's thought save for the author's discussion of Calvin and biblical authority" (note 77). Fortunately the "neo-Protestant" label hung on Wendel by Woodbridge does not preclude a recognition of a superior piece of theological work. What Woodbridge claims the "scholastics" are to us, the "neo-Protestants" are to him!

7. The Inappropriate "Historical Disjunctions." We are charged in this section with assuming that "certain correct assertions about an individual's thought logically disallow other ones from being true." Woodbridge then lists a number of these. He claims, for example, that we believe "because a thinker speaks of God accommodating himself to us in the words of Scripture, it is assumed that he or she does not believe in complete biblical infallibility." (Throughout his list of our logical errors, Woodbridge repeatedly uses the "complete biblical infallibility" language which only confuses things.) But the primary question is not whether we were right or wrong in making so-called "assumptions." The question, historically, is whether or not the people and documents *actually did teach* the inerrancy position Woodbridge espouses. Does the evidence show that the people who spoke of accommodation also believe in "inerrancy"? We believe the evidence does not support this. On the positive side we've shown how accommodation, for example, was an important tool for maintaining the complete integrity of the biblical revelation and its *full* theological authority. Again the question is history and not logic. Ironically, Woodbridge knows this too when he writes that "only careful open-minded historical investigation can perhaps reveal if a person adheres to limited or complete biblical infallibility." Actually it is Woodbridge who is making the "historical disjunctions" and the "logical deductions" with his conclusions in light of our documentation that his categories are the only ones to be read rightly into the evidence.

8. The Dated Models of Conceptualization. It is said that we write "elitist history" since we do not delve into "new methods of conceptualization" dealing with the fields of "popular religion," the book trade, disparities of belief and practice, etc. This makes our study "surprisingly dated" according to our critic. Yet we must ask: since when do we find those supporting the inerrancy view producing the kinds of historical studies Woodbridge appraises so highly?

Moreover, Woodbridge claims loyalty to the idea of taking stock of the individual's thought "with the categories of his or her age." But when inerrantists use the scientific categories of the seventeenth century to read third-century theologians or the nineteenth-century categories of Hodge and Warfield to read the sixteenth-century Calvin, we must wonder who really needs to heed the advice about "models of conceptualization."

9. The Bibliographical Insensitivity. The final consideration put forth by Woodbridge is our "peculiar insensitivity to the problem of doing balanced bibliographical work." On the one hand he chastises us for not including Kantzer's dissertation on Calvin in our "Selected Bibliography." But then in the next sentence Woodbridge says that we "do interact with this and other literature." He calls our interactions, however, "sometimes at a very superficial level."

Our "Selected Bibliography" was just that. It and all the others were selective. Why Woodbridge should worry that an "unapprised reader would not generally surmise from this bibliography that a scholarly literature exists that challenges many of the conclusions of the authors' choice volumes" is puzzling. The unapprised reader would no longer be unapprised of this if he or she became actually a reader of the book since it is apparent throughout (as Woodbridge knows) that we have put forward a thesis and offered a model for biblical authority. We interacted with varying interpretations throughout. Space limitations precluded more extensive arguments with all those with whom we did not agree—whether from a "liberal" or "conservative" direction. We wanted to point people to the sources, to lay out the main contours of the scholarly debate, to provide data, and to say openly and honestly how we read and interpret the history and documents with which we deal.

Both Jack Rogers and I are glad for the opportunities to work with others in coming to understandings about the nature of biblical authority and issues of scriptural interpretation. This is

the task to which we have all been called and along with John Woodbridge and his colleagues are glad to announce our allegiance to the Lord of the Scriptures.

More specifically, Jack and I hoped to open new avenues for many who have felt increasingly uncomfortable with their present understandings of what the Bible is for and how it is to function in their lives. Some have felt this discomfort because of what they have been taught the church has believed about Scripture throughout its history. In the face of these teachings, we've sought to say what we've discovered and to hold forth the Scriptures as God's gracious communication of Himself to us, His children. We look to the Scriptures with confidence and in faith believing them to be God's written word. And we look to all our brothers and sisters in Christ to work with us in understanding the Scriptures that we might be faithful interpreters of that Word.

Correction: The address for the *Trinity Journal*, in which John Woodbridge's complete article appears, is Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2045 Half Day Rd., Deerfield, IL 60015. The zip code was listed incorrectly in our March issue.

OLD TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM: SOME RECENT PROPOSALS By A. J. Petrotta, Ph.D. candidate, University of St. Andrews

Textual criticism is not likely to excite the imagination of most students. More often than not, it conjures up visions of poring over countless manuscripts, sifting through endless variants, or the dreaded task of unlocking the mysteries of the *apparatus criticus*! Our survey is highly selective but seeks to illustrate some recent trends which promise to disenfranchise the subject from the dungeons of the exegetical task.

An essay by S. Talmon (1975) was one of the first attempts to show the new directions that textual criticism could take "in direct conjunction with the wider realm of biblical studies." He argued that the "creative impulse" did not end with the authoring of a biblical text but overlaps with the history of the transmission of a text. Once this is accepted the separation between "lower" and "higher" criticism is less distinct. He concluded the essay with numerous examples of the continuity of literary and scribal techniques to show how stylistics and textual criticism can be united to illumine a text.

An essay by M. Greenberg (1978) is a fine example of the fruitful use of textual criticism in the exegetical task. It includes a comprehensive treatment of a single pericope in the book of Ezekiel. For Greenberg, the primary role of textual criticism is not the reconstruction of a hypothetical "original," but a more precise understanding of particular texts. As Greenberg summed up his own study:

We have tried to show through study of two examples that divergences between MT (= Masoretic text) and G (= Septuagint) in Ezekiel (and by implication elsewhere) may constitute alternative messages, each with its own validity. Exegetical rewards came, in each case, by asking not which reading was the original one, but what effect the divergences work on the messages of the respective versions (p. 140).

In his presidential address for the Society of Biblical Literature, J. Sanders (1979) also sought to unite the sibling disciplines of textual criticism and exegesis. Against the backdrop of two major projects on the Hebrew text: the Hebrew University Bible Project, and the United Bible Societies Hebrew Old Testament Text Critical Project, Sanders addressed himself