

Faith and Thought

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation
of the Christian revelation and modern research

Vol. 93

Number 2

Winter 1963

E. J. YOUNG, Ph.D.

Some Thoughts on Old Testament Scholarship

ONE who reads the Book of Psalms attentively must be struck with the strong emphasis that is found therein on the study of the law. The righteous man is characterised in the first Psalm as one who meditates in the Law of God day and night. Application to the Scriptures is stressed in the longest of the Psalms, the one hundred and nineteenth. That the man who would live godly in Christ Jesus must be well versed in the Scriptures goes without saying.

It soon becomes apparent, however, that mere cursory reading of the Bible will not meet the needs of the Church nor of the individual Christian. There must be a more careful and painstaking study of the Bible. The Bible is written in Greek and Hebrew, and the study of these languages raises many problems. What does the Bible say? What is the relation of the Bible to the many recent discoveries? All these questions and many more simply point up the need for Christian scholarship.

We shall be concerned in this brief article with the philosophy that underlies Christian scholarship. What is a Christian scholar, and what is Christian scholarship? Questions such as these will occupy our attention and we shall even engage in some apologetic for Christian scholarship.

The Basis of Christian Scholarship

Christian scholarship must approach its task with certain presuppositions. It cannot agree with those who insist that their only desire in research is without any preconceived biases to follow the facts wherever they lead. There is a type of scholarship which prides itself upon its objectivity. It has no desire to be guided by any presuppositions; it has no bias or prejudice. Rather, it will follow the facts wherever they may go. It treats the Bible like any other book, fully confident that in so doing it is able to explain the Bible. Above all it wishes to reject any presuppositions upon which its research is to be based. Theology is not to guide study, it says, for it desires to be purely objective. Facts and facts alone are its only concern. Wherever they point, it will follow,

irrespective of the consequences. Its only desire is objectivity, a disinterested, dispassionate search for truth. Truth, and truth alone, is its concern.

Now this sounds quite commendable. What could be more admirable than a disinterested following of the facts, with no theories or preconceived notions of our own to get in the way? Admirable as this sounds, however, it is not admirable at all, and the reason why it is not admirable is that it paints a false picture of the situation. It might indeed seem at first blush that a truly objective method of research would divest itself of all theories or presuppositions and simply plunge in after the facts, boldly following them to whatever consequences they might bring. As a matter of fact, however, such a method is not objective. It is a method deluged with presupposition. It is a method which has already erected a presupposition which is to guide its research. That presupposition is simply that it will reject all presuppositions and follow facts. It presupposes, apparently without realising that it is so doing, that it is perfectly capable in its own strength and ability not only of meeting and recognising the facts but also of interpreting them correctly. It has, in other words, itself adopted certain presuppositions, and these govern its investigation. Those who follow such a method of study never come to the conclusion that the Bible is a special revelation from God, for they have already ruled out the view that the Bible differs from other books. Even this type of study, then, which seems to be objective, is in reality not objective at all. It too has its presuppositions, and they guide it in its procedures.

No scholarship can be without presuppositions. What kind of book is the Bible, and how is the Bible to be studied? In answering these questions, scholarship may appeal to the human mind as the ultimate and final basis of predication, or it may declare that wisdom and knowledge belong to God. If scholarship assumes the ultimacy of the human mind it will never come to the conclusion that the Bible is the Word of God, for it has already made the human mind capable of judging God. Christian scholarship indeed has its presuppositions; it believes that this is God's world, and that He is the Creator of all things. It regards the Scriptures as unique. They are unlike all other books, for they are the revelation of God Himself. How does the Christian scholar come to this knowledge? He comes to it, for God himself has made it known that the Bible is His Word. Christian scholarship believes that man's final persuasion of the divinity of the Bible lies in the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit. In other words, it is God who testifies to His word, and

the renewed soul receives the Scriptures as God-given. Christian scholarship, therefore, believes the Bible to be the Word of God, and seeks to think God's thoughts after Him as they are made known in the Bible.

In thus describing the basic presupposition of Christian scholarship we would point out that not all Christian scholars are consistent. Not all follow their presuppositions as they should. In particular, elements of anti-theism may enter into a man's thinking when at one point or another he becomes inconsistent. The man who is willing to assert the presence of historical errors in the Bible, for example, is one who, whether consciously or not, has set himself above the statement of Christ. 'The Scripture cannot be broken' and the express declaration that all Scripture is God-breathed. There are many Christian scholars who do not exhibit a consistently Christian method of study, for at one point or another they depart from the position required by genuine Christian theism. A truly Christian scholarship, however, is based upon the assumption that God is the Creator and that in His written Word He has spoken in a special way.

Christian scholarship therefore is not ashamed of its presuppositions. In fact it glories in them, for it knows well enough that all approaches have presuppositions, whether consciously or unconsciously adopted. Christian scholarship knows where it stands and what it is seeking to accomplish. It understands that there is really but one alternative to the position which it has adopted. If it does not proceed upon the assumption that God is the ultimate source of meaning in life, and hence the ultimate point of predication, it knows that the only alternative is to believe and assert the ultimacy of the human mind. The human mind, however, is something created and finite, and from a finite source knowledge of the ultimate meaning of life can never come.

Christian scholarship therefore, if it is to be truly Christian, will, in consistency with its basic presupposition, acknowledge the Bible to be the Word of God. To discover in what sense the Bible is God's Word it will turn to the Bible and allow the Bible to speak for itself. What the Bible has to say about itself, Christian scholarship will willingly accept. In other words the Bible is the norm which must guide genuine Christian scholarship. For that matter the true Christian scholar will be guided by what the Bible has to say on all subjects. An illustration will make this clear.

The nineteenth century witnessed a continual production of theories concerning the origin of the Pentateuch. These theories were inter-

esting, and some of them were ingenious, but they all had this in common, that they were willing to contradict explicit statements of the Bible. In the Pentateuch we often read that Moses spake, but these theories were perfectly willing to assert that he did not speak. When in the book of Deuteronomy, to take an example, we read that the Lord spake unto Moses, the theories we are now considering had no hesitation in asserting that Deuteronomy was produced in the seventh century B.C. If it was a work of the seventh century B.C., however, it would follow that the Lord did not speak to Moses, as Deuteronomy claims. Hence, whatever else may be said of these theories, they were not Christian. They were willing to assume that their originators had a better knowledge of the situation than did the Scripture itself. And that is a bold assumption. This is not to say that the men who advanced these theories were themselves not Christians. On that point no man can judge. God alone is able to pass judgment upon the human heart, and we are not for a moment saying that the advocates of the positions which we are now discussing were not Christians. But, if they were Christians, in advocating these theories, they were acting in a manner quite inconsistent with their Christian beliefs. And whether the men themselves were Christians or not, their theories were not Christian theories, for they went contrary to express statements of the Bible.

The same may be said of some of the views that are being presented today, views which are widely acclaimed and even received with favour by some evangelicals. These theories have not the slightest hesitation in overriding express statements of the Bible. For that reason they are not in accord with Christian presuppositions and consequently they may be dismissed as mistaken explanations of Israel's history and religion. This is not to say that there is no value in them or that they should not be studied. But the unlearned reader who simply reads the Old Testament itself and believes it to be true has a far more profound insight into the truth of Israel's history and religion than he will find in the positions advocated by some modern scholars. One of the saddest signs of the times is that some evangelicals do not seem to recognise that fact.

May the writer be pardoned for mentioning personal experiences? Every now and then following a lecture, some young student will approach and say something like, 'Why didn't you pay more attention to Mowinckel, or, Do you not think that Von Rad's writings are showing us some exciting new things in Old Testament studies?' Now, surely, we should pay attention to what modern scholars are writing, and

surely we can learn from modern scholars, but when we are making a serious effort to understand the history of Israel and its religion we shall learn far more by a serious exegesis of the Old Testament, an exegesis undertaken in a believing spirit, than we will from the writings of men such as Von Rad and Mowinckel who hold an extremely low view of the Bible. Christian scholarship rejoices in the confines that the infallible Word of God places upon it. It wishes to be true to the Bible.

And this brings us to what is probably the heart of the matter. True Christian scholarship will be characterised by humility. What, however, do we mean in this connexion by humility? We mean simply obedience to God. The humble scholar is the one who is truly obedient to God. But how shall one be obedient to God? The answer is that to be obedient to God means to do His will. We learn of His will, however, in His Word. Hence, we shall follow His Word in all that it says. Even though we may not always understand all the factors involved, we shall, if our desire is truly to be Christian, allow the Word of God to be our guide in all things. Its statements will direct our investigation, and we shall never dare to go contrary to those statements, for we know that they were breathed forth by Him who is truth itself and cannot lie. Christian scholarship then would be bound by the Bible, and rejoice that such is the case.

An objection is likely to rise at this point. Is this not obscurantism, it may be asked, is it not fundamentalism? What about the great gains of nineteenth-century scholarship? Are we to throw them by the board? In answering these questions we would point out that names in themselves are not too important. It matters not if unbelievers call Christian scholarship obscurantist. After all, some of the most obscurantist positions imaginable are those held by the 'advanced' scholars of the nineteenth century. What about Wellhausen's view of Genesis, a view which he claimed was held by all scientific scholars? Can one imagine anything more obscurantist than that view, namely, that from Genesis one could learn nothing concerning the background of the patriarchs? This position, so confidently and almost arrogantly advanced by Wellhausen and others, is now completely shown to be false, and those who today, had they been living in Wellhausen's time, would probably have gone along with him, are perfectly ready to acknowledge that Genesis does give an accurate picture of the patriarchal background. We who believe the Bible need not fear the term obscurantist.

Nor need we really be afraid of the term fundamentalist. Better to be called a fundamentalist than to be found in the ranks of those who

deny the Bible. In the long run the truth will prevail, and if Christian scholarship continues in devotion to God's Word, it need not fear what man can say. Its purpose in the last analysis is the glory of God, and in seeking to accomplish this purpose it may well expect opprobrium.

It may be thought that what we have written involves too negative an attitude toward that scholarship which is not based upon Christian presuppositions. We must therefore indicate some of the areas where we believe that one can learn from such scholarship. For one thing, unbelieving scholarship is not always consistent with its basic presuppositions. Just as fallen man is not as bad as he can be, so also non-Christian scholarship is not completely consistent with its own basic assumptions. The result is that it often says things which in themselves are good and true. In the writings of Von Rad, for example, although we think that the basic position is wrong, there are nevertheless many fine things that are said. Sometimes in the exegetical sphere, for example, there is at least a formal agreement with what a Bible-believing scholar might assert; in this respect one can learn much from Von Rad's writings, even though, when judged from the Christian position, the basic approach must be regarded as seriously mistaken.

Furthermore, many gifted researchers who may not themselves embrace Christian presuppositions have nevertheless done remarkable service in the fields of archaeology and language. Of course even in these fields, basic presuppositions are important, and the Christian would maintain that only upon theistic positions do these fields of study have meaning. This is true, and yet many gifted men have performed remarkable service in these areas. We may think of the tremendous amount of excavation that has been done, and the extremely difficult work of deciphering the cuneiform languages. For all of this we should should of course be profoundly grateful.

It must be recognised that if non-theistic presuppositions were correct, this positive work could not be done. For then there would be no true meaning in life. The fact that serious philological and archaeological work can be done is in itself an argument in favour of the theistic position. Certainly the Christian scholar recognises with gratitude the fact that much work has been done in these fields, sometimes by Christians and sometimes by non-Christians. The Christian recognises truth wherever it is to be found and understands full well that even a man whose basic presuppositions are false will himself act contrary to those presuppositions and say and do much that in itself is true.

True Christian scholarship therefore is willing and glad to recognise the debt it owes to all who have advanced the cause of learning. In itself, however, it would hold as the great goal to be achieved the glory of God. In all that it does it strives to bring glory to God, the Creator. The Christian investigator, whatever be the field in which he is working, will realise that this is God's world, and in his endeavour to arrive at the truth will be guided by the Bible itself. He will not proceed in his investigations contrary to the Bible, but will permit the Bible to be His guide.

The Requirements for Christian Scholarship

With respect to the Bible Christian scholarship has many tasks to perform. Perhaps one of the greatest of these, if not the greatest, is that of exegesis. What can be more important than to know what God has said in His holy Word? But how should exegesis be undertaken? Christian exegesis should seek first of all to understand the meaning of the text. It is not concerned to assert what the original writer should have meant, or should have said, and above all it will not emend the text or interpret away the meaning of that text in the interests of some supposed theory; it wants, first and foremost, simply to know what the Scripture says.

This, however, brings immediately to the fore the great distinction between Christian and non-Christian scholarship. For Christian scholarship believes that the true author of Scripture is the Holy Spirit, and therefore, without the Holy Spirit it cannot know the true meaning of the words of Scripture. It labours in dependence upon the Spirit of God, praying for His illumination and guidance so that it will rightly understand what He has written. For the words of the Bible are words indicated of God's Spirit, and he who would understand them must be taught of the Spirit. The "natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" [1 Cor. ii. 14]. Inasmuch as these things are 'spiritually discerned', the unbeliever cannot understand them. Without the Holy Spirit we can do nothing, and unless the Spirit of God be with us in our labours we shall fail in our attempts to explain the Bible.

The blessing of God's Spirit, however, cannot be made a substitute for hard work. We must be taught of God, but we must also apply all the talents and abilities which God has given to us in the endeavour to understand His Word. Certain requisites must of course be present. Unless we have a sympathetic understanding of Scripture we shall not

properly exegete it. For this reason, it is well to read over and over again the Scriptures which we are working on. The continued and the repeated reading of the Bible is of inestimable value. It enables one to keep in mind the context in which a particular verse is found and so not to treat that verse in an atomistic fashion. All too often it appears that some commentators treat individual verses in isolation from their context. This of course is not warranted.

Whereas reading large sections of Scripture and in particular the constant reading of those sections with which we are working will keep before our eyes the context of particular verses, it goes without saying that more than this is necessary for exegesis. Christian scholarship must have a knowledge of the original languages of Scripture. An Old Testament student is immediately faced with the array of languages that confront him. There is Hebrew with all its cognates and semi-cognates; and there are the multitudinous modern languages, each one of which seems to call for a reading knowledge. In fact, if one is going to deal seriously with the Semitic languages, he must be a master of the modern tongues, at least as far as a reading knowledge is concerned. The first Semitic language that an Old Testament scholar should learn, it has been facetiously said, is German, and there are times when one is tempted to think that there is more truth in that statement than appears upon the surface.

At any rate, the Old Testament scholar must be a linguist, able to handle the requisite languages with facility. And above all he must know Hebrew. Now, despite what is sometimes said to the contrary, Hebrew is not an easy language for an English-speaking person to acquire. It is true enough that in two or three years one may obtain a reading knowledge of certain parts of the Old Testament, but this is not the same thing as a genuine mastery of the language. Such a mastery comes only after years of hard work. There is, however, one practice which will greatly facilitate one's learning of Hebrew. Let the student early acquire the habit of daily reading the Old Testament aloud in Hebrew. It is the practice of reading aloud which is all-important. If the student will daily read from the old Testament in Hebrew, he will discover that the language will take on life and meaning. At first this reading may be confined to a verse or so, but after about two years of study, at least one page of the Old Testament should be read aloud daily. This is an exercise which will pay rich dividends. For such reading should also be devotional. If there are words which the student does not understand, let him glance at an English translation. Thus, his

vocabulary will rapidly increase, and he will obtain the necessary background for serious work. Such reading, however, valuable as it is, is not sufficient. There must accompany it a solid study of the structure of the Hebrew language, such as can be obtained only by careful study of the grammars and in particular of the usage of the Hebrew vowels in the syllables. And this can be furthered by a profound knowledge of Arabic grammar, which, in this writer's opinion, is indispensable for Old Testament study. In particular, a knowledge of Arabic syntax is essential. Side by side with this there must also be a knowledge of the cuneiform languages. An Old Testament scholar, in the nature of the case, cannot master the cuneiform languages and at the same time do justice to his own field. But for the sake of background purposes he should keep up constant reading of cuneiform texts, and he should certainly know at least as much grammar as is found in Ungnad's *Grammatik*. This will be of tremendous help in understanding the structure of Hebrew itself.

With respect to a knowledge of the other cognate languages, who can say how much the Old Testament scholar should know? Certainly he should be acquainted with Aramaic, but men's gifts differ. Some learn languages only with great difficulty; others seem to pick them up with little effort. The present writer makes bold to say that no language is easy. Those who boast about their linguistic attainments may very well be questioned. Possibly some men may acquire a language easily, but when men speak of themselves as masters of twenty or thirty languages one may be pardoned for entertaining doubts. The more one works with a language the more one realises how little he really knows about it.

Serious students of the Old Testament, however, will not flee from hard work, for one cannot engage in genuine exegesis of the Old Testament unless he has a fairly thorough knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. Such a knowledge, among other things, will help him to recognise the folly of emending the text whenever he does not understand it. A dark day truly came over Old Testament studies when commentaries such as those of Bernhard Duhm could be written. Duhm's emendations seem to be almost legion, and many of them are without value. Difficult forms are not necessarily incorrect, and only as a last resort should one consider emendation. Indeed, one of the greatest tasks lying before Old Testament scholarship is the explanation of difficult forms in the Old Testament. Sometimes this can be done by a comparison with similiar forms in Arabic or in the cuneiform languages. But a more precise knowledge of Hebrew is an essential if one is

to avoid the unwarranted examples of emendation which appear in some of the commentaries and in the *Biblia Hebraica*.

One of the crying needs of the day is for thorough commentaries upon the books of the Old Testament. But such commentaries can be written by conservatives, only if they have a profound knowledge of Hebrew. A knowledge of Hebrew, however, is not in itself sufficient. One who writes upon the Old Testament nowadays must also have a knowledge of archaeology. This does not mean that he must himself be a professional archaeologist, but he must know of recent discovery and its bearing upon the Old Testament. At this point, the theistic presuppositions of conservative scholarship must be guarded. A study of the texts of the ancient Near East reveals the fact that there are many formal similarities between these texts and the Old Testament. It would be a mistake, however, merely to assume that the Old Testament derived its content and even its form of expression from the surrounding ancient environment. One must remember that the Old Testament is a revelation from God, and that therefore it is to be interpreted on its own terms and not merely as a piece of literature from the ancient east.

This point can be easily illustrated. Much has been said about the relationship of Genesis i to Enuma Elish. Some have claimed that the latter is the Babylonian Genesis or Creation Account, and have held that Genesis was really derived from it. If, however, we believe that Genesis i is a divine revelation, must we not maintain that the information which it contains was given to man by God? And is it not to be expected that this information, being handed down from mouth to mouth, would in the course of time, and not very much time at that, have been corrupted and rendered impure by the admixture of other elements? Hence, it is what we might expect if we discover that there are elements of superstition in Enuma Elish. But to assume that Genesis is dependent upon this document is certainly to refuse to do justice to Genesis.

One cannot take too seriously the claims of Scripture to be the Word of God. Hence, the exegete must always take into consideration the biblical theological significance of the passage which he is studying. Now, Biblical theology is a term that is bandied about quite frequently these days; there is good biblical theology and there is bad, and the bad, of course, is not really biblical theology at all. True biblical theology is concerned with the study of divine revelation in the various epochs or periods of redemptive history. It is this basic point which must be

kept in proper emphasis. Even some conservatives seem principally concerned to find Christ everywhere in the Old Testament. In a certain sense, of course, Christ is everywhere, but we must certainly be on guard against a reversion to allegorical interpretation. Concern for biblical theology in biblical proportions, however, will prove a great asset for interpretation of the Scriptures.

Not only is concern for biblical theory essential, but it is also essential that we consider in our interpretation each verse in the wider context of the entire Scripture. In true study of Scripture the analogy of Scripture must ever be brought into play. To state this in slightly different terms, we must study and know systematic theology. With the advent of the neo-orthodox emphases genuine systematic theology has fallen into disrepute in some circles. This, of course, is to be expected, for in its very nature systematic theology presupposes that the entire Bible is the Word of God, and that is a position which neo-orthodox, despite its frequent assertions, does not really take seriously. Possibly systematic theology has fallen into disrepute because it is not really understood by many. We are not concerned in the true study of systematic theology merely to state that a certain doctrine was held by Calvin and Luther—but to discover what the Bible has to say about these doctrines. What, for example, is the teaching of the Bible on the doctrine of justification by faith? To answer that question is to engage in the study of systematic theology. Systematic theology is no less biblical than is biblical theology. It is, indeed, the queen of the sciences, and if our exposition is truly to do justice to the Scriptures, we must know what the doctrines of the Bible are. This is certainly one of the reasons why Calvin's commentaries have so greatly excelled. The same can be said for Luther's commentaries and for those of Charles Hodge. These men were theologians, and they knew what the Word of God taught. A knowledge of systematic theology will protect one from going astray doctrinally, for when isolated parts of the Bible are studied apart from the context of the entirety of Scripture, error is likely to creep in. We tend to emphasise one aspect of truth at the expense of others, and when we emphasise one verse or section of Scripture to the neglect of others, our exposition is likely to be faulty. Systematic theology can keep us from falling into this error.

Christian scholarship also needs discrimination in its judgment. It must first of all have a genuine understanding of the Christian presuppositions and must know what it means to believe in an all-powerful God and in the truth that the Bible is His Word. And it must also be able

to detect what is contrary to the Word of God. We are commanded to try the spirits whether they be of God. It is a great mistake to think that everyone who happens to write a book or an article on some Biblical subject is thereby making a contribution to knowledge. Such is not the case. The present writer confesses to sadness of heart at the lack of discernment displayed upon the part of some evangelicals who ought to know better. In part this lack of discernment is due to simple ignorance of the contents of the Bible on the one hand, and ignorance of systematic theology also. Indeed, we should not even make this distinction, for he who is ignorant of systematic theology is really ignorant of what the Bible teaches. But whatever the reason, there is abroad a surprising lack of discernment as to the nature of much that is being written today.

It may be that there is a tendency to look upon all scholarship, whatever be the presuppositions that govern it, as a kind of social club or Kaffeklatsch in which believers and unbelievers alike have fellowship, and that everyone who is a scholar or who writes a paper or book is making a contribution or having an insight. Such a position, of course, is not in accord with the facts. As far as the truth is concerned much that is written today is worthless. Many articles upon the Old Testament seem to this writer to be in vain. One may seriously ask how the whole Wellhausen emphasis brought glory to God. Did it ever bring blessing to any soul? Did it really contribute to a basic understanding of the Scripture? Did it exalt the Word of God and honour Him, or was it nothing more than a finely spun theory that exalted man alone? It is a grave mistake to think that everything that is written is significant and a real contribution. Much of it is almost without value and of no great help in properly understanding the Word of God.

The Christian scholar need not endeavour to read everything. Scholars who seek to read everything are notably superficial when it comes to really fundamental matters. If a man tries to read all that is written in his field he simply cannot have the time to do the solid research that is needed if he himself is to produce something worthwhile. Discernment is needed that he may concentrate upon those works from which he may truly derive profit.

The Challenge of Christian Scholarship

The Christian scholar is fighting a battle and in these days he is likely to be a lonely figure. The religious world today is being engulfed by

the neo-orthodox emphases that so many are making. Even evangelicals and Bible believers are aping the language of the neo-orthodox. Thus, for example, no longer do we have a discussion with a person; we have a dialogue; we no longer have a divine revelation, we have the Hebraic Christian tradition. But perhaps the saddest thing in the scholarly world has been the manner in which some evangelical scholars have looked with welcome to the appearance of neo-orthodoxy as though it had somehow brought about a true return to the Word of God. And the superficial manner in which many evangelicals have handled Barth's distinction between *Geschichte* and *Historie* is nothing short of tragic. Here a radical form of unbelief has been welcomed into the Christian fold as though it were an ally. It would almost seem that God has placed a veil over the eyes of some evangelicals.

In such times, however, despair is not the keynote. Never was the need of God's Word greater than it is now. The ignorance of Scripture abroad today is nothing short of appalling. When a reformation comes, it will, we believe, be the work of the Spirit of God. And one means which the Spirit will use is consecrated Christian scholarship. The Christian scholar need not fear if terms of opprobrium are heaped upon him. He is in the service of the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords. He knows that in himself he is weak and helpless; he realises how great his ignorance is. In himself he may not have the wit, the genius and the brilliance to match the minds of this world. That, however, is not his task nor is it his responsibility. His task is to be faithful to the Lord of glory. He is to study the Scriptures that are alone able to make one wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus.

The glory of God is the ultimate aim of Christian scholarship, and this is to be accomplished through the edification of the church. The Christian scholar is not writing primarily to convince 'destructive' critics. No doubt God will at times use his arguments to convince even opponents of His Word. But first of all Christian scholarship exists for the benefit of the Church. It is to aid Christ's little ones in the knowledge of Him that Christian scholarship has a place. It is to help believers get straight in their minds the message of Christianity. And it is to fight the battles of the Church.

Conclusion

In the face of the terrible wave of neo-orthodoxy that today is engulfing Christendom, what is the Christian Church to do? Christian

scholarship should give the answer. In giving the answer, however, it relies not upon human wisdom, but upon the Word of God. Relying upon the Holy Spirit and trusting the Scriptures as God's Word, it will point out to the Church how great a departure from the truth neo-orthodoxy is and how great are the errors that characterise much that is written today. In particular it will warn the church against the position of those who say that the Bible is not infallible and inerrant and will call the Church to take her stand upon the unchanging rock of Holy Scripture.