

normative. Consequently, in the extreme, what the Scripture is does not matter very much...what you receive from it matters a lot. The emphasis is on dynamic, not fact. To those who feel Barth rescued the Scripture from the critics, this analysis is sufficient to say that he did not.

#### f. Conclusion

We have not mentioned the orthodox critics in this area simply because their stand is the apparent one of believing the Bible and accepting it for what it claims to be. There have been many who could be noted. They both expressed a strong defense of the faith and continued to offer stimulating understanding of the way in which God communicated. Among those who stand out would be E. Hengstenberg, strong Teutonic conservative critic of the last century. His countryman Keil and in this country Stuart and Green. In England James Orr and Principal Douglas were very prominent. There was throughout the era a strong orthodox corps but the tide in human affairs was against them...rather like in Noah's day. Ironically, such movements as the evangelical Methodism of the 19th century and the pietistic Lutheranism of a slightly earlier age did not do much to aid the evangelical cause. In fact, since both groups rather distrusted scholarship, they contributed indirectly more against the cause than for it. In the end their criticisms of scholarship led to their own undoing and both groups fell heavily into the critical camp. Evangelicals had the standard number of dogmatists and weak thinkers who did not help but the large problem was simply that the average Christian had lost his interest in maintaining the essential points of Christian truth. Subsequently the church lost much of its message and a lot of its punch and set the stage for the present failure of the church-body politic as well as the rise of the Bible-church movement.

These later ideas are fully as complicated as those of Wellhausen and equally devoid of Biblical support. The only real advantage to them is that they keep the ball of scholarship moving and since they must advance themselves against the established line they tend to make dents in the armor of other critical expressions...so all is not lost. But they are really no closer to the truth than is the older criticism. Perhaps, due to their intricate ideas, they are actually more removed. While in some cases they will allow for a Mosaic cult, it is no substitute for a real Moses and the acts of God. In the long run