

something of this uncritical acceptance in the conservative camp. Are some evangelicals just being unwary or are they deliberately trying to bridge a gulf to the other side at a time when that side is making some progress to ours? We must say plainly to evangelicals who are enthusiastically set on the redaction course: if you must go forward, please proceed with caution, it is a dangerous road.

REMARKS ON THE FUNDAMENTAL PERSPECTIVE OF
JAMES BARR'S THEOLOGY

Dr Paul Wells,
Faculté Libre de Théologie Réformée, France

James Barr's published work spans a period of 30 years to this point. His article on the Pelagian controversy, published in 1949, was the first of a series of important articles and books on a wide range of subjects. As well as his major books, Barr has published material of a very specialised nature, dictionary articles and reflections of a more general nature on the nature of biblical authority and interpretation.

In this comment, we shall therefore limit ourselves to a description of one aspect of Barr's work, concerning the nature of the Scripture. (1)

Much of Barr's work reveals a continuing search for an adequate statement of the relations between the nature of the biblical materials and their interpretation, between the status we accord the Scriptures and how we interpret the text. It can be considered as an attempt to approach the Scriptures apart from dogmas concerning the status of the Bible which invariably foster methods of interpretation which impose preconceived meanings

on the text. Barr has therefore sought to criticise certain accepted views of the nature of the biblical materials and the methods of interpretation that these seem to imply. Thus he has developed a critical attitude toward the linguistic practices commonly accepted in recent biblical theology, to the neo-orthodox view of Scripture in which the categories of revelation and history play a prominent part and also to fundamentalism, in which a traditional view of the Bible leads to various inconsistencies in interpretation.

Barr's aim is therefore a positive one, even though we may differ with him as to the material results of his work. To use his own words, it is to "encourage the Scripture to speak freely". Formally all Christian interpretation must seek a freedom in interpretation from pre-conceived ideas in order that the Scripture may speak for itself. However materially there is a great deal of difference as to how this free-speaking of the Scripture is to be attained and whether in many cases the results of interpretation do in fact state the real meaning of the Word of God.

Barr's fundamental approach to the question is seen in this quotation from his Inaugural Lecture given at Oxford in 1977:

"It is in the interest of theology that it should allow and encourage the Scripture to speak freely to the church and to theology. It must be able to say something other than what current theological and interpretive fashion would have it say. But it cannot do this if theology controls the presuppositions with which it may be approached. It is thus in the interests of theology itself that the meaning of Scripture should be allowed an adequate measure of independence; and that must mean that the discipline of biblical study also should be recognised to

have a fitting independence." (2)

One could hardly wish for a clearer statement regarding exegetical method by a biblical scholar. Whether the aim stated in this passage is realisable in practical terms is, of course, another question. For the present it is sufficient to define the perspective, which is quite lucid. These remarks apply to the relation of biblical studies and theology in general. The distinction which Barr sees between the two lies in that the one gives a purely descriptive statement of the evidence, whereas the other involves the theologian in a statement of personal confessed faith, either individual or ecclesial.(3) Biblical studies then involve assertions about human relations, which, even should they provide material for theological affirmation in the proper sense of the word, do not themselves transcend the descriptive by venturing into the domain of faith-statements oriented to the divine. Biblical studies in the academic sense are therefore largely descriptive and no common methodology covers all aspects of this study, to say nothing of such a methodology including also the properly theological, which is on a different level.(4)

The separation of the biblical-descriptive and the theological-normative which we have considered may be seen as a refusal on the part of Barr to make a conjunction of the divine and human elements of Scripture an integral factor in the understanding of Scripture. Scripture must be examined as a human document quite apart from an immediate consideration of its divine origin or the revelation it may contain or witness to. The risk of considering Scripture in terms of a Christological analogy is that of falsifying the truly human character of the Scripture.(5) Thus in establishing the analogy between the two natures of Christ and the divine and human with respect to Scripture the temptation is to under-emphasize the human character of the Scripture by holding it in

tension with the divine. The danger is that in spite of assertions to the contrary, there takes place an implicit transfer of the hypostatic union of Christ to the Bible.

These comments illustrate that for Barr the Scripture is not to be evaluated as is traditionally the case in terms of a God to man revelational model by analogy with the incarnation in which the divine and human are united in the revelation of the Son of God. If we wish the Bible to speak freely, its status and interpretation are not to be approached in the context of considerations of the uniting of the divine and human elements in Scripture.

The Critique of the Christological Analogy

The criticism of views of the status of the Bible which seek an understanding of the nature of Scripture by means of an analogy with the person of Christ is a strand which runs through Barr's work. It applies first of all to the Christological analogy as it was used in neo-orthodoxy, but also to fundamentalist approaches to Scripture. As the first is the more important in the development of Barr's own theology, we shall limit ourselves to Barr's critique of the Christological analogy in neo-orthodoxy.

Barr gives the following autobiographical indication:

"... there is in my work a very decided striving for reappraisal of the work of Karl Barth. This has a sort of biographical explanation through the great influence of Barth on my earlier theological formation. Though I still feel that it is Barth's God whom I seek to worship, the intellectual framework of Barth's theology has in my consciousness to a very great extent collapsed in ruins ... Barth's theology forms for me one of the chief areas in

which I hope to find lines of thought. Sometimes it has afforded me suggestions for fresh construction, sometimes it has made clear for me a point to which we must go back if certain dilemmas of modern discussion are to be overcome."(6)

This relatedness to Karl Barth and the desire to find new directions from within his thought, is clear above all in the substantial review which Barr wrote on J.K.S.Reid's *The Authority of Scripture*.(7)

Barr notes at the outset the centrality of the Christological analogy for the understanding of Scripture and compares statements by Reid and Barth to this effect.(8) Reid affirms that the imperfection of the Bible is located in the human and not the divine element, in the recording and not in the revelation itself.(9) "It is men in their finitude, and more exactly in their sinfulness, that introduce perversion into God's self-disclosure, or rather into the record they make of it". Reid has clearly learned in Barth's school - the drawing together of finitude and sinfulness, and the contrast of self-disclosure and Scripture as record of revelation are fairly typical, to say nothing of the structure of this thought which tends to contrast the divine and human.(10)

What then does Barr think about all this? Firstly he recognises the central significance of the analogy "which more than any other single factor has assisted the revival of biblical authority in the Church." It has been a powerful weapon against fundamentalism with its inerrancy-mentality and liberalism which saw little in Scripture beyond human religiosity. However, Barr thinks the last word has not been said yet. What lacks in Reid's work is a criticism of the Theology of the Word; Barr wonders whether with Barth's formulation we have really reached a terminus, or if "a new period of restatement must now begin."(11) He suggests

that "considerable modification" must be introduced because of an "important inadequacy" in the Theology of the Word. The point at issue concerns the role of the human response "behind" the Scripture.(12) How are we to understand what the Word of God in human form is?

Barr does not think that theologies which insist on Scripture as witness and speak of its "pointing away from itself" do justice to the human form of the text. For we must, says Barr, take into consideration the facts of the formation of the Bible. In respect to the relation of the word in its God → man and its man → God aspect Barr says that the second is at least as important, if not more constitutive of Scripture than the first. For in the making of the Scripture-tradition the Word/Act of God and the human response are entwined together, having worked on one another in the tradition. "The moulding of the tradition is a continual response to the divine Act or Word".(13) This amounts to saying that as there is interaction of both elements within the tradition their relation must be seen in terms of the process of tradition. It is not so much a case of revelation and response, the one being divine and the other human, but both the divine and the human element exist within the context of a human historical unfolding of tradition in Israel and the Church.

The difference between Barr and Barth opens out at this point. Barr puts it very precisely. In Barth's structure the prophetic/apostolic response "is a response of further transmission of the Word to Man, not a response of answer to God from Man." What Barr envisages is that even if there be divine revelation, this Act/Word takes its place in the tradition as an element of the developing human response of man to God. So although Barr does not want to deny the function of the Bible as witness to God's revelation, we cannot consider this unilaterally. "Scripture is answer as well as address". Referring to one of

Barth's images Barr says with some wit: "The finger of John the Baptist should be given a rest; he is simply not an adequate analogue for the whole range of biblical statement".

How are we to consider this suggestion of Barr's in relation to the thought of Barth? It seems possible that this can be seen as the radicalisation of one of the aspects which entered into the finely balanced dialectic of revelation and Scripture in Barth. In Barth the negative distinction between human and divine and the emphasis on the limitation of the Word, existed nevertheless with a positive aim - that of pointing beyond to the ultimate unity of the Word in the actuality of revelation. Even should Barth affirm the total character of the humanity of Scripture as witness, to the point of declaring it to be "everywhere a human word" (14) in the overall structure the human could function only as preliminary to the divine, rather than something of value for itself. So for Barr, this humanity remains neglected as being only a moment in the movement from God to man, which remains dominant. On the other hand Barr would like to see something really positive in the human aspect for itself, and in the wake of recent developments in the field of OT studies, suggests a radicalisation of the human aspect indicated by Barth. Thus the Scripture is seen as a tradition process which entwines the divine Act and the response as man's answer to God. If one regrets a slight lack of focus in the exposition of these ideas and the absence of a more explicit development, the rectification is to be expected in subsequent developments.

As far as the traditional way of speaking of the "elements" of Scripture goes, Barr reckons it to have broken down. For if we make the act of revelation the divine aspect and the recording the human function, then it is clear that the divine act is simply depicted in a human story. The divine

act itself is not a part of the Bible. Or, alternatively, if we speak of the divine and human as mingled in Scripture the "two elements" fall from view. Therefore it is better to affirm, says Barr, that "there is in fact only one 'element', the human", in Scripture.

Thus Barr comments "... it needs to be said emphatically - the human character is the bearer of revelation, the human word is the word that has authority."(15) This is another way of insisting on the Scripture as the product of the community of the people of God bearing witness and responding to God's leading in its traditions.

At a later date Barr sums up his reservations about the Christological analogy in these terms:

"There is ... no good reason why the relationship between God and man in the person of Christ should be supposed to hold good also for the relationship of divine and human in the Bible; even if one accepts in the fullest way a formula like the Chalcedonian ... there is no reason why it should be applicable also to the Bible ..." (16)

The Christological Analogy and Interpretation

This criticism of the status of the Scripture articulated in the context of a revelational analogy with the person of Christ has its correlate in the field of interpretation.

Once again it is necessary to relate Barr's criticism to Karl Barth's reflections on exegetical method. According to Barth, exegetical method must be adapted to the subject-matter in view. Exegesis must take into account the reality beyond the text in order to constitute a proper means to understanding. Scripture being considered a human witness to revelation, interpretation must seek to go beyond this humanity to see God's revelation. (17) This is at the heart

of Barth's well-known remarks concerning historical criticism and interpretation in his Preface to *Romans*. (18) An historical approach to the human text of Scripture is in itself not sufficient. We cannot forget that the Bible is witness; a true historical understanding cannot ignore this. The Bible does not speak of itself, but of God's revelation. Interpretation, if it is to achieve its goal, must seek not only the human and historic, but in order to understand these, must see them as witness pointing beyond to the divine revelation.

It may not be necessary to belabour the point here, as it should be fairly clear that this orientation fits hand in glove with what Barth says of the Christological analogy in the context of his *Theology of the Word*. Exegesis must take into account the structure of appropriation and participation which characterises incarnation and inscription. Just as humanity is taken up into the revelation of Christ in the Word made flesh and human words are taken into service in the biblical witness, so also interpretation cannot ignore that the text, if a human Word, belongs with revelation. So it has to look beyond the text itself, to the act of revelation.

In this respect Barth speaks of "open exegesis". A true understanding of the human Scriptures is one that leaves the interpreter free to be grasped by the subject matter of the Bible in the event of revelation which is God's affair, not ours. Thus "... the exegesis of the Bible should be ... left open on all sides, not for the sake of free thought as Liberalism would demand, but for the sake of a free Bible." (19)

This approach has caught the attention of Barr, the exegete. In his review of Reid's book, he refers to the above passage and adds - "Do we not need more guidance what this means, and how the working minister may put it into practice?" (20) That this question has continued to preoccupy Barr

is seen in another such affirmation some fifteen years on:

"My own position is in every respect in favour of a greater and freer use of the Bible by the church, and I believe that many of the troubles of modern Christianity are self-inflicted burdens which would be much lightened if the message of the Bible were more highly regarded." (21)

Barr's concern as stated here has obvious Barthian undertones. However, if Barr has taken this basic concern for an "open" Bible and its "free" use from him, this is by no means an indication that his way of achieving this freedom will necessarily coincide. In Barth's case this freedom is concerned with a recognition of the three-fold structure of the Word of God. The relation of the divine and human in Christ applied to Scripture, with the necessary modifications, gives the essential structure which exegesis must bear in mind. For exegesis does not exist for itself, but in seeking an understanding of the subject-matter of the text must envisage proclamation and the freedom of the event of God. It is a preparation for being grasped by the subject-matter of the text which lies beyond the human aspects of the text.

The problem with the double-nature approach, complains Barr, is that it leads to a dualism in exegesis, one line working with the human in a scientific fashion and the other making a "theological" approach to the divine Word. For Barr the dualism of the approaches is based on a now defunct understanding of the nature of Scripture. In his restatement the freedom of exegesis will be no longer, as with Barth, the freedom of the Subject related to a construal of the text in terms of the divine and human. It will rather be an openness based on the interpretation of Scripture on a totally human level, uncumbered by the

interjection of theological authority. (22)

Barr's approach to exegetical questions here is in correlation with his criticism of the structure of the Christological analogy. Just as this inhibits our discernment of the true humanity of Scripture by the contact with the divine, so in the realm of interpretation considerations of theological normativity connected with the divine aspect will inhibit true freedom in exegesis. This is a consequence of the tension between an ontological approach and a functional one in theological methodology. Exegesis is not concerned primarily with questions of theological normativity but with an account of human relations.(23) It is concerned with the dynamics of history and ontological questions should not impede it in this pursuit. This is not to say it will never be concerned with this sort of question, but such considerations are not its aim. It seeks above all the opening of the meaning of a human text in freedom from considerations of authority.

These considerations provide the necessary background for understanding Barr's critique of the linguistic methods used in Kittel's *TONT* and in much recent biblical theology, given in the *Semantics of Biblical Language* and *Biblical Words for Time*. The distinctiveness of the individual texts is lost in the context of biblical concepts which have normative value and are supposed to yield a key to the revelational character of Scripture. In this same respect Barr criticises the attempt made by some theologians, such as G.E.Wright, to see in the revelation-historical character of God's mighty acts spoken of in Scripture, the essential unitive theme of the Bible.(26) It also serves to indicate one aspect of Barr's distaste for fundamentalist theology which supposes the Scriptures to be revealed on their own witness and seeks to defend traditional views of Scripture by means of an appeal to the

inerrancy of the Bible.(27)

A Critical Approach to the Human Scriptures?

Having now criticised the influence of the Christological analogy as a model for describing the status of Scripture and a guide to its interpretation, what has Barr to offer in the way of reconstruction?

Barr would doubtless be of one mind with Marcus Barth who remarks that the analogy cannot solve the problem of Scripture's authority and affirms that it is "but another yoke fabricated by those who want to impose the Bible on its readers." (28) Barr seems to regard the analogy as an authoritarian structure which prevents us seeing the true humanity of the Bible and the real issues of interpretation which lie on the human historical plane. Thus Barr seeks a reconstruction of the doctrine of Scripture which will account fully for the human character of the text and allow us liberty in interpretation. His proposition is stated once again in his review of Reid's book. This suggestion has been developed in detail in Barr's later works such as *Old and New in Interpretation* and *The Bible in the Modern World*.

Barr's own contribution to the debate on the Christological analogy is not only the emphasis on the human aspect of the Bible text. It is a little more adventurous than this, and quite original, in its way. Leading on from his assertion that there is only one element in the Bible, the human, Barr seeks to formulate the consequences of this for the doctrine of Scripture. His suggestion is as follows: "the true analogy for the Scripture as Word of God is not the unity of God and Man in the Incarnation; it is the relation of the Spirit of God to the People of God." (29)

These propositions can be understood in the context of the modification of Barth's analysis of the threefold form of the Word of God. Once the

analogy between Christ and Scripture is removed from this structure, the third form of revelation, not Scripture, becomes the mediacy where the Word is actualised. No longer is mediacy sought on the level of Scripture as a divine-human analogue to revelation in Christ, but in the form of the continuing people of God in relation to the Spirit. This shift is already prepared for in Barth's own work, where Scripture and proclamation are two aspects of the same genus. Scripture is a church-document, written proclamation, which present day preaching continues. Jeremiah and Paul are at the beginning and the modern preacher nearer the end of one and the same series. (30) If there is also dissimilarity, related to the constitutive significance of Scripture, the continuities are very profound.

Thus for Barr Scripture can be considered as an aspect of a tradition forming process which develops historically. Rather than analogy between the writings of the OT and NT and the nature of Christ, there is a relation of continuity in the life of the people of God through contact with the Spirit of God.

The question Barr wishes to answer by replacing the Christological analogy with a Pneumatological one, is as to whether anything "rational can be said about the status of the Bible in the church." (31) The alternative lies between continuing to claim a special status for the Bible without acceptable explanation, and seeking to account for Scripture in a way that makes sense in the world framework in which we live. (32)

In Barr's description of the status of Scripture in the context of the analogy between the Spirit and people of God, the "special" theological categories of the former theologies are translated from a revelational context, to acquire new meaning in that of an immanent historical process expressed in the development of a human tradition. The traditional language is generally maintained,

with a different sense. Three illustrations of the nature of Barr's proposals can be given, from the two major books referred to above.

1. The Tradition Process

The tradition of Israel which is crystallised in the OT is multiplex in character; its diversity must be recognised. We cannot reduce it to a single formative element such as the acts of God or direct verbal revelation of divine truths. These are elements which function in the tradition rather than generating it. Thus progressive human tradition replaces progressive divine revelation; the character of the OT narratives is that of an on-going story rather than what we would strictly call history.

2. The Tradition and Revelation

The previous models of revelation accepted in theology often conceive of knowledge of God as the result of a divine act or inspired words conveying truth about Him. Such views can't fit in with the approach to Scripture as a cumulative human tradition formed in contact with the Spirit. Thus revelation is no longer conceived of as preceding the formation of the Scriptures. Revelation rather follows on from the tradition in the sense that Scripture which is formed "by a human action which is a reflex of contact with God"(34) is adopted by God as His word for future generations. (35) Thus tradition which is generated on the understanding that God is known and present with His people provides a framework for understanding in new situations. What is the mode of this divine presence in which tradition is formed? Barr admits: I do not see how we can think in the present day other than seeing the mode of God's presence then as not different from how God continues to make himself known.(36) The mode of formation of the tradition is "in the Spirit". God is 'with' His people. But Barr seems "at a loss" as to what this really could mean, beyond affirming that the Spirit accompanies human thought and action. (37) Thus

the tradition can be described in an historical way without pleading of divine interventions at any points of difficulty. This "appeals to" Barr.

3. The Scripture Tradition as Classic Model

If the Scripture is the crystallisation of a human tradition how can its function be described in the Church? Barr proposes that the Bible may be considered as giving a model or paradigm of how faith may be related to the God of Israel who is the Father of Jesus Christ. It does not therefore provide a revelation of what faith should be, but a classic human expression of what faith might be.

"The relation of the biblical writers and traditionalists to God through the Spirit is thus not basically other than that of the Church today in its listening to God. There is however a difference in the stage . . . the biblical men had a pioneering role in the formulation of our classic model, and this may make it fitting for them to be called 'inspired' in a special sense." (38)

Since Scripture is a human document, if we are to speak of inspiration this must be in a human sense in a way "purified from all suggestion of inerrancy and infallibility, and from all teaching that identifies the production of the Bible with the revelation of God." (39) A Scripture "inspired but fallible" including errors, theological and other, might describe the way God uses sinfulness to conquer sin. (40) To speak of Scripture as classic model would seem to mean that we seek in reading Scripture to gain understanding of how the Spirit dynamically led the people of God to express their faith in response to the total situation of their time; this can be paradigmatic for the leading of the Church by the Spirit in the situation which is ours. Because these situations, then and now, are human

ones, this understanding in relation to faith is aided by the proper use of historical analysis in exegesis. The Bible is therefore not a norm which can be applied to present situations as the rule of faith and practice. It is a model which illumines us as we face present situations and make our own decisions.

Conclusion

We are now in a position to see where Barr's rejection of the Christological analogy leads him. Many questions might be asked about the reality of the knowledge of God and salvation to be had in this scheme and as to the adequation of human faith to its divine object. Do we know anything real about God, and how are we sure that our human expressions of faith are not merely figments of our imaginations? Again it might be asked whether there is not a problem with the human fallibility Barr is willing to accord to the biblical texts on the basis of the almost infallible capacity Barr seems to accord present human reason to judge this fallibility. Barr does not tackle the foundation on which truth is to be discerned. He seems simply to validate modern thought as being adequate to judge truth historically.

Such questions may be interesting and vital. However, in this conclusion a few words must be said as far as analogies are concerned. In Barr's presentation, it is a choice between a Christological analogy or a Pneumatological analogy. Barthianism lacks a doctrine of inspiration of Scripture; Barr supplies one but rejects the revelational context of the Theology of the Word. In both cases it is inevitable that a polarity ensue between the divine and the human. For Barthianism the lack of a doctrine of Scripture which is truly theopneustic results in the tangentiality of the acts of God's revelation. Nowhere does God seem to reveal Himself concretely in the world of phenomena. (41) Human knowledge

and history remain unreconstructed and secular. The same is all the more true of Barr's approach. The Spirit leads, but God does not reveal. Tradition is "inspired" but totally human; the activity of the Spirit is tacit. Thus in both cases there is no real union of the divine and human in Scripture. The two "elements" are separate and the presence of one seems to exclude the other.

This duality of the divine and human arises, in my opinion, since there is no idea of general revelation as covenantal either in Barthianism, nor in the thought of Barr. In Barth everything becomes governed in terms of a Christological reductionism; in Barr in terms of the primacy of present knowledge.

Neither can put us in touch with the Living God of Scripture. In Barth an all-sufficient Christ compensated in principle for an insufficient Bible. In Barr the humanly-sufficient tradition seeks adequation with the God in unity "out there" who has a history which is different from human history, the one God who is "a unity with a history".(42)

However, if neither analogy is adequate to solve the problem of the relation of the divine and the human in so far as Scripture is concerned there remains, it would seem, only one possible way to overcome the duality. This is in the combination of the two analogies, but not in the sense that Barth understands the one or Barr the other. The Spirit works in human affairs, but God also reveals Himself in our world. Thus the solution to the divine/human duality which plagues modern doctrine of Scripture is not in Word or in Spirit, but in Spirit and Word: in God creating man for communion in the Spirit and speaking His Word in the fellowship of the Spirit; in God renewing man through His Spirit and speaking to man the Word of salvation. In creation and re-creation the initiative is with God; it is in His Spirit that we are formed in the Glory-Image (43) receiving His

Word as the covenant truth of the Almighty. In Christ also we are renewed in the image of the Son who is the Lord of the Spirit by receiving the Word of the Gospel of salvation.

Reflection along these lines would bring us to an adequate formulation of the relation of the divine and human aspects of the Scriptures, which may also be found to be conformed with the witness of the Scriptures themselves.

"For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ."

* * *

(1)

A detailed account of the Theology of Barr is given in the writer's doctrinal thesis to be published in the summer by Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, entitled "*JAMES BARR AND THE BIBLE: CRITIQUE OF A NEW LIBERALISM*".

(2) *Does Biblical Study still belong to Theology*
Oxford 1977

(3) *ibid*, 7,8

(4) *ibid*, 4, cf.14,16

(5) The Christological analogy is the parallel drawn between the divine and human nature in the person of Christ and the similar elements discerned in Scripture.

(6) *Old and New in Interpretation*, London 1966,12

(7) *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11:86-93

(8) *ibid*, 86

(9) See J.K.S.Reid, *The Authority of Scripture*,
London 1957, 184f

(10) See Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, I.2, 499ff.

(11) *SJT art.cit*, 87

(12) *ibid*, *loc.cit*, The use of the word "behind" is rather strange in this connection, but it is

- perhaps indicative of Barr's appreciation of its subsidiary character in the Theology of the Word.
- (13) *ibid*, 88. The reference to tradition can be attributed to the influence of Von Rad's theology.
 - (14) Barth, *op.cit*, 464
 - (15) *SJT*, 90.
 - (16) *The Bible in the Modern World*, London 1973, 22. (BMW)
 - (17) Barth, *op.cit*, 466ff
 - (18) See the remarks of J.M.Robinson, in *The New Hermeneutic*, J.M.Robinson and J.B.Cobb eds., New York 1964, 22ff.
 - (19) Barth *op.cit*, I.1, 106. cf. Reid, *op.cit*, 199ff.
 - (20) *SJT*, 93
 - (21) *BMW*, 112
 - (22) As is seen in Barr's lecture, notes 2-4
 - (23) *ibid*, 8
 - (24) Barr, 'Scripture, authority of' in *IOB(S)*, 795
 - (25) 'Reading the Bible as Literature' *BJRL* 56: 20.
 - (26) See 'Revelation through history in the OT and in Modern Theology', *New Theology No.1* ed. M.E.Marty and D.G.Peerman, New York 1964, 60-74.
 - (27) See my article 'Révélation et Inspiration: James Barr contre B.B.Warfield', *Hokhma* (Lausanne) 8: 39-64.
 - (28) M.Barth, *Conversation with the Bible*, New York 1964, 170.
 - (29) *SJT*, 89
 - (30) Barth, *op.cit*, I.1, 101f.
 - (31) *BMW*, 111
 - (32) *ibid*, 109ff.
 - (33) *ONI*, 20
 - (34) *ibid*, 163
 - (35) *SJT*, 91
 - (36) *BMW*, 18

52.

- (37) *ibid*, 131
- (38) *ibid*, 132
- (39) SJT, 90f.
- (40) BMW, 179
- (41) This point has been developed in the works of J.Hamer, Langdon Oilkey, D.Tracy, C. van Til and G.Wingren where the theology of Barth is referred to.
- (42) BMW, 181
- (43) See on the function of the Spirit in creation the article of M.Kline, 'Creation in the Image of the Glory Spirit', *Westminster Theological Journal* 39: 254ff.

BOOK REVIEWS

'THE MAKING OF THE BIBLE'

William Barclay

The St. Andrew Press

£1.25 94 pages

William Barclay spent his brilliant literary life seeking to popularise the Bible. He was remarkably successful. But he was also sadly successful in achieving in the minds of many the exact opposite of what he had hoped to fulfil. Barclay always maintained the authority of Scripture as the Word of God but through a subtle erosion by inuendo, he in fact, left wide open doors of doubt concerning the accuracy and reliability of Scripture.

This book is the first in a proposed series of twenty-two under the title "Bible Guides" and edited by Barclay and F.F.Bruce. This volume is really concerned with the formation of the canon of Scripture. The introduction explains that the series, though written for non-theologically equipped readers who want to know what the Bible is about, is soundly based on all the generally accepted conclusions of modern Biblical research.