
What's at Stake: "It's Hermeneutics!"¹

Margaret Köstenberger
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Hermeneutics is the unfinished item on our agenda of theological prolegomena. It must be seriously and comprehensively addressed by all evangelical theologians and biblical scholars in the immediate future. Without a hermeneutical consensus, any hope for a consensus in theology and ethics is mere wishful thinking. We evangelicals rightly make a great deal of the normative nature of the biblical text. Our views must be judged in the light of Scripture. But our agreement on this point has real significance only to the extent that we "correctly handle the word of truth."

— Stanley N. Gundry, "Evangelical Theology: Where Should We Be Going?" (1978)²

Author's Note: *Who was Jesus? Was he a chauvinist? A feminist crusader? An egalitarian emancipator of women? In my forthcoming book Jesus and the Feminists: Who Do They Say That He Is?, portraits of Jesus painted by proponents of women's equality are investigated in order to determine how they fit with descriptions in the Gospel narratives. Specific attention is given to the evaluation of the hermeneutical methods employed by the different feminist interpreters. A study of feminist scholarship on Jesus shows that the feminist quest for self-realization has led feminists to distort who Jesus really was. Not only this; the various "Jesuses" resulting from the different feminist attempts to reconstruct Jesus are contradictory, indicating that feminism is a movement divided with regard to Jesus and his approach to women.*

The article printed below will appear as chapter 2 of the book. It focuses on special issues in the feminist debate regarding Jesus. Issues that are discussed include the reconstruction of history, epistemology, the role of the reader versus authorial intent, canonicity,

the alleged patriarchal nature of Scripture, and fundamentalism. Also, the reader is informed as to the most glaring pitfalls of feminist interpretation.

Introduction

During the 1992 United States presidential campaign, Bill Clinton's advisers kept hammering home one simple truth: "It's the economy!" They were convinced that the state of the American economy was the number-one issue in that election, and in part owing to their dogged insistence and determination their candidate triumphed. As our study of feminist scholarship on Jesus will demonstrate, something similar is the case in biblical studies: "It's hermeneutics!" In other words, people's understanding of individual passages of Scripture largely depends on their overall view of the nature of Scripture and on the interpretive methodology they bring to the table in the first place.

As we will see, in the case of radical feminists,³ their approach to Scripture is, in a word, rejection, owing to what they perceive to be the Bible's irredeemably "patriarchal" nature; i.e., it springs from and provides for a disproportionate amount of male power.

The same is true to a lesser extent with reformist feminists,⁴ except that they do not reject Scripture in its totality but selectively use or discard what does or does not conform to their feminist presuppositions. In keeping with the Enlightenment spirit, reformist feminists start out with the "enlightened notion" that all men—and women—are equal, and then they critique and supplement Scripture as they see fit, whether by rejecting the authority of Scripture where it does not conform to their feminist outlook or by adding additional writings to their "canon" that reflect more closely their own beliefs.

As for evangelical feminists or egalitarians, they accept Scripture as inerrant and authoritative, while supporting a hermeneutic aimed at discerning authorial intent. For egalitarians, Scripture is treated with more respect than it is with radical or reformist feminists. Unlike the latter, who already start out with the presupposition that feminism is right and the Bible wrong where it stands in conflict with feminism, evangelical feminists claim to show inductively that the Bible, rightly interpreted, teaches male-female equality, including women's eligibility to all church offices and roles of leadership in the church.

There is a wide range of interpretations among feminists with regard to Jesus and women. How do we account for this diversity of views, even among those who all hold to a form of feminism? And how do we know which interpretation is right? Since a proper approach to the study of Scripture is foundational to its interpretation and also essential for the construction of sound theology, it is important to unearth the theological method, including the hermeneutical method, of various schools of interpretation with regard to Jesus' approach to women.⁵

Special Issues in the Feminist Debate

In our efforts to understand feminist hermeneutics, it will be helpful to take a look at a few general hermeneutical issues.

Reconstructing History

Reconstructing biblical history is the first such issue, an endeavor that has had a major impact on the discussion of the feminist interpretation of Jesus' stance toward women. In the prevailing climate of postmodernism in much of American culture, including academia, the question of the nature of history and of historical research naturally arises. How do we really know what happened in history? Since history is forever past, how can one properly investigate it? Since all historical research is conducted by historians with various views and agendas of their own, is not the entire enterprise of historical research hopelessly subjective? Recent scholarship, including the feminist variety, has increasingly questioned whether history "as it actu-

ally happened"⁶ can be recovered with any degree of confidence from the available sources.⁷ Postmodern theorists believe that history is written by the winners; those victorious in a given struggle are the ones who recount the story from their point of view. According to them, history is a function of power rather than truth. History is but a fable agreed upon.⁸

There is, of course, some truth to these claims. Sources must still be evaluated, and they will often—some would say *always*—reflect the bias of a particular historian. At the same time, few would go to the extreme of denying that it is possible to reconstruct history "as it actually happened" to at least some extent. For example, few would question that Jesus Christ lived as a historical person or that he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, because a variety of sources, biblical and extrabiblical, attest to his existence and the facts of Jesus' life. The same can be said with many other historical persons and events both ancient and modern. As P. W. Felix notes,

It must be granted that twentieth-century exegetes are outsiders to the culture in which the Bible was written, and for this reason can never achieve a complete understanding of the original meaning of the Bible in its historical setting. An undue emphasis upon this limitation, however, loses sight of the fact that all historical study is a weighing of probabilities. The more evidence we have, the higher degree of probability we can attain. The practice of exegesis, therefore, is a continued search for greater probability and a more refined understanding.⁹

Once doubt is cast on the interpreter's very ability to determine history with a reasonable degree of confidence, we can no longer be sure of the very foundations of our Christian faith, which is of necessity grounded in historical events such as Christ's incarnation, crucifixion, burial, and resurrection (1 Cor 15:3–4).

Most feminists, however, still seek to reconstruct the historical circumstances surrounding Jesus' ministry to determine his approach to women in order to critique or commend it, though different

feminists do not necessarily agree on a particular reconstruction. In this quest, of course, evangelical interpreters will trust the testimony preserved in Scripture as their primary historical source.

Epistemology

A foundational issue related to hermeneutics is the question of how we know anything to be true, the study of which is called *epistemology*. Is knowing truth strictly subjective, varying from person to person as postmodernism claims, or is truth absolute and applicable to all individuals regardless of their cultural context? The postmodernism view is that truth is but the linguistic expression of a socially constructed notion of customs and values characterizing a particular community. Yet noted philosopher J. P. Moreland, among others, has recently raised some serious questions about its validity.¹⁰

Moreland's critique of postmodernism implies that truth is not merely subjective, as if there were the possibility of many different Jesuses roaming first-century Palestine. Nor is truth based merely on the perspective of the interpreter so that the first-century Jesus is hopelessly irrecoverable. The "real Jesus" is attested by eyewitness testimony in our primary sources, the Gospels, and these sources essentially cohere. For this reason we can approach Scripture with confidence, hoping to discover who Jesus really was, as long as we are aware, and properly suspicious, of our own presuppositions.

The Role of the Reader vs. Authorial Intent

The question must be raised not only about *what* we are interpreting but also about *who* is doing the interpreting.¹¹ Evangelicals endeavor to operate within the Bible's own frame of reference, accepting the reality of a transcendent God and of the supernatural. But many who approach the Bible from a postmodern perspective allow their personal situation and experience not only to influence but even to determine the outcome of the interpretation.

This premise is paramount in feminist interpretation of Scripture; it is approached self-consciously by women with predetermined outcomes. Yet, arguably, if we desire to interpret Scripture, we

must attempt to allow its authors to have weight in the interpretive outcome. This procedure should be applied in as fair and unbiased a fashion as possible, whether or not we believe that Scripture is the inspired, authoritative, and true Word of God.

It is a realistic danger for any interpreter from whatever point of view to read her own agenda into the Bible rather than to let the Bible speak for itself. She must recognize that she has presuppositions but not allow these to be determinative in her interpretive outcome. Using proper exegetical methods will help interpreters overcome their own lack of knowledge or deficiency and will enable them to come as close as possible to the author's intended meaning of Scripture and to determine its significance for their own lives.

The quest for the intention of the author is heavily criticized in many circles and is not without its challenges and in some cases proves inconclusive, but it must be maintained that, in principle, determining authorial intent is an academically defensible and legitimate strategy for discerning textual meaning.¹² An author-oriented approach to interpretation also corresponds best to reality and common sense, since every text has an author and is willed by that author to express a particular message. Texts do not simply come into being, nor do they, properly understood, mean anything apart from authorial intention.

In recent years, certain approaches to interpretation have completely turned away from authorial intention and put the interpretive emphasis in discerning meaning squarely on the reader. According to some, a text means what it means to a given reader. This renders interpretation very difficult since a given text will mean different things to different readers; there are no criteria for determining what constitutes a valid interpretation.¹³

What various postmodern hermeneutical approaches have in common and what they share with much of recent feminist approaches is an emphasis on the reader rather than on the author of a given piece of writing. No longer do interpreters seek to discern authorial intention in seeking to understand the meaning of a given passage. Instead, they deny that a passage has the same meaning for

all who interpret it; a passage has only a multiplicity of readings, and these readings, in turn, are a function of the subjectivity and experience of the reader, whether feminist, Hispanic, white Anglo-Saxon male, or African-American. The end result is that the meaning of a given text will be different for different readers, and there are no clear standards by which to evaluate the validity of different readings. All are equally valid.

Now, there surely is an element of truth in these postmodern approaches. It is true that the focus on authorial meaning is often oversimplified. Nevertheless, the radical shift from authorial intent to reader-created meaning is too reactionary. In the end, there is no adequate substitute to make up for the loss of the author in determining the meaning of a given text. Moreover, it is important to remember that there is no way to know the author's intention other than by what is expressed in a given text.

The conclusion must be that *authorial meaning is textual meaning*, and the meaning of a given text is the meaning intended by its author. The reader's role is largely passive, seeking as much as possible to discern the various textual clues for the original author's intended meaning. Only after this approach has been applied is there a need for the reader to apply the text to her personal life.

While objectivity in interpretation is clearly impossible in light of a reader's presuppositions, this does not mean that sound interpretation is doomed to failure. Interpreters who approach the text with an openness to be engaged by its message and by its ultimate author—God himself—will find their understanding of its meaning increasing.

Issues Related to Canoncity

Given the perceived patriarchal bias that both radical and reformist feminism bring to Scripture, whole portions have been excluded by them and its authority is rejected. Other books have been co-opted or materials have been created and put in their place.¹⁴

Historically, the Scripture that we are interpreting has come down to us in church history as a canon of biblical books.¹⁵ The canon of Old

Testament books was possibly set as early as the end of the first century A.D. The New Testament canon took shape in the first few centuries of the early church. Paul's letters were given recognition before the end of the first century (2 Pet 3:16). At the Reformation, the church removed several Old Testament apocryphal books from its canon while continuing to affirm the canonicity of all twenty-seven New Testament books that had been included at least since Athanasius's famous Easter letter of A.D. 367. Therefore, the church through the ages, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, has held that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, and they alone, are inspired and authoritative.

Regarding the canon, the church has historically affirmed, first, that the canon is *closed*; that is, the early church's determination of canonicity was definitive and binding on the church ever since.

Second, the canon of Scripture is characterized by what has been termed "progressive revelation," which means that later revelation builds on earlier divine self-disclosure. This is important for interpretation, since it means that earlier material must be interpreted in the light of later revelation.

Third, the canon of Scripture is characterized by both an underlying theological *unity* and *diversity* in expression on the part of the different biblical authors.¹⁶ For example, with regard to unity, all of Scripture is the story of God's dealings with humankind. This theme runs through Scripture as a common thread and lends unity and coherence to the various biblical books. At the same time, different writers of Scripture may express themselves in diverse ways. A classic example is the way in which Paul and James address the issue of justification by faith. The implication of this for our topic is that evangelicals will expect the biblical teaching on the role of women, such as that of Jesus and Paul, to be coherent and consistent.

Fourth, in light of the diversity of biblical books many feminists have postulated the need for a "canon within a canon." They seek to determine the "central message of Scripture" and to interpret portions of Scripture that seem to be at variance with that central message in light of it.¹⁷ The problem with this procedure, however, is that only what

is considered to be the central message is important while less central passages may be neglected. Also, there is danger in an interpreter arbitrarily selecting a “central theme” of Scripture in keeping with her preference while neglecting teachings that are countercultural or otherwise offensive.

In keeping with the church’s historic affirmation, then, we affirm that the canon is closed and consists of the sixty-six books traditionally included in the Protestant Scriptures.

The Alleged Patriarchal Nature of Scripture

Another issue at stake is the question of the perceived patriarchal nature of Scripture. Those who hold to this view believe that Scripture was written and settled in a framework controlled by men, thereby affording men an inordinately large share of authority. The question is whether such male authority is to be taken as God’s will for all people at all times.

It is undeniable that patriarchy as a cultural system of family relations existed in the Old Testament period. So should we consider patriarchy as a cultural institution that expresses God’s will for human relationships? Or is this system culturally determined and thus relative, if not intrinsically evil, because it permanently enshrines male supremacy over women, justifying the removal of portions of the canon of Scripture? How is patriarchy to be defined in the first place? If patriarchy is God’s intention for us, how is this authority to be exercised? What do Jesus’ teachings and practice contribute to this discussion?

All sides can agree that concerted efforts should be made to combat abuse of male authority, which is still found in many homes and cultures today. In the end, this is not merely an academic issue but one that has enormous practical consequences. This is one of the great strengths of feminism, which has always strongly rejected male domination and the abuse of women. Yet it is necessary to elaborate on the difference between patriarchy and what may be called *patricentrism*, between harsh male dominance on the one hand and loving, caring leadership on the other.

Is the Bible’s teaching, then, hopelessly patri-

archal and thus irrelevant for today’s enlightened, egalitarian culture? How do we rightly interpret Scripture in any case? Is not all biblical interpretation irredeemably subjective? And is not historical research fraught with insurmountable difficulties? Feminism has brought all these issues to the fore. In arguing for an interpretation of Scripture, including an interpretation of Jesus, that is ideologically and experientially driven, feminists have set themselves over Scripture, critiquing it and determining what Scripture may or may not say to modern, or postmodern, men and women.¹⁸

What are we to say, then, regarding the charge leveled by radical feminists that Scripture is to be rejected since it enshrines patriarchy, understood as the exercise of a dominant, heavy-handed type of male authority? Without exception, patriarchy is characterized as the source of all evil in feminist literature. This, however, may be shown to reflect feminist bias rather than scriptural deficiency.

In fact, Daniel Block has made a strong case that ancient Israel practiced not the kind of patriarchy depicted by today’s feminists but by what he calls “patricentrism.”¹⁹ According to Block, like the spokes of a wheel, life in ancient Israel revolved around the father in his role as the provider and protector of the extended family. It was not so much the “rule” of the father (patri-archy) but his loving care and provision for the well being of his own that were most central to the father’s role.

Scripture in its entirety is pervaded by the principle of men bearing the ultimate responsibility and authority for marriage and the family as well as for the church, “the household of God” (1 Tim 3:15). This principle of male headship reaches from God’s creation of the man first (Gen 2:7), to his holding the first man accountable for humanity’s sin (Gen 3:9–12), to the ancient Israelite practice of “patricentrism,” to the all-male Levitical priesthood in Old Testament Israel, to Jesus’ choice of twelve men as his apostles, to Paul’s teaching that men bear ultimate responsibility and authority for the church (1 Tim 2:12). In fact, Paul himself believed that his teaching of male headship was rooted in the Genesis creation narrative (see 1 Cor 11:8–9; 1 Tim 2:13).

It is true that the historical narrative books of the Hebrew Scriptures witness to numerous abuses of this abiding principle of male headship in the Old Testament period, such as arbitrary divorce (Deut 24:1–2), the intermittent practice of polygamy, adultery, rape, incest, and so on. Scripture does not condone these behaviors and attitudes.²⁰ At the same time, the New Testament does not abrogate the principle of male headship even subsequent to redemption in Christ. Thus, Paul still can call Christian wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22–24), and Peter similarly enjoins wives even of unbelieving husbands to submit to them (1 Pet 3:1–6).

Feminists regularly stress women's need for liberation. There can be no doubt that all over the world millions of women are oppressed, often just because of the traditional structures remaining intact, though by and large this is not a feature of North American society, which is very much egalitarian in practice. Christian wives should experience liberation from the dominant, unloving, abusive exercise of their husband's authority (see Gen 3:16), a form of "rule" that in the Bible is contrasted with the loving, sacrificial exercise of the husband's servant leadership in Christ (Eph 5:25–28). But the gospel does not entail a promise of, or call to, women's liberation from all forms of male authority over them.

The point is that true freedom in life is not found in the abolishing of any authority over oneself, especially if it is God-ordained. Scripture presents men's authority in the home and in the church not as autocratic or grounded in male superiority or merit but in the mysterious, sovereign divine will subsumed under the supreme lordship and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. Living within God's created male and female order allows for a genuine experience of fulfillment and freedom for everyone.

Evangelicalism vs. Fundamentalism

The diminishment of biblical authority in feminism has left a vacuum that has been filled by a vast array of feminist readings of Scripture and interpretations of Jesus. These readings make Jesus

an extension of feminist aspirations, domesticating him rather than allowing him to speak with his own unique voice to today's world and church.

Some are dismissing an evangelical approach to Scripture out of hand for illegitimate reasons. For example, conservative evangelical Christians may at times find themselves confronted with the label "fundamentalist," and their conservative viewpoint on gender issues gets rejected without further discussion.²¹ But there is quite a difference between fundamentalism and a conservative evangelical reading of Scripture. Fundamentalism often tends toward a narrow-minded approach to Scripture that may neglect legitimate aspects of the historical-cultural background. It at times can be dogmatic and may tend to impose systematized doctrine onto the text. It is also often characterized by simplistic thinking. Some have even used the Bible in the past to justify such terrible things as slavery and racism.

Other more balanced conservative evangelical interpreters of Scripture, while attempting to interpret the Bible literally, are open to taking the specific historical-cultural background into account to aid interpretation in order to acknowledge their own presuppositions, and they can therefore be more nuanced and open to complexity and diversity.

These foundational considerations will enable us to evaluate the various feminist proposals regarding Jesus' approach to women.

Conclusion

Hermeneutics is of critical importance in the study of Jesus' approach to women. As has been seen, several special hermeneutical issues arise in this regard: (1) the challenge of reconstructing history; (2) the question of how we know (epistemology); (3) the role of the reader versus authorial intent; (4) issues related to canonicity; (5) the alleged patriarchal nature of Scripture; and (6) the distinction between evangelicalism and fundamentalism. In assessing feminist scholarship on Jesus, it is important to realize that the various feminist approaches are driven by various hermeneutical presuppositions that predetermine the interpretive

outcome. A critique of feminist portrayals of Jesus must therefore assess the viability of these underlying hermeneutical presuppositions. This is the underlying thesis of *Jesus and the Feminists: Who Do They Say That He Is?*

ENDNOTES

- ¹The article is taken from the forthcoming book *Jesus and the Feminists: Who Do They Say That He Is?* by Margaret Köstenberger (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008). Used by permission of Crossway Books, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers, Wheaton, IL 60187, www.crossway.org.
- ²S. N. Gundry, "Evangelical Theology: Where Should We Be Going?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 22, no. 1 (1979): 13; repr. in *Quo Vadis, Evangelicalism? Perspectives on the Past, Direction for the Future. Presidential Addresses from the First Fifty Years of the Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (ed. A. J. Köstenberger; Wheaton: Crossway, 2007), 90. This was Gundry's presidential address delivered at the 1978 annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society. The quote reproduces the conclusion of Gundry's address.
- ³Radical feminists reject Scripture and even Christianity as hopelessly sexist and pursue a feminist agenda outside the bounds of Christianity.
- ⁴Reformist feminists claim Scripture has a "patriarchal bias" but seek to "salvage" biblical texts that portray women in a favorable light. In addition, they supply other extrabiblical texts to their feminist "canon."
- ⁵For that reason, before delving into a study of feminist interpretations of Jesus, you might find it helpful to review Appendix 2 of *Jesus and the Feminists* to see how Scripture ought to be interpreted. For a helpful summary see D. J. Smit, "Biblical Hermeneutics: the first 19 centuries," in *Initiation into Theology: The Rich Variety of Theology and Hermeneutics* (ed. S. Maimela and A. König; Pretoria: J L van Schaik, 1998), 275–96.
- ⁶The phrase is that of the German historian von Ranke: *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*.
- ⁷See further on this point the interaction with E. S. Fiorenza elsewhere in *Jesus and the Feminists*.
- ⁸For conservative evangelical evaluations of postmodernism see D. A. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); and M. J. Erickson, *Truth or Consequences: The Promise and Perils of Postmodernism* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001).
- ⁹P. W. Felix Sr., "The Hermeneutics of Evangelical Feminism," in *Evangelical Hermeneutics: The New Versus the Old* (ed. R. L. Thomas; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002), 386, citing R. Thomas, "Some Hermeneutical Ramifications of Contextualization and Feminist Literature" (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society; Atlanta, GA; November, 1986).
- ¹⁰J. P. Moreland, "Truth, Contemporary Philosophy, and the Postmodern Turn," in *Whatever Happened to Truth?* (ed. A. J. Köstenberger; Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2005), 75–92. The following summary of Moreland's argument is taken from the introduction.
- ¹¹Klein, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," in *Initiation into Theology*, 324–25; chap. 5 in W. W. Klein, C. L. Blomberg, and R. L. Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (2d ed.; Dallas: Word, 2004).
- ¹²E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University, 1967); Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral:*

A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation (2d ed.; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006); and Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998).

¹³Anticipated by Hirsch, *Validity*.

¹⁴See, e.g., R. R. Ruether, *Womanguides: Readings toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon, 1985) and various works by E. S. Fiorenza.

¹⁵B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (7th ed.; London: Macmillan, 1896); B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); F. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988); Klein, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," 324; chap. 4 in Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, *Introduction*; R. L. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Scriptures* (Greenville, SC: A Press, 1995).

¹⁶Klein, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," 324.

¹⁷This is found not infrequently in the writings of biblical feminists, though they may not use the "canon within a canon" terminology. See, e.g., I. H. Marshall, "An Evangelical Approach to 'Theological Criticism,'" in *The Best in Theology, Volume Three* (ed. J. I. Packer; Carol Stream, IL: Christianity Today, 1989), 45–60. The article first appeared in *Themelios*, as cited and critiqued by A. J. Köstenberger, "Gender Passages in the NT: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued," *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 278–79.

¹⁸See the surveys in M. E. Köstenberger, "Feminist Biblical Interpretation" and "Feminist Theology," in *Encyclopedia of Christian Civilization* (ed. G. T. Kurian; Oxford: Blackwell, forthcoming).

¹⁹D. I. Block, "Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (ed. K. M. Campbell; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 33–102, esp. 40–48.

²⁰A. J. Köstenberger, *God, Marriage, and Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004), 42–51.

²¹For a classic example of these two approaches to Scripture see the work by J. Barr, *Fundamentalism* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1981), on which see the critique by M. Silva, "Can Two Walk Together Unless They Be Agreed? Evangelical Theology and Biblical Scholarship," in *Quo Vadis, Evangelicalism?*, 111–20.