

method. This is then a history that is robbed of objective divine *speaking* and *acting* in human history. In spite of the many variations in approach between Gunkel, von Rad, Hesse and a host of others, it remains the case that all who adopt the historical-critical method ultimately are forced into some form of humanistic religious subjectivism because they have rejected *a priori* the possibility of objective divine revelation in word and act.

There is hardly a more important issue facing the world of biblical studies today than this issue. As G. Hasel points out, the historical-critical method requires that:

Historical events must be capable of being explained by antecedent historical causes and understood in terms of analogy to other historical experiences. The method which prides itself of its scientific nature and objectivity, turns out to be in the grip of its own dogmatic presuppositions and philosophical premises about the nature of history.

A biblical theology which rests upon a view of history that is based on an unbroken continuum of causes and effects cannot do justice to the biblical view of history and revelation nor to the Scripture's claim to truth What needs to be emphatically stressed is that there is a transcendent or divine dimension in biblical history which the historical-critical method is unable to deal with. If all historical events must by definition be explained by sufficient historical causes, then there is no room for the acts of God in history, for God is not a historical character. If one's view of history is such that one cannot acknowledge a divine intervention in history through deed and word, then one is unable to deal adequately and properly with the testimony of Scripture. We are, therefore, led to conclude that the crisis respecting history in biblical theology is not so much a result of the scientific study of the evidences, but stems from the historical-critical method's inadequacy to deal with the role of transcendence in history due to its philosophical presuppositions about the nature of history.^22

That is the issue. The God of the Bible is a God who has *spoken* and *acted* in human history to provide for the redemption of fallen man. Whenever and by whatever means God's *speaking* and *acting* in human history are denied then inevitably the Bible's message of redemption is destroyed. The Bible unites divine revelation, redemption and human history in such a way that any tampering with the objective historical reality of divine revelation inevitably eviscerates the Bible's message of redemption. It is for this reason that it is so necessary for evangelical scholarship to vigorously maintain the importance of the historical trustworthiness of the Bible. The history of the Bible is the history of redemption.

Unfortunately we find that some who consider themselves to be within the evangelical community have made significant concessions to the historical-critical method, and have even moved towards accepting a divided field of knowledge in biblical studies,^23 which I might say is unavoidable when one tries to fuse the historical-critical method with traditional biblical teaching. The certain result of such a position however will be increasing erosion of confidence in biblical historicity and a consequent loss of authenticity and authority for the Bible's message of redemption. As J. Gresham Machen said in his inaugural address as Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Princeton Seminary on May 3, 1915:

The separation of Christianity from history has been a great concern of modern