Chapter 1: Scripture in a Digital Context

> *Our inventions are wont to be pretty toys, which distract our attention from serious things. They are but improved means to an unimproved end, an end which it was already but too easy to arrive at; as railroads lead to Boston or New York. We are in great haste to construct a magnetic telegraph from Maine to Texas; but Maine and Texas, it may be, have nothing important to communicate. … We are eager to tunnel the Atlantic and bring the old world some weeks nearer to the new; but perchance the first news that will leak through into the broad flapping American ear will be the Princess Adelaide has the whooping cough.*
>
> Henry David Thoreau[1]

This is an effort to write theology as an insider. It starts with Apple iPhones and the GPS display at the train stop, with e-mail spam hawking Canadian drugs and rapid status updates. It begins without an omniscient view, but instead works its way from the digital interior of a rapidly emerging cultural context defined by the speed of light—a culture of information and of communication and how these two have become indistinguishable. It necessarily begins with experience and ends with experience, though it does not locate its gravity in either end.

The topic of reflection is the Christian doctrine of Scripture—the Word of God. Already an unstable and revisited vista in the realm of post-deconstruction theological reflection, here we suggest there is a more significant confrontation of the *Text* than those who have successfully questioned its relevance under the postmodern moniker.[2]

---

[1] Henry David Thoreau, *Walden* (New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1904), 61.

[2] This suggestion affirmed by psychologist Kenneth Gergen who writes, "As a result of advances in radio, telephone, transportation, satellite transmission, computers, and more, we are exposed to an enormous barrage of social stimulation. … What is generally characterized as the post-modern condition within the culture is largely the by-product of the century's technologies of social saturation." Gergen, Kenneth. *The Saturated Self*. (New York: Basic Books, 1991) xi. As quoted in Robert Fortner, "Digital Media as Cultural Metaphor," in *New Paradigms for Bible Study: The Bible in the Third Millenium*, ed. Robert M. Fowler, Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, and Fernando F. Segovia (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 23.

My thesis is this: I hope to show that the cultural shift from print media to digital media (and particularly the sub-stream of digital information) first changes the *practices* of the church and its *use* of scripture in new media environments, which therefore cannot do any less but modify the church's perception of the nature (and therefore the authority) of scripture.[3]

My approach is theological in the sense that deals with the people of God and their faithful understanding of the Word of God as incarnated in today's world. It is optimistic when it understands culture as not something we the church stand apart from, but walk in the door already having. It is communication-oriented in the sense that it views the building blocks of culture as communicative in nature, and most recently, digitally mediated. It is ecological because it sees communications systems as cultural networks and interdependent environments that defy simplistic labels such as "sender" or "receiver," and it is technological because it recognizes that media are, in-fact, not original to human existence, but invented or added or constructed. Yet media, as "extensions" or "amplifications" of our natural, communicative selves, are as organic as they are technological—whether they are transparently familiar, such as the printed book (the most influential technology to date), or novel, such as the new evolution of the Palm Pre, the handheld digital device that pulls social media and GPS location data wirelessly from the invisible cloud, sorting and condensing in real time as it presents its content on a brilliant three inch screen.

There is another sense in which this thesis cannot truly be written yet, that the phenomena that I will attempt to describe here are too young to be trusted and too unsettled to support conclusions. This is undoubtedly one of the reasons why, while the digital revolution is in full swing, direct academic reflection is hard to come by, and nearly impossible to locate in the realm of theologians or church historians.[4] Though we'll examine what few reflections have been

[3] The "sub-stream" of *digital information* can be contrasted with *digital image.* I'll address this distinction shortly.

[4] Perhaps another reason is that most theologians—as non-digital-natives ("digital immigrants") over the age of 40—spend most of their day regarding their e-mail as more of an intrusion onto their work and their computer screen as little more than an improved assistance in typing up documents.

compiled to date, the majority of this thesis will use historic formulations of theology and the more recent discipline of *media ecology*[5] in a rather untested combination.

We'll begin by establishing some initial building blocks in both.

Information about Information

We will begin with building blocks and definitions regarding technological environments. Some words on definitions will be particularly helpful, although the youthfulness of this inquiry means that we'll have make apologies to the future for outdated terms. Already resources from five years ago, using such terms as 'Cyberspace' and 'World Wide Web' (never mind ten to fifteen years ago: "Netscape, Bulletin Board, Gopher") have a quaint feel, and it would be naive to think we will avoid similar linguistic consequences. Nevertheless, some of the following categories will be helpful for our entire discussion.

Toy, Tool, Environment

Though much of Europe has used cell-phone based SMS (Short Message Service) messages—also known as "text messaging" (or "txt")—for many years, at this writing it is just beginning to become ubiquitous in the United States, with many people sending and receiving a text message of 160 characters or less as often as once a day,[6] while our junior-high aged youth routinely process a breathtaking 2,272 messages monthly.[7] For those just catching on, new

---

[5] Extensive definition, review of key literature, can be found in Chapter 3

[6] Li Yuan, "Text Messages Sent by Cellphone Finally Catch On in U.S.," *wsj.com*, August 11, 2005, sec. Telecommunications, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB112372600885810565.html. reported in late 2005 that 71% of European mobile phone users regularly used SMS ("text") messaging, about twice the U.S. percentage—Pew Internet & American Life places it about 27%.["34 million American adults send text messages on their cell phones | Pew Internet & American Life Project," *Pew Internet & American Life Project*, March 14, 2005, http://www.pewinternet.org/Press-Releases/2005/34-million-American-adults-send-text-messages-on-their-cell-phones.aspx.] UK industry tracker TextIt would places European volume about the same time at approximately 100 million text messages daily. ["32 Billion Text Messages for 2005," *Text.it | The UK's definitive text related information source.*, September 27, 2005, http://www.text.it/mediacentre/press_release_list.cfm?thePublicationID=4D7B0212-D61A-70B5-BAD1AB3B53FFA133.], or about 32 billion for the year.

[7] Eric Zeman, "U.S. Teens Sent 2,272 Text Messages Per Month In 4Q08," *Information Week*, May 26, 2009,

technologies can be "fun." Unwittingly, we may view new technologies in one of three stages of adaptation.

Technologies begin as *toys*. The "play-with-it" oriented showroom floor of technology retailer Best Buy confirms it—new technological innovations are curiosities and entertainment. Our first time "txting" another individual, we wanted to "try it." "I don't who I txt or what I say, I just want to 'try it'," we say. Users focus on the experience of using the technology, and use language appropriate to the novelty, referring directly to the technology rather than the content or recipients of the message ("Look ma, I'm texting!").

They continue as tools. This intermediary stage discovers the toy to be useful, and once the entertainment value has worn, enjoys the new efficiencies or tasks that the technology can effect. Marketing messages claim to save us time. In this, the language typically retains the presence of the technological phenomenon, but adds self-referential task-based language, e.g., "I did my e-mail this morning" or "I used the new txt feature from my bank to check my account balance." Not everyone in the *tool stage* sees the technology in a positive light. Henry David Thoreau's 1854 critique of the telegraph indicates that he has left the honeymoon of the toy stage, and, now firmly utility-oriented, is unsure the relationship should continue.

Technologies finally melt into an *environment*. This third stage removes the technology from explicit discussion and makes it implicit or even invisible. Terminology focuses exclusively on sender, receiver, and content. "She said she'll be five minutes late," says a junior-high student, who doesn't think to explain that that message updating her friend's status arrived via txt message. Academics routinely speak of relating with other thinkers in their field, "I've been interacting with Smith lately," and don't find it necessary to state that they have been using a printed book technology to read Smith's thoughts, or a computer to compose a measured response destined for a print journal.

---

http://www.informationweek.com/blog/main/archives/2009/05/us_teens_sent_2.html;jsessionid=NQKGP2LUWWUITQE1GHOSKH4ATMY32JVN.

It's this last stage that we'll be speaking from as we move forward to consider the digital environment. And for some this last stage, at least as it relates to portions of digital media[8] will remain foreign. The liminal nature of the current acceleration in technology leads to all sorts of levels of acceptance, and some, frozen in their familiarities, will never see certain technologies recede into their environment, either begrudgingly using them as a tool (think grandma with the microwave) or rejecting them outright as a toy for others.[9] Fortunately, there is language for this too.

Digital natives and digital immigrants.

Education author Mac Prensky's notable 2001 article on students of the future established two terms that are now in common use: *digital native* and *digital immigrant*.[10] Prensky describes students who have grown up with digital technology—by college having accumulated 10,000 hours playing video games. The digital native lives in a world of mobile Internet, social networking and that average of 2000+ text messages we've already mentioned—The Pew Internet and American Life Project is tracking a growing category of teens they dub *supercommunicators* that use more than five forms of interactive media daily.[11] The change has been rapid, and natives either have been young enough to flexibly adapt, or may not even recall life without the technologies.

The difference between these students and their older teachers is not slight, Presnky insists, calling the "arrival and rapid dissemination of digital technology" a "singularity."[12] It's not that digital immigrants don't use new technologies, but it's how they use them—"with an accent." Presnky's observations are clever and specific. Immigrants print long e-mails out on

---

[8] Let's hope after 500 years, the printed book is generally an environmental technology for most of us.

[9] My grandmother used her brand-new microwave gift as a small cabinet for cook books

[10] Marc Prensky, "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants - Part 1," *On the Horizon* 9, no. 5 (October 2001), http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf.

[11] Amanda Lenhart et al., *Teens and Social Media* (Pew Internet and American Life Project, December 19, 2007), http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2007/Teens-and-Social-Media.aspx.

[12] Prensky, "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants - Part 1," 1.

paper in order to read them; make phone calls and ask "did you get my e-mail?," or pull someone into their office to look at a website instead of sending a link. They don't understand how natives listen to music, edit video, and study at the same time—and as teachers they tend to present information in a linear fashion that natives struggle not to be bored with.

Placed within our previous framework: digital natives live in information as an environment, while digital immigrants use technologies as a tool, and neither are likely to change their patterns.

Digital culture is both information and image.

New media theorist Lev Manovich makes a particularly helpful distinction in the history of technological development between contemporary *visual culture* and contemporary *information culture*.[13] Visual culture he traces to 1839 and the invention of the daguerreotype in Paris—an early camera prototype by Louis Daguerre that, with patience, used silver halide particles to directly capture a real image on a polished plate.[14] Information culture (a term that Manovich claims as his) has a separate precursor—an 1833 punch-card mathematics machine dubbed "the Analytical Engine" by its inventor Charles Babbage. Today, visual culture is image-based—signs, televisions, photographs, cinema, design, and graphical interfaces. Information culture is complex databases, search engines, social networks, RSS feeds, knowledge retrieval and manipulation, computational instructions. These two streams—the photograph and the computer—were developed separately, but in Manovich's description of new media, dramatically collide, a fact we now live *in*, in the age of the CNN's stock tickers and the Internet's YouTube database, showing hundreds of millions of video clips daily.[15]

---

[13] Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), 13.
[14] Ibid., 21.
[15] "YouTube Fact Sheet," *YouTube*, n.d., http://www.youtube.com/t/fact_sheet.

Although the distinction is now blurred and in practice it is nearly impossible to separate, from an analytical perspective it's helpful to perpetuate Manovich's taxonomy.[16] Therefore, for our purposes we will use the term *digital culture* as interchangeable with information culture, that is, primarily referring to communication environments associated with the retrieval, display, and manipulation of data. This is the context in which we'll consider Scripture, and will not attempt to address visual cultural forms such as the relationship of scripture to visual metaphor, icons, video and images, a line of inquiry which deserves its own paper (if not library).

Theology From Context

The language to this point has made free use of words such as "environment," "culture," "context," "native," and "immigrant." The language initially comes from our conversation partner in media ecology, whose basic orientation, as we'll see, is to view communications technologies as cultural environments. Here is where the link to theology can be made. Outside of the classic discussion on H. Richard Neibuhr's *Christ and Culture* typology—theology and culture meet in the world of *contextual theology*.[17]

To speak of contextual theology today typically calls to mind one of two possible approaches to theology and culture, distinguishable by both their roots and their intention. In fact, though they share the same label, they're not often found in the same academic walls (if we can forgive some painting in rather broad strokes).

---

[16] Even "raw" data is typically accessed by humans via graphic interfaces. Clients like Microsoft Excel or data-driven websites both present and interact with data visually. It's interesting to note that the cinema industry has been one of the longest hold outs on the blend. While digital post-production for "special effects" has long been common, directors and production studios have resisted the move to digital media for production, many still using the analog 35mm standard. An agreed upon digital standard for production and distribution to movie theaters has only existed since 2005. See "Digital Cinema Initiatives (DCI) Digital Cinema System Specification, Version 1.2," *Digital Cinema Initiatives, LLC*, n.d., http://www.dcimovies.com/.

[17] Neibuhr's 1956 book *Christ and Culture* is the typical starting point when "theology and culture" are mentioned in the same sentence. He considered five approaches to the relationship between the two: Christ against culture, Christ of culture, Christ above culture, Christ in paradox with culture, and Christ the transformer of culture." Interpreters note that while Neibuhr sees all five as legitimate, he clearly favors the last. Critique and answers and reformulations of the typology over the last fifty years have been numerous, but I think at the most basic, Neibuhr begins with a fundamental split between sacred and secular that I don't believe is there. Culture is something the church already walks in the door having.

Evangelical academics are likely to locate the discussion in the missiology department, where examination of culture has an evangelical impetus. With roots in the successes and failures in the nineteenth-century Western missionary societies, these approaches are primarily praxilogical, discussing custom and ritual and global cultures. Anthropology and sociology are engaged for their descriptive powers, and missionary-theologians like Paul Hiebert and John and Anna Travis are referenced in an effort to understand the incarnation and communication of the gospel, especially in non-western environment.[18]

Mainline academics, on the other hand, are likely visit contextual theologies as an invited critique on the Western hegemony of the academy. The approach is postmodern and plural, and builds on the foundational stones of liberation, feminist, and black theologies, citing Gustavo Gutierrez, Mary Daly, and James Cone. In intention, these voices are studied to rectify a missing voice to marginalized people groups, a segment that is destined to continue its expansion even beyond Womanist, Minjung, and Queer theologies.

Each general approach—the missiological or the postmodern—maintains some suspicion of the other, not least because of their perceived (and not without cause) position as liberal or evangelical approaches. But both share in common a potential marginalization in the theology classroom which implicitly (and unintentionally) accepts the mainstream of Western theology as neutral, generic, or context free. That course catalogs will allow "Feminist theologies" or "African Christologies" but not "European Reformed Theologies" or "Germanic Pre-Modern Doctrine" underscores the point. The Frankfort school's Herbert Marcuse helpfully speaks of "repressive tolerance" to describe a hegemonic system that receives minority views with open arms, but in treating them as such uses them as evidence to reinforce the dominant view.[19] And

---

[18] Paul Hiebert, formerly of Fuller Seminary, was the "Distinguished Professor of Mission and Anthropology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School" when he died in 2007. See Robert J. Priest, "Paul Hiebert: A Life Remembered," *Books and Culture*, October 1, 2007, http://www.christianitytoday.com/bc/2007/sepoct/9.9.html?start=1.; John and Anna Travis established the oft-cited C1-C6 model of inculturation for the Muslim context. See John Travis, "The C1 to C6 Spectrum," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 34 (1998): 407-415.

[19] Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, jr., and Herbert Marcuse, "Repressive Tolerance" in *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 95-137.

Dutch Catholic Frans Wijsen laments that contextual theologies are treated like "exotic fruits to supplement their traditional Western theological dishes."[20]

If these two approaches were to have more than just casual interaction, one might imagine they'd band together on a protest march with slogan posters held high: "All theologies are contextual theologies!" And this is the approach this study takes, attempting a theology from context because *all* theologies—as faith seeking understanding—seek from their point of view.

Catholic theologian Stephen Bevans writes, "There is no such thing as "theology"; there is only contextual theology… the attempt to understand Christian faith in terms of a particular context is really a theological imperative" and cannot be "something on the fringes of the theological enterprise. It is at the very center of what it means to do theology in today's world."[21] Bevans provides six detailed sketches of contextual theology, set out as "inclusive models."[22] The translation model seeks adaptation; the anthropological model seeks to preserve cultural identity; the praxis model is "faith seeking intelligent action"; the counter-cultural model seeks prophetic voice; the synthetic model seeks dialog; and the transcendental model seeks paradigm shift. It's these last two models that may partially describe the approach that will be attempted here. The transcendental model, describes Bevans, requires, "a radical shift in perspective, a change in horizon."[23] Jesus says that a new patch cannot be put on an old garment (Mark 2.21-22). This model begins with the individual or community's experience of itself, and sees God's revelatory action as received by real human people. The synthetic model, on the other hand, assumes that contexts have both uniqueness and similarity to other contexts.[24] It emphasizes dialog, and while it does not begin with "Christianity's previous inculturations," easily borrows resources or language from other contexts as it seeks to explain.

---

[20] Frans Wijsen, "Intercultural Theology and the Mission of the Church," *Exchange* 30, no. 3 (2001): 218.

[21] Stephen B Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology*, Rev and Exp Ed., Faith and Cultures Series (New York: Orbis Books, 2002), 3, 15.

[22] Ibid., 139.

[23] Ibid., 103-116.

[24] Ibid., 88-102.

It's probably important to note that the cultural context in view—digital information culture—cannot be defined geographically or generationally.[25] Though American children and teens in middle-class settings are a staple of the online demographics, research shows us that younger adults (the latter half didn't grow up with e-mail) are still highly digitally active—84% of 18 to 29 year olds check social networking sites at least once a week.[26] Exceptions abound, and the Washington Post reports on examples of both "resisters" and "adopters" in the mostly-connected age groups.[27] And Pew Internet demonstrates effectively that the "digital divide" between poor and rich, urban and rural, and elderly and young is rapidly vanishing.[28] So for our study, instead of defining a digital native by "generation" or social location, we instead say that a digital native is simply one who lives in digital technology as an environment. The description still may not encompass certain teenagers, while it could easily include a Blackberry-armed business person that exceeds the typical age assumptions, but the cultural links between digital natives remain. For instance, though the author was born in 1978, he would view himself as a digital native.

Biases and Background

In that light, it seems appropriate here to briefly narrate a bit of my background and therefore bias on the topic. As a technological citizen, Pew Internet would classify me as an

---

[25] This project does not address global digital culture. A fascinating study would be the impact of digital culture on the Global South in light of Lamin Sanneh's assertion that Africa today, having skipped the European Enlightenment, is more like the early church recorded in Acts than any Western culture. How would an African doctrine of scripture today be affected by the digital cell phone networks that have appeared on the continent without the American progression through classic electric or mass technologies like landline phones early television? See Sanneh, Lamin. *Whose Religion Is Christianity?: The Gospel Beyond the West.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003

[26] Ian Shapira, "No Friends of Facebook's, in a Generation That Is," *Washington Post*, October 15, 2009, Online edition, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/story/2009/10/15/ST2009101500563.html.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Amanda Lenhart, "The Democratization of Online Social Networks" (presented at the AoIR 10.0, Milwaukee, WI, October 8, 2009), http://www.pewinternet.org/Presentations/2009/41--The-Democratization-of-Online-Social-Networks.aspx. Lenhart, for instance, concludes that "the urban tilt has disappeared" in accessing online social networks, as well as showing there are "no regional differences" in the United States.

early adopter[29]—having used connective technologies such as Bulletin Board Systems since 1992, or *digital collaborator*[30]—who is defined not only by his constant work with and sharing of digital technologies, but his attitudes toward them: enthusiastic, confident, and positive about the future (the latter "tech user typology" places information and communication technology, or ICT, users into 10 categories, which also include *ambivalent networkers* and *information encumbered*).[31] The reasons are my education and environment: we were brought up with more significant access to computers, with above-average restrictions on non-interactive mass media such as TV and radio. Though my undergraduate training is in economics and business administration, throughout college I worked as a student supervisor of fifty peers who answered questions on technology in classic "computer labs"—this before laptop computers were prevalent. My early professional years I consulted in partnership with a Microsoft-certified training center, and my years in ministry were spent on one of the most technologically advanced campuses in the world, the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign, which still rightly claims the invention of the Internet.[32] Throughout, I've can't recall a time when a "Personal Digital Assistant" wasn't in my hand—from the original Palm Pilot III through the Palm Pre, which appeared in June 2009.[33]

Theologically, a few items should be noted. As my father is an ordained military chaplain in the Presbyterian Church in America, my childhood training was conservative reformed—the Westminster Confession and John Calvin. The ten years of young adulthood

---

[29] Amy Wells, *A Portrait of Early Adopters* (Pew Internet & American Life Project, February 21, 2008), http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2008/A-Portrait-of-Early-Adopters.aspx.

[30] "The Mobile Difference - Tech User Types," *Pew Internet & American Life Project*, March 31, 2009, http://www.pewinternet.org/Infographics/The-Mobile-Difference--Tech-User-Types.aspx.

[31] Ibid. The ten types (in two sub-groups) in order, from most to least connected: Motivated by Mobility [1.Digital collaborators 2. Ambivalent networkers 3. Media movers 4. Roving nodes 5. Mobile newbies] Stationary Media Majority [6. Desktop veterans 7. Drifting surfers 8. Information encumbered 9. Tech indifferent 10. Off the network]

[32] Case in point: open any Microsoft Internet Explorer "About/Credits" window and you'll find my university listed because of our early work via the National Center for Supercomputing Applications and the invention of the early web brower Mosaic, which gave way to the first rather public browser: Netscape Navigator.

[33] Personal Digital Assistant, or PDA, is another of those terms that has quickly left the building at the advent of multi-feature cell phones.

were greatly influenced by a small network of evangelical, Jesus-movement sourced fellowships that emphasized house churches of ten to thirty people, emphasis on the Great Commission, an informal and participatory worship style, plurality of eldership, the priesthood of all believers, scripture memorization, and discipleship marked by principles of mentorship, multiplication, and leadership development. I have spent time in and out of what was called the "emerging church" conversation in the last eight years or so. And my recent training has been with the Evangelical Covenant Church, with its emphasis on theological moderation, rejection of creedal formulations, and its association with the evangelical left.

The results are these: First, my approach is interior to the digital culture, which naturally gives me the advantage of an "insider" (emic) cultural description, but leaves me open to "outsider" (etic) criticism. Secondly, it's possible my view is inherently optimistic about technology and its effects, as will become apparently in my evaluation of Marshall McLuhan versus Neil Postman. Thirdly, my doctrine of scripture has moved from a view of rigid inerrancy (and accompanying ecclesiology of doctrinal purity), to pietistic authority, to postmodern despair of texts, and now towards a reconstructed concept of authority that seeks to synthesize my past views. My choices of sources and conclusions from a "digital context" are certainly greatly influenced by my theological past alone, although after all is admitted, I'd still be likely to argue that Kevin Vanhoozer's recent proposals hold a measure of coherence with a digital environment that I haven't seen elsewhere.

Mapping The Way

Having done some basic definition of a digital cultural context, established a contextual theology approach, and declared media ecology as a partner in discussion, we'll move forward in the following ways. Chapter 2 will look at the theology of the doctrine of scripture in the plural: as the Theologies of Scripture. It presents a brief overview of the history of Christian thought on the topic, and then reviews three current moderate evangelical proposals that will provide a pool

of reference for future discussion. Chapter 3 turns to defining media ecology as a theory group, and pays most careful attention to Marshall McLuhan and Walter Ong, the most influential voices in this study. Chapter 4 asks one of our key driving questions, "If 'the Bible' is not a book, then what is it?" The answer is a dance between media ecology and theology, with the former first taking the lead (the elaborate "media history") and then the latter (a waltz of creation, revelation, and incarnation). Having set a foundation, Chapters 5-7 make three "contextual probes" into the nature of scripture in a digital context. Each begins at a feature of the culture. Chapter 5 examines the collapse of time and space in a digital culture—starting with what Marshall McLuhan would have termed the "global village." Chapter 6 begins with social media showing how Facebook gives us a fascinating probe into the relationship between scripture and the church—which might call the *filtering community*. And Chapter 7 defines *remix* as a digital cultural value that operates an epistemological and identity forming function. Finally Chapter 8 turns the tables and asks three questions from the academic literature that aren't naturally posed from the insider view. It also gives us further ways forward and concluding thoughts in Scripture in a digital context.

We'll begin with the doctrine of scripture.