

The valid point is that Jesus is using a parable and you do not interpret a parable in the way you interpret a direct statement. He says the sower goes forth to sow and you don't think he was referring to one particular man whose name you could give and one particular place where all the types of soil he mentions are present; it is an illustration, that is its genre. But the tendency of those who have genre criticism is that they read it in such a way that you can get rid of almost anything.

In a book that's been recently published and I'm looking forward to seeing is a book on the Gospel of Matthew in which a man who has a fine reputation as a Christian writer says the book of Matthew was written as a historical novel, that's the genre. So this man knowing a few facts about Jesus went to work to build a novel about him and tell us what the life of Christ perhaps was like! When you ~~xxx~~ adopt a thought like that you lose all thought of inerrancy, all thought of the Bible as being dependable except in a few main teachings.

These different subjects were given for people to write on. The one that was No. 2 in the list was called: Historical and Grammatical Problems. Originally there were two responders to it, and one of them who was a good friend of the man who wrote the paper was not mentioned when the second paper came out. I don't know why he dropped out of it. It may be he was closely associated with the man on various matters and did not like his paper and did not want to attack him. I don't know whether that was the reason or not.

These papers were written a couple of years ahead of time. The responses a year and a half ahead of time. They had plenty of time to think about them. Then just 6 weeks before the meeting was to be held I got a phone call from Portland, Oregon from the man who was director of this hermeneutics conference and he said we are in trouble would you be able to write a response to this paper? School was just starting. It was a pretty hard thing to fit in -- a big task like that. But it sounded like he felt it was tremendously important to get me to write it, and he mentioned others whom he had thought of to write it but he said, I'm not quite sure they would be absolutely straight on this matter of inerrancy and while they have written some fine things, I wish you could fit it in to write it.

So I agreed to do it and they sent me a copy of the paper. The paper which was supposed to deal with Historical and Critical Problems was longer than most of the papers, but it began with saying there are problems in the grammatical-historical method as is obvious from the fact we have different denominations which have different views! Then he went on and instead of discussing many historical and grammatical problems he spent a long time discussing various approaches to the Bible by people, most of whom, do not accept inerrancy and saw considerable good in practically every one. Like the higher criticism. He devoted several pages to the critics ? ? . like where they unite on agreeing on something then we should accept it as true! All these various approaches he found some good in about every one of them.