

our fine evangelical men who are trying to teach in our schools and teach the great central doctrines of the Bible, when it comes to hermeneutics are getting their ideas from the writers of ~~sociology~~ sociology and psychology, from the unbelieving writers in all these areas, and bringing them in and trying to make the Bible fit with them instead of going to the Bible and finding what it teaches and seeing how it enlightenings == revises in all these things.

It was valuable to me to have that fact brought out so clearly. The fact that we need to get back to the Bible as our basis and find the many truths I believe are in it that no human being has yet seen because we have not taken time to look into the history, look into the grammar, look into the meaning of words and study them and see the truths that God has there for us.

God has given us a wonderful book of truth, a book which we need to interpret carefully and to avoid reading our false ideas into it. The hermeneutics conference produced a statement but the statement starts in by referring to these various approaches and recognizes that there is some good in about every one of them. I was able to keep them from allowing the higher and historical criticism to be referred to in that way. I would like to have made a ringing denunciation of it, but was unable to persuade them to do that. At least it did not express any approval. But they expressed approval of the idea of genre criticism dorrectly used, and of course there is a difference between a parable and a statement of historic fact. They recognized many of these different factors which are true but not to be carried beyond a certain point.

They recognized them and then they wrote the negative feature that we do not recognize any form of genre criticism that denies the accuracy, inerrancy and dependability of Scripture. So this statement in my opinion is not near as valuable as the statement which so clearly sets forth what we believe by inerrancy. This one on hermeneutics brings out the problem and shows that in every one of these we must avoid these interpretations that bring question upon its accuracy.

But the thing I would so much like to have seen of getting into these historical and grammatical problems and develop more of the teachings that are in Scripture but are not found inctbe because people approach it with their ideas inststead of going to it and seeing what it says. The conference did not do that. So I believe it was worthwhile, ? buttthere is a tremendous amout to be done in this area of hermeneutics. I believe one of the greatest ? of the Christian world today is to recognize that the Bible should be not be merely a banner to be waved but should be the source from which we get our ? We need to study it and look exactly at the possibilities and see many possibilities that have been passed over because they simply ruled it out. Of course these four are talking about the atonement! No they are not. The first three are, and the fourth is in a different xtense. That of course this is a dat. of method.