

6

as very excellent. What I have seen in general of his influence has been good, and I do not wish to say anything at this time that would detract from it. He was asked to write a paper that was numbered called Number 2: "Grammatical Historical (hyphen Exegesis." It would of course seem natural that this would deal with ways "Grammatical His-orical (hyphen?) Problems." One would think that this would deal with ways of examining the grammar and the historical background in order to determine exactly what the words of Scripture mean, and therefore what meaning we should ~~der~~ derive from them. When the paper came in, I suspect that the head of the director of the conference was greatly surprised. At any rate, instead of although it still kept the number 10 [you said "2" above] in the book of the papers it was not placed second, but about in the middle, and this was also true ^{of the} announced program for the meeting. In this paper he discussed various methods of interpretation, most of which had nothing to do with either grammar or history, nothing directly. Thus he spoke at considerable length about ^{H C} the higher criticism which he seemed to have adopted to a very considerable extent. He spoke of the J document and the P document and said that ~~with the~~ where the ~~knives~~ knives of the ~~exist~~ critics coincide we must accept what they say, and said that the arguments that they present show that Genesis 1 and 2 must come from two different sources.

In my opinion what while I am sure this man would declare his strong acceptance of every Christian doctrine, yet the attitude toward Scripture taken in his paper, in my opinion, completely undermines all confidence in the integrity of God's Word.

I prepared an extensive discussion of the matter of Higher Criticism and of some of the other problems raised in the paper. I wish that the matter had had more prominence in the meeting. There were those there ~~h~~ who have particular theories as to methods of interpretation and there was much discussion of these in certain sections. There were others who were dealing with. The conference was based on the attitude that the Bible is God's Word and is true; how do we ~~we~~ interpret it? But some of the papers showed that they were greatly