

He has enough praise for these approaches to completely undermine the Christian faith. It just shows the influence this theory has when one is submitted to it. It has a tremendous hold and influence in subverting (faith).

A man recently wrote a commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. A man who was a very fine NT scholar, a member of the Evangelical Theological Society to join which one must sign a paper saying he believes that the Scripture is inerrant, it is the Word of God inerrant in the original Scripture. Without error is the word used. This man has written a paper in which he has made an exegesis of Matthew and he says that it is inerrant in the meaning that it conveys the idea that Matthew meant to convey, and he says for instance the story of the wise men coming to bring gifts to Jesus, that Matthew simply gives that as his way of saying that the Gospel was not just meant for the Jews, but was meant to reach out to all the earth.

Actually, he says, there were no such men. He has at point after point in his book thrown aside ~~his~~ belief in it as fact, but he says Matthew did not mean it to be taken as fact. Everybody understood what Matthew meant." I don't see possibly how that could be true, but that is the view that he took in the book. The thing that shocked me far more than his saying the things he does in the book is that when the question was raised whether a man writing such a book and holding such views should be a member of the ETS, which everyone is supposed to sign this simple statement that he believes the Bible is inerrant in the original. The Executive Committee talked with him and decided that his views were satisfactory for a member of the Society.

Many in the Society protested this. Consequently the Executive Committee appointed a special committee to study the matter, and invited everybody to make suggestions. At a meeting last month of the Society, at the annual meeting, the magazine of the Society they gave half of it over to his answers to people attacking him. Someone would criticize him and he would answer. Someone would criticize him and he would answer. They spent half the time discussing the matter. Then a vote was taken as to whether he has a right to remain in the society with the views that he holds, and 40 voted that he did. (120 voted he didn't). But the fact that 40, doubtless including the Executive Committee would do so, shows to my mind how the HC has undermined Christian faith to the point where you won't know anything in the Scripture ~~belives~~ means and claims to accept at all.

This then is a tremendous force in our Christian world, and we see its effects in Sweden, in Scotland, in England, in Germany, in these countries where they were great Protestant centers not many decades ago. We see it in our own country in the part of our people, the scholars whom we consider the evangelicals because those who have taken advanced degrees in Universities like Harvard, have been so subjected to this sort of thing that everyone (I should not say everyone) but with very few exceptions they have ideas which they think they can related to the central Christian approach to the Scripture.

I think it is much more important than most Christians realize that we have some idea of what this theory is, this theory which is being taught in S.S. literature of all the larger denominations. Except the Missouri Synod Lutherans, I guess that is the only one ~~you~~ you would call a large denomination in which it is not presented simply as fact.