

On p. 9 the paper urges that the principle of commitment of that which is being looked into should be consciously linked as part of the historical-grammatical method of interpretation. AT this point I would take rather sharp issue. I believe that what the Scripture means to one of us should not be basic in determining what it ought to mean, or what another part does mean. If one does not have the guidance of the Holy Spirit and does not accept the Scripture as the true Word of God, he is ^{dramatically} grammatically prevented from ever getting into its real meaning.

On my opinion the importance of textual criticism has been greatly over rated. The Bible is God's message to us. [Footnote: to convey a message from one mind to another and human words are a very frail method of conveying such a message.] I do not believe that we should take a text and try to squeeze it to the point where we extract every possible bit of meaning from it. If we do so we are all too apt to insert into it a large part of the meaning we pull from it.

True hermeneutics, in my opinion, involves comparison of Scripture with Scripture and constant checking of the meaning derived from one part of Scripture with careful analysis of other parts of Scripture. The Bible is God's Message to His people and our aim should be to learn what he wants to tell us. When God caused the Bible to be written the whole course of human history was already clearly laid out before Him and He knew exactly what thoughts he wished to be communicated to the hearts of His people as each particular action of --section of world history. Just as the creation of the universe is a marvel far transcending any man's full understanding, so it is a great marvel how God