

I found the paper on Historical Grammatical Problems rather frustrating. The paper contains many excellent statements but often they are surrounded by suggestions and inferences that might be interpreted as negating them. There is very little in the paper that would seem to be properly come under the heading of Historical Grammatical Problems. Much of it deals rather with philosophical or critical problems. The study of such problems has a proper place but does not in most cases greatly affect the historical method of exegesis rightly formed.

The paper begins with 9 pp. == The paper is divided into three major heads of which the first is prejudgment. Here the emphasis is indeed of a very vital matter for hermeneutics or for any study. Though I see no reason for dignifying with a title the New Hermeneutics an effort to avoid nor do prejudgment though I think that the authorities quoted on the top of p. 5 most of whom deny not only inerrancy but actually but most of the outstanding points of historic Christianity, are necessary Such a statement for instance as Bultman's that there cannot be any such thing as presuppositional exegesis is really a retreat from the effort to get ideal as near to this idea as possible, Granted that all human beings are fallible and sinful and without to fall into error at various points, the duty of the difficulties involved in avoiding prejudgment clearly emphasize the great importance of doing so. Personally I feel it extremely important in taking up the study of any section of Scripture to first get a general impression of the progress of thought in the section and to note the natural points of division between the particular subjects. Then in looking at the vv. contained in each section to ask the question constantly, Is my idea of the progress of the thought in the passage as a whole correct or is there something in this v. that proves that I have made an error? ~~Assas~~ It is always good to take a passage and