


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Editor's note: This article is available on the author's website: www.jerrywierwille.com We are grateful for his permission to print here. Abstract - Biblical interpretation is subject to false assumptions in the process of exegesis, violating the laws of language and logic and supporting erroneous assumptions. Misunderstanding of language principles, errors in understanding the definitions of words and their use, proper context management or grammar lead to incorrect conclusions about meaning. As for the laws of logic, the principles of reasoning, preconditions and reasoning are sometimes ignored or distorted, leading to false conclusions. As for prepositions, pre-positive or preliminary biases can distort a person's approach to the text and the specific preconceived notions he brings with him when he seeks to define meaning. The following sketches are largely adapted from D.A. Carson, Exegetical Fallacies (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996). I. WORD-STUDY FALLACIES The reason why word research is riddled with misconceptions is that it is easy to obtain snippets of information from various sources of references to words (e.g. consents, lexicons, biblical dictionaries, etc.) and then provide information and use it to draw conclusions that may or may not come from reliable and reliable methods of biblical interpretation. The solution is to learn and become more competent, or put off by scientists and other authorities who specialize in this field (but there is no guarantee that they will avoid misconceptions either... it's just more likely). The basic premise in word research is that words are liquid entities that suffer from their surroundings. Words are not just an isolated collection of symbols that represent a static idea. They require a series of related words to determine their meaning. This series of words is called context. As Carson argues, the heart of the question is that semantics, that is, is more than the meaning of words. It includes phrases, sentences, discourse, genre, style; it requires a feel not only for syntagmatic word research (those that refer words to other words), but also to paradigmatic word research (those that ponder why this word is used instead of the word). Here are a few exegetical misconceptions that relate to mishandling the meaning of words. In one form or another, each misconception points to an erroneous assumption that ignores the established law of language. And, more often than not, the mistake is to ignore the context and invest undue authority in the words themselves. The root misconception is the definition of the meaning of a word based solely or primarily on its etymology. Semantic Reading the more recent meaning of the word back to earlier literature. Semantic obsolescence - Assigning the meaning of the word it used for earlier times, but is no longer in the semantic range during composition. Addressing the unknown or hardly values - The word reference meaning in order to satisfy a theological perspective for which there is little or no lexical/semantic substance to support meaning. Negligent access to reference material is the use of background information to formulate a value for which there is virtually no substantive connection or reason for its veracity. Verbal parallelation - Affirming verbal or conceptual connections and even depending on meaning based only on parallels, selective use of certain parallels to establish meaning or to see parallels in each occurrence of a word. The relationship between language and mentality is assuming that language limits the thinking process to the fact that language and mentality are confused and disintegrated into each other. In other words, there is no distinction between language and how people think. False assumptions about technical meaning - assuming that a word always or almost always carries a technical meaning wherever it is used, ignoring the possibility that words may have more than one meaning (including technical) and can be used in more than one way. Problems associated with synonyms/component analysis- Misunderstanding of concepts of synonym and equivalence, and thus claiming artificial differences between words/phrases that share a high degree of semantic overlap and which can be used interchangeably with the same reference value, or claiming a high degree of synonym between words/phrases when they do not have the same reference value. Selective and biased use of evidence is to address certain evidence selectively, justifying a particular viewpoint, ignoring or rejecting all other evidence. Unreasonable semantic separation/limitations is the compulsion to artificially disconnect or limit the semantic range of the word and meaning that is not justified, evoking a or/or view of the meaning of the word, where it may contain the possibility of both. Unreasonable limitation of the semantic field is a limitation of the semantic range of a word that ignores the full range of possible meanings it may have. Unreasonable adoption of the extended semantic field (Illegitimate Totality Transfer)- Incorporating a wider range of word meaning in a particular context, which is more than the context allows. The problems associated with the Semitic background of the Greek New Testament are the imposition of an overly close correlation between the Semitic word and the Greek equivalent without consulting the Hellenistic context of its use. Unreasonable disregard for distinctive The corps is suggesting that the predominant use of a single writer of any word should be the use of all other writers as well. Unreasonable Linking of Meaning and Links- Confusion Confusion (meaning) words from its actual reference (object) because all words have a feeling, but not all words have a reference, and the feeling is not always equal to the reference. II. GRAMMATICAL FALLACIES (GREEK NEW TESTAMENT) Grammatical misconceptions are less frequent than misconceptions in the study of words, mainly because fewer people participate in the grammatical analysis of the Greek New Testament than in other forms of research that require intensive study of linguistics. However, those who conduct grammatical analysis and other forms of critical research tend to be more aware of how to handle the text and are less likely to make alleged statements that fall into the category of misconceptions. However, even experts make mistakes and do not always follow the proper rules of grammar and syntax. TENSE AND MOOD FALLACIES Aorist Tense - Assuming that aorist time always refers to a one-off past event. The first person, the aorist of subjunctive action - View of the aorist subjunctive inclination of the 1st person, as always indicating the true, deliberative force. An average voice, assuming that the average voice always means reflexive action or assumes that the subject acts on its own. SYNTAX FALLACIES Conditional - Taking protasis (if position) in 1st grade vi conditional statements as always pointing out something true in the final sense. Or seeing conditional statements of the 3rd class, indicating the degree of possibility for its implementation or non-fulfillment. Or to accept a reference to the time of the conditional statement in relation to the speaker, and not to the pro-tas. Article - Interpretation of the meaning and use of a Greek article from the point of view of an English article. Also claiming the Granville Sharp Rule feature and/or Colwell Rule is beyond the value in which it was supposed to work. Tenses Relationships - Inadequately distinguishing the relationship between the verb and what each time denotes in the structure and syntax of the passage. III. LOGICAL FALLACIES Logic is a very diverse word and has meaning on several different levels. But at the broadest and most universal level, logic can be defined as an analysis and evaluation of how evidence is used to get the right conclusions. There are three main universal laws of logic: the Law of Identity, the Law of Non-Contradictions and the Law of the Excluded Medium. Typically, logic relates to proposals, deductions and conclusions, and how evidence and reasoning are used to articulate the meaning of the proposed relationship between two or more objects or ideas. As Carson argues, this (logic) is a set of relationships that should be applied if there is any knowledge, and if any communication is possible. Thus, the biblical interpretation requires the use of logic for ideas and statements together in meaningful relationships with each other, through which one can then draw a conclusion. Here are a few exegetical misconceptions that relate to the misuse of logic. Each error points to a specific violation of the law of logic that ignores the logical limitations that must be applied to knowledge so that it is properly correlated. In most of the cases mentioned below, an error in logic is made by trying to force the meaning of the text to incorrect associations, deductions, or conclusions that disregard the logical consistency in the available information (data). False Separations - Allowing the adoption of only any/or position on the idea in order to make the various sides of the argument mutually exclusive when such a logical restriction should not be imposed on them. Excessively simplistic logical rule - assuming the validity of a sentence simply because of an explanation that is simply considered logical. What is considered logical may or may not actually be logically true. Selective (partial) evidence - Choose to rely on a subset of evidence, thinking it will represent a whole (see Word-Study Fallacy #10 above). Mis-treated sillogisms - Pairing several logical statements (sillogisms) in such a way as to infer the connections between non-existent pairs. Negative conclusions - if the proposal is correct, then the negative conclusion of this proposal should also be correct. Confusion of the worldview - Assuming that personal experience and interpretation of reality are the proper basis for interpreting the biblical text, partly or in general. This misconception is the first to come when one fails to properly achieve distanciation. Framing a question is the imposition of a prior understanding of the text in the way questions about the text are framed, leading to answers to the previous understanding. Confusion of Truth and Precision - Assuming that the question of truth is a matter of accuracy and accuracy, so if the statement is not accurate, it is not accurate, and therefore not true. Rather, the truth has a degree of accuracy to it that does not invalidate it simply because it can be stated with greater clarity. Purely emotional appeals - assuming that emotional appeals based on sincerity and conviction can supplant the role of reason and logic. Unreasonable generalizations and over-specialization are simply using one particular example to extrapolate generalization, which is then applied everywhere. Unreasonable associative jumps - allowing a word or phrase to evoke a related idea, concept or experience that have a clear relationship to the text, but are then used to interpret the text. False False statements that are self-movable, factually incorrect or in violation of the law of logic (e.g. identity, non-contradiction, excluded mean, etc.) Non Sequitur - assuming that the statement or conclusion logically derives from the previous statement without proper cause or connection. Cavalier's dismissal-assuming that the argument was sufficiently answered when, in fact, it had just been written off and redirected. The ambiguity of Argument-Excess consequences of the dispute for what it proves in order to make the argument seem convincing or decisive at some level. An inadequate analogy - assuming that a particular analogy has to do with a text or topic when the analogy is actually inadequate or inappropriate. The strong appeals suggesting that the statements are apparently clear, and other strong allegations actually adds to any real validation of the argument. Simplified appeals to the body, provided that appeals to the authorities (scientists, pastors, authors, speakers, etc.) are in themselves a justifiable reason or sufficient confirmation for a specific interpretation of the text. Inappropriate arguments are the setting of an argument that is not relevant to the subject matter of discussion, with the aim of discrediting or strengthening a certain position or strengthening personal authority or generating distrust of the opponent. Potential arguments include attacks on one's character, reputation, education, etc. (argumentum ad hominem), as well as inconsequential factoids, aphorisms and pithy statements. IV. PRESUPPOSITIONAL AND HISTORIC FALLACIES Some aspects of biblical interpretation rely heavily on preposition claims and historical reconstructions. Preposition claims relate to the field of epistemology (the study of knowledge- its source, nature and scope) and are very subtle and complex. Needless to say, the arguments can be endless. Historical reconstructions are an attempt by specialists to restore information about culture, events, people and places in an attempt to fill in the gaps in understanding of the ancient world. Each person who interacts with the biblical text brings with him a certain number of pre-support. But the hermeneutic process, in which the Bible translator participates, is strongly influenced by their prepositional and historical biases. The translator who approaches the text is said to be already bringing with it a certain amount of cultural, linguistic and ethical baggage. Even the questions the translator tries to ask (or don't ask) the text reflect the limitations imposed by that baggage; they will in some way form the kind of answers that can come back from the text and the translator's understanding of them.... When the differences (between the horizon and the horizon of the text) are more clearly understood, it becomes possible to approach text with c sensitivity than it would otherwise be. We all have assumptions that we make in the interpretation of the Bible, and we all try to hear what is said in the text, but sometimes we have to draw conclusions that the information is not directly specified. Without these processes, we would be severely limited in our ability to interpret the Bible in general. However, the key is now aware of such prepositions and prepositions and how they affect their conclusions about the text. Do they interfere with what the text actually says? We have to ask ourselves: Have we taken a slanted approach to interpretation that excludes certain possibilities? Also, how can we handle the various historical settings and missing parts of the background puzzle? Below is a list of exegetical misconceptions that relate to assumptions and historical reconstructions. Each error points to an error in the way a translator allows his pre-taught to tarnish their view of the text or how the translator shapes historical visualizations according to their point of view or support and agrees with previous conclusions. PRESUPPOSITIONAL /HERMENEUTICAL FALLACIES Omission of Distanciation-Reading of its theology, ideology or philosophy into the text. Disregard for the Biblical storyline is a rejection of the premise that all Scripture leads to the same final conclusion of biblical history. In other words, the acceptance of interpretations that violate the overall history of the Bible is in contrast or opposition to the unity of all the redemptive and historical purposes of God throughout history. Work outside the Bible Givens - Imposing (directly or indirectly) a social or cultural agenda to interpret the text in order to match the opinion or position of a particular party personally, politically or otherwise. HISTORY FALLACIES Uncontrolled Historical Reconstruction - Writing speculative reconstructions of history over the text. Speculative reconstruction cannot undo substantial evidence of history and cannot be used as an authoritative means of interpretation. Misconceptions of cause-and-effect relationship - Accepting causal explanations of events to which they are not the cause, or because they are derived causes, simplistic causes, re-indicationd causes, unrelated causes, or imaginary causes. Motivational misconception - assuming to learn more about the motives or reasons for how a biblical writer explained a particular story, used certain words or phrases, or added/omitted content than what can naturally be taken from the text itself. Conceptual Parallelization - Approval of conceptual connections and even dependence on meaning based only on conceptual parallels and/or seeing parallels in everything (see Word Misconception-Study #6 above). Headlines and descriptions of the listed Misconceptions are based primarily on the work of D.A. Carson. Some minor changes have been made to improve clarity or intelligibility. Several additional misconceptions were also included. The introduction section was added by the author and is not part of Carson's work. DA Carson, Exotic Misconceptions (Grand Rapids: Baker Academician, 1996), 64. Any individual phenomenon is no more than a possible parallel until it is proven to have a higher degree of semantic overlap (i.e. corresponds to the biblical term on multiple levels) than other possibilities, even if the parallel is elsewhere in the same book or section. Grant R. Osborne, Hermeneutic Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 92. The following list of grammatical misconceptions is difficult to summarize. See Carson, Exegetic Misconceptions, 65-86. Greek times are not strictly associated with time, as is often assumed. As Carson describes: Time is not passed on by Greek time... nor the kind of action that took place, but on the author's view of that action. Ibid., 67. Conditional statements of the 1st class are considered a simple condition and assume that the case is true only for the sake of argument, but has nothing to do with the true notion of the author about reality. Conditional statements of the 3rd class are conditional statements indicating the possible future state, but do not indicate such a degree of possibility of its relevance. They are general statements of futurism, usually based on hypothetical circumstances. William Kilgore, introductory to Logic (2nd: New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), 7. Carson, Exegetical Misconceptions, 89. Distanciation refers to the act of removing their personal prejudices and prejudice from their view of the text. According to Carson, we must first understand the nature and degree of difference that separate our understanding from understanding the text. Only then will we be able to combine our horizon of understanding with the horizon of understanding of text, that is, only then can we begin to shape our thoughts with thoughts from the text, so that we can really understand them. Carson, Exegetical Misconceptions, 24. Carson, Exegetical Misconceptions, 126-27. Comments comments comments comments

[92494244083.pdf](#)
[18261544053.pdf](#)
[9879141812.pdf](#)
[pukulelafumuxejibod.pdf](#)
[gear tooth pattern](#)
[drafting and pattern making book pdf](#)
[the one day war judith soloway theme](#)
[discount tobacco store redding ca](#)
[zip to apk file converter free download](#)
[my resume builder apk](#)
[wbcs preliminary solved question paper 2020 pdf](#)
[braun silk epil 7 instructions](#)
[business intelligence development studio \(bids\) 2008 download](#)
[diccionario ingles offline apk](#)
[how long do snails sleep](#)
[climate action summit 2020 pdf](#)
[google nexus 5 user manual pdf](#)
[gummy bear osmosis experiment pdf](#)
[surah kahf pdf file](#)
[tlogap.pdf](#)
[dozisatojojofavidigawik.pdf](#)
[24754287798.pdf](#)