Title: Conversations
Subtitle: Critical Structural Method
Second Subtitle: Critical Structural Method
Author: wizanda
Date: 1744036143
URL: https://www.wizanda.com/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=30

There are a couple of analytical methods that people use to assess relig

The Historical Critical Method means they try to understand what the aut historical setting, and to use as much information connected to that to b what was intended.

The Historical Grammatical Method tries to use the history surrounding t conclusion of what the author meant based on the language used within t method can believe the texts are inspired by God, and so allows for inter

I personally find both methods why religious people are all arguing, as n assessments of everything available to us.

I've always used my own method, which when asked I've called the Critic reason for the naming is it does exactly that, it deals with all structuring author might not have read it, to properly analyse if the authors stateme ideas, we have to also know that data.

So for example: Biblical ideas had previous religions before, where Zoro a thousand years older than Moses, and they discuss a child found in a b Foundling, as they will create a great movement.

The wise men that came to Christ birth came from the East in the Bible, frankincense, and myrrh, based on Zoroastrian prophecy, where they wer born under a great star.

To properly deal with what the Bible was implying, we have to deal with t before it, not assume like with the Historical Critical Method, that the au about what they knew, and limiting the data to something that neglects w from.

The problem with the Historical Grammatical Method is it can assume tha when some of them were forged by the religious institutions, and contrad base material.

If they'd Critically dealt with what are the primary precepts, then they'd should be within the later material.

This is where we have to build 'Precept upon Precept' (Isaiah 28:10+13) conclusion of what the texts mean, not only what the author intended, ye

as we don't know if the author within prophetic texts foresaw everything they were merely given something to write down.

Part of using the Critical Structural Method is that any equation shown w like Algebra, where a sum can be reversed to check our workings.

Where if we believe that a structuring shows a prophetic utterance was f all the criteria match in all jurisdictions, and if not, why not, no part of so it is more based on logic, where everything has to add up.