

| | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| HERMENEUTICS | Page 1 |
| HERM010 | a Grace Notes course |

a **Grace Notes** course

Hermeneutics

Source Materials:

“Hermeneutics: the Science and Art of Biblical Interpretation”

Drue Freeman, Pastor, Trinity Bible Church, Oklahoma City, OK

“A Syllabus of Studies in Hermeneutics”, Rollin Thomas Chafer

HERM010

adapted for Grace Notes training by Warren Doud

Grace Notes

Web Site: <http://www.gracenotes.info> E-mail: wdoud@gracenotes.info

Hermeneutics

A Grace Notes course

| Lesson | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| HERM 001 | Lessons 1 and 2 |
| HERM 002 | Lessons 3 and 4 |
| HERM 003 | Lesson 5 |
| HERM 004 | Lesson 6 |
| HERM 005 | Lessons 7 and 8 |
| HERM 006 | Lesson 9 and 10 |
| HERM 007 | Lesson 11 |
| HERM 008 | Lesson 12 |
| HERM 009 | Lesson 13 |
| HERM 010 | Lesson 14 |

Lesson 14 - The Hermeneutics Of Logic

Logic is by definition the rules of non-contradiction and correct reasoning. Even though attempts to use logic throughout the history of the church have gotten people into trouble and caused divisions, nevertheless, it is a valuable tool for our understanding.

Deductive Reasoning occurs when a necessary conclusion is drawn from one or more statements. For the conclusion to be correct, both of the statements have to be correct. For example, from the statements, "All life requires water," and "There is no water on the moon," one can deduct that, "there is no life on the moon." The truth of the deductive conclusion depends on the truth of the statements from which it is drawn. A deduction can prove only that if certain things are true, then certain things will follow.

Inductive Reasoning involves the observance of all possible cases and then assumes it is true in the other cases that have not been tested.

Needless to say, this type of reasoning is much less certain than deductive reasoning. For example, the observation that heat expands iron, gold and platinum might lead one to believe that heat expands all metals. Each metal must be tested though in order to be certain.

The expression of a logical argument in a formal way is called a "Syllogism." Logic is divided into Concepts, Propositions and Arguments.

Defined words are used to define a concept. Concepts are derived by words that are used to form further definitions. Propositions declare what we intend to prove or disprove. They are statements that our concepts exist in a certain way. Propositions must be stated in terms of true or false. Commands, exclamations and questions do not and cannot express propositions. Propositions are concerned with the relationship between concepts. They can be wrong either by designation or they can ascribe to the subject what does not belong to the

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| HERMENEUTICS | Page 3 |
| HERM010 | a Grace Notes course |

subject. For example, to say that, "World War II killed 300 million people," and then try and to make a deduction from a comparison with the statement that, "Noah took two of each animal into the ark," will not be fruitful. Both statements may be correct but have no connection to each other. We can compare propositions only when they contain the same words.

Any inferences that we draw from a proposition can be valid only if the proposition is true. If we consider the proposition, "All snakes are poisonous," there are other inferences we can consider such as, "No snakes are poisonous," "Some snakes are poisonous," and, "Some snakes are not poisonous." When the proposition is false though, the truth of the comparable propositions or inferences is not determinable. When we know the truth and falsity of a given proposition, we can determine the truth and falsity of the inferences

Contradictions are those comparisons that communicate when one thing is true then another is false. For example, if it is true that we are saved by grace through faith, not works, then for one to say that we are saved by works is a contradiction to truth. If one statement is indeed true then other is false. Both cannot be true.

A Superimplication exists when one statement is true and another statement implied from it is also true. From the universal you can validly infer the specific but from the specific you cannot validly infer the universal. For example if "whoever believes in Jesus Christ shall be saved (John 3:16), is true (and thank God it is), then since I have believed in Jesus Christ it is validly inferred that I am saved.

A Complementary Statement occurs when we say the same thing in a different way. If we say that, "very well-educated student of history studies Greek," we can also validly say that, "no well-educated student of history fails to study Greek." The statements do not contradict but are simply restated.

The reasons that are given for one's deductions and the validity of those deductions are called, "Arguments." Conclusions are reached using reasoning. They are found throughout God's word and they are introduced by many different words such as therefore, so, as a result and the like.

The "most important term" of an argument is called the "Predicate." The "minor term" of the argument is called the "Subject" and what appears in both arguments is called the "middle term." For example, take the statements.

- Whatever is constitutional is just.
- Whatever is decided by the Supreme Court is constitutional.

The conclusion would be, "Therefore, whatever is decided by the Supreme Court is just."

In this example, "Whatever is just" is the predicate. "Whatever is constitutional is the middle term which does not appear in the conclusion and, "Decisions reached" is the subject. The Conclusion is a mediate inference, which is drawn around the major and minor terms based on their relationship to the middle term.

The Relation of Logic to Interpretation (Rollin Chafer)

Accepting the prerequisite fundamental facts enumerated in the preceding sections as a basis upon which general interpretational study must advance, the next step should be the choice of the right method of logical procedure, and to avoid ultimate confusion this must be consistently adhered to. Some writers place before all else the necessity of attention to grammatical construction, idiomatic expression and other textual consideration. Although these very important matters should have close attention in their proper order, it remains a fact that one may trot all day in a grammatical half-bushel and not come within clear sight of the great themes of the Bible and their logical development.

The Bible is not a handbook of Logic. It is not a compendium of Natural Science. Its own themes, however, are developed in accordance with the principles of logic and in harmony with classification of proved facts. The logic of the sacred writers has been made a subject of special attack by radical critics, one such writer voicing the sentiment of the many in the thought that Paul was too logical, that his logic is so inexorable that modern thinkers are forced to reject his conclusions. It is a sad commentary on certain phases of so-called orthodox theologies that this sentiment, now boldly voiced by spiritual outlanders, exhibits the evidence of its influence in various theological formulas.

Sadder still is the fact that many hold these dicta to be normative as a standard by which the Word of God itself should be interpreted. In whatsoever measure this idea is allowed to influence the student's thinking it weakens to that degree faith in the fundamental fact of the Spirit's authorship of the Scriptures. To attack the logic of the sacred writers is to attack the logic of God. This is the necessary conclusion if the Biblical doctrines of revelation and inspiration are accepted.

In revealing God's thought the Holy Spirit not only employs the bald and dogmatic statement of fact which must be accepted without argumentative proof (Example, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"); but also He makes use of the reasoning process, amplifying the bald statement of truth by comprehensible proof and illustration (Example, in 1 John 4:8 the dogmatic statement, "God is love," is not revealed as a bolt of sheer truth flashed from heaven to dazzle the human mind, but the gracious proofs are given in the context, as also in such a passage as John 3:16, cf. 1 John 3:16, wherein the argument that the giving of the Father's only begotten Son proves His so great love and through the terminology of family relationship brings it within the comprehensibility of the simplest mind).

Not only is it revealed that God deigns to reason with man in specific instances (Example, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord," Isa 1:18), but much of the Scripture is cast in the form of argumentative reasoning. Dr. A. B. Winchester emphasizes in a lecture the fact that the language of Paul "is not the language of the poet, the historian or the romancer, but the language of the logician."

Among the accepted ideas which are included in definitions of applied logic the following concise formula meets the requirements of this discussion, namely, *Logic is the science of the principles which govern correct thinking and sound reasoning*. If the doctrine of the omniscience of God is accepted, if the revelation given to Isaiah is believed, "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts," if God's thoughts are correct and His reasoning perfect, His revelation expressed in human language must be logical. Although this may seem to be truistic and its statement superfluous, it is vitally related to the subject of Biblical interpretation.

If it be granted that the Spirit Author expressed divine thought in accordance with the laws governing human language, correct thinking and sound reasoning-and no other conclusion is possible to one who accepts the Bible as revelation inspired by the omniscient Spirit-it stands to reason that any interpretation which does not follow these same laws will be subversive and misleading.

An exhaustive treatment of logic is neither possible in this work nor is it necessary, the whole discussion being confined to certain fundamental principles of interpretation. The discussion of this section, therefore, will be confined to an outline of the fundamental principles, postulates and forms of logical

process which are applicable to the study of the Scriptures.¹

Logicians reduce the laws of logic to four fundamental principles:

(1) "The Law of Identity, or Affirmation.

Everything is identical with itself, or is what it is, and we may affirm this of it." This is "at the basis of all consistent affirmative thinking." The Scriptures affirm that God is. Related to faith the word is, "for he that cometh to God must believe that he is" (Heb 11:6). They consistently identify Him with himself as apart from, above and over all creation. The Bible affirms that sin is, and that it is what it is-sin. To deny this fact results in illogical and absurd conclusions (Example, the vagaries of Christian Science.)

(2) "The Law of Contradiction, or

Negation, or as Hamilton terms it, Non-contradiction, may be stated as follows: *Everything is not what it is not, and we may affirm this of it.* The Scriptures never confuse opposites. Law and grace are antipodal. A thing can not be what it is not, and Paul applies this Law in the words, "And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" (Rom 11:6). *"The Law of Contradiction lies at the basis of all distinction in thought."*

(3) "The Law of Excluded Middle, or

Exclusion, may be stated as follows: Of two contradictories one must be true and the other false. If one is affirmed, the other is thereby denied." Predictive prophecy is a component of the divine revelation, or it is not. If by the Law of Identity it is true that

the Scriptures contain predictive prophecy, then, by the Law of Exclusion, the proposition that they do not contain it is false.

(4) "The Law of Reason and Consequent, or Sufficient Reason.-

The Law is stated as follows: All continuous thought must be rationally connected. The Law has been formulated: Infer nothing without a ground or reason. The starting-point in continuous thinking is the affirmation of some knowledge by which the mind is necessitated to affirm or posit something else." Thus the "logical reason" is followed by the "logical consequent," and the relation between them is the "logical connection" or "consequence." This involves the relations of "cause to effect," "effect to cause;" "whole to part," "part to whole," etc. Hamilton points out that this axiom takes both a positive and negative form. When a reason exists there must be a consequent, and *vice versa*; where no reason exists there can be no consequent, and *vice versa*. This law is in evidence throughout the Scriptures. The contexts governed by Paul's "wherefores" and "therefores" may be cited especially.

Two fundamental postulates of logic should be noted:

The First Postulate.-*There is such a thing as truth which can be ascertained, and on which all minds, acting in accordance with the laws of thought, must agree.*

This is true of truth which comes within the purview of the natural mind. All minds following the laws of correct mentation must arrive at the result, 4, when 2 and 2 are added. The Scriptures, on the other hand, disclose divine truth which is not perceivable by natural men. The Lord said to Pilate, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate saith unto him, What is truth?" All natural men share this perplexity of the Roman procurator, for none can perceive God's revealed truth

¹ A thorough course in Logic is earnestly urged as a prerequisite to the study of Hermeneutics. At the Dallas Theological Seminary it is a required prerequisite.

until regenerated and indwelt by the Holy Spirit (John 3:5, 6; 1 Cor 2:14).

At this point, however, the dictum of Dr. Wright should be called to mind: "The written word or God, like the Word which became flesh, must be human in its manward aspect; for the written word is divine thought manifest in human language as Christ was God manifest in human flesh. As the compound personality of Christ was conditioned by the flesh, so the compound character of a written revelation is conditioned by the nature of language." Although it is true that only the children of God are divinely enabled to perceive His truth, it remains a fact that the ascertainment of a comprehensive and correlated knowledge of revelation is dependent upon adherence to the laws governing logical thought. Intelligent "searching of the Scriptures" predicates a logical procedure on the part of the student because the Scriptures themselves are expressed in conformity with the laws governing logical thought.

Many sincere Christians are befogged in their understanding of great portions of God's truth because they have accepted illogical and misleading interpretations instead of the logical conclusions of the Bible's own testimony.

The Second Postulate.-This, as stated by Hamilton, is, 'to be allowed to state explicitly in language all that is implicitly contained in thought.'

Logic deals ultimately with thought, and it has to do with language only as expressing thought. It is, therefore, proper to ask, in connection with any term, proposition, or argument, 'What is the thought in this?' or, in other words, 'What is the full and exact meaning of this?' and to state in full this meaning." The province of Bible interpretation is to get at the meaning of

the divine thought as expressed in the human language chosen by the Holy Spirit.

This brings us to a consideration of the forms of logical process a general understanding of the principles of which is necessary to intelligent judgment of current theological interpretations of Scripture. There are two fundamental forms of logical procedure, namely, Induction and Deduction. There is another form which is reducible to a combination of these two, namely Inference by Analogy.

1. Induction

"Logical Induction (we are not here concerned with Mathematical Induction) is the process of reasoning from all the parts to the whole." "The product of Inductive Reasoning is a Generalization." Two rules must be observed:

- (1) "Observe, analyze, and classify the facts to be generalized and explained, in order to ascertain their reality and their various elements and relations."
- (2) "Correctly interpret the facts" in order that a true basis for the generalization may be found.

A Perfect Induction takes place "when, by a perfect enumeration of all individuals or particulars, the whole sphere of the universal is exhausted," and an Imperfect Induction "includes the cases in which the universal is reached by inference, without the complete enumeration of objects."

There are two fallacies to guard against in the inductive form:

- (1) The first "may result from *careless and incomplete observation of facts*, and may then be called the Fallacy of Insufficient Observation."
- 2) "The false generalization may also result from the hasty assumption of something as the cause which is not the cause."

These two fallacies bulk large in the writings of evolutionists. On the other hand, scientists of first rank who have taken all of the particulars

| | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| HERMENEUTICS | Page 7 |
| HERM010 | a Grace Notes course |

into account, and who have faithfully avoided assumption that anything is a fact until it is proven to be a fact, are united in their testimony that the theories of evolution have not yet been proved to be facts. This testimony, however, does not reach the general public effectively because the popular channels of information are largely under the control of that class of disseminators of materialistic teachings who lecture dogmatically on these themes to callow youth in the classroom or scribble their indiscriminate and unfounded assumptions to that larger audience represented by readers of the Sunday Newspaper Supplement. In like manner these fallacies underlie all heretical offshoots from Biblical Christianity for the departures of which a Scripture basis is claimed.

The Bible is a collection of writings certified by the Holy Spirit to be God's Word. It is a documentary evidence of the divine thought. Although here and there short summaries of important doctrines are found, complete statements of thematic teachings seldom occur in a single passage. Rather, the general principle of the revelatory method is the progressive development of the Bible themes, partial statements of them being scattered through several, or in some instances many, of the writings.

This being true, the *inductive method* of the thematic study of the Scriptures is of first importance, for Scripturally defensible thematic generalizations result only from perfect, or near perfect, induction, that is to say, "when, by a perfect enumeration of all individuals or particulars, the whole sphere of the universal is exhausted." In this connection, it should be noted that many students arrive at a correct generalization without a complete induction, faith carrying them over many neglected particulars which are necessary, nevertheless, to sustain a logical conclusion. Such students too often rely on the conclusions of others and are, therefore, even when holding

right conclusions, poorly equipped to support their position with Scripture proofs.

Before passing on to a consideration of the deductive form of logical process as applied to the study of the Scriptures, an example of the inductive method will be cited. Many of the accepted generalizations of Protestant theology were formulated from an inductive study of the respective themes as revealed in the Bible, and upon these orthodox Christians generally agree. On the other hand, other generalizations were formulated from an unwarranted application of the deductive method which will be examined in the section under Deduction. The inclusion of these statements which were not formulated through the inductive process has been the cause of divisions amongst Christians with continued controversy and disagreement.

An Example of the Inductive Method: A Study of the Doctrine of the Resurrections.

Among other similar problems, every Bible student is confronted with the question: Is the theological dictum that there will be only one and all-inclusive resurrection of the bodies of the saved and unsaved of mankind immediately preceding the ushering in of the new heavens and new earth Biblically correct, or is the doctrine of two resurrections separated by a period of time the teaching of the New Testament? It will be recognized at once by a student whose chief concern is to learn what the Spirit has revealed on the subject that an unassailable generalization from the viewpoint of the New Testament revelation can only be arrived at by a complete enumeration of the particulars of the theme which exhaust the sphere of its universal.

Applying the first rule of this procedure, all the passages containing the particulars and facts to be generalized or explained must be collated, observed, analyzed and classified. Only after this has been done faithfully is it possible to proceed to the second rule, namely, correctly interpret the facts thus analyzed and classified

in order that a true generalization may be formulated.

The following three general rules under observation should be noted:

- (1) Observe all the essential facts, parts, or properties in any case.
- (2) Admit no fact, part, or property that does not belong to the case in hand.
- (3) Avoid all delusive mixtures of inference with the facts of observation.

The particulars of the example are as follows:

First Particular

John 5:24-29

24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

25 Verily, verily, I say unto you, The [an] hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear [shall have heard] shall live.

26 For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;

27 And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

28 Marvel not at this, for the [an] hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice.

29 And shall come forth; they that have done [ποιήσαντες, followed, were devoted to, practiced] good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done [πράξαντες, did] evil, unto the resurrection of damnation”

The central thought in this passage is the authority given to the Son by the Father in the issues of life and death, but these issues are linked with two bodily resurrections—one unto life eternal and the other unto condemning

judgment. The Lord first states the conditions which must be met by men to secure eternal life (v. 24).

He then predicts the bestowal of life to all that hear His voice in “an hour” which not only existed as He spoke but which as the then “coming” hour of grace is still in extension (v. 25), for the issues of life are given to the Son of the Father, and authority to execute judgment to the incarnate Word—the Son of man (vs. 26, 27).

This is followed by the prediction of another “hour” in which those that have previously heard His voice and have received life shall then be clothed with their immortal bodies, while those that have been deaf to His voice, and therefore have not passed “from death unto life” but in death have passed from death unto death, are raised unto judgment.

The one point to determine is, does this first New Testament passage in which two futures resurrections are mentioned allow without contradiction for the further development of the doctrine of two resurrections separated by a period of time? The point hangs on the Lord’s use of the word “hour.”

There can be no question that the words, “an hour is coming, and now is,” indicate a long period of time. It can be no other than that extended period of time during which men have the opportunity to hear His Word and receive that Life the possession of which alone makes possible that practice of good which is pleasing to God and the final concomitant of which is the immortal body. It is, therefore, in perfect harmony with the passage to consider the resurrection “hour” also as an extended period of time.

An observable rule of revelation is that the passage which contains the beginnings of a doctrine is so stated that it does not contradict the later and fuller revelations on the subject (Example, the words, “God” and “Heaven,” in the first verse of the Bible are both in the plural number, thus allowing for the later revelations

that all three members of the Godhead took part in creation and that three heavens are distinguished in the Scriptures).

It is entirely admissible to suppose, until either confirmed or disproved by other Scriptures, that one resurrection occurs at the beginning and is continued during the early part of an extended period of time and that the other takes place at the end of the same period of time. If the "hour" during which eternal life is bestowed has already lasted nearly two millenniums, it is entirely permissible to suppose that the resurrection "hour" may include one millennium between the close of the first resurrection and the occurrence of the second resurrection. At this early point of the observation, however, this permissible supposition must be reserved as an hypothesis to be verified later.

The first particular to be noted, then, is that this New Testament passage in which mention of two resurrections occurs allows, without contradiction of anything in the passage, for their separation in point of time, based upon the extensiveness of the word "hour" as used by the Lord in connection with the sharp contrast between the subjects of the resurrections and their following states.

Second Particular

I Thess. 4:13-17

13 But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind:

14 And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just" (Luke 14:13, 14).

22 For as in Adam all die, even in Christ shall all be made alive.

23 But every man in his own order. Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Cor 15:22, 23).

13 But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are

asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope.

14 For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.

15 For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [precede] them which are asleep.

16 For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:

17 Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord"

Phil. 3:10,11

10 That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death:

11 If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of [ἐξανάστασιν, resurrection out of] the dead"

Each of these four passages contains a restrictive phrase which precludes the idea that a simultaneous resurrection of the bodies of the believing and unbelieving dead shall take place. Saints are to be "recompensed at the resurrection of the just"; "they that are Christ's" are to be given their resurrection bodies "at his coming"; when the Lord descends with a shout "the dead in Christ" shall be raised and shall precede the translation of the then living believers; while Paul writes not of attaining unto *mere* resurrection but the "out-from-among-the-dead" resurrection. In these first three passages the restrictive element is clearly evident in the English translation and needs no further comment.

That Paul has in mind, in the Philippians passage, that resurrection which he limits in

the two preceding quotations by the phrases “they that are Christ’s” and “the dead in Christ,” is evident for two reasons:

(1) Paul was well aware that all believers and unbelievers that pass through natural death shall be joined to their resurrection bodies. In his defense before Felix he speaks of his own belief in common with that of the accusing Jews, in the words: “And have hope toward God, which they themselves allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” For Paul to write of merely attaining unto bodily resurrection which all men *must* experience would be absurdly illogical, a serious charge to bring against this divinely inspired logician.

(2) In this single instance in the Scriptures of the use of the compound of ἔξ and ἄνάστασις Paul clearly has in mind that summons of the shout of the Lord which shall call out from among the dead the bodies of all those only who shall have passed through natural death in Him.

The second particular to notice is that the testimony of the New Testament is that the resurrection of the bodies of believers is to take place at the coming of the Lord for His own. No Scripture even hints that the bodies of unbelievers are to be raised either in this “the day of Christ,” when He comes in the air with His saints to give them their immortal bodies, or at His succeeding glorious advent with the clothed saints to reign and judge during the “day of Jehovah.”

Third Particular

1 Cor. 15:20-25

20 But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.

21 For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

23 But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.

24 Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

25 For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet” 1 Cor 15:20–25).

In this passage the complete order of the resurrections is given but without a specific reference to the resurrection of unbelievers, there being only the provision for it in the order at “the end,” and implied in the words, “every man in his own order.”

First, Christ in His resurrection became the “first fruits of them that slept”-those sleeping “in Jesus” (the death of unbelievers never being spoken of as sleep). “Afterward [ἔπειτα] they that are Christ’s at his coming. Then [εἶτα] the end” when He shall have accomplished the objects of His earth rule. These two Greek words are synonymous, the lexicons giving the same meaning to each which may be according to the context, “then, afterward, or next in order,” etc. In this context whose central disclosure is an order of events the latter definition expresses what evidently seems to be the meaning.

Between the resurrection of Christ and the predicted resurrection of believers’ bodies nearly two millenniums have already elapsed, and yet in the divine program of resurrections the resurrection of believers’ bodies is the *next* in order. This is followed with “Next in order the end” [“cometh” being supplied by the translators].

The common interpretation that the fulfillment of “the end” immediately follows the preceding resurrection which is supposed to synchronize with a universal resurrection, is unwarranted for two reasons: The believers’ resurrection being next in order as to the sequence of resurrections but only after an elapse of an

extended period of time, the same interpretation concerning the time element in the phrase “next in order the end” is in harmony with the preceding use of the word as translated “afterward.”

Moreover, the context specifically places “the end” after the Lord has accomplished the objects of His reign and “shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,” this reign being here set forth clearly as occurring between the first “next in order,” namely, the resurrection of those that are “Christ’s at his coming” and the second “next in order,” namely, “the end.”

The third particular to note is as follows: In view of the statements of this passage that (1) every man is to experience resurrection but in his own order or rank, (2) that an extended period of time occurs between Christ’s resurrection and the resurrection of believers only at His coming for His own, (3) and that the context clearly indicates an extended period of time between that restricted resurrection and the end resurrection, it is clear that the “every man” whose rank will exclude him from participation in the resurrection of believers will be raised in the “next in order” time,-the end of Christ’s dealings with man in the old earth,-and which will be the final or end resurrection.

Fourth Particular

Rev 20:4–6, 11, 12, A.V., 14, 15 R.V

4 And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

5 But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.

6 Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

11 I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was no place for them.

12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.

14 And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, even the lake of fire.

15 And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire

The Book of Revelation presents a part of its revelatory matter in symbolic form, the majority of the symbols employed being those consistently used throughout the Scriptures by the sacred writers to denote well defined ideas. Besides these symbols which were familiar to the early Christians, especially to those of Jewish origin, a few new ones were introduced for the first time in this the last book of the Bible, but in each instance of such use of a new symbol an explanation of its meaning accompanies it in the text (Example, 1:20).

On the other hand, much of the book is couched in language as devoid of symbolism as any other part of the Bible and as assuredly intended to be understood by the plain meaning of the words employed. To force a symbolic meaning on such passages under the excuse that the Revelation is a book of symbolism is unscientific in method and indefensible under the laws of Biblical interpretation.

In the above quotations from chapter 20 we have the capstone of the revelatory structure which discloses the doctrine of the future resurrections. In respect to this unfolding the only new element introduced in this final message on the subject is the length of the time period which shall elapse between the close of the resurrection during which “the just,” “the dead in Christ,” “they that are Christ’s at His coming,” and “they which came out of the great tribulation,” shall receive their glorified bodies. It is not only revealed that the order or rank, in the words-“every man in his own order,” applies to the sequence of the resurrections of the saved and the unsaved, but we have the strong implication of a sequential order in the resurrection of believers.

Paul uses military language in 1 Thess 4:16, and the implication is that the saved of all ages come forth in an order of phalanxes. This may be inferred, also, from the fact that heavenly companies are distinguished (Heb 12:22, 23), and in addition to these, tribulation saints are mentioned as a separate company (Rev 7:14).

It is this latter company of believers which comprises the rearmost phalanx of the first resurrection. Although these tribulation saints are especially in view in the 20th chapter, the promised blessing in the words, “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power,” is not confined to them but applies to all severally in whatsoever division they belong. The change to the plural pronoun in the rest of the sentence, “but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and reign with him a [the] thousand years,” however, implies a more restricted antecedent, for we know from other Scriptures that the “they” refers not to all who have part in the first resurrection, but only to the church [ἐκκλησία, called-out ones] of Christ, that is to say, that divisions of saved ones which the Lord had in mind when He prophesied, “I will build my church,” and which He has been

doing through the ministry Of the Holy Spirit since the day of Pentecost.

The only new feature revealed in the 20th chapter concerning the reign of this portion of those who shall have part in the first resurrection is, as in the case of the resurrections themselves, the length of the time period of their reign with Christ on the earth. The promise that the church saints shall reign with Christ (2 Tim 2:12) with a “rod of iron” (Rev 2:27) on Christ’s own throne (Rev 3:21) “on the earth” (Rev 5:10) is merely completed in the 20th chapter with the revelation that the reign on earth is to be coextensive with the time elapsing between the resurrections of the just and the unjust.

That the second resurrection is not “unto life” but only “unto judgment” is clear for the following reasons:

There are two classes of divine judgments, namely, the one whose issue is life or death and which is wholly separate from any complicity with the others, and the class of judgments which deal with the “works” of all mankind and which have nothing to do with life and death.

The first is the judgment of the cross. The question of eternal life for those who receive it by faith in Christ and what He accomplished in His death and resurrection, on the one hand, and the continuing state of death for those who fail to accept Christ and His gift of eternal life and which death is to be sealed eternally with the “second death” at the “great white throne,” on the other hand, was eternally settled on the cross.

With His approaching death in view the Lord said: “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall [*shall*-the execution of it is yet future] the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said signifying what death he should die” (John 12:31-33). His death was to be the judgment of the crucifying world and its head, the usurping prince of evil. When it soon after became a historical fact He not only

judged the World, but He bore the curse for every man. Thus the issues of life and death were bound up in that transaction, turning thereafter for each individual during the dispensation of grace upon the acceptance or rejection of Him and what He accomplished in His sacrificial, substitution death and justifying resurrection. This He makes clear further on: "He that rejects me and receives not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (vs. 48).

In an earlier revelation with especial reference to the bestowal of eternal life He said: "He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18 R.V.). Believers are to be raised "unto life" because they receive eternal life before natural death. Unbelievers are to be raised "unto judgment" because, not accepting eternal life before they pass through natural death, they are judged already as to life and death, and are to be judged at the end only according to their unbelieving works, which brings us to the second class-the judgment of works.²

Believers are to appear before the "judgment seat" of Christ (Cf. 1 Cor 3:11-15 and 2 Cor 5:10. Note that the "any man" of the former and the "we" of the latter refer only to believers). This is the reward throne of Christ at which the subject of life and death is not raised, only those possessing eternal life appear there. In the last chapter of Revelation the testimony of the Lord is, "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me," thus synchronizing the time of adjudging rewards to believers with their resurrection "at his coming."

² Only two of the judgments of this class are cited here. An inductive study of all the judgments should be made.

On the other hand, nothing is said of rewards at the judgment following the second resurrection. Following this resurrection "the dead" are to be "judged out of those things which were written in the books"-the records of their unbelieving works. Life or death is not the issue in this judgment as it is not at the reward judgment of believers. As only the spiritually alive are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so only the spiritually dead are to appear before the great white throne. They are raised "unto judgment" which terminates in "the second death" that eternal state which "hath no power" on them that shall have part in the first resurrection.

It should be noted that "the dead" are not judged out of the book of Life. In the consummation of God's dealings with unregenerate humanity its open pages stand only as testimony to the eternal Truth and to the long-suffering love of God who "gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The plain meaning of the words in this context warrants no other conclusion than that the second resurrection is as restrictive concerning its participating subjects as is the revelation concerning the subjects of the first resurrection. This final word of the unfolded doctrine harmonizes perfectly with the preceding revelations on the subject. The language is specific in its restrictive distinction. The "blessed" and "holy," the subjects of the first resurrection, are set over against "the dead," the subjects only of the second resurrection, who are to be judged according to their works. Before yielding to the temptation of reading into these plain words a meaning not warranted by their consistent use in the Scriptures the student should ponder the warning against tampering with the words of the Spirit (Rev 22:18, 19).

The fourth particular to note, therefore, is that a time period specifically mentioned as "the

thousand years” separates the resurrection of the “blessed” and “holy” on whom “the second death hath no power” (which can be said only of those who have “passed from death unto life”), and the resurrection of “the rest” on whom the sentence of the second death is pronounced.

Fifth Particular

1 Pet. 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

This quotation is representative of all the passages which refer to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. These do not bear specifically on this discussion, excepting as the resurrection of His body “out from among the dead” is a pattern of the believers’ out-resurrection, hence it is not necessary to take further notice of this group of passages.

Sixth Particular

John 11:24, Martha said unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.

Acts 23:6, But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.

These two passages are representative of all those in which the two unspecific phrases, “in the resurrection” and “resurrection of the dead,” are found, and which phrases taken without due attention to the contexts in which they occur have seemed to afford a Scriptural warrant for the belief in one general resurrection. The first of these unspecific phrases occurs six times (Matt 22:28, 30; Mark 12:23; Luke 20:33, 36; John 11:24).

In Matt 22:28, Mark 12:33 and Luke 20:33 the phrase occurs in the three records of the Sadducees’ question, “therefore in the

resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?” The Sadducees did not believe in any resurrection, much less the doctrine held by the Pharisees, namely, the resurrection of the just and unjust. In their attempt to trap the Lord it was a question only of the *fact* of resurrection. In His reply the Lord not only touched upon the marriage relationship in heaven, but in the use of the quotation concerning the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He gave them a silencing thrust concerning the fact of resurrection.

It should be noted that only in the Matthew record of His reply (vs. 30) is the Sadducees’ phrase repeated. In both the Mark and Luke accounts the restrictive ἐκ νεκρῶν [out from among the dead] is used to denote the character of the resurrection, instead of the unrestricted νεκρῶν [of the dead] in the recorded question of the Sadducees. And this restrictive sense is doubly emphasized by the Lord immediately following in Luke’s account. “Neither can they die anymore; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.”

Commenting on the conversation of Martha with the Lord concerning the death of Lazarus, Grant says: “The Lord tests her at once with an assurance of a joy too great for her: ‘Thy brother shall rise again.’ She sinks at once into mere orthodoxy. ‘I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.’”³ She voiced only that which had been hitherto revealed to God’s people, but the reply of the Lord contains the fuller revelation on which the later disclosures concerning the separate resurrection of believers is based, namely, “I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die” (John 11:25). It is only such about whom later it could be revealed, on them “the

³ *Numerical Bible*. Vol. The Gospels, p. 555.

second death hath no power," because they only are partakers of His life, and possessing His life shall have part in the first resurrection. The inference that there is to be a simultaneous resurrection of the just unto life and the unjust unto judgment, based on the expression "in the resurrection," is groundless. The expression is introduced by the unbelieving Sadducees and a partially instructed disciple, none of whom knew the later and fuller disclosures on the subject. Furthermore, even if the use of this unspecific expression had the sanction of the Lord, the context would indicate that one of the two resurrections, according to the class of resurrection subjects occupying His thought, was referred to (Cf. Matt 22:30 with Mark 12:25 and Luke 20:35. Note the restrictive phrase, "from the dead").

The phrase, "the resurrection of the dead," is employed ten times in the New Testament, one of which is attributed to the Lord (Matt 22:31), and four reported by Luke in connection with Paul's addresses (Acts 17:32, 23:6, 24:15, 21), four recorded by Paul (1 Cor 15:12, 13, 21, 42), and the last probably recorded by the same Apostle (Heb 6:2). It seems clear from all these quotations that the *fact* of the resurrection of the bodies of all the dead, as opposed to the Sadducean doctrine of *no* resurrection, is in the mind of the Lord and the Apostle Paul when employing the phrase, "the resurrection of the dead." In the Lord's controversy with the Sadducees; the dissent of the Athenian philosophers "when they heard of the resurrection of the dead" from Paul's lips on Mars' Hill; and in Paul's speeches before the Sanhedrin and the governor, Felix, as well as the Apostle's argument against the Sadducean theory in 1 Cor 15, resurrection as a *fact* is in view and not any specific resurrection.

Likewise, in Heb 6:2, the Apostle includes the doctrine of resurrection of the dead as one of the fundamental tenets of the Jewish belief as well as the Christian faith. Both the Lord and the Apostle Paul, on the other hand, use specific

and restrictive phrases when the *participating subjects* of the resurrections is their theme. An example of this is the very specific treatment of the believers' resurrection by Paul in 1 Cor 15 in contrast to the unspecific term in the argument against the theory of no resurrection in the same chapter.

When these facts are kept in mind the seeming lack of harmony between the use of the general expression, "the resurrection of the dead," and the specific revelations concerning the resurrection of "the dead in Christ" and the resurrection of "the rest of the dead," disappears. To base the doctrine of a general simultaneous resurrection on this unspecific phrase carries with it the implication that it overrides the specific revelations of two resurrections, which implication is logically untenable.

Reduced to a simple statement the particulars found in the forty references in the New Testament in which the word "resurrection" occurs, classified and analyzed above as an example of inductive interpretation, are:

- (1) The passages which mention the resurrection of both the just and unjust allow without contradiction in their own statement for the later revelations concerning
- (2) the clear prediction that only the bodies of believers of the past and present dispensations are to be raised at the coming of the Lord for His own in the "day of Christ";
- (3) the program of resurrections, namely, first, Christ the first fruits, next in order, believers, and finally in order, "the end";
- (4) the specified period of time which shall elapse between the believers' or "first" future resurrection, and the unbelievers' or "second" future resurrection at "the end."
- (5) The passing over of the passages which treat of the fact, meaning and present effect of Christ's resurrection as not affecting the

discussion of two resurrections, only in so far as His resurrection is a pattern of the believer's resurrection.

(6) The contexts in which the two unspecific phrases, "in the resurrection" and "the resurrection of the dead," clearly indicate that the *fact* of the resurrection of the body is the question at issue, and that nothing in these passages is out of harmony with the other revelations which treat of the separate resurrections of the just and the unjust.

As a result of this complete enumeration of all the particulars and their analyses there is but one generalization possible by induction, namely, The New Testament teaches that there are to be two future resurrections, (1) that of the bodies of believers only at the coming of Christ, and (2) that of the bodies of unbelievers only after an intervening period of time specified in the final revelation on the subject to be a thousand years. Judged by the laws of inductive reasoning the theory that there is to be a simultaneous resurrection of the bodies of believers and unbelievers rests upon one of two faulty processes:

(1) either the well intentioned but careless and inadequate observation of particulars, in other words, the "fallacy of insufficient observation," or

(2) the deliberate isolation and distortion of certain particulars together with the ignoring of essential particulars which detract from the tenability of the theory. It is impossible to reach a sound generalization through either of these procedures.

Deduction

"Deduction as contrasted with induction is reasoning from the general to the particular," and "it means the drawing out of a particular proposition or conclusion from the universal premise." "The product of deduction is the Syllogism proper. Syllogisms are divided, by the

form of the judgments embodied in them, into categorical and hypothetical." In the categorical syllogism the three propositions, namely, the major and minor premises and the conclusion, are stated categorically (Example, The worship of graven images is gross idolatry; Israel worshiped a graven image of gold while encamped at Sinai; therefore, Israel was guilty of gross idolatry).

In the hypothetical syllogism "the reasoning turns upon some hypothetical judgment embodied in the major premise." Both of these forms of the syllogism are divided into monosyllogisms and polysyllogisms, the former having one argument and the latter being constituted of two or more related arguments. Hypothetical syllogisms, as well as the categorical forms, are frequently employed in interpretational writings. The hypothetical monosyllogism takes two forms,

(1) conjunctive (Example, If the Bible proclaims the only way of salvation all men ought to heed its testimony; but it does proclaim the only way of salvation; therefore, all men ought to heed its testimony);

(2) disjunctive (Example, The Bible is either the product of human reason or a revelation from God; it is a revelation from God; therefore, it is not a product of human reason).

The hypothetical polysyllogism takes several forms only one of which will be mentioned here, namely, that which has been called the *horned syllogism*, or the *dilemma* in the strict sense. It is composed of "a plurality of conditional antecedents all having one common consequent." It is called the *horned syllogism* "because it confronts an opponent with two assumptions, on which it tosses him as on horns from one to the other, each being equally fatal to him" (Example, If we are confronted with obstacles in Christian service which we can overcome we ought not to worry about them; if we are confronted with obstacles in

Christian service which we cannot overcome we ought not to worry about them; but all obstacles in Christian service can or cannot be overcome; therefore, we ought not to worry about the obstacles in Christian service). Further subdivision of the syllogism is not necessary for the purpose of this discussion. As a means of analysis the syllogistic form of argument is of great value, but it is also the means of many false conclusions. The necessity of testing the premises of a syllogistic statement is ever present when this form of argument is employed. Dr. Gregory emphasizes in his text this necessity when studying the arguments of even great intellectual leaders: "In all deductive reasoning, it should be remembered, that the conclusion can never be any more certain than the premises. Forgetfulness of this is the source of many and great errors in both Science and Philosophy." This caution is of peculiar force when considering theological conclusions.

Dr. G. Frederick Wright⁴ illustrates this forcefully: "A Cretan once remarked that all Cretans were liars and knaves. A bystander interposed: 'But you are a Cretan!' Whereupon a neighbor added, 'Then, of course, he is a liar, and his testimony is worthless.' To put this reasoning in the syllogistic form, it stands thus:

- (a) All Cretans are liars: (major premise);
- (b) This man is a Cretan: (minor premise);
- (c) Therefore he is a liar: (conclusion).

To this form all syllogisms in deductive logic can be reduced. But in such reasoning the question arises, How do we know *all*, before we know *each*? By what authority do we pronounce all Cretans liars and knaves before the character of this particular Cretan has been observed?

⁴ *Logic of Christian Evidences*, Chapter II.

To vary the illustration, consider the syllogistic form of Hume's objection to the proof of miracles:

- (a) All purported miracles are incredible;
- (b) The resurrection of Christ is a purported miracle;
- (c) Therefore the resurrection of Christ is incredible (or, as he would say, incapable of being proved by human testimony).

But how are all miracles known to be incredible till the particular evidence for this one is fully considered?

Another form of Hume's argument illustrates the point still better:

- (a) All events which happened in the first century have a parallel in those occurring in the eighteenth century;
- (b) The resurrection of Christ has no parallel in the eighteenth century;
- (c) Therefore it is incredible that it really occurred in the first century.

It is plain here, that the thing needing proof is the major premise from which the conclusion is drawn. On what grounds is it decided that the historical developments of the eighteenth century will perfectly correspond to those of the first? There is no known universal principle from which that conclusion follows.

Since deduction is based on a previous generalization [which, in turn, is arrived at by induction], the process may easily be made to conceal the real steps of the reasoning. In a properly constructed syllogism the conclusion comes out of the premises mechanically. The difficulty lies in showing how it legitimately got into the premises. In the conclusion the *implicit* contents of the premises are *explicitly* stated. But the conclusion must first have been *involved*, before it could be *evolved* [italics of the latter sentence mine].

The major and minor premises may with propriety be compared to the upper and the nether millstones, between which the coarser

products of our thought are ground to powder. But nothing can reach the bag which was not first put in at the hopper. However important to clearance the process of deduction may be, it is utterly unproductive of material additions to knowledge. On the other hand, induction is productive. Inductive logic always holds us down to the vicinity of facts, and compels us to interrogate nature as to what really is. The Baconian method first chastens arrogance and curbs fancy, even though at length it furnishes wings on which to rise far higher than the imagination could otherwise soar.”

In contrast to the conclusion that there shall be resurrections of the just and unjust separated by an extended period of time, which necessarily results from an inductive study of all the New Testament particulars, the claim that the theological doctrine of a simultaneous resurrection of believers and unbelievers “at the end of the world” is the result of a valid deduction should be tested by every Bible student prejudiced in favor of that conclusion only by creedal statements.

Calling to mind the meaning of logical deduction that it is the drawing out of a particular proposition or conclusion from the universal premise, the question arises at once, Is the premise from which this conclusion is drawn Scripturally true? For strenuous mental drill perhaps nothing can be more highly recommended to the student than to attempt to find the Scripture material for this assumed universal premise and construct a syllogistic statement which logically results in the conclusion under discussion. No theologian has ever accomplished this, but that fact should not discourage an honest student if he has determined to accept this conclusion, for he must make the attempt or abandon a dogmatic position on the matter. A sincere attempt to prove the tenability of a wrong conclusion has often been used of God to lead the seeker after truth into the light of the Word.

Referring to the same example, if by induction it is proved that the New Testament teaches the doctrine of two resurrections separated by a period of time and if this is the only generalization possible from an enumeration and careful analysis of all the New Testament particulars, it must follow that any assumed universal premise from which the conclusion is drawn that there is to be a simultaneous general resurrection is Scripturally false. The second and third fundamental laws of logic demand this for we are here confronted with contradictories and both can not be true. It is a significant fact that the written defenses of the doctrine of a simultaneous general resurrection are faulty in procedure in one, two, or all of the following manners:

- (1) The isolation and misapplication of a part of the essential particulars, while ignoring the rest, as a basis for a universal premise which is faulty because it is not founded on the data of the whole field of evidence;
- (2) the citation of lists of proof texts without analysis under unwarranted and gratuitous statements with which the texts themselves are at variance;
- (3) the never absent and gratuitous statement that Rev 20 does not refer to the resurrection of the body and that there is no hint of two resurrections elsewhere in the New Testament. Any deduction drawn from premises thus formed is untenable.

Instead of deductively proving the desired conclusion such a process proves it to be logically invalid, in other words, the premises being inadequately grounded in the Scripture doctrine the deduction is Scripturally invalid.

Analogy

Analogy involves “both induction and deduction, the inductive being the principal element. As analogy depends upon some assumed likeness, its kinds may be indicated by the kinds of properties in which the likeness is

found." Three kinds are based upon resemblances: those of essential properties, non-essential properties, and relations. There is also analogy from contradictories. "Analogy based upon resemblance in essential properties is the most valuable kind."

In Biblical interpretation inference from analogy is sometimes useful, but it is of little value excepting when used with strict attention to *essential* resemblances or differences. The danger in its employment is that the question as to how far the analogy holds true may not receive adequate attention. This is especially true of inferences which follow analogy based upon *resemblance of relations* (Example, There is a relation between thought and language. Divine thought, satanic thought and human thought alike depend upon language for intelligent communication amongst men, but the analogy from the resemblance of the relation between these classes of thought and language ends there)

Although language is the necessary vehicle for the expression of all thought, the thinker must *control* the language which expresses his thought. The control by the divine Thinker of the language of geniuses such as Moses, Isaiah and Paul, as well as the language of sacred writers of more limited natural ability, places it in a unique class. The acceptance of this expressed thought not only results in the individual believer in that peace with God which passes all understanding but when generally accepted it results in its concomitant also, namely, peaceful relations amongst men.

On the other hand, the control by Satan of the mind of such a genius as Nietzsche places his language in an entirely different class. When it is accepted and acted upon its repulsive doctrines concerning Jesus Christ and His teachings and its abominable ideas concerning might and right not only prevents any peace with God in the individual but causes a whole people to run amuck bringing chaos, ruin and untold suffering upon humanity. Again, there is

a gulf between the expressed thought of mere human genius and the expressed thought of the divinely controlled writers of the Bible.

There is much truth which is discoverable by the human mind. The person and attributes of God and His eternal purposes are not discoverable apart from His revelation. Any truth concerning the things of God put forth by man is only the reflected truth from the divinely inspired Word which for all time has been spoken and recorded. There can be no argument by analogy that the writings of all geniuses are divinely inspired. Two facts must classify all writings: the source of their ideas and the effect of those ideas when accepted and tested as rules of life. Mere human genius has never risen above idealism. But idealism does not carry with it the dynamic power for its own realization. The Bible not only holds before man the loftiest idealism, but it alone reveals the dynamic power by which it may be realized and the conditions on which this power may be secured.

When we turn to analogy based upon essential properties we sometimes find it helpful in grasping the reality of that which must be received by faith (Example, All men of rational mentality recognize the reality of natural human life. On the other hand, many men deny the reality of that which the Scriptures reveal as "eternal life," this term being a technical one which connotes far more than mere continued existence).

In the passages which treat of eternal life, several of the terms which express essential properties of natural life are employed in revealing the reality of eternal life.

Both are said to follow a begetting process,- natural life following generation in the flesh and eternal life following regeneration by the Spirit.

Both are said to issue through birth,-the one through natural birth and the other through spiritual birth, the fact of the latter being expressed in the phrases "born of the

Spirit," "born again," and "born of God"; two natures are attributed in the Scriptures to man, the Adam nature which is the common inheritance of all men and the divine nature of which the "born again" man only is partaker in addition to the Adam nature

Both the possession of natural life and the imparted divine life are said to be the result of the creative power of God, -man created in the image of God and, having lost his high estate, recreated as part and parcel of the "new creation"; natural life as well as eternal life is said to be everlasting, and in harmony with this the thought of annihilation is foreign to the Scripture teaching concerning death.

The following formula expresses the Scripture teaching concerning life and death: the man born but once [natural birth] must die twice [pass through the transitional experiences of natural death and "the second death"]; while the man born twice may never die, the happy experience of translation replacing the dissolution of death should the Lord come during the believer's lifetime in the flesh, and at the most must die but one [natural death]. The *fact* of eternal life must be accepted by faith, but the analogy between natural life and eternal life based upon the resemblance of essential properties, as cited above, helps the believer to grasp the *reality* of eternal life as a present possession.

In conclusion, the foregoing discussion brings out the fact that, within the province of logical procedure, Biblical interpretation is chiefly dependent upon the inductive method. While it is true that the deductive method is valuable in testing premises and conclusions by reducing thoughts to a syllogistic statement, and while it is true that the analogic method is helpful within certain prescribed limits, the fact must never be overlooked by the student that thematic generals of Scripture can be logically formulated only as a result of inductive study of their respective particulars.

No theological conclusion based upon an extrabiblical general is of any value to the Bible student. Calling to mind the dictum of Dr. Gregory that a conclusion can be no more certain than the premises from which it is drawn, the premises of all theological deductions should be carefully tested by comparison with the respective concordant teachings of the Scriptures. Experienced Bible expositors recognize certain catch phrases in theological literature as signals which, like the bell buoys of a harbor channel, sound a warning of hidden dangers. These catch phrases are surface symptoms which indicate that fallacious premises are at the bottom of the reasoning. The following and similar phrases should put the student on his guard: "in the light of modern scientific research," "judged by twentieth century learning," "crass literalism," "accommodation to the 'thought forms' of the first century," "outworn Jewish notions," etc. The reasoning in which such phrases occur will be found, when analyzed, to contain indirect denials of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

Protestant theology as it emerged in its variant forms out of the Reformation period is a composite system. It is not only composed of doctrines which were formulated as a result of *inductive* study of all the particulars of their respective Scripture themes, and on the conclusions of which all believers have generally agreed; but it also contains points *deductively* arrived at from premises arbitrarily set up without reference to the Scripture particulars of their respective themes, and on which points there has always been disagreement and of necessity must always be controversy. This controversy divides on the fundamental question. Shall *every* doctrine of our creed be formulated only as a result of painstaking inductive study of all its Scripture particulars, or shall we make exceptions to this rule and raise to canonical authority arbitrary theological dicta on certain points irrespective of the Scripture teaching?

Why should we insist upon the doctrine of regeneration as inductively arrived at after taking account of all that the Scriptures reveal on the subject, on the one hand, and accept an arbitrary theological statement that there is to be a simultaneous resurrection of the just and the unjust, on the other hand?

Why insist upon an inductively arrived at doctrine of blood sacrifice and accept an arbitrary and unscriptural dictum that there is to be one general assize at the end of the world into which both the just and the unjust are to be brought?

Why insist upon all the minutiae of prophetic and fulfilled testimony concerning the first advent of Christ and throw overboard many of the distinguishing features of the prophecies concerning His second advent?

Why insist upon the inductive study of Scripture testimony concerning every feature of salvation truth and balk at the application of this method of study concerning the Scriptural distinctions in the revelation of kingdom truth?

Why insist upon an inductively formulated doctrine of the Holy Spirit and ignore the Scripture details of the provision for a victorious life in the Spirit?

Why enter protests against Professor Kent's Shorter Bible while at the same time employing a method of interpretation which effectually reduces the student's Bible to a shorter Bible and cuts him off from great sections of revelatory matter which contain precious promises and rich spiritual food as well as light on God's revealed program of the ages?

Every theme of the Scriptures must be studied inductively, collating, observing, classifying and analyzing all the passages which treat upon it. There is no other way to know all that God has spoken on any revealed subject. The student

should not be disturbed by the slurs cast upon this serious work.

Some writers have rather contemptuously spoken of this inductive study as a "hop, skip and jump" method. A recent writer calls it, "seining through the Bible for proof texts." It only needs the reminder for an effectual answer to such thoughtless remarks that if some one had not "hopped" from passage to passage of those which treat of the doctrine of the blood sacrifice, and for the time "skipped" irrelevant passages, there would be no completely formulated statement of the doctrine; and that if faithful expositors had not gone "seining" through the Scriptures for all the detached and fragmentary details of the subject of justification that great doctrine never would have been put into such complete form from all the Scripture particulars that sinners saved by grace may grasp the meaning of it and have the assurance that they have been in God's court and have been justified forever through faith in Christ.

The student who is not prepared to lay aside all prejudice and has not become possessed with a desire to know "the whole counsel of God" is ever in danger of being led into controversy over the mere captions of theological systems, sharing in all the misunderstandings that result there from. Theological captions are words with which prejudiced writers often conjure. The business of the seeker after a fuller knowledge of the Lord and His truth is to lay aside all prejudice and search for all the particulars which God has revealed on each and every theme of revelation. A prayerful classification and analysis of the data thus brought together will bring that fuller knowledge, blessing and joy which the true seeker craves.