

**Appendices to**  
***Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics***

- A. Selected Bibliography
- B. Selected List of Problem Passages
- C. Sample Problem Passages Paper
- D. Suggested Procedure for Exegesis
- E. History of Interpretation: An Overview

## Appendix A: Selected Bibliography

(\*\* denotes sources highly recommended or heavily used in the preparation of these notes)

Adler, Mortimer J. and Charles van Doren. *How To Read a Book*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

Anders, Max E. *30 Days To Understanding the Bible*. Brentwood, Tenn.: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1988.

Braga, James. *How To Study the Bible*. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1982.

Brooks, Keith L. *Basic Bible Study for New Christians*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1961.

Carson, D. A., ed. *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: Text and Context*. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984.

Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.

Carson, D. A. and John D. Woodbridge, eds. *Scripture and Truth*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.

Conn, Harvie M., ed. *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.

Fee, Douglas and Douglas Stuart. *How To Read the Bible for All Its Worth*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993

Habermehl, H. A. *God Has Spoken But What Has He Said?: A Coherent Guide to Interpreting the Bible For Yourself*. Cortland, NY: Antiphon Books, 1995.

\*\*Hendricks, Howard and William. *Living By the Book*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Living By The Book: Workbook*. Chicago: Moody Press, 2000.

Henrichsen, Walter and Gayle Jackson. *Studying, Interpreting, and Applying the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.

Johnson, Elliott E. *Expository Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.

Kaiser, Walter C. and Moises Silva. *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.

MacArthur, John, Jr. *How To Get The Most From God's Word*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1997.

Maier, Gerhard. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1994.

Mayhue, Richard L. *How To Interpret the Bible for Yourself*. Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1989.

\*\*McCartney, Dan and Charles Clayton. *Let The Reader Understand: A Guide To Interpreting and Applying the Bible*. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1994.

McQuilkin, J. Robertson. *Interpreting and Applying the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.

Mulder, Martin Jan and Harry Sysling, eds. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum). Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Phillips, John. *Bible Explorer's Guide*. Neptune, N. J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1987.

Poythress, Vern S. *God-Centered Biblical Interpretation*. Glenside, Pa.: Westminster Campus Bookstore, n. d.

\*\*Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (3rd edition). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.

\*\*Rosscup, James. *Hermeneutics* (syllabus). Sun Valley, Ca.: The Master's Seminary, 1988.

\*\*Shealy, Brian. "Notes on Hermeneutics" (syllabus prepared for courses in Hermeneutics and Interpretation at The Master's Seminary and The Cornerstone Seminary, n.d.).

Silva, Moises. *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.

Sire, James W. *Scripture Twisting: 20 Ways the Cults Misread the Bible*.

Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1980.

Stott, John R. W. *Understanding the Bible*. Glendale, Ca.: Regal Books, 1972.

Terry, Milton S. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, n. d.

Thomas, Robert L. *Evangelical Hermeneutics: The Old Versus the New*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2002.

Vos, Howard. *Effective Bible Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.

Zuck, Roy B. *Basic Bible Interpretation*. Wheaton: SP Publications, 1994

Zuck, Roy B., ed. *Rightly Divided: Readings in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1996.

## Appendix B: Selected List of Problem Passages

NOTE: The following list is suggestive. You may choose another problem passage for your paper with the approval of the instructor.

### Old Testament

1. Is there a gap in Genesis 1:2?
2. Are the “days” in Genesis 1 to be taken as literal, 24-hour days, or figuratively?
3. Was Noah’s flood (Gen 7-8) local or universal?
4. How does God abhor men (Lev 26:30, 44; cf. Psa 5:5; 11:5) when the Bible says that He loves men (John 3:16, etc.)?
5. Resolve the discrepancy between the 24,000 in Num 25:9 and the 23,000 in 1 Cor 10:8.
6. Did Jephthah offer his daughter as a physical sacrifice in death or commit her to seclusion in perpetual virginity (Judges 11)?
7. Is 1 Samuel 16:2-3 an instance of bad ethics by misrepresentation, that is, by giving only a *part* of the whole truth while hiding some of it from Saul (cf. a similar episode in Jer. 38). Since God was the one who told Samuel to say this, how can we reconcile this with God’s own statement in Proverbs 12:22 which states that “lying lips are an abomination to the Lord”?
8. Who really moved David to number the people, God or Satan (2 Sam 24:1; 1 Chron 21:1)?
9. How do you reconcile the statements of Proverbs 26:4 and 5?
10. What is meant by Isaiah 7:14, and when was it fulfilled?
11. Is Satan involved in the words of Isaiah 14:12-15, or does this passage refer to a human king?
12. Did God command Hosea to marry a woman who already was immoral, or a woman who later would prove unfaithful, or both, or something else (Hos 1:2ff)?

### New Testament

1. What is the relationship between the genealogy in Matthew 1:1-16 to that in Luke 3:23-38? Specifically, why does Matthew list Joseph’s father as Jacob (1:16), while Luke lists his father as Eli (Luke 3:23)? How can this discrepancy be resolved?
2. Was Matthew misusing the Old Testament when he applied Hosea 11:1 (which in context spoke of the nation of Israel) to Christ in Matthew 2:15?
3. What does “except for fornication” in Matthew 5:32 mean and how does it relate to the question of divorce and remarriage (cf. also 19:9)?
4. On what day was Jesus crucified? If on Friday (the traditional view), how does one reconcile that with Christ’s statement that He would be in the

tomb “three days and three nights” (Matt 12:40)? **NOTE: You may not do this one — see model paper below!**

5. What is meant in Matthew 16:18 “upon this rock I will build my church”?
6. Does John 1:1 (“ . . . and the Word was God”) support the deity of Christ, or is it better translated, as the Jehovah’s Witnesses, “the word was a god”?
7. Why did Paul have Timothy circumcised in Acts 16:3 when just previously he had refused to have Titus circumcised (Gal. 2:3)?
8. What kind of baptism is in view in Rom. 6:3-4?
9. What does “baptism for the dead” refer to in 1 Cor. 15:29?
10. Is the man Paul commanded to restore in 2 Corinthians 2:5-11 the same man who was disciplined in 1 Corinthians 5:1-13?
11. What does the phrase “emptied Himself” mean in Phil. 2:7?
12. What does Paul mean by “I do not allow a woman to teach” in 1 Tim 2:11-12?
13. Does Heb 6:4-6 teach that one can lose his salvation? If not, what is the passage saying?
14. Does James 2:14-26 contradict Romans 4, or complement it, in regard to justification by faith without works?
15. How could James use Rahab’s lie as an example of faith (Jas 2:21ff)?
16. Who are the “spirits in prison” in 1 Peter 3:19? When did Christ preach to them, and what was the nature of His message?
17. What is meant by “the Lord’s day” in Rev. 1:10?
18. Who are the “angels” of the churches in Revelation 2-3?

### **Hermeneutical principles to apply to the problem passages**

1. Clarity of Scripture (the literal principle).
2. Accommodation of Revelation
3. Progressive Revelation
4. Cross-Reference (Scripture interpreting Scripture)
5. Analogy of the Faith
6. Singleness of the Meaning of Scripture.
7. The relationship between interpretation and application.
8. Historical appropriateness.
9. Checking principle
10. Priority of the original languages.
11. Necessity of literal interpretation
12. Word Study.
13. Grammar
14. Context
15. Genre (literary mold)
16. Cultural factors.

# Appendix C: Sample Problem Passages Paper

STUDENT NAME  
BE 501: Hermeneutics and Interpretation  
Dr. Michael Canham  
DATE of PAPER

## Matthew 12:40

"for just as JONAH WAS THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS IN THE BELLY OF THE SEA MONSTER, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

1. **Statement of the Problem:** In Matthew 12:40, the Lord Jesus draws an analogy between Jonah being in the belly of the sea monster and his own burial following his crucifixion. The main question that must be settled here is the meaning of "three days and three nights." Can this be reconciled with the traditional date of Friday for a crucifixion, since, by this view, Christ would be resurrected in less than two solar days? Or does a Thursday or a Wednesday crucifixion do more justice to the use of this phrase?
  
2. **Proposed Solutions.**<sup>1</sup>
  - A. **Christ was crucified on *Wednesday*.** This view holds that Jesus died around sunset on Wednesday and arose exactly seventy-two hours later (I. e. Sunset on Saturday).<sup>2</sup> The following arguments are used in support of this view.
    1. *The Lord's statement in Matthew 12:40* ("three days and three nights"). Scroggie takes this statement as reference to seventy-two solar hours. Therefore, the only way Christ could be in the tomb for three *nights* is for Him to have been there Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday nights. To this, he adds all of the passages which refer to *after three days* (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34; Matt 27:63; John 2:19) and those which speak of *the third day* (Matt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; 27:64; Luke 9:22; 13:32; 18:33; 24:7, 21, 46; Acts 10:40; 1 Cor 15:4). Scroggie sees both expressions as referring to the same amount of time, based on Matthew 27:63-64 ("and said, 'Sir, we remember that when He was still alive that deceiver said, *"After three days* I am to rise again." Therefore, give orders for the grave to be made secure *until the third day...*"<sup>3</sup> Although recognizing that the Jews reckoned any part of a day as a whole, Scroggie goes on to assert that "when the number of 'nights' is stated as well as the number of 'days,' the expression ceases to be an idiom, and becomes a literal

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the different views, see Harold Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977) 65-74; reproduced also in J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981) 573-576.

<sup>2</sup> Advocates of a Wednesday crucifixion include William Pettinghill, *Bible Questions Answered* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979) 29-31; W. Graham Scroggie, *A Guide To The Gospels* (Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell, n. d.) 569-577 and R. A. Torrey, *Difficulties in the Bible* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1907) 101-106.

<sup>3</sup> Scroggie 570 (emphasis added).

statement of fact, and there were not three 'nights' between Friday evening and Sunday morning by any process of reckoning."<sup>4</sup>

2. *The number and nature of the happenings between the death of Jesus and His burial.* Scroggie lists twenty events that, by the Friday view, would have had to take place in three hours between Jesus' death and burial (assuming He died at 3:00 p. m. on Friday and was buried by 6:00 p. m.). Scroggie sees these as too many things to accomplish in so short a time, and postulates that the *burial* of the body took place on Wednesday evening with the *embalming* of it taking place on Friday.<sup>5</sup>
3. *Argument from typology.* Hoehner summarizes this argument as follows: "there is also the argument from typology whereby the lamb was chosen on Nisan 10. In the triumphal entry, Christ, the Lamb of God, appeared in Jerusalem on Saturday, Nisan 10."<sup>6</sup>

#### B. **Christ was crucified on Thursday.**<sup>7</sup>

1. This view points out that in the year Christ died, the Passover Sabbath fell on Friday (Nisan 15). Thus, there were two Sabbaths in a row. This is supported by the plural form of the word "Sabbath" used in the Greek text of Matthew 28:1.<sup>8</sup> Advocates of the Thursday view suggest that Matthew 28:1 should therefore be translated "at the end of the *Sabbaths*." Roy M. Allen concludes that this proves that the regular weekly Sabbath was preceded that year by the Nisan 15 Sabbath, and since Christ was crucified on the day preceding Nisan 15, He must have been crucified on Thursday.<sup>9</sup>
2. This view is advocated by some because it eliminates the "silent Wednesday" in

---

<sup>4</sup> Scroggie 570; cf. also R. A. Torrey 107, with nearly the same wording in John Stewart, *When Did Our Lord Actually Live?* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1935) 62.

<sup>5</sup> Scroggie 572, 576.

<sup>6</sup> Hoehner 66 (summarizing Scroggie 573-574).

<sup>7</sup> This view is advocated by J. K. Aldrich, "The Crucifixion on Thursday---not Friday," *BibSac* XXVII (July, 1870): 401-429; Roy M. Allen, *Three Days In The Grave* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1942); Roger Rusk, "The Day He Died," *Christianity Today* (March 29, 1974): 4-6; and Brooke Foss Westcott, *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (5th edition) (London: MacMillan And Co, 1881) 339-45 (sixth edition 343-49). Leslie P. Madison wrongly states that Westcott held the Wednesday view ("Problems of Chronology in the Life of Christ." [unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1963] 208).

<sup>8</sup> Aldrich 424-25; Rusk 5; cf. Westcott 349 (cited in Hoehner 68).

<sup>9</sup> Allen 22 (cited in Madison 220); cf. also William Sheldon, *Chronology and Prophecy Made Plain* (Boston: W. Kelloway, Book Printer, [n. d.]) 138 (cited in Madison 222).

the traditional Friday chronology.<sup>10</sup> This is one of the stronger arguments for this view. Allen argues against a "silent day" in the passion narrative as follows:

Approximately one third of all that is written in the combined Gospels relates to this last week, out of a lifetime of thirty-three years and a public ministry of over three...Moreover, from the time of the arrival at Bethany, six days before the Passover, every moment of His time appears to be accounted for, until the morning of the resurrection. Yet when they are pieced together into one connected whole, the Friday proponents calmly tell us that two whole days are missing.<sup>11</sup>

3. This view also retains a literal rendering of "three days and three nights" advocated by the Wednesday view without the problems attending a full seventy-two hours. For example, Aldrich's explanation allows for parts of three days and parts of three nights.<sup>12</sup> Page notes this as well:

Even if, by counting the small portion of Friday afternoon and Sunday morning as two days of the time, we make out three days, we are clearly at a loss for the third night; for no method of calculation can make more than two nights intervene between Friday afternoon and Sunday morning.<sup>13</sup>

4. This view also advances an argument from typology (cf. II A. 3. above) but differs from the Wednesday view in that it sees Christ as the Passover Lamb being set aside on Sunday, Nisan 10 rather than the Sabbath and then being observed for four days before being sacrificed (cf. Exodus 12:3).<sup>14</sup> Of course, this evidence runs into difficulty if it can be demonstrated that Sunday was Nisan 9 and Thursday was Nisan 13 (cf. III. C. 5 below).<sup>15</sup>

C. **Christ was crucified on *Friday*.** The arguments for this position will be outlined below.

3. **Preferred View.** All three views are well supported by their primary advocates. There is some strong support for both a Thursday and a Friday crucifixion, but it seems

---

<sup>10</sup> Hoehner 69; Madison 216; Rusk 4.

<sup>11</sup> Allen 23 (cited in Madison 218). The two silent days would be the Sabbath preceding the passion week and Wednesday.

<sup>12</sup> Aldrich 401-407.

<sup>13</sup> William M. Page, *New Light From Old Eclipses* (St. Louis: C. R. Barns Publishing Co., 1890) 135.

<sup>14</sup> Allen 25; Page 149.

<sup>15</sup> Madison 220.

best to go with a Friday crucifixion (I. e. view C above) for the following reasons.<sup>16</sup>

- A. **The meaning of "three days and three nights" (Matthew 12:40).** This is the primary reason most hold to a Wednesday or a Thursday view, and it is most difficult objection that must be overcome by those who hold a Friday view.<sup>17</sup> Several inadequate solutions by those advocating a Friday view have been suggested. George Ogg suggests deleting the verse from the inspired text as a gloss,<sup>18</sup> but there is no manuscript evidence for this. Smith B. Goodenow actually begins the reckoning of the three days and three nights from Christ's agony in Gethsemane!<sup>19</sup>

However, both of these suggestions are efforts to force the Western understanding of "three days and three nights" onto the biblical text. But, as Bernard Ramm pointed out, "the expression 'three days and three nights' *must be determined by Jewish usage.*"<sup>20</sup> In fact, if "three days and three nights" is taken to mean a literal, seventy-two hour period of time in the tomb (as advocated by the Wednesday view) *each* of the three views are rendered impossible. If Christ was buried on *Wednesday* before 6 P. M. (to avoid Sabbath defilement), His resurrection would have been on the Sabbath (cf. below), which contradicts the Gospel accounts that He rose upon the first day of the week. If Christ was buried on *Thursday* after 3 P. M., His resurrection would not be until Sunday afternoon after 3 P. M., which could hardly be "at the break of dawn." And of course, a *Friday* burial would put the resurrection seventy-two hours later on a Monday (hardly "the first day of the week" by Jewish reckoning)! It is simply impossible to get an equal number of literal days and nights if the burial took place in the afternoon and the resurrection took place in the morning. So, whatever "three days and three nights" means, it must mean something *less* than 72 hours!

When one examines the phrase "three days and three nights" as it is used in Scripture, he will discover that the Jews rendered any part of a day as a whole. Thus the expression is idiomatic of any three day period, whether or not it covers 72 hours.

1. Other New Testament references to the resurrection note that Jesus rose *on the third day* and not on the fourth (Matt 16:21; 17:22-23; 20:19; 27:63-64; Mark

---

<sup>16</sup> **NOTE TO HERMENEUTICS STUDENTS.** The format of this paper is set up a little differently, in that the specific principles (e.g. principle of context, cross reference, cultural background, priority of the original languages, word study, interpreting figurative language, all of which are used above) aren't highlighted as such. I would prefer that you highlight the given principles you are using, or at least turn in with your paper a separate list with the principles outlined and where you are using them.

<sup>17</sup> Madison 232ff.

<sup>18</sup> *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1940) 205 (cited in Madison 233)

<sup>19</sup> *Bible Chronology Carefully Unfolded* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896) 50-51.

<sup>20</sup> *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970) 202.

8:31; 9:31; Luke 9:22; 18:33; 24:7, 21, 46; John 2:19-22; Acts 10:40; 1 Cor 15:4).<sup>21</sup> Comparing these references with Matthew 12:40, we find that "three days and three nights" is an idiomatic expression used the same way as "on the third day" (Gk. τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ).<sup>22</sup>

2. There are four passages that speak of Christ being raised "*after three days*" (Matt 27:63; Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34), but this is speaking of the same time period as "on the third day" for the following reasons:
  - a. The parallels to the Markan passages (**in bold**) in the other Synoptic Gospels (I. e. Matt 16:21; Luke 9:22 (**8:31**); Matt 17:23 (**9:31**); Matt 20:19; Luke 18:33 (**10:34**)) all use the phrase "on the third day." Thus the two phrases together mean a period extending to the third day.<sup>23</sup>
  - b. Thus Scroggie's argument from Matthew 27:63 noted above (II. A. 1.), while valid, actually supports the Friday view, as Hoehner explains:

The phrase 'after three days' must have been equivalent to '[*MMC* until] the third day,' or otherwise the Pharisees would have asked for a guard of soldiers until the fourth day." Indeed, this account shows how the Jews interpreted this statement of Christ's.<sup>24</sup>

3. The corroboration of Old Testament and rabbinic literature shows that this was standard Jewish thinking. The Old Testament references which follow show that Jews reckoned a part of a day as one whole day.<sup>25</sup>
  - a. Joseph imprisoned his brothers for *three days*, and then *on the third day* he spoke to them and released them (Gen 42:17-18).
  - b. Israel and Syria camped opposite each other for *seven days*, and began fighting *on the seventh day* (1 Kings 20:29)
  - c. Rehoboam stated that the people of Israel were to return to him *in/after three days* (cf. LXX), and Jeroboam and the people came to him *on the*

---

<sup>21</sup> Hoehner 66, 71, 72; Madison 229; cf. Scroggie above in II. A. 1.

<sup>22</sup> **NOTE TO HERMENEUTICS STUDENTS:** Scripture fonts are referred if your word processor has them, otherwise, transliteration into English letters is acceptable if a standard transliteration is adopted (JBL's guide to contributors has a list of these).

<sup>23</sup> Hoehner 72; cf. also Madison 236.

<sup>24</sup> Hoehner 72-73; Madison 229, 235 (citing Matthew E. Power, "John 2:20 and the Day of the Crucifixion," *Biblica*, 9 [July 1928] 265).

<sup>25</sup> Unless otherwise noted, the below are cited in Hoehner 73-74; cf. also Madison 234-35.

*third day* (2 Chron 10:5, 12).

- d. Esther asked the Jews not to eat or drink *for three days* and then she would go in unto the king, which happened *on the third day* (Esth 4:16; 5:1).
  - e. An abandoned Egyptian servant states that since his master left him behind *three days ago*, he had not eaten bread or drunk water for *three days and three nights* (1 Sam 30:12-13).
  - f. Rabbinic literature agrees with this usage. There are several passages in the Jewish literature which combine Jonah 1:17 ("Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights") and the Old Testament passages listed above in a-e (e. g. *Midrash Rabbah*: Genesis lvi. 1 (on Gen. 22:4); Genesis xci. 7 (on Gen. 42:17-18); Esther ix. 2 (on Esther 5:1); *Midrash on the psalms*: Ps. 22:5). Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah (*ca.* 100 A. D.), stated "A day and a night are an Onah [a portion of time] and the portion of an Onah is as the whole of it."<sup>26</sup>
4. A Friday crucifixion is corroborated by the testimony of the disciples referring back to the crucifixion in Luke 24:21 in saying that "now it is the third day *since* this occurred." Counting back from the Sunday upon which this statement was spoken, this leaves Friday as the day in which Christ was crucified.

When one realizes that the Jews reckoned part of a day as a whole day, the primary objection to the Friday view no longer stand.<sup>27</sup> By the same token, the key reason for taking the other views (namely, that Jesus had to be buried for three days and three nights) also no longer stands.

- B. The "Friday" view is the only view that takes the references to "Sabbath" in the Passion narratives naturally (Luke 23:54, 56; John 19:31; cf. Matt 28:1; Mark 16:1; Luke 24:1; John 20:1).
- 1. The other two views must reinterpret "Sabbath" to be either the Passover Feast or the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Neither view holds that a literal Sabbath is intended. R. A. Torrey, a Wednesday advocate, states that "the first day of the Passover week, no matter upon what day of the week it came, was always a Sabbath (Exodus 12:16; Leviticus 23:7; Numbers 28:16-18)."<sup>28</sup> Yet while each of these passages cited by Torrey refer to a feast day, *none* of them are called a "Sabbath" (Heb. שַׁבָּת) — significant since this Hebrew word is used over one

---

<sup>26</sup> *Jerusalem Talmud*: Shabbath ix. 3; cf. also *Babylonian Talmud*: Perashim 4a (cited in Hoehner 74).

<sup>27</sup> Allen 19.

<sup>28</sup> Torrey 102.

hundred times in the Old Testament.<sup>29</sup>

2. Thus, the "argument that since Nisan 15 is a holy convocation on which no one works and thus conclude that it was a Sabbath is a *non sequitur*. There is no evidence for this anywhere."<sup>30</sup> That John 19:31 ("that Sabbath was a high day") points to a Passover Sabbath rather than a weekly Sabbath is unlikely. It would indeed be a "high day" if the Passover Sabbath and the weekly Sabbath fell on the same day.<sup>31</sup> Also, the plural form of "Sabbath" in the New Testament is quite frequently (I. e. one-third of all of its New Testament occurrences) used to refer to *one* Sabbath day (cf. Matt 12:1-12 where both the singular and the plural forms are used).<sup>32</sup>
3. The Friday view is thus more in keeping with the hermeneutical principle of the clarity of Scripture, since a natural reading of verses like Matthew 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54, and John 19:31 leads one to the conclusion that the crucifixion took place on the day immediately preceding the Jewish *Sabbath*, which would naturally be on Friday.<sup>33</sup>

### C. **Objections to the other views.**

1. If one takes Matthew 12:40 as referring to a seventy-two hour period (I. e. the Wednesday view), Christ must have risen *no later* than 6 P. M. on the Sabbath (else He would have risen *on* the fourth day!). But Christians celebrate the Resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2), not on the Sabbath.<sup>34</sup> Madison points out that this view is adopted by the Seventh-Day Adventists, whose interest in the theory is that it cannot call for a Sunday Morning resurrection.<sup>35</sup> While other advocates of the Wednesday view hold to a Sunday resurrection, it is still impossible to have a Wednesday burial and a Sunday resurrection even if the full seventy-two hours are granted. Joseph Hoffman Cohn observes:

...if Christ were in the grave exactly seventy-two hours, then He must have risen after the seventy-two hours were completed; and if He rose one

---

<sup>29</sup> See George V. Wigram, *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980) 1235.

<sup>30</sup> Hoehner 69; Madison 223 (citing Goodenow 46).

<sup>31</sup> Hoehner 69.

<sup>32</sup> Hoehner 70.

<sup>33</sup> Conceded by Allen 18 (cited in Madison 227).

<sup>34</sup> Hoehner 67.

<sup>35</sup> Allen 9 (cited in Madison 213-14).

second after the seventy-two hours, then it was the fourth day, and not the third.<sup>36</sup>

This is especially true if the reference in Matthew 12:38-41 speaks of the duration of His soul in the heart of the earth rather than the burial of His body.<sup>37</sup> In that case the "three days and the three nights" would have begun with the *death* of Christ rather than His burial. Since Christ's death would have taken place around 3 P. M. in the afternoon, the three days (I. e. 72 hours) would have been up at 3 P. M. on Saturday afternoon. "And it is obvious that 3 P. M. Saturday is not the dawning of the first day of the week (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:1; Luke 24:1; John 20:1)!"<sup>38</sup>

2. The corroboration of typology for the Wednesday view (cf. Scroggie) is weak, since it makes Christ's Triumphal entry on the Sabbath. Interestingly, Torrey rejects a Friday crucifixion because that has Christ traveling from Jericho to Bethany six days before the Passover on the Sabbath (John 12:1) and Christ would not have violated the Sabbath in such a way by traveling more than a Sabbath-day's journey. Torrey further states that since the distance from Bethany to Jerusalem was "about a Sabbath days journey" (Acts 1:12; Luke 24:50), it was within the legal restrictions for Sabbath travel.<sup>39</sup> What Torrey fails to address is that, while *travel* from Bethany to Jerusalem would have been permissible on the Sabbath, Christ's action of riding on an animal and the people's action of cutting down branches from the trees were not (Matt 21:8; Mark 11:8). In both cases the Law concerning the Sabbath would have been violated (Deut 5:14; Num 15:32-36). It is unlikely that Christ would have done this and even more unlikely that His enemies would not have mentioned it during the Passion week (especially since the actions of Christ or His disciples on the Sabbath were often criticized (e. g. Matt 12:1-2)).<sup>40</sup> Roy M. Allen maintains that the Sabbath entry is essential to maintain a Wednesday crucifixion:

The Wednesday theory stands on precarious ground in one respect; it is a complete unit theory. If it fails in a single respect, like a chain which is only as strong as its weakest link, it falls completely. For instance, if it can be shown that the triumphal entry could not have occurred in the Jewish

---

<sup>36</sup> *A Passover Trilogy* 39 (cited in Madison 214).

<sup>37</sup> As Madison 214; Allen 50-51.

<sup>38</sup> Madison 215.

<sup>39</sup> Torrey 104. However, Leon Morris suggests on John 12:1 that "Jesus may have arrived on the Friday after sunset, or alternatively not have traveled very far so as not to exceed the Sabbath day's journey" (*The Gospel According to John* [NICNT] [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971] 575).

<sup>40</sup> Hoehner 67; Madison 213.

sabbath, but must have taken place on the first day of the week, the crucifixion could not have taken place on Wednesday.<sup>41</sup>

Also, the Friday view is more compatible with the Paschal lamb typology, since at the very moment that Christ dismissed His spirit the High Priest would have killed and offered the typical Passover lamb. Also, Christ would have arisen three days later on Nisan 16--the day of the offering of the first fruits. Since in 1 Corinthians Paul identifies the death of Christ with the date the Passover lamb was slain (5:7) and equates the resurrection of Christ with the offering of the first fruits (15:23), the typology is complete. Since Paul limits these events to Nisan 14 and 16 respectively, and since the Scripture clearly reveals that Nisan 16 (the resurrection) fell on a Sunday, it follows that Nisan 14 must fall on a Friday.<sup>42</sup>

3. The Thursday view makes the word παρασκευή ("day of preparation") refer to the preparations for the Passover rather than its' normal usage referring to Friday preparation for the Sabbath.<sup>43</sup> Support for this is claimed from John 19:14 ("Now it was the day of preparation for the Passover"). This suffers from three problems:
  - a. As mentioned above, this forces an unnatural meaning of παρασκευή. Josephus (*Antiquities* xvi. 6. 2) and the Scriptures (Matt 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:14, 31, 42) both indicate that the word refers to the day of preparation before the Sabbath, i. e. Friday.<sup>44</sup> Significantly, even B. F. Westcott, who argues against a Friday crucifixion, is forced to concede this point.<sup>45</sup> Nor is Rusk's argument suggesting a double-observance of the day of preparation based on a hint given in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* convincing.<sup>46</sup>
  - b. Mark 15:42 ("it was the preparation day, that is, *the day before the Sabbath*") exclusively makes this day Friday (unless one reinterprets "Sabbath").<sup>47</sup> Rabbinical writers attribute no other name to Friday except παρασκευή, and Matthew Power notes that the only Greek word John had

---

<sup>41</sup> Allen 32 (cited in Madison 212).

<sup>42</sup> Madison 224-25, 227-28; cf. Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* III. x.5.

<sup>43</sup> So Allen 87.

<sup>44</sup> Hoehner 70; Madison 222 (citing Matthew A. Power, "Nisan Fourteenth and Fifteenth in Gospel and Talmud," *The American Journal of Theology* 24 [April, 1920] 253).

<sup>45</sup> Westcott 344 (cited in Madison 222, 231).

<sup>46</sup> Rusk 6.

<sup>47</sup> Hoehner 70.

for "Friday" was παρασκευή.<sup>48</sup> Patrick Fairbairn notes:

In a passage, quoted by Wetstein at Matt. xxvii.62, from a Rabbinical authority, the days are given thus: the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, paraskeue, Sabbath. Clearly therefore the word in question had come to be familiarly applied to denote that day as a whole,...but we have no evidence of any such appellation being customary in regard to the Passover Feast. Nor, indeed, can we conceive how it should have been thought of. For, as already stated, even on the first day itself of the feast, a certain freedom was allowed for traveling and preparing victuals; and the day preceding it must usually have been one of considerable bustle and activity. We hold it, therefore, as established beyond all reasonable doubt, that the paraskeue is the day preceding the regular Jewish Sabbath.<sup>49</sup>

c. The actual statement in John 19:14 to the preparation for the Passover is better seen as having reference to the Friday of Passover week rather than the day before since there is much evidence for παρασκευή referring to Friday while there is no evidence for it referring to the day before the Passover. This is also substantiated by the immediate context where it is stated that the bodies must be taken off the cross so that they would not remain on the cross on the Sabbath, and they put Jesus in the tomb on the "Jewish day of preparation" (John 19:31, 42).<sup>50</sup>

4. The Thursday view in particular lacks the support of astronomy (or should we say that there are "astronomical problems" with the Thursday view?). Madison explains:

To hold a Thursday view requires that one select a year in which the fourteenth of Nisan fell on a Thursday. A brief glance at a carefully prepared lunar chart will reveal that in the possible years for the crucifixion there is not one year in which Nisan 14 fell on a Thursday. The only year between A. D. 28-35 when Nisan 14 fell on a Thursday was in A. D. 34, and neither Page, Sheldon, Aldrich, or Allen assign the crucifixion to that late a date. Allen, Sheldon, and Aldrich argue for an A. D. 30 date, but they are unable to bring the testimony of astronomy to the

---

<sup>48</sup> Matthew Power 253.

<sup>49</sup> *Hermeneutical Manual: or Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858) 352.

<sup>50</sup> Hoehner 70-71; Morris 776-77, 800; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Origins of the Eucharist," *New Testament Studies* I (April, 1955) 206-08; Charles C. Torrey, "The Date of the Crucifixion According To The Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* L (December, 1931) 233-37; *idem.*, "In The Fourth Gospel The Last Supper was the Paschal Meal," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* XLII (January, 1952): 237-40, 250; cf. also Madison 229-30 (citing M. Power 253); Augustus Tholuck, *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1866) 318.

support of their Thursday view.<sup>51</sup>

- D. While it is true that many events occurred between Christ's death and burial, the list of twenty things given by Scroggie is not so formidable when examined, since many of them could have been done simultaneously, while others could have actually been done before He died.<sup>52</sup>
- E. A problem with the Thursday view is that its advocates hold that Christ and His disciples did not eat the Passover. This view is contrary to the united testimony of the Synoptic gospels, which state that Christ *did* eat the Passover with His disciples. In fact, Allen not only rules out the eating of the Passover on the eve before the crucifixion, but he even goes so far as placing the disciples around the Passover table at the time of Christ's burial!<sup>53</sup> R. A. Torrey (Wednesday advocate) tries to alleviate such difficulties between John and the Synoptics by stating that John's gospel, written much later than the others, was written to correct false impressions given from the other Gospels.<sup>54</sup>
- F. The Friday view is the common consensus of the Church Fathers and scholars throughout church history.<sup>55</sup> Though this should not be the standard for determining the truthfulness of a position, it does lend weight as corroborating evidence. Even Allen (who holds the Thursday view) admits the strength of this argument:

The presumption is strong that evidence against the Friday theory is not so apparent on the surface as some would have us believe. Then again on the basis that "possession is nine points of the law," Friday has one marked advantage over both Wednesday and Thursday. As a man on trial is assumed to be innocent until proven guilty, so must Friday stand until it is demonstrated conclusively that some other day meets the requirements as Friday never can do.<sup>56</sup>

Power notes that although the church fathers debated over the day of the *month* of Christ's crucifixion, there was universal agreement over the day of the *week* of the

---

<sup>51</sup> Madison 223 (citing A. T. Olmstead, "'The Chronology of Jesus' Life," *Anglican Theological Review* 24 [January, 1942]: 4; J. K. Fotheringham, "Astronomical Evidence For The date of the Crucifixion," *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 [April, 1911]: 123-24).

<sup>52</sup> Hoehner 67.

<sup>53</sup> Allen 93 (cited in Madison 221).

<sup>54</sup> Torrey 102.

<sup>55</sup> Hoehner 72.

<sup>56</sup> Allen 17 (cited in Madison 225).

crucifixion.<sup>57</sup> Obviously, then, the Fathers did not consider the Friday view to be contrary either to the Scriptures or to the Hebrew method of reckoning time.

- G. Finally, the Friday view is corroborated by astronomical evidence. Olmstead has reconstructed Israel's lunar calendar for the years A. D. 29-36. This chart reveals that Nisan 14 fell on a Thursday only in A. D. 34, but that it fell on a Friday in A. D. 27, 30, and 33, the last two of which are the two years most likely for the crucifixion.<sup>58</sup>

### **Bibliography of Sources Consulted**

[NOTE to Cornerstone Seminary Hermeneutics Students—a separate bibliography is not required as long as all sources cited are fully documented upon their first occurrence in your papers. The bibliography that follows has been retained to give you an idea of the variety of sources that can/should be consulted as you write your paper]

- Aldrich, J. K. "The Crucifixion on Thursday---not Friday," *Bibliotheca Sacra* XXVII (July, 1870): 401-429.
- Allen, Roy M. *Three Days In The Grave*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1942. (cited in Madison, p. 212)
- Cohn, Joseph Hoffman. *A Passover Trilogy*. New York: American Board of Missions to the Jews, [n. d.].
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *Hermeneutical Manual: or Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858.
- Field, Frederick. *Notes on Select Passages of the Greek Testament* (Oxford, 1881) 8-9 (This resource gives usage in Greek literature of "on the third day," etc. outside of the New Testament.
- Goodenow, Smith B. *Bible Chronology Carefully Unfolded*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Origins of the Eucharist," *New Testament Studies* I (April, 1955): **pages?**
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977.
- Madison, Leslie P. "Problems of Chronology in the Life of Christ." (unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Dallas [Tx.] Theological Seminary, 1963.

---

<sup>57</sup> Matthew A. Power 24:262 (cited in Madison 226).

<sup>58</sup> J. K. Fotheringham, "Astronomical Evidence for the Date of the Crucifixion," *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (April, 1911): 120-127 (cited in Madison 232).

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According To John* (NICNT). Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.

Olmstead, A. T. "The Chronology of Jesus' Life," *Anglican Theological Review* 24 (January, 1942): 1-26.

Page, William M. *New Light From Old Eclipses*. St. Louis: C. R. Barns Publishing Co., 1890.

Pentecost, J. Dwight. *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.

Pettinghill, William. *Bible Questions Answered*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.

Power, Matthew A. "Nisan Fourteenth and Fifteenth in Gospel and Talmud," *The American Journal of Theology* 24 (April, 1920): 252-76.

Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (3rd revised edition). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.

Rusk, Roger. "The Day He Died," *Christianity Today* (March 29, 1974): 4-6.

Scroggie, W. Graham. *A Guide To The Gospels*. Old Tappan, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Publishing Company, n. d.

Stewart, John. *When Did Our Lord Actually Live?* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1935. (cited in Madison 210).

Torrey, Charles C. "The Date of the Crucifixion According To The Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* L (December, 1931)

---

\_\_\_\_\_. "In The Fourth Gospel The Last Supper was the Paschal Meal," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* XLII (January, 1952): 239-240.

Torrey, R. A. *Difficulties in the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1907

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. 5th edition. London: MacMillan And Co, 1881. **NOTE:** The edition cited by Madison was the sixth edition, in which pages 343-349 covered this issue; in the fifth edition the issue is covered in pp, 339-345. This accounts for the differences in pagination above.

Wigram, George V. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

## Appendix D: Suggested Procedure for Exegesis<sup>59</sup>

The following is taken from Prof. Brian Shealy's Hermeneutics syllabus, to whom proper credit should be given. Many of these have already been discussed under the Introductory section of this syllabus, but this appendix brings together into one place a checklist of various items with which the expositor needs to concern himself as he carries out exegesis.

### 1. Be a spiritually prepared interpreter.

- A. Proper exegesis requires that you be saved (1 Cor 2:14-16)
- B. Have a reverence for God's word (2 Tim 3:14-17).
- C. Have a hunger to be fed by Scripture (1 Pet 2:2)
- D. Approach Scripture with an attitude of diligent investigation (Acts 17:11; cf. Ezra 7:10)
- E. Be filled by the Spirit and Saturated by the Word (Col 3:16; cf. Eph 5:18).
- F. Pray (Psalm 119:18)
- G. Be humble and willing to obey whatever God's Word teaches (James 1:22-27; 4:5-6).
- H. Be dependent upon the Holy Spirit's illumination (1 Cor 2:6-13).

### 2. Approach the text with biblical presuppositions. These are implications that grow out of the *Bible* as context.

#### A. *Keep in mind that the Bible is a Divine book.*

- i. Presuppose that it is God-breathed (2 Tim 3:16)
- ii. See the 66 books of the canon as His full and complete special revelation.
- iii. View the Bible as inspired, inerrant, and authoritative.
- iv. Assume that it will be a unified body of teachings that must harmonize
- v. Remember that God intends Scripture to *communicate* truth — not obscure it. Therefore, there will be an *external* clarity arrived at through the principles of interpretation and an *internal* clarity illuminated by the Holy Spirit so that the believer sees it as the truth of God.

---

<sup>59</sup> From Shealy 121-24.

- vi. Approach Scripture with the following principles based on the Bible as a divine book.
  - (1) *Scripture interprets Scripture*. Each individual Scripture should be compared with the entirety of Scripture to bring it into harmony with the whole.
  - (2) *Analogy of faith*. “No single statement or obscure passage of one book can be allowed to set aside a doctrine which is clearly established by many passages.”<sup>60</sup>
  - (3) *Progressive revelation*. God has revealed Himself in stages to His people. Later Scriptures add to what God has given in earlier portions.
  - (4) *Allow for mystery*. While the Scriptures are clear in what they present, the content of the presentation is often hard to understand.
  - (5) *Recognize accommodation of revelation*.
  
- B. ***Keep in mind that the Bible is a human book.*** Therefore it must be understood that certain things must be accounted for before the author’s intended meaning can be understood.
  - i. Historical context
  - ii. Purpose in writing.
  - iii. Structure of the book
  - iv. Immediate context
  - v. Grammar and syntax of the language used.
  - vi. Meaning of the author’s words.
  - vii. Light from related books or similar passages of Scripture.
  
- C. ***Keep in mind that the Bible presents a context.***
  - i. Be familiar with the Bible’s flow of *history*.
  - ii. Be familiar with the Bible’s general *themes*.
    - (1) The character and attributes of God.
    - (2) The tragedy of sin.
    - (3) The blessings of faith and obedience.

---

<sup>60</sup> Terry 579.

- (4) The need for and provision of Christ as Savior.
- (5) The ultimate destinies of man and the universe.

3. **Be aware of the significance of the *testament* in which the passage appears.** Read the Bible, and Bible survey and history books.
4. **Make yourself familiar with the corpus of the author's writings,** along with his style of writing and vocabulary. Use Introductions to the Old and New Testaments, Commentaries, Nigel Turner's *Styles of NT Writers*.
5. **Review the implications of the type of literature in which the passage appears.**
  - A. Read Hermeneutics books on genre.
  - B. See D. Brent Sandy and Ronald L. Geise, Jr., eds., *Cracking Old Testament Codes* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, Publishers, 1995).
6. **Familiarize yourself with the historical background of the book.** Read commentaries, Bible handbooks and dictionaries, and biblical introductions.
7. **Make sure you have the right text.**
  - A. Use English translations
  - B. Greek or Hebrew (Aramaic) texts.
  - C. Textual apparatus.
  - D. Textual criticism books (comparing versions, manuscripts, lectionaries, fathers, etc.)
8. **Read the book through making observations.**
9. **Develop an outline or structure diagram of the whole book** to understand the argument and flow of thought.
10. **Determine how your passage fits into the book's purpose, argument, and flow of thought.**
11. **Prepare a tentative translation.**
12. **Diagram the passage** to see syntactical relationships.
13. **Read a few good exegetical commentaries** and make observations.

14. **Based upon your translation, reading, diagram, and commentary reading, compile lists of**
  - A. Words to be studied
  - B. Grammatical relationships and nuances needed to be decided upon.
  - C. Questions to be answered
  - D. Problems to be solved.
15. **Analyze significant grammatical issues.**
16. **Study key words and wordings.**
17. **Solve problems** based upon grammar, word study, historical background, context, comparing Scripture with Scripture, etc.
18. **Synthesize the information obtained into an explanation of the passage** verse-by-verse, phrase-by-phrase, word-by-word.
19. **Outline the text syntactically.**
20. **Principalize the text.**
  - A. Major points
  - B. Important themes
  - C. Important doctrine
21. **Apply the text to construct theology and to apply to Christian living.**

## Appendix E: History of Interpretation — An Overview.<sup>61</sup>

[Kaiser/Silva, 211-50; Ramm, 23ff; Rosscup, 24-54; Silva, 32-44; Terry, 163-74, 603-738; Zuck, *BBI*, 27-58. Cf. *History of Interpretation* class; Shealy 8-33].

The following is a *brief* overview of the History of Interpretation, with a focus on some of the key individuals and issues raised. Obviously, a survey course such as this cannot pretend to deal thoroughly with all of the relevant questions that have been raised in the history of interpretation,<sup>62</sup> and the interested students should consult additional hermeneutics manuals and their bibliographies for more specialized resources. We may study the schools of interpretation topically (as Ramm) or chronologically (as Mickelsen) to see the development of all the strands at once. The present appendix will examine these schools topically.<sup>63</sup>

I. **Ancient Jewish Exegesis** [Terry, 603-28; Mikra, *passim*].

II. **Allegorical Schools** [McCartney/Clayton, 85-91; Phillips, 54-57; Ramm, 24-45].<sup>64</sup> Allegoricalism represents the primary alternative to the grammatico - historical hermeneutic examined here. The word “schools” is in the plural because there are a number of these: (1) Greek allegorism; (2) Jewish allegorism; (3) Christian/Patristic allegorism; and (4) Catholic allegorism.

The allegorical method is defined as follows: *The allegorical method regards the literal, grammatical, historical sense of a passage as a mere vehicle for getting underneath to a hidden meaning which is deeper, more profound, and more spiritual.* Beneath the letter (*rhete*) or the obvious (*phanera*) is the real meaning (*hyponoia*). Mickelsen says of this method: “What the original writer [of Scripture] is trying to say is ignored. What the interpreter wants to say becomes the only important factor.”<sup>65</sup> In many cases, imagination replaces observation.<sup>66</sup>

A. **Greek Allegorism.**<sup>67</sup> The Greeks were not concerned with Scripture but with their own writings. However, their allegorical method of interpreting their writings was later adopted by both Jews and Christians. Thus, allegorism as a system of

---

<sup>61</sup> The bulk of the material that follows is taken (with some adaptations) from Rosscup 24-54.

<sup>62</sup> The present author’s Ph. D. Program in Hermeneutics and Biblical interpretation at Westminster Theological Seminary had two seminar courses that were devoted exclusively to examining some of the issues treated here in a cursory fashion — namely, History of Interpretation, and Hermeneutics in the New Testament Period.

<sup>63</sup> Rosscup, 25.

<sup>64</sup> Rosscup, 25-37.

<sup>65</sup> Mickelsen 28.

<sup>66</sup> Rosscup, 25.

<sup>67</sup> Rosscup, 25-27.

interpretation originally sprang from a pagan source.

1. *The Conflict* that caused the introduction of allegorism.<sup>68</sup>
  - a. RELIGIOUS TRADITION IN THE POETS HOMER AND HESIOD. These writings had a popular appeal, yet were filled with the fanciful, grotesque, absurd, and even immoral (e.g. the lustful escapades of Greek gods), which created philosophical tensions with Plato's school of thought.
  - b. PHILOSOPHICAL-HISTORICAL TRADITION IN THUCYDIDES AND HERODOTUS. Plato, who came much later, found it impossible to harmonize the embarrassing crudities he found in Homer with his own philosophical convictions. He was forced either to reject Homer because of the illicit sex capers of the gods, or to interpret them in such a way that would smooth them over.<sup>69</sup>
2. *The Consequences*.<sup>70</sup>
  - a. THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM. Greeks relieved the tension and explained that there was really no clash after all. The stories of the gods and the writings of the poets were not to be taken literally but allegorically, as the real meaning (*hyponoia*) was underneath the surface. The immoralities thus evaporated and vices in the gods came to be seen as values. Thus, Homer spoke the language of a Pythagoras or a Plato. Borrowing from them the same methods, the Alexandrian Jews made the Bible express and anticipate the doctrines of the same philosophers.<sup>71</sup>
  - b. THE SPREAD OF THE PRINCIPLE. Greek allegorism spread to Alexandria, Egypt, where there was a great Jewish population and later a large Christian segment, who would adopt this method in interpreting their own sacred writings.

## B. *Jewish Allegorism*.<sup>72</sup>

1. *The conflict*.<sup>73</sup> Tensions for the Alexandrian Jews were created by conflicts

---

<sup>68</sup> Ramm 25; Rosscup, 25-26.

<sup>69</sup> "The problem is at once *apologetic* and *hermeneutical*. It is interesting that the religious apology and the allegorical method of hermeneutics have the same historical root. The tension was relieved by *allegorizing* the religious heritage" (Ramm 25).

<sup>70</sup> Rosscup, 26-27.

<sup>71</sup> Rosscup, 26.

<sup>72</sup> Rosscup, 27-30.

between the Mosaic law/ prophets/ OT writings (in which they were steeped) and Greek philosophy (e.g. Plato). Their own Scriptures were constantly ridiculed, and they could not hold to both without embarrassment.

2. *The consequences.*<sup>74</sup>

- a. SOLUTION.<sup>75</sup> Many found a convenient method of resolving the conflict and saving face. They simply allegorized the Scripture and erased the problem.
- b. SCHOLARS.<sup>76</sup>
  - (1) *Aristobolus* (160 BC):<sup>77</sup> He held that Greek philosophy was actually borrowed from the OT (especially Moses). The OT taught the same thing as the Greek philosophers when the allegorical method was applied. Thus, the OT was made “respectable.”
  - (2) *Philo* (20BC – AD 54).<sup>78</sup> Philo was not the first Jew to adopt the allegorical method, but he was the man who systematized it in relation to the OT and brought it to its epitome in early times.
    - (a) His preparation: Philo was weak on OT and rabbinical culture, but was steeped in Greek literature which he read voluminously.<sup>79</sup>
    - (b) His purpose: As a Jew, Philo loved the Scripture and felt that the Mosaic law and the prophets were superior to Plato and the philosophers. But he was also impressed by Greek philosophy, and sought to find a middle means by which Moses and the philosophers could be united and harmonized. He developed a massive system of interpretation filled with allegorism to give the OT a charm to the Greek mind. He read philosophy back into Moses and so reconciled the two. He could thus regard himself as a learned philosopher and yet at the same time be a

---

<sup>73</sup> Rosscup, 27.

<sup>74</sup> Rosscup, 27-30.

<sup>75</sup> Rosscup, 27.

<sup>76</sup> Rosscup, 27-30.

<sup>77</sup> Rosscup, 27.

<sup>78</sup> Rosscup, 27-30.

<sup>79</sup> Farrar, 137-38 (referenced in Rosscup, 27).

faithful Jew.<sup>80</sup>

- (c) His problem: He saw the problem of defending the cause of Judaism against ridiculing Greeks. He wanted to save face for the Mosaic Law and the prophets and make these attractive and respectable. NOTE: This assumes that when there is a conflict between Scripture and popular opinion, it is Scripture that must bend, and not men!
- (d) His principles: [Ramm 27-28; Mickelsen 29; Farrar 136-57]. Philo taught that there were several instances in which the Scriptures were to be interpreted allegorically:
- i) When a statement is made which is *unworthy of God* (e.g. "Adam hid himself from God" or Jacob said, "God is in this place"). In many of these, Philo and other allegorists did not account for anthropomorphisms in the Scripture.
  - ii) When a *contradiction* seems apparent (e.g. Cain had a wife).
  - iii) Where an *allegory is obvious*.
- Philo did not consider the literal meaning useless--he even claims respect for it. However, to some extent this appears as lip service only, since the overall impression one gains from Philo's statements is that he regarded the literal sense as the "immature" sense (i.e., a concession to the weak and ignorant). It was the body, but the allegorical sense was the soul which could be seen and appreciated by those who were enlightened or elite.
- (e) His perversions: At Philo's hands, even the simplest statements of Scripture evaporated and were replaced by philosophical niceties or moral platitudes.<sup>81</sup> By way of example:
- i) When Moses mentions "the green herb of the field," he really means "that portion of the mind which is perceptible only by intellect."
  - ii) The verse "God did not cause it to rain upon the earth"

---

<sup>80</sup> Farrar, 137 (referenced in Rosscup, 28).

<sup>81</sup> Farrar 140.

(Gen 2:5) means that God did not shed the perceptions of things upon the senses.

- iii) When God planted a Paradise in Eden, this means that God implants terrestrial virtue in the human race.
- iv) The four heads of the river going out of Eden are the cardinal virtues - prudence, courage, temperance, and justice. Otherwise, why mention such a mundane thing in Scripture? Farrar says aptly: "...He was determined to get circuitously what he could not get directly. And thus did he practically create a Bible of his own--a Bible infinitely less venerable and more obscure--endowed with claims and interpreted by methods which were not derived from its own pages but were a feeble exotic transplanted from the theories of Greek philosophers into a completely alien soil."<sup>82</sup>

### C. *Christian and Patristic Allegorism.*<sup>83</sup>

#### 1. *Introduction.*<sup>84</sup>

- a. DURATION of the system: More than 1500 years until the Protestant Reformation.
- b. OBJECTIVES of the system:
  - (1) To explain the Old Testament as a Christian document.
  - (2) To emphasize truths of the Gospel.
- c. OBJECTIONS to the system:
  - (1) Ignoring of the historical sense of texts.
  - (2) Inadequate understanding of passages in view of progressive revelation (i.e., reading back into the OT texts meanings that were not yet fully developed.
  - (3) Indiscriminate use of allegorism to explain the meaning of parables.

---

<sup>82</sup> Farrar 152.

<sup>83</sup> Rosscup 30-35.

<sup>84</sup> Rosscup 30.

- (4) A confusing of the allegorical and the typical.
- (5) Insistence that Greek philosophy was in the OT and could be uncovered by means of allegorism.
- (6) Fostering of dogmatic interpretations and ecclesiastical absolutism (the rise of the magisterium as necessary for biblical interpretation).
- (7) Summary: Allegorism obscures the true meaning of the Word of God and offers no check to determine its correctness.

2. *Individuals*.<sup>85</sup>

a. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.<sup>86</sup> Clement saw five senses in a passage of Scripture.<sup>87</sup> For example, Exodus 16:36 reads, "An omer is the tenth part of a ephah, while the LXX renders it, "the tenth part of the three measures." Clement identified these three measures as the three criteria of sensation, speech, and understanding.<sup>88</sup>

b. ORIGEN.<sup>89</sup>

(1) His setting:

(a) A group of Christian scholars in Alexandria, Egypt sought to make the Christian faith appealing and meaningful to the intellectual elite of their own day. Men such as Celsus and Porphyry were labeling the Bible as immoral, trivial, and absurd, pointing to such episodes as Lot's incest, Noah's drunkenness, Jacob's wives and concubines, Judah's seduction of Tamar, supposed petty distinctions about which animals were clean or unclean, and many other matters.<sup>90</sup> Origen followed others before him in resorting to allegorism to make the Jewish scriptures to make them attractive to minds that would not accept them.

---

<sup>85</sup> Rosscup 31-35.

<sup>86</sup> Rosscup 31.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Ramm 31.

<sup>88</sup> Farrar 186.

<sup>89</sup> Rosscup 31-33.

<sup>90</sup> Mickelsen 32.

- (b) NOTE: Scripture says that the natural man can neither receive nor understand the things revealed in Scripture (cf. Rom 3:11; 1 Cor 2:14). Accordingly, there must be change in the man by regeneration and a new viewpoint as a new creation (2 Cor 5:17), not a change in the Bible.

(2) His system.

- (a) Origen's hermeneutical method is set forth in voluminous writings.<sup>91</sup> He reduced the allegorical method to a system. Drawing an analogy with Platonic trichotomy, Origen cited 1 Thess 5:23 as proof that every passage of the Bible has three senses, i.e. the literal (body sense, which was the earthly, carnal, and sensual), the soulish sense (that which relates to matters of religious life), and the spiritual sense (that which relates to heavenly life).
- (b) For example, the water pots of stone in John 2, containing two or three firkins (about twenty gallons) apiece, mean the scriptures. They are intended to purify the Jews and sometimes contain two firkins- -the moral and literal sense--and sometimes three, including the spiritual.
- (c) As he used the three senses, Origen employed the following principles in interpreting Scripture:
  - i) The literal meaning of Scripture is the preliminary level of interpretation. It was good for the crude layman, but the more intelligent (enlightened) believer was expected to go beyond the literal to a “deeper” understanding.
  - ii) To truly understand the Bible, we must have grace given to us by Christ. NOTE: While this is a true statement, it can be falsely applied. One could justify any interpretation on the basis that “this is what God told me it means.” We need sound rules of interpretation!
  - iii) The true exegesis is the spiritual meaning of the Bible. (There is truth in this statement also, but Origen was so anxious to bend the scripture to make the Christian faith palatable to unsympathetic men that he made many concessions).

---

<sup>91</sup> Eppiphani estimated that he authored about 6,000 different works (A. H. Newman, *A Manual of Church History* 1:282).

- (d) Origen held that much of the literal (body) sense was derogatory to God's greatness, and he regarded many Old Testament stories as immoral and unbecoming (e.g. Lot's incest, Judah's fornication with Tamar, prohibitions to eat vultures [Deut 14:5], etc), which were inherently absurd to him.
- (e) Further, Origen asserted that many things are contradictory and involve discrepancies.<sup>92</sup> How, Origen asks, could readers possibly receive edification from the minutia of Leviticus or Numbers? It would be unbecoming of God to give minute rules about fat and leaven (Leviticus 3), or to justify the slaughter of enemy peoples. To interpret these literally as having happened would render the Christian faith grotesque and impossible.<sup>93</sup>
- (f) Farrar's evaluation is incisive: "In reading most of Origen's difficulties about the Bible in its literal meaning, we stand amazed. . . . By the slightest application of literary criticism they vanish at a touch. . . . Had he abstained from applying to the whole of scripture mere fragments of clauses often divorced from their meaning and dissevered from their context. . . he would have contemplated such difficulties with a smile. It was only because he saw Scripture in a false light that he was unable to account for its most salient phenomena except by explaining them away. . ."94
- (3) His significance. Origen's system of allegorism was soon adopted as the popular method of the Christian Church and prevailed throughout the Middle Ages. Only the Antiochene School of Antioch held out solidly against the system and adhered to a rigid literal method.
- c. AUGUSTINE (North Africa, 354-430).<sup>95</sup>
- (1) His presuppositions. While Augustine did nobly in some matters, he was badly equipped for the work of exposition. He knew no Hebrew and only a little Greek.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Farrar 191-93.

<sup>93</sup> Farrar 192.

<sup>94</sup> Farrar 193.

<sup>95</sup> Rosscup 33-35.

<sup>96</sup> Farrar 234.

- (a) He presupposed that he should find almost all the truth of the Gospel in the OT. Again, there is some truth in this, but Augustine grossly overdid it by reading senses into OT verses.
  - (b) Augustine presupposed that 2 Cor 3:6 supports allegorical interpretation.<sup>97</sup>
  - (c) Augustine also presupposed that the Bible must be interpreted in agreement with the dogma of the Catholic Church. The magisterium, again.
- (2) His principles: Ramm lists twelve principles held by Augustine.<sup>98</sup> Farrar summarizes Augustine as follows: "Nothing, indeed, can be theoretically better than some of the rules which he lays down. . . . But when we read his actual comments these principles are forgotten."<sup>99</sup> Ramm adds, "There is hardly a rule [Augustine] made which he did not frequently violate."<sup>100</sup>
- (3) His practice: Augustine allegorized extensively.
- (a) For example, Psalm 3:5 speaks of lying down, sleeping, and rising up again or awakening. Augustine said that the Psalmist is referring to the death and resurrection of Christ here.
  - (b) Psalm 104:19 speaks of "the sun which knoweth his going down." To Augustine, this meant that Christ was aware of his approaching death.
  - (c) In *The City of God*, Augustine applied kingdom prophecies to the Roman Catholic Church. This was partly to establish the current ecclesiology (Christianity by this point had not only been legalized but had also become the state religion — the kingdom has arrived!). In addition, the concept of the millennial kingdom in Augustine's day was degenerated into the gratification of fleshly desires (it was pictured as having wine, women, and song in abundance. Having lived immorally as a young man, Augustine reacted rigidly against such a concept of the kingdom and changed it from a literal one to a

---

<sup>97</sup> See Ramm 35 footnote on this .

<sup>98</sup> Ramm 36-37.

<sup>99</sup> Farrar 234.

<sup>100</sup> Ramm 37.

spiritualized one.

- (4) Evaluation: Augustine was arguing against a "straw man." Twisted concepts about the kingdom had created a distasteful image in his mind. However, instead of rejecting the perverted concept of the kingdom and going back to a purely Scriptural conception, Augustine advocated a third concept that was as unscriptural (in what it denied) as that which he rejected.

D. ***Catholic Allegorism*** [McCartney/Clayton, 91-92].<sup>101</sup>

1. *Panorama of the Period*.<sup>102</sup>

- a. CONFORMITY TO TRADITIONAL DOGMA OF THE CHURCH. Though there was some fresh and original thinking which careful research can demonstrate today, the overall situation was not so. Mickelsen says, "Except for an oasis here and there, the Middle Ages were a vast desert so far as biblical interpretation is concerned."<sup>103</sup>
- b. CENTRALITY OF THE ALLEGORICAL METHOD. Interpreters of the period generally saw the following senses of the Scripture:
  - (1) Literal sense, or the letter of Scripture.
  - (2) Spiritual or mystical sense. This breaks down into three divisions. The word "Jerusalem" serves as an illustration:
    - (a) Allegorical – Jerusalem refers to the church.
    - (b) Moral – Jerusalem refers to the human soul.
    - (c) Anagogical--Jerusalem refers to the heavenly city which believers hope to enter.

While granting that a single word can have different senses in the Bible (e.g. "sea" could mean a body of water, the heathen, etc.), some would take the same word to mean Scripture, baptism, etc. The problem here is that (with the partial exception of "(c)" above, see Heb 12:22-23), there is absolutely no scriptural warrant for applying "Jerusalem" either to the church or to the human soul.

---

<sup>101</sup> Rosscup 35-36.

<sup>102</sup> Rosscup 35-36.

<sup>103</sup> Mickelsen 35.

2. *Principles of the period.*<sup>104</sup> Most of these simply develop the point above on conformity to the traditional church position.
3. *Proponents of the period.*<sup>105</sup>
  - a. THOMAS AQUINAS (1225-1274). Aquinas represented a partial move back toward a literal, historico-grammatical method of interpretation, in that he taught that theological reasoning must be based upon the literal sense of Scripture, which he saw as preventing problems with the scripture's having several senses. Aquinas argued that the history itself, and not just words about history, was prophetic.<sup>106</sup> However, in practice Aquinas was still deeply enmeshed in the allegorical method. He still held as his primary hermeneutical consideration that the Catholic Church was the authoritative interpreter, and still held to the fourfold exegetical method.<sup>107</sup> For Aquinas, interpretation of Scripture requires no special grace, because theology and the knowledge of God (which did require grace) were not the direct result of interpretation of Scripture. For Aquinas, the knowledge of God was more wedded to philosophy and tradition than to exegesis.
  - b. NICHOLAS OF LYRA (1279-1340). Farrar calls Nicolas "the Jerome of the fourteenth century."<sup>108</sup> He accepted the various senses of Scripture described above (i.e. the literal sense and the three divisions of the spiritual sense). However, he took major strides back toward a literal interpretation. For example, he insisted on the principle of referring to the original languages; complained because the mystic sense had almost been allowed to choke out the literal; and demanded that the literal sense alone should be used in proving doctrines. Farrar pays tribute to Nicholas when he writes ". . . he did more than any other writer to break down the tyranny of ecclesiastical tradition, and to overthrow the blind belief in the bad method of centuries."<sup>109</sup>

E. *Concluding Evaluation of Allegorical Interpretation.*<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Rosscup 36; cf. Ramm 39-45.

<sup>105</sup> McCartney/Clayton 91-92; Rosscup 36.

<sup>106</sup> MMC Matthew 2:15 and Hosea 11:1 paper

<sup>107</sup> For more, see Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* 1.1.10 (cited in McCartney/Clayton 91).

<sup>108</sup> Farrar 274.

<sup>109</sup> Farrar 277.

<sup>110</sup> Rosscup 36-37.

1. *Its derivation:* pagan Greek philosophy.
  2. *Its defense:*<sup>111</sup> Some things can be said in an effort to justify allegorical interpretation.
    - a. IT RELIEVES SCRIPTURE OF ELEMENTS UNSAVORY TO THE RATIONAL MIND and makes it more appealing.
    - b. IT IS TAUGHT IN SCRIPTURE ITSELF AS A VALID PRINCIPLE. NOTICE, however, that the positive arguments many of the Fathers gave for allegorism were founded on misapplications which cannot stand the acid test of sound exegesis. They also confused legitimate typology with allegorism, anthropomorphisms with allegorism, etc.
      - (1) 2 Corinthians 3:7-13, 14
      - (2) 1 Thessalonians 5:23 — This, of course, does not really support allegorism. It is not speaking of different levels of Scriptural meaning but about the psychological make-up of man.
      - (3) 1 Corinthians 5:7-8
  3. *Its distortions.*<sup>112</sup> Allegorism has distorted plain passages by reading in meanings which have no valid connection with the obvious, literal sense.
2. **Literal Schools** [McCartney/Clayton, 92-98; Ramm, 45-60].<sup>113</sup>
- A. **Jewish Literalism.**<sup>114</sup>
1. *The beginning* (Nehemiah 8:1-8). Students of the history of hermeneutics generally agree that organized interpretation began in Ezra's day (ca. 445 B.C.).
    - a. THE PURPOSE FOR IT: Jews during the exile in Babylon had lost their ability to speak Hebrew and were speaking Aramaic instead. Upon their return to Jerusalem, they found they could not understand the Hebrew Scriptures. Therefore, Ezra assembled the people in Jerusalem and explained the sense of the Hebrew to them.
    - b. THE PRINCIPLE OF IT: The literal sense was used primarily (cf. Neh 8:8)

---

<sup>111</sup> Rosscup 36-37.

<sup>112</sup> Rosscup 37.

<sup>113</sup> Rosscup 37-44.

<sup>114</sup> Rosscup 37-38.

2. *Intertestamental Jewish interpretation.* Rabbinism used the literal method. While valid, the rabbis often swung to the extreme of letterism.<sup>115</sup> Many of their rules were excellent, but their fault was in the application of these rules. They produced many fallacies by exaggerating the incidental and the accidental, while ignoring or missing the essential thrust.
  3. *Jewish interpretation in the NT Period.*<sup>116</sup>
    - a. The Jews who spoke with Christ and appealed to the OT gave no indication of the allegorical interpretation.
    - b. Josephus always speaks of OT episodes in a literal sense.
    - c. Philo of Alexandria, though using the allegorical method himself, had to defend something new and opposed by the other Jews on the whole.
    - d. Christ Himself interpreted literally, but not with letterism.
    - e. The apostles followed the method of Christ.
- B. ***The Syrian School of Antioch.***<sup>117</sup> This was not an institution of teachers (as at Alexandria), but rather a loosely knit fellowship of men who interpreted the Bible in a historical-grammatical sense.
1. *Proponents.*<sup>118</sup>
    - a. DIODORUS, bishop of Tarsus (ca. 379-394), was the real founder. He was a presbyter at Antioch and taught Chrysostom and Theodore.
    - b. THEODORE, BISHOP OF MOPSUESTIA (350-428), was the ablest and most logical representative of the school of Antioch. For a time, he was a presbyter at Antioch, and a key participant in the Christological controversies of the post-Nicene period. Apollinaris (ca. 390) said that the Logos simply came on a true human body but not a human spirit, for the Logos is the spirit. Theodore opposed this and insisted on the true humanity of Christ. He is considered the father of Nestorian theology. Nestorius (ca. 428) opposed the view that Mary was "mother of God"

---

<sup>115</sup> Ramm 46-48.

<sup>116</sup> For a helpful overview, see Thomas H. Horne, *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures* 1:324 (cited in Rosscup 38).

<sup>117</sup> Rosscup 38-40.

<sup>118</sup> Rosscup 38-39.

(divine nature). The Roman Catholic Church denounced his opposition as a heresy. Farrar describes Theodore as follows: "That clear-minded and original thinker stands out like a rock in the morass of ancient exegesis."<sup>119</sup>

(1) His defects:

- (a) Theodore was weak in Hebrew and textual criticism, so that he uses arbitrary principles to decide the reading he prefers when there is a critical apparatus reading.
- (b) He is weak on typology, having no definite principles for deciding why some facts were to be regarded as typical and others not.

(2) His strengths:

- (a) Theodore gave close attention to linguistic details such as particles, prepositions, moods, etc.
- (b) He studied a context as a whole rather than simply focusing upon texts isolated from their surroundings.
- (c) He practiced literal interpretation, refusing to read the full-blown revelation of the New Testament back into the utterances of the Old Testament, such as reading redemption back into Rahab's red cord (Joshua 2).

- c. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (347-407) was a friend and fellow student of Theodore. Schaff styles him "the prince of commentators among the fathers."<sup>120</sup>

2. *Features.*<sup>121</sup>

- a. It accentuated the plain, natural meaning of a text according to the use of a language and the setting of the writer, and did justice to the human factors. Schaff calls this grammatical and historical exegesis a sane check on the wild fancies of allegorizing in Alexandria, which "substituted imposition

---

<sup>119</sup> Farrar 215.

<sup>120</sup> Schaff, 2:816 (cited in Rosscup 39).

<sup>121</sup> Rosscup 39-40 (cf. Schaff 2:816).

for exposition.”<sup>122</sup>

- b. While literal interpretation acknowledged the spiritual sense of a text, it made this flow out of the historical-grammatical meaning which was the basis.

3. *Fate.*<sup>123</sup>

- a. The image and influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia was tainted by the charge of Nestorianism (which probably was not that far from the truth, even though condemned as a heresy).
- b. The church now had the legal recognition of the state, and it steamrolled all who stood up against the allegorical method of interpretation.

C. *The Reformers.*<sup>124</sup>

1. *Preparation for the Reformation.*<sup>125</sup> A number of men helped form views of Scripture exegesis which set the stage for the great work of Luther, Calvin, and others. Farrar discusses four such men. Desiderius Erasmus was a key figure among these. In 1516, he issued his *Editio Principis* of the New Testament, giving principles for interpretation. He often pointed out mistakes and misconceptions of the "authorities" whom the church traditionally felt had said the last word.” He even showed imperfections in Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, etc. Though opposing the Reformation, Erasmus also repudiated the infallibility of the pope, and rejected so-called "Scripture proofs" when he considered them misinterpretations which were not applicable.

2. *Principles of the Reformers.*<sup>126</sup>

- a. MARTIN LUTHER.<sup>127</sup>

- (1) S. Skivington Wood has pointed out that the Reformation did not begin on the steps of the temple in Rome, as legend has it, or even at the Wittenberg church door where Luther posted his ninety-five

---

<sup>122</sup> Schaff 2:816.

<sup>123</sup> Rosscup 40.

<sup>124</sup> Rosscup 40-44.

<sup>125</sup> Rosscup 40.

<sup>126</sup> Rosscup 40-44.

<sup>127</sup> Rosscup 40-43.

theses which ignited the Reformation. Rather, says Wood, it began "in the Black Tower of the Augustinian monastery at Wittenberg where Luther sat before an open Bible and allowed God to address him face to face." He says that the Tower discovery came to Luther in the fall of 1514. "Luther himself tells us how he dwelt upon the first chapter of Romans (1:17). 'Night and day I pondered until I saw the connection between the justice of God and the statement that "the just shall live by faith." Then I grasped that the justice of God is that righteousness by which through grace and sheer mercy God justifies us through faith. Whereupon I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors into paradise. The whole of Scripture took on a new meaning and whereas before "the justice of God" had filled me with hate, now it become to me inexpressibly sweet in greater love. This passage of Paul became to me a gate of heaven."<sup>128</sup>

- (2) Illuminated so that the Bible was coming alive to him, Luther affirmed: "That is the true method of interpretation which puts scripture alongside of scripture in a right and proper way."<sup>129</sup>
- (3) Some of Luther's principles of interpretation are listed below.
  - (a) *The supreme and final authority of Scripture itself* apart from all church authority, interpretation, or interference.
    - i) "a layman who has Scripture is more than pope or council without it."
    - ii) "the Church cannot create articles of faith: she can only recognize and confess them as a slave does the seal of his Lord."
    - iii) "with all due respect to the Fathers, I prefer the authority of scripture."
  - (b) *The sufficiency of scripture.* A Christian man needs scripture and nothing more, not even a commentary. We have to understand this idea of Luther within a historical context where commentaries slavishly parroted official church views. Were the commentaries available in that day that are now available, Luther's emphasis would no doubt have been different.
  - (c) *The centrality of Christ.*

---

<sup>128</sup> Wood, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* 73-74 (cited in Rosscup 40-41).

<sup>129</sup> Martin Luther, *Works* (Philadelphia Edition) 3:334 (cited in Rosscup 41).

- i) "Scripture must be interpreted to mean nothing else but that man is nothing, Christ is all."<sup>130</sup>
  - ii) Christ is "the sun and truth in Scripture."<sup>131</sup>
  - iii) He compared the Old and New Testament with swaddling clothes and the manger, and said that Christ lies in them as He lay in the manger: "dear is the treasure, Christ, that lies in them."<sup>132</sup>
- (d) *Luther emphasized the literal sense.*
- i) "Each passage has one clear, definite, and true sense of its own. All others are doubtful and uncertain opinions."
  - ii) "The literal sense of Scripture is the whole essence of faith and Christian theology."<sup>133</sup>
- (e) *Luther rejected the validity of allegory.*
- i) "Origen's allegories are not worth so much dirt."
  - ii) "Allegory is a sort of beautiful harlot, who proves herself specially seductive to idle men."
  - iii) "To allegorize is to juggle with Scripture."

NOTE: Did Luther accept allegory in any way? Yes, he did, in a sense. He admits that Scripture has a double meaning, an outward meaning gained by the aid of the Word and another that lies in what the heart comes to know. And so Luther is concerned to emphasize heavily that we must understand Scripture by faith, and experience it in the heart. "Experience is necessary for the understanding of the Word. It is not merely to be repeated or known, but to be lived and felt."<sup>134</sup> Wood says of Luther, "Although he is staunchly opposed to all 'monkey tricks' of unbridled allegorization, he nevertheless admits a significance in Scripture beyond the strictly

---

<sup>130</sup> MMC: For source, see Rosscup 41-42.

<sup>131</sup> *Werke*, Weimar Ed., III: 643.

<sup>132</sup> *Works*, Philadelphia ed., VI: 638.

<sup>133</sup> Cited by Farrar 327.

<sup>134</sup> *Werke*, Weimar Ed., XLII, 195.

literal."<sup>135</sup> What Luther was burdened to stress was that the unsaved person can grasp the grammatical and outward meaning of scripture (the external form), but only the Spirit-taught, enlightened man can receive the inner, spiritual meaning (the internal form). NOTE Luther's distinction discussed above between the Internal and External Clarity of Scripture.

- (4) *Conclusion about Luther.* Some of his principles are quite excellent and refreshing; however, he was inconsistent in their implementation. Even with the principle of finding Christ everywhere in Scripture, was at times guilty of reading fully developed NT theology back into OT passages. This required Luther to resort to some form of the allegorical method which in theory he had spurned.
- b. JOHN CALVIN (1509-1564).<sup>136</sup> Calvin authored the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, and wrote commentaries on 57 books of the Bible. He has been called the greatest exegete and theologian of the Reformation, and also "the Geneva theologian."<sup>137</sup>
- (1) Calvin clearly rejected the allegorical interpretation and emphasized the historical-grammatical method.
    - (a) In the Psalms, Calvin seeks to find the historical background and to apply a psalm first to that situation.
    - (b) In Calvin's preface to his commentary on Romans, Calvin states that "It is the first business of an interpreter to let his author say what he does say, instead of attributing to him what we think he ought to say. "
    - (c) Calvin felt that the Word of God is inexhaustible and applicable to all times, but that there is a difference between explanation and application. Application must be consistent with explanation.<sup>138</sup>
  - (2) Though not to the same degree as Luther, Calvin showed some inconsistency in the use of his principles.
    - (a) He often read into passages his own preconceived ideas of what they had to mean, and even attributed glosses to texts

---

<sup>135</sup> A. S. Wood, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* 80.

<sup>136</sup> Rosscup 43-44.

<sup>137</sup> See Ramm 57-59 for five of Calvin's hermeneutical principles.

<sup>138</sup> Schaff VIII: 532

which did damage to his views.

- (b) He spiritualized away the obvious sense of many prophetic passages relating to a national future for Israel in the land of Palestine. Even in Romans 11:26, he makes "all Israel" mean Gentiles and Israelites, all who are of the saved community which he believes is the spiritual Israel.

- c. SUMMARY ON THE REFORMERS.<sup>139</sup> Despite inconsistency in the use of their principles, the great Reformation leaders for the most part emphasized the literal sense of Scripture. In general, the method of Calvin in repudiating the allegorical interpretation was honored by the leading scholars after him.

- 3. **Devotional Schools.**<sup>140</sup> The devotional interpretation of Scripture is that method of interpreting Scripture which places emphasis on the edifying aspects of Scripture, and interpreting with the intention of developing the spiritual life.

- A. **Medieval Mystics.** (See above). The medieval period produced both scholasticism and mysticism. Mystics read the Scripture as a means of promoting the mystical experience. Representatives included the Victorines and Bernard of Clairvaux. Their principal book was the *Song of Songs* which they readily interpreted as the love relationship between God and the mystic, resulting in spiritual delights told in terms of physical delights.

- B. **Pietism.**<sup>141</sup>

- 1. *Its idea.* The post-Reformation period was a period of theological dogmatism, which Farrar says was characterized by a threefold curse: "The curse of tyrannous confessionalism; the curse of exorbitant system; the curse of contentious bitterness. . . . *They read the Bible by the unnatural glare of theological hatred.*"<sup>142</sup> It was in reaction to this situation that pietism developed. It was a movement emphasizing a return to a vital spiritual life feeding upon the Bible rather than living in cold, stale, dead doctrine.

- 2. *Its individuals.*

- a. PHILIP JACOB SPENER. Spener was a Lutheran minister who was the pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main in Germany. He saw the need for more

---

<sup>139</sup> Rosscup 44.

<sup>140</sup> Ramm 60-63.

<sup>141</sup> Rosscup 44-45.

<sup>142</sup> F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* 359, 363 (italics added by Ramm, cited in Ramm 60).

emphasis upon the devotional life. In 1670 he began to have meetings in which people could study the Word. Later he did the same in Dresden and Berlin. In 1675 Spener published his *Pia Desidera*. His emphasis, which had some healthy repercussions, had a telling effect on some.

- b. AUGUST HERMANN FRANCKE. He was also a Lutheran minister who taught at the University of Halle in Germany, which became the center of pietism. Francke was much more the scholar, linguist, and exegete. He insisted that the entire Bible be read through frequently; that commentaries were to be used but with discretion so as not to take place of the study of Scripture itself; and that only the regenerate could understand the Bible.
- c. JOHANNES ALBRECHT BENDEL. Farrar describes Bengel as the “heir and continuator of all that was best in Pietism.”<sup>143</sup> Bengel studied under the pietists and was impressed by their spirituality, their wonderful Christian fellowship, their emphasis on grammatical and historical interpretation, and their emphasis on the application of Scripture to spiritual life. Bengel eventually wrote his famous *Gnomon* which is concise, grammatical, penetrating, and which emphasizes the unity of the scriptural revelation. Bengel’s work in textual criticism represents one of the great landmarks in the development of NT textual criticism.

### 3. *Its impact.*<sup>144</sup>

- a. MORAVIAN BRETHERN: These became famous for missionary work.
- b. COUNT LOUIS VON ZINZENDORF (1700-1760). He was educated at the Halle Orphan Asylum and influenced by the pietistic teaching. Later, as a man of means, he heard of the sufferings of the Moravian Brethren (Hussites) in Bohemia. He offered them refuge on his estates in Upper Lusatia. There they settled and founded the village of Herrnhut in 1722, naming Zinzendorf himself as bishop. The Saxon government banished Zinzendorf and he went to Holland, England, and America. Through his energetic outreach, the work of the Moravians then flourished in Bethlehem and Nazareth, Pennsylvania, and in Salem, North Carolina. When the Saxon government recognized the Moravians as a Protestant church in 1749, Zinzendorf returned to Germany and resumed his place as bishop of Herrnhut.

---

<sup>143</sup> Farrar, *History of Interpretation* 392; cf. J. Pelikan, “In Memoriam: Joh. Albrecht Bengel,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* (November, 1952) 23:785-96; Charles T. Fritsch, “Bengel, Student of Scripture” *Interpretation* (April, 1951) 5:203-15 (all cited in Ramm 61).

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Dana, *Searching the Scriptures* 81ff (cited in Ramm 62). Inmer (*Hermeneutics* 46) claims that the chief error of the pietists was that “the Scriptures were not so much explained as overwhelmed with pious reflections” (cited by Terry 166fn).

- c. THE PURITANS.
- d. JONATHAN EDWARDS.
- e. JOHN WESLEY.
- f. MATTHEW HENRY.
- g. QUAKERS.

C. **Modern Emphases.**<sup>145</sup> The insights of the pietists have not been lost. It would not be amiss to say that the average Christian reads his Bible in the devotional tradition, i.e., for his own blessing and spiritual food. A great number of men in modern times have written in the devotional vein. Among the many are such as the following: F. B. Meyer, W. H. Griffith-Thomas, Andrew Murray, A. W. Tozer, V. R. Edman, Paul Rees, and Lehman Strauss.

1. *The aim.* The goal of such writers is to help the reader see the relevance of the message to his practical Christian life. Usually, though not always, these writers pass over technical problems in a passage and simply stress the meaning or application of the text to the devotional life in the pursuit of godliness.
2. *The advantage.* The devotional and practical emphasis in Bible teaching is *absolutely* necessary. The purpose of preaching is more than doctrinal communication or exposition of the meaning of Scripture. It must reach over into life and experience, and this is the function of the devotional teaching of Scripture. The vital, personal, and spiritual *must be present in all the ministries of the Word.*
3. *The abuses.* There are certain abuses which sometimes are true of writings in this emphasis. These abound in some writers more than in other more careful writers who have combined scholarship and spirituality in a fine balance.
  - a. EISEGESIS, especially in the Old Testament. Often there is a shallow brush with a verse in its grammatical sense. The writer's goal is to extract from it some edifying idea. The abuse is in imposing meanings that sound good and bless the heart at the expense of what the verse actually means if it is studied responsibly. Many times a certain devotional thought may be found in some other biblical passage, but not in this one.
  - b. EXTREMISM IN TYPOLOGY. Many let their typological hobby-horses run wild with them. They build elaborate arguments out of even the smallest details to find specific analogies with some aspect about Christ of New Testament truth. In this respect, some devotional interpretation differs

---

<sup>145</sup> Rosscup 45-46.

little from allegorization, especially in its use of the OT.

- c. **EMPTINESS OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL TRUTH.** At times, a person can be so anxious to get his "blessing" that he can jump past details of history or doctrine that are a necessary basis for understanding a passage in its true perspective. Often the result is the building of an idea on a wrong foundation. Once again, any genuinely devotional aspects must be legitimately drawn from a passage, not imposed upon it.

4. **Liberal School** [McCartney/Clayton, 98-100].<sup>146</sup> Today about forty million members belong to this movement in about thirty-five denominations. On the national level, liberalism is represented by The National Council of Churches, and on the world level by The World Council of Churches.

A. *Its Presuppositions.*

1. *Rationalistic approach to the Scripture.* The debate over the Bible in modern times is a debate of rationalism versus authoritarianism. Rationalism in biblical studies boils down to the fundamental assertion that whatever is not in harmony with *educated* mentality is to be rejected (of course, the critic defines "educated" in terms of one who accepts higher critical presuppositions).
2. *"Modern mentality" is to govern our approach to Scripture.*
  - a. This "modern mentality" is made up of a complex of presuppositions, e.g., standards of scholarship as practiced in higher education, the validity of the scientific *outlook* as well as *method*, and the ethical standards of educated people. Whatever in the scriptural account does not measure up to these criteria is rejected.
  - b. Liberal "scholarship" claims that all books are to be treated as (exclusively) human documents and by the same methods and the Bible is no exception.<sup>147</sup>
  - c. Science presumes the regularity of nature so that miracles are not accepted.
  - d. The doctrines of sin, depravity, and hell offend the liberals' moral sensitivities, so these doctrines are rejected.
  - e. This also means a rather free use of the text of the Bible. If a book of the

---

<sup>146</sup> Ramm 63-69

<sup>147</sup> Cf. E. C. Colwell, *The Study of the Bible* (chapters III - V); H. E. Fosdick, *The Modern Use of the Bible* (cited in Ramm 64).

Bible seems “patched” the text may be rearranged, e.g., as Moffatt does with the Gospel of John in his translation. If the text is obscure, the text may be remade, as the RSV does too frequently in the Old Testament.<sup>148</sup>

3. *Inspiration is redefined.*

- a. All forms of genuine inspiration (verbal, plenary, dynamic) are rejected. If liberalism rejects all transcendental and miraculous activity of God, then it must reject a supernaturalistic doctrine of inspiration and revelation, which it does.<sup>149</sup>
- b. In its place it puts Coleridge’s principle that the inspiration of the Bible is its power to “inspire” religious experience. “Revelation” is redefined as human insight into religious truth, or human discovery of religious truths.<sup>150</sup>
- c. The canon of criticism is “the spirit of Jesus.” Whatever in the Bible is in accord with the “spirit of Jesus” is normative, and whatever is below the ethical and moral level of the “spirit of Jesus” is not binding.<sup>151</sup> Of course, this means that the doctrinal or theological content of Scripture is not binding. It was Sabatier who argued that religious experience was fundamental and theology was the afterthought of this experience. But the religious experience could not be completely expressed in thought-form so theological expression was but symbolical of the religious experience.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Otto A. Piper’s sharp criticism of rationalism in the hermeneutics of religious liberalism (“Principles of New Testament Interpretation,” *Theology Today* 3 [July, 1946] 202 [cited in Ramm 64]).

<sup>149</sup> E.g., Fosdick, *The Modern Use of the Bible* 30-31 (cited in Ramm 64).

<sup>150</sup> Or, as Fosdick puts it: “The under side of the process is man’s discovery; the upper side is God’s revelation” (*Modern Use of the Bible* 30 [cited in Ramm 65]). This thesis is found widely in the literature of religious liberalism and no clearer expression of it has been given than in A. Sabatier’s *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion based on Psychology and History* 34ff (cited in Ramm 65).

<sup>151</sup> “To the Christian the only norm and standard is the Spirit of God as revealed in Jesus. . . . all those parts of the Old Testament which are contrary to the spirit of Jesus, or which have no direct spiritual meaning to us, are for us without authority” (Bewer, *Authority of the Old Testament* in T. Kepler’s *Contemporary Religious Thought* 127 [cited in Ramm 65]).

<sup>152</sup> With this essential thesis Fosdick agrees, for to him religious experience is the heart of religion and theological forms are temporary. One of the chapters of his book has the title, “Abiding Experiences and Changing Categories.” His thesis is expressed in these words: “What is permanent in Christianity is not mental frameworks but abiding experiences that phrase and rephrase themselves in successive generations’ ways of thinking and that grow in assured certainty and richness of content” (Fosdick, *Modern Use of the Bible* 103; cf. also his remarks in T. Kepler, *Contemporary Religious Thought* 13-20) (both cited in Ramm 65). Ramm 65 himself perceptively remarks: “But is not this thesis itself a theological proposition? Therefore, this theological proposition is prior to religious experience. Result: his basic position is contradictory.”

4. *The supernatural is redefined.*
  - a. The supernatural may mean: that which is extraordinary, miraculous, oracular, not attainable in knowledge or power by ordinary human nature. Or, it may mean: above the material order, or beyond mere natural processes, e.g., prayer, ethics, pure thought, immortality. Historic orthodoxy has accepted supernaturalism in *both* these meanings. Religious liberalism accepts only the *latter*.
  - b. Everything in the Bible which is supernatural in the first sense is rejected. Colwell argues that the *same* methodology must be used in interpreting the Bible as is used in interpreting the classics; no special principle may be appealed to by Christians. If, therefore, we reject all reports of miracles in the classics as violating our scientific good sense, then we must reject miracles in the Scriptures.<sup>153</sup> When the miracle or supernatural is found in Scripture it is treated as folklore or mythology or poetic elaboration.
5. *The concept of evolution is applied to the religion of Israel and thereby to its documents.*

---

<sup>153</sup> Colwell 122f (cited in Ramm 66). Piper 201's comment is: "Critics who had no experience of the supernatural concluded, for instance, that everything in the Bible which referred to the supernatural was wrong. Sound criticism would have contented itself with saying: 'My judgment as to the truthfulness of these documents has to be suspended because I know nothing of these things.'" (cited in Ramm 66).



- a. Fosdick's book *The Modern Use of the Bible* is considered a most lucid presentation of the Wellhausenian interpretation of the OT. The primitive and crude (ethically and religiously) is the earlier; and the advanced and elevated, is the later. We can thereby recreate the evolution of the religion of Israel and rearrange our documents accordingly.<sup>154</sup> In the study of the canon this put the prophets *before* the law. The basic Wellhausen position calls for considerable rearrangement of books and materials.<sup>155</sup>
  - b. The same procedure has been applied to the New Testament. Harnack's *What is Christianity?* is considered the finest and clearest expression of religious liberalism. Its thesis is that Jesus, a good man in the highest prophetic order, is transmuted by theological speculation and Greek metaphysics into the strange God-man of the creeds. The critic of the NT must be an expert archaeologist and geologist to uncover the strata of accretions imposed upon the true Jesus of history. When archeology failed to support such contentions, "form criticism" arose, postulating a pre-literary theory for accounting for the NT. The NT was regarded as the creation of the Christian community out of its spiritual needs, and so the Gospels are not the life of Christ as much as they are the life of the early church.
6. *The notion of accommodation has been applied to the Bible.* Much of the theological content of the Bible is weakened or destroyed by asserting that the theological statements are in the transitory and perishable mold of ancient terminology. For example, the only terms in which Paul could describe the death of Christ were from bloody Jewish sacrifices or the blood-baths of Mythraism. Thus, Paul's doctrine of the atonement is accommodated to the expressions of his time and these are not binding on us. It is claimed that our Lord in dealing with the Jews had to accommodate His teaching to their condition, especially in matters of biblical introduction (e.g., the historicity of Adam and Eve, of Jonah, of the Davidic authorship of the Psalms).<sup>156</sup> The

---

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Fosdick 11: "We know now that every idea in the Bible started from primitive and childlike origins and, with however many setbacks and delays, grew in scope and height toward the culmination of Christ's Gospel" (cited in Ramm 66). Speaking of the application of evolutionary principles to biblical criticism, H. P. Smith says that such application is widely accepted because men see evolution in *history* as well as nature (*Essays in Biblical Interpretation* 141 [cited in Ramm 66]). However, a great reversal has taken place in anthropological theory and the evolutionary principle of social cultural no longer dominates anthropological theory.

<sup>155</sup> Ramm 67 notes that this entire concept later came under severe criticism. Cf. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*; also *Archeology and the Religion of Israel*; John Bright, "The Prophets Were Protestants," *Interpretation* 1 (April, 1947) 153-82.

<sup>156</sup> That our Lord did not accommodate Himself in this sense is thoroughly argued by C. J. Ellicott (*Christus Comprabatur*). Horne (*An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*) also has an able refutation of this type of accommodation that is still relevant though written well over a century ago. Gore's essay in *Luz Mundi* argued that the incarnation involved ignorance and so Christ knew only what a typical Jew would know about matters of Biblical Introduction (Ramm 68).

religious liberal feels it is his assignment to recast the essence of the NT doctrine in the language of his contemporaries, and in so doing must strip off the concepts and images of the Old and New Testament cultures.

7. *The Bible was interpreted historically — with a vengeance.*<sup>157</sup>
  - a. The historical interpretation is used in a special leveling and reductionist sense by the religious liberal. He means more than painting the historical backdrop of the various passages of the Bible. It is a method which endeavors to break the uniqueness of the Scriptures.
  - b. It makes religion a changing, shifting phenomenon so that it is impossible to “canonize” any period of its development or its literature. It believes that there are social conditions which create theological beliefs and the task of the interpreter is not to defend these theological beliefs (as in orthodoxy) but to understand the social conditions which produced them.
  - c. It stresses the *continuity* of biblical religion with surrounding religion, and emphasizes “borrowing,” “syncretism,” and “purifying.”
  - d. Furthermore, in so stressing the necessity of finding the meaning of a passage for the original hearers of it, it repudiates the prophetic or predictive element of prophecy. It rejects typology and predictive prophecy as Christian abuses (albeit in good faith) of the Old Testament.
  
8. *Philosophy has had an influence on religious liberalism.*
  - a. IMMANUEL KANT made ethics or moral will the essence of religion. Kant shut himself up almost completely to the *moral* interpretation of Scripture. Whatever was not of this he rejected. This emphasis on the moral element of Scripture with its tacit rejection of theological interpretation has played a major role in the liberals’ use of the Scripture.
  - b. DEISM made ethics the essence of religion too. In a typically deistic fashion Thomas Jefferson went through the Gospels picking out the ethical and the moral while rejecting the theological, and so published his *Jefferson Bible*.
  - c. HEGELIANISM has had its influence on biblical interpretation. According to Hegel progress in the clarification of an idea involves three terms: the *thesis*, the *antithesis*, and the *synthesis*. This Hegelian waltz was applied to the totality of human culture including religion. Hegelian students were not slow in applying it to the biblical records. Wellhausen applied it to the

---

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Colwell, Chapter VI and H. P. Smith, Chapter XIII for the results of a religious liberal’s use of the historical principle in criticism (cited in Ramm 68).

OT, and Strauss and the Tübingen school to the New. Thus, in the Tübingen school the alleged strife between Pauline and Petrine factions is “harmonized” by the Lukan approach.

- d. Ethical idealism and idealism with strong ethical and religious elements has had its influence on American religious liberalism. At the headwaters of much of our American religious philosophy were Josiah Royce and Borden Parker Bowne. Bowne’s personalism through his students and their students has had a real influence on much of Methodist and liberal theology in America.

B. *Its Proponents.*<sup>158</sup>

1. *Seventeenth Century.* Rationalism in regard to the Bible dates back to Hobbes (1588-1679) and Spinoza (1632-1677). These philosophers stand out as representative men. The essence of their thesis was that human intellect is adequate in itself to select between the true and the false, between what is acceptable and what is in error. The emphasis is placed upon man's mental reflection on factors in the world of time, space, and sense, not upon revelation from God who is beyond man's own dimensions. The rationalistic contention is that the Bible can be true only when it harmonizes with the things a man's own independent reason can accept. "Rationalism is closely interrelated with deism, humanism, and empiricism."<sup>159</sup> The final authority is transferred from God to the throne-room of the human mind. This is a subjective authority residing in man.
2. *Eighteenth through Twentieth Centuries.* Liberalism in these centuries grows out of its seventeenth century roots. An emphasis upon historical criticism in German secular universities began to influence theological thought. A rationalistic attitude ruled out miracles, for the universe is ruled by set laws which cannot be suspended or altered. The Bible must be interpreted like any other book, minus every miraculous feature which is deemed attributable to a superstitious and precritical mindset. The idea that God intervened in the historical drama and communicated to certain spokesmen (kings, prophets, priests, apostles, etc.) was dismissed.
  - a. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER (1768-1834).<sup>160</sup> Before Schleiermacher, few had thought about the problem of how meaning was conveyed in texts. Up until Kant, readers generally assumed that there was an objective content to a text, and this is what was directly perceived by the interpreter.

---

<sup>158</sup> Rosscup 47-50.

<sup>159</sup> Mickelsen 43.

<sup>160</sup> This discussion on Schleiermacher is summarized from McCartney/Clayton 98-101.

But Kant's dialectic which set human freedom and understanding over against nature as object had introduced a gap between an interpreter's understanding of a text and its scientifically describable character. Schleiermacher thought through many of these matters.

- (1) First, Schleiermacher argued that, although in some respects the Bible was unique, since it was written to humans it must partake of the character of linguistic communication in general. "No text is intended in such a way that its hearers could not possibly have understood it." Therefore, the problem of understanding texts in general was not different than the problem of understanding the Bible.
- (2) Second, he recognized that presuppositions and background determine understanding:<sup>161</sup> "The understanding of a given statement is always based on something prior, of two sorts — a preliminary knowledge of human beings, and a preliminary knowledge of the subject matter." Preliminary knowledge of human beings involves especially some awareness of the speaker or author. Where an author is remote in time and/or culture, or where the reader is unfamiliar with the subject matter, some background work is necessary, and in all cases the gap between an author and the readers must be bridged. Schleiermacher thus identified two sides to the process of understanding a text: an objective side (which focused on the text itself, its words, grammar, and such, which he called "grammatical interpretation"), and a subjective side, which attempts to "step out of one's own frame of mind into that of the author." This "subjective" side he called "technical interpretation."

Strictly speaking, grammatical interpretation is the objective side; technical, the subjective. Consequently, grammatical interpretation plays a negative role in hermeneutical construction, marking the boundaries; technical interpretation is positive.

- (3) Grammatical interpretation proceeds according to two canons:
  - (a) The first is "one should construe the meaning from the total pre-given value of language and the heritage common to the author and his reader. . . ." In other words, the characteristics of the language in which the author and his readers operated must determine the semantic value of the author's statements.

---

<sup>161</sup> MMC Note carefully — these determine *understanding* (subjective to the interpreter), not *meaning* (objective to the text)

- (b) The second canon is “the meaning of each word of a passage must be determined by the context in which it occurs.”
- (4) Essentially, Schleiermacher laid the methodological groundwork for grammatical-historical exegesis as it is practiced today. Although this kind of investigation had been done intuitively before (particularly by Calvin), Schleiermacher was the first (MMC that we know of) to codify the method, and to present it as a means of overcoming the distance between the author and the present-day interpreter.

START HERE, McCartney/Clayton 100.

b. OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

- (1) Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) is a key man here.
  - (a) In 1887, he wrote *The Prolegomena of the History of Israel*, in which he presented an elaborate system of strands on the sources of the Pentateuch called J, E, D, and P. He labeled material in four blocks and claimed that each block represented a different period, different authorship, etc.
  - (b) The actual historical development was not as it appears to be in the Old Testament, that is, Law, priests, prophets. Rather, the historical order of events was prophets {who created the law}, law, and priests.
  - (c) This type of system has been shattered by archeological evidence since Wellhausen's day. For example:
    - i) Many law codes existed at the time of Abraham, showing that the law did not have to await the time of the prophets to be created.
    - ii) The Wellhausen school had maintained that the law of one central sanctuary in Israel was a late development and that the prophets inserted the idea back into the Pentateuch to give support to the system of their own day. However, archeology has demonstrated that one sanctuary was the norm for the ancient peoples.
    - iii) Customs of the patriarchs, as recorded in the Bible, fit exactly with data discovered about customs during the period 2000-1500 B.C.

- (2) Form criticism has helped refute many aspects of the above system, but it is not much of an improvement. Most still recognize J, E, D, and P but say that great blocks of material came down to the literary (composing) stage. J, E, D, and P relied on ancient sources, but much of the material in the Bible is only legend.<sup>162</sup>

c. NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES.

- (1) F. C. Baur (1792-1860) and the Tubingen School handled the NT in much the same manner as Wellhausen and others after him treated the OT. The approach was rationalistic. Baur saw Peter and Paul as representing two different doctrinal groups antagonistic to one another. He said that the second century church wrote most New Testament books and created an artificial unity for the sake of theology in their own day (note the refutation in W. Gresham Machen, *Origin of Paul's Religion*).
- (2) Others after Baur continued the rationalistic approach. Many, for example, severed the actual words and deeds of Jesus from the "kerygma" or preaching of the later church (cf. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1911, trans. from German into English; James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1959).
  - (a) Schweitzer: "The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethics of the kingdom of God, who founded the kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give his work its final consecration, never had any existence" (p. 398).
  - (b) He said that the actual Jesus of history is not presented in the Gospels and Epistles. The writers distorted the facts and created their own image of Jesus, which is artificial. The true historical Jesus was not God and can scarcely be distinguished from the rest of men.<sup>163</sup>
- (3) A contemporary neo-liberalism carries on the rationalistic emphasis. Embarrassed by neo-orthodox criticisms of old liberalism, neo-liberalism has made claims to a return to biblical theology. The return, however, is actually a mere return to some of the *terminology*

---

<sup>162</sup> See, for example, German authors like Hermann Gunkel (*The Legends of Genesis*) and G. von Rad (*Genesis*), as well as Americans like W. F. Albright (*The Biblical Period*), John Bright (*A History of Israel*), and G. E. Wright (*The Old Testament Against Its Environment*).

<sup>163</sup> See Robert Lightner, *The Saviour and the Scriptures* 127.

in the Bible without attaching biblical meanings to those terms. In reality, the system still hangs on to destructive higher criticism out of a desire to be respected as scientific.

- (a) Some of the main representatives of this modern emphasis have been Rudolf Bultmann (Germany) ; Paul Tillich (America) : and J. A. T. Robinson (England).<sup>164</sup>
- (b) The dilemma which neo-liberalism faces is stated by Packer: "The problem is, how to enthrone the Bible once more as judge of the errors of man while leaving man enthroned as judge of the errors of the Bible; how to commend the Bible as a true witness while continuing to charge it with falsehood."<sup>165</sup>

5. **Neo-Orthodox School** [Ramm, 69-92].<sup>166</sup>

A. ***The Proponents.***

- 1. The first key man in this school was Karl Barth of Switzerland, who in 1918 issued his *Romerbrief* or his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans*. Barth also authored *Church Dogmatics*, in addition to other works.
- 2. Other main writers have included:
  - a. Emil Brunner (Switzerland), whose works include
    - (1) *The Theology of Crisis*,
    - (2) *The Divine Imperative*, and
    - (3) *Man in Revolt*
  - b. Reinhold Niebuhr (America),
    - (1) *Does civilization Need Religion?*
    - (2) *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, and
    - (3) *The Nature and Destiny of Man*.

B. ***The Principles.*** (See Ramm's good statement of these). We may briefly examine the more crucial matters that lie at the heart of neo-orthodox belief.

---

<sup>164</sup> See, for example, Rudolph Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (1957); Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (1951, 1958); *The Shaking of the Foundations* (Pelican series, 1962); John A. T. Robinson, *Honest to God* (1963).

<sup>165</sup> J. I. Packer, in Carl F. H. Henry, ed., *Revelation and the Bible* 94.

<sup>166</sup> Rosscup 50-51.

1. The neo-orthodox principle on revelation holds that God does not reveal facts or propositions about Himself; He reveals Himself. In crisis confrontation or encounter with men, He reveals Himself, as He did to Moses. When Moses, however, wrote things down, these were not revelation from God but signposts pointing back to the time when revelation did occur as he had a personal encounter with God. Or, they also point the reader forward to an encounter when revelation occurs again. The Bible in itself, then, is not objective revelation from God according to the neo-orthodox belief.
2. Since neo-orthodoxy denies an orthodox view of inspiration, it believes there are many errors in Scripture, which is a human and subjective product.
3. Can a Bible like this have any real authority? They say yes, the Bible has instrumental authority because it is an instrument pointing to Christ, in whom is authority. It does not have inherent authority, however.
4. How can the Bible be worth much for objective authority to men when it is full of errors, as purportedly demonstrated by the findings of modern science and criticism? In actuality, this neo-orthodox position is destructive to true authority as held in the orthodox faith in the following ways:
  - a. It destroys theology, for if revelation is free from propositions, how can there be a theology? The neo-orthodox idea ultimately leads to a relative and subjective theology (man-made) and destroys theology.
  - b. It destroys genuine, trustworthy, objective spiritual experience in that it is based on an unworthy human book.
  - c. It destroys authority since we can pin nothing down as concrete revelation. Ryrie writes: "Their doctrine includes orthodox terminology built on liberal exegesis; it attempts to have inspiration without infallibility and authority without actuality. What kind of Bible is that?"<sup>167</sup>
6. **Summary:**<sup>168</sup> The historical survey above has shown how the question of the relationship between a historical, human meaning of the Bible and the trans-historical, divine meaning has run throughout the history of the church. Too often the divine and human meanings have been seen to be in tension. Instead, a genuinely submissive approach to the Bible as God's Word along with a sincere inquiry into the historical meaning are mutually enhancing. The human meaning is the key to understanding God's meaning (*contra*. Origen's allegorizing and Bultmann's demythologizing), and if we truly understand the historical meaning it will direct us to the relevant message for today. The chart below summarizes the data discussed above.

---

<sup>167</sup> Charles C. Ryrie, *Neo-Orthodoxy* 48.

<sup>168</sup> McCartney/Clayton 111; Rosscup (2005) 62-64.

| School             | Definition  | Division and Representative  | Evaluation  |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| <i>Allegorical</i> | Views literal sense as only a preliminary vehicle for getting beneath to that which is the deeper, more profound and more spiritual sense   | 1. <i>Greek</i> : Plato sought to rescue the gods of Greek poetry from off-color episodes by denying literal meaning and imposing allegorical idea.              | 1. <i>Subjectivity</i> . It is subjective, each man is a law unto himself.                        |
|                    |   | 2. <i>Jewish</i> : Philo sought to give Scripture charm for unbelieving minds by discarding literal details which offended them and by allegorizing these texts. | 2. <i>Rationalistic</i> . The Scriptures are manipulated to suit man's reason.                    |
|                    |   | 3. <i>Christian and Patristic Origin</i> . Principles of Philo applied to their own times.   | 3. <i>Obscurantist</i> . It obscures Scripture by imposing eisegesis for exegesis.                |
| School             | Definition  | Division and Representative  | Evaluation  |
| <i>Literal</i>     | Says the meaning of a Scripture is the basic, customary, socially-acknowledged designation of the terms. The literal sense is <b>the</b> basic meaning shown by grammatical and historical factors. | 1. <i>Jewish</i> : Ezra, Jews of Palestine, Christ.  | <i>Negative</i> : It is not letterism, though some have drifted into this extravagance.           |
|                    |   | 2. <i>Syrian School of Antioch</i> : Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom.   | <i>Positive</i> :<br>1. <i>Normal</i> . It is the usual practice in interpretation of literature. |

|                   |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
|                   |  | 3. <i>Victorines</i> .   | 2. All secondary meanings depend upon previous objective literal sense.  |
|                   |  | 4. <i>Reformers</i> : Luther, Calvin, etc.   | 3. Large part of the Bible makes sense this way.   |
|                   |  | 5. <i>Post-Reformation</i> scholars like Ernesti   | 4. Exercises a control over the imagination.   |
| <b>School</b>     | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Division and Representative</b>   | <b>Evaluation</b>  |
| <i>Devotional</i> | Regards the Bible as a rich book primarily given to nourish the spiritual life of the believer. Emphasis is placed on the edifying aspects of Scripture. | 1. <i>Medieval mystics</i>   | 1. In essence, it seeks application, and this is essential.  |
|                   |  | 2. <i>Pietists</i> ; Spener, Francke, Bengel.  | 2. There are dangers in abuse (e.g., allegorizing, excessive typology, neglect of prior doctrinal bases); therefore, there must be a balance between interpretation and application. |
|                   |  | 3. <i>Others</i> : Puritans, Wesley, Matthew Henry, Quakers.   |  |
|                   |  | 4. <i>Modern Men</i> : F. B. Meyer devotional books; A. W. Tozer, Alan Redpath, Keswick conference tradition, The Torchbearer Missionary Fellowship (Ian Thomas), etc. |  |
| <b>School</b>     | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Division and Representative</b>   | <b>Evaluation</b>  |

|                       |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <b><i>Liberal</i></b> | Holds that human intellect is adequate in itself to select between what is acceptable and what is error in Scripture. Bible can be true only when it harmonizes with man's reason. Final seat of authority is in man. | 1. <i>Roots</i> : systems of men such as Hobbes and Spinoza  | 1. It is <i>rationalistic</i> .  |
|                       |   | 2. <i>Old Testament</i> : J. Wellhausen and those who influenced him and followed him.   | 2. <i>Inspiration</i> and the <i>supernatural</i> are both redefined.    |
|                       |   | 3. <i>New Testament</i> : F. C. Baur and Tübingen School of criticism. Albert Schweitzer and J. M. Robinson on the question of the historical Jesus. | 3. <i>Evolutionary concepts</i> are imposed upon the religion of Israel. |
|                       |   | 4. Others like Harry Emerson Fosdick.  | 4. <i>Accommodation</i> presupposition erases much Bible doctrine.       |
| <b>School</b>         | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Division and Representative</b>   | <b>Evaluation</b>  |

|                     |  |   |   |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| <i>Neo-Orthodox</i> | That line of interpretation which denies propositional revelation and employs the premise that the Bible is only a fallible <b>witness</b> pointing back to when revelation occurred or forward to when it can occur. The Bible has <b>instrumental</b> authority because it is an instrument pointing to Christ, but it does not possess <b>inherent</b> authority, | This school has been splintered off into several movements. Not all Barthians have followed Barth in all of his details, but all of the Neo-Orthodox accept the general guidelines. | 1. Denies that the Bible <i>is</i> the Word of God; claims it <i>becomes</i> the Word of God when God speaks to a man and he responds.    |
|                     |  |   | 2. Only that part of the Bible which witnesses to Christ is binding, and the seat of authority for deciding this is in man's mind.        |
|                     |  |   | 3. Many Bible episodes are treated mythologically, i.e., as teaching serious theological principles but not as having literally occurred. |