

## Appendix E

### Inductive or Deductive Thinking

**All reasoning may take only two possible courses, either by deduction or by induction, to determine Truth of anything.**

**Probability of a Truthful Conclusion Premises --> Conclusion (inferred)**

**A cat is fat /// Tom is a cat /// Henry is a dog /// All dogs are red --> Henry is red. Can't tell if Tom is fat.**

### **TRUTH OF A CONCLUSION DEPENDS UPON FULLY COMPLYING WITH THREE RULES**

**[[[ All the Western world in all dealings with concepts and the Eastern scientific world, have progressed only by Sir Francis Bacon's formulation of Inductive thinking in 1607 in England. This short greatly excerpted abbreviated explanation is taken from the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. The language is somewhat stilted taken from 1600's writings.**

(Quote) "Already in his early text *Cogitata et Visa* (1607) Bacon dealt with his scientific method, which became famous under the name of induction. He repudiates the syllogistic method and defines his alternative procedure as one "which by slow and faithful toil gathers information from things and brings it into understanding" (Farrington, 1964, 89). When later on he developed his method in detail, namely in his *Novum Organum* (1620), he still noted that "[of] induction the logicians seem hardly to have taken any serious thought, but they pass it by with a slight notice, and hasten to the formulae of disputation. I on the contrary reject demonstration by syllogism ..." (Bacon, IV [1901], 24).

**His induction, founded on collection, comparison, and exclusion of factual qualities in things and their interior structure, proved to be a revolutionary achievement within natural philosophy, for which no example in classical antiquity existed. The method of induction works in two stages: 1. Learned experience from the known to the unknown has to be acquired, and the tables (of presence, absence, degrees) have to be set up before their interpretation can take place according to the principle of exclusion. 2. The second phase of the method concentrates on the process of exclusion. Here exclusion functions as the process of determination. Bacon's method starts from material determination in order to establish the formal determination of real causes, but does not stop there, because it aims at the progressive generalization of causes. The sequence of methodical steps does not, however, end here, because Bacon assumes that from lower axioms more general ones can be derived (by induction).**

There were few doubts in the past that Bacon "encouraged detailed and methodical experimentation" (Hesse, loc. cit.); and he did this on account of his new inductive method, which implied the need for negative instances and refuting experiments. Bacon saw that confirming instances could not suffice to analyze the structure of scientific laws. In his "[m]ethod of analysis by exclusion" (Sessions, 1999,

141), negation proved to be “one of Bacon's strongest contributions to modern scientific method” (cf. G. H. von Wright, *A Treatise of Induction and Probability*, London 1951, 152).” (Unquote)

**From this brief documentation concerning the only way of determining TRUTH relating to concepts about us, whether in words or nature, Sir Francis Bacon's work is the only means of reasoning by which the world has progressed from the dark ages in logic (thinking) and scientific advancement (came to be called "the scientific method").**

**As fully detailed and extensively explained and examined in Hermeneutics in Doffun.com, we find it is the only means plainly laid out by the scriptures by which the Holy Spirit directs man's investigation of Truth in His Word. ]]**

## **Here is a brief complete explanation concerning the method of Inductive Reasoning in today's language**

**(1) ALL related truthful consistent premises (contexts) **MUST** be considered, as relating to the same subject, and**

**----ALL TRUTHFUL concepts must be gathered relating to the one subject. (Bacon's principle of exclusion)**

**(2) OBEYING the Law of Non-contradiction (sometimes called Law of Consistent Comparisons). This Law of Non-contradiction is "something cannot exist and exist at the same time and in the same sense." An orange cannot be an apple and also be an apple at the same time. But a man may be a father and also a son at the same time, because the terms may be used in a different sense.**

**----Only ALL TRUTHFUL concepts consistent in known existence and in the same sense must be considered concerning the one subject. Any inconsistencies *must* be excluded, either by demonstrating the concept is not in the same sense, or not applicable. Otherwise, the inconsistency means that a re-evaluation of the one True meaning of *All* the applicable concepts must be reconsidered. No contradictions or inconsistencies must be allowed, in order to arrive at the one Truth meaning. (Bacon's process of exclusion)**

**(3) A CONCLUSION concerning all appropriately gathered concepts from rules 1 and 2, may then be "INDUCTIVELY" inferred that yields a single conclusion of meaning that is consistent and coherent in all gathered applicable concepts of the one subject.**

**This is called inductive reasoning. ("from lower axioms more general ones can be derived")** In plain English: "from exclusion, details; then processing by further exclusion of these first gathered details, general principles or conclusions are inferentially or inductively derived. From details to conclusion is the whole method.

**This is what any detective or prosecutor is supposed to do in any legal case, or the charge should be reconsidered before any trial. Otherwise, there is reasonable request for a new trial. The one subject (defendant) was not properly defined by a full and complete proper process of exclusion. The prosecutor was just trying to make a case, they will say.**

**[[ Without realizing it, they are saying the prosecutor was doing deductive reasoning to make his case, instead of inductive reasoning to find TRUTH. ]]**

\*\*\*\*\*

**The subject, *LOGIC*, STARTED WITH ARISTOTLE (384-322 BC) AND THE ANCIENTS WHO TAUGHT WHAT IS CALLED "DEDUCTIVE REASONING" of a Syllogism Form. Most all modern scholarship in all Bible Schools and Seminaries assumes and teaches this ancient "Deductive Reasoning" as logical thinking for determining Truth today. However, in advanced Philosophy college courses in "Logic" itself and in Logic Books, this is totally contradicted.**

**Very few Bible Schools, it seems, know anything about "*Inductive Reasoning*," as first described above. Inductive reasoning is used in all scientific endeavors concerning concepts for understanding reality (Truth). But, unfortunately, the ancient syllogistic Form of Deductive reasoning (Aristotle) is taught to everyone today, as valid reasoning for *describing* Truth (absolute reality). This world-wide error in Bible Schools and Seminaries today has caused much baboonery by preachers.**

**Here is a good modern description of DEDUCTIVE REASONING:**

**"Deductive reasoning, also called deductive logic, is reasoning which constructs or evaluates deductive arguments. Deductive arguments are attempts to show that a conclusion necessarily follows from a set of premises. A deductive argument is valid if the conclusion does follow necessarily from the premises, i.e., if the conclusion must be true provided that the premises are true. A deductive argument is sound if it is valid and its premises are true." [[Wikipedia, underlining is ours for your attention.]]**

**The obvious problem with having such a FORM logic "constructed," a syllogism logic, composed of accepted truthful premises, is that how can one be certain that the premises of concepts are absolute totally perfectly**

**true** (perfect absolute reality), and if **ALL applicable** premises have been considered (when only two or three are considered in this composed FORM syllogism) and especially when the **conclusion is in the person's mind first** in order to construct the FORM as given? No claim to finding Truth can ever be made. Only a valid "form" of reasoning can be made and taught.

Even more disturbing, when one considers **only concepts**, can't anyone then start with an asserted conclusion (their preferred interpretation), which necessarily is the starting place in this Form of reasoning, and then **redefine** or even **invent** premises or only **selectively choose** certain premises that would "seem" to make the starting conclusion true? Of course !! Couldn't this be used to "logically" confirm "as truth," anything proposed by anyone? Of course !! Cults or anyone could use the Bible in this manner. And they do this today, thinking they are truly determining Truth of the subject. Interestingly, a valid court of justice would grant another trial or even dismiss any proposed trial upon this basis, saying the prosecutor had not any valid reason to make such an accusation.

How can this possibly be a means of discerning "TRUTH" of reality concerning concepts? It cannot be by any measure of common sense. The typical "scholarly" pastor sees a scripture (having an interpretation in mind) yet in order to be sure, he goes to Lexicons and picks out from among the multiple definitions given, what fits his starting premise, then proudly concludes that he is discerning Truth, by this logical thinking taught to him in Seminary. This is childish nonsense. But 99.99% of the congregation fail to see this.

This is why the good Logic books explaining both inductive and deductive reasoning, are quick to say **that the deductive FORM logic has no relationship to discerning Truth**, and only is an exercise of "valid" thinking in the FORM of the constructed syllogism.

However, all people coming from Bible Schools (stories) and Seminaries (Cemeteries) are NOT taught the truth about the subject "Logic." They are taught that the only valid means of Biblical exegesis is by finding all the scriptures (defined according to **their "proper" interpretations**, of course) and such **carefully selected** Lexical meanings that **"apply" to their "properly asserted" starting doctrinal understanding**. This is purely circular deductive reasoning.

And after graduation they seldom learn anything of Truth, being satanically dead blind thereafter. They are pompously proud of their deductive logical thinking taught to them. This makes little more than chattering baboons of all of them. They forever find any other form of thinking (inductive thinking) about anything incomprehensible. And their churches then submissively accept such considered high scholarly expositions of scripture to be themselves satanically blinded forever, also.

Over hundred's of years of this being taught in churches with progressively false doctrines introduced and by all public schools, it is of little wonder that our society is now totally pagan. All we needed is pagans to start teaching in our public schools for the past 100 years also making their starting assertions in deductive "logical" reasoning.

This is why modern scientific reasoning concerning concepts immediately declares invalid any such Deductive Reasoning when utilized. Truth (absolute reality) cannot be discerned with this totally backward ancient method of Aristotle, by starting with a conclusion and then finding "whatever" seems to confirm it, and, thereby, declaring it as Truth.

For the history of this Philosophy of thinking, the reader is encouraged to read, "Some Definitions and History of Meanings," in the top of the homepage of Doffun.com.

## **ONLY TWO TYPES OF REASONING POSSIBLE.**

Since we are dealing with scriptures being interpreted, all "premises" are just Bible words or phrases being considered toward a conclusion of meaning. Only two methods to determine meaning: Inductive Reasoning or Deductive Reasoning. Here, they are clearly and completely described.

### **Inductive arguments or thinking:**

**Induction reasons from the particulars (effects, consequences) to the general conclusions (cause, conditions). "From details to conclusion."**

**Inductive reasoning is the only valid means of finding TRUTH relating to concepts (ideas, statements, natures details).**

**Inductive thinking was first formally described by Francis Bacon (1561-1626) Middle Ages, and called "scientific method" or thinking.**

100% probability that the conclusion is true **if** all appropriate consistent premises are true. With ALL appropriate consistent premises being totally true (obeying consistent comparisons, like to like at the same time in the same sense), the conclusion will be totally true. Any one false premise (even half-truth) may give a totally false conclusion. This reasoning follows the Law of Consistent Comparisons. See *Hermeneutics* >> "2. Law of Consistent Comparisons" for detailed explanation and applications in Doffun.com.

So-called scientific thinking can involve only probabilities, since man in natural sciences cannot know "ALL appropriate consistent premises being totally true." This leads to constant improvements in understanding as more true premises are found and false premises discarded.

**This is God's method of sound thinking, using man's Laws of Mind legitimately.** See section, *Hermeneutics*, "Four Laws of Human Mind," in Doffun.com

Premises --> Conclusion inferred from ALL premises (contexts) **related** (appropriate, consistent) to each other. All scriptures with dog or Henry, will give best logical conclusions about dog or Henry, if at the same time in the same sense, as illustrated above in the heading captions.

Premises need not always be related identically to conclusion, but related only by demonstrated probability of association. Also, they must be consistent, applying to identical subject in kind and time and sense.

Conclusions always changeable upon new evidence (relating premise(s), plural)  
Mind set: If premises only used to infer conclusion, new premises may infer a new conclusion. Change (growth) is built in and anticipated as more evidence (premise) is learned.

Relevance of premises is necessary for truth of conclusion (**Fallacy of Relevance**). Premises may later be found to be not relevant to original conclusion, or to each other.

Total evidence, all possible premises, is a condition required for inductive argument to be valid (**Fallacy of Suppressed Evidence**). Every place in the Bible where the one Greek or Hebrew word or phrase is used must be considered.

No conclusion is guaranteed by inductive arguments, but progressive learning is. Given absolute verbally inerrant Truth (God's Word), we ever **grow in knowledge** upon a firm foundation of only true premises. We have infallible Truth (premises), but we must use our minds as God intended, by inductive thinking, to arrive at a proper meaning or understanding.

### **Deductive arguments or thinking:**

**Deduction reasons from the general conclusion idea (cause, condition) to particular ideas (consequences, effects). " From conclusion to details." It is exactly backwards from Inductive reasoning. This perversion in satan's kingdom (the entire world) is greatly unperceived by natural man.**

**Deductive reasoning is a philosophical Form of reasoning, first started in the Garden of Eden by the satan [[ first asserted lying conclusion, "Ye shall not surely die" if you disobey God; second asserted lying conclusion, in the day you eat,"Ye shall be as God."]], and first described by Aristotle**

in fourth century B.C., and generally thought to be legitimate thinking by "scholars" ever since.

The satan has never left the Tree of Knowledge since then, with his deductive thinking. Bible Schools and Seminaries are his most favored places to take countless millions to hell. Bible Schools and Seminaries teach most demanding deductive thinking or you won't graduate.

Deductive reasoning in philosophy is a FORM of reasoning, and not a valid way to find TRUTH in concepts, because the particular ideas (details) may still be defined or redefined or preferentially selected to confirm the starting conclusion, yet still conform to be a valid FORM. TRUTH is not a concern in Formal logical Syllogisms from antiquity.

Deductive reasoning can only be of valid value when dealing with objects and processing "in the world of satan." This world is of material objects to manipulate (as driving a car or flying an airplane, or applying chemistry or physics, and so forth) or manipulating numbers in applied mathematics, and other applications in the world of satan.

But in everything there always becomes a point in which man cannot possibly explain the existence of findings in quantum physics, waveforms, or light, or gravity, or electro-magnetic phenomenon, or planetary or solar organization or existence, or even the existence of man or animals or plant life, or understanding of a brain's functioning, or spiritual manifestations. Deductive thinking has no valid use when trying to find TRUTH of God (reality) in concepts.

\*\*\*\*\*

Primary Axiom: The satan (rebel) does not deal in TRUTH in his kingdom.

So few people want to recognize and live their lives AGAINST this principle understanding about satan. TRUTH is not their primary concern; it is self (which is the sin of satan also).

Regardless of a person's profession, he or she either lives according to satan's kingdom (lies and deductive thinking) or God's Kingdom (Truth and inductive thinking). "No man can serve two masters" (Matt 6:24).

\*\*\*\*\*

Conceptually, deductive thinking is ideal for teaching LIES, propaganda, brainwashing. It is extremely important that you understand what deductive thinking is, and the implications of it, so you can understand

## **satan's means of blinding men from seeing Truth in God's Word or in anything.**

Decide upon a conclusion that you prefer (interesting personal reasons), then contrive by whatever means of interpretation to make all premises (words or phrases in the sentence or context) support the starting conclusion. Today, this is proudly described as "interpreting the meaning of a word by the immediate sentence or context in which it occurs." This is the universal teaching of all Seminaries and Bible Schools today. And they think they are teaching "good" Hermeneutics. It is backwards, deductive thinking.

This necessary contrivance of other word meanings to make supportive premises sound logically coherent, is what we are calling **REDEFINITIONS** so often apparent. Since we start the reasoning, say of a meaning of a word, based upon ones personal bias of the meaning of the immediate sentence or context, we *must* then proceed to REDEFINE all words or phrases within the sentence to support the preferred meaning of the word that was defined by our starting bias. This is what we call the "**tall-tail sign**" of the devil in their doctrinal tall grass explanations.

This is most obvious to a few, when someone looks up multiple meanings of a Biblical word in a Lexicon (dictionary of multiple meanings in secular history) of Biblical Greek or Hebrew words, and finds a meaning that fits his particular bias of what his presumed starting meaning is, and triumphantly selects that meaning as confirming "the truth" of his starting conclusion with which he began. Today, they call this Biblical exegesis. It is the highest form of scholarly stupidity, in actuality of TRUTH.

Also, any time someone must give redefinitions of *plain child simple words*, like "all, world, all men, man, every, all the world, all the world, whosoever, and so forth.," not each defined by inductive exegesis but only to support their arguments *in only certain specific places*, we know the devil is at work.

Their redefinitions of these words cannot be applied throughout the Word of Truth, because then they would seem nonsensical in many places, in God's pure non-contradictory Word. This would prove their error but deductive thinkers are irrational, do not regard the Law of Non-contradiction, they do not see this lack of consistency as of any importance. They are blinded by satan in deductive teaching methods from Seminaries and Bible Schools, or someone just accepting their assertions from reading their writings.

Their necessary starting lie is upheld, or their whole irrational system fails, so a single word may have many meanings as suits *their purposes*. They *must* insist that Biblical words are equivocal, just like any other profane literature. The hall-mark of all errant people in Bible interpretation (deductive thinkers), is to say that the local context meaning defines any word in that local context. Like the modern "higher" textual critics today, they insist that the Bible must be treated like any other profane equivocal world literature.

Other names for this deductive thinking is "**circular thinking**" because of the circular route of argument to the conclusion being the same as the original statement; or "**block thinking**" because the imaginatively interpreted premises (perhaps, a preferred meaning picked out of a Lexicon) devised to support the beginning statement may exist as isolated "blocks" of devised assertions which often exist as self-contradictory statements to other such devised premises within the same argument.

Again, they do not see this lack of consistency as of any importance. The Law of Non-Contradiction, or Consistent Comparisons is not in their world. They are functioning in the kingdom of satan, not the Kingdom of their Creator God. Satan blinds people to contradictions. Blocks of contradictions are not seen at all. When one observes these very explicit contradictions in a persons explanations, you know that you are listening to a blinded deductive thinker, snared by the devil.

The conclusion may be totally false (total lie or half-truth) to start, since it is not derived from any starting factual premises (details) at the start, only an assertion of something. And this false asserted start, learned from listening or reading somebody, must then be supported necessarily by asserted half-truths (lies) or out right lies. And from doing this with total abandon, they soon become totally unaware of contradictions. This thinking is typical of Catholics, Baptists, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Dispensationalists when talking about their salvation doctrines. They are totally unaware of their asserted contradictions.

People that become habituated to this type of thinking, are not aware of the great error and irrationality of their thinking. Sincerity and devotion is frequently only a measure of their deception. They are not aware at all that they are illogical in thinking; they do not conform to the Law of Non-contradiction or Consistent Comparisons. This is the thinking of worldly (carnal-flesh driven) people, regardless of their religion or denomination or level of education and religious piety.

**This is the devil's method of thinking, deductive, for all people concerning concepts.** Conclusion (asserted possible lie) --  
» Premises, **details**, interpreted to support starting **conclusion** (lie).

Impossible for the conclusion to be invalid in the minds of these blind people, since all premises are "**interpreted**" or **redefined** to support the starting conclusion (bias). This is where all the redefinitions of plain words, "tall-tails," are introduced to "define" the premises to make the reasoning seem logical, therefore, acceptable to the undiscerning.

Conclusions are logically unassailable to these deceived individuals, regardless of "new evidence" (any different new premises). Any new evidence or premises will be necessarily redefined to fit the starting conclusion. Mind set: All premises arising are interpreted to support a

starting assertion, deceitfully stated to be a conclusion. New premises will also be so redefined.

**Therefore, no possibility of change (growth) in future.** Biblical definition of **Blind**. They think they know Truth. Regardless of their education, numerous doctorates, or extreme piety, the people who think by deductive thinking become totally blind to the irrationality of accepting the contradictions of their devised isolated "blocks" of premises when pointed out to them. They are so blind they proudly excuse them by being only human under a higher inscrutable unknowable God, so we must accept contradictions, they proudly and indignantly say. After all, "Who can know all of God," they say.

Premises are always relevant to conclusion, since always designed by redefinition to give or support conclusion, regardless of any new premises found. Once an argument has been achieved, no further additions can alter conclusion because all premises, whether old or newly discovered, will be devised (redefined) to support the starting assertion. Concerning concepts, guaranteed premises are provided by deductive arguments to deliberately confirm the starting conclusion or lie. **Thereby, the devil can never be wrong in his world kingdom.**

**No one can be as blind as the highest educated and the highest IQ created by God, who's mind is deceived to accept deductive thinking of the devil's kingdom of this world.** Their minds become totally reprobate, despite being the most dedicated of religionists for "christianity". They may be used by satan to likewise deceive millions.

**Hereby, all the world will become "christian" worshipping the devil. What a victory the devil thinks he will achieve, totally usurping God's Kingdom of Truth. Total deception of extremely sincere people, putting real Christians to death "thinking he is doing God service" (read John 16:1-4).**

**It is of extreme interest and so obvious, to listen to politicians or some very apostate pastors on TV interviews. When asked a question, they seldom answer anything directly. They start redefining in explanations "the situation" and avoid answering directly "yea" or "nay." An obvious sign that one is talking to a liar, a deductive thinker.**

**Formal Deductive Reasoning can have no fallacies**

**of reasoning, so long as the syllogism form is accepted. TRUTH from the Syllogism Form is not relevant. Fallacies of reasoning only relate to whether the Form is violated. [[ i.e., Tommy is now an adult, so he can do**

as he pleases.]]

Formal Education necessarily involves deductive method being taught. The inductive method would be extremely time consuming and the educational systems requires the minimum time necessary to learn the "facts." The teacher spouts and the student sprouts.

This is why Einstein was expelled from school. He couldn't accept this process. The person from cradle to grave is to just memorize the Facts as given (?) and make all thinking (details) conform to what is memorized. In order to graduate, you must conform to this Form. Don't reject the assertions or you won't graduate. Einstein did very poorly in school and finally we know what happened. He just could not think well, they thought. So he taught himself, inductively.

This deductive method is how anything taught to people become their cultural truth to them, regardless of what they are taught as being the facts.

**This is the method of satan to control the world.** Ignorant or lazy or impoverished people simply believe the propaganda they have readily offered to them as to how to interpret all the things they hear or see. This is called blinded, snared by satan. Work all day then relax and listen to TV at night. Or go to school and become a great scholar (?). **It is all satan's world.**

**When one gives a list of premises ("redefined" scriptures, or Lexicon meanings), and says see these all conform to our proper understanding of this conclusion--they are only confirming that they had the starting premise in their minds at the beginning. It does not confirm the validity of finding Truth in any way by this deductive FORM.**

**But Deductive (Blinded) thinking ONLY cannot comprehend this very simple fact, when it is pointed out to them!! And, today, this deductive thinking is called "Biblical exegesis" by blinded Bible teachers and preachers. And whenever anyone thinks they know Truth, they will learn nothing thereafter. One is wasting their time in talking to them (2 Tim 2:24-26).**

Further details about reasoning, either by deduction or by induction, since this is important to thoroughly understand. Your Eternal Life depends upon protecting against such deception.

**Deduction:** This is reasoning from the general to the particular. This is starting with a believed generalization and interpreting all particulars so that the generalization is thereby supported. It is reasoning from a premise to a conclusion. This is what may be called "subjective hermeneutics." Quite well suited for the New Agers who make things whatever they wish them to be.

For some reason all the "me" generations after WWII, which now comprise most all of our Christian pastors today, use this "subjective hermeneutics" like a spiritual endowment. Since we start the reasoning, say of a meaning of a word, based upon ones personal bias of the meaning of the immediate sentence or context, we *must* then proceed to **REDEFINE** all words or phrases within the sentence to support the preferred meaning of the word that was defined by our starting bias.

This is the origin of the "tall-tail sign" of the devil in our doctrinal explanations. Any time someone must give redefinitions of plain simple words, not previously defined by inductive exegesis but only to support their arguments *in these specific places*, we know the devil is at work.

Obviously, a deductive study of the scriptures is easier and always subject to deceptive and false perceptions, gullibly accepted by teachers and pupils alike. A starting prejudice or a preconceived belief may always find support by any or all particulars found or twisted to support such starting prejudices.

Teachers today start with a conclusion concerning a specific scripture, then find in a lexicon a preferred meaning of a word or words that supports his starting conclusion about the scripture, and proudly declare that this confirms his understanding of the scripture. And proceed to do this with multiple scriptures, thereby, forcing them to say the same thing. Then they proudly say, "Since all these scriptures support this belief, it must be true. We have compared scripture to scripture. This is how you can know that this is the meaning intended by the Holy Spirit." This is nonsense grown into blindness! This is doing deductive reasoning. What is worse. all their simple minded sheep in the flock think they are really getting deep exegetical spiritual insight. This is truly a sad spectacle.

This is what may be called **circular thinking**. You start with a prejudice and you end with the same prejudice. It proves nor interprets no thing. But millions today are deceived by this satanic method.

One of the hall marks of such "teaching" expeditions in deductive reasoning (irrational thinking) is a proud pastor who gets definitions of a Greek or Hebrew word used in a scripture by referring to Greek or Hebrew Lexicons (dictionaries) with many meanings and shades of meanings taken from different Greek usages or common Hebrew usages of common daily papyri of social life. They pick out a meaning that fits their personal purposes and use it, to apply to their personal interpretation of a scripture and the blind congregation is in awe of his exegesis.

These have no relationship to the Holy Spirits specific single use of each Greek word throughout the scriptures. But he then applies these errant meanings to the scriptures that use this Greek or Hebrew word, thinking he is giving real understanding to the verse. In actuality, what he is doing is picking out from among the many offered definitions the one definition that best confirms or explains his starting premise. Then he proudly feels that he has been given illumination and confirmation of his starting premise by the Holy Spirit. Circular demonic thinking, plain and simple. And trying to explain this obvious fallacy to this deceived BLIND preacher is met with totally blank stares and incomprehension. **Debating with demons is foolishness.**

You can be sure that anyone who makes an appeal to a Greek lexicon as to gain understanding of a scripture is doing deductive circular irrational reasoning, whether they like to admit it or not. We must say that the New Agers with relativism as their creed of life, are much less self deceived in that they say, "Hey, I make it say whatever I want." Instead of choosing one of the many meanings possible in the Lexicon that more suits his wish or bias, an honest person would say, "What am I doing? I am simply choosing my bias to support what I want it to say. How can I know what the truth is?"

An illustration of the error of using Greek Lexicons is in order. Suppose that I want to understand 1 Timothy 4:7 so that I may please God. I want to know what it means when it says, "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness." I look in a Greek lexicon (Biblesoft's New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary. Copyright (c) 1994, Biblesoft and International Bible Translators, Inc.) and find that the word used here for "exercise" is Strong's number 1128, used 4 times in the NT, a verb "gumnazo." The Lexicon says, NT:1128 *gumnazo* (goom-nad'-zo); from NT:1131; to practice naked (in the games), i.e. train (figuratively). Further, for word 1131 it says, "gumnos (goom-nos'); of uncertain affinity; nude (absolute or relative, literal or figurative)."

Now, what may I conclude: "refuse fables and go nude as a means of becoming more Godly. " You may say this is ridiculous, and I agree. But the point is that with any tendency to any bias (which is only natural to have), conscious or unconscious, when we go to a Lexicon we may find whatever interpretation, regardless of your good and noble intentions. And what is even worse, if the Lexicon provides multiple possible uses or definitions of the Greek word, the problem is only worsened to satisfy your choice of bias.

The point is this, you really have no means of reference to *the choice* of "the" truth when you refer to a Lexicon. It is the thinking of a natural man, not only by the writer of the Lexicon, who is just reporting the many linguistic uses of man, but by the reader of the Lexicon. And "the natural man is receiving not the things of the Spirit of God... neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (1 Cor 2:14), which things also we speak, not in words

which man's wisdom is teaching, but which the Holy Spirit is teaching, *comparing spiritual to spiritual*" (1 Cor 2:13). Going by lexicons or even dictionaries is simply finding how satan's world has used that one word. Can this be a help in understanding the Holy Spirit Words of God's Kingdom?? NO!

We are unconsciously carrying around all sorts of biases from our backgrounds and this will predispose each of us to think about anything from our preconceived experiences and learning's. This is just another way of saying we all tend to use "deductive reasoning," starting with an assertion, conscious or unconscious. For Biblical interpretation we need a means of guarding ourselves from such conscious or unconscious indulgences of biases. **Any starting bias, or any necessitated choice among worldly details, provokes "deductive" thinking.**

This last sentence is extremely important to remember. It is an important "tall-tail" sign that someone may be using deductive thinking. Whenever one consciously or not uses (1) a bias or (2) a choice from among worldly details, deductive thinking is necessarily being provoked. "Provoked" is the operative word. A choice among worldly details necessarily provokes biases, which may or may not be totally relied upon.

**Induction:** This is the process of inference, by which we formulate a general truth only after first finding all the particular applicable facts regardless of what they may indicate. "These are all the applicable facts or details of Greek words of scriptures themselves; they seem to support this generalization or interpretation." This is the ONLY valid method of reasoning or interpreting anything. Obviously, any interpretation of anything must ONLY be by the induction method in order to arrive at any valid conclusion. This is called "scientific thinking," and is the bedrock of any scientific effort to find the truth relating to the physical world. To use deductive reasoning in a scientific publication would be obvious foolishness and frivolity.

We may look at lexicons from time to time, but we must guard ourselves from using any of their definitions as opposed to those derived purely from inductive reasoning using the Greek scripture words only, *comparing scriptures to scriptures*, and *all* their associated contexts only. Lexicons help us to find related Greek words. After I have done an inductive meaning search for each of these from the scriptures ONLY, I get a better understanding of the inductively related Greek words in the scriptures. And nothing can be trusted outside of Textus Receptus Greek scriptures.

### **Three Steps to Inductive Scripture Study**

**Find the Greek lemma for an English scripture word. (Using an Interlinear to give Strong's Number for the Greek word)**

**Find All Places this Greek word number is used in NT. (Using an Englishman's Concordance).**

## **Inductively Discern one meaning that would make sense in every context found in Englishman's Concordance.**

In applying inductive reasoning to scripture interpretation, we obviously must restrict our inquiry to the Holy Spirit's scriptures alone. No lexicons, dictionaries, commentaries, or writings of man could be authoritative. Otherwise, it would be like trying to solve a question about an automobile by going to a zoo and carefully examining a few zebras. What would be the relevance? We don't know either.

The following words of Dean John William Burgon (1813-1888) of Chichester in England, to whom the DeanBurgonSociety.org is devoted, have been quoted often: "Either the whole Bible is inspired, the Words as well as the sentences, the syllables as well as the Words, the letters as well as the syllables, every 'jot' and every 'tittle' of it, or the whole of it must be abandoned, since no part of it can be certainly depended upon as an infallible guide." As Dean Burgon says,<sup>4</sup> "if we do not believe that every single word is inspired and that the one Greek text from which they are derived is inerrant then you have no firm foundation for anything. We must settle in our minds that to understand the Bible as an infallible guide, we must be settled that it comes down to a study of each single pure and infallible word." Well said.

Every [single] word of God is pure. "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times" (Ps 12:6). "And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that is proceeding out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live" (Deut 8:3). "Every word of God is pure (no mixture, only one meaning, no synonyms): he is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him" (Prov 30:5). But He answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word (single word) that proceeding out of the mouth of God. Matt 4:4

This means that each Original Greek or Hebrew word only has one meaning throughout its use in the entire Word. And it means that an English meaning of one Greek word applies only to that one Greek word throughout the entire Word. One Greek word lemma given one meaning consistently throughout, and giving perfect coherent sense throughout without any synonyms, is the way God gave His Word, every word pure.

We know of only one translation of the NT that does this. It was finished in December 2008 but not yet published.

It should be obvious to anyone that even inductive study of the Bible is impossible if there is not such a fact as verbal inerrancy. **If the Bible is not preserved every word pure in the original language, then Bible study would be useless.** It would be impossible to say that we can know what the Bible says.

See this footnote for a clear explanation of verbal inerrancy and its relationship to teachings today of apostate Ecumenical Bible schools.

The only way we can discern the Holy Spirit's use or meaning of a word in scripture is to see how He uses the word in *all contexts* ONLY in His scriptures, to infer His *one singular meaning* of that word. You cannot understand what a written Russian word means by looking in a Spanish dictionary. "Elementary, my dear Watson." The only dictionary we have of Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit scriptures, and fortunately, the scriptures are self defining because only one meaning is assigned to each word according to the scriptures in the preceding footnote <sup>9</sup>. The scriptures then become self-defining. And to find this one meaning, we must follow an inductive process, a three step sequence to reach a conclusion.

**All Inductive (inference) reasoning will be valid only if three steps are completed.**

These are exactly the steps by which a good detective or scientist arrives at a conclusion as to any question. All references to a single word mean the Greek root (lemma) word, however, translated. An illustration is in order: Let us try to interpret a Bible verse in the New Testament.. Let us say, the meaning would obviously be clarified if we understood the meaning of a certain word.

[ Using a Strong's or Young's Greek and Hebrew English concordance or Englishman's Greek-English Concordance or any number of appropriate computer software available in Bible bookstores today, by which we may have displayed before us all verses and surrounding context of all scriptures containing any one Greek word or Hebrew word in question. *We are using these books or software as tools, not for any meaning stated in them. These are to be used only as tools for consistent comparison of all scripture contexts of the one word to derive by inference the one meaning of the word that would make sense in all the contexts in which it is used. Obviously, one must use a consistent word for word translation, not a dynamic, like NIV, or idiomatic, like Living Bible, translation. We prefer the KJV for its Textus Receptus origin, and its tendency to a single word for word translation (unfortunately not in every instance). The KJV is far from perfect in this or in consistency or even accuracy. Fallible men of pronounced Calvinist biases and King James's mandates for preserving Church of England Ecclesiology made it extremely flawed. ]*

**AGAIN, FOR SAFETY**

So, **first** of all, we look up all the scriptures and only in the scriptures (not consult man's opinions as to the meaning in a Lexicon) in which the Greek word actually occurs. The meaning then can be reasoned (inferred) from the way the Holy Spirit uses it in context of all the scriptures in which it occurs. This inference is checked out by seeing if the meaning makes sense in all the scriptures used. This is self-proving by using the scriptures themselves, only comparing scriptures to scriptures (1 Cor 2:13).

This is much like proving a math solution by working backwards in simple math or

by substitution in algebra. If the single meaning substituted gives coherence in all its scriptures used, we can assume as much as possible that the inference is correct and that all other meanings are not acceptable as to consistent Truth.

To do this, of course, we must look up all instances of use of the one Greek word (not all instances in which any Greek word could have been given that particular translation). Again, it means that we do not derive our meanings from consulting man's opinions in Greek Lexicons or historical writings or papyri of everyday life. These many and varied uses are simply compilations of just that, varied meanings as in a translation or every day usage of the time, but may not be the Holy Spirit's usage of the one specific word. This is an area where much abuse of God's consistent pure words occurs, by which one picks whatever of many available meanings that fit one's preferred doctrine. Of course, this is obvious fallacious deductive "interpretation" from the start.

**Second**, we infer by all the ways the Holy Spirit uses the one word in each of its verses used as to the one meaning that would satisfy *all instances* of its use. Now we have good reason to believe that we have arrived nearest to the meaning of the pure word as the Holy Spirit of Truth ( Unchangeable, in Whom there is no shadow of turning, James 1:17) used it in His Word.

These First and Second steps may seem too rigorous and restrictive. But in scripture our effort should be to determine the single meaning the Holy Spirit uses when He inspired His Word. Since every (single) word of God is pure, as purified by fire seven times, Prov 30:5 and Psa 12:6, we can rely on finding only one meaning which may be applicable within every verse of its' use.

Even in everyday life let's say as a detective trying to solve a crime, we must make all applicable facts reasonably indicate the same meaning, otherwise we can have no valid inference or conclusion. "Elemental, purely elemental, my dear Watson," says Holmes.

This second step must not allow contradictions, multiple meanings, or synonymous meanings. Just think, if multiple meanings for any one word, or even a synonymous meaning was allowed, then language in the Bible could be subject to any number of interpretations. There could be no way of knowing what anything really meant. This is what all cults and many denominations concerning certain doctrines do, they simply redefine words to support their doctrines, circular deductive reasoning. A single pure meaning for each word is mandatory by considering all the contexts in which that one word is used.

**Third** and last, we then apply that inferred single meaning to the verse in question to understand the way the Holy Spirit uses the term in that scripture. This and only this is Truth of that verse or verses despite all your previous beliefs and doctrinal teachings by men. This is why the admonitions in the Overview at the beginning are so important: (1) you must never be governed by a theological predisposition or school of thought, and (2) Truth always stands in judgment of each one of us and our belief systems.

**Scriptural Application:** The believer who would diligently pursue the inductive study must be filled with a passionate desire to know "the whole counsel of God." and **only** the counsel of God. He must of necessity ignore all sectarian prejudices, theological doctrines, and man-made theories; in order to coolly decipher, analyze, and classify the total body of details to find their true inter-relationships as they, in fact, do exist in the Scriptures. This takes some helpful study books as mentioned. Also, it takes discipline to discard all of man's Studies in Theology textbooks and doctoral dissertations and all his preconceived beliefs, with their doctrines of men.

**For the first time, Bible school, starts and ends on your own desk with your Bible doing its own teaching to you,** with the Holy Spirit illuminating His meanings and scriptures. You have the scriptures (with the best Greek text and the best verbal translation you can find) and the Holy Spirit to reveal His word to you. "Even a child..... And you have the anointing, and have no need that any man teach you." "And no prophecy is of any private interpretation." Scriptures themselves are their own interpreters, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word (rhema) be established" (Heb 10:28, 1 Tim 5:19, Matt 18:16, and 2 or 13:1).

J. Carnell set forth something called "systematic consistency" as the final test of religious Truth. We may say that in summary this is our test of "the" Truth of scriptural interpretation. This is a test of "means" of interpretation as well as "result" of interpretation. It is a test of the entire process of arriving at Truth.

---