Rule 6: Logic

August 10, 2019 · https://letgodbetrue.com/sermons/2019/rule-6/

Hermeneutics: How to Read and Understand the Bible

RULE #6: Reason by Proper Rules of Logic.

I. The Bible is reasonable. Logical thinking will help interpret, understand, and prove the Bible.

A. **Reason**. n. A statement of some fact (real or alleged) employed as an argument to justify or condemn some act, prove or disprove some assertion, idea, or belief.

B. **Reason**. n. That intellectual power or faculty which is ordinarily employed in adapting thought or action to some end; the guiding principle of the human mind in the process of thinking.

C. **Reason**. v. To employ reasoning or argument with a person, in order to influence his conduct or opinions.

D. **Reason**. v. To think in a connected, sensible, or logical manner; to employ the faculty of reason in forming conclusions.

E. **Logic**. The branch of philosophy that treats of the forms of thinking in general, and more especially of inference and of scientific method. The art of reasoning and that system of rules for convincing or confounding an opponent by argument.

F. **Logic**. The rules governing right reasoning; the study of the methods and principles to distinguish good (correct) reasoning from false (incorrect).

G. You have heard of the “three R’s,” which are reading, writing, and arithmetic. But you also need rhetoric, which used to be taught, but doesn’t suit the MTV generation.

H. **Rhetoric**. The art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order to express himself with eloquence.

I. Scripture does not use “logic” or “rhetoric,” but it does use “reason” in the senses above (I Sam 12:7; Job 9:14; 13:3,6; 15:3; 32:11; Pr 26:16; Eccl 7:25; Is 1:18; 41:21; Dan 4:36; Matt 16:7-8; 21:25; Mark 2:6,8; 8:16-17; 11:31; 12:28; Luke 5:21-22; 9:46; 20:5,14-15; 24:15; Acts 6:2; 17:2; 18:4,14,19; 24:25; 28:29; Rom 12:1; I Pet 3:15).

J. And it uses other terms to indicate reasoning, logic, and rhetoric (I Sam 24:15; 25:39; Job 23:4; Ps 35:1; 43:1; 74:22; 119:154; Pr 22:23; 23:11; 25:9,15; 31:9; Is 1:17; 3:13; 43:26; Jer 2:35; 12:1; Matt 27:20; Mark 9:33-34; Luke 1:1-4; 16:31; Acts 6:10; 9:29; 13:43; 17:3,11,17; 18:4,24,28; 19:8-9,26; 28:23; Rom 1:29; 4:21; 8:38; 14:5,14; I Cor 14:24; Eph 5:15; Phil 1:7,17; Col 4:6; I Thess 5:21; II Tim 1:12; 2:23,25; Tit 1:9-11; Heb 11:13; I John 4:1-6; Jude 1:3,15).

II. Faith and the gospel are reasonable, and they must be believed, taught, and defended logically.

A. Logic and reasoning are not contradictory to faith and the Holy Spirit, as we shall see.

1. It is wrong to make faith and reason mutually exclusive, though humanists do.

2. True science is not the enemy of truth, but a servant. The false sciences today, like evolution,

psychology, sociology, and many others, are based on nothing but the crazed speculations of God-hating atheists (I Tim 6:20-21).

3. We do not have to prove the existence of God or the validity of the Bible, for these are givens to our faith. Their "scientific" speculations deserve and need no more refuting than the child crying out that the emperor is naked! Any believer can see that he has no clothes! And that he has had a frontal lobotomy!
4. We know God exists by these three categories of proof: the natural creation, the declaration of the Bible, and the Spirit's internal witness.
5. Christians begin reasoning from God's existence, and everything is reasoned by logic from that starting point. Neither Jesus nor the apostles would waste a second on a man denying God's existence (Gen 1:1; Acts 17:24; Heb 1:1).
6. The humanist is insane by our faith, and as far as reasoning is concerned, for his foundational premises are Godless fantasies! He can reason in circles around Karl Sagan, the big bang, and his monkey ancestors for an eternity in hell.
7. Christians also generally assume the truth of the Scriptures as a starting point (Ps 119:128; Is 8:20; Matt 22:29; Acts 17:2). We only seek to prove its validity as the revelation of the only God for the pleasure of our believing souls.
8. We can prove the validity of the Bible by many internal proofs, as we did in the extensive study, "Why I Believe the Bible."
9. God is truth (Deut 32:4). His word is truth (John 17:17). Anything else is false.
10. If the whole world were to unite against us with their puny threat of death, we would laugh at them, as all the martyrs have done for the last 2000 years. Glory!

B. God is reasonable and logical. He Himself dares men to reason and dispute with Him!
   1. God is truth (Deut 32:4). 2+2=4 for sane men, and 2+2=4 for God as well. He didn't have any problem counting his way through the six days of creation!
   2. His ways are always equal; our ways are often unequal (Ezek 18:29; Is 55:8-9).
   3. He dares men to bring their best arguments to debate Him (Isaiah 1:18; 41:21).
   4. He mocks the lies of foolish men who put their trust in themselves (Is 44:20).
   5. He is the invisible, indivisible, eternal, independent I AM THAT I AM. He is not proven by syllogisms; He is self-existing, self-evident, and self-proving.
   6. He is the Source of all evidence, and before or outside Him there is no evidence!
   7. Pitiful man is not going to validate His glorious existence by symbolic logic!
   8. We prove He exists to those with faith, and the proof is only a servant of faith.

C. It is the man without faith who is unreasonable, for all his arguments begin from faithless insanity and can reach no higher, regardless of their validity (II Thess 3:2).
   1. Remember. Zero multiplied by any number is still zero. Denying the First Premise of truth and reality results in circular reasoning from the hallucinations of foolish men, who are creatures that begin and end soiling themselves!

2. Consider. Humanists require more “faith” to believe the universe came from a big bang of cosmic gases and evolutionary processes than we do in believing it came from an infinitely wise Creator.
3. We reason from the First Cause of all things (Acts 17:24), and they reason from the No Clue About Anything (Is 8:20; I Tim 6:3-5)! They are inherently insane!
4. Satan, as the father of lies and false reasoning, is irrational (John 8:44). His arguments are always false, though subtly so! Men under his control are miserably deranged and oppose themselves (Mark 5:1-20; II Tim 2:25-26).

D. There is a violent reaction today, from Eastern and Satanic influence, against objective knowledge and absolute truth. For the pagans of India, China, and Japan have no truth.

E. The Bible is logical in its content, provides examples of godly men reasoning, has doctrine established by logical extension, and confutes error by logical refutation.
1. Christians should learn logic, for they are the rules of thinking, persuading, and defending. Faith is based in logic, for it comes from rightly understanding the Bible, which produces the practice of faith (Rom 10:17; II Pet 1:5).
2. It is a contradiction to say, “Your argument is logical, but it isn’t Scriptural.”
3. We should not let the pagans hold their illogical positions without some pain!

F. We call the period when Roman Catholicism dominated Europe the Dark Ages. They separated faith and science. Nations with a majority of Catholics are still dark.
1. If you convince a nation the dissolving wafer in their mouth is the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, you have created an irrational vulnerability to sentimental superstition. Here comes Mother Superior to blind and enslave you!
2. The Catholic churches of Europe claimed more pieces of Christ’s cross than needed to rebuild the ark! More forefingers than John the Baptist had fingers! Numerous foreskins of Jesus! And hairs from Mary of four different colors!
3. Faith to these rejecters of Scripture is sentimental superstition. They do not care about faith in God and faith in the doctrine and promises of His Word.

G. Christians should never apologize or shrink in their faith toward God and His Word.
1. We have the perfect source of knowledge for all issues of life and eternity.
2. Bible believers are the world’s greatest philosophers, with the answers for man’s purpose, man’s past, man’s future, and the ethics for successful living and joy.
3. We know the world, and all of its glory, will soon be melted with fervent heat.

H. Paul taught the ministerial work of destroying false ideas and thinking (II Cor 10:4-5).
1. Which was the same work given to the prophets before him (Isaiah 54:17).
2. For the Word of God in the right hands is a hammer and fire (Jer 23:28-29).

III. The rules of logic are as basic as mathematics and thinking. Do not be intimidated by them.

A. You learned the elementary rules of logic in basic mathematics, algebra, and geometry.

B. This study cannot go very far in the study of logic, for that is a large subject of its own. But wise men

will learn the rudiments of sound reasoning and logical fallacies.

C. The first rule of logic is the law of identity. In a certain specific context (set of facts and circumstances), a proposition (thing or situation) has only one single meaning. A=A. If any statement is true, then it is true. Here is where we must carefully define our terms, which is the beginning of all thought and communication. The Bible uses the law of identity (Ex 3:14; Is 46:9; Matt 22:43; John 10:35; Gal 3:16; Heb 8:13).

D. The second rule of logic is the law of contradiction. You cannot know anything without the use of this law. No statement can be both true and false at the same time, in the same sense. Jesus is the Christ is either a true or false statement; it cannot be both. This law establishes the basis of truth or error. We call violating this rule talking out of both sides of your mouth. Or we say we caught him coming and going. In extended and complicated reasoning, this rule is often broken, depending on the need or subtlety of the one arguing. Contradictions are patently false. Our generation seeks to overthrow this law to steal absolute knowledge and truth. God and the Bible use the law of contradiction, or noncontradiction (Prov 8:8; II Tim 2:13; Tit 1:2; I John 2:21).

E. The third rule of logic is the law of excluded middle. Any statement must be either true or false; it cannot be something other than true or false. There are not three options regarding a statement. There is not a vague middle ground where something is sort of true and sort of false. We must determine any statement to be either true or false. Our generation seeks to find a neutral ground between true and false to allow every sort of idea and opinion as valid or true. But this law demands a statement to be true or false. The Bible uses the law of excluded middle (Judges 24:15; I Kings 18:21; Matt 6:24; 12:30; II Cor 6:16).

F. The fourth rule of logic is the law of logical inference. If A=B, and B=C, then A=C. Any argument by analogy uses this law. It is a very common form of reasoning, and a necessary form once we leave pure axioms. This law assumes the identify law for B. The Bible uses the law of logical inference (Matt 12:1-8; 22:15-22; Mark 2:23-28).

G. Deductive reasoning, arguing from general propositions to particular facts, is the most powerful and certain form of reasoning, for it begins with axioms of truth and applies them to individual cases. It is generally the method of Bible interpretation. The syllogism is a common way of showing deductive reasoning, which can also include Venn diagrams and other symbolic representations.
    1. As the identify theory in math states, if A = B and B = C, then A = C.
    2. Spot is a dog; dogs cannot talk; therefore, Spot cannot talk.
    3. Baseball players are rich; John Doe plays baseball; therefore, John Doe is rich.
    4. However, consider this variation. Baseball players are rich; John Doe is rich; therefore, John Doe plays baseball. This is illogical and false. John is a doctor!
    5. God created all things (John 1:3); I am thing (Acts 17:26); God created me.
    6. The wages of sin is death (Rom 6:23); I have sinned (3:23); I have earned death.
    7. Jesus died for sinners, and Judas Iscariot was a sinner, but it does not necessarily follow that Jesus died for Judas, since it was not stated that Jesus died for every sinner without exception. The major premise was too vague.

H. Inductive reasoning, arguing from particular facts to general propositions, is a weaker form of reasoning. Its conclusions are not as authoritative or certain, for that would require complete knowledge of the case, which is generally not possible.
    1. Do saints sin after conversion? By looking at the lives of many saints in both Testaments, and seeing that they sinned, we may conclude that no man can live perfectly after conversion. But we run into at least two quick problems. There are Bible characters without sins mentioned. Do we consider them? And, we have not absolutely proved our point, for we have not examined every saint.
    2. On the other hand, we can settle the issue certainly by deductively reasoning from I John 1:8-10 that all saints will continue to sin after conversion.
    3. Great caution must be exercised with inductive reasoning in the Bible, especially in the absence of a general proposition covering the case. For how do you know you have "sampled" the Bible adequately? Properly interpreted the sample? And correctly drawn the right conclusion? And identified all the exceptions? Beware!
    4. Men love inductive reasoning in the Bible to find verses that support the opinions they have already formed. They go to the Bible, not to find what God has declared, but to find Bible support for what they have chosen to believe.
    5. The only safe method of using inductive reasoning with the Bible is to not begin with a hypothesis already formed, unless it is based on an axiom of Scripture.

IV. Consider the Scriptural examples of reasoning by God, Jesus, and His prophets and apostles; and let anyone who thinks truth is found any other way be confounded by these examples.
    A. See the numerous references provided above, in two categories, under the first point.
    B. God requested Israel to reason with Him about mercy and judgment (Isaiah 1:16-20).
    C. God called skeptics to bring forth their best arguments for idols (Isaiah 41:1,21-29).
    D. Paul shows his method of reasoning from the Scriptures at Thessalonica (Acts 17:2-3).
        1. This passage is very important. Here the greatest apostle of the Christian faith shows us his standard methods in persuading men to accept the truth of Jesus.
        2. Reasoning was not exceptional for Paul, but rather very typical and common.
        3. He reasoned – he employed logical argumentation to convince his hearers.
        4. He reasoned out of the Scriptures – he assumed them as totally true and valid.
        5. He opened – brought forward assertions and conclusions to present his case.
        6. He alleged – brought forth evidence to prove his assertions and conclusions.
        7. These two expressions – opening and alleging – are legal terms for pleading a case in court, with opening remarks and presenting the supporting evidence.
        8. He did not expect them to believe his testimony, even with eyewitness accounts of seeing Him after His resurrection and the miraculous power to heal the sick!
        9. He proved from the Bible that Jesus "must needs" have suffered and risen from the dead. He inductively established the necessity, then provided the fulfillment!

10. True gospel preaching is reasoning out of the Scriptures, not a chalk talk! Not a sob story! Not an art form! Not a sentimental appeal! Not personal testimony!
11. Paul looked for an audience that feared God, for all other audiences are insane.
12. He had results by convincing men that Jesus was truly the Christ of God.

E. Paul disputed in Athens' synagogue and market with several parties (Acts 17:17).
F. Paul took on the best wisdom of the Greeks, especially the Epicurean and Stoick philosophers, at Mars' hill, otherwise known as the Areopagus (Acts 17:18-34).
    1. Here were disciples of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek philosophers.
    2. Here was the most intellectual audience to ever hear the gospel of Jesus Christ.
    3. He opened by accusing them of superstition and ignorance, which was very true!
    4. He assumed the existence of a single, personal, Creator God, an immense Spirit.
    5. He presumed the wise and total sovereignty of God in His providence over men.
    6. He rejected all the Greek manmade idols, temples, and worship as poppycock.
    7. He rejected any thoughts of Greek superiority by lumping all mankind together.
    8. He quoted a minor Greek poet, but no Bible, when it served his argument.
    9. He condemned the ignorance of all men about this in the past and present.
    10. He gave an "invitation" of the coming judgment of the world by Jesus Christ.
    11. He introduced the resurrection of Christ as the proof of His coming judgment.
    12. The particular tools of logic that he used would make an interesting study.
    13. Most of the hearers rejected and mocked him, but some believed and are named.
    14. But Paul could not be answered! They had to mock him! Let this stir your soul!
    15. With Jews, he presumed Scripture; with philosophers, he presumed God.
G. Paul reasoned in the synagogue and persuaded two classes of hearers (Acts 18:4).
H. Apollos used eloquence and might in the Scriptures to convince Jews (Acts 18:24,28).
I. Paul reasoned, disputed, and persuaded at Ephesus in two different places (Acts 19:8-9).
J. Paul reasoned of several matters that left Felix the governor trembling (Acts 24:25).
K. Paul expounded and persuaded regarding God's kingdom to the Jews (Acts 28:23).
L. Peter told every believer to be ready to give a reason of their hope to men (I Peter 3:15).
M. Solomon wrote excellent things in truth for words of certainty in answers (Pr 22:17-21).
N. Elihu patiently considered the false reasoning of Job and his three friends, before cutting loose with his own opinion to confound their fallacious reasoning (Job 32:1-22).
O. Luke wrote Theophilus to add further evidence to what he had been taught, so he would be established in the certainty of the Christian religion (Luke 1:1-4).
P. Nobility in God's mind is searching and proving things before believing them, which leaves feelings in the realm of the simple and base (Acts 17:11-12).
Q. Reasoning is not an option; it is a command for us to prove all things, which is to reason about the

validity of the arguments and evidence of things (I Thess 5:21).

R. Jesus was the Master logician and rhetorician of all time, when it came to Scripture and logical defense of truth; it would be a great and extensive study to review His glorious use of Scripture and reason to teach truth and confound enemies (Matt 7:28-29; 12:7; 21:27,45; 22:46; Mark 2:27; 12:34; Luke 2:46-47; 13:17; 14:6; 20:39-40; 21:14-15; 24:32,45; John 8:7-9).

V. Consider the examples of Scriptural reasoning to declare and prove a doctrinal argument.

A. Consider how often the prophets reasoned by analogy with Israel to aggravate their offences (Isaiah 1:3; Jeremiah 3:1; Ezekiel 16; 23; Malachi 1:6).

B. Jesus argued from the lesser to the greater with grass and men (Matt 6:28-30), evil fathers and God the Father (Matt 7:9-11), and sparrows and men (Matt 10:29-31).

C. Paul argued from the lesser to the greater with condemnation and righteousness and temporal and permanent (II Cor 3:9,11), the blood of animals and that of Christ (Heb 9:13-14), and a voice on earth and a voice from heaven (Heb 12:25).

D. Jesus argued from the greater to the lesser with masters and servants (Matt 10:24-25).

E. Paul argued from the greater to the lesser with judgment of angels and men (I Cor 6:3).

F. Jesus argued deductively that Christ would have to be more than David's Son, since David by inspiration called Him Lord (Matthew 22:41-46).

G. Jesus argued about the rank of miracles – forgiving sins or healing (Matthew 9:1-7).

H. Jesus used logical arguing when defending against a Pharisees' charge (Matt 12:24-30).

1. He began by arguing from analogy, with kingdoms, houses, and nations (25-26).
2. Then He used the law of rational inference to apply the analogy to Satan (26).
3. And He brought his first powerful conclusion by reductio ad absurdum (25-26).
4. He raised another argument from analogy, by comparing to their gypsies (27).
5. He made use again of rational inference of God's kingdom by power (28-29).
6. He made use of another analogy of a strong man's house and taking it (29).
7. He used the law of contradiction to condemn any hypocritical position (30).
8. He used the law of excluded middle to condemn any position of neutrality (30).

I. Peter argued inductively (from particular facts to a general proposition) that Jesus Christ was indeed risen from the dead (Acts 2:22-32). These particulars were (1) David said he would never see corruption, (2) David is dead and corrupted, (3) David was a prophet, and (4) God had promised a Son of David that would sit on his throne as the Christ of God. Therefore, David told a long time ago of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which we have witnessed and declare unto you.

J. Paul used a similar line of reasoning in Acts 13:32-39 about Jesus Christ's resurrection.

K. Paul reasoned extensively in the book of Hebrews. It may well be the strongest piece of persuasive literature ever written. Consider how he established a rest for the New Testament saints (Heb 4:1-9). Consider how he used analogies for the greater burden of the New Testament (Heb 2:1-3; 6:4-6; 10:26-31; 12:25-29). Consider "therefore" (16 times), "wherefore" (13 times), "if" and "then" (3 times).

L. Paul argued deductively (from general propositions to particular cases) that God has changed His covenant dealings with Israel (Heb 8:7-13). He argued that (1) "new" means what is replaced is old, (2) what is old is no longer of value or service, and (3) therefore the new covenant had put away the former covenant.

M. Paul used the occasion of "ascended" in Psalm 68:18 to briefly reason a proof of the incarnation and humiliation of Jesus Christ in this world (Ephesians 4:9-10).

N. Paul reasoned deductively regarding the priesthood of Jesus Christ and Moses' law in such a way that the conclusion was a "necessity" (Hebrews 7:11-14).

O. This very short list of examples could be multiplied greatly, as the Bible is full of them.

VI. Consider some applications of Bible reasoning that help us interpret God's revealed will for us.

A. Let us consider divorce and remarriage inductively. Jesus taught plainly the principle of mercy (Matt 12:7) and the principle of intent (Mark 2:27), when justifying the breaking of the Sabbath. The Sabbath and marriage are very similar institutions, by virtue of their inclusion in the Ten Commandments, their heavy emphasis in Scripture, and their typical fulfillments in the New Testament. Breaking the Sabbath was justified by Christ, even for activities not expressly permitted by Scripture: the principles of mercy and intent were sufficient. David even ate the shewbread by these principles (Matt 12:3-4). Therefore, we conclude that marriages may deteriorate to the point where they no longer serve their purpose and should be broken. The fact that Christ allowed only one exception for fornication (in Matthew) does not overthrow this reasoning. He allowed no exceptions at all in Mark 10:11 and Luke 16:18; Paul added the exception of desertion specifically by inspiration; and He used the same type of absolute language when condemning improper swearing (Matthew 5:33-37) and establishing the Sabbath commandment in the beginning (Exodus 20:8-11). While such a use of inductive reasoning must be applied with great care and wisdom, the Scriptures nevertheless justify it plainly.

B. Let us consider Moses' marriage to the Ethiopian deductively. God divided the three races (Gen 9:27-27; 10:32), the world's language groups (Gen 11:8-9), and the nations (Gen 10:32; Acts 17:26-27). God divided the earth (Gen 10:25; Deut 32:8). God sometimes allowed things that He did not intend or consider as ideal. He allowed polygamy (II Sam 12:8), and He allowed Israel to have a king (I Sam 8:6-22). God is merciful in situations where human nature is stressed (Exodus 22:2; I Sam 21:1-6). Therefore, we conclude in the case of Moses that we have an exception to God's plan for marriage, and it should not be used as an example of what we can do lightly.

C. Some have taken Christ's example of humility and service by washing the disciples' feet as a mandate for churches of the New Testament to have foot-washing services (John 13:1-17). Since washing the saints' feet is also mentioned in I Timothy 5:10, they falsely assume this text further proves it is an ordinance of the gospel. However, by elementary reasoning, we can easily deduce that this latter passage rather precludes foot washing from being a public ordinance of the church. Paul in I Timothy 5:9-10 gave the conditions necessary to qualify widows as widows indeed for support by the church. Since these requirements identify exceptional widows from unqualified widows, the marks themselves must not be true of the entire congregation. The list of qualifications does not contain any general requirements true of all church widows, since such qualifications would serve no purpose of identifying special widows. Therefore, we conclude that foot washing

was definitely not an ordinance of public worship in New Testament churches.

VII. Fallacies of reasoning are an excellent way to be a critical thinker and learn practical logic.
   A. Again, this section could be multiplied indefinitely. It is up to the serious student to pursue the study of logical fallacies further than the few examples given here.
   B. God is eternal. Jesus is God. Therefore Jesus is eternal. Where is the error? The error is assuming that Jesus is simply or only God: He is the Godman, and as such He is not eternal, for His humanity had a definite beginning with Mary.
   C. Jesus died for sinners. Judas was a sinner. Then Jesus died for Judas. Where is the error? The error is assuming that Jesus died for all sinners without exception.
   D. Since God loves the world, He loves you. What is the faulty premise slipped in? The faulty premise is "the world" means everyone without exception.
   E. Learn how to identify non-sequiturs, or arguments not in sequence, which are arguments without logical connections and not making any sense.
      1. Get a load of Matthew 28:19-20 used to teach baptismal-membership. Some argue that baptism must cause church membership or baptized disciples could not keep Christ's commandments that pertain to church membership. Consider such folly carefully. Obviously each baptized convert is responsible only for those commandments that apply to his situation. If this argument did prove their point, it would also prove that baptism caused marriage, so that all baptized converts could keep the commandments pertaining to marriage.
      2. Get a load of Acts 2:47 used to teach baptismal-membership. Some argue that if church membership results in salvation, then it must have resulted from baptism, which also results in salvation (Mark 16:16). If this connection proves baptismal membership, then by connecting Matthew 24:13 we can also teach that baptism causes guaranteed perseverance.
      3. False reasoning can either be (1) very crafty in its design to avoid detection or (2) so foolish as to eliminate any reasonable starting point. Do not be discouraged with initial perplexity at a given argument. One of the best and simplest books on fallacies of reasoning is Don't You Believe It by A.J. Hoover.
   F. Any reasoning from Scripture must agree with Scripture, so don't get waylaid.
      1. There are no contradictions in the Bible, so remember rule #1.
      2. There is no substitute for knowing the whole Bible. Then you can easily compose inductive reasoning, and you can easily think of exceptions that overthrow the false reasoning of others.
   G. The fallacy of "faulty dilemma" wrongly assumes only two possibilities, when in reality there are one or more possibilities between the two extremes.
      1. The Sadducees, attempting a reductio ad absurdum, created a faulty dilemma, which Jesus neatly crushed (Matt 22:30).
      2. Some ridicule election by reducing salvation to freewill or living any way you want, not recognizing the need for evidence.
      3. The error in a faulty dilemma is in the word "or," when they are more options.
   H. The fallacy of "begging the question" is reasoning in a circle by assuming the conclusion as a

premise. It is saying A=B, without evidence. Look for assumptions without proof.

1. Seventh-Day Adventists will reject your use of Colossians 2:16, since obviously those must be special feast day Sabbaths! Why? Because God would not treat weekly Sabbaths as a matter of liberty. Don't let these heretics do that to you!
2. Obviously, the wine in Psalm 104:14-15 must be non-alcoholic; otherwise God could not commend its use! Don't you love them!

I. The fallacy of "argumentum ad hominem," against the man, attacks a man's character.
   1. When all else fails, some reason, just attack your opponent's personal life.
   2. It has been truly said, "You can prove I'm the Devil's brother, and you still haven't answered my argument."
   3. Festus condemned Paul's speech to Agrippa by calling him mad (Acts 26:24).
   4. The Jews said Jesus was a Samaritan, a winebibber, and had a devil, as character assassinations, for they could not answer Him (John 7:20; 8:48; Matt 11:18-19).

J. The fallacy of "poisoning the well" is tainting the source of an argument.
   1. It is a little different from attacking a man's character, as in ad hominem.
   2. Nathanael was guilty of initially rejecting Jesus merely by His origin from Nazareth (John 1:46). Hearing the unpopular town he didn't like, he rebuffed Philip's enthusiasm. He didn't even ask for further evidence!
   3. A common fallacy today against independent churches is to poison the well by using the inflammatory and condemnatory slur of cult, which has such a moving definition as to be of no force at all. But it is used over and over by scorners.

K. The fallacy of *argumentum ad baculum*, appeal to force, is "argument of the club."
   1. It is a Muslim specialty. Instead of persuading us infidels to convert, they grew their cult by the point and edge of a scimitar.
   2. The Roman Catholic Inquisition was based on this form of "reasoning." Either deny all you believe and have written or be burned at the stake!

L. The *argumentum ad verecundiam*, an "argument to revered authority," means nothing to us, unless it appeals to the authority of Holy Scripture! We revere only Jesus Christ!
   1. Scripture blasts the opinions of any or all men (Job 32:21-22; Ps 119:99-100,128; Is 8:20; Rom 3:4; I Tim 6:3-5). They mean nothing to us.
   2. We reject Rome's church "fathers," who collectively can be reduced to absurdity easily, given their many differences, as so much blither and blather, twiddle and twaddle. It is a shame that Protestants nurse at their breasts as well.
   3. We don't care what "good and godly men of the past" think about our theology or practice any more than what doctors thought would "cure" our first president.
   4. All creeds, confessions, counsels, conferences, and confabs do not compare to Scripture. They are meaningless mumbo-jumbo of men who need the security of large groups to take a stand, within the group, of course!

VIII. Consider a few miscellaneous aspects of logical reasoning to conclude our study of this subject.

A. What do Luke 16:31 and II Tim 2:25-26 teach about logic? God must grant repentance for men to be recovered from Satan and opposing themselves. We can only do so much.

B. How do you get men to ask a reason of your hope (I Peter 3:15)? Live a holy life!

For further reading and study:

Simple introduction to logic via FAQs

Introduction to inductive and deductive reasoning.

Examples of fallacies in reasoning.

A collection of logic links with descriptions.

← Rule #5
Rule #7 →