

The letters 'JTLL' are rendered in a large, bold, green, sans-serif font. The 'J' is a simple hook. The 'T' is a solid block with a vertical stem. The 'L' is a solid block with a vertical stem and a horizontal base. The 'L' is a solid block with a vertical stem and a horizontal base.

JTLL  
JOURNAL OF TRANSFORMATIVE  
LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP

Journal of Transformative Learning and Leadership (JTLL)  
Volume 1, Number 1, Fall 2023  
Digital Edition

A Varsity Publication in partnership with  
**Exegetica Publishing**  
2023

**Journal of Transformative Learning and Leadership (JTLL)**

Digital Edition

ISSN 2836-1539

Volume 1, Number 1, Fall 2023 – Digital Edition

Copyright ©2023, Vyrity

**JTLL Open Access Policy**

The Journal of Transformative Learning and Leadership (JTLL), a Vyrity publication, is Open Access (fulfilling the DOAJ definition of open access). Vyrity allows for immediate free access to the Digital Edition of JTLL, permitting any user to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose.

The Journal of Transformative Learning and Leadership (JTLL) is a twice-per-year, peer review academic journal, for the advancement of understanding and applying transformative learning to educational and leadership contexts in diverse disciplines.

#### **JTLL Mission**

The JTLL serves as a scholarly forum for the refinement and dissemination of research pertaining to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary implications of transformative learning and its applications for leadership in diverse contexts.

#### **JTLL Core Values**

The JTLL espouses the essential idea that learning that transforms is best understood through Biblical descriptions and processes. The JTLL is thus committed to refinement and dissemination of research and applications from the platform of the Biblical worldview in every discipline engaged. The JTLL also is rooted in the idea that those engaging in transformative learning ought also to be well equipped and active in transformative leadership – the application of transformative learning principles in the processes of assisting and guiding other individuals and communities in their own transformative growth.

#### **JTLL Editorial Board** (In Alphabetical Order)

##### **Christopher Cone, ThD, PhD, PhD**

President, Professor of Transformative Learning and Leadership – VyrSity

##### **Jamie Ervin, EdD**

Chief Academic Officer, Professor of Transformative Learning and Leadership – VyrSity

##### **Allan Henderson, EdD**

Educator, Author, Entrepreneur

##### **S. Michael Houdmann, ThM, DMin (Studies)**

Founder, GotQuestions.org

##### **Paul Miles, DMin**

Founder, International Society for Biblical Hermeneutics

##### **Mike Stallard, PhD**

Vice President for International Ministries, FOI

##### **Christine Tan, PhD, PhD**

President, GRACE School and College (Philippines)

##### **Paul Weaver, PhD**

Associate Professor of Bible Exposition, Dallas Theological Seminary

#### **Research and Article Submission Standards and Style Requirements**

Submissions to the JTLL should be submitted publish-ready in the style (Chicago, Turabian, APA, MLA) typical for work in the discipline(s) that the article addresses. As a multidisciplinary journal, the JTLL evaluates style on a per-article basis. The JTLL Editorial Board will prioritize research and article submissions that demonstrate alignment with the JTLL Mission and Core Values. Submissions must be received by published call for papers due date to receive consideration for the upcoming issue, and no guarantee of publication is made. Proposals and articles may be submitted to the JTLL Editorial Board via email at [jtll@vyrSity.com](mailto:jtll@vyrSity.com).



# Table of Contents

JTLL, Volume 1, Number 1, Fall 2023

Digital Edition

1. EDITOR'S PREFACE: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING – Cone.....7-11
  
2. THE LIFE AND THEOLOGICAL METHOD OF LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER, PART 1 (INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND) – Gunn.....13-29
  
3. THE CREATOR/CREATION DISTINCTION: AN ONTOLOGICAL BASIS FOR PROPER TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP – Miles.....31-46
  
4. THE IMPORTANCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF A BIBLICALLY DERIVED INTERPRETIVE METHOD AS MODELED THROUGH SYMBOLS WITHIN THE BOOK OF REVELATION – Oglesby.....47-69
  
5. THE APPLICATION OF ADULT LEARNING PRINCIPLES IN EFFECTIVE PREACHING, PART 1 (SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY) – DeVille.....71-96



THE CREATOR/CREATION DISTINCTION:  
AN ONTOLOGICAL BASIS FOR PROPER  
TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP

*Paul Miles, DMin*

INTRODUCTION

The distinction between the Creator and His creation is a characteristic of the biblical worldview that sets it apart from other religions of the Ancient Near East. As such, it is the proper basis for transformative learning and leadership. In the alternatives, man deifies the cosmos and then mythologically depicts life being formed by gods and from gods. These two ontological schools of thought can be labeled *Creator/creation distinction* (CCD) and *continuity of being* (COB). The distinction between the biblical God and His creation has worldview implications beyond ontology as many differences in epistemology, ethics, and politics that are found in alternative worldviews can ultimately be traced to their presuppositions of continuity of being.

When a man accepts the CCD, he recognizes that the Creator's Word is the authoritative source of epistemological truth, that proper ethics come from the Creator, and that politics exists as a stewardship under the Creator. Continuity ontology diminishes authoritative epistemology, which compromises the basis for ethics and gives way to political strife where pagan kings try to make worldview ends meet by establishing their statuses as supermen through extensive propaganda. The COB worldview extends beyond the Ancient Near East and is the fundamental worldview of evolutionism today, which sees life evolving out of the same primordial substance as the cosmos. The subjectivity that comes with the COB worldview is evident

in current discussions of epistemology, ethics, and politics. If transformative learners are to have fruitful interaction with the world today, they must understand the difference between these two worldviews to relate more effectively as CCD advocates in a COB world.

## CREATOR/CREATION DISTINCTION DESCRIBED

### **A Brief Definition**

The CCD worldview sees a clear distinction between the Creator and His creation. This is the biblical worldview. In eternity past, before any acts of creation, God was the only thing that existed. When He created matter, He did not form it from Himself, but rather created everything to be entirely distinct from Himself. The doctrine of God's aseity speaks of His independence from anything else for existence.<sup>1</sup> Creation is subject to its Creator, so man must turn to God's revelation if he is to have a proper epistemological basis for his worldview. Therefore, the Bible sets the authoritative basis for ethics and politics.

### **Biblical Support**

God is infinitely holy. The word *qâdôsh* (קדוש), often translated *holy*, means to be set apart or above as seen, for example in the words of Hannah: "There is no one holy [*qâdôsh*] like the Lord, Indeed, there is no one besides You, Nor is there any rock like our God" (1 Sam. 2:2). God's holiness is active in the creation narrative as He created the material of the universe *ex nihilo* (Gen. 1:1–8). Man was formed out of the dust that God created and he was resuscitated by God Himself (Gen. 2:7). Since

---

<sup>1</sup> John Feinberg, *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God, The Foundations of Evangelical Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2001), 239–243.



the dust is distinct from God, man was not made of God material and since the resuscitation creation act was unique for mankind, man is a uniquely above the earth, plants, and animals (Gen. 1:28–30; 2:20) while remaining distinctly below God (Ps. 24:1–3).

God's ontology of holiness carries over to the nature of epistemology because God's Word is characterized by His holiness. Since holiness in its most fundamental sense is about division, it should come as no surprise that the author of Hebrews compares the Bible to a sword that divides (Heb. 4:12). Since God is immutable (Num. 23:19), His Word is immutable (Isa. 40:8).

An epistemology that is based on the Bible has ramifications in ethics and politics. Paul makes a clear statement about the Bible's relationship to ethics: "All Scripture is inspired by God and beneficial for teaching, for rebuke, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the man *or woman* of God may be fully capable, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16–17). The Bible also gives the basis for human government in the Noahic covenant (Gen. 9:1–17) and the basis for national distinctions (Gen. 11:1–9), so that nations have governments that are led by fallen humans, but should be subject to one Holy God.

### **False views in Christendom**

One of many ways how Christian theologians are compromising on CCD is through the false doctrine of panentheism, which John Feinberg describes:

...one of the hallmarks of panentheistic views, whether in process theology or elsewhere, is that God interpenetrates everything that exists. Transcendence is downplayed dramatically. ...since [God's] body is our

world, he not only empathizes with us when we suffer but actually feels our pains and rejoices in our joys. This is no remote, unattached, disinterested God.<sup>2</sup>

Feinberg rightly noted that panentheism was common among process theologians, but it is worth noting that since 2001 when his book was published, some trends have remarketed panentheism as the basis for Christian ecojustice.<sup>3</sup> While the typical transformative learner may not have heard of process theology, he has almost certainly been pressured by a loved one to support ecojustice, so as worldly justice becomes more common, one should anticipate that evangelicals will increasingly drift toward panentheism and thereby compromise the distinction between God and His creation.

## CONTINUITY OF BEING DESCRIBED

### **A Brief Definition**

The COB worldview is an invention of man that sees nature and divinity as coming from a common source. Often there is believed to be preexistent matter which is deified. Then, through a series of acts, this god-matter is divided into other gods and bits of nature. Eventually, life comes from nature which ultimately has its common source in god-matter. Since there is an accepted plurality of gods with conflicting personalities, there is a constant struggle for authority. Since there is no clear and superior authority, the epistemological standard is lowered. Politicians under this worldview appeal to

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>3</sup> For example, see Catherine Keller, *Political Theology of the Earth: Our Planetary Emergency and the Struggle for a New Public* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018), 142–148.

their gods for authority over man, but since the gods are subjective, so are their rulership and laws.

### Examples From Paganism

The Egyptian creation myths feature Atum, a primordial water god, who creates the twin gods Shu and Tefnut,<sup>4</sup> who go on to mate and produce the Ogdoad of eight Egyptian deities. The accounts are conflicting; in PT 527, Atum creates Shu and Tefnut through cosmic masturbation, while in PT 600, he sneezes and spits them into existence. The Memphite theology puts Ptah as the creator of Atum. Some have tried to reconcile the contradicting accounts among Egyptian texts,<sup>5</sup> but the most likely explanation is simply that these accounts were thought up by perverse men over centuries who could not keep their stories straight.

Likewise, the Mesopotamian gods came from nature like humans, but they possessed superhuman powers. While they were superhuman, they were not characterized by attributes such as omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, or immutability. They were ethically capricious; sometimes they were benevolent, and sometimes they were spiteful.<sup>6</sup>

The Egyptian creation myths bring the ideology of continuity into Egyptian politics. For example, one of the hieroglyphic titles for the king's wives was  $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆏}} \overline{\text{𓆑}} \overline{\text{𓆒}}$  *drt ntr* which consists of two elements:  $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆏}} \overline{\text{𓆑}}$  *ntr*, meaning *god*, and  $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆏}} \overline{\text{𓆑}}$  *drt*, meaning *hand*, so that  $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆏}} \overline{\text{𓆑}} \overline{\text{𓆒}}$  *drt ntr* means *hand of god*. This phrase is a

<sup>4</sup> Joyce Tyldesley, "The Role of Egypt's Dynastic Queens," in *Women in Antiquity: Real Women across the Ancient World*, eds. Stephanie Lynn Budin and Jean Macintosh Turfa (London: Routledge, 2016), 275–276.

<sup>5</sup> Ragnhild Bjerre Finnestad, "Ptah, Creator of the Gods," *Numen*, 23:2 (1976), 81–113.

<sup>6</sup> Jeremiah Unterman, *Justice for All: How the Jewish Bible Revolutionized Ethics* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2017), 1–2.

reference to the masturbation act by which Atum created Shu and Tefnut.<sup>7</sup> This title also put a responsibility on the queen to produce more god-kings: “It has long been recognised that the role of wife to a male god is one that allows the priestess to assume the role of a partner who stimulates the god, allowing him to regenerate.”<sup>8</sup>

### **Continuity Of Being Today**

COB worldviews are still evident in religions of pantheism, polytheism, animism, etc., but as the Western world embraces atheism, one should understand that this too is a COB worldview. A short article from an atheist perspective says much:

Our solar system formed 4.5 billion years ago in much the same way dust bunnies amass and assemble beneath bed frames: A few errant bits stick together, eventually building up to form sizable clumps. Below the mattress, static cling is the glue; in the cosmos, gravity is. The first of these celestial scraps came from the big bang, which sent the five lightest elements careening into space to make early stars. Through those sparklers’ lives and explosive demises came enough stellar dust to create the heavier elements that comprise almost everything we run into in our day-to-day existence. Understanding this series of events has allowed scientists to trace the origins of atoms in our solar system to one or more cosmological phenomena.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Joyce Tyldesley, “The Role,” 275–276.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 275.

<sup>9</sup> Sara Chodosh, “We Are Made Of Star Stuff,” *Popular Science*, 290:3 (Summer 2018): 104.

The “cosmological phenomena” are not acts of gods per se, but there is a continuity of existence which positions man at ontological oneness with his source. Thomas Aquinas built a logical argument from the CCD perspective that whatever the first mover is should be recognized as God<sup>10</sup> and there is a parallel to Aquinas’ argument in modern atheism. The atheist recognizes the first mover as an impersonal force applied to preexistent (or self-appearing) matter rather than a personal God. It turns out that the atheist’s epistemological results are similar to those of the pagan: the primordial matter becomes the higher authority that is inaccessible unless it is explained by human sages who are recognized as the information authorities who have the responsibility to inform other men about their mythological origins.

## WORLDVIEW RAMIFICATIONS OF DISTINCTION ONTOLOGY

### **Effects On Epistemology**

Since the biblical God is absolute and His Word is absolute, the biblical worldview has an epistemology that can be stated in terms of absolutes:

Interpretive method is an integral factor in applying a Biblical epistemology. If the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Prov 1:7), and if wisdom is knowable and discernable (Prov 1:2), then the fear of the Lord is knowable and discernable. If knowledge and understanding come from His mouth (Prov 2:6), and if knowledge and understanding are rooted in the fear of the Lord (Prov 9:10), then the fear of the Lord is discovered in His word. If these two syllogisms are valid

---

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I.2.3.

and true, then the word of God (at least insofar as it considers the fear of the Lord) is knowable and discernible.<sup>11</sup>

The biblical prescription may not always be easy to understand, but the shortcoming will always fall on the interpreter who reads the Bible, not on the God who wrote the Bible.

### Effects On Ethics

Monotheistic CCD recognizes a single God who is the objective standard of authoritative truth; what God says is right and wrong is absolutely right and absolutely wrong. Moreland and Craig summarize the attributes of moral absolutism:

(1) Moral statements have truth values that make no reference to the beliefs of individuals or cultures. (2) There are objectively good/bad arguments for the truth of moral positions people take. (3) Nonmoral facts (e.g., persons exist) and moral facts (irreducibly moral properties like goodness) are relevant to the assessment of the truth value of moral statements. (4) When two moral statements conflict, only one can be true. (5) There is a single true morality. The main thing to keep in mind here is that this first understanding of *absolute* emphasizes the fact that we discover moral values, we do not merely invent moral beliefs. This is the most fundamental sense of the term used by moral absolutists.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Christopher Cone, *Priority in Biblical Hermeneutics and Theological Method* (Raymore, MO: Exegetica Publishing, 2018.), 215–216.

<sup>12</sup> J. P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017), 434.

The biblicist does not invent his ethics but derives ethics from the Bible which is authoritative because God gave His Word.

### **Effects On Politics**

The least advanced form of State has a human monarch who is the absolute ruler over the land and the result is frequently despotism.<sup>13</sup> From the COB perspective, pagan kings would frequently appeal to continuity to deify themselves to a higher level than their subjects; however, if a monarch would be subject to God, then his ethics would shift to one of personal accountability to an absolute higher authority. Such accountability is often the remedy to despotism as seen in the cases of Israel's kings who followed God.

Even good kings are still fallen, though, and so there is an eschatological hope of a coming kingdom where God Himself will rule as a righteous dictator over the world, but in the meantime, God has granted authority to human governments as a check against evil (Rom. 13:1–7). A good form of government has been demonstrated in classic American thought. The Declaration of Independence presupposes a distinct Creator has endowed men with certain rights, and so the American Constitution is framed in a way to protect human rights which align well with a biblical understanding of ethics and divine institutions.

Theological attacks against that which is considered conservative American thought are often rooted in faulty views of the biblical God. For example, in a recent publication, a liberation theologian renounced the personality of the Holy Spirit in favor of a view that sees the Holy Spirit as an

---

<sup>13</sup> Arthur Christensen, *Politics and Crowd-Morality: A study in the Philosophy of Politics*, trans. A. Cecil Curtis (Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books, 2001), 120.

impersonal attitude<sup>14</sup> or attitudes that become manifest among different religions<sup>15</sup> any time a movement of liberation occurs at a political level.<sup>16</sup> This is only one of many examples of theologians trying to penetrate Christianity with woke political agendas, so there are many other doctrines at stake. At any rate, whenever a theologian tries to push the Leftist agenda into Christianity, he does so from a low view of God that carries over to a low view of Scripture that allows for enough of a subjective interpretation that the theologian is free to introduce any political agenda to the text.

## WORLDVIEW RAMIFICATIONS OF CONTINUITY ONTOLOGY

### **Effects On Epistemology**

Continuity ontology has immediate ramifications for epistemology. In pagan COB, ultimately “mankind becomes the architect of deity”<sup>17</sup> since man is the author of pagan religious texts. COB lacks the clear boundary of authority that comes with distinction ontology, so COB relies on subjective and often contradictory texts that serve to teach man’s current agenda rather than absolute truth. Pagan prophets often were used for propaganda purposes:

Rather than predicting a future ideal king, the text [*The Marduk Prophecy*] was apparently written toward the

---

<sup>14</sup> Mark Lewis Taylor, “Spirit,” in *Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., eds. William Cavanaugh and Peter Scott (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2019), 419.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 429.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 427.

<sup>17</sup> Henry M. Morris III, *The Book of Beginnings: A Practical Guide to Understanding Genesis* (Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2016), 24.



end of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I (1126– 1103 BCE) in order to serve as “a propaganda piece” to support his campaigns and to glorify his reign. As such, it is not comparable to the biblical prophecies of redemption which originate prior to the return to the land under Persian rule, even though those prophecies will look forward to agricultural increase and a just society.<sup>18</sup>

Likewise, Sumerian restoration lament texts depict conversations between lesser gods and greater gods, not men.<sup>19</sup> The gods sat on a spectrum of varying degrees of greatness, but humans would be too weak to attempt an appeal to the greater gods. In reality, there is only one God and he is distinct from His creation, but He wants fellowship with man, so He overcomes the communication barrier Himself through divine revelation directly to unworthy man.

### **Effects On Ethics**

Since Egyptians did not have a singular God who was distinct, their soteriology was one of self-righteousness. Ma'at was both the goddess and personification of truth and the Egyptians believed that to live forever, their hearts would need to be lighter than the feather of Ma'at. To assist in these weighing ceremonies, the Egyptians would make confessions about their lives which became a source of ethical codes among the Egyptians.<sup>20</sup> Soteriology was a matter of doing good deeds, but more importantly about not doing bad deeds. On what grounds, though, could an Egyptian be good enough or bad

---

<sup>18</sup> Jeremiah Unterman, *Justice for All*, 148.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>20</sup> For a recent example, see the door lintel that was published in Bassem Ahmed, “Old Kingdom Door Lintel of Isi at the Egyptian Museum,” *Egyptian Journal of Archaeological and Restoration Studies* 10:1 (2020): 23–27.

enough to determine his ultimate destiny? The system was entirely subjective. In contrast, even the most fundamental aspect of Christian soteriology—that man is saved by grace



Heart-weighing ceremony from *The Book of the Dead of Hunefer*, frame 3. The feather of Ma'at is on the right side of the scale and the container with a heart on the left. Notice how the continuity between pagan gods and nature is evident as the Egyptians combined parts of humans and animals to build their deities. Image from the British Museum.

through faith—is rooted in the CCD aspect of Christianity. Since God is infinitely holy and separate from that which is unholy, man cannot merit righteousness and so he can only be saved by God Himself. Some theologians have tried to syncretize COB ethics of ecojustice into a Christian soteriology, but the result is often a rejection of the biblical view of the atonement. Willis Jenkins is an ecotheologian who redefines the biblical message of the cross from a message that makes it possible to close the gap of holiness through faith to a message that has Christ appointing men to ecojustice:

Inhabiting the reconciliation accomplished by Christ, human relations with all creatures are restored and redeemed. When Christ sets the captives free, he frees them to restorative service in a land damaged by sin. The Christian mission to all the earth means becoming physician and healer to the earth, priests and ministers to all creation.<sup>21</sup>

Nobody is calling for the destruction of the environment, but certain forms of ecotheology, such as Jenkins' proposal above, by necessity redefine Christ's work on the cross and should be rejected as syncretism.

### **Effects On Politics**

Pagan versions of COB politics relied on the divine authority of the king. In Hammurabi's case:

...the prologue and epilogue of *Hammurabi's* Code praise the King as representative of the Gods with the divine mandate to create justice among the people: The Gods had chosen him to be King of Righteousness. Therefore, serious breaches of the Code's penal provisions at the same time were acts of sacrilege against the Gods.<sup>22</sup>

Whatever humans accept as the source of everything ultimately becomes the focal point of political discourse. Such is evident even today in America, where the division between blue and red

---

<sup>21</sup> Willis Jenkins, *Ecologies of Grace: Environmental Ethics and Christian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 89.

<sup>22</sup> Volker Krey, *About Death Penalty Reflections on Legal History: From the Code of Hammurabi and Sumerian Precursors up to Germanic Law, the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2019), 7.

is often framed as a fight on one side by Christians who maintain biblical distinctions, and on another side, which sees life evolving out of a primordial soup into a justice utopia. Laying aside the bipartisan tendencies in American politics, a reliance on Marxist ideology and practice is evident in Jenkins' work as he relates social justice to ecojustice:

Practices of social justice hitherto associated with humanitarian mission—practices like charity, simplicity, economic fairness, political solidarity, and compassion—turn out to be indispensable for rightly perceiving the natural world and doing justice to creation. We have to practice loving the weak and suffering with the oppressed, say ecojustice theologians, in order to understand how God loves creation.<sup>23</sup>

Jenkins' quote goes full circle back to epistemology, as he requires service to the weak and oppressed "in order to understand how God loves creation." God's written revelation is deemed insufficient; understanding is only available to men who promote political agendas that are rooted in a COB understanding of ontology.

## APPLICATION FOR TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERS

### **On The Tendency Toward Deconstruction**

As the deconstructionism trend continues, transformative leaders must prepare their learners for the challenges in a world that urges them to apostasy. It would be impossible to list out every single attack on Christianity, and regardless, as soon as one falsehood is disproven another is bound to take its place. Instead of fighting individual challenges,

---

<sup>23</sup> Willis Jenkins, *Ecologies of Grace*, 68.

a proper response could be to develop a holistic worldview that emphasizes the distinction between the Creator and His creation.

### **That The Social Pressure Begins with Politics and Ethics**

While the logical formation of a worldview begins on the levels of metaphysics and epistemology, social pressure usually occurs at the levels of politics and ethics. As seen by the examples above, politics and ethics are merely results of metaphysics and epistemology. If transformative learners can become well-grounded in biblical ontology, then they should be more resilient to the errors that the world promotes on the levels of ethics and politics where worldview conversations tend to occur.

### **That Transformative Leaders Must Teach Biblical Ontology and Epistemology**

To protect young learners from the trend of deconstruction, it is necessary to teach biblical ontology and epistemology. The examples given above are mostly comparative to ancient pagan worldviews; this is a safe area to draw contrasts since nobody is worshiping the Egyptian gods today. Perhaps transformative leaders would be wise to teach the contrast between Christianity and ancient paganism as an introduction to worldview issues which can then be transferred over to contemporary issues which often have parallels. Also, there is a constant attack on the Bible that accuses the biblical authors of sharing worldviews with the pagans,<sup>24</sup> so having a better familiarity with ancient near eastern religions could be

---

<sup>24</sup> This line of thought is even penetrating evangelicalism. See for example Michael Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015), 44–47.

helpful for defending proper hermeneutics from such accusations.

## CONCLUSION

Worldviews develop from the way things are to the way things ought to be. The way things are can be expressed in terms of metaphysics and epistemology, with ontology being central to metaphysics. The way things ought to be can be expressed in terms of ethics and politics. The Bible declares an ontology of distinction between the Creator and His creation while alternative worldviews blur the distinction to have continuity between the source and the result.

More could be said and more examples could be given, but this framework of distinction versus continuity is a first step in the clarification of the biblical worldview, both against the contemporaries of the biblical authors as well as the contemporaries of the Bible student today. Developing a proper worldview should be a top priority for everyone – but especially biblicists – and transformative leaders should help in this development by studying and teaching the Creator/creation distinction.

THE IMPORTANCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF A  
BIBLICALLY DERIVED INTERPRETIVE METHOD  
AS MODELED THROUGH SYMBOLS  
WITHIN THE BOOK OF REVELATION<sup>1</sup>

*John Oglesby, MA*

ABSTRACT

A Biblically derived interpretive method<sup>2</sup> is founded upon the authority of God as revealed in the Scriptures and is foundational for a Biblical worldview<sup>3</sup>. The outcome of this approach is Traditional Dispensationalism as a framework<sup>4</sup>. The significance of the Biblically derived interpretive method may be most apparent whenever viewing the landscape of eschatological study. Within history, the church's view of end-times has driven their mission as an organization ranging from world domination<sup>5</sup> to complacency<sup>6</sup>. The interpretations are vast and subcategories within eschatology are numerable. However, the method of interpreting symbols is an excellent case study for the

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was formally presented at the 2022 Council on Dispensational Hermeneutics, September 15, 2022, held at Southern California Seminary, El Cajon, California, and is published as presented.

<sup>2</sup> For clarification – the interpretive method itself is drawn from the Scriptures and modeled within.

<sup>3</sup> Note: the interpretive method is not outside of the worldview, leading to a Biblical worldview but is a foundational aspect of a Biblical worldview.

<sup>4</sup> Traditional Dispensationalism may have variations, as other systems of theology. I use this term in a general sense understanding there are differences of opinion within the system itself. It is also worth noting, this system of theology can be wholly found within the study of metaphysics and leads to a particular ethic, both individually and communally.

<sup>5</sup> Dominion Theology is particularly in view here.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Thess. 4:13-5:11.

importance of a biblically derived interpretive method.<sup>7</sup> By identifying and interpreting the symbols found within the book of Revelation, one can understand the outcomes, implications, and significance of utilizing a Biblical hermeneutic model and is the aim of this study.

## INTRODUCTION

Traditional Dispensationalism<sup>8</sup> is the outcome of an interpretive method known as the literal grammatical historical hermeneutic<sup>9</sup> which is consistently applied throughout the whole of Scripture<sup>10</sup>. This interpretive method is grounded upon the authority of God<sup>11</sup> as He has provided this method within

---

<sup>7</sup> This study also shows the importance of the sufficiency of Scripture and may reveal the state of the church in their practice (or lack thereof) of this doctrine.

<sup>8</sup> Traditional Dispensationalism may have variations from person to person, as is seen in other frameworks of theology. However, I use this term in a general sense understanding there are differences of opinion within the system itself. While I would conclude that there is one metaphysical reality as presented in Scripture and unity in accurate understanding amongst brothers and sisters is certainly attainable, there is also always room for growth in one's understanding of the truth. Where one has room for growth, one may find differences amongst other Traditional Dispensationalists.

<sup>9</sup> Some variations are understood in the naming of the method. Some may prefer normative grammatical historical.

<sup>10</sup> Louis Berkhof would seem to agree with this sentiment whenever critiquing dispensational premillennialism in his work, *Systematic Theology*, yet concludes that taking this approach in prophecy is "entirely untenable."

<sup>11</sup> The literal grammatical historical hermeneutic is founded within a Biblical epistemology. This epistemology presents the Biblical God as the source of authority and the Biblical text as His source of special revelation in this dispensation. God has communicated through general revelation, but is limited in what is communicated and interpretable (Rom. 1:18-20). God has also communicated through personal revelation (John 3:19), however, Jesus is no longer physically present. Therefore, the mode of communication which carries God's authority is the Biblical



the Biblical text.<sup>12</sup> To deviate from a Biblically supplied methodology without exegetical reason to do so strips the authority from God (in one's worldview) and gives it to someone or something else.

It is not the purpose of this paper to explore the importance of traditional dispensationalism as a theological system, but instead the importance of the foundation which traditional dispensationalism rests upon and the implications where those foundations lead, if applied consistently.<sup>13</sup> Traditional dispensationalism should be understood as the metaphysical result of a Biblical interpretive method founded upon the authority of the Biblical God. This metaphysical framework then leads to a particular ethic, both individually and communally. This process can arguably be seen most clearly whenever looking at the book of Revelation due to the history of genre's assigned, supernatural nature of the events recorded within it and the figures of speech the author utilizes as he attempts to explain these spiritual realities, and the forward-looking nature of the book. Even further, the landscape of interpretations revolving around symbolism in the book provide

---

text. The focus of this paper certainly is not to discuss the validity of cessationism, but it should be understood this is the position this writer holds to be true.

<sup>12</sup> Christopher Cone, among others, has striven to show this through various projects. Cf. Cone, Christopher, *The Precedent for Literal Grammatical Historical Hermeneutics in Genesis*, drcone.com, <https://drcone.com/2017/08/26/precedent-literal-grammatical-historical-hermeneutics-genesis/>. Likewise, I have presented argument from the book of Revelation, modeling Cone's research method, and concluded that God intends to be understood in a normative, common-sense way. Abner Chou's work, *The Hermeneutics of the Biblical Writers: Learning to Interpret the Scriptures from the Prophets and the Apostles* is also a great work striving towards a similar goal.

<sup>13</sup> Many works have been published on the importance of Biblical hermeneutics and a Biblical epistemology. I hope to present the material in a unique way, taking a truly biblical approach, presenting a methodology that is presented in the Scriptures.

more clarity to the relationship of interpretive methodology and ethical/socio-political implications.

### WHAT'S AT STAKE AND WHERE DOES HERMENEUTICS CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISCUSSION?

At the root of the discussion, authority of one's worldview is in focus and truth is at stake—not in the sense that one is correctly representing reality and one is not (although this is true), but more broadly, constructing a worldview based upon the wrong authority leads to falsehood in every category resulting in a wrongful understanding of reality and wrongful action<sup>14</sup>. Solomonic Literature presents this concept throughout as it focuses on wisdom and knowledge.<sup>15</sup> Solomon begins the book of Proverbs by giving the prerequisite for proper knowledge and understanding—the fear<sup>16</sup> of the Lord.<sup>17</sup> He later reinforces this concept when discussing the acquisition of wisdom.<sup>18</sup> It would seem, based on the context of Proverbs and the use of the term in other passages such as Deuteronomy 2:25, the fear would rightly result from a proper perspective of God. Solomon then continues in His writing to discuss proper living based on proper knowledge and understanding.

---

<sup>14</sup> This can be seen clearly in passages revolving around the Jewish sect known as the Pharisees. Cf. John 5:37–40.

<sup>15</sup> Particularly, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon.

<sup>16</sup> Fear, or *יִרְאָה*, is not simply a reverence for something or someone. It refers to a terror or trembling of someone or something. For example, the same term is used in Deuteronomy as Moses is recounting the words which God had spoken to him. God tells Moses that He is going to put a dread, *תַּפַּח*, and fear of His people upon everyone under the heavens which would result in their trembling. Another example of this fear of God can be seen in Isaiah's encounter of God in Isaiah 6.

<sup>17</sup> Prov 1:7.

<sup>18</sup> Prov 9:10.

The concept of “fear of the Lord” is modelled clearly in Isaiah 6:1–7 as Isaiah “saw the Lord sitting on a throne.”<sup>19</sup> His immediate response was woefulness as he recognized Who he was in the presence of and the condition in which he found himself. Isaiah’s proper view of God led to a proper fear.<sup>20</sup> This fear of God also places the authority in the hands of God as the giver of wisdom and understanding—particularly sourced from the mouth of God.<sup>21</sup> Notice Isaiah’s fear of the Lord led to a particular action—his epistemology (and presumably his metaphysic) resulted in a particular ethic.<sup>22</sup> Also note, after Isaiah was given a position of right standing before God, his action changed from trembling to a confident desire to serve the Lord.<sup>23</sup> This principle is echoed in Romans 12:1-2 as Paul concludes that, because of the reality presented in the previous chapters—namely, the gospel of Jesus Christ—every Christian

---

<sup>19</sup> Isaiah 6:1, NASB. All Scriptural quotes will come from the NASB unless otherwise noted.

<sup>20</sup> Like Isaiah was forgiven, the believer in the gospel of Jesus Christ is cleansed. The body of Christ can now approach the throne of grace with confidence.

<sup>21</sup> Prov 2:5-6.

<sup>22</sup> This relationship between the “is” and “ought” of worldview is a particularly interesting discussion. David Hume popularized the idea that the correlation between the “is” and the “ought” is much more difficult and the gap between the two is much more difficult to cross than one may think. Modern philosopher, Jordan Peterson, posits the idea, in his Maps of Meaning course from the University of Toronto, that our actions are inherently linked to our value system, effectively linking axiology and ethics. However, Peterson then discusses the concept of subconscious values which lead to action. For instance, if one desires to play a game, but believes that games are a waste of time and shouldn’t be played in length, why do they have the desire to play the game? It could be that they are subconsciously valuing the rest, the pleasure of the game, or something else but is unaware of such a value. These are all fascinating discussions, and worth exploring further, but it seems logically, at the very least, our metaphysic leads to a particular action (again, pointing to Romans 12:1-2).

<sup>23</sup> Isa 6:8.

should present themselves as a living sacrifice,<sup>24</sup> for it is only logical to do so. The foundations of one's worldview predictively and consistently *should* lead to particular action as it defines one's understanding of reality.

### **The Relationship Between “Is” and “Ought” Modeled in Eschatological Studies**

This concept can also be seen amongst modern theologians as various interpretations of the book of Revelation and their ethical implications are presented. By simply examining any of the three major schools of thought about the millennial kingdom, one can identify the relationship. At risk of over-simplifying, it seems beneficial to explore post-millennialism as an example.

Post-millennialism is an eschatological belief that Christ will return after the millennial kingdom, which some understand to be a literal thousand years<sup>25</sup>, and some take a more allegorical approach<sup>26</sup>. Either way, before Christ returns, the commission given in Matthew 28 will be successful, the nations will turn to Christ in belief establishing a Christianized

---

<sup>24</sup> Paul continues throughout the remainder of the book to present a proper ethic (how one can present themselves) based on the truths presented beforehand.

<sup>25</sup> Many would divide the time between the first advent of Christ and the second advent of Christ into two sections where in the first, the church is not triumphant, but are triumphant in the second period.

<sup>26</sup> In Sam Waldron's respond to James White's conversion from Amillennialism to Post-millennialism, he presents differences between the two systems but often makes statements such as, "It is this future golden age before Christ returns and in which we do not already live that distinguishes Postmillennialism from Amillennialism. Subtract this idea from Postmillennialism and you might as well call all of us optimistic Amillennialists postmillennial." Amillennialists, practically by definition, take the thousand years as a symbolic amount of time which we currently find ourselves in today.

world and golden age of righteousness, and then He will return. The Savoy Declaration of 1658 presents it this way:

As the Lord in his care and love towards his Church, hath in his infinite wise providence exercised it with great variety in all ages, for the good of them that love him, and his own glory; so according to his promise, we expect that in the latter days, antichrist being destroyed, the Jews called, and the adversaries of the kingdom of his dear Son broken, *the churches of Christ being enlarged, and edified through a free and plentiful communication of light and grace, shall enjoy in this world a more quiet, peaceable and glorious condition than they have enjoyed.*<sup>27</sup> [emphasis mine]

Sam Waldron, the President of Covenant Baptist Theological Seminary, a self-proclaimed amillennialist, writes in response to a recent conversion of a colleague from amillennialism to postmillennialism:

...Amillennialists are postmillennial with regard to the denotation of millennium, but they are not postmillennial with regard to the connotation of millennium. That is, we amils believe that Christ is coming back after the thousand years. We do not, however, believe that this thousand years is what the millenarians conceive it to be. *It is not a great golden age of happiness, peace, prosperity, and righteousness in which such blessedness*

---

<sup>27</sup> The Savoy Declaration, 1658, Ch. 26 para. 5.  
<https://www.creeds.net/congregational/savoy/>.

*is the dominant tone of the world and in which evil is subdued under these things.*<sup>28</sup> [emphasis mine]

Waldron distinguishes postmillennialism and amillennialism by focusing on the success of the church and the golden age of the kingdom. Amillennialism, in Waldron's estimation, does not see the kingdom as a golden age (or a thousand years in its normative form) while postmillennialists do.

Likewise, Boettner, an advocate for postmillennialism, states it this way, "But it does mean that evil in all its many forms eventually will be reduced to negligible proportions, that Christian principles will be the rule, not the exception, and that Christ will return to a truly Christianized world..."<sup>29</sup> It is the responsibility of the Church, in this view, to proclaim the gospel message which will grow more and more successful throughout time, impacting various aspects of culture, society, politics, etc. This view, taken to the extreme, leads to things such as Christian Reconstructionism where it is the responsibility of the church to infiltrate government, establish mosaic law, and reconstruct the world, establishing this period of prosperity.<sup>30</sup> In this more radical view, the church is not simply responsible for ushering in this time of prosperity through the successful spreading of the gospel of Jesus Christ, but much more.

C. Peter Wagner, the leader of the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR), states this in one of his presentations after proposing that the Church *is* currently under a mandate to have

---

<sup>28</sup> Waldron, Sam, *#datpostmil? A Friendly (and Reluctant) Response to James White (and All My Postmillennial Friends)*, cbtseminary.org, March 22, 2021, <https://cbtseminary.org/datpostmil-a-friendly-and-reluctant-response-to-james-white-and-all-my-postmillennial-friends/>.

<sup>29</sup> Boettner, Loraine, *The Millennium*, (P&R Publishing, Phillipsburg, NJ), 1991, p. 14.

<sup>30</sup> See R.J. Rushdoony's work, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, as well as Greg Bahnsen's, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics*.

dominion over the whole earth, “Dominion has to do with control, dominion has to do with rulership, dominion has to do with authority and subduing and it relates to society...dominion means ruling as kings...*now the dominion mandate is another phrase for the Great Commission...it’s talking about transforming society [emphasis mine].*”<sup>31</sup> It is the purpose of the church, in Wagner’s view, to transform societies and nations into Christian nations, establishing theonomies throughout the world. The position of Wagner involves much more than just postmillennialism, as can be seen in the above quote, but postmillennialism is also a keystone doctrine of this position. Shawn Nelson in a paper regarding the NAR states it this way:

The New Apostolic Reformation (NAR) can be characterized as a postmillennial restorationist movement which seeks to restore the so-called lost office of apostle and prophet with the goal of establishing the kingdom of God upon the earth. Six broad values and beliefs of the movement are evaluated in the following order: postmillennialism, restorationism, manufactured continuationism, reconstructionism, experientialism and pragmatism. It is argued [in Nelson’s paper] that postmillennialism is a weak biblical position and that NAR’s brand (“dominionism”) *wrongly places the responsibility of the kingdom on Christians rather than God.*<sup>32</sup> [emphasis mine]

---

<sup>31</sup> C. Peter Wagner, *On Dominionism, a Key Doctrine of the New Apostolic Reformation*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7WboWrp-Cwo>.

<sup>32</sup> Nelson, Shawn, *Six Big Problems With the New Apostolic Reformation*, [isca-apologetics.org](https://www.isca-apologetics.org), <https://www.isca-apologetics.org/sites/default/files/papers/suntereo/Nelson%20-%20New%20Apostolic%20Reformation.pdf>.

It is the belief that the Church is responsible for establishing the kingdom on earth *before* Christ returns, and an understanding of a particular method the Church is to utilize in doing this which leads to restorationist and reconstructionist action or ethic/sociopraxy.<sup>33</sup>

While one of many, embedded deep within this discussion is a more precise mechanism utilized to establish such an understanding of the millennial kingdom and the ethics/sociopraxy associated with that understanding; namely, the interpretation of symbolism. A symbol is an object which is utilized to represent a shared characteristic of the thing in discussion. For example, the sentence, “Satan is a roaring lion” does not intend to communicate that Satan is an actual lion, but the lion is the object which shares a common characteristic with Satan. Perhaps the shared characteristic is they are both fierce, looking to devour.

Because of the nature of symbols, simply based on definition, they can be difficult to interpret. However, not only is it the *interpretation* of symbolism that proves difficult, but simply the *identification* of symbolism. Before one can interpret a symbol, that figure of speech has to be present in the text. To misidentify something as a symbol leads to a wrong understanding of the passage. This can be seen clearly, again returning to our various views of the millennial kingdom, in Revelation 20:1-7. This passage explains a period of time where, after Jesus returns and conquers the nations<sup>34</sup>, Satan shall be bound<sup>35</sup> and a group of people will be resurrected and reign with Christ<sup>36</sup>. This period of time, from the binding of Satan to his

---

<sup>33</sup> It is worth noting: it is not my intention to show error in post-millennialism but instead use it as a case study displaying the relationship between theology/metaphysics and action/ethics/sociopraxy.

<sup>34</sup> Rev 19:11-21.

<sup>35</sup> Rev 20:2.

<sup>36</sup> Rev 20:4.



release, is described as a thousand years.<sup>37</sup> As Waldron comments in the above quote, all three camps, premillennialists, amillennialists, and postmillennialists, recognize and agree with the concept of a thousand years—to disagree with this would require one to eliminate Revelation 20 altogether. However, amillennialists and many postmillennialists see the thousand years as representative or symbolic to a large amount of time. While the premillennialist, and some postmillennialists, would interpret these passages in Revelation 20 as describing a time period of a literal thousand years, the amillennialist and the other postmillennialists would interpret this passage symbolically. The disagreement is founded upon different interpretive methods, but more specifically, the identification of something being a symbol.

### **The Time for Interpreting Symbolically**

All those advocating for premillennialism, amillennialism, and postmillennialism take some scripture literal (in the strictest form of the word) and some symbolic. In fact, it has been a great endeavor in recent history for the “literalist” to define what is meant by literal. Those who hold to the LGH understand figures of speech exist, such as symbols, and therefore understand those symbols as symbolic. Those who hold to the loosest allegorical or symbolic interpretive methods understand some Scripture in a literal sense. Henry Virklir puts it this way, “Thus the differences between literalists and symbolists are relative rather than absolute, involving questions of ‘how much’ and ‘which parts’ of prophecy should be

---

<sup>37</sup> Rev 20:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; I break these versus up individually as the term is used in each verse. Over the course of six verses, “thousand years” is utilized six times.

interpreted symbolically rather than literally.”<sup>38</sup> This use of literal is why it seems better to refer to the interpretive method as normative, taking into account figures of speech. However, the question then is this: “when should one interpret passages in a symbolic fashion?” The answer must be whenever a symbol is present—beyond that, you interpret the symbol symbolically, not the entire passage. To interpret symbolically in the absence of a symbol places the reader as the definer of meaning, not the discoverer of meaning. Interpreting something as symbolic even in the absence of a symbol is what makes an interpretive method a symbolic methodology—non-normative.

The next logical question seems to be, “How do you identify whether something is symbolic or not?” Is there a marker in the text which identifies things to be symbolic? Is there a general rule of thumb, so to speak, which is modeled in the Biblical text? These questions must be answered before you can rightfully muster the effort to interpret the symbol.

### **The Extent of Understanding God’s Communication**

The last question that seems necessary before diving into the world of symbols in Revelation is, “Is every aspect of God’s communication purposed for understanding by the receiver of said communication?” As one approaches symbols, is it possible that the details of a symbol are meant to be obscure, lacking clarity?

This question is not to undermine the understandability of the text. God has certainly communicated with mankind<sup>39</sup>, provided clarity and understanding through the text<sup>40</sup>, and

---

<sup>38</sup> Virkler, Henry A., *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation*, (Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, Michigan), 1981, p 196.

<sup>39</sup> 2 Tim 3:16-17.

<sup>40</sup> 2 Pet 1:3; John 5:39.

holds humanity responsible for rightly understanding the text<sup>41</sup>. Paul, among other Biblical writers<sup>42</sup>, certainly seems to teach that truths presented by the Scriptures are to be understood and applied.<sup>43</sup> However, are there any examples where God communicates with an alternative purpose to clarity and understanding?

In Daniel 12:8-9, Daniel is being informed about the events which will take place in the end times. After revelation about how long the “wonders” will last, Daniel records, “As for me, I heard but could not understand; so I said, “My lord, what will be the outcome of these events?”<sup>44</sup> Daniel, being eager to understand what the Lord had previously revealed, asks a clarifying question. The answer Daniel was given was, “Go your way, Daniel, for these words are concealed and sealed up until the end time.”<sup>45</sup> As Thomas Constable states, “The Lord reminded Daniel that much of what he had received would remain obscure until the end time (cf. v. 4).”<sup>46</sup> While clarity and increasing understanding would be achieved, it would not be until the end times. Some of the details of the communication given to Daniel would remain uncertain and obscure.

Another example of this is Jesus’ parables. After Jesus’ rejection as messiah in Matthew 12, Jesus begins to speak in parables. As the disciples are following Jesus, they recognize this shift in communication style. Naturally, they ask, “Why do you speak to them in parables?”<sup>47</sup> Jesus responds by stating, “To you it has been granted to know the mysteries of the kingdom of

---

<sup>41</sup> 2 Tim 2:15.

<sup>42</sup> David in Psa 1; Jesus in Rev 1:3; Luke in Luke 1:4; etc.

<sup>43</sup> 1 Tim 4:3; Col 2:8; Eph 6:14.

<sup>44</sup> Dan 12:8.

<sup>45</sup> Dan 12:9.

<sup>46</sup> Constable, Thomas, *Notes on Daniel*, Soniclight.com, 2022, <https://www.planobiblechapel.org/tcon/notes/html/ot/daniel/daniel.htm>.

<sup>47</sup> Matt 13:10.

heaven, but to them it has not been granted.”<sup>48</sup> Jesus then continues to explain the parable to the disciples as they had been granted access to understanding. The purpose of parables was not to add clarity but obscurity.

This is not meant to be an argument obscuring confidence in the Scriptures, but it does seem that God purposes communication, at times, for obscurity and not clarity. These passages are certainly still useful, and humanity is held responsible for wrestling with them. It should, however, act as a warning to providing meaning to symbols which is not presented in the Scriptures. At the very least, those things which are not apparent in the context should be held as opinion, not certainty. A. Berkeley Mickleson recognizes this limitation when he states, “Where symbols are not explained or are explained only briefly, ambiguity may result. The interpreter is forced to be subjective. Even when an explanation accompanies the symbol, he may read more into the symbol than the explanation warrants.”<sup>49</sup>

## DOES THE BIBLE PROVIDE A MODEL FOR IDENTIFYING AND UNDERSTANDING SYMBOLS?

If one desires to approach the Scriptures with a Biblical methodology regarding symbolism, the question has to be asked, does the Bible provide a methodology for understanding symbols? E.W. Bullinger posits, “The assertion as to anything being a symbol of another rests entirely on human authority, and depends for its accuracy on its agreement with the teaching of Scripture.”<sup>50</sup> Bullinger is arguing that there are not any markers within the Biblical text that identifies something as

---

<sup>48</sup> Matt 13:11.

<sup>49</sup> Mickleson, A. Berkeley, *Interpreting the Bible*, (Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, MI), 1987, p 265.

<sup>50</sup> Bullinger, 769.

symbolic, leaving the identification of the symbol to rest completely on man's thinking and authority. However, the interpretation of said symbol must agree with the canon of Scripture. Is the identification of symbols reliant completely on the authority of man, or do the Scriptures provide aid in this arena? Where might one gather principles for interpreting symbols?

### A CASE STUDY: REVELATION 1:9-20

Revelation 1:9-20 describes John's first visionary experience in the book of Revelation. As John hears Jesus commanding him to "write what you see and send it to the seven churches,"<sup>51</sup> John turns around and sees Jesus speaking to him. John then proceeds to explain, and presumably write, what he sees. John explains the appearance of Jesus, using mostly similes<sup>52</sup>. There are two symbols present within this description—the lampstands which Jesus is standing among and the stars which are present in Jesus' right hand. The "sharp two-edged sword" coming from His mouth<sup>53</sup> is often described as a symbol, but as will be seen later, it seems to be describing an actual sword lacking representative characteristics in this context. Both symbols are describing what John is seeing, but representative of something else.<sup>54</sup> This is an important aspect

---

<sup>51</sup> Rev 1:11.

<sup>52</sup> Similes are a figure of speech comparing two things utilizing the modifier like or as. Both similes and symbols carry a representative and comparative purpose but differ slightly in grammatical function.

<sup>53</sup> With every other aspect of Jesus being described utilizing a simile, it is interesting that this aspect is not. There are not any significant variants within this section of the passage.

<sup>54</sup> Note the difference between simile and symbol here – John is utilizing simile to try and represent what he is seeing in an understandable fashion to his audience. The symbols are easily described but

of symbolism. While John is seeing lampstands, stars, and a sword, at least two of the three are representative of some other object(s). In Revelation 1:20, Jesus provides the objects which these symbols are representing. By Jesus providing this information, one can identify basic principles for identifying and interpreting symbols.

Within this case study, there are three principles that can be identified from the Biblical text. Each are modeled within the passage. These principles can be consistently utilized throughout the Biblical text regarding symbolism. While Biblical models do not necessarily result in prescription, it would seem viable to assert interpretive models found within Scripture should be followed whenever God is communicating Biblical truth<sup>55</sup>. For example, Jesus is interpreting the symbols which are present, providing a model from God Himself.

### **Principle #1:**

#### **Symbols Can Be “Mysteries”**

Through a line of reasoning and historical attestation, E.W. Bullinger equates the term “symbol,” or *symbolon* in the Greek, with “mystery,” or *mysterion* in the Greek.<sup>56</sup> *Mysterion* identifies something unknown previous to special revelation. Bullinger submits that, “Μυστήριον (mysterion) means secret; and later it came to mean a secret sign or symbol... Thus it will be seen that symbol is practically synonymous with the latter use of mystery as meaning a secret sign.”<sup>57</sup> While this may be

---

representative and established by the author of the vision, not John himself.

<sup>55</sup> There are certainly descriptive sections of Scripture which would not lead to beneficial prescriptions. For instance, it would be poor for one to follow the interpretive model provided by the Pharisee’s due to the consistent indictment of misunderstanding given by Jesus.

<sup>56</sup> Bullinger, 769.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

true, it seems that in the Biblical text, symbol is a broader term than simply a mystery. There are seemingly many examples where a symbol, as defined as an object representing another, is not a secret, or something not revealed at an earlier time. In fact, as Bullinger later explains how a symbol is established, he states, “The stages by which a symbol is reached, therefore, are: (1) either by Metonymy or Metaphor, one thing is used to represent another; then (2) the one is used to imply the other; and finally (3) it becomes permanently substituted for it as a symbol of it.”<sup>58</sup> It would seem this process would *require* a symbol to be previously understood throughout establishing the representation as a symbol. It would seem then, that *symbolon* is a broader term than *mysterion*.

While it seems *symbolon* is certainly a broader term than *mysterion*, Revelation 1:20 shows that symbols can certainly be used whenever previously unknown by the audience. However, such a symbol requires interpretation for the audience to understand it. As Jesus utilizes both stars and lampstands to represent the messengers of the churches and the churches themselves respectively, He identifies and defines them as the audience would not have understood the vision otherwise.

## **Principle #2:**

### **Immediate Context May Identify and Define Symbols**

Within any exegetical endeavor, it is the primary role of the immediate literary<sup>59</sup> context to define meaning within the passage being examined. The immediate context in any situation defines words, provides insightful information for the passage being examined, and identifies many different grammatical and syntactical structures in the passage under

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, 770.

<sup>59</sup> Literary context here is pointing to the immediate context within the text itself as opposed to the historical context.

examination. Jesus' explanation in Revelation 1:20 shows this to be true regarding symbolism as well. This concept is also seen very clearly in Revelation 17 as the "mystery" is given in verses 3–6 and the explanation provided in verses 8–18.

### **Principle #3:**

#### **Far Off Context May Identify and Define Symbols**

There are certainly symbols within the book of Revelation which are not defined immediately surrounding the use of the symbol. An example of this is the use of Babylon the Great in Revelation 14, 16–18.<sup>60</sup> If Babylon the Great is to be understood symbolically, it doesn't seem there is an apparent interpretation of that symbol in the immediate context. However, Babylon the Great does share a common description of "great city" with the city of Jerusalem.<sup>61</sup> One could argue that the context in Revelation 11 would give reason to identify Babylon the Great as symbolic for the city of Jerusalem.

Another example of this can be seen in Revelation 1. The sharp two-edged sword can be identified as non-symbolic. Of course, this, among those things which are symbolic, represents what John is seeing in these visions. However, later context helps to understand that the sword should be understood as representing just that – a sword. Revelation 19 records the second advent of Christ as He returns in judgement of the world. In verse 5, John records, "From His mouth comes a sharp sword, so that with it He may strike down the nations..."<sup>62</sup> The sword

---

<sup>60</sup> There have been those who believe Babylon is a symbol as well as those who would disagree with this position. Andy Woods presents, in his book *Babylon: The Bookends of Prophetic History*, an argument that Babylon the Great should not be understood symbolically, but understood in a normative fashion, representing a literal Babylon which will be rebuilt. This would certainly give reason for absence of an explanation.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Rev 11:8, Rev 16:19, 17:18, 18:10, 16, 18, 19, 21.

<sup>62</sup> This is also seen in Rev 19:21.



is the instrument Christ will be using for judgement and war. It would seem fitting that John sees Jesus with the sword in Revelation 1. While the far-off context does not identify the sword in Revelation 1 as symbolic, it does seem to identify the sword as non-symbolic.

### CASE STUDY: REVELATION 5:6

In Revelation 5, John is in the throne room of God<sup>63</sup> and has previously witnessed an incredible scene with God sitting on His throne being worshipped by four creatures and twenty-four elders.<sup>64</sup> After this, John “saw in the right hand of Him who sat on the throne a book written inside and on the back, sealed up with seven seals.”<sup>65</sup> Only one was found worthy to open the book and break the seals, “...a Lamb standing, as if slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent out into all the earth.”<sup>66</sup> Much like the previous case study, there is an identification and interpretation of some symbols in the immediate context—the seven horns and seven eyes. However, it seems that there is a symbol in this passage which is not defined in the immediate context—the Lamb as if slain.

#### **Principle #4:**

#### **Previously Established Symbols Can Be Utilized Without Explanation**

The first symbol—the seven horns and seven eyes—are defined in the immediate context but are not identified as being a mystery. The symbolism of the lamb is not defined or identified in the immediate context. However, through distant context, one

---

<sup>63</sup> Rev 4:2.

<sup>64</sup> Rev 4:3–11.

<sup>65</sup> Rev 5:1.

<sup>66</sup> Rev 5:6.

can quickly conclude the Person whom the “lamb” object is representing. In John 1:29, John the Baptist announces the arrival of Jesus proclaiming, “Behold, The Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!” In Revelation 5:9, it can be seen that this Lamb is one Who has “purchased for God with your blood from every tribe and tongue and people and nation.” The connection between the descriptors of the Lamb seem to provide reason for identifying the symbol of a lamb as representative of the Person of Jesus Christ. This is not to say that the symbol represents the same thing in every context, but other contexts can give clues and helpful insights as to the nature of the symbol in the context being studied.

#### CASE STUDY: REVELATION 7:1-8

The beginning verses of Revelation 7 present the sealing of 144,000 men from the tribes of Israel. These are presented as the bond servants of God from Israel, 12,000 from each tribe. These are later described in Revelation 14:1-5 as those who “have not been defiled with women, for they have kept themselves chaste. These are the ones who follow the Lamb wherever He goes. These have been purchased from among men as first fruits to God and to the Lamb.”<sup>67</sup> If understood non-symbolically, during the time of God’s wrath on the earth, angels will seal 144,000 Israelites, 12,000 from each tribe, for the service of the Lord and they will be those who are chaste.

Exegetically, the context does not seem to provide any reason for understanding such a passage as symbolic. In fact, this passage provides reason for the sealing, a detailed list of who will be sealed, and a purpose for the sealing. The later passage in Revelation 14 then provides further clarity as to the

---

<sup>67</sup> Rev 14:4.

condition of those being sealed. There is nothing obscure or absurd that would lead one to believe such a passage is symbolic and there also is not any interpretations provided in the immediate or distant context.

Some theologians, however, understand the passage as symbolic due to an external genre assigned to the book of Revelation; namely, the apocalyptic genre.<sup>68</sup> Within the apocalyptic genre, many argue the books are symbolic throughout and numbers are typically representative of something else. Therefore, the 144,000 should represent all of God's elect because, "It's not to be taken literally. It's 12 x 12 x 1,000: 12 being the number of completion for God's people (representing the 12 tribes of Israel and the 12 apostles of the Lamb) and 1,000 being a generic number suggesting a great multitude."<sup>69</sup> The assertion is based on a particular genre assigned to the book and a theological precommitment.<sup>70</sup> The implications are vast as the interpretation by DeYoung and others places all of God's elect on earth during the time of the tribulation (although DeYoung, as an amillennialist, would assert the tribulation is not a time period of seven years where God pours out His wrath on a churchless world, but a much longer period of time where the church is present). It is this same concept that drives many to symbolize the thousand-year reign

---

<sup>68</sup> See Kevin DeYoung, <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/blogs/kevin-deyoung/theological-primer-the-144000/>; Leland Ryken, *Symbols and Reality: A Guided Study of Prophecy, Apocalypse, and Visionary Literature: Reading the Bible as Literature* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2016).

<sup>69</sup> Kevin DeYoung, "Theological Primer: The 144,000" The Gospel Coalition, Accessed August 30, 2021, <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/blogs/kevin-deyoung/theological-primer-the-144000/>.

<sup>70</sup> Both DeYoung and Moises Silva make a case for the theological hermeneutic which identifies one's theological system as a presupposition to any text being studied.

of Christ found in Revelation 20, as has already been discussed. Likewise, in Revelation 20, there is not any exegetical reason to symbolize the time period given to Christ's reign on earth prior to the establishment of the new heaven and new earth as found in Revelation 21.

### CASE STUDY: REVELATION 17-18

Revelation 17 begins by an angel carrying John into the wilderness to be given a vision regarding "...the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters, with whom the kings of the earth committed acts of immorality, and those who dwell on the earth were made drunk with the wine of her immorality."<sup>71</sup> After John is shown the vision in verses 3-6, John "wondered greatly."<sup>72</sup> Seeing this, the angel asks John why he stares in wonder *at the mystery* and then offers an interpretation, in Revelation 17:7-18, of what has just been seen. A similar situation is found in Revelation 1 where a mystery is seen and then immediately explained.

#### **Principle #4:**

#### **Previously Established Symbols Can Be Utilized Without Explanation**

Immediately following this vision and interpretation of the symbolism within, the same symbols are utilized in Revelation 18 without further clarification. For example, Revelation 18:3, "For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the passion of her immorality, and the kings of the earth have committed acts of immorality with her, and the merchants of the earth have become rich by the wealth of her sensuality." There is not any need for explaining again the context in symbols found

---

<sup>71</sup> Rev 17:1-2.

<sup>72</sup> Rev 1:6.

within the great harlot because they were just explained in the previous context.

## CONCLUSION

Symbolism can be difficult to identify and interpret. The Bible, however, provides guidance for approaching the topic. While the four principles provided in this paper are far from comprehensive, they do provide a Biblical foundation for approaching symbolism throughout the Biblical text and hopefully provide a starting point for further research. Some further questions which should be further studied are: 1) Are there any exegetical markers which provide further clarity on the identification of symbols? 2) What are the symbols presented in the book of Revelation and what are their interpretations based on Biblical data alone? 3) Are there any symbols within Revelation which we are unable to understand before the end times?

It is the responsibility of the exegete to wrestle with the Biblical text utilizing a Biblical methodology. Symbolism is a difficult aspect of that interpretive practice. If symbolism – especially in the book of Revelation – is approached wrongfully, the consequences are dire. Let us endeavor to rightly divide the word of truth in all areas including symbolism.

