

# **Dr. David Bauer, Inductive Bible Study, Lecture 7, Book Survey, Primary Structural Relationships and Questions**

© 2024 David Bauer and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. David Bower in his teaching on Inductive Bible Study. This is session 7, Book Survey, Primary Structural Relationships and Questions.

We've been discussing primary relationships. We want to move now to auxiliary relationships. I promised that I would, at this point, indicate the difference between primary relationships and auxiliary relationships. A primary relationship is a relationship that can be used by itself.

Now, sometimes, as we've seen, they are combined. We've talked about, for example, the recurrence of contrast in the Book of Proverbs. Repeatedly, recurringly, you have contrast between wisdom and foolishness.

So, they can be combined, but they don't have to be combined. You can have primary relationships simply by themselves. Whereas, auxiliary relationships are typically not used by themselves, but in combination with primary relationships in order to strengthen the primary relationship.

The reason why auxiliary relationships are typically not used by themselves, but in combination with a primary relationship to strengthen the primary relationship is because these auxiliary relationships have only to do with placement of material, with arrangement. They do not address a sense of connectedness. That is to say, they do not have meaning attached to them.

They do not address sense connectedness. Whereas, primary relationships do involve sense connectedness. The relationship, for example, of contrast involves a sense connectedness of difference or of comparison, the sense connectedness of similarity or particularization, the sense connectedness of specificity.

But, you do not have that kind of sense of connectedness implicit within auxiliary relationships. But, the fact that writers will use structure, usually, in order to communicate sense leads them not to use auxiliary relationships by themselves but in combination with primary relationships in order to strengthen the sense connection that is implicit within the primary relationship that is being strengthened by the auxiliary relationship with which it is used. Now, there are a few of these auxiliary relationships that we will mention here.

The first is interchange, which is the exchanging or alternation of certain elements, usually in terms of blocks of material. You have this when you have, say, an alternation between two, going back and forth, exchange or alternation between two things in an A-B, A-B sort of arrangement. Scholars sometimes refer to this as striped structure, A-B, A-B, alternation, blocks of material.

An example of interchange at the book level would be interchange in the book of Micah, where you have a constant going back and forth between blocks of declarations of guilt and punishment and blocks of declarations regarding restoration of the remnant. So, you'll note you have guilt and punishment in 1:2b through 2:11, followed by restoration of the righteous remnant in 2:12 through 13. Then, in 3:1b through 12, he goes back to guilt and punishment.

And in 4:1 through 5:15, he goes back to restoration of the remnant. And then in 6:1b through 7:14, he goes back to guilt and punishment. And then the book ends with the final block that deals with restoration of the remnant.

So, A-B, A-B, A-B. Now here, of course, quite clearly, the interchange is used to strengthen contrast. He's emphasizing here the contrast between Israel's guilt and proper judgment upon Israel's guilt with God's determination to graciously restore the remnant of Israel.

Now, really, this alternation of blocks of material is a way for the writer to emphasize the contrast between Israel's guilt and punishment on the one hand and Yahweh's restoration of the remnant on the other. So, it really highlights the contrast. It makes it more obvious, reveals the importance of it.

That's one reason why he uses this interchange to strengthen the contrast. But beyond that, this constant going back and forth allows the writer actually to develop specific dimensions of the differences in ways that he otherwise wouldn't be able to do by placing these blocks side by side against each other. A further type of auxiliary relationship is intercalation.

We have this when this involves the insertion of one literary unit in the midst of another literary unit. Now, you can't have this in epistolary material. The so-called Pauline digressions may be a form of intercalation.

But usually, you have intercalation in narrative material. If you can picture it, it's as though a writer has a story, and he pulls that story apart and then plops down in the midst of that story, another story that, on the surface, doesn't seem to have much to do with the story that surrounds it. And that's really the point.

That's really the force of intercalation. When you have that kind of intercalation, it's a way for the writer to cause the reader to pause and scratch his or her head and say,

what exactly is the relationship here? And how does this story that's plopped down in the midst of the surrounding story illumine the surrounding story? And how does that illumine, that surrounding story illumine the story that's plopped down within it? In other words, they're mutually illuminating. Now, an example of intercalation is in Genesis 38.

You remember that in the book of Genesis, from chapters 37 through 50, we have the so-called Joseph narrative. Genesis 37 through 50 is really concerned with Joseph. The Joseph narrative begins in chapter 37.

But in chapter 38, you have the story of Judah, who is, of course, Joseph's brother, Judah, and Tamar, which on the surface doesn't seem to have anything at all to do with the story of Joseph and his brothers that begins in chapter 37 and continues in chapter 39 and runs through chapter 50. So, the reader is encouraged then to pause and ask, what in the world is this story about Judah and Tamar doing here in the Joseph narrative? Now, you remember what happens there in chapter 37, in the case of Judah and Tamar, that Tamar was married to one of Judah's sons and that he died. According to the Levirate Law in custom, his brother was to take his place and to raise up children for his brother who had died in order to continue the covenant people, in order to continue the line, in order to continue the line, which was not simply a matter of family interest and concern, but really had to do with continuing the line of the covenant people, of fulfilling the covenant that God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would make their descendants as the stars of the sky and as sand upon the seashores of the world.

When the brother came in, who was under obligation to perform the conjugal rites and to raise up children for his brother, he spilled his seed upon the ground so as not to do so. And, of course, God was displeased with this, and he was struck down. Tamar was very concerned about this whole situation and extremely unhappy with regard to it, particularly when Judah refused really make to his other son available to Tamar.

And so, Tamar actually went out and dressed herself up as a prostitute. Judah went in with her, thinking that he was having sex with a prostitute, and raised up unintentionally, inadvertently, children to the line. Now, once you consider what's really going on in chapter 38 of Genesis, you see exactly how it functions in the Joseph narrative, that it underscores the contrast between Joseph and his brothers, represented by his brother Judah here.

Joseph, you remember, is actually seduced by Potiphar's wife. He refuses to engage in sexual immorality in fornication, whereas Judah goes into a woman he thinks is a prostitute and has casual sex with her. Also, by what Joseph does, or we might say by what God does through Joseph here in chapters 39 through 50, he saves the

covenant people from destruction and makes it possible for God's covenant promises regarding descendants to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to continue.

And again, this ties in with what God does here in chapter 38. He continues that God causes the covenant line to continue through Joseph here in chapters 39 through 50, through Joseph's obedience, through Joseph's faithfulness, and through Joseph's integrity. But God is also at work in causing the covenant line to continue in chapter 38 through Judah's, through the brothers' unfaithfulness, through their lack of integrity, and through their fornication.

Again, you see how the story of Joseph is informed by and is illumined by the intercalated material dealing with Judah and Tamar here and how the story of Judah and Tamar makes sense. We understand what the writer has in mind thereby understanding it as an intercalation in contrast to the Joseph narrative that surrounds it. I'm going to give you one additional example of this, which is extremely fun, I think.

And it comes from 1 Samuel. It comes from 1 Samuel, and I have reference here to 1 Samuel chapter 24. Well, actually, I should say to chapter 25, 1 Samuel chapter 25.

You remember, in this whole portion of the book of 1 Samuel, really from 1 Samuel 19 on, you have the struggle between David and Saul. An evil spirit comes upon Saul from the Lord, and Saul, of course, strongly suspects that David has been chosen by God to be Saul's successor and actually his replacement as king. And so, David is pursued by Saul repeatedly, constantly in these chapters and escapes, of course, in each case.

But intercalated in the midst of this story, of this narrative of David being pursued by and escaping repeatedly from Saul, we have chapter 25, which is the story of Nabal. Here, David encounters this churlish boor, Nabal, and his wife, Abigail. Nabal treats David and David's servants shamefully and does not perform the rites of hospitality that are very much central to the ancient Near East culture.

David is angry with him and mounts up along with all the men who are with him, the mighty men who are with him, and goes after Nabal with a view toward destroying him and everything that he owns. But Abigail, Nabal's wife, comes out and meets David and turns him away from the destructive actions that David had intended towards Nabal. And David says, of course, in chapter 25, verse 32, David says to Abigail here in the wake of her turning David aside from the killing that he had intended on Nabal and Nabal's house, blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, who sent you this day to meet me.

Blessed be your discretion and blessed be you who have kept me this day from bloodguilt and from avenging myself with my own hand, for as surely as the Lord, the

God of Israel, lives who has restrained me from hurting you, unless you had made haste and come to meet me truly, by morning there had been not left to Nabal so much as one male. Then David received from her hand what she had brought him, and he said to her, Go in peace to your house. See, I have hearkened to your voice.

I have granted your petition. Now, on the surface, that story seems to be irrelevant with regard to what's going on in this portion of 2 Samuel as a whole, to David's pursuit of David's pursuit by and escape from Saul. But you note here that the writer who is a skillful storyteller, the writer of 1 Samuel makes a connection between the story of David and Nabal in chapter 25 and the story of David and Saul in the surrounding material.

In chapter 24, the chapter that immediately precedes chapter 25, the Nabal story, and also in chapter 26, the chapter that immediately succeeds the Nabal story, David encounters Saul in a vulnerable position. He is asleep. Saul is asleep in chapter 24.

David could take his life. David's servants urge him to kill Saul, but David refuses to do so. In chapter 26, David comes upon Saul in the cave.

When Saul is asleep, relieving himself, and actually, I should say, he comes upon him in the cave in chapter 24, and he comes upon him asleep in chapter 26. And again, his servants urge him to kill Saul, but he refuses to do so. Note also the phraseological connection.

Here, when he confronts Saul in the cave at En Gedi in chapter 24, this is what Saul says to him. You are more righteous than I. You have repaid me good, whereas I have repaid you evil. Notice how that relates to what David says about Nabal in 25, 21.

Surely in vain have I guarded all that this fellow has in the wilderness so that nothing was missed of all that belonged to him, and he has returned me evil for good. The very same thing, the very same thing in the very same words that Saul says about David. You have repaid me good, whereas I have repaid you evil.

David says with regard to Nabal in 25, 22. He has returned me evil for good. When David spares Saul's life at the camp when Saul is asleep in chapter 26, Saul says in 26, 21, I have done wrong.

Return my son, David, for I will no more do you harm because my life was precious in your eyes this day. Behold, notice this: I have played the fool and have erred exceedingly. Saul says about himself in relation to David, I have played the fool.

This connects with what Abigail says about her husband Nabal in 25:25. Let not my Lord regard this ill-natured fellow, Nabal, this ill-natured fellow Nabal, for as his

name is, so is he. Nabal, which, by the way, means fool, Nabal is his name and folly is with him.

Also, a kind of throwaway line in chapter 25, the story of David and Nabal in 25:36. And Abigail came to Nabal, and lo, he was holding a feast in his house like the feast of a king. So, the writer couldn't do much more than he has done to indicate that there is a comparison here between Saul and David and between Nabal and David.

That Nabal, that Saul, and of course, what this indicates is that Saul is a fool, even as Nabal is a fool. And the kind of folly, the kind of foolishness that you have in Nabal, is meant to illumine the character of Saul, the foolishness of Saul in the surrounding chapters, and the like. But the thing that's especially emphasized, and this is a real point I think of chapter 25 being here, is that David makes it clear that the Lord has sent Abigail to him in order to turn David away from bloodguilt, which he had in mind in his intentions to destroy Nabal.

This is extremely significant in terms of our interpretation of David and Saul because, by way of comparison, this is a strong, it offers a strong suggestion that David refused to put his hand against the Lord's anointed. He refused to destroy Saul on these two occasions, not one occasion, but on the two occasions when he had the perfect opportunity to do so. And when he was encouraged by his men to do so, he refrained from doing that, which would have involved bringing guilt, bringing blood guilt upon himself and his family, and that it was the Lord who caused him to do that.

It was the Lord, actually, who was behind David's decision not to lift up his hand against the Lord's anointed. It was the Lord, really, who, through his grace, helped David and caused David not to kill Saul when he had the opportunity, with the consequence of bringing blood guilt upon himself and upon his descendants, the sons of David. So that's intercalation.

A further type of, and this is the last one, well, not quite the last one, but almost the last one that we'll mention is a chiasm. Let me just make sure that I didn't miss any here. Okay.

Chiasm is the repetition of elements in an inverted order. In an AB, and if you have a middle element, C, B prime, A prime sort of order. ABBA or ABCBA.

Now, this is a very common feature in the Bible. It was very popular. Chiasm was very popular in the ancient world.

We find it many times in the Bible. It can be used, and that's why we're mentioning it here, at the level of the book as a whole, although you normally find it in smaller units of material, because for chiasm to work, it really needs to be recognizable, and if it's spread throughout a very broad bit of material, it tends not to be as obvious as

otherwise it would be. So, I'm going to take examples, although, as I say, you can find it in whole books.

We could give examples from it. For the sake of illustration, I'm going to note where it might be found in smaller units, and I mentioned here Matthew 19:30 through 20:16. Once again, let me remind you that it's very important for you to look these passages up in your Bible and note where they appear there. Now, Matthew 19:30 reads, Many that are first will be last, and the last first.

And we have almost the same statement in 20:19, actually 20:16. So the last will be first, and the first last. Many that are first will be last, first last, and last first. A, B, B, A. And again, in 19:30, the last will be first, and the first last.

A, B, B, A. Now, notice that this actually, between these two statements, 19:30 and 20:16, is the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, where the householder, who of course represents God, goes to the marketplace to hire workers for his vineyard at 6 o'clock in the morning, at 9 o'clock in the morning, at noon, again at 3 o'clock, and then again at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and then again at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. And, of course, at the end of the day, when he goes to pay them, he pays them all the same amount. But also, what is often missed here with regard to this parable is that at the end of the day, he also pays those who are hired first last, and he pays those who are hired last.

So that this principle, the first shall be last, and the last shall be first, is actually reflected in the parable itself, which is also structured according to chiasm because in the parable, you have the first to be hired and then the last to be hired, this has to do with hiring, and then with regard to pay the first to be hired are, the first to be hired, excuse me, the first to be hired are, yes, I should do it this way, the last to be hired are paid first, and then the first to be hired are paid last. So again, you have this A-B-B-A, hired first, hired last, and then those who are hired last are paid first, and those who are hired first are paid last. The first shall be last, and the last shall be first.

By the way, notice that in terms of 19:30 and 20:16, you have a chiasm within the chiasm. Notice first shall be last, and the last shall be first, and then the last shall be first, and the first shall be last, A-B-B prime, A prime even here. So, you have chiasm upon chiasm here within this passage.

And, of course, all of this is to highlight the whole element of contrast and to make the point that God's understanding of justice, of right, is different from typical human calibrations of justice. It seems to us fair, of course, for those who are hired first and who work really 12 hours in the day, not only to be paid more than those who are hired at five o'clock in the evening and work only one hour in the heat of the day, in the cool of the evening, for them to get more than that, but also for those

who are hired first to be paid first, and those who are hired last to be paid last. But here you have a reversal then of expectations.

So, of course, the point is that God's understanding of justice is different from typical human ways of understanding justice. Okay. Then we'll mention inclusio, and this will be the last of these that we'll talk about.

Inclusio involves a repetition of the same word or phrase at the beginning and end of a unit, really creating a bracket effect. As I mentioned earlier on, the individual psalms in the book, in the Psalter, in a sense, function as their own individual little books. They were originally, of course, independent.

They were composed independently, this kind of thing. So you can use the Psalms really to illustrate what's involved in book survey. Now, so let's look at Psalm 106 with regard to inclusio here.

Actually, the 104 Psalm is better. The 104 Psalm, bless the Lord, O my soul. The Psalm begins with this urging, this exhortation to bless the Lord, O my soul.

In verse one, verse 35, the very last verse of the Psalm, bless the Lord, O my soul. Now, what we need to consider here when you have this kind of inclusio is how the intervening material relates to the bracketing verses. Here, how do verses two through 34 relate to verse one, bless the Lord, O my soul, and verse 35, bless the Lord, O my soul.

Basically, what you have in verses, as you'll see if you read it, in verses two through 34 are reasons why we ought to bless the Lord. Here, then, you have substantiation. Bless the Lord, O my soul, because of his mighty, gracious acts, which reveal that he is worthy to be blessed. Then, of course, causation because of his mighty, gracious acts that express his worthiness to be blessed. Therefore, bless the Lord, O my soul.

So, Psalm 104 is structured according to substantiation and causation by inclusio. The inclusio actually reinforces and strengthens the substantiation and causation that you have here. Now, inclusio really functions to indicate the primary concern of the unit as a whole, in this case, a psalm or a book, of the unit as a whole by way of bracket.

So, the concern here is the urging on the part of the writer to the reader to live a life of constant blessing of the Lord from the very depth of the person's being. Bless the Lord, O my soul. That's really the burden of this psalm. And then, of course, motivation or reasons and why, in fact, we ought to order our lives in this way.

Now, some additional notes with regard to major structural relationships. A major relationship really, as we mentioned, needs to control the bulk of the material, more



than half the material in the book that is being surveyed. And it's helpful if it is distinctive, then, that is to say, the kind of thing that really does bear meaning along.

We can make a distinction, too, though, between implicit versus explicit relationships. An implicit relationship, an explicit relationship is one in which you have an earmark explicitly present. We saw, for example, that whenever you have the word, you know that you have contrast.

And whenever you have the word therefore, you know that you have causation. But that would, those would be explicit relationships. But you can have contrast when there's no word but explicitly present.

And you can have causation when the word therefore does not explicitly appear. In cases like that, the relationship is implicit rather than explicit. And then we can make a distinction also between simple and complex relationships.

A simple relationship is one relationship used by itself. Let's say causation. But we see that sometimes two or more structural relationships are so bound up together in terms of the way they function within a book that you cannot describe how one relationship functions within this book without also talking about another one.

They're so closely bound up that way. When that's the case, it is helpful to combine them into a complex relationship. And we saw that in some of the examples.

For example, we mentioned the recurrence of contrast in Proverbs repeatedly between wisdom and foolishness or folly. You see, you can't talk about contrast in Proverbs without talking about recurrence because the contrast recurs. And you can't talk about recurrence in Proverbs without bringing in contrast.

You can't describe how one of those relationships functions without also talking about the other one. And therefore, it's helpful really to combine them because the writer himself has combined them. That's to say, they're combined in the program and the dynamics of the book itself.

And then, we can make a distinction also between general versus specific relationships. Some relationships are more general than others and are implicit within more specific relationships. We mentioned, for example, that implicit within cruciality is a recurrence of causation.

When you have this notion of the radical reversal because of the pivot, the material preceding the pivot causes a pivot. But especially, there is a causation from the pivot passage to that which follows. And, of course, there is a radical contrast between that which precedes a pivot and that which follows a pivot since that which follows a pivot undoes that which precedes a pivot.

So that cruciality is a more specific form of the recurrence of causation and contrast. But when you have this kind of recurrence of causation and contrast, it's more precise really to label it cruciality. That's a more precise way of observing what's actually going on.

And so we think it's helpful always to try to identify the most precise specific relationship here. We can also make a distinction between conscious and subconscious relationships. Some relationships were employed consciously by the writer.

Others subconsciously. For example, one might ask with regard to the cruciality that you have in the book of Esther, did the writer of the book of Esther sit down with his list of structural relationships and say, well, I think I'm going to, I see there's cruciality here. I think I'm going to use cruciality to structure my book.

It's unlikely that he did that. Nevertheless, the point, the fact is that there's every reason to think that the writer of the book of Esther did consider seriously how best to communicate the message he had to communicate. And he chose to use this radical reversal because of a pivot as a means for communicating his message.

So, although he did not consciously, perhaps not consciously, intend to use cruciality, he did give consideration to how best to communicate what he had to communicate and decided to make use of this form, to make use of this structural arrangement in order to do so. Beyond that though, we do know that the ancient world was very much was very much obsessed with matters of communication. Education, and of course a lot of education was informal, but both informal and formal education in the ancient world was largely rhetorical.

It largely focused upon methods and manners, practices of communication. We know that that was the case with regard to education in the 21st-century Greco-Roman world. So Aristotle, for example, has written, wrote a whole book on poetics in which he talks at great length about a number of these structural relationships, including comparison and contrast, which Aristotle refers to as synchrosis and the like.

So, it may very well be that actually some of these writers did intentionally use these structural relationships, but because we are not really as clued in, we're not really as focused upon methods and means of communication as the ancient, as ancient peoples were, we tend to take them for granted. We might be neglectful of the kind of intentionality that they gave to these kinds of structural features. But even if that's, even beyond that, we have to consider that the kinds of structural relationships we've been talking about are actually embedded within the human mind and within human communication.

They're found in all languages, in all cultures, in all times, and, in fact, in all forms of art, not simply in verbal communication like literature, but they're also, for the most part, they're found in other forms of art, such as music, architecture, painting, sculpture, and the like. As a matter of fact, the inductive Bible study movement became first acquainted with these kinds of dynamics through an essay, a very famous essay by John Ruskin, called *Essay on Composition*, in which Ruskin argued that many of these that we've been talking about are found in nature themselves. We think it's maybe a little bit more accurate to say that it has to do with the structuring of the human mind, so that communication, art really, seems to be impossible without using these kinds of structural relationships.

Now, the fact of the matter is, we use them all the time, both in communication and in interpreting communication, but like grammatical structures, subject, predicate, adjectives, all this kind of thing, we don't pause and parse them out. We don't have to. Nevertheless, they are embedded within the processes of our thought, and when it comes to deep, specific, careful interpretation of very significant communication, it's helpful to, as we do with grammatical analysis, so also with regard to literary structural analysis, it is helpful to pause and actually to think about how this is being said as a way of coming to understand more fully, more accurately, more specifically, what is being said.

Again, you can grasp content best by paying attention to and attending to form and structure. Now, why identify major structural relationships? Well, for one thing, of course, it helps in identifying the most significant passages and the most significant issues or concepts within the book, therefore quite important, relevant, and practical when it comes to interpretation, and also it helps us to identify how individual elements within the book relate to each other, to other individual elements within the plan and thought of the book. It's really through these structural relationships. Otherwise, we could call them organizational systems within the book; it is precisely through these that the writer communicates meaning, and they'll be very significant when it comes to interpretation.

Now, that's why we say that, most significantly, it directly aids in the specific and precise interpretation of individual passages and of the book as a whole, and it does it in two ways. One thing, it serves as a basis for asking questions. We raise questions of these structural relationships, and these questions then will serve as a bridge to interpretation.

It is by answering questions that are raised under structure that we actually will interpret the book, and they will serve as a type of evidence for interpreting both individual passages and the book as a whole. Again, everything that we observe in the survey, we do for the sake of interpretation. We will come back to it and make use of this, positive use of it, of these observations when it comes to interpretation.

Now, as we mentioned, all biblical exegesis pay careful attention to structure, or at least pay some attention to structure. They all talk about it. IBS is unique in that it tends to be more intentional and analytical in labeling structural features and considering their significance for interpretation.

Again, IBS isn't doing anything that's not done otherwise, but somewhat more methodologically reflective and intentional than is often the case with exegesis in general. Now, we've talked about the book survey identifying the general and specific materials. We've also talked about the importance of identifying structure, noting the main units and subunits, and the major structural relationships operative in the book as a whole.

The third thing we want to mention in book survey has to do with raising questions, interpretive questions directed towards the structural relationships that we've identified. There are essentially three types of questions that we want to raise. The first is a definitive question, which is essentially what is here and what is the meaning of what is here.

The definitive question is essentially what is the meaning of. Now, sometimes it can be stated as a modal question: how? For example, how are these two things different? But that's another way of getting at what is the meaning of.

The rational question is essentially the why question. Why is this here? Why has a writer used this? Why was this said or done, purpose or reason? And the third type of question is the implicational question. What are the implications of the answers to the definitive and rational questions? Now, implications really have to do with logical assumptions or outgrowths.

In other words, for the writer to communicate what he has communicated that we've ascertained through our answers to the definitive and rational questions, what must the writer assume? What kinds of assumptions lie behind his communication? If he actually believes what he is communicating here, which we are grasping through our answering of the definitive and rational questions, what must he assume? That's one type of implication. Another type of implication would involve natural outgrowths. If the writer really believes this, what necessarily flows from it? What other things must he also believe? What are the necessary logical corollaries of what he has presented here? Now, at this point, I'm actually going to make reference to a passage in the book *Inductive Bible Study*, where I illustrate what we have in mind by implications by talking about the implications of Genesis 1.1. This clearly does not involve implications of a structural relationship, but it does involve implications of a statement to illustrate what we have in mind by implications, both assumptions that lie behind a claim as well as necessary logical outgrowths of a claim.

I don't need to quote Genesis 1:1. to you, but I will. In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Okay.

For the writer to believe or to claim that God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning, what must he assume? What assumptions lie behind that claim? Well, one assumption is that God exists. In the beginning, God. Nowhere do you have in the Bible a kind of philosophical argument for the existence of God.

What you have is the assumption that God exists on the basis of God's work as a creator. The claim that God created implies or assumes the existence of God. Also, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, implying by way of assumption that God is distinct from creation, which incidentally is one of the great claims of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Probably, it's true to say that since the Judeo-Christian tradition, Islam is in a sense related to the Judeo-Christian tradition. Historically, as a matter of fact, it's possible that Islam emerged from a Jewish-Christian heresy and the like, but of the great religions of the world, really only the Judeo-Christian religion and perhaps Islam along with it really takes seriously the notion that God is distinct from creation. But that's an implied assumption in Genesis 1:1, that God is distinct from creation.

Also, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, suggesting that God is free. That is to say that God is not constrained by anything within creation. That is assumed.

It is also assumed that God is pre-existent with creation. He is not co-existent with creation. He is pre-existent with creation.

That is implicit. It's assumed in the phrase, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Also, for him to say that in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, he must assume that God is powerful, that God is intelligent, that God is purposeful, and that God is active.

All these things are present implicitly within that statement. Now, those are assumptions, but there are also natural outgrowths from Genesis 1:1. One is that if, in fact, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, it follows then that God will be expected to be concerned for the well-being of his creation. If God took the trouble to create the heavens and the earth, it implies that God will be concerned for the well-being of the creation that he has made.

That flows from it. Also, God has an absolute prerogative over his creation, including the prerogative to destroy or to judge it. This, of course, pertains to the age-old issue

of theodicy, of the justification of God, for example, in terms of what God does in the world, God allowing pain and suffering and the like.

One of the answers that the Bible gives, which is implicit in Genesis 1.1, is that, in a sense, God doesn't have to justify himself. The fact that in the beginning, he created the heavens and the earth means that he has prerogative in the heavens and the earth, over the heavens and the earth, including the prerogative to judge it and to destroy it, and he doesn't have to answer to anybody. Also, it implies that God has the authority to make demands upon his creation.

It implies that God has the power to sustain his creation. It implies that God has the power to control the destiny of creation that he has made and that he has the power to redeem or to repair creation, should that repair become necessary. I want to give credit to the book here.

That's found on page 134 of our book. Now, I do think it's important to remember that, I think it's important, for one thing, to ask these questions in the order, definitive, rational, and implicational questions, because these three questions build on each other. The rational question builds on the definitive question.

In other words, you really have to answer what is the meaning of what's here before you answer the question, why is this here? And clearly, the implicational question builds on the definitive and rational questions, in that it involves implications from the answers to the definitive and rational questions. Now, at this point, we don't really answer these questions. This is observation.

Answering questions really is a task of interpretation. At this point, we're simply raising questions that will then become the basis for our interpretation work. Now, these implications I mentioned are interpretive rather than applicatory.

These are not applicatory questions. It's not a matter of what this implies in terms of how this might apply to us, but it really normally involves theological implications. As I say, if this is true, then this necessarily follows from it theologically.

Incidentally, it's very interesting that, and it's important to remember, what a passage implies is just as much a part of its meaning as what it overtly states. That's why I say this is not an applicatory question. It's an interpretive question.

What a passage implies is just as much a part of its meaning as what it explicitly states. And so, that's why we always should attend to, at least to ask, the question of implications. Beyond that, and I mentioned these auxiliary questions are really more specific forms of the definitive question, it's important that the questions be directed to the observation made, that the questions be precise and general, that is to say

they address a specific way the structural relationship is employed in the book, and that they be creative and penetrating over against superficial.

And, of course, those are kinds of skills that are developed over time as we gain skills by practice in raising questions. We've already mentioned that the purpose of raising questions in the book survey, at the conclusion of the interpretation of the entire book, or at least a number of significant passages within the book, these questions are answered so as to synthesize the message of the book. For most books, particularly a book of any size, it will be difficult to move directly from the book survey and the questions that you raise in the book survey to answering these questions.

But as you work through the interpretation of passages throughout a book, you can come back and, by way of synthesis, answer these questions raised at the point of the book survey. As a matter of fact, here at the seminary, this is how I often manage courses. In my course on the book of Acts, for example, we as a class work through the interpretation of passages throughout the book of Acts, and then the final assignment is for students to come back and answer a set of questions that they raise under one of the major structural relationships as a way of synthesizing the message of the entire book of Acts.

That's one purpose of raising questions in the book survey. In shorter books, though, usually books of four chapters or less, these questions can serve as a means to interpret the book immediately. If the book is short enough, you can use these to get into the message of the book and interpret the book at the very outset.

The very asking of perceptive and penetrating questions can provide insight and clarification of the structural relationship observed. Educational theorists refer to this as metacognition. In the very process of asking questions about an observation, you actually discern aspects or dimensions of that observation that otherwise you might miss.

Then, of course, here we talked about what I just mentioned in terms of implications. The first thing that we do in the survey of the book is to identify key verses or strategic areas. In other words, passages in the book, what are the passages in the book that represent major structural relationships and thus provide insight into the book as a whole? Now, it's important to realize that all of us, when we work with a biblical book, actually consider certain passages to be more important than others, to be key passages or strategic passages.

We believe that in an inductive approach, it's important for the dynamics of the book itself to determine what are the key passages, the strategic passages in the book. And the way the book does that for us is to set forth key passages or strategic areas by way of major structural relationships. In other words, we ought to go back and ask

ourselves what one brief passage best represents each major structural relationship that I've observed.

And that will be, those will be your key passages within the book. And I think it's helpful, actually, to give reasons in terms of structural relationships represented. So, for example, you might say, 1-1 is a key passage because it represents particularization and the like.

Again, by allowing the structural relationships to determine or to point to the key passages or strategic areas, you're really allowing the book itself, the program, and the dynamics within the book to determine what the most significant passages within the book, the key passages or strategic areas within the book. Now, it's, I think, helpful to keep these key verses or strategic areas few in number in their own scope. You don't because they are strategic, because they are key passages; you don't want large portions of the book to be subsumed under them.

They're meant to be brief and few in number because keeping them brief and few will make them manageable. In other words, it will help us actually to focus upon these key passages and to use them as key passages that will provide entree into the book as a whole. Now, some structural relationships, of course, point you more directly to key passages and strategic areas, like if you have, for example, if you have climax, clearly the climactic passage would represent the structural relationship of climax.

Or if you have cruciality, clearly the pivot passage would represent the cruciality. But other structural relationships make it more difficult to identify, and you have to work a little bit harder to identify, the key verse or strategic area that may be represented by that relationship. An example of this would be recurrence, which is the reoccurrence of the same or similar things throughout the book, in which case you have to ask yourself what one occurrence of the recurrence best represents this recurrence.

It may be the first one, or a number of things may go into the decision to say this particular occurrence seems to represent the recurrence best of all. But all that to say the structural relationship of recurrence doesn't point you directly to one passage. You have to work a little bit more on this.

Now, the purpose of strategic areas is to provide insight into the book as a whole. Really, once you identify your key verses or strategic areas, it's important to ask, okay, exactly how are these, how do these key passages illumine the book as a whole? That is really one of the functions of a key passage. It is key or it is strategic in that it opens up, really, major aspects of the entire book to provide insight into the book as a whole, and they may actually point to the structure of the book.



In other words, when it comes to identifying key verses or strategic areas on the basis of structural relationships, you might identify, you might say, well, you know, there is a passage within this book that really seems to me to be critical, that seems to me to be key, but it doesn't represent any major structural relationship that I identified. That may be a clue to you that you've missed a major structural relationship. I've actually had students who have identified a major structural relationship because they considered a passage key, but it didn't represent any major structural relationship they had identified, and it caused them to go back and to ask, is there a relationship here that is actually suggested by this passage within the book? But even more significant is it will give directions as to where to place stress and study when time is limited, as it almost always is.

In other words, it will point you to the most significant passages to spend interpretive time with when it comes to interpretation. If you cannot interpret every passage within a book, these key verses will suggest that these are the passages that, according to the agenda of the book itself, are most worthy of interpretive investment. And they will provide a focus for preaching, pardon the typo here, not preaching, but for preaching and teaching.

Dr. Trena used to tell the story years ago when he was on the faculty at the Biblical Seminary in New York City of being asked to give a series of Bible studies on each book of the Bible at Marble Collegiate Church, which was Norman Vincent Peale's church in Midtown Manhattan, on successive Wednesday evenings. And he was given one hour for each book of the Bible. So, first week, book of Genesis, 50 chapters, one hour, what to do? He said what he did in each case was to take a key passage or a strategic area, which, because it was limited in scope, was manageable, but to work with that key passage in each case in such a way that the passage became an entree into the message of the book as a whole.

He was, therefore, able to deal with the essential message of each book in a manageable way by focusing on one or two key passages within that book within an hour's time. I have a former student who went on from here to pastor in Pennsylvania, and he came back and told me that he did this in a series of preaching, that he was able to preach a whole sermon on several books of the Bible, successive Sunday evenings and the like, again by preaching, by taking one strategic passage, that was his text, but preaching on it in such a way as to show how it actually developed the message of the entire book. The fifth thing that we do in terms of book survey is to identify higher critical data, that is, data within the book itself that bear on issues of what scholars refer to as critical introduction.

For example, the person of the writer, the place and date of writing, the recipients, and the occasion of writing. This kind of thing involves the historical background of the book, which, of course, as we mentioned earlier, can be very significant. Now, at this point, we don't go to secondary sources, but simply on the basis of the direct

study of the text, what does the text itself say? What does the text itself suggest about who the writer was, who the recipients were, what was the occasion of the writing of this book, this kind of thing. This is really important because as you acquaint yourself with the data found within the book itself pertaining to these kinds of issues, when you go to secondary sources and read what scholars say about the background of the book, who the author is, when was it written, what was the occasion of the writing, this kind of thing, you will understand those kinds of discussions much more fully.

You understand much better what they're talking about. And incidentally, you'll be able to make judgments about an assessment of the legitimacy of what they're saying. Maybe a particular scholar will make certain claims with regard to authorship or with regard to the audience here, but you know that there are data within the book that actually would point in another direction.

It may in fact cause you to wonder whether in fact what this scholar says with regard to historical background is accurate. Of course, this involves tentative considerations over against firm conclusions here. We're simply identifying data that may bear upon these kinds of things within the book.

And then other major impressions, this is a catch-all category. Anything else that pertains to the book as a whole that you think really should be mentioned but doesn't fit under A through E, under numbers one through five, might be mentioned here. For example, in the book of Amos, it's interesting that Amos, the book of Amos is punctuated with hymns of praise to the creator God.

You have about four of these that pop up in the course of the book of Amos. It's the kind of thing really that ought to be observed and would fit here at this point. You might note in the book of Ruth that the book of Ruth is extremely positive in that there are no bad people presented in the book of Ruth.

There are no scoundrels in the book of Ruth. This is kind of unusual with regard to stories in general and biblical books in particular. There really are no bad people.

You have some people who are not as good as others. Orpah, for example, is presented quite not as positively as Ruth is, but she's presented quite positively herself. And again, that's the kind of thing that might be, I mean it's just a beautiful story because there is really no evil within the book of Ruth.

Again, the kind of thing that might be noted might be important when it comes to book surveys. In the book of Matthew, it may be important to note that you have five great speeches or five great discourses of Jesus, each of which ends with the form of a formula; when Jesus had finished these sayings or the like, he went on to. Again, the kind of thing that should be mentioned in the survey of the book didn't

necessarily, might not necessarily fit in the preceding areas, so you can mention it here.

This is actually a good place to pause. When we come back, we want actually to do a book survey, kind of as a sample. And in anticipation of this, before you watch the next video, I urge you just to read through the book of Jude.

It's only one chapter long. Read through the book of Jude and just ask yourself, if you were going to do a book survey, what would you do? In other words, feel your way through in terms of where you would make the major breaks, what you would do in terms of breakdown, and whether you can discern any of these structural relationships that we've talked about in the book of Jude. This may be your first, if this is your first time, as it most likely will be, of doing this kind of thing.

Don't expect too much of yourself. Don't beat up on yourself if you don't see everything that we may point out, but in an inductive approach, you learn by doing. And so, it's not just a matter of hearing what I'm saying and taking it down, but you'll actually understand this better.

All that we're saying is better, that you'll understand it better, and you'll be able to make use of it as you put it to practice yourself in the study of these books. So do what you can in the book of Jude, and then I think you'll have great fun in looking at what you've done in relation to what we've done in the survey of the book of Jude.

This is Dr. David Bower in his teaching on Inductive Bible Study. This is session 7, Book Survey, Primary Structural Relationships and Questions.