

He says, Jesus rested the doctrine of life after death on the tense of a word. I've seen this expressed in other books where they say Jesus showed proved the fact of the resurrection by the fact that the tense of the Heb. verb in the sentence, in the expression "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" is the present tense. Anyone who has had Hebrew ought to laugh at that point because there is no present tense in Hebrew.

Anybody who knows Greek would say, Greek has a present tense. Yes, but Hebrew does not. If you bother to look in a copy of the KJV you will find where it says, I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the am is in italics. Of course if you don't know anything about Greek or Hebrew you would stress it I AM. Just like the story in Kings where the prophet said to his son, Saddle me the ass. And he saddled HIM the ass." Italicized. In the KJV you know this word italicized indicates it is not in the original. So there is no word there in Mark. It's true in one of the other Gospels that it is told with a verb there.

Jesus did not rest his argument on the tense of a Hebrew verb. He did not even quote a verb. He was resting it on the idea that was expressed by this that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are continuing and God is showing His faithfulness to them by what He does not to someone who merely dies and that's the end. But He still shows His favor and faithfulness to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Then he says Paul rests the covenant of faith on the singular form of "seed" (Gal. 3:16) where Paul says the blessings were given to Abraham's seed which is Christ. He said seed as of one, not seeds as of many. It is true that in the Hebrew it uses the singular "seed", but two vv. later it says, I will make thy seed as the stars of the heavens. If you can count the stars you can count your seed. Very clearly two vv. later he uses "seed" as a collective. There is no reason to say that here he is not using it as a collective but it is equally possible to take it as a singular and that's the way Paul is taking it.

In other words Paul is not resting any argument on the fact that the Heb. uses a singular noun. He is resting his argument on the interpretation which is required by the context. So these two arguments which Rushdoony gives which you find in many other books, simply do not stand up when you examine them. If you read the NT where it says, This is proven by the fact--and it quotes the OT there are cases where if you look up the OT reference those particular words don't prove this at all! And you say, What is the matter with those NT writers? In building an argument on those words?

But if you look at the OT passage you will find that the OT passage prove what the NT writer set out to prove. In other words the quotations are not to prove that this particular word proves this. But they are to show this context in the OT. The thought that is expressed there in this passage is the basis upon which we can rest this conclusion. I would therefore feel that we are justified in saying that what is important in Scripture is ideas rather than words. When I say that immediately some people become