induces, or one infers) that death is the normal experience for all mankind. But, whereas the particular induction might be shown at the end of time to have been correct, there is no logically necessary way to show at the present moment that this inference is correct. With inductive/inferential reasoning there is always a gap. Beyond the gap may lie numerous inferences based on particulars: (1) all men die; (2) most men die; (3) some men die; (4) everything I observe is unreal; (5) the moon consists of green cheese; just to cite a few possibilities.

Now Inferential Theology is all attempts at explicating the inspired text which go beyond the mere vocalizing of the text itself. (Of course, even vocalizing could become inferential by means of one's inflections, divisions of phrases, order of verses—as in a responsive reading or lectionary.) Having thus defined Inferential Theology is it therefore to be shunned? Is it un grand péril? Or is it to be humbly embraced as de rigueur (i.e., strictly required) activity which Christ-confessors must pursue?

A most important question needs to be asked. Must all knowledge about God be reduced to inference? If so, “then we are of all men the most miserable.” Ludwig Feuerbach’s smile could then be drawn wide and damning, because his judgment that all theology is simply anthropology would be firmly established. Thankfully, such is not the case. We presuppose that the Scriptures, which are the Word of God in written form, contain direct assertions in the indicative mode about God and by God.

For example, “I am a jealous God,” is an indicative, qualitative assertion about the God of Scripture. It is emphatically not adduced as a theoretical notion or opinion of Moses. It is not an inference about God simply drawn from something in the context. The jealousy of God is recorded as a datum of primary revelation.

By contrast, note the words of Chapter II, paragraph 3 of the Westminster Confession of Faith stated in the indicative mood:

> In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost: the Father is of none, neither begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Those phrases contain some significant words found in the English Bible—substance, power, eternity, God, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, begotten, and proceeding. However, it is obvious that the paragraph itself is not an excerpt from Scripture. The framers of this valuable confession were engaged in confessing not xeroxing. Their confession must be acknowledged as such and tested and re-tested by the Scriptures themselves.

Confessions by nature are limiting concepts, the latter being defined by Cornelius Van Til:

> If we hold to a theology of the apparently paradoxical we must also hold, by consequence, the Christian notion of a limiting concept. The non-