

The Historical Development of Hermeneutics

by Thomas Ice

A couple of years ago Mark Hitchcock and I wrote a book interacting with Hank Hanegraaff of Bible Answer Man fame entitled *Breaking The Apocalypse Code*ⁱ. The reason we wrote the book is because Hanegraaff mentioned Tim LaHaye about 350 times in his book. I don't recall if any of them were in a good light. Hanegraaff's book *The Apocalypse Code*ⁱⁱ professed to be a book that would lay out the correct method for interpreting the Book of Revelation. Needless to say to this group, I was not impressed. In fact, I believe that if his method were followed, it would set hermeneutics back 500 years.

The well-known truism that “words have meaning and ideas have consequences” certainly applies to the issue of how to properly interpret Scripture, especially the prophetic portions. The Book of Proverbs speaks of the end of a matter,ⁱⁱⁱ in other words, where does one's viewpoint lead? A good way to examine this issue is to see where interpretive methods have lead in the past. I believe that Hanegraaff's interpretive approaches, if they become widely accepted, would send the church back to the Dark Ages hermeneutically. He may want to produce only a method of interpretation, but the moment anyone applies a method, it produces an outcome or model of eschatology.

HANEGRAAFF'S HERMENEUTICS

Hank Hanegraaff's book *The Apocalypse Code* is said to be primarily about method. He appears to come across as proud to tell readers that his methodology is “called Exegetical Eschatology or e²,”^{iv} as if no one before he came along had ever produced a view of eschatology from proper exegesis. Interestingly, for someone who claims such

a deep commitment “to a proper *method* of biblical interpretation,”^v it is stunning to realize that Hanegraaff’s “method” is stated as principles, rather than an actual method like the historical-grammatical, contextual approach.

Hanegraaff says, “I have organized the principles that are foundational to e² around the acronym LIGHTS.”^{vi} The letters of the acronym LIGHTS stands for the following principles: L refers to the literal principle, I represents the illumination principle, G stands for the grammatical principle, H for the historical principle, T means the typology principle, and S is for the principle of scriptural synergy.^{vii} Let’s briefly consider each of these points.

A major problem arises when one realizes that only half of Hanegraaff’s principles should even be classified as interpretive methods (method), the other three are best classified as theological beliefs (model). Hanegraaff says, “above all else I am deeply committed to a proper *method* of biblical interpretation rather than to any particular *model* of eschatology.”^{viii} It is not hard to figure out that when one incorporates theological conclusions (or as Hanegraaff calls them, a model of eschatology) into one’s method that it is impossible to take one’s method seriously.

In *AC*, the LIGHTS acronym conveys the six principles that compose Hanegraaff’s method for interpreting Bible prophecy. He writes a chapter explaining and demonstrating each principle. It is not the purpose of this paper to examine the soundness or lack thereof of Hanegraaff’s interpretative principles. I want to look at the historical implications of similar allegorical approaches throughout the history of the church.

HISTORY OF HERMENEUTICS

During the first two hundred years of the early church two competing schools of interpretation arose. One was the Syrian School of Antioch that championed literal and historical interpretation and the other was in North Africa at Alexandria, Egypt, which advocated an allegorical or spiritual hermeneutic. Bernard Ramm says, “The Syrian school fought Origen in particular as the inventor of the allegorical method, and maintained the primacy of the literal and historical interpretation.”^{ix} Alexander of Alexandria and Origen (185–254) developed the allegorical approach to biblical interpretation in the early third century.

“The fundamental criticism of Origen, beginning during his own lifetime,” notes Joseph Trigg, “was that he used allegorical interpretation to provide a specious justification for reinterpreting Christian doctrine in terms of Platonic philosophy.”^x Origen believed that “Proverbs 22:20 authorizes interpreters to seek a three-fold meaning in each passage of Scripture: fleshly, psychic and spiritual.” Since Origen believed that “the spiritual meaning belongs to a higher order of ideas than the literal,”^{xi} he was attracted to the spiritual or allegorical meaning of the text. Ronald Diprose explains the implications of an allegorical interpretation as follows:

He motivated this view by appealing to the principle of divine inspiration and by affirming that often statements made by the biblical writers are not literally true and that many events, presented as historical, are inherently impossible. Thus only simple believers will limit themselves to the literal meaning of the text.^{xii}

Hanegraaff sounds just like a twenty-first century Origen when he exhibits just such a rationale in his rejection of a literal interpretation of Bible prophecy on a number of issues. For

example, Hanegraaff labels LaHaye's view of Revelation 14:20 as a "literal-at-all-costs method of interpretation," where the text says that the blood from the slaughter will run "up to the horses' bridles, for a distance of two hundred miles." He declares: "Interpreting apocalyptic imagery in a woodenly literal sense inevitably leads to absurdity." Why does he think this is the case? Hanegraaff explains: "Since it is difficult to imagine that the blood of Christ's enemies could create a literal river reaching as high as 'the horses' bridles for a distance of 1,600 stadia,' LaHaye exercises extraordinary literary license."^{xiii} A page later Hanegraaff says, "Figurative language requires readers to use their imagination . . . Such imaginative leaps are the rule rather than the exception."^{xiv} Hanegraaff imagines that the blood in this passage, rather than just emanating from the subjects of God's judgment as the text says, it is also a symbol "of blood that flowed from Immanuel's veins."^{xv} As his imagination continues to speculate, we find out that "the number sixteen hundred is pregnant with meaning." He quotes preterist commentator David Chilton who "explains, that the number sixteen hundred is a number that uniquely emphasizes Palestine. Four squared symbolizes the land and ten squared is emblematic of the largeness of the land."^{xvi} Now how does he know that is what that means? Hanegraaff is clearly importing his meaning into the text. Where is the evidence that his explanation of sixteen hundred is the meaning? Why could it not be a multiple of eight, instead of four and ten? How does Hanegraaff know that this will not happen literally? We believe it will happen literally because that is what the text says will occur.

The bottom line of interpretation for the Syrian School at Antioch is their assertion that "the literal was plain-literal and figurative literal." By this, they meant that "a plain-literal sentence is a straightforward prose sentence with no figures of speech in it. 'The eye of the Lord is upon thee,' would be a figurative literal sentence."^{xvii} Such an approach had a tremendous impact on

Bible prophecy as R. H. Charles notes: “the Alexandrians, who, under the influence of Hellenism and the traditional allegorical school of interpretation which came to a head in Philo, rejected the literal sense of the Apocalypse, and attached to it a spiritual significance only.”^{xviii}

Further Hanegraaff’s downgrade of the modern state of Israel as prophetically significant also has roots in Origen and an allegorical hermeneutic. Diprose notes as follows:

An attitude of contempt towards Israel had become the rule by Origen’s time. The new element in his own view of Israel is his perception of them as “manifesting no elevation [of thought]”. It follows that the interpreter must always posit a deeper or higher meaning for prophecies relating to Judea, Jerusalem, Israel, Judah and Jacob which, he affirms, are “not being understood by us in a ‘carnal’ sense.”

In Origen’s understanding, the only positive function of *physical* Israel was that of being a type of *spiritual* Israel. The promises were not made to physical Israel because she was unworthy of them and incapable of understanding them. Thus Origen effectively disinherits physical Israel.^{xix}

Hanegraaff’s treatment of Israel follows the same course as Origen. In Hanegraaff’s model of eschatology, he clearly disinherits physical Israel and replaces her with what he regularly calls “spiritual Israel,”^{xx} which is the church. “Origen likens Israel to a divorced wife in whom an unseemly thing had been found,” notes Diprose. Origen says, “And a sign that she has received the bill of divorce is this, that Jerusalem was destroyed along with what they called the sanctuary.”^{xxi} Hanegraaff holds a similar view as he regularly depicts Israel “as an insatiable prostitute,”^{xxii} while the church is “the purified bride.”^{xxiii} In spite of all the evidence in his book, from a historical perspective, Hanegraaff says he has “never argued for Replacement Theology.”^{xxiv} Geisler provides a more reasonable assessment when he says, “ideas do have consequences, and the typological-allegorical idea has had severe consequences in the history of the church. Denying a literal fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel have led to anti-Semitism.”

Geisler concludes that those “who replace literal Israel with a spiritual church, nullify the literal land and throne promises, thus opening the door to Liberalism and cultism.”^{xxv}

Although the Syrian school had great influence the first few centuries the Alexandrian school eventually won out, as Jerome and Augustine were advocates of the allegorical approach in the area of Bible prophecy. Henry Preserved Smith concludes concerning Augustine that “with his endorsement allegory may fairly be said to have triumphed.”^{xxvi} Their influence paved the way for the dominance of allegorical interpretation during much of the Middle Ages, especially when it came to Bible prophecy. Augustine developed a dual hermeneutic. On the one hand, he tended to interpret the Bible literally, but when it came to eschatology he interpreted that spiritually or allegorically.

The Middle Ages

The Middle Ages was a time that was primarily dominated by an allegorical method of interpretation. Since Origen taught that the spiritual is the deeper or real meaning of a text, why deal with the inferior literal meaning of a passage when one can see so much more in the spiritual realm. One of the beliefs that became dominant, especially in late-Medieval times, was the belief that every sentence in the pages of Scripture has to be understood as referring to Christ. This erroneous interpretive dictum was based upon a misapplication of Luke 24:44, which says, “Now He said to them, ‘These are My words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that all things which are written about Me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled.’” This passage does not say that every word or sentence in the Old Testament has to refer to Jesus, the Messiah, but instead it says Jesus is the one being referenced in the Old Testament when it speaks of the Messiah. This would mean that a clearly historical passage like

1 Chronicles 26:18, which says, “At the Parbar on the west there were four at the highway and two at the Parbar,” would have to be interpreted as referring to Christ. This sentence is not speaking about Christ, but through allegorical alchemy it was explained in some kind of Christological way. “During these nine centuries we find very little except the ‘glimmerings and decays’ of patristic exposition,” notes Farrar. “Much of the learning which still continued to exist was devoted to something which was meant for exegesis, yet not one writer in hundreds showed any true conception of what exegesis really implies.”^{xxvii}

The Reformation

It was not until the dawning of the Reformation that biblical interpretation began to return to the sanity of literal interpretation. The Reformation could not have occurred if the reformers did not have the confidence that they knew what God’s Word was saying. “The tradition of the Syrian school . . . became the essential hermeneutical theory of the Reformers.”^{xxviii} Ramm points out that in Europe “there was a hermeneutical Reformation which preceded the ecclesiastical Reformation.”^{xxix} Thus, we see demonstrated once again in history that one’s interpretive method precedes and produces one’s exegesis and then their theological beliefs (i.e., model). Luther and Calvin generally returned the church to literal interpretation. Had they not done this, then Protestantism would have never been born and reformation would have never taken place. Luther said, “The literal sense of Scripture alone is the whole essence of faith and of Christian theology.”^{xxx} Calvin said, “It is the first business of an interpreter to let his author say what he does, instead of attributing to him what we think he ought to say.”^{xxxi} However, like most of us Luther and Calvin did not always follow their own theory, but they and like-minded reformers turned the hermeneutical tide in the right direction.

The Post-Reformation

During the post-reformation period many protestants began to slowly cast off a thousand years of allegorical interpretation of the Bible, especially in the area of Bible prophecy. They applied literal interpretation first in issues relating to the doctrine of salvation and then began to apply it increasingly to the entire Bible. In the early 1600s there was a return to premillennialism because of some started applying the literal hermeneutic to Revelation 20.^{xxxii} At the same time many protestants began to see that there was a literal future for national Israel,^{xxxiii} which was spearheaded by reading the premillennialism of the early church fathers^{xxxiv} and for the English-speaking world the notes in the Geneva Bible.^{xxxv}

Even though literal interpretation was being restored during the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, it still took a while for biblical interpreters to more consistently rid themselves of the medieval allegorical influences. For the influential Puritan theologian William Perkins, “the medieval four-fold sense was reduced to a two-fold or double-literal sense.”^{xxxvi} This would be similar to Augustine’s dual hermeneutic. However, most Protestant Bible interpreters were increasingly moving toward the literal hermeneutic and functioning within that framework so that the historical, grammatical, contextual method is labeled the Protestant hermeneutic.^{xxxvii}

While biblical interpretation by the 1600s tended to agree in theory that literal interpretation is the right way to handle Scripture, it still took a couple hundred years to work that out into every area of Bible interpretation, especially when it came to dealing with Bible prophecy. Even though premillennialism had been restored, it was still dominated to a large extent by the blend of literal and allegorical interpretation that is known as historicism, which calculated time within

a contrived day/year theory. Thus, 1260 days from Daniel and Revelation really referred to 1260 years. This is not literal interpretation!

It was not until the late 1700s and early 1800s that some biblical interpreters began to become consistent in applying a literal hermeneutic. Wallis tells us that, “a consistent futurism, which completely removes the necessity for calculating the times, did not emerge until the early nineteenth century.”^{xxxviii} In general, the Evangelical church, especially in the English-speaking world, returned to the premillennial futurism of the early church. Now they would apply the literal method and develop it beyond the beginning stage of the early church. As Wallis notes, the views of Irenaeus (c. 185) contained the basics of the literal and futurist understanding of Bible prophecy as seen in modern dispensationalism.^{xxxix} The important point to note here is that as interpreters became more consistent in applying a literal hermeneutic to the entire Bible, especially to biblical prophecy, it undoubtedly yielded a futurist view of prophecy. “We have returned to Irenaeus’ conception of the futurity of Daniel’s seventieth week,”^{xl} says Wallis.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TODAY

Hanegraaff admits to the current dominance of the futurist emphasis among Bible-believing evangelicals toward literal interpretation for the entire Bible including prophecy, but he wants to change this 200-year trend. In fact, he wants to create a paradigm shift away from the literal interpretation of Bible prophecy and back toward the mysticism of the Alexandrian school and the hermeneutical trends of the Middle Ages. This is not progress, rather if it were to happen it would be retrogression and downgrade.

When one studies the interpretive trends of the Middle Ages, we need to realize what this would mean for us today. Beryl Smalley, a Medieval scholar who specializes in their views of

biblical interpretation tells us that “they subordinated scholarship meanwhile to mysticism and to propaganda.”^{xli} “Again the crisis was reflected in biblical studies. The speculation of Joachim signified a new wave of mysticism.”^{xlii} “Revolution and uncertainty have discouraged biblical scholarship in the past and stimulated more subjective modes of interpretation,” she contends. “Conditions today are giving rise to a certain sympathy with the allegorists. We have a spate of studies on medieval ‘spirituality’.”^{xliii} Hanegraaff demonstrates in his *AC* that he is following the overall trends of both secular society and too many evangelicals who are moving away from literal interpretation into the shadowy darkness of non-literal hermeneutics.

We have noticed that culture cycles back-and-forth between rationalism and mysticism over the years. Since the 1960s, American culture has definitely moved in the direction of and is now firmly dominated by a mystical worldview. Biblical Christianity is not based on reason or mysticism as its starting point for truth instead it is built upon revelation or God’s Word. When mysticism dominates a culture’s mindset then it predisposes one hermeneutically toward mysticism and non-literal interpretation. It is into just such an American evangelical climate that Hanegraaff’s non-literal approach to Bible prophecy enters.

Dr. John Walvoord was asked a few years ago “what do you predict will be the most significant theological issues over the next ten years?” His answer includes the following: “the hermeneutical problem of not interpreting the Bible literally, especially the prophetic areas. The church today is engulfed in the idea that one cannot interpret prophecy literally.”^{xliv}

Walt Kaiser suggested about twenty-five years ago that the church is “now going through a hermeneutical crisis, perhaps as significant in its importance and outcome as that of the Reformation.”^{xlv} He notes, “the meaning of the text lies in its subject matter, rather than in what an author meant by that text.”^{xlvi} Kaiser explains further:

The process of exegesis of a text is no longer linear but circular—one in which the interpreter affects his text as much as the text (in its subject matter) somehow affects the interpreter as well. Clearly, there is a confusion of ontology with epistemology, the subject with the object, the "thereness" of the propositions of the text with the total cultural and interpretive "baggage" of the interpreter.^{xlvii}

Geisler says that his chief concern about the AC is that it "is based on an allegorical method of interpreting prophetic Scripture, that if applied to other teachings of Scripture, would undermine the salvation essentials of the Christian Faith."^{xlviii} We share Geisler's concern, especially in light of the fact that it is this method that Hanegraaff wants to emphasize.^{xlix} It is clear from 2,000 years of church history that if we do indeed adopt Hanegraaff's method for interpreting Bible prophecy then it will put us back on the road to the subjectivism and mysticism of the Dark Ages. "It is sad that a man who has fought so hard for so long against cults and aberrant teachings," concludes Geisler, "has himself succumbed to a method of interpreting the Bible that is not significantly different from those used by the cults which he so vigorously opposes."¹

ⁱ Mark Hitchcock & Thomas Ice, *Breaking The Apocalypse Code* (Cosa Mesa, CA: The Word for Today, 2007).

ⁱⁱ Hank Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2007).

ⁱⁱⁱ For example Proverbs 5:4, 11; 14:12, 13; 16:25; 18:18; 20:21; 25:8; 29:21.

^{iv} Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code*, p. xxvii.

^v Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code*, p. 2. Italics original.

^{vi} Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code*, p. 3.

^{vii} Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code*, pp. 3–10.

^{viii} Hanegraaff, *The Apocalypse Code*, p. 2. Italics original.

^{ix} Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics*, 3rd edition, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970), p. 49.

^x Joseph W. Trigg, "Introduction," in R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory & Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), p. vi.

^{xi} Ronald E. Diprose, *Israel in the development of Christian thought* (Rome: Instituto Biblico Evangelico Italiano, 2000), p. 87. Frederic W. Farrar tells explains further: "The Bible, he [Origen] argued, is meant for the salvation of man; but man, as Plato tells us, consists of three parts—body, soul, and spirit. Scripture therefore must have a threefold sense corresponding to this trichotomy. It has a literal, a moral, and a mystic meaning analogous to the body, to the soul, to the spirit. . . . But of two of these three supposed senses Origen makes very little use. To the moral sense he refers but seldom; to the literal sense scarcely at all." Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, [1886] 1961), pp. 196–97.

-
- ^{xii} Diprose, *Israel*, pp. 87–88.
- ^{xiii} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, p. 21.
- ^{xiv} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, p. 23.
- ^{xv} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, p. 22.
- ^{xvi} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, p. 23.
- ^{xvii} Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, p. 49.
- ^{xviii} R. H. Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913), p. 11.
- ^{xix} Diprose, *Israel*, p. 89. (emphasis original)
- ^{xx} See for example, Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, pp. 116, 124, 127, 180, 199, 200, 221.
- ^{xxi} Diprose, *Israel*, p. 90.
- ^{xxii} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, pp. 115–16, 117–24, 233–35.
- ^{xxiii} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, pp. 116, 124–28, 135–36.
- ^{xxiv} Hank Hanegraaff, “Response to *National Liberty Journal* article on *The Apocalypse Code*, www.equip.org/site/apps/nl/content2.asp?c=mu11LaMNJrE&b=2616123&ct=3839317.
- ^{xxv} Geisler, “Review of Hank.” It is interesting that Hanegraaff does understand his own model within a historical context of what the church has believed throughout her history. Thinking that he does not hold to any form of replacement theology he says, “God has only ever had one chosen people who form one covenant community, . . . As such, the true church is true Israel, and true Israel is truly the church—one cannot replace what it already is.” Hanegraaff, “Response.”
- ^{xxvi} Henry Preserved Smith, *Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1921), p. 58.
- ^{xxvii} Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, [1886] 1961), pp. 245–46.
- ^{xxviii} Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, p. 51.
- ^{xxix} Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, p. 52.
- ^{xxx} Martin Luther cited in Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, p. 54.
- ^{xxxi} John Calvin cited in Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, p. 58.
- ^{xxxii} Jeffrey K. Jue documents how Joseph Mede and a host of many others among the English began adopting a millennialist view of eschatology. Jue says, “By the mid-seventeenth century the most popular eschatological position in England was millenarianism. *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (Dordrecht, Holland: Springer, 2006), p. 4.
- ^{xxxiii} Jue notes that, “the majority of New England puritans held to the doctrine of a future national conversion of ethnic Jews.” *Heaven Upon Earth*, p. 191. “The doctrine of the national conversion of the Jews was an integral part of the eschatology of the New England settlers.” Jue, *Heaven Upon Earth*, p. 193. “Virtually all seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century millennialists on both sides of the Atlantic agreed that even though the Jews were still languishing in their Diaspora, Jehovah had not forgotten his chosen people and would, in due time, restore them to their once-elevated position among the nations.” Reiner Smolinski, *The Threefold Paradise of Cotton Mather: An Edition of “Triparadisus,”* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1995), p. 21.
- ^{xxxiv} Wallis tells us: “The rediscovery of the last five chapter of Irenaeus about 1570 may have contributed to Alsted’s formulation of premillennialism, since he and others used the writers of the ancient church. We may feel that the intensive Bible study of the Reformation, combined with the knowledge of antiquity, was beginning to swing the pendulum back to the primitive premillennialism of Irenaeus which had been rejected by Augustine.” Wilber B. Wallis, “Reflections on the History of Premillennial Thought,” in R. Laird Harris, Swee-Hwa Quek, & J. Robert Vannoy, editors, *Interpretation & History: Essays in honour of Allen A. MacRae* (Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986), p. 229. Early Puritan Joseph “Mede observed a similarity between Patristic chiliasm and his own millenarianism especially the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. However, in the early sixteenth century any appeal to the Ante-Nicene Fathers’ views on the Apocalypse was discouraged for fear of encouraging their chiliasm.” Jue, *Heaven Upon Earth*, p. 110.
- ^{xxxv} In a note on Romans 11:25, The Geneva Bible says, “The blindness of the Jews is neither so universal that the Lord hath no elect in that nation, neither shall it be continual for there shall be a time wherein they also (as the Prophets have forewarned) shall effectually embrace that which they do now so

stubbornly for the most part reject and refuse." *The 1599 Geneva Bible* (White Hall, WV: Tolle Lege Press, 2006), p. 1155. Notice that this note believes that the Old Testament Prophets also taught a future for Israel as well.

^{xxxvi} Jue, *Heaven Upon Earth*, p. 199.

^{xxxvii} Bernard Ramm has entitled his presentation of literal interpretation or the historical, grammatical, and contextual method as Protestant Biblical Interpretation in his book with that title. Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics*, 3rd edition, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970).

^{xxxviii} Wallis, "Reflections," p. 229.

^{xxxix} Wallis, "Reflections," pp. 232–34.

^{xl} Wallis, "Reflections," p. 234.

^{xli} Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, [1964], 1982), p. 358.

^{xlii} Smalley, *The Study*, p. 359.

^{xliii} Smalley, *The Study*, p. 360. Traditionally non-literal interpretation has been an old garment that has been labeled "spiritualizing." In this approach the words of the author are clothed with some deeper spiritual sense. With this method of interpretation, the words of the Old Testament prophets are often explained away. A more recent and "fashionable" term is *sensus plenior*. Use of this concept involves finding a "fuller meaning" that the author did not clearly intend. The "layered look" is also finding its way into the evangelical community as some are returning to the multiple meanings of the text once held by the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages. Waltke suggests a fourfold approach: historical, typical, analogical, and moral. See Bruce K. Waltke, "The Schoolmen's Hermeneutics Reconsidered," an unpublished paper given at the Northwest Evangelical Theological meeting: April 1993.

^{xliv} "An Interview: Dr. John F. Walvoord Looks at Dallas Seminary," *Dallas Connection* (Winter 1994, Vol. 1, No. 3), p. 4.

^{xlvi} Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "Evangelical Hermeneutics: Restatement, Advance or Retreat from the Reformation?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 46 (1982), p. 167. Kaiser believes that the present-day crisis finds its historical roots in the writings of liberal existentialists like Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), and Hans Georg Gadamer (b. 1900). Kaiser, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," p. 167.

^{xlvi} Kaiser, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," p. 167.

^{xlvi} Kaiser, "Evangelical Hermeneutics," p. 167.

^{xlvi} Geisler, "Review of Hank."

^{xlvi} Hanegraaff, *Apocalypse Code*, p. 2.

¹ Geisler, "Review of Hank."