The Biblical Basis for Logic

Dan Vacco, M.A.

The Biblical Basis for Logic

Introduction

The twenty-first century is a time of extreme irrationalism. Irrationalism is characterized by a de-emphasis on reason and logic. In this context, logic has been regarded as conventional, relativistic, or dependent on the constructs of language. It can often be denied that the laws of logic are universally true. Human thought does not need to be captive to them. Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen, philosophers, and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do."[1] A.J. Ayer asserted, "There is no absolute standard of rationality…. If in the future we were to adopt different methods, then beliefs which are now rational might become irrational from the standpoint of these new methods."[2] Although this will not be an in-depth critique of irrationalism, these ideas deserve a response.

Attempts to deny the laws of logic are self-defeating. The *law of contradiction*, "asserts that *A* can't be both *A* and non-*A* at the same time and in the same relationship."[3] If someone like Ayer or Emerson wishes to deny the *law of contradiction* then their very denial ends up being an assertion of its validity. Ayer claims there is no absolute standard of rationality, which can be labelled position *A*. Non-*A* becomes the position that there is *not* no absolute standard of rationality. In other words non-A is that there *is* an absolute standard of rationality. Ayer is assuming that it is universally true that *A* is true and that non-*A* is false. Relativism in logic is

---

[1] Ralph Waldo Emerson as quoted in A.J. Hoover, *Don't You Believe It!* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1982), 16.
[2] A.J. Ayer *Language, Truth, and Logic* (New York: Dover Publications, 1952), 100. Also quoted in Gordon Clark, *Language and Theology* (Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1993), 48.
[3] Hoover, *Ibid*, 15.

true, and absolutism is false. However, his assumption, that rules of logic will change, requires him to use the *law of contradiction* as an absolute. But, if Ayer is correct, then the *law of contradiction* is not a law. Therefore, he cannot exclude non-*A* from his assertion, the very thing he has just done. His very assertion turns out to be a denial of his own position. His position can only be meaningful if he is wrong. He cannot be correct, since to be correct he would also have to be not-correct at the same time and in the same way. The result would be the equally valid conclusion that Ayer just said, "There is absolute morality," which is the very thing Ayer wants to deny. Ayer's irrationality is impossible on his own assertion.

The *law of contradiction* cannot be avoided. A.J. Hoover uses Aristotle to illustrate the way to show a skeptic that this law is required. As soon as someone affirms anything meaningful to both the speaker and hearer, the law is justified. "If you say anything at all meaningful, you implicitly deny the contradiction of your own statement."[4] This is demonstrated in the use of the formal symbols in the paragraph above. Any assertion requires its negation to be denied, or else the statement is meaningless. When someone meaningfully attempts to deny the *law of contradiction*, their denial must be false. If it is not false, then their statement of denial becomes meaningless because it will also mean its opposite. Meaninglessness does not need to be refuted. However, the very assumption that the rejection is meaningful, refutes the denial itself.

The question then becomes whether or not there is a foundation for logic. Hoover answers, "You don't prove [logic] in the same way you prove most other things, because it is the basis of all other kinds of proof. It is so ultimate in your thinking process that it must be self-evident. You could never get 'behind' or 'under' it."[5] Contrary to this, Gordon Clark points

---

[4] Hoover, *Don't You Believe It!*, 16.
[5] *Ibid*.

to passages of Scripture like Ps 31:5, and 1 John 5:6, which claim that God is a God of Truth. He exclaims, "Such verses indicate that God is a rational, thinking being, whose thought exhibits the structure of Aristotelian Logic."[6] Earlier he had stated, "Even Aristotle failed to give Aristotelian logic an acceptable basis."[7] Clark disagrees with Hoover and thinks Scripture *does* get, "behind," and "under," the laws of logic.

The Word of God does provide a basis for the laws of logic. God did not leave His people to an appearance of undeniability regarding the laws of logic. He has established those very laws in His Holy Word.

The following will examine various laws of logic that are found in Scripture. First, the nature of the laws of logic will be justified by the scriptures. That is, the laws of logic will be seen to be universal, unchanging, and immaterial. Second, the three basic laws of logic will be found in Scripture. Those basic laws are; (1) *the law of identity,* (2) *the law of excluded middle*, and (3) *the law of contradiction*. Third, various aspects of formal logic will be discovered in the Word of God.[8] Fourth, some informal fallacies of logic will be established by the Bible. If the laws of logic are found in the Word of God, and the latter is the foundation for all truth[9], then Clark is correct, and there is a foundation for logic. Christians do not need to have a blind faith in logic, since logic is established by the certain Word of God in the Bible. Faith in the scriptures establishes logic.

The Nature of the Laws of Logic

---

[6] Clark, *Language and Theology*, 137. In addition to Clark, philosopher Greg Bahnsen, and astrophysicist Jason Lisle, both assert in many places that the laws of logic are the ways God thinks. This will be demonstrated below.
[7] *Ibid*, 103.
[8] Formal logic is distinguished from informal logic in that the former are examples of error due to the *form* an argument takes, while the latter can be viewed as errors of *language*.
[9] This assertion is assumed in this paper but cannot be defended at this time.

The laws of logic must be universal, unchanging, and immaterial. In order for our thinking to be

reliable, these laws cannot be conventions, changeable, or material. That they cannot be

changeable conventions has been illustrated in the previous section. That they cannot be material

should be obvious. Dr. Greg Bahnsen demonstrated the necessity of the immaterial nature of the

laws of logic in his debate with Dr. Gordon Stein in *The Great Debate*.[10] In the

cross-examination portion of the debate, Bahnsen asked Stein, a materialist, if the laws of logic

are material in nature. Stein asked, "How can a law be material?"[11] It is significant that even a

materialist must acknowledge the existence of immaterial laws. Jason Lisle, an astrophysicist,

affirms this when he says:

> You cannot stub your toe on a law of logic, or accidentally swallow one. They are not made of
> matter and do not have a location in space. They deal with ideas not physical things. No one uses
> a law of logic like a hammer to drive in a nail, or like a shovel to dig a ditch. Rather, we use them
> to analyze ideas and to reason properly.[12]

The laws of logic indeed *must* be universal and immaterial.

Christianity easily explains these characteristics of the laws of logic. Lisle writes, "All

these properties of logic make sense in the Christian worldview, where the laws of logic are

God's standard of thinking. Since God is an unchanging, sovereign, immaterial Being, His

thoughts would necessarily be abstract, universal, invariant entities."[13] The thoughts of God must

---

[10]The full debate is posted by trueblueauctions, "The Great Debate: Does God Exist? Dr. Greg Bahnsen versus Dr. Gordon Stein," *Youtube*, May 19, 2012, 2:12:11, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZLZdOGCE5KQ. The relevant portion begins at 39:48.

[11] For a written account of this, see Bahnsen, *Pushing the Antithesis,* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 2017), xxi-xxii.

[12] Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation,* (Green Forest, AR: MasterBooks, 2009) 55.

[13] *Ibid*.

partake of the nature of God. If God is abstract (i.e. immaterial), universal and unchanging, then His thoughts must be as well.

Scripture reveals that God is universal. There is not a single portion of the universe where God is not found, and where His thinking will not be valid. God asks the people of Jerusalem, "Do you really think anyone can hide himself where I cannot see him?" and, "Do you not know that I am everywhere?" (Jer 23:24). David affirms the universality of God's presence in Psalm 139:7-8: "Where can I go to escape your Spirit? Where can I flee to escape your presence? If I were to ascend to heaven, you would be there. If I were to sprawl out in Sheol, there you would be." There is no place where God, or His thoughts, will not be found.[14]

The Christian worldview also establishes that God is immaterial. John, in his Gospel, conveys, "God is spirit, and the people who worship him must worship in spirit and truth," (John 4:24).[15] Further, Paul tells Timothy, "Now to the eternal king, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever! Amen," (1 Tim 1:17). Paul establishes the immaterial nature of God by claiming that He is invisible. This is why the laws of logic cannot be found by stepping on them. God, and His thoughts, are immaterial, or invisible.

Lastly, Scripture affirms the unchangeableness of God. Balaam tells Balak, "God is not a man, that he should lie, nor a human being, that he should change his mind," (Num 23:19a). The writer of Hebrews declares that, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever!" (Heb 13:8). Finally, James assures his readers that, "All generous giving and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or the slightest hint of change," (Jas 1:17).

---

[14] Lisle, *Ultimate Proof,* 55. These are the scriptures Lisle uses to defend the idea that the laws of logic are universal.
[15] *Ibid.*

In light of the fact that the laws of logic are established by God's thinking, it makes sense that the laws of logic cannot be refuted. People cannot deny the laws of logic without using them, because they live in God's universe even if they do not believe that they do. God created everything (Gen 1:1, John 1:1). People who reject Christianity, still live in His universe and are still made in God's image (Gen 1:27). Because of this, any attempt to relativize the laws of logic must fail. They must fail because such an assertion is a denial of the very reality in which the denial is being affirmed.

The Christain worldview provides a basis for the necessary characteristics of the laws of logic. Hoover is incorrect then to assert that there is no basis of the laws of Logic. Clark is correct; God's thinking establishes the laws of logic.

The Three Basic Laws of Logic

Christians, based on Scripture, are not left with just an understanding of the nature of the laws of logic. Specific laws of logic are found throughout the Word of God. In this section, the three basic laws of logic will be discovered in the biblical text. These laws are established by the scriptures.

The first of the basic laws of logic is the *law of contradiction*. Hoover defines this law as asserting that, "*A* can't be both *A* and non-*A* at the same time and in the same relationship."[16] Lisle demonstrates this law in Scripture by looking to 2 Timothy 2:13; "If we are unfaithful, he remains faithful, since he cannot deny himself."[17] God cannot deny Himself. In other words God cannot be *A* while also being non-*A*. God's very nature establishes the *law of contradiction*.

---

[16] Hoover, *Don't You Believe It!*, 15.
[17] Lisle, *Ultimate Proof*, 54.

Scripture also affirms that God does not lie (Num 23:19). Lying necessitates the *law of contradiction* is valid. For lying to be possible *A* cannot also be its opposite non-*A*. If event *A* is, "I broke the lamp," then non-*A* is, "I did not break the lamp." Both of these cannot be true at the same time and in the same respect if the lamp is indeed broken. If God says that sinners can be forgiven of their sins in Jesus Christ (Rom 3:24-28, 4:6-8, 1 John 1:9), and God does not lie, then it must be false that sinners cannot be forgiven of their sins in Jesus Christ. In light of this, God commands that human beings ought not to lie (Exod 20:16). Human thinking is to be patterned after the nature of God's thinking. God does not violate the *law of contradiction* and human beings are not to do so either.

The second of the basic laws of logic is the *law of identity*. Hoover defines this law to mean, "that *A* is *A*; that every event and every judgment is identical with itself."[18] This law is established by God in His declaration of Himself to Moses. God said, "I AM that I AM," (Exod 3:14).[19] In other words God is God, or *A* is *A*. Jesus', "I am," statements also establish the reliability of this law.[20] God is identical with Himself. In light of this, the theological implications of Jesus declaring Himself to be, "I am," cannot be overstated.

The third of the basic laws of logic is the *law of excluded middle*. Again, Hoover submits that this law, "asserts that everything must be either *A* or non-*A*."[21] A car is either in the garage or not in the garage. Someone may object that the car could be half-way in the garage. This still affirms the *law of excluded middle* since the car is half-way in the garage and not not half-way in

---

[18] Hoover, *Don't You Believe It!*, 15.
[19] Bahnsen uses this text to establish the law of identity in Bahnsen, *Pushing the Antithesis*, 241.
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] *Ibid*.

the garage. One would have to assert that the car is half-way in the garage and not half-way in the garage at the same time to be denying this law. This should be obvious nonsense.

Scripture establishes the *law of excluded middle*. Jesus said, "Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters," (Matt 12:30).[22] Someone is either with Christ, position *A*, or not with Christ, position non-*A*. They cannot be for Christ and against Him at the same time. It is either *A* or non-*A*.

Samuel uses the *law of excluded middle* in order to rebuke Saul. In 1 Samuel 15:3, Saul is commanded, "Destroy everything [the Amalekites] have. Don't spare them. Put them to death—man, woman, child, infant, ox, sheep, camel, and donkey alike.". Instead of destroying everything, Saul spares the king, "as well as everything else that was of value," (1 Sam 1:9). When Samuel comes to Saul he hears the sheep and cattle that were supposed to be destroyed. Samuel challenges Saul as to why he did not obey the Lord's command. He was supposed to destroy everything, but he did not. Saul defends himself and says, "But I have obeyed the Lord!" (v. 20). Samuel repeats the charge that Saul indeed did not obey God's command. Samuel is vindicated and Saul repents.

The validity of Samuel's charge is found in the *law of excluded middle*. Saul was commanded to destroy everything (*A*). He did not destroy everything (non-*A*). Saul could not destroy everything and not destroy everything at the same time. Everything was either completely destroyed, or not completely destroyed (either *A* or non-*A*). Since non-*A* occurred, and Saul was commanded *A*, Saul disobeyed and was guilty.

---

[22] Bahnsen uses the passage to justify the law of excluded middle, *ibid.*

Based on Scripture, the three basic laws of logic are found to be the way God thinks, and are directly related to His nature. The Christian then not only has a foundation for the nature of the laws of logic, but the most fundamental laws of logic are also affirmed and rest on the foundation of the Word of God. Scripture gets even more specific than this.

Formal Logic

Formal logic deals with the structure arguments take in order to justify their validity. Arguments often take the form of a syllogism. Clark defines a syllogism as, "an inference with two premises and three terms, the latter so arranged that one term from each premise is also in the conclusion, and one term is in both premises but not in the conclusion."[23] A valid syllogism is:

All *b* are *a.*

All *c* are *b.*

Therefore, all *c* are *a.*

This syllogism is often illustrated as:

All men are mortal.

Socrates is a man.

Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

This argument is in a valid form. In logic, this is given the name *barbara*.[24] There are only twenty-four valid syllogisms in logic.[25] Establishing every valid syllogism is beyond the scope of

---

[23] Gordon Clark, *Logic*, (Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1984), 59.
[24] *Ibid*, 69.
[25] See *ibid*, 57-82.

this paper. What follows is only a partial representation of what can be found in Scripture. If Scripture establishes a foundation for logic, then it should be expected that formal logic is also found in the Bible.

Scripture establishes various valid syllogisms. First, the valid syllogism illustrated above, *barbara*, is found in Scripture. In Malachi 1:6, God says, "A son naturally honors his father and a slave respects his master. If I am your father, where is my honor? If I am your master, where is my respect?" This statement can be translated into formal logic as:

All that-which-is-a-father are honor-worthy.

All God are that-which-is-a-father.

All God are honor-worthy.[26]

God argues using the syllogism *barbara*. The Christian logician is not left with blind faith in a logic textbook for the validity of this syllogism. If the logician starts with Scripture, a sure foundation is found.

Another valid syllogism is given the name *Camestres*.[27] This syllogism is:

All *a* are *b*.

No *c* are *b*.

Therefore, no *c* are *a*.

---

[26] In the grammar of logic, propositions are translated into "*b* are *a*" form even if it is bad grammar in English. The argument in proper English, and not logical form is: All fathers are worthy of honor. God is a father. Therefore, God is worthy of honor. In formal logic, *God* is considered a class to Himself.

[27] For logicians, this is *Camestres* of the second figure. See Clark, *Logic*, 59-72.

In the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John, Jesus is rebuking the Pharisees. He tells them that their father is the devil (v. 44). He asks them to consider why they do not believe the words that He speaks. Then, Jesus responds, "The one who belongs to God listens and responds to God's words. You don't listen and respond, because you don't belong to God," (v. 47). The phrase, "The one who belongs to God listens and responds to God's words," when translated into propositional form is, "Only those-who-belong-to-God are God's-words-hearers," or, "All God's-words-hearers are those-who-belong-to-God." In syllogistic form, Jesus said:

> All God's-words-hearers are those-who-belong-to-God.
>
> No you-Pharisees are those-who-belong-to-God.
>
> Therefore, no you-Pharisees are God's-words-hearers.

Keep in mind, the question was, "why don't you believe me?" (v. 46b). The conclusion has to answer the question as to why the Pharisees do not hear/believe Jesus' words. This passage is often misunderstood to conclude that Jesus is saying, "You Pharisees do not hear my word *therefore* you do not belong to God." But that was not the question. The question was not whether or not the Pharisees are of God, since this was already established in v.44, but why they do not hear His word. The dialogue is then, "Why do you not hear my words? All those that hear my word are of God. None of you are of God, Therefore, none of you can hear my words." This fits perfectly within the context of Jesus already declaring the proposition that they were not of God, since they were of the devil. More importantly, Jesus establishes *Camestres*. God uses proper formal logic to make His points.

Another aspect of formal logic deals with hypothetical syllogisms. An example of a hypothetical syllogism is:

If p then q.

p.

Therefore q.

There are two valid forms of the hypothetical syllogism and two invalid forms. One of each form will be established by Scripture below.

The first valid form of a hypothetical syllogism is called *Modus Ponens* or the method of affirming. The example in the previous paragraph is in this form. An illustration is the argument:

If it is snowing, then it must be cold outside.

It is snowing.

Therefore it must be cold outside.

This conclusion is valid.[28]

God's command in Genesis 1, and the following history, establish the validity of *Modus Ponens*. God told Adam, "But you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat from it you will surely die," (Gen 2:17). After Adam and Eve are tempted, Adam eats from the tree (v. 6). The result is Adam being cut off from his relationship to God (v.8), and physical death enters the world. In other words, God has written in His word:

If Adam eats of the tree, then he will die (Gen 2:17).

Adam eats of the tree (Gen 3:6).

Therefore, Adam died (Gen 3:7-19).

---

[28] This is the example Jason Lisle gives in *Ultimate Proof*, 144.

The Christian has the authority of God's Word in order to trust that *Modus Ponens* is reliable.

An invalid form a hypothetical syllogism called *affirming the consequent*. In symbolic form, the fallacy is:

If p then q.

q.

Therefore p.

An example is:

If Bob's credit card was stolen, then Bob will not be able to find his credit card.

Bob cannot find his credit card.

Therefore, Bob's credit card was stolen.

There are many other reasons that can explain why Bob cannot find his credit card. Perhaps he dropped it at the grocery store. Perhaps his two-year-old son threw it down a heating vent. This fallacy is often committed in scientific studies.

God warns His people not to commit this fallacy in the book of Proverbs, when He says, "The first to state his case seems right, until his opponent begins to cross-examine him," (Prov 18:17). In syllogistic form:

If the case occurred in a certain way, then a person will say it happened in that way.

A person says it happened in that way.

Therefore, it must have happened in that certain way.

That person could be lying. They could have misunderstood the situation. They could be genuinely mistaken. They could be remembering incorrectly. Each of these is just as likely an explanation as to why a person may say a case took place in a certain way. It is then fallacious to draw the conclusion that it must have happened as the person said. This error in reasoning is committed far too often.

God thinks and argues according to the principles of formal logic. It is not that God's thoughts are tested against the rules found in logic textbooks. It is that the rules of logic are discovered to have a foundation which establishes them as reliable. Unlike Hoover's assertion, the laws of logic are not rationalistic presuppositions. They are deductions made from God's Holy Word.

Informal Logic

Informal logic is not concerned with symbolic form.[29] When people commit fallacies of informal logic, the error is not found in their construction of an invalid syllogism. Instead, these fallacies are largely the result of ambiguity, presumption, or relevance.[30] Ambiguity occurs when an argument is made using terms that are not clearly defined, or that change definition.[31] Errors of presumption occur when not enough information is present in order for a certain conclusion to be determined.[32] Fallacies of relevance happen when a conclusion is drawn that is not logically

---

[29] Lisle, *Ultimate Proof*, 120.
[30] *Ibid*, 121.
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *Ibid*, 123.

related to the premise.[33] A few examples from Scripture will be provided in order to establish that God's thinking is the foundation for informal logic as well.

One of the most common fallacies of ambiguity is that of *equivocation*. Someone commits this error when the definition of a term changes in the middle of an argument. Jason Lisle gives the example, "Practice makes perfect. Doctors practice medicine. Therefore, doctors must be perfect."[34] The error is in the changed definition of the term *practice* which makes the conclusion not follow from the premises.

Paul reveals that Israelites in his day committed this fallacy. In Romans 9, he discusses who are truly God's children (*Grk* τέκνα), or descendants (*Grk* σπέρμα). He says, "This means it is not the children (τέκνα) of the flesh who are the children (τέκνα) of God; rather, the children (τέκνα) of promise are counted as descendants (σπέρμα)," (Rom 9:8). In this verse the term τέκνα is used in three ways: (1) τέκνα of the flesh, or a physical descendant; (2) τέκνα of God; and (3) τέκνα of promise. Meanings (2) and (3) correspond, but are distinct from meaning (1). When an Israelite believed that because they were τέκνα of the flesh they were therefore τέκνα of God, they were guilty of equivocation. The term τέκνα changed meaning from physical descent to one who truly had a relationship with the God of Israel. Since they missed that distinction they were incorrect in their conclusion.

Fallacies of presumption are also established in Scripture. The *fallacy of bifurcation,* which is often referred to as the *fallacy of a false dichotomy,* occurs when someone presents an argument as if there are only two options, when more possibilities exist. Jesus establishes that this is a fallacy in his interaction with the Pharisees in Matthew 22. The Pharisees thought they

---

[33] Lisle, *Ultimate Proof, 131*.
[34] *Ibid,* 121

would trap Jesus by asking Him if it was lawful to pay taxes to Caesar. The assumption was that

if He answered in the affirmative, He would be at fault for siding with the Roman empire over

God's people. If he answered in the negative, then He would be guilty of rebellion against the

Romans. The implication of the question is the assumption that one must honor Rome or God.

Jesus replied, "Then give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are

God's," (Matt 22:21b). Jesus revealed that there were more than just the two options presented.

The correct answer is the option the Pharisees did not mention. One can honor both the

government *and* God.

The *fallacy of the hasty generalization* occurs when someone draws a universal

conclusion with too little data. Paul reminds the church in Rome that they should not commit this

fallacy. Paul had just established that many Jewish people had rejected Christ (see Romans 10).

The conclusion could then be made that God has completely rejected *all* Israelites (Rom 11:1).

Paul assures the church that God has kept a remnant for Himself (Rom 11:2-5). Just because

some Israelites have rejected Christ does not mean that all have. Paul himself is proof that to

draw the universal conclusion is the *hasty generalization fallacy.* All implies some, but some

does not imply all.

Finally, errors of relevance are demonstrated in the Bible. The *fallacy of the faulty appeal*

to fear occurs when someone does not convince using reason, but elicits ideas of coming harm to

the person who does not affirm the desired conclusion.[35] This is similar to the *ad baculum*

fallacy, or the *appeal to force*. A threat of harm can be made, which would then motivate

someone to adopt a certain conclusion based on fear instead of reason. Pilate fell victim to these

---

[35] Lisle, *Ultimate Proof*, 133.

fallacies when he condemned Jesus to the cross. In John 19, it is evident that Pilate did not hold

to the conclusion that Jesus was guilty as the Pharisees wanted. Scripture is abundantly clear that

Jesus in fact was not guilty. However, the Jewish leaders could not convince Pilate to adopt their

conclusion based on reason. Instead, they said, "If you release this man, you are no friend of

Caesar! Everyone who claims to be a king opposes Caesar!" (John 19:12b). This is a not so

veiled threat that political trouble would come to Pilate if he did not condemn Christ to death.

Pilate comes to their conclusion and hands Jesus over to be crucified, not because evidence and

reason had forced him to the conclusion, but out of a fear of the consequences of not drawing

that conclusion.

Various fallacies of informal logic are found in Scripture. God rejects faulty conclusions

based on ambiguity, relevance, and presumption. God's thinking is the basis for informal logic as

well.

Conclusion

God's Word establishes logic. The above is not a full presentation of every way in which God's

thinking is the foundation for Aristotle's laws. However, it does reveal that God thinks according

to the ways these laws are described. Christians ought to learn from God's thinking process.

God's people do not honor God by violating His standards of reasoning.

God's Word is the foundation for Logic. Hoover had claimed that it is impossible to get

behind or under logic in order to justify it. Clark asserted that God's thinking is the foundation

for logic. Clark is correct. The Christian who holds to the authority of God's Word is not left to

rationalistic assumptions regarding the nature of the laws of logic. God establishes, in His certain

Word, that the laws of logic, because they are how he thinks, are indeed universal, unchangeable, and immaterial.

Bibliography

Ayer, A.J. *Language, Truth, and Logic.* New York: Dover Publications, 1952.

Bahnsen, Greg. *Pushing the Antithesis.* Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 2017.
.
Clark, Gordon H. *Language and Theology*. Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1993.

Clark, Gordon H. *Logic*. Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1984.

Hoover, A.J. *Don't You Believe It!* Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1982.

Lisle, *The Ultimate Proof of Creation,* (Green Forest, AR: MasterBooks, 2009).

Web Reference

Trueblueauctions. "The Great Debate: Does God Exist? Dr. Greg Bahnsen versus Dr. Gordon Stein." *Youtube*. May 19, 2012. 2:12:11. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZLZdOGCE5KQ.