

Searching for Theological Truth

Robert A. Herrmann Ph.D.

27 APRIL 1997. Latest revision 27 JUN 2016.

This is a non-technical article written for a general audience.

In the Beginning

In 1978, I made a fundamental scientific discovery that is used to construct significant mathematical models. This discovery allows certain theological notions to be mathematically modeled. The fundamental theory is “The Theory of Ultralogics.” Application of this theory was originally called the Grundlegend Model (i.e. G-model). The term G-model or G-structure now only refers to a set-theoretic construction. [At the end of this article, I present a brief discussion about the fundamental mathematics used to obtain this theory.] Portions of The Theory of Ultralogics are used to model attributes of God. This implies that such attributes are scientifically rational attributes. These portions were originally call the “Deductive-world (D-world) model.” The combination of the original methodology and the D-world model is now called the “GD-model.” Other portions of The Theory of Ultralogics and recent papers yield “The General Grand Unification Model (GGU-model)” and its “General Intelligence Design” (GID) interpretation.

Using various descriptions from C. S. Lewis, as mentioned, the G-model was first utilized theologically to model the attributes of the Godhead and major portions of the theological doctrines described by Lewis. These mathematically obtained findings were published in the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 34(1)(March 1982, pp. 17-23). Of course, the findings were actually submitted a year or so earlier than the publication date. One problem was evident. How does one know that the Scriptures actually state that such and such is an attribute of the Godhead, or such and such is a specific theological doctrine since I had relied mainly upon the C. S. Lewis descriptions?

At the time the G-model was being created (1978-1979), I attended a Lutheran Church near to my home. However, in actuality, I knew very little about the differences between the theological doctrines proclaimed by various denominations, doctrines that are contradictory. This situation needed to be corrected. Following 2 Tim 2:15, I began a study of these differences. My conclusion was that these differences, when they are compared one with another, may produce logical contradictions and, every now and then, they tend contradict a straightforward Scriptural interpretation, as it is substantiate by the G-model. As is often claimed, many of these differences came about by what is called “revelation” as “verified” by the indwelled Holy Ghost. But this Spirit is also called the Spirit of Truth, and, in the most common sense of the term, could not uphold contradictory doctrine.

Research indicates that the original languages used within the Old and New Testaments represent the common languages used at the time the various “books” were written. Further, research proves that Biblical logic is, in general, “common logic,” what we now call the “first-order predicate” logic or the classical logic investigated partially by Aristotle. This is the “scientific” logic that is used within most scientific disciplines and is absolute in a certain sense. This logic is a “two-valued” logic. This means that a written scientific description, if that description actually corresponds to a reality, is either “true” or “false,” and not both relative to such a reality.

A better way to understand this two-valued notion is that a statement that describes specific behavior can have only two outcomes. The behavior will occur or it will not occur, and the behavior cannot both occur and not occur. Further, these ideas can be extended to the concept of what is Scripturally described as “good” or “evil.” A behavior is either “good” or “evil,” and cannot be both “good” and “evil.” I point out that this two-valued concept need not correspond to objective reality since a written statement itself need not describe objective reality.

I concluded that in order to determine the proper theological doctrine, I would first need to ignore all doctrine presented by any of the church bodies of which I was aware and all forms of extra-biblical “revelation” as stated by any individual. The only doctrine I would accept is the doctrine stated explicitly within the Scriptures, starting with the explicit doctrine as stated by Jesus and His Apostles, and especially Paul, the Apostle to the gentiles.

If I am to be judged by God relative to my theological doctrine and can obtain unbiased documentation, then I firmly believe that I cannot use the excuse that I accept such and such doctrine **without** investigation simply because some individuals claim that their doctrine is correct. In this case, if I am held accountable for basic doctrine, then such doctrine should be obtainable in a straightforward manner, a manner comprehended by the ordinary human being. It should be comprehensible using everyday common logic. However, an obvious problem presented itself. I was aware that not all “Bibles” are the same. Subtle changes, such as word omissions or additions, different word arrangements, and even variant translations have occurred. Thus, I needed what is the best and most unbiased source for Biblical information.

Unbiased Scriptures

To ensure that I was minimally influenced by any form of Christian doctrine as stated by specific church denominations, my investigations were done in a manner that insulated me, as much as possible, from such doctrine. To investigate the Scriptures in as unbiased a format as possible, the oldest and most complete extant copies of the Scriptures that are

now in existence were consulted. Specifically these are the Sinaiticus (S), the Alexandrinus (A) and the Vaticanus (B) Greek manuscripts and some of the oldest fragments. None of these manuscripts is absolutely complete and a very minor amount of other evidence is necessary to fill in the missing sections. ((S) is the most complete where it only omits the end of Mark.) Further, the Septuagint (LXX) as contained in these manuscripts is used for Old Testament concepts as well as the Masoretic text.

I point out that the LXX contained in these Greek manuscripts is not a copy of Origen's fifth column taken from his Hexapla as some individuals have claimed. My hope was that these manuscripts would be the least altered manuscripts due to their sacred nature. My investigations indicated that in the early church great care was taken to insure the accuracy of these copies while, at the same time, doctrinal illumination was obtained by re-interpretation rather than by any significance alteration. In hand copying and editing such manuscripts, most errors constitute of omissions rather than additions.

The above Greek manuscripts have been reproduced in a combined form, with their ancient editors' remarks, noting where the manuscripts have omissions or additions. Further, a special "literal" English translation has also been created with the express purpose of presenting a translation that is as unbiased as possible relative to doctrinal interpretations and this translation is also insulated from the personal bias of the translator. Much of this material has existed since 1926, and it is published by the Concordant Publishing Concern. In this translation, certain English words are used that may not convey the actual meaning. However, when this occurs a companion Key Word Concordance gives a more complete description as to its first-century meaning. The "Concordance" method used also allows the reader to decide upon the appropriate nuances determined by a word's location within a specific section of Scripture.

In order to propagate philosophic ideas not originally presented by the Apostles, modifications were made to the basic understandings of the first-century common language terms. It was claimed that the Bible was written in a type of sacred language understandable only by a chosen few. This was shown not to be the case about 100 years ago. Further, I also used twelve distinct well-known English Bibles for comparison purposes and investigated all of the extant writings of the "Apostolic Church Fathers" and other significant "Church Fathers" through Aquinas. [Note: As will be explained later, I have since discovered that this depth of investigation is not necessary.]

The Apostles Doctrine

[Please note that the doctrine I accept is not new doctrine, but rather the original and, hence, the oldest of New Testament doctrine, doctrine that has, in some cases, been rejected for over 1950 years. Other individuals have also discovered this doctrine while in various

modes of isolation.] My major method of investigation uses the purest form of classical logic as it is represented by the construction of a mathematical theory. Since it can be established that the so-called “dialectic” logic is classically inconsistent, dialectic arguments are not applied. [I note that it is the philosophic dialectic argument that has been used since about 125 AD where term meanings are altered from their Apostolic meanings. These alterations are obtained via “revelation” and lead to Biblical “re-interpretations.”]

The major investigation uses a special technique that attempts to determine, as close as possible by a paper and pencil activity, **the doctrine as presented by Jesus and the joint doctrine of the original Apostles, including Paul, termed the Apostles Doctrine**. To the Apostles, who exactly is Jesus, what are the attributes of the Godhead, what is the Holy Ghost, what are the meanings of other theological concepts described within the Scriptures? Does the Apostles doctrine correspond to doctrine as presented within extra-biblical writings? I firmly believe exactly what Paul implied that adhering to Scriptural doctrine as understood by the Apostles yields a fixed path to salvation. Further, such an approach insulates an individual from “cult” concepts.

Do the Scriptures strongly imply that I should know and abide by the doctrine as taught by the Apostles? Consider what happened after Acts 2:42. The Scriptures state “And they continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine” Paul instructed Timothy that Timothy should abide at Ephesus and that, while there, Timothy should “. . . charge some that they teach no other doctrine” [1 Tim. 1:3]. Indeed, Paul tells us that the doctrine Timothy knows is Paul’s doctrine [2 Tim. 3:10]. Paul’s supernaturally verified doctrine, doctrine obtained by revelation [Gal. 1:12], is apparently the same refined doctrine preached by the other Apostles [Gal. 2:6]. Moreover, Peter indicates that Paul’s doctrine, although sometimes difficult to understand, is the correct refined doctrine [2 Peter 3:15-16]. Paul states an explicit rule, **the Paul rule**, that should be followed, a rule to which I adhere.

“Brothers, I want to remind you of the gospel I preached to you, the gospel that you received and in which you are firmly established; because the gospel will save you only if you keep believing exactly what I preached to you - believing anything else will not lead to anything” [1 Corinthians 15: 1-2 (Jerusalem Bible)].

Obviously, my investigation would concentrate upon the descriptions as they appear in the Scriptures. Then, for the New Testament and via my best research, the first-century meanings of the Greek words used is determined. The basic methods used are termed the *describing set* method and *mathematical modeling*. Take a concept such as the Holy Ghost. Then consider the set of all Scriptural statements that describe this concept. This set is the describing set. Now use this set as a set of hypotheses and extend this set, as much as you wish, by classical deduction without adding any additional hypotheses not Biblically

stated. God specifically states that this is the method to apply. (Genesis 1:26, Job 13.3, Isa. 1:18.) From a pure logical point of view, this is all that the ordinary individual can descriptively know about such a concept.

I repeat, that, most importantly, I try to determine and use only the common everyday meanings for the Greek terms used by the Apostles when they wrote their original manuscripts. I imagine myself an everyday Greek tradesman at the church at Antioch, where the followers of the Apostles doctrine are first called Christians (Acts 11:26). I seek salvation based upon this and only this doctrine. Trivially, I will not accept that certain terms used by the Apostles are “code” words that have meanings distinct from those taught by the Apostles. Meanings that would only be “discovered” by a “chosen few” many years later. **Paul assures his followers that they are saved if they believe exactly what he teaches.**

The same describing set procedure can be done with a single Godhead attribute, with the concept termed the Father, and all other such notions. One can apply set theoretic operations to these describing sets, and a great deal of very complex analysis; however, as discussed later, such analysis is not, in general, necessary. In particular, in 1978, portions of The Theory of Ultralogics were used to model the attributes of the Godhead as described in the Bible and as these attributes are compared to human attributes. This establishes that God as so characterized is a scientifically rational concept. Although totally unnecessary, one can group God’s Biblically described attributes into various not disjoint named categories. If one uses but three such categories, then the result is the “tri-category” concept.

There are basic reasons why the tri-category concept appears useful, but following the Paul rule and accept in one case, I find it totally of no significance to add other speculated non-biblical attributes to these categories. On the other hand, if such speculation contradicts the Apostles teachings, then I reject it. My first results were published in 1982. (“The reasonableness of metaphysical evidence,” J. of the Amer. Scientific Affiliation 34(1)(1982), 17-23.) [I applied these procedures since at that time my only supernatural connection with the Godhead was an external connection.]

These are technical methods, methods to which I was accustomed, that allowed me to produce portions of the Apostles doctrine; theological doctrine as it would be understood and shared by the Apostles and members of the church at Antioch. [I will not state the complete Apostles doctrine within this article.] Although I am convinced that I had discovered major portions of Apostles doctrine by this method, the doctrine I had deduced mathematically is different, in certain respects, from doctrine expressed by some Christian denominations. This is especially the case for my 1983 refinements. The fact that I had verified these doctrinal differences bothered me greatly. Was I the only person in the world

that knew major aspects of the Apostles doctrine?

It was suggested that I discuss my scientific findings with Pastor Chester Wright of Antioch the Apostolic Church in Arnold Maryland. This I did in June 1983 and he verified that my findings are the same as the doctrine he accepts. [In refined form, there is a slight difference, however, in the procedures I accept compared to some of the not truly necessary procedures Pastor Wright accepts.] The major difference in doctrinal determination was that I had deduced them via a mathematical model whereas he had come to the conclusions by a different approach. Indeed, I discovered that there are hundreds, thousands, indeed, millions of others who also share the exact “basic” doctrine that I had logically deduced while I was in complete natural-world doctrinal isolation. Some individuals have come to the same conclusions by Scriptural investigation and their investigation took place while they were similarly isolated. But most discovered the Apostles doctrine by a different means; a means that would have eliminated much of the effort I had put forth for exactly five years.

Obviously, such a paper and pencil activity in which I was engaged cannot establish that any supernatural doctrine is “true in objective reality.” But, there is a specific Scriptural method that can be used, and that I have since used, to verify that the doctrine I had deduced is, to me, the correct Apostles doctrine.

The Holy Ghost

I firmly believe that without a supernatural means, no “supernatural” doctrine can be **verified** although such doctrine needs first to be expressed. Acceptance of doctrine and verification of doctrine are not the same. I accept that a more complete comprehension of Scriptural ideas requires a supernatural verification. Although I knew the Scripturally described processes that lead to being indwelled by the Holy Ghost, I had not sought such an indwelling. I was caught up in my analysis and did not participate in such an activity. However, many individuals have so participated in the **exact** Scripturally described procedures and claimed to be so indwelled. Indeed, the processes follow the exact same general procedures as used in a laboratory science.

Exact natural procedures, as described within the Scriptures, are applied and, if an individual follows the Scriptural rules, that individual will not only be so indwelled but will demonstrate that he/she is so indwell. However, I can find no Scriptural statement that implies that one is so indwelled if and only if a certain type of physical behavior is displayed or if and only if one of the two methods Scripturally described is employed. Indeed, if these are the only ways to attain this “gift,” then being so indwelled would not be possible under various physical circumstances. I do not accept that God intends to restrict this gift only to those that find themselves restricted to the two Biblical circumstances.

Further, depending upon the circumstances, an indwelling may be displayed more subtly over many years by a persons changed behavior. [Possibly one difficult part relative to the procedures is for an individual to repent, truly repent.]

The fact is that millions of individuals are so indwelled by the Holy Ghost and experience the *literal presence* of the Spirit of God. These individual experiences, which are equivalent to a scientific experiment, yield personal evidence for the existence of God. Further, it is a remarkable fact that all the “gifts of the Spirit” are aspects of such a supernatural indwelling. I also agree that such gifts are not displayed by individuals who accept other doctrinal statements that, usually, include teachings that such gifts are no longer appropriate for the “modern” church.

In the early morning of 30 June 1983 while my daughters slept quietly, God presented to me an absolute indication that I should seek the full indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This occurred on July 17, 1983 at the Antioch Church in Arnold Maryland. The procedure I followed is as described in Acts 10:44 - 48. It was only after this supernatural experience that I finally understood what Jesus meant in John 16:13 “Yet whenever that may be coming - the spirit of truth - it will be guiding you into all truth,” [Unfortunately, some of the Antioch Church practices contradict Paul’s requirements, requirements that I accept.]

I now firmly believe that the absolute and simplest path to all verified truth is as it is stated in 1 John 2:27. I am not guided by any individual, church, creed, domination or, indeed, a religion. I am guided explicitly and personally by a supernatural entity that has verified all of the Apostles doctrine as I originally deduced it, the straightforward and specific first century doctrine, and much more. Moreover, it is evident that since this is the Spirit of Truth that all doctrine verified by each indwelled individual must be the same doctrine. But, how is the verification obtained? Does verified doctrine ever contradict, in any manner, the Scriptures and has this verification refined or given to me further illumination for significant Scriptural concepts?

The last two questions are answered easily. The verification never contradicts the Scriptures and the verification has given to me important doctrinal refinements. If you read my Christian Testimony, then you are aware that for forty years of my life the Adversary controlled me. This control was always related to my “mental” voice. I know exactly how this is done and I can discern easily when it is being done to other individuals, especially those individuals who do not believe that they are being so controlled. For me, the Holy Ghost does **not** verify in this manner. For me, such **verification** is not some sort of “small, still mental voice.” The verification process or manifestation is **physical** and usually of the exact same type.

What is my Holy Ghost manifestation? It is a *personal* and physical manifestation

that gives absolute evidence that God's Holy Spirit is the actuating agent in this verification process. No mode of argument can ever persuade one who accepts the Apostles doctrine that the source of such verification is materialistic since its effects are essentially indescribable. My investigations have shown that a physical manifestation is specifically designed for each individual in such a manner that it cannot be mistaken for any other effect. Due to this fact, I cannot give an explicitly described word-picture. But, I can describe what it is not.

Almost always, it is not an emotional manifestation. For me, it does not produce a euphoric feeling. It is not some "thought" or mental imaginary. It can occur during an ordinary course of events, usually when discussing theological notions, or at times of worship. It cannot be reproduced upon demand. Although an observing individual might conclude that "something" is occurring, the specific physical manifestation cannot be externally observed.

Many times when I am considering specific but distinct theological notions and I need to determine which is "correct" the manifestation occurs at the moment I "think" or discuss one of the possibilities. When this occurs and after determining that the possibility does not contradict the Scriptures, which it never has, I accept that possibility and consider it as verified. The manifestations seem to occur only when necessary for specific verification purposes. Note that in Job 4:15, Eliphaz the Temanite describes a physical manifestation that indicated to him that a spirit being was present. However, the Job 4:15 manifestation is not what I and others experience.

The meanings that one assigns to Biblical passages must also be verified. I reject such processes as used within "higher criticism" to comprehend the Bible by comparison with other known literary forms, historical circumstances, etc. For example, is a particular passage to be taken as literal, poetic, metaphorical or something else entirely? There is only one source that can answer such questions and that source is the Holy Ghost.

Evidence for the Existence of God

Although it is scientifically rational to assume that God as described in the Bible exists; unfortunately, absolute evidence for the existence of the God of the Scriptures first requires that you "truly" believe that He exists. This belief can be developed through hundreds of sources. For example, the fact that it is rational to assume that all physical-system behavior is produced by a higher intelligence, an intelligence that verifies many Scriptural statements. The fact that the Scriptures are written perfectly when properly interpreted relative to the word meanings at the times of the original autographs. Then the belief in the existence of God is often influenced by the testimony of those that do believe.

The next step is to seek the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Once you are truly indwelled

by this supernatural entity, then your personal form of Holy Ghost verification will be your absolute evidence that God does exist. No one will ever be able to “explain away” such evidence. All explanations that claim that such verification is not supernatural will fail on more than one account. There are millions of individuals who display attributes of the indwelled Holy Ghost and each has **personal** evidence that the God of the Scriptures is an objectively real entity. And, they accept the existence of God as fact. Unfortunately, I am not exactly one of them.

My brain is trained in such a manner that even with all the experiences I have had, even with what are classified as “miraculous events” I still retain a type of “safety value,” a type of slight doubt that my experiences point to an actual supernatural God. I cannot explain why I continue to seek “more” evidence. Why, for me, is there a “safety value”? I am the one who has established the rationality of the statement that “God has an infinitely strong power to accomplish any goal of which I can ever conceive.” This might be a rather frightening notion for one reason or another.

My Theological Writings and Choice

In the past, I have written on various theological subjects. **I do not want any individual to accept or deny any portion of the Apostles doctrine based upon these writings.** These writings may be interesting but they only establish that the Apostles doctrine is scientifically rational. These writings are but *paper and pencil activities* in applied classical logic. There is only one doctrine I emphasize continually and this is the “indwelling” of the Holy Ghost. Again notice that the Apostles state that an indwelling does not occur until God determines that one is truly seeking repentance. Thus, one must first know the Scriptural meanings for the terms “good” and “evil” in order to satisfy this requirement. Once an individual obtains this supernatural method of verification and demonstrates its presence in various ways, then the individual can easily determine what is true and what is false through **Holy Ghost verification.**

The Bible is my final written authority. But, being written, each term, phrase, sentence, etc. must be interpreted. There are specific linguistic rules that influence such interpretations. As mentioned, there are different interpretations for specific passages and these have led to hundreds of distinct “Christian denominations.” It is often the case that individuals are presented with doctrinal choices that are not logically equivalent. Indeed, one should always consider different doctrinal possibilities when a specific choice has not been Holy Ghost verified. This is where some of my writings and many others might be helpful.

Consider 2 Tim 2:15, “Study to shew yourself approved unto God, a workman that needth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” Investigate different doctrine and compare it to the Scriptures. Study the Scriptures to determine what the Apostles

believed. Study and investigate whatever you wish. But, please don't accept a doctrine based simply upon some other individual's authority or acceptance or claimed revelation. Nothing in the Scriptures requires the knowledge of some great "scholar" to decipher.

The Holy Ghost is obtained via repentance and the desire to be so indwelled. All a person needs to do is to obey. One need not deeply analyze these two basic requirements in an attempt to determine why they are necessary. After being granted this divine gift, other doctrinal choices can be considered and Holy Ghost verification sought. If you don't receive such verification, continue your search. I am confident that if one sincerely seeks the correct theological doctrine and is truly indwelled by the Holy Ghost, then this Spirit of Truth **will** be a guide to the correct choice and once this choice is presented, it will be verified absolutely.

It is my firm and absolute belief that one cannot know, with certainty, the truth about supernatural theological concepts through any form of human secular activity. Such assurance can only be obtained by supernatural means. If you do not have supernaturally produced physical verification, you cannot truly know which interpretation is correct.

There are many questions that can be asked, questions that require Holy Ghost verification. For example, can Jesus Christ be characterized as exhibiting, during the time He walked this earth, the most complete set of Godhead manifestations that can be perceived within the natural universe? Although Jesus the man is God manifested in the flesh, when one reads the words that Jesus spoke is it necessary, in order to have an in-depth comprehension, to know when to interpret these words as statements spoken as a man might speak them, or as God might speak them? Are there actually any logical contradictions within the Scriptures? Are there really any "mysterious" or "secret" concepts within the Scriptures, concepts that can only be known by a chosen few? Are the Scriptures actually direct and "straightforward" when describing theological concepts? Can the displayed attributes of the Godhead be placed in three general categories? Indeed, can you find specific descriptions in John's gospel that imply a title for each category and how they are related?

Is it possible that every question one might ask relative to Scriptural concepts has an answer; but a few of these answers might not be comprehensible while humankind is in its present fallen mode? [Determining the answer to this last question is rather important since it appears that much erroneous doctrine and many "cult" like concepts often come from attempts to answer such questions by worldly means.] Well, as the Scriptures say, if you sincerely "seek, then you will find" answers to many such questions. The answers you find, if verified by the Holy Ghost, will be the exact same answers found by millions of others.

As stated, it is possible that a few portions of the verified Apostles doctrine will be different from the theological doctrine that many individuals presently accept. It is also

possible that their accepted theological doctrine cannot be deduced in a straightforward manner from the Apostles doctrine. As Paul implies in 1 Cor: 15:1-2, if one accepts doctrine that does not adversely affect the doctrine taught by the Apostles, then such doctrine is of no significance.

Although verified doctrine should not be altered, you might ask “How is it possible that some highly educated individuals could have been wrong for so many years” Well, maybe, just maybe, the doctrine that they propose has not actually been verified by the Holy Ghost but this doctrine has simply been repeated over and over again under the assumption that many years ago it was founded upon such verification. Is this possible? One small example, from what are thousands, will establish that this is indeed very possible even within science.

One of the greatest “thinkers” of antiquity was Aristotle. He claimed to have logically deduced many, many aspects of physical-system behavior. However, he did not verify these claims. One such “self-evident fact,” was that if two similarly configured bodies, one 100 pounds and another 10 pounds, are dropped from a tower, the 10 pound body will take ten times longer to reach the ground. For 1,800 years, all of the philosophers of nature (i.e. scientists) accepted without question this “self-evident fact.” Although Aristotle’s “Law of Fall” obviously contradicts observation, it was Galileo who appears to be the first scientist to mention that an actual experiment would demonstrate that this so-called fact is totally false. Indeed, other “self-evident facts” of Aristotle were also shown to be false because no one had, over all these years, attempted to **verify** Aristotle’s claims.

Relative to Biblical directives, I emphasize that I do not accept any proposed additional doctrine or alterations in the meanings of Biblical terms as commonly understood at the time of Jesus, the Apostles and their followers, that are put forth, after the deaths of the Apostles, by any individual or group via claimed revelation or by any other means.

But why should anyone go to this often time consuming effort? Well, most Christians seem to have, at the least, one common doctrine. It states that there is a spiritual life after death. There is “something” supernatural that does exist and is associated with each individual, **and** it will exist for an eternity. The Scriptures appear to teach that the doctrine chosen is related to “how” a personal supernatural spirit will spend this eternity. Clearly, it is important to investigate and determine the correct theological doctrine. I firmly believe that objectively real supernatural verification by means of the fully indwelled Holy Ghost is the only way to know the truth. Is there a way that might indicate that an individual has such an indwelling and the degree to which it is operative? Although this will not “prove” that such is the case, one could consider how an individual’s behavior compares with that as described by Paul in 1 Cor. 13:3-5.

A Biblical Apostolic Christian

Any individual or group that uses the title “Christian” should give a specific definition or reason for using the title. As mentioned, the disciples were first called “Christians” at Antioch (Acts 11:26), a church where Paul preached the Apostles doctrine as stated in Acts 15:35. The doctrine followed at Antioch, according to the above remarks, was that held by the Apostles and no other doctrine was to be accepted. I attempt to follow the doctrine stated and demonstrated by the Apostles with knowledge gained only from the Bible and as illuminated and verified by the Holy Ghost. This I do as directed by John in 1 John 2:27. If such Biblically defined doctrine does not lead to salvation, then the Apostles themselves will not be saved.

Many groups that use the title “Christian” have diverse doctrine, often very distinct from the Apostles doctrine. Many groups practice the complete, just portions or altered versions of the Apostles doctrine and they all term themselves as “Apostolic.” For these reasons and in order to identify me as an individual who follows the Apostles doctrine and that I am not a member of one of these groups that incorrectly identify themselves as Apostolic, I have decided on a different label. One might call me a Biblical Apostolic Christian.

Millions of individuals have received supernatural verification that among all of the doctrinal choices the Apostles doctrine is the correct choice. However, except for the concept of the indwelling Holy Ghost and the questions I have posed, I have not discussed any other aspects of the Apostles doctrine within this brief article.

I will not alter the concepts described within this article. Later, I may refine some of this material. However, for now, this is all that I will state relative to the Apostles doctrine within this article and how, without extra-biblical influences, one can discover its content. I have written other articles that one can consult such as the one that describes the true meaning of the symbol string JESUS.

You certainly noticed that five times I used the phrase “firmly believe” in the above. I have repeated a particular concept at various places in this article for emphasis and the term “firmly” signifies that I will not alter the stated belief that follows the term. Obviously, from my above statement, the material I have presented in this article is not open for destructive “debate.”

I am not an official member of any religious organization. If possible, I attend churches that follow Biblical modes of worship and that teach doctrine that is in the closest accord with the Apostles doctrine as deduced by my research and verified by the Holy Ghost.

[Note: I always use, in these articles, the transitive form of indwell.]

The Mathematical Foundations

The foundational mathematics used to produce The Theory of Ultralogics is Nonstandard

Analysis. I wrote my Ph.D. dissertation on applications of Nonstandard Analysis (NSA or NS) to general topology. Although, I have taught Mathematical Logic and have shown how certain aspects of Mathematical Logic lead to NSA, I have never had a course in any aspect of NSA and I did not have an “advisor” who had any experience in this subject. All the necessary foundations are self-taught. This procedure was very successful since many of my publications and 5 of my 7 monographs are on applications of NSA to various mathematical, physical and philosophic concepts.

I mention all of this since, at present, it appears highly likely that the only way to obtain training in NSA is still through self-study. This is unfortunate when you consider the significance of NSA not just to theological notions but also to such secular results as the General Grand Unification Model. However, if you have a background in undergraduate mathematics, then I have placed on the Mathematics and Physics Archives, arxiv.org. and the vixra.org archives papers and monographs that can aid greatly in self-study. These can be downloaded, saved and viewed as a PDF. The four major monographs, with the latest corrections, also appear on my Web site. Except for the cost of printing, if you wish, these are all free to the general public. Of course, there are commercial books available.

I list the four major monographs and I follow this with the method that can be used to view all of my other stored monographs and many papers, which use, in some manner, NSA. (I also have re-prints of all of my published papers.)

“Nonstandard Analysis - A Simplified Approach,”

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0310351>

<http://www.raherrmann/cont5.htm>

(A) “ Nonstandard Analysis Applied to Advanced Undergraduate Mathematics - Infinitesimal Modeling (Including Elementary Physics)”

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0312432>

(B) “ Nonstandard Analysis and Generalized Functions”

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0403303>

(A) and (B) <http://www.raherrmann/cont2.htm>

(C) “The Theory of Ultralogics Part I of III”

<http://vixra.org/abs/1606.0160>

(D) “The Theory of Ultralogics Part II of III

<http://vixra.org/abs/math/1606.0159>

(D’) “The Theory of Ultralogics Part III of III

<http://vixra.org/abs/math/1606.0158>

(C), (D) and (D’) <http://www.raherrmann/cont3.htm>

There are other papers related to the GGU-model and GID at arxiv.org and elsewhere. These are

(E) “General Logic-systems and Finite Consequence Operators,” *Logica Universalis* 23(1)(2006):201-208. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0512559>

(F) “The GGU-model and Generation of Developmental Paradigms”
<http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0605120> <http://vixra.org/abs/1308.0145>

(G) “General Logic-Systems that Determine Significant Collections of Consequence Operators,” <http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0603573>

(H) “Nonstandard Ultra-logic-systems Applied to the GGU-model,”
<http://vixra.org/abs/1308.0125>

(I) “GGU-model Ultra-logic-systems Applied to Developmental Paradigms,”
<http://vixra.org/abs/1308.0145>

(J) “The GGU-model and the GID-model Processes and Their Secular and Theological Interpretations,” <http://vixra.org/abs/1404.0421>

Note: The important part of the monographs that come before “The Theory of Ultralogics” is not the actual theorems established but rather the general methods used. For example, the results in the “Generalized Function” monograph do not apply to The Theory of Ultralogics, but the “concurrent” relation concept does. This method is very important.

In order to locate all of my other papers on the archives, consider
http://arxiv.org/a/herrmann_r_1 http://vixra.org/author/robert_a_herrmann