



THEOS
BIBLIOLOGY

REV. D. THOMAS PORTER, PH.D.

3422 Fallview Court ♦ Land O' Lakes, FL 34639

DrTom@PorterHouse.info

813.728.5713^{Cell}

<https://DThomasPorter.com/BibleStudies/SYS501>

Wednesday, March 27, 2024

BIBLIOLOGY & THEOLOGY HAYWOOD TEXT IMPLICATIONS

An Introduction to the Bible and Theology (2016)

REVIEWING SOME ISSUES REGARDING BIBLIOLOGY & THEOLOGY – HAYWOOD TEXT

1. Do you share and understand Haywood’s distinction between “studying” the Bible (exegesis) and “understanding” the Bible (hermeneutics)? Why is this distinction important in SYS 501?¹

2. He argues that taking notes should be a consistent feature of one’s Bible study. Why is he correct?

3. What is the difference between an inductive and deductive approach to investigating truth or Truth? How does that difference apply when studying the Scriptures? Why is it difficult to deploy an inductive approach? Examples? (see page 4)

Example? _____

4. Why does Haywood misspell his words (e.g., page 5, “analyses” for “analyzes”)? So what?

¹Haywood asserts, “Our theology must be drawn from the Scripture and not imposed upon it.” Page 33.

5. How would you teach the distinctions of “literal” or “dynamic equivalent” or “paraphrase”² (Haywood calls it “free”) when choosing a translation of the Scriptures? Consider 1 Timothy 1:10³

6. Which is your favorite translation and why?

7. What publisher’s choice makes an exegetical and hermeneutic challenge for understanding 1 Corinthians 3:10-17? (See page 21 of Haywood)

8. Why is it important to understand actual history for understanding the Scriptures? What were you taught about David’s reasons for killing Goliath, Tulsa 1921, secession order of the states? How do you feel about granting money to count communion wafers used in 15th century France?

9. What is your apologetic for the claim that “The Scriptures are a collection of myths?”

² See Porter’s [Examining the Validity of Scripture and Subsequent Canonical Choices](#).

³ “...for the sexually immoral, for those practicing homosexuality, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine...” (NIV) versus “...for fornicators, for sodomites, for kidnappers, for liars, for perjurers, and if there is any other thing that is contrary [also “opposed”] to sound doctrine...” (NKJV)

10. Does 2 Timothy 3:16— *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness* — hermeneutically apply or exegetically apply to the Hebrew Scriptures or the New Testament?

11. Why is Revelation “at the end” of the New Testament? Why is Hebrews after Philemon? Why is John after Luke? Why is the Apocrypha not “included in the Bible?”

12. Why should you study the Apocrypha? Which versions of the Bible include the Apocrypha? Why should you study the Pseudepigrapha?

13. What is the title of the first book in the Bible? The title of the book we call “Numbers?” From where did our titles come? Why is it useful to call the Hebrew Scriptures the “Old Testament?”

14. What is the significance of Kings coverage of Solomon’s wives & concubines versus Chronicles?

15. Why is it useful to use allegorical interpretation, a normally discounted approach, to interpret the Song of Solomon?

16. Why is theology “messy?” When does it become “messy;” i.e., what factors effect an inconsistent, if not incorrect, theology? To what extent is problematic when said theology is not messy? (103)

Just who is the Deity of said theology?_____

What prevents a dog from having a theology?_____

17. Given Deity is, and that Deity is often beyond human understanding,⁴ how do we avoid mysticism and its limited ability to decree theologically driven behavior? (104)

18. Which identity of Yeshua the Christ best mystifies you the most, and why – His deity, his humanity, or the union of these two identities? (104)

19. What incident in the Hebrew Scriptures shows the Christ best? (105-118)

20. When Jesus the Christ returns, will He be easily recognized? How so? Why or why not? (108)

21. What threatened (threatens) the establishment by the appearance of the Christ as Jesus of Nazareth? Then? Now? (109-111)

⁴“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,” declares the LORD. “As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.” –Isaiah 55-89 (NIV)

22. On what basis did Yeshua at His "bar mitzvah" (actually bar mitzvahs did not start until the Middle Ages) at the Temple declare He was the Messiah? (112; Luke 2:41-52)

23. Who do you know that is the strongest believer that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of God? (113; Note: only four answers are correct.)

24. Why does Haywood review the Christ's claims regarding His identity as Jesus of Nazareth, His mission, and His deity? (111-121)

25. What is the theological problem of equating "the Messiah" with being "the Son of God?"⁵ (119)

26. What are some distinctive characteristics of the Christ on earth as noted by the synoptics versus John's gospel? (117-121; 127-130)

27. Pauline emphasis. Why did Saul of Tarsus, aka Paul, use Lord (often meaning LORD) 250 times vs. "Son of God" 17 times in his epistles? And "theos" [θεος] to mean "Father God?" (122-123)

⁵See [Job 2:1](#) records "...the sons of God came to present themselves before YAHWEH" or [2 Samuel 7:14](#), YAHWEH says of Solomon, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son"; or [Psalms 2:7](#), the coronation of a king is announced in an oracle from heaven, which says, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee;" or [John 1:12](#), "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." Ergo, the divinity of the Christ cannot be logically inferred from the fact He is called "the Son of God." Simon Peter challenged everyone by declaring that Jesus of Nazareth was not only the Christ, but also "the Son of the living God."

28. Haywood's case for the import of the *virgin* birth includes "...it points to His sinlessness." Why? Are births not conceived from Holy Spirit "sinful?" Are we associating "sin" with sexual interaction? Puritanism? Gnosticism? 134

29. The deity of the Christ when on earth as Jesus of Nazareth has always been a source of angst, argument, and division. Haywood reviews some of the issues regarding Philippians 2:5-11,⁶ specifically the κενωσις ("emptying"). Paul argues the Christ "gave up" some of His deity when on earth, perhaps challenging the notion that Jesus of Nazareth was both Deity and human. Some have used this to assert either the Christ only appeared to be human, or was not fully Deity. How do you answer an honest inquiry regarding Philippians 2:5-11? Haywood 135-140 For one answer, see my article at: [DiggingDeeper.Life/content/The Kenosis Problem.pdf](http://DiggingDeeper.Life/content/The%20Kenosis%20Problem.pdf)

30. Haywood says "not to worry" about not understanding kenosis. How do we avoid the challenges of mysticism and still recognize/appreciate/inculcate that "His ways are not our ways;" i.e., there are some attributes and actions of the Lord God Almighty we may never understand?

⁶Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus:

1. Who, being in very nature [or *in the form of*] God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing [ἐκένωσεν], taking the very nature [or *form*] of a servant, being made in human likeness.
2. And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death—even death on a cross!
3. Therefore God exalted him to the highest place and gave him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus [the] Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." –Philippians 2:5-11 (NIV)

31. Haywood asserts the Christ was born as Jesus “without sin” by referencing Luke 1:35 — “The angel answered, ‘The [τον (“The”) is not there] Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the [τον (“the”) is not there] Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called [or *So the child to be born will be called holy*] the Son of God.’ ” Do you accept his argument based on this evidence? How is being conceived by Holy Spirit “without sin?” 140

32. C.S. Lewis provided this view of the Christ’s claim for Deity — Jesus of Nazareth was either lunatic or Lord. To wit:

“...it is patronising nonsense about he being a great human teacher. He hasn’t left that opened to us. He didn’t intend to.” *Mere Christianity*

Unbeliever’s retort to Lewis: He was neither a lunatic nor Lord; He was merely mistaken.

How would you respond to this unbeliever’s challenge? 142-143

THE WORK OF THE CHRIST — CHAPTER 5

33. Haywood (page 147) asserts “...sin causes separation from God...” To what extent do you agree with this assertion? If sin is, rather, separation from the Lord God, then how do explain atonement, propitiation, expiation, forgiveness, and/or redemption? 147-149

34. The first Passover occurred when the eldest child of every one was taken, except those residing in a house which had the blood of a lamb smeared on the lintels of the front “door.” Three questions:

(1) Who did the killing of those children?

(2) Why did the LORD kill those innocent children?

(3) How have rabbis, priests, and translators mediated the severity of this killing? 150-151

35. Haywood asserts “The Passover is a part of the history of the Jews...” What do you see, if anything, problematic with this assertion? Do Christians celebrate Passover? 151

36. Throughout his text, and especially in explaining the role of sacrifice (the shedding of blood) for expiating, appeasing, and atoning for “sin,” Haywood consistently asserts sin causes separation from the LORD God Almighty (e.g., 147, 152, 153). What are the theological, logical, and cultural implications of asserting sin is the cause of separation, rather than as a synonym for said separation from the LORD? Asserting sin as a *cause* of separation—

- A. Theologically, makes the LORD the reason for sin; i.e., the LORD can countenance evil yet allows His creation to commit evil? Evil separates us from the LORD God. Evil causes sin.
- B. Logically, equates the *cause* of separation from the LORD with the *result* of separation. This false equation creates neither logical nor coherent thought. It would be like asserting the cause of accidents is accidents. This is not to say accidents do not have consequences—repair bills, hospital stays, license revocations, etc. And, similarly, separation from the LORD God has consequences—for the believer guilt, sadness, worry, remorse. And for the unbeliever—sin is not separation from the LORD, for there is no LORD to whom to be accountable or from whom to be separated. “Freedom.”
- C. Culturally, equating sin to disobeying the LORD’S commands allows humans to obey, or disobey, based on the rewards or penalties associated with “the rules.” Thus, sin becomes mere compliance, something to “get away with” or to avoid to “get rewards.”⁷ Confession becomes a “get out of jail” card rather than true remorseful repentance.

⁷Here’s what I wrote recently (3/15/24) to an atheist Facebook group who were complaining about Christians and our beliefs regarding sin. Please keep the audience in mind; I was attempting to bring the Truth *closer* to their values.

When we idiot theologians started equating “sin” with “disobeying rules,” we obfuscated the whole issue. “Sin” is separating ourselves from those who should be loved—people, Deity, children, good causes. When we equate “sin” with disobedience, we’ve confused the effect (distance from good) with the cause of said distance; i.e., moral violence. We humans are an odd species. When we sense that doing good, or not doing bad, is mere rule compliance, we continually ignore doing good (staying closer to who and what is good) IF we see no consequence for acting rightly, or righteously.

The whole notion of sin being equated to doing evil rather than being the result of evil is a difficult construct to explain, and often when understood, difficult to accept.

So what? “Sin” as rule violation has been used for eons to manipulate others to conform. What would happen if we taught, enculturated, and rewarded people for seeking to do good for others, loving others... Idealistic nonsense? Or, pragmatically uplifting? The choice is ours.

37. Haywood (page xxx)

38. Haywood (page xxx)

39. Haywood (page xxx)

40. Haywood (page xxx)

41. Haywood (page xxx)
