

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 indeed 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, 155

---

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; 161). What are the theological, logical, and cultural implications of asserting sin is the cause of separation, rather than 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. Unbelievers love “freedom.” So do believers; the difference is “to” versus “from.”
- C. Culturally, equating sin to disobeying the LORD’S commands allows humans to obey, or disobey, based on the perceived rewards or penalties associated with “the rules.” Thus, sin becomes mere compliance, something to “get away with” or to avoid to “get rewards.”<sup>7</sup> Confession becomes a “get out of jail” card rather than true remorseful repentance.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

<sup>7</sup>Here’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 argues from Hebrews 10:7-10<sup>8</sup> that the “system of sacrifices” is “set aside.” How is the *atoning* sacrifice of Jesus warranted if said system is no longer in place? What are the theological and pragmatic implications of characterizing the sacrifice of the Christ as *the atoning* act?<sup>9</sup> (page 154, 159)

---

---

---

38. What is theologically “messy” [Haywood’s word] about asserting the power of the gospel is dependent upon the *atoning sacrifice* of the Christ when He was on earth as Yeshua? 11/11/18

KJV only, -women deacons, fundamentalism: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

## NEW TESTAMENT CONTENT — CHAPTER 6

---

39. Haywood asserts Paul teaches in Galatians that humans should not expect Holy Spirit to begin one’s life in the Christ without relying on Holy Spirit to continue helping them. What theological morass is Haywood attempting to clear up or “pave over?” (page 169)

---

---

---

40. To what extent are you comfortable with declaring the gospel of Mark as written by John Mark because as Haywood claims “...it is well attested by other early writers?” (page 171)

---

---

---

<sup>8</sup>Then I said, ‘Here I am—it is written about me in the scroll—I have come to do your will, O God.’ [Psalm 40:6-8] First he said, “Sacrifices and offerings, burnt offerings and sin offerings you did not desire, nor were you pleased with them” (although the law required them to be made). Then he said, “Here I am, I have come to do your will.” He sets aside the first to establish the second. And by that will, we have been made holy through the sacrifice of the body of Jesus [the] Christ once for all. –Hebrews 10:7-10

<sup>9</sup>[Father] God presented Him [the Christ] as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in His blood. He did this to demonstrate His justice, because in His forbearance He had left the sins committed beforehand unpunished--He did it to demonstrate His justice at the present time, so as to be just and the one who justifies those who have faith in Jesus. –Romans 3:25-26



41. Why does Haywood call “1 Corinthians” “1 Corinthians” rather than “2 Corinthians?”<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor: 5:9 So what? (page 172-174) *The Cecil B DeMille Effect*

---



---

42. Who wrote Romans, Paul (actually Παῦλος) or Tertius (actually Τέρτιος)? So? And was the difference between he being called “Saul” (actually שאול; i.e., “Shaul”) and “Paul” (actually Παῦλος; “Paulus”)?<sup>10</sup> (page 174) Paul, John, Luke, Peter wrote Scripture: why didn’t the Christ write any Scripture? Again, *The Cecil B DeMille Effect*

---



---



---

43. Haywood asserts Acts should not be used “...to copy what the early church did, but to put into practice the principles given them by the [sic] Holy Spirit.” Why would Haywood need to add this editorial point in summarizing the content of Acts? (page 183)

---



---



---

44. Haywood asserts Jude deals with the heresy called “antinomianism.” In the Greek/Roman culture of the time, antinomianism was popular; i.e., free from the law, the spirit of a human is not affected by rules affecting the flesh. Later known as Gnosticism (see page 193). What examples of antinomianism do you find in the church and in secular society today? (page 191)

---



---



---

45. What evidence supports/rejects the age of John and Revelation being no “younger” than “90-96AD?” (pages 191-195) Caesars.

---



---



---



<sup>10</sup> Luke records in Acts 13:9—“Then Saul, who was also called Paul, filled with the [τον is not there] Holy Spirit...”

46. Haywood asserts Holy Spirit is a person and deity, and not merely the power/force of Father God and the Christ. What is useful is asserting Holy Spirit is “the power of God?” (page 201-204) Consider also...

- A. “Dear Father God, please send your holy spirit to...”
- B. And Haywood himself (page 200) uses this phrase as a header:

**2. Who or What is the Holy Spirit?**

C. What are we saying when we put “the” in front of His name, especially when Scripture does not automatically have “the” prefacing either “Holy” or “Spirit Holy?” Do we refer to Jesus as “the Jesus” or Jehovah as “the Jehovah” or when talking to “God” as “the God?”

Again, *The Cecil B DeMille Effect*

John				1				Bible			
2597 [e]	2532 [e]	3306 [e]	1909 [e]	846 [e]	3778 [e]	1510 [e]	3588 [e]	907 [e]	1722 [e]		
katabainon	kai	menon	ep'	auton	houtos	estin	ho	baptizōn	en		
καταβαῖνον	καὶ	μένον	ἐπ'	αὐτόν	, οὗτός	ἐστιν	ὁ	βαπτίζων	ἐν		
descending	and	abiding	on	Him	He	is	the [One]	baptizing	with		
V-PPA-ANS	Conj	V-PPA-ANS	Prep	PPro-AM3S	DPro-NMS	V-PIA-3S	Art-NMS	V-PPA-NMS	Prep		
4151 [e]	40 [e]	2504 [e]	3708 [e]	2532 [e]	3140 [e]	3754 [e]	3778 [e]	1510 [e]	3588 [e]		
Pneumati	Hagiō	kagō	heōraka	kai	memartyrēka	hoti	houtos	estin	ho		
Πνεύματι	Ἁγίῳ	. 34	κἀγὼ	έώρακα	καὶ	μεμαρτύρηκα	ὅτι	οὗτός	ἐστιν	ὁ	
[the] Spirit	Holy	And I	have seen	and	have borne witness	that	this	is	the		
N-DNS	Adj-DNS	PPro-N1S	V-RIA-1S	Conj	V-RIA-1S	Conj	DPro-NMS	V-PIA-3S	Art-NMS		
5207 [e]	3588 [e]	2316 [e]									
Huios	tu	Theou									
Υἱὸς	τοῦ	Θεοῦ									
Son	-	of God									
N-NMS	Art-GMS	N-GMS									

