

Theology

Eschatology
Thanatology
Ecclesiology
Israelology
Dispensationalism
Doxology
Hodology
Soteriology
Hamartiology
Natural Law
Anthropology
Angelology
Pneumatology
Christology
Paterology
Trinitarianism
Cosmology
Theology Proper
Bibliology
Natural Theology

Philosophy

6 Hermeneutics 2
5 Language 155
4 Epistemology 32
Existence 50
History 50
3 Metaphysics 32
Trans. 50
2 Reality
- Logic, 32
- Truth, 32
1 Realism – 32

**1 Corinthians 6; Classical Theism 77 – Virtue:
The Theological Virtues of Faith and Science - 32**

INTRODUCTION

Life in God by knowledge and by love: Matt 22:37-40; 1 Tim. 1:12; 1 Jn 4:7-17; Hab. 3:17-19; Job 42:1-6; Jn 8:12; 1 Tim. 1:12; 1 Pt. 1:3-8; Philip 3:18-21; John 18:36; 1 Tim. 2:1-2 ; 1 John 2:15-16; James 4:4; 1 Tim. 2:1-2; Psa. 73:24-25.

Outline of Bible class:

1. Chronological reading through the NT: 1 Thess. - 1 Corinthians 6.
2. The metaphysics/ontology of love: the intellect and the will (64).
3. Philosophy of hermeneutics (2).
4. Classical theism: Faith-knowledge and scientific knowledge (31).

III-Metaphysics of Love: 64

Intellect and Will: Loving God


- A. How we, in effect, “predestine” our temporal lives by what our wills consume.
- B. The classical view of love, in radical contrast to what is called formalism, is all about a properly ordered intellect and will. Note what the virtue of love looks like in the NT: John 15:13; Rom 13:10; 14:15; Eph. 5:1-2; 1 Cor. 13:4-7; Gal 5:13-25; 1 Jn 2:3-6; 3:16-18.
- C. Scriptural depictions of the nature of love relationship with Christ by 2nd person proper knowledge and proper love as per the Christ-centered life (Gal 2:20; 1 Tim. 1:12; 2 Cor. 3:18; 5:9, 14-15; 12:8-10; Eph. 5:10; Philip. 3:8; Col. 3:1-5; John 15:1-6).
- D. What undermines any chance for a 2nd person proper knowledge and love of God.
 - 1. Divided will: Second-order desires that are in conflict with first-order desires.
 - 2. Divided intellect: Deception, suppression of truth, divided beliefs, distractions.
 - 3. Sin, wrongdoing, and guilt are sufficient for alienation from self and God.
 - 4. A person with a divided intellect and will is not even close to himself, let alone God.
 - 5. God Himself cannot even be close to a person who is self-alienated.
 - 6. Our powerful inclination for our own power and pleasure over greater goods are sufficient to undermine a love relationship with God. Thus, the need for grace for forgiveness and integration around the Good.
 - 7. Spiritual adultery, a divided heart, James 4:4.

IV-Philosophy of Hermeneutics (2)

✓ Introduction: Worldviews

- Dasein
- Language
- Pragmatism
- Anti-phil/Bible-only

1. There are radical differences between biblical Christianity and contemporary American Christianity in fundamental areas of the spiritual life, divine providence, church life, work, economics, and government. As far as epistemology, it comes down to selective induction based on *Dasein* versus the absolutes of God's Word guided by love for God.
2. There four *mental* influences in contemporary American Christianity that effect our otherwise Christian interpretations: (1) the *Dasein* bubble (Heidegger), (2) the linguistic bubble (Cratylus, Wittgenstein), (3) the pragmatic bubble (Pierce, Dewey, James); (4) the anti-intellectual/philosophical Bible-only bubble (Jennings/Dake).



Classical Theism 77 – The Theological Virtue of Science and Faith (32)

1. Biblical faith-knowledge is all about sharing in the knowledge of one who has direct knowledge, 1 Cor. 1:21-25; 2:7-10.
2. Biblical faith-knowledge is certain, indivisible, unified, absolute and finds its ultimate beauty in the incarnate Son of God.
3. “Faith seeking understanding,” in the sense of seeking exterior, rational knowledge to make faith more certain is not biblical, see 1 Jn 2:20-21. Faith is about trusting one who knows and thus cannot be directly validated.


4. A closer look at the nature of biblical faith-knowledge: Matt. 16:17; John 6:64, 68-69; 8:31-32; 10:38; 12:44-45; 16:13, 30; 17:8; Acts 16:14; Rom 6:8-9; 8:16; 1 Cor 2:6-10; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:6; 4:13-14; 5:1; Philip 3:8; 1 Thess. 1:9-10; Heb. 1:1-3; 1 John 2:20, 27; 4:2, 16; 5:9-10.

Contemporary Scientific knowledge: It is no wonder that CS is antirealistic and no longer has an agreed on definition or method. This largely due to idealism and mathematization of ontology.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Epist. Relativism. | 26. Pragmatism | 51. Biology | 76. Mathematics | 101. Karl Popper |
| 2. Idealism | 26. Social influences | 52. Physics | 77. Psychology. | 102. Kuhn |
| 3. Empiricism | 27. Ethics | 53. Cognition | 78. Rhetoric/dem | 103. Lakatos |
| 4. Nominalism | 28. Experimentalism | 54. Analytical | 79. Meth natural | 104. William Wallace |
| 5. Paradigms | 29. Explanatory scope | 55. Constructivism | 80. Met natural | 105. Alan Sokal |
| 6. Induction | 30. IBE ("best"?) | 56. Confirmationism | 81. Realism | 106. Michio Kaku |
| 7. Humeanism | 31. Laws of nature | 57. Godel's theorem | 81. Anti-Realism | 107. Hawking |
| 8. Metaphysics | 32. Causation | 58. Feminism | 82. Infinite options | 108. D. Berlinsky |
| 9. Rationalism | 33. Naturalism | 59. Language | 83. Darwinism | 109. M theory |
| 10. Critical rationalism | 34. Mechanism | 60. Relativism | 84. Neo-Darwin | 110. Math morality |
| 11. Underdetermination | 35. Reductionism | 61. Explanation | 85. A priori | 111. Bas Van Fraassen |
| 12. Falsification | 36. Research programs | 62. Animus to humanities | 86. A posteriori | 112. No Sci definition |
| 13. Verificationism | 37. Measurement | 63. Platonism | 87. Parmenides | 113. No 1 Sci method |
| 14. Outliers | 38. Models | 64. Reality/phenomenon | 88. Heraclitus | 114. Creation Science |
| 15. Averages | 39. Observation | 65. Reality/models | 89. Plato | 115. Quantum insanity |
| 16. Neo-essentialism | 41. Determinism | 66. POLang vs POMath | 90. Aristotle | 116. Inertia |
| 17. Instrumentalism | 42. Predictibility | 67. Food/nutrition claims | 91. Aquinas | 117. Non-causality |
| 18. Conventionalism | 43. Demarcation | 68. Health claims | 92. Bacon | 118. Possible worlds |
| 19. Value-ladenness | 44. Symmetry | 69. Symbolic logic | 93. Descartes | 119. Subjectivity |
| 20. Theory-ladenness | 45. Creationism | 70. Evidence (5 theories) | 94. Newton | 120. Deconstructionism |
| 21. Output | 46. ID science | 71. Idealization. | 95. Galileo | 121. ATE Essentialism |
| 22. Positivism | 47. Eliminativism | 72. Function. | 96. Imman Kant | 122. C. Essentialism |
| 23. Propaganda | 48. Reductionism | 73. Measurement. | 97. Ayer | 123. Existence/Essence |
| 24. Bayesianism | 49. Schrodinger | 74. Speciation | 98. Albert Einstein | 124. Form/Matter |
| 25. Computer sim. | 50. Chemistry | 75. Economics | 99. Heisenberg | 125. Substance/Accidence |

Pierre Duhem (1861-1916), renowned French physicist and historian of science wrote :

“The laymen believes that the result of a scientific experiment is distinguishable from common observation by a higher degree of certitude; he is mistaken for an account of an experiment in physics lacks that immediate certitude, comparatively easy to check up on, which characterizes common, non-scientific testimony. Though less certain than the latter, scientific certitude has the advantage over it in the number and exactitude of the details it makes known to us; there lies its true and essential superiority.”



ATE vs. Contemporary Essentialism

1
ATE

2
**Contemporary
Essentialism**

World is filled
with beings, like
men, birds, trees,
apples, water,
squirrels, etc.
-philosophical
-non-scientific
-no inner nature
-no inner structure
-the whole being
-being is multilayered
-not univocal

1 Essence + 9 accidents

- 1- ουσια ("essence")
- 1-ποσον ("how much") quantity
- 2-ποιον ("of what kind") quality
- 3-προς τι ("toward something") relation
- 4-που ("where") location
- 5- ποτε ("when") time
- 6-κειστηαι ("to lie") position
- 7-εχειν ("to have") possession
- 8-ποιειν ("to do) action
- 9-πασχηειν ("to undergo") passion

2
Quantifiable/Extension

- **Empirical**
- **Seeks inner natures/structures**
- **No longer believes in species**
- **Man = 10^{28} atoms**
- **Apple = quantities of ____.**
- **Water = H_2O**
- **Heat = molecular action**
- **Microscopic**
- **Univocal**

Philosophical
"what it is"

Phenomenological
"appearance" (part)


Principles on the three degrees of knowledge

1. Realism is thoroughly realistic in every aspect—from human knowledge to extra-mental reality. To grasp AT realism is to grasp the essence of reality as such without an artificial, arbitrary, reductionistic, or positivistic human contrived systems.
2. Understanding the three degrees of knowledge uncovers reality as such in a Total Truth manner. Moreover, it removes the myth of scientism: Pierre Duhem, “The laymen believes that the result of a scientific experiment is distinguishable from common observation by a higher degree of certitude; he is mistaken for an account of an experiment in physics lacks that immediate certitude, comparatively easy to check up on, which characterizes common, non-scientific testimony. Though less certain than the latter, scientific certitude has the advantage over it in the number and exactitude of the details it makes known to us; there lies its true and essential superiority
3. Understanding reality as such in realism (existence/essence, form/matter, substance/accidence) enables one to see God as per Romans 1:20.


Romans 1:20 For since the creation of the world His invisible *attributes* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,

4. First degree of knowledge (being, philosophy of nature)

- a. Knowledge begins with a particular (1a) and rises to universal nature (1b).
- b. The 1st degree is where essences are grasped intuitively. The first intellectual operation, abstraction, immediately yields the essence of things.
- c. This abstraction transfers us from the level of sensible and material existence to the level of objects of thought that introduces us into the order of intelligible being, or of what things are (1b).
- d. This is where we gain *quidditative* definitions of beings
- e. At this level, beings cannot be conceived of without matter.
- f. This is the great realm that the ancients called *Physica*, knowledge of sensible nature, the first degree of abstraction.
- g. The first degree needs and welcomes the 2nd degree, but never as replacement.
- h. It is philosophy of nature (1b) that determines the nature of objects.




5. Second degree of knowledge (quantifiable)
 - a. This is the great area of *mathematica*, knowledge of quantity as such.
 - b. Here the mind considers objects abstracted from matter.
 - c. This degree considers nothing more than a certain accident: quantity/extension.
 - d. It leaves all else behind except the one property it abstracts.
 - e. The modern problem is that this realm of quantifiable attempts to displace philosophy of nature and metaphysics. It attempts to, for example, mathematize nature. However, the human mind cannot be satisfied with merely *mathematica*
 - f. Scientific explanations do not reveal the very being of things.
 - g. Science depends upon philosophy (1st and 3rd degrees of knowledge)



6. Third degree of knowledge: *Metaphysica*

- a. This is the highest degree of knowledge. It deals with first principles, logic, causation, laws, and properties that reveal essences.
- b. The focus here is on being as such and the laws that saturate beings.
- c. These objects of thought can be conceived without matter whether they never existed in matter (God and angels) or whether they existed in matter as well as in immaterial things, for example, substance, quality, act, beauty, goodness, laws.
- d. The whole domain of metaphysics is knowledge beyond sensible nature.
- e. For the ancients, it was the philosophy of nature and metaphysics that accounted for most all knowledge. They made many errors in 2nd degree knowledge.
- f. There can be no science (#2) without first principles (metaphysics).


3- *Metaphysica*




First Principles
Existence
Being
Laws
Logic
Causation
Properties

Scientific knowledge according to A-A philosophical realism.

“There is a desire deep within the soul that drives man from the seen to the unseen, to philosophy & to the divine.”



Levels of abstraction: from infra-science to metaphysics.



Two views of science and the Bible.

1. Martin Luther (1483-1546): “There is talk of a new astrologer who wants to prove that the earth moves and goes around instead of the sky, the sun, the moon, just as if somebody were moving in a carriage or ship might hold that he was sitting still and at rest while the earth and the trees walked and moved. The fool wants to turn the whole art of astronomy upside-down. However, as Holy Scripture tells us, so did Joshua bid the sun to stand still and not the earth.” This is an example of crass literalism of 1 Chron. 16:30; Psa. 93:1; 104:5; Psa. 19:4-6; Ecc. 1:5. We are still living in the curse of Luther’s nominalism, which leads to anti-realism, anti-essentialism, and a very thin/nominal view of Christianity. Moreover, Luther was devoted to Mary as the Mother of God and her immaculate conception and perpetual virginity.
2. Galileo (1564-1642), another Christian (A-T realism), believed that God “endowed us with senses, reason, and intellect,” and intended us not to “forgo their use and by some other means to give us knowledge which we can attain by them.” He held that the laws of nature are written by the hand of God in the “language of mathematics” and that the “human mind is a work of God and one of the most excellent.” Like A-T and classical realism, his science operated according to methodological naturalism.

More on science and degrees of knowledge.

1. Science divorced from first principles leads to the destruction of man.
2. As far as positions with regard to modern science, as I see it, there are three live options regarding science.
 - a. Scientific realism: the view that successful scientific theories are true or approximately true model of the theory-independent world.
 - b. Scientific antirealism: the view that science works—it solves problems, gives us predictions, allows us to control nature and describe observations simply—but that its success does not indicate that scientific theories are true or approximately true. Science is merely useful fiction.
 - c. A-T philosophy of science (3 degrees of knowledge). Why we need this for science and life with God. This is the only method that provides a realistic and objective view of reality, knowledge, and true science (knowledge about the world), and life with God.

3. Human cognition, though integrated , possesses different dimensions: breadth, length, height, depth (Eph. 3:18). We are examining its height measured in three degrees. PR not only provides a realistic account of reality but of human cognition and knowledge as such.
 - a. First Degree: *phyisca*.
 - b. Second Degree: *mathematica*
 - c. Third Degree: *metaphysica*.