1. Does the modern church overemphasize the divine origin of Scripture? (0:10)
2. Doesn’t downplaying the human origins of Scripture make the Bible more exciting? (2:50)
3. When Christians are illiterate, is it helpful for the church to make authoritative decisions? (4:35)
4. Is it legitimate for the church to use images to teach illiterate Christians? (7:00)
5. Did classical polyvalence always ground the figurative meanings of Scripture in its literal meaning? (10:25)
6. How does a polyvalent approach differ from a search for literal meaning? (15:00)
7. Were there good aspects of the medieval Roman Catholic Church? (17:25)
8. How does the modern Roman Catholic Church interpret the Bible? (21:45)
9. Did the Reformers really get their methods of interpretation from the Renaissance? (25:25)
11. How did first-century Christians interpret the Bible? (33:15)
12. Was Matthew concerned with the original meaning of Hosea? (37:10)
13. Did the Reformers believe that Scripture could have multiple meanings? (38:50)
14. Why did the church move away from a polyvalent view of Scripture? (40:35)
15. Is every passage of Scripture limited to one, unified meaning? (45:35)
16. Did the Reformers base their theology entirely on their exegesis of Scripture? (49:50)
17. How clear are the teachings of Scripture? (52:50)
18. Should we use clear passages of Scripture to interpret unclear passages? (59:35)

19. Is John 3:16 a clear passage? (1:02:15)

20. Should we hold all our beliefs with equal conviction? (1:06:10)