

Creation: Believe It or Not

Code: B100530

Throughout this series, John has demonstrated the inability of science to answer the key questions of origins. Scientists tacitly admit that reality when they change or adapt their evolutionary theories to fit new evidence. They call it being honest with the facts; for answering metaphysical questions, we call it a foundation of quicksand.

John continues to make the case that the Bible is the only authoritative and reliable source for answers about life—what it is, where it comes from, and where it's going. But many Christians still seem enamored with science, trusting it over the Bible. They're willing to reinterpret the Bible to fit the temporary conclusions of science rather than use a consistent, grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture to direct their study of science.

So, here's the question for those who unduly elevate science above the Bible: at what point do you start believing the Bible? If you don't believe Genesis 1 and 2 mean what they say, when do you start applying a literal hermeneutic, and on what basis? On what grounds do you reject Genesis 1 and 2 while accepting what God tells you about the redemption and consummation?

For the comment thread, let's discuss two points of John's concern. First, why do so many Christians seem to adopt a compromising posture with regard to a literal, six-day creation? Second, what is at the heart of taking an allegorical approach to Genesis 1 and 2 while using a literal hermeneutic to interpret the rest of Genesis, and the rest of the Bible?

Available online at: <http://www.gty.org>

COPYRIGHT (C) 2015 Grace to You

You may reproduce this Grace to You content for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Grace to You's Copyright Policy (<http://www.gty.org/connect/copyright>).