

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Problems with the "Literal" Adam****Problems with the "Literal" Adam - posted by vbc66 (), on: 2019/5/11 9:46**

Hello everyone, this is my first post here so I apologize if this is in the wrong section or if my post goes against the standard protocol here.

Yesterday, during one of my live broadcast on our church app. I spoke about an article that challenged the historic Christian understanding that Adam was a real and literal person. The article claimed Adam was merely a symbol. Let me quote from the article: "I suggested that the Adam story could be viewed symbolically as a story of Israel's beginning, not as the story of humanity from ground zero." I understand this kind of attack has been around forever, but this article was put out by a ministry that claims to hold to the historic Christian faith and the inspiration of the Bible. I obviously reject their teaching but thought people should be aware of it, that is why I addressed it on my Broadcast. I posted the entire article on our church app. I will not post it here since I don't want to violate any rule. However, I will provide a link so people can read their attempt to prove their teaching. <https://biologos.org/articles/pauls-adam/>

Trevor

Re: Problems with the "Literal" Adam - posted by davidkeel (), on: 2019/5/11 13:03

You should get involved with the Youtube channel of Kent Hovind and you will get some amazing facts about scientific data. And the creation of the earth

Re: Problems with the "Literal" Adam - posted by drifter (), on: 2019/5/11 13:09

Welcome to Sermonindex Trevor!

You're right, these attacks against the plain teaching of scripture have been around for many years. If an article says something like "Well, the Bible seems to teach this, but modern science contradicts this teaching" you can safely put said article in the trash can where it belongs. No man needs a "guru" to teach them what the Bible says. The average person, if he has the Holy Spirit, can pick up the Bible, read it, and understand it. No man, if he had never heard evolution theory, would read Genesis and think Adam was not a literal person, and that the universe is billions of years old. It simply does not teach that.

Evolution theory actually has its roots in pagan religions such as Hinduism. If you like, here is a link to an excellent video by Dr. Paul James-Griffiths explaining this:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cqFChgeSJGA>

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2019/5/11 14:17

There are many Dangers of Biologos

<https://answersingenesis.org/theistic-evolution/the-danger-of-biologos/>

Is It Necessary to Believe in a Literal Adam and a Literal Fall?

<https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/ken-ham/2013/08/09/is-it-necessary-to-believe-in-a-literal-adam-and-a-literal-fall/>

There are so many problems believing in a evolutionary beginning as there is no gospel as there is no fall. If there is no literal Adam. There is no reason for being saved from our sin.

Once you destroy there are so many things that are destroyed such as marriage, original sin and the gospel itself.

Psalm 11:3 King James Version (KJV)

3 If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?

Re: Problems with the "Literal" Adam - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/11 17:19

I read the Paul Enns article in my estimation you did right to call it error. This same tactic has been used for many millennia, namely "hath God said" questions. Sounding very professorial he invites you to swim in a sewer treatment plant all the while claiming how pure it all is.

His liberal theological stance killed the institutional churches years ago, now in the form of re-thinking Paul's Adam its starts again with college students awed by academic approvals listening to the idiocy of unbelief. Its all very well packaged and marketed as "real knowledge"

The article was a series of rationalizations directed at swaying the Christian from trusting God to teach him. This puppet insinuates you need men like him to guide you into all truth. Paul the apostle was a stupid man he was ancient, old thinking and not savvy to the scientific discoveries of our day. With this little assertion he is saying Paul can't be your bible guide men like himself have arisen to fill your need. I cannot stomach these professors of falsehood, I would discourage every one from listening to liberal theological sewage.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/11 17:38

I'll make it very clear biologos considers the current scientific research as equal to mount Everest, But the scriptures cannot be trusted by the simple reading of them. It is this devilish premise that undergirds all their claims.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/12 8:43

I believe in is literal Adam but one still has to recognize the problems raised in the article- the archaeological ones- because they are indeed problems if the earth is believed to be only 6000 years old.

For example, where does Gobekli Tepe fit into the biblical timeline? It is far more ancient than 6000 years yet it had to have been built after the flood or it would have been destroyed.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/12 10:23

I have heard the arguments on both the sides. I am personally undecided. But I have observed that those who believe in a literal interpretation of the Bible are dangerous because they mostly call others heretic just because they disagree with them. I do not believe Bible is saying that earth was 6000 years old. It is just interpretation of men.

Instead of focusing on things that are unclear, why don't we focus on clear things like 'Sin will not be master over you' and 'Anyone who claims to abide in Christ must walk like him'. These things are so plain yet not true in most of the serious believers. But very few seem to care about this!

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/12 11:49

Couldn't agree more Sree. Amen.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/12 20:05

Fine I'll be the worst offender, because their main premise is no one understands the bible without modern science. The ancients were stupid men incapable of knowing God's meaning in his word. That premise which they cleverly hide is why we suffer their attacks on scriptures.

Who says we have older civilizations? The guys who say the bible cannot be understood without their help. This is just repackaged popery in humanist terms.

There is more to contend with than your own sin conscienceness

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/13 13:15

œThe placing of a catastrophic global flood in the year 2304 BC means that all civilizations discovered by archaeology must fit into the last 4,285 years.œ

From creation.com

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/13 13:28

Todd: So what is wrong with that? We really don't have any cultures older than that. Yes I know about all the supposed cultures claimed to be older, but by what standard? Surely if the scriptures have a literal Adam, we cant have more than a round 6k years to have any.

But if Adam (as Peter Enns says) is just an Israelite symbol, well, I suppose we can just jettison the bible altogether.

With an all powerful God there are no half-right bibles, or half-right chronologies or half-right accounts. Of course with men, they have multitudes of them.

One of the reasons you get fired upon as a Darwinist is because the T.O.Evolution requires these ages to introduce man and animals into the mix. The scriptures do not.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/13 13:46

Liberal theology has never stopped attacking literal meanings on any key doctrines.

Adam is myth or poetry

The Noah's flood is myth or a local flood

Parting the Red Sea was just low water that day.

The red Nile was just a mud slide

The Miracles of the prophets are mostly fabrications

The prophecies of Daniel are written 'after the fact'

The virgin birth never occurred

The resurrection never occurred

The miracles of Jesus are mostly fabrications

The sin nature of man is founded upon the misconception of Paul concerning Adam.

The Deity of Jesus Christ is a fabrication

Hell is a pagan myth

Heaven is a hopeful crutch in religion

The scriptures cannot be understood as divinely inspired.

The ancient Church manufactured the Trinity from near-by paganism

Satan is a myth or at best a personification of evil men.

Angels are a myth or at best a personification of good men.

The liberal theologian works exhaustively to supply the skeptic, atheist, agnostic and apostate every tool they need to attack the Church. You will find the Atheists in their books love to quote the Liberal Theologian because even they recognize a theology that inert and superficial comes from the mind of men...a religious concoction.

Letting a liberal theologian teach the Church is to eventually rip away any super-naturalness. The Church is reduced to... as Paris Reidhead says "poetry and nice words and axioms".

I for one refuse Peter Enns and any other liberal theologian. While they may add an ounce of truth to the scales, they have already mined away tons of truth and piled it up as waste.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/13 13:51

Paris Reidhead "Ten shekels and a shirt" if anyone has listened to this sermon and actually believes anything the man says cannot without serious conflict and contradiction accept the teachings of liberal theology.

Sree - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2019/5/13 15:42

â€œBut I have observed that those who believe in literal interpretation of the Bible are dangerous because they mostly call all others heretic just because they disagree with them.â€

So, by your definition I am DANGEROUS?

You are using a very broad brush there brother.

A simple study of the ages of those in Jesusâ€™s genealogy will add up to roughly 6000 years till now. A honest look at these scriptures will show that they require a literal reading.

The problem I have with those of a differing opinion, is that the Bible IS very clear on this. Be careful of the influence of a narcissistic, worldly approach to reading scripture.

â€œTruly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.â€

I do value your contributions and insights on the forum.

Blessings

Re: Sree - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/13 15:54

The problem is not only population growth but also population spread- there are places all over the globe with massive complex structures that required certain levels of culture and skill and manpower. Itâ€™s not as if pyramids were only being built near Mesopotamia.

Re: Sree - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/13 16:35

Quote:

So, by your definition I am DANGEROUS?

You are using a very broad brush there brother.

I apologize if I appear to have used a broad brush. That is not my intention. The literal interpretation people I have met have always called others heretic for not believing in what they believe.

Quote:

The problem I have with those of a differing opinion, is that the Bible IS very clear on this. Be careful of the influence of a narcissistic, worldly approach to reading scripture.

Unless Bible clearly says that the earth was formed 6000 years before, we have NO reason to believe in such a view. All so those who are undecided are not influenced by Science. I love Science and I am decently intellectual. But it is not of the fear of science or its influence that makes me take a neutral stand. I just do not believe Bible was intended to give a clear picture of Scientific way of formation of earth. Bible is a spiritual book, it answers a realm that science cannot reach, for example nature of God, how God wants us to obey him, his standard, his love for mankind etc. Science answers a realm that Bible is not intended to reach like layers of earth, chemical composition etc.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Problems with the "Literal" Adam

You are against someone painting everyone with same brush but you do the same when you say Science influences the idea of those who disagree with your view! Which as I explained is not true.

Quote:

A simple study of the ages of those in Jesus's genealogy will add up to roughly 6000 years till now. A honest look at these scriptures will show that they require a literal reading.

If everything in the Bible is to be taken literal then Sun going down and coming up as well should be taken serious. But here we use the knowledge of science! Bible is not direct word of God, it is an inspired word of God (2 Tim 3:16). When God inspired men, he can only inspire him within the boundary of knowledge of men. For example when Jesus used his parable, he did not quote cellphones are laptops in his parable. He only used objects like farming which were known to the people. Same way God inspired only the way people of that time could understand.

Now I certainly do not believe everything in the Bible should be taken literal. I also do not use my wisdom to decide what should be literal and what is not. That is why I am undecided.

On the age of the earth, it was not created on Day one. There is a gap between heaven and earth being created and day 1 creation. We cannot be certain on what happened in this gap.

Re: Sree - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/13 16:35

Quote:

So, by your definition I am DANGEROUS?

You are using a very broad brush there brother.

I apologize if I appear to have used a broad brush. That is not my intention. The literal interpretation people I have met have always called others heretic for not believing in what they believe.

Quote:

The problem I have with those of a differing opinion, is that the Bible IS very clear on this. Be careful of the influence of a narcissistic, worldly approach to reading scripture.

Unless Bible clearly says that the earth was formed 6000 years before, we have NO reason to believe in such a view. All so those who are undecided are not influenced by Science. I love Science and I am decently intellectual. But it is not of the fear of science or its influence that makes me take a neutral stand. I just do not believe Bible was intended to give a clear picture of Scientific way of formation of earth. Bible is a spiritual book, it answers a realm that science cannot reach, for example nature of God, how God wants us to obey him, his standard, his love for mankind etc. Science answers a realm that Bible is not intended to reach like layers of earth, chemical composition etc.

You are against someone painting everyone with same brush but you do the same when you say Science influences the idea of those who disagree with your view! Which as I explained is not true.

Quote:

A simple study of the ages of those in Jesus's genealogy will add up to roughly 6000 years till now. A honest look at these scriptures will show that they require a literal reading.

If everything in the Bible is to be taken literal then Sun going down and coming up as well should be taken serious. But here we use the knowledge of science! Bible is not direct word of God, it is an inspired word of God (2 Tim 3:16). When God inspired men, he can only inspire him within the boundary of knowledge of men. For example when Jesus used his parable, he did not quote cellphones are laptops in his parable. He only used objects like farming which were known to the people. Same way God inspired only the way people of that time could understand.

Now I certainly do not believe everything in the Bible should be taken literal. I also do not use my wisdom to decide what should be literal and what is not. That is why I am undecided.

On the age of the earth, it was not created on Day one. There is a gap between heaven and earth being created and day 1 creation. We cannot be certain on what happened in this gap.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/13 16:52

TMK - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2019/5/14 4:17

Hi Todd

You might find this video interesting -
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V11yRTC6kGE>

Blessings

Re: TMK - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/14 11:00

Excellent video- thanks. I had watched the Exodus documentary on Netflix which was also very good.

Re: Kruger (jochbaptist) - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/14 11:25

You said Bible has to be interpreted literally but I have posted my concerns on that. Can you please address them? I am not interested in arguments but always wanted to know how people supporting literal interpretation pick and choose certain things.

Re: Sree - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2019/5/14 18:48

Unless Bible clearly says that the earth was formed 6000 years before, we have NO reason to believe in such a view.

Dear Brother

The Bible does say that clearly. In Exodus 20:11 it says - For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. This is a literal statement. The creation account, although brief and concise, spells this out very clearly & literally. Other creation narratives, like those in Job or the Psalms might be poetic, but Genesis 1&2 are literal accounts, saying that Adam was created on the sixth day. Thereafter his literal age, and those of his kin, is given in literal historical accounts. I don't agree with you, it is possible to discern whether something is stated literally. I am not saying everything is literal ...

I am also not saying you are swayed by science. I am not calling anyone a heretic either. But when one is unswayed by clear, simple truths in scripture it smacks to me of narcissism. - The unwillingness to accept truth (unteachable), and the inclination to determine their own belief system.

You can believe in a gap theory, but just remember to tippex out Exodus 20:11 :)
Blessings

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/14 19:54

The gap theory posits an unknown period of time between Genesis 1:1 and Gen 1:2. Ex 20:11 does nothing to disprove the idea because some persons who believe in gap theory also believe in 7 literal creation, or re-creation days.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/14 20:14

Quote:

Ex 20:11 does nothing to disprove the idea because some persons

I do not believe Gap theory is right but I see it having a valid argument against earth being 6000 years old. I think I made my point here which is a neutral stand.

But I would like to know how Ex 20:11 does not disprove gap theory. Can you please expound on this?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/14 20:51

1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. 2 Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.
Genesis 1:1-2

Gap theorists interpret "was" in v2 as "became" which apparently is also a legitimate interpretation. Thus the creation account is actually a re-creation account, the theory being that there was an earlier creation destroyed by cataclysm- possibly due to Satan's fall- but that dinosaurs etc existed in the earlier creation until they were destroyed.

Ex 20:11 does not disprove gap theory because gap theorists still believe in 7 literal days of (re)creation.

I have never been a fan of the gap theory. I prefer the idea that Gen 1 is a poetic description of God's creation of the universe. I simply cannot accept that the universe is only 6000 years old. But we've been over that ad infinitum in the past. I couldn't care less what folks believe about the universe as long as they believe God created it.

TMK - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2019/5/15 3:06

"Ex 20:11 does not disprove gap theory because gap theorists still believe in 7 literal days of (re)creation."

Then they have to concede that the heavens was also recreated - which is silly. Nowhere will you find that the heavens "became"

Ex 20:11 - For in SIX DAYS the LORD made HEAVEN AND EARTH, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.

You can waltz around Ex 20:11 as much as you like, but Scripture can not be broken.

Also, let me quote Genesis 1:1&2, and please point out to me what you read as "poetic" about it -

1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. 2 The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters.

Poetic - definition

â€¢ written in verse rather than prose.

â€¢ having an imaginative or sensitively emotional style of expression.

synonyms: expressive, figurative, symbolic, flowery, moving, aesthetic, artistic, tasteful, graceful

Blessings

Re: TMK - posted by deltadom (), on: 2019/5/15 4:14

This has many theological implications on the nature of the gospel

If you do not believe in a literal Adam then there is no literal fall, no need for a second adam

This is not a secondary issue

The gospel , the need for a saviour

Once you destroy the foundation everything else is up for grabs

I have read the so called egyptian creation story it is nothing like genesis and with the genonologies.

It is only recently that people believe in billions of years as none of the early commentators

Why did Jesus even come and die for our sin if there is no original sin

If there is no death before the fall as the Bible says the world was created perfect but sin destroyed it .

You cannot believe this if you believe in billions of years.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/15 7:27

Dom-

What kind of â€œdeath?â€œ

I already said I believe in a literal Adam.

Jochb-

What â€œheavens?â€œ

A gap theorist would say that eons ago God created the universe which would include â€œheavensâ€œ but that creation fell into ruin and had to be remade, which is what Gen 1:2 and thereafter describes.

Like I said I am not a proponent of this but again Ex 20:11 does not render the interpretation impossible.

ADD: Arthur Pink and Chuck Missler were proponents of gap theory.

Re: TMK - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/15 9:30

Quote:

"Ex 20:11 does not disprove gap theory because gap theorists still believe in 7 literal days of (re)creation."

Then they have to concede that the heavens was also recreated - which is silly. Nowhere will you find that the heavens "became"

Ex 20:11 - For in SIX DAYS the LORD made HEAVEN AND EARTH, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.

I think TMK is right. I did some research and the word for create that i used in Ex 20:11 is different from that used in Gen 1. It means recreate. So in short Ex 20:11 can be read as, God recreated heavens and earth in 6 days. Which still holds the gap theory a possible option.

Again I am still neutral, I do not believe Bible says anything about earth's age. Gap theory is a valid argument that puts a considerable possibility that the earth can be old as indicated by science.

If Bible clearly says that earth was created 6000 years ago then I will believe it no matter what Science says. Like I said before, Bible is not intended to answer any of Science's questions. It was revealed to man by the Holy Spirit based on his knowledge of things. If God revealed Genesis to today's man it will be more detailed.

Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2019/5/15 9:59

Ex 20:11 word is "asah"
Gen 1 word is "bara"

Interpreting asah as "recreate" would render the text incomprehensible when taken in light of the usage of the two terms...

for example; in Genesis 1:26&27

The idea to create man is in fact expressed first as "asah" recreate???

While in verse 27 the act of creating is referred to as "bara"...

a quick word study reveals that interpreting asah in these passages as recreate would be at best careless-

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/15 12:02

One has to admit the gap theory solves certain seemingly insurmountable problems.

If correct one can have their cake (accept scientific evidence of billions of years old universe) and eat it too (accept more recent re-creation in 6 literal days).

I may have to research it further.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2019/5/15 12:59

Quote:

One has to admit the gap theory solves certain seemingly insurmountable problems.

Other than solving the questions posted by science(which I am not interested), it solves few Spiritual questions,
1. How can a perfect God create an Earth which was formless and empty, as indicated in Gen1:2.

2. When did the fall of Satan happen? Since Satan was already on the earth during Adam's creation, there should have been a period when he fell.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/16 12:24

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qsa-A2ynkKs>

Dr. Lisle is really good here.

Re: brother Marvin - posted by JFW (), on: 2019/5/16 14:38

That was quite good, thanks for sharing:))

Reminded me of the verse in 1 Timothy...

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2019/5/16 17:36

Strong's:+6231 257. אָחַז / Ah.S.H Translation:+Do Definition:+To bring to pass; to bring about; to act or make. AHLB:+1360-H (V) Strong's:+6213

No

40. אָחַז / B.R.A Translation:+Fatten Definition:+To make more substantial, fleshy or plump; to fill up. The filling of the earth in Genesis 1 with the sun, moon, plants and animals. The filling of man with breath and the image of Elohiym. AHLB:+1043-E (V)

No

What Hebrew lexicon have you been looking up as with the Hebrew root system there is no way that you can say that

There is no evidence of a recreation event in scripture

There is problems with the paleontology record study Dr John McKay and things like polystrata fossils.

The problems are not purely it is with destroying things like original sin and the fact that Jesus is called the second adam and that Jesus mentions Adam as an historical person

Matt 19

3 The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for a very cause?

4 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, (Compare)

5 And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

6 Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. Mark 10

5 And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.

6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. (Compare)

7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

8 And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Amen.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2019/5/17 7:36

Dom wrote:

//The problems in not believing in a literal Adam , u say u donâ€™t believe in a literal Adam //

WRONG! I specifically said I DO believe in a literal Adam. Please do not misquote me for your own nefarious purposes.

Do you doubt AW Pinkâ€™s salvation? He was a proponent of gap theory. So is Chuck Missler and so was Scofield to name only a few.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2019/5/17 11:45

I have A.W Pink' book on Genesis. I love Pink but he turns a little green when incorporates the science-of-today (for his generation) into Genesis.

Im no proponent of an old earth or a gap theory, but there are items the scripture clearly mention but leave unexplained.

"darkness was over the face of the deep"
"earth was without form and void"

Though there were no "days", there were elements, matter namely water and earth. When God created those, it is not mentioned. This does give room for hypothesis of ancient creation of the element.

But, the problem lay in 'hypothesis' or speculation, God spent no time explaining that, but he did explain the creation of life forms and those necessary bodies to sustain a physical creation.

I am a young earther, but based upon explicit texts not upon current science; though, I am glad to have ICR and others who help the Christian to realize there is another story the scientific data can tell.

If you take the first two verses of Genesis literally, you have God's quick summation. God created two things. The heavens and the earth. That's it.

So, what I see in Gen 1 is God filling the heavens and filling the earth.

I begs the question "then the earth must be the oldest of all planetary bodies?" Because the Heavens was just 'empty space'.