

The Nature and Purpose of Biblical Apologetics

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; (2 Corinthians 10:3-5)

The Gospel Goes Forth

1. The gospel enters in narrowly as the good news of reconciliation with a holy God through union with His only-begotten Son in His incarnation, life, death, burial, resurrection and ascension.
2. The broader gospel includes much information about Christian doctrine, the Christian life, etc. so as to encompass the whole counsel of God.
3. The facts of the gospel are often rejected. We know from 2 Cor 4:3-4 that the gospel comes to those whose minds are blinded. That does not mean they don't have minds nor does it mean that their minds don't work quite well in coming up with objections to the gospel.
4. Apologetics therefore goes hand-in-hand with the gospel in order to defend it against all objections. In Paul's words, apologetics casts "down imaginations, and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God" (2 Cor 10:4).
5. The Bible calls us to "give a reason" for the hope of the gospel (1 Peter 3:15) but the Biblical idea of "giving a reason" may not be what we naturally think, and we must be very careful that our apologetics is consistent with our theology. As we hold the highest view of God as absolute Sovereign and of Scripture as inerrant and infallible, we ought to be careful not to embark on an apologetic that undermines those beliefs. That is, to affirm with one breath or out of one side of the mouth that the God in which we believe is absolute, the ground of all being and knowledge, and then to offer arguments that undermine that belief is to be an example of what James 3:11 refers to as being a spring of sometimes clear and sometimes salty water. This is no good.

Worldviews in Collision

What is a worldview?

1. A worldview is a system of beliefs that flows from a set of fundamental commitments or presuppositions and which provides an all-encompassing framework for understanding ourselves and our place in the world around us. A person's worldview is how he looks at the world, not with his physical eyes but with his mind. A person's worldview represents his most fundamental beliefs and assumptions about the world. It includes fundamental ideas of who and what we are, how we got here (wherever "here" is), why we're here, where we're going and what things may happen when we get there. It encompasses all aspects of our thinking about what is real, what is true, what is good, what is right. Few people think through these issues in any depth nevertheless most people have some opinion on almost every question, whether they have studied it or not. They draw inferences from their worldview and seek to be consistent though everyone certainly has inconsistencies among the many beliefs that are held because of a failure to fully examine oneself.
2. A worldview is grounded on presuppositions. A presupposition is a belief which is presupposed, that is, accepted without proof as fundamental. Presuppositions include such things as the ultimate nature of reality, how we come to know things, what is truth, what is right/wrong, etc.

3. A worldview is based upon its presuppositions like a building is based on its foundation. As a building may soar above its foundations yet it can never escape them. A person's beliefs about ultimate reality control what things he think can and cannot be real and known. If a person thinks, for instance, that ultimate reality is only material then he is a materialist and will not be able to believe the truth of the gospel that there is a God who is "spirit" (John 4:26) because he says he doesn't believe that there are non-material things. Of course, he can't prove this but accepts it anyway.
4. One philosopher likened our belief system to a web of connected beliefs because naturally our beliefs are related to one another. The laws of logic are like the strands of the web which connect one belief to another. These force us to be consistent among our beliefs. But as in a complex web, not all the strands are directly connected to each other. There are some threads that are central to the web which hold many downstream strands, so too some of our beliefs are more foundational, more fundamental. Some filaments are closer to the center of the web and so it makes sense that changing one of those would affect much more of the web than one which is far from the center. Our belief system is like this – a web of interconnected beliefs that spread out from a few central strands. The more central a belief is to our worldview, the greater the disruption that comes from changing it. Disruption equals pain so the more foundational a belief is to us, the more we resist any changes to it.
5. A classic example of a collision of two worldviews took place in what is called the Copernican revolution. In ancient times, Aristotle taught that the earth was the center of the universe and that everything revolved around it. That belief was adopted by the Roman Catholic church and viewed as fundamental to the faith.
 - a. Around the year 1500, Copernicus published a paper which set forth the basic understanding of a heliocentric model, that is, one in which the sun is at the center of the solar system, and that planets revolve around the sun and the moon revolves around the earth. This idea didn't catch on at the time but ~100 years later a man named Galileo constructed the first telescope powerful enough to observe moons orbiting the planet Jupiter. This simply disproved the old view that had been held for 2000 years which said that everything orbited around the earth. Those moons orbited around Jupiter. This new information was bound to come into conflict with the established worldview.
 - b. Galileo's discoveries contradicted the authoritative position of the Roman Catholic church which, though not ultimately derived from Scripture, nevertheless appeared to them to be so fundamental to their worldview that they greatly resisted the heliocentric view. In 1616, the Inquisition put the question to a group of theologians and natural scientists and they concluded that "the proposition that the Earth moves and is not at the center of the universe is foolish and absurd in philosophy, and formally heretical since it explicitly contradicts in many places the sense of Holy Scripture" and Galileo was commanded "to abstain completely from teaching or defending this doctrine." Galileo complained that some of the philosophers who opposed his discoveries had refused even to look through a telescope:
 - i. My dear Kepler, I wish that we might laugh at the remarkable stupidity of the common herd. What do you have to say about the principal philosophers of this academy who are filled with the stubbornness of an asp and do not want to look

- at either the planets, the moon or the telescope, even though I have freely and deliberately offered them the opportunity a thousand times? Truly, just as the asp stops its ears, so do these philosophers shut their eyes to the light of truth.
- c. Galileo was persecuted by the church for his discovery and placed under house arrest for the rest of his life. When he died in 1642 he was refused burial in the church ground.
 - d. It wasn't until 1757 that the geocentric view was officially rejected and the church formally recognized that the earth revolves around the sun. The term "Copernican Revolution" refers to the change of belief from the idea that the sun revolved around the earth to the idea that the earth actually revolves around the sun. This fundamental change of belief is a perfect example of the conflict that arises when two worldviews come into conflict. There is a collision which forces a reevaluation of one or more beliefs in the prevailing view. This is painful and may cause upheaval, and causes pushback, even violent pushback, because the change of a fundamental proposition threatens the worldview as a whole.
 - i. We think of the pushback that Paul and the other apostles experienced in the propagation of the gospel – from both Jews and Gentiles because the gospel overturns the natural worldviews of men. So there is pushback –
 - 1. From the Jews five times I received forty stripes minus one. (2 Corinthians 11:24)
 - 2. Alexander the coppersmith did me much harm. May the Lord repay him according to his works. You also must beware of him, for he has greatly resisted our words. (2 Timothy 4:14-15)
 - e. The "Copernican Revolution" is also a good metaphor for the change from a man-centered viewpoint to a God-centered viewpoint. Since our infancy, we all naturally reckon ourselves as the center of the universe. We fancy that we get to decide what is true, what we believe, what is right/wrong, what is good. We naturally seek our own honor and glory and even imagine that god exists to satisfy our wants and needs.
 - i. But, presuppositional apologists, like Galileo, point out the problems with the geocentric (man-centered) view and how the heliocentric (Triune God-centered) view resolves all those problems. Even though he may hear the argument that the heliocentric view solves all his problems, the natural man still resists this change with all his might because it is too fundamental a change in that it overturns everything in the old order. The pain of such a renovation of his web of belief makes it impossible for him to desire to undertake it.

The Biblical Worldview

1. The foundational belief of the Biblical worldview is stated in the name itself – the Bible, aka the Scriptures, the writings which are themselves the very Word of God. All Scripture is God-breathed (2 Tim 3:16) and are the condensation in human language of the very breath of God. And it is those very Scriptures which confront us from the outset, from Genesis 1:1, with the words, "In the beginning God ..." Here we are presented with the eternal God as existing in the beginning. Scripture doesn't give us an argument for the existence of God – nothing of the kind – Scripture simply states God's existence as a matter of fact. In the beginning ... God.
2. We have here two mutually-supporting, mutually-involved propositions – the infinite, eternal God and the holy Scriptures. Logically God is more fundamental than the Scriptures but without

the Scriptures we could not know God. The Scriptures are God-breathed, the breath of God, and they reveal God as Triune, one God in three Persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. These truths are the ultimate reality and are interwoven into every aspect of reality yet such is our blindness that we could never discover the glory of God apart from a written revelation. The Holy Spirit is the Author of Scripture and the Son is the Logos, the Word of God, the Revelation of God who came forth from the Father. God attests to the Scriptures and the Scriptures attest to God.

3. These two presuppositions are distinct yet involve each other so have a unity. The authority of Scripture is God's authority. It is His Word which He speaks. He says, "I have spoken" and that is the end of the matter. God says, "... I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it. (Isaiah 46:11) And He says, "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isaiah 55:11).
4. Ultimately, this is the same Word which was "in the beginning with God" (John 1:2) and which is eternally God. This is the One who is in the bosom of the Father and who was sent and came to reveal the Father. We have this duality which is yet a unity – Jesus tells us "Let not your heart be troubled; you believe in God, believe also in Me" (John 14:1) because He and the Father are One. Likewise, we presuppose the absolute Triune God as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

The non-Christian Worldview

1. It may seem as if there should be as many non-Christian worldviews as there are non-Christians. There are such radically different alternatives as atheism and Islam which, on first, second and third glances, seem like polar opposites. Nevertheless, they are alike in that they deny the Triune God of Scripture. They deny the revelation of God in Christ. While Islam may speak much of God yet it is not the Triune God of the Bible of which they speak but a uni-personal God. We will examine the Islamic idea of God in a later study to see that it is not a coherent idea at all. The main point of this is to argue that every non-Biblical worldview denies some central aspect of the Biblical worldview which is a consistent set of beliefs. Whether a worldview denies the incarnation or the sovereignty of God or the resurrection of Christ, there is a denial of the Biblical worldview because there can be no sense of the crucifixion apart from the incarnation, etc. It all hangs together.
2. There are many examples of non-Christian worldviews. In a sense, everyone's worldview is unique but are all alike in deny the ultimate truths of the gospel. They are all the same kind of wolf but dressed up as different kinds of sheep.
 - a. The scientific worldview depends on the validity of observation and induction. It is important for the establishment of scientific laws that experiments be repeatable. If you measure something this week, it is expected that it be the same next week, etc. And if you measure something 100 times, you expect it to be the same the 101st time. But what is the foundation for this belief? If you believe that, once upon a time, the universe big-banged into existence for no particular reason, then why believe that a ball dropped from a certain height will fall the same every time? The existence of a rational Sovereign God, good and kind, who works all things according to the counsel of His own will. This is the only possible ground of the scientific endeavor.
 - b. Other non-Christian worldviews are defined by foundational writings. There are ancient writings of the Buddhists and the Hindus. More recently there is the Islamic Quran, the book of Mormon and the NWT plus Doctrine and Covenants, Pearl of Great Price, etc. of

the JWs. All these have some pretended authority as of coming from God and the worldview of the latter works are parasitical on the Bible. Each is some form of Bible plus other writings which always twist the true doctrine of Scripture into something false. Each of these is a study in itself in terms of dealing with the presuppositions.

3. The question of authority of non-Christian worldviews is always a relevant consideration. We must always be asking “how do you know?” and “what makes you think so?” Each of the non-Christian worldviews has a false authority based on a deception. “For all the gods of the people are idols: but the LORD made the heavens” (1 Chronicles 16:26)
 - a. The gods of other books are idols – “all the gods of the people are idols.” That includes the gods of the Hindus, the Muslims, the Mormons and the JWs. A thorough investigation of those worldviews will bear out that the gods of those systems are man-made worthless idols. Each of those books also depends on the Bible and tries to leverage the Bible for legitimacy. The Quran mentions the Bible as authoritative and defends its preservation but also contradicts key doctrines of the gospel.
 - b. The scientific method is presented as an authority but in reality it is a process of “ever learning but never being able to come to a knowledge of the truth” (2 Tim 3:7). Scientific pronouncements are never authoritative because the nature of the scientific method is to make educated guesses and then try to disprove them. But just because something hasn’t yet been disproved doesn’t mean it is true. Any scientific pronouncement might be invalidated by additional information. The geocentric worldview was finally invalidated after it became impossible to defend. But then the heliocentric view needed to be corrected because our whole solar system revolves around something else.

The Illusions of Autonomy and Neutrality

Autonomy

1. This is the idea of “being a law to oneself” as in Romans 2:14, “for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, (Romans 2:14) is to be self-determining. And there is truth to the idea that all men freely choose as they wish from among the choices presented to them.
 - a. The idea of autonomy began in the garden of Eden, at the fall, when Adam and Eve first believed the lie that "For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:5). The underlying thought here is that Adam and Eve believed they would be like God and therefore independent of God in the knowledge of good and evil. If they were like God in this, then they would not be dependent on God to tell them what was right and wrong. Well, that is a false understanding of reality. There is no knowledge independent of God. They reached out their hands to grab what they thought was self-governance and yet it turned out to be bondage. The idea of getting out from under God’s sovereign control and interpretation of events is what we naturally want for ourselves. Adam and Eve wanted to become autonomous, self-governing creatures but, instead, became bound over to condemnation and subjugated to the rule of Satan.
 - b. The persistent struggle against God is expressed by the words of Psalm 2:3, "Let us break Their bonds in pieces and cast away Their cords from us" (Psalm 2:3). Everyone naturally wants to break God’s bonds in pieces and struggles to make himself free from

the bonds and cords of God, i.e. of the obligations acquired under the first covenant, of violations to the law, which demand strict justice.

- c. The way that men do this is, as Romans 1:18 says, by “holding the truth in unrighteousness” – man naturally holds the truth about God down, as one would naturally try to keep a beachball under the water, they struggle to suppress the knowledge of God in order to preserve the unrighteousness of their belief in being a law to themselves. The knowledge of God’s existence, eternal power and Godhead because such a thought is absolutely inconsistent with his presupposition of autonomy.
2. Returning back against to Romans 2, the Gentile does think that he is autonomous, a law to himself, and so he does everything possible to suppress the specific knowledge of God, in order that he can live in the way that seems good to him. However, verse 15 reveals the fly in the natural man’s ointment – his conscience.
 - a. Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) (Romans 2:15)
 - b. There is no escape from the constant interference of the conscience which acts independently of the person. Thus, the person can’t be an autonomous agent because the conscience operates within him and most often contrary to his desires, choices and actions. In response to this, men become masters of self-justification, distraction, delusion and in the use of chemical weapons like drugs and alcohol for this war that is raging on the inside.
3. Thus, in Romans chapters 1 and 2, the natural concept of autonomy is explained as something which is developed in the awareness of this God who is there in response to the terror of His holiness. As the angels must cover their feet in His presence so natural man must suppress the knowledge of God in creation and in conscience.
4. Thus men come to believe that they do not believe in God and in reality they do believe in Him and hate Him so much that they have suppressed all awareness of their dependence on Him. However, the dependence is real and it is undeniable. And the conscience can become defiled and even become as flesh that is seared and loses all sensitivity.
 - a. Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled. (Titus 1:15 KJV)
 - b. Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; (1 Timothy 4:2 KJV)

Neutrality

1. Men are guilty in Adam and naturally alienated from God and enmity against Him. In terms of the covenant, Adam broke the covenant and we with him are all fallen under the curse of the covenant. All men are born under condemnation (John 3:18) and are by nature children of wrath (Eph 2:3). This is obviously not a neutral condition before God!
2. And so, while many men would admit that they are sinners before God and certainly not neutral in a moral or legal sense, it is another matter to get someone to admit that he is biased in his judgments.
 - a. Most people naturally think of themselves as objective but they are like the people who believed that the earth was the center of the universe. It’s not that their observations are necessarily invalid it’s just that they are from a biased viewpoint which is confused

with the objective viewpoint because of a false sense of autonomy. It is the very profession of having an objective viewpoint that is the error – it is those who profess themselves to be wise who become fools, (Romans 1:22) as Adam and Eve reached out their hands to become wise – it is the very assertion of autonomy and neutrality that is sin.

- b. Theologically, all truth is one and all truth is in God and the unbeliever is steadfastly opposed to God. Therefore, there is not an unbiased attitude toward the truth because all truth is ultimately of or pertaining to the Triune God – He is the LORD God of truth (Psalm 31:5). Jesus said I am the truth (John 14:6), and He called the Holy Spirit, the “Spirit of truth” (John 14:17, 15:26, 16:13). He said, “Thy word is truth” (John 17:17). So, the unbeliever’s attitude toward truth in general is biased so cannot claim neutrality in any specific case.
- c. Each unregenerate individual’s “understanding is darkened” (Eph 4:18) and each naturally walks “according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience” (Ephesians 2:2). This is not neutrality but bondage
- d. Each person evaluates truth claims in the context of his own worldview but no one can claim that his worldview is comprehensive and perfectly correct in every detail. So, though almost everyone see himself as unbiased, as a neutral observer able to render impartial judgments of truth and fact, the real situation is quite different. At best, our viewpoint is subjective and at worst we are completely misled about every single thing we believe.

The interpretation of evidence

1. Evidence requires interpretation and interpretation requires a framework of related and consistent ideas. Since everyone has a worldview, everyone is able to offer some idea about the interpretation of all kinds of evidence.
2. It is just this that the natural man believes himself quite capable of doing because it is consistent with his belief in his autonomous judgment and his neutrality.
 - a. When confronted with the lack of transitional forms in the fossil record, evolutionists didn’t just give up their belief in evolution. Stephen Gould responded with the theory of punctuated equilibrium: that there are no transitional forms in the fossil record because evolution proceeds by long periods of unchanged form punctuated by the sudden appearance of new life forms. The creationist looks at the same fossil record and sees not some inexplicable process of punctuated equilibrium but the work of God in creation and variation within a species.
3. It is in the presentation of evidence that classical or evidentialist apologetics makes its defense of the faith. An evidentialist comes upon a person who says, “I don’t believe that God exists” and immediately begin trying to prove that God does exist.
 - a. This puts the person into the very role with which they are most comfortable: as an autonomous and neutral arbiter of the truth. It actually encourages the person to weigh the evidence for belief in God, as if he had no skin in the game.
 - b. What is the proper way to respond to the question, “Have you stopped beating your wife?” Is it to say either “yes” or “no”? If you say “yes” then you admit you did beat your wife. If you say “no” then, please talk with Pastor Mark or me after the study.

- i. This is called a “Loaded Question” because it comes as a question with a hidden premise or presupposition.
- ii. The correct way to respond is not to offer evidence that you don’t or haven’t beaten your wife. Why?!
 - 1. Every shred of evidence offered is refutable by various interpretations.
 - 2. The mere offering of evidence reeks of guilt.
- iii. The correct way is to simply deny the presupposition of the question by stating “I have never beaten my wife.”
- c. So too, when the unbeliever denies some Biblical truth, the approach is not to present evidence in favor of the rejected belief but to examine and refute the faulty presuppositions which support the rejection of the belief. The presentation of evidence, treating the unbeliever as an autonomous and impartial judge of the facts is to abandon the Biblical position from the outset.

The Absoluteness of God

1. Underlying the presuppositional apologetic is the idea that God is absolute – which is only fully and correctly expressed in Reformed theology – that God is the truth and that there is no aspect of human experience which is not wholly dependent on God. When Scripture says He “upholds all things by the word of His power” (Heb 1:3) and that “in Him we live and move and have our being” (Acts 17:28) and the He “works all things according to the Word of His power” (Eph 1:11) and that He “lights every man” (John 1:9) we get a sense of the pervasiveness of God. David wrote that “Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me” (Psalm 139:5) and this applies to every aspect of human life and experience.
2. The absoluteness of God constrains our approach to apologetics. It is not possible to prove the existence of the absolute Triune God. Scripture makes it clear that every man already believes in God and depends upon God in every way.
 - a. The neutral approach to discover the truth excludes the Biblical answer from the beginning for it is Christ who “lights every man” and not we ourselves learning from experience. The neutral approach to considering the question of the existence of God excludes and precludes the Biblical answer which is, “in the beginning, God.”
 - b. The presuppositional approach takes the full revelation of God into account and affirms that (i) the unbeliever has the knowledge of God but has suppressed it and (ii) the unbeliever has a conscience which is like a trumpet of God which speaks to the inner man of right and wrong and of future judgment, but men drown out the sound and cover their ears as did Stephen’s hearers, Acts 7:51, 57.
 - i. (51) Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.
 - ii. (57) Then they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord

The Presuppositional Method in Action

In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; (2 Timothy 2:25)

Worldview warfare

1. The problem with the unbeliever is not that he does have enough evidence but that his interpretation of the evidence is flawed because one or more of his presuppositions is faulty.
 - a. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. (Luke 16:31)
2. So, when the unbeliever objects to some essential fact of the gospel, the approach is not to offer more evidence for him to misinterpret but to engage in the following two-step process presented in Proverbs 26:4,5 which we will apply in reverse order:
 - a. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.
 - b. Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly

By the words “according to his folly” we can understand the worldview of the unbeliever. To answer a fool according to his folly, we adopt the unbeliever’s worldview for the sake of argument and show him how the presuppositions of his worldview are inconsistent with the conclusion he wants to draw. We must ask the questions, “how do you know?” and “what makes you think so?” until we have an understanding of why he believes what he believes and by what authority he asserts it as true.

If the fool says in his heart, “there is no God” then we assume for the sake of argument that there is no God (as we understand God) and examine this person’s claim in the light of their worldview. To assert that there is no God as a presupposition necessarily leads to a belief in relativism, nihilism, a belief in ultimate nothingness, meaninglessness and vanity. The counter-assertion of the apologist is two-fold: (i) to assert that within the unbeliever’s own worldview, there is no ultimate meaning and so saying “there is no God” is equivalent to saying “there is a God who sovereignly rules all things”. Nothing makes any sense or difference without an absolute God. (ii) Then, it must be made clear that the unbeliever is not living in accordance with his denial of God. He has no explanation for the regularity of nature, the principles of rationality and right/wrong, ideas like truth, love and beauty. His worldview cannot give an account for those things and so by denying God those things are implicitly denied as well. But the unbeliever lives as if those things are real and so implicitly believes in the God he explicitly rejects.

What we are doing is showing the unbeliever that by denying whatever aspect of the gospel he denies, to speak metaphorically, that he is pulling the rug out from under his own feet. Thus we are fulfilling the words of 2 Timothy 2:25. We are pointing out to the unbeliever how they are opposing themselves by showing them that their presuppositions are false and need to be modified. We do this in all meekness, knowing that it is only by grace that we were granted repentance unto life. And so we answer the person according to his own flawed worldview, so that he be not wise in his own conceit.

Answer not a fool according to his folly

By the words “not according to his folly” we can understand the Biblical worldview. To not answer a fool according to his folly we must answer him within the framework of the Biblical worldview. This is a demonstration of how the presuppositions of the Biblical worldview do lead to the correct understanding, how that integrates in with the overall worldview and the explanatory power of the glory of God in the gospel.

To continue on with the fool who says in his heart, “there is no God,” whom we’ve shown the impossibility of his worldview, we are now able to assert the claim that the Biblical worldview of the Triune God as revealed in the Scriptures is the only worldview which makes sense of the full range of human experience. The Biblical worldview is so vast that the full presentation and explication of it can never be fully made. There is nothing like the Biblical worldview in which the revelation of the glory of God in Christ crucified, died, buried and resurrected gives meaning to all of human history. The revelation of God in Christ is set like a diamond in the midst of the ages, foretold by the prophets and prefigured by types and shadows. Apart from this central reality, our lives, as well as everything else would be (in the words of Shakespeare) “a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing” (Macbeth, Act 5, Scene 5).

Ultimately the presuppositional method hinges on the realization that every non-Biblical worldview must “borrow” from the Biblical worldview to facilitate the existence of rational human experience. Yet the borrowed beliefs are always at odds with the fundamental principles of the system. The instruction of those who oppose themselves by basing their beliefs on non-Biblical ideas is done in all meekness, even though the principles of the presuppositional method, once mastered, allow the apologist to fairly easily stop the mouths of “unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake” (Titus 1:10-11). Presuppositional apologetics can effectively stop the mouths of such people and so special care must be given to meekness in instructing those who oppose themselves. The presuppositional apologetic and the Scriptures agree that it is ultimately God who is able to “give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.” No argument will grant the ability to repent unto the acknowledging of the truth. Ultimately, the Scriptures teach and we believe that regeneration is the only way by which the fundamental change – the individual’s personal Copernican Revolution – can be brought about. We hold our autonomy as too central to be willing to adopt the absolutely fundamental change which the gospel requires – the Lordship of Christ over every aspect of the life, the beliefs, the thoughts and the actions.

(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; (2 Corinthians 10:4-5)