

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

C1016 – May 5, 2010 – Progressive Creationism

Question: What about the dinosaurs? Answer, I'll have a whole lesson on those great creatures that since 1841 have been referred to as dinosaurs. In the meantime consider whether God created the dinosaur kinds on the fifth and sixth days and consider whether they lived in the post-Flood world by reading about Leviathan in Job 41 and Behemoth in Job 40:15ff.

Question: If the plants were created on the third day and the sun wasn't created until the fourth day how did they survive without light? Answer, was there a dark light cycle before the third day? Yes, we read it was "evening and morning." What was the source of the light before the third day? On the first day God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Is that the sun? No, the sun wasn't created until the fourth day. Well, what was this light? Some people say it's the sun, we'll meet some of those people tonight, but that's not the sun. People have said it was God, God is light, and that seems to make sense to people. But there is a a problem. It says God created the light, therefore God cannot be the light. I'll tell you what I think and you can take it from there. God created a light independent of the sun on day one and on the fourth day He replaced that function with the sun. You say, well why would He do that? Let me suggest a reason. Question: who wrote Genesis? Moses.ⁱ When did he write it? During the Wilderness Wanderings, circa 1446-1406BC. Where had they just come out from? Egypt at the Exodus. What did Egyptians think of the sun? The sun was intertwined with the god Re.ⁱⁱ Let me quote from an Egyptian tour guide resource, "Re (Ra) was the Egyptian sun god...The early Egyptians believed that he created the world, and the rising sun was, for them, the symbol of creation. The daily cycle, as the sun rose, then set only to rise again the next morning, symbolized renewal and so Re was seen as the paramount force of creation and master of life."ⁱⁱⁱ The Israelites were no doubt heavily influenced by this idolatrous view of the sun

and so when God created the world He deliberately created light independent of the sun to show that you don't need the sun to have light. It cuts the sun down to size. And of course, God will do this again in the new creation because in the new heaven and new earth there will be no need of the sun or the moon for the glory of God will be the light. So to answer your question about the plants and how they could survive without light from the third day to the fourth day, they didn't have to wait until the fourth day, they already had light, it just wasn't sourced in the sun until the next day.

Alright, we've been talking about presuppositions. Let me repeat the basic presuppositions of interpreting earth history. There are two basic presuppositions or frameworks involved: either you are committed to the principle of uniformitarianism, that all continues just as it was from the beginning of creation or everything does not continue just as it has was from the beginning of creation. Those are the only two positions. There are no other options, either uniformitarian processes are stable and continual such that the processes we observe today are the key to reconstructing past earth history or there are catastrophic discontinuities in earth's past history and we need God's word to reveal those discontinuities so we can understand earth's history. I know of no other positions, fundamentally speaking. At the root level either uniformitarianism is true or biblical catastrophism is true.^{iv}

Practically, how this works is that data is gathered (and there's a lot of data that has been gathered), by Christians and non-Christians, mostly non-Christians. And that's fine; it makes no difference who's collecting the data. Data is data. I find a fossil, I run a chemical analysis, I take a measurement, I compare it with other measurements and do a statistical study. That's all fine, that's observational data in the present, but that doesn't tell you what processes in the past gave rise to that data. It tells you about that specimen in the present. But when you start to interpret the data you bring to the data one of these two frameworks and that's where the dispute is. Which framework is the right framework? Which presupposition is correct? You want you to be aware that the dispute is not over the data itself. It behooves us to repeat this point over and over because two people can look at the same data and come away with opposite conclusions. Two people can look at Grand Canyon and walk away arguing over how it formed, when it formed, how long it took, etc...And the reason that happens is because their presuppositions,

their pre-eminent commitment to one view of the world or the other is bringing that interpretation to the data.

And these presuppositions are controlled by your ethical orientation to God. This is what we have got to grasp if we're going to handle the issue of the Age of the Earth. Pagans are at enmity with God and they are hiding from the wrath of Him who sits upon the throne. If that is the case then of course they're going to re-interpret all the data into an imaginary world where it is safe to sin. That's what we would expect given the revelatory data concerning their heart. They have deep enmity toward God. And it's that ethical animosity that is the underlying motive of paganism.

As Christians, can we assume their presuppositions are valid, neutral, benign, and objective and use them to build knowledge? Not in God's eyes. In God's eyes they're sinful presuppositions. In God's eyes we must take every thought captive to Christ. Not just religious thoughts, not just moral thoughts, not just ethical thoughts but every thought, including historic and scientific thoughts. Are we going to believe what Jesus said about these things? Jesus said, "If I tell you of earthly things and you don't believe, how can you believe when I tell you of heavenly things?" That's the challenge for the Christian in our era.

We started with the three strategies. It's easy to get lost in the many views floating around so we always come back to these three strategies. Every view can fit into one of these three strategies. Two of these strategies I've shared with you, the Capitulation Strategy and the Accommodation Strategy. The Capitulation Strategy is simply I reject the Bible, I throw the Bible out completely. The Bible is wrong, modern science is infallible. We showed how this view grew in the 1800's with the rise of uniformitarian geology and how Bible believers at the time recognized that they were observing the fulfillment of 2 Pet 3:4, "that all continues just as it was from the beginning of creation." So, for those men who were already liberal in their theology it was a short step to capitulate to full-blown evolution. That's the strategy of unbelief.

The second strategy is Accommodation and the accommodationist tries to bring together the conclusions of modern science with the Bible but always at the expense of the Bible. This is mainstream Christianity. Oh, it doesn't

matter, we can believe in millions of years. This is what most seminaries teach, this is what most pastors believe, this is what most Christians think. This is the view. We wait until the findings of modern science come in and we re-interpret the Bible to fit. The problem we said with this was that the findings of modern science are what? A moving target. And so as science changes what do Christians do? Go back to Genesis and re-interpret. And they have done this over and over and over for the last 150 years. I hope we learn the lesson what this does to the integrity of Scripture. It destroys it. After awhile it looks to us like science is more valid than the Bible, so why not just give up the Bible? Why not Capitulate?

Those are the two strategies we've seen so far. Both buy into the sinful presupposition of paganism that Peter warns us about. "In the last days, mockers will come mocking, saying, where is the promise of His coming? For ever since the fathers fell asleep, all continues just as it has since the beginning of creation." In other words uniformitarian principles based on my observational experience in the present are absolute for all time. Think about that: if my present observational experience can be exalted to a status so powerful that it can re-construct past history totally unaided by divine revelation, what does that say about man? Think of the sheer audacity of the claim. My present experience can be extrapolated through all of space and time. That is the pinnacle of arrogance. It says man is great. It says man doesn't need God's revelation. And that's what we're having to face as we talk to our accommodationist friends. We're challenging them to repent; to shed themselves of the world system and take every thought captive to Christ, the Lord of glory.

Alright, last week we looked at Theistic Evolution, the most extreme of the accommodation positions. This is a Christian position. These are people who profess to believe in Jesus Christ. And what they say is that God used evolution. And people say, well, so? What difference does it make? First of all, if that's true, what does that do to your picture of God? If God used evolution to create and evolution is the process of death bringing about life through survival of the fittest, then what does that say about God? That's something we want to think about more as we go into these accommodation views. It says He's a God of death. When you play with Gen 1-2 it always warps your view of God inevitably and we'll look more at that tonight. We also said the word "day" preceded by the numerical adjective in Genesis 1 always refers to

a sequence, a counting measure.^v Theistic evolution denies the sequence of Genesis and accepts the evolutionary sequence and we showed how different the sequence really was. We also pointed out the expression “evening and morning” at the end of each day, except the seventh day, and that this expression indicates a dark-light cycle and together with *yom* indicates six normal 24-hour days of dark and light. We pointed out Exod 20:11, in the midst of the Ten Commandments the six and one ratio of work to rest and how that was understood by the Israelites as normal days. We pointed out the problems with 2 Pet 3:8 where it says a day is like a thousand years. That can’t get you more time in Genesis; it has nothing to do with time in Genesis. It has to do with God’s eternality, that He’s not time-bound. We mentioned also certain theological problems, the problem of death going on in the animal kingdom for millions of years before man’s fall and finally the problem of Gen 1:31, that when God completed the creation He said, it was very good, and if death had been going on for millions of years then that would be His signature on the idea that death is very good. And I never read that in the Bible. So theistic evolution has some serious problems.

b. Day-Age-Day Theory

Seeing this some people came up with another slick solution, the Day-Age-Day theory. That means rather than make each day equal to millions of years I stick an indefinite amount of time in between each day. That way I can have six literal 24-hour days of Genesis but also the geological ages in between. Okay, well, you can make stuff up but there’s no biblical indication of that. Obviously, you still have the ordinal counting measure problem. What does it mean to count days in succession if in between each day is a million years? Doesn’t that destroy the whole point of counting in the first place? If I’m going to relate two events to one another in time I can’t legitimately put a gap of unaccounted time in between without destroying the relationship. And further, the sequence is still way off. Think about it. Does any evolutionist in his right mind agree that the stars didn’t come into existence until after planet earth? I never read an evolutionist that believes that. So even if you put millions of years between each day you still can’t get it into an evolutionary mold. This is not helping resolve issues, this is creating other issues.

Today we want to spend most of our time on a third accommodation view that is not as extreme as Theistic Evolution. And I hope by doing this it will help you see the Scriptures as a coherent whole and the danger involved in how you handle the early chapters of Genesis. Genesis is setting up every other doctrine in the Scriptures, from God, to man, to sin, to judgment/salvation, all this and much more is set up in Genesis 1-11, so what happens if you start playing re-interpretive games with Gen 1-11?

c. Progressive Creationism

This one is pretty popular right now, especially among Big Bang Christians. It's called Progressive Creationism. It grew out of a group that started in the 1930's and was accepted in the 1950's by men as important as Bernard Ramm who was a champion of literal hermeneutics. He wrote the book that was a standard in hermeneutics for 50 years; the first book I ever read in seminary, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*. Gleason Archer, an expert on the Old Testament who wrote *A Survey of the Old Testament*, another standard in conservative seminaries, which I also had to read, also held to progressive creationism. Today the leading proponent is astronomer Hugh Ross. These folks believe in Big Bang Cosmology, billions of years, geological ages and the principle of uniformitarianism as an interpretive key for all time. But, and here's where they part from Theistic Evolutionists, they do not believe in macroevolution, they don't believe that all life came from a single cell. So to explain the diversity of life that we see they say, "God miraculously intervened throughout the history of the universe in various ways millions, possibly even billions, of times to create each and every new species of life on Earth."^{vi} He has the days of Genesis stretched out over billions of years (just like the Day-Age Theory) but not believing in macroevolution they say God periodically intervenes and miraculously creates new species of plants and animals.

Let's think for a moment. Let's just back away from the view and ask a question. Does the way a person does something tell you anything about the person? Just think of people you know or a company that builds a product. Does the way a person does something, or the way a company builds something, tell you anything about the person or company? Of course it does. We all know that. But for some reason when people come to how God created the universe we don't want to think about that. You'll hear it over and over: it

doesn't matter how God created, it just matters that He did create. Friend, that is religious mumbo jumbo. Obviously it does tell us something about Him. It tells us who He is. We have God slowly, incrementally creating individual species over billions of years and we've got death going on for billions of years. What does that tell us about this God? First it tells us if you've got specie created, specie lives, species dies, God creates another specie, specie lives, specie dies and God does this over and over and over. What does that suggest? Failure on the part of God to make good creatures. That His creations are imperfect and that God is sort of experimenting with creation. What does that imply about God? That He doesn't really know what He's doing. That He's limited in knowledge. See how quickly you get into a problem? They might not want to verbalize that, but that's the implication of the view. The point is you can't separate how God created from who God is. It is important how God created. The methodology a person uses communicates the character of the person using the methodology. And so whatever you do with Gen 1 it carries tremendous implications for the character of God. And what I'm trying to do here is train you to think through these bigger issues.

"All dates are approximate, subject to change, and reflect the best established evidence." They say, "As new evidence emerges, date estimates may be revised." What he's saying is, we wait till science comes in, then we re-interpret the Bible. He's admitting that out front. What does that tell us? What's really going on with these people? I want to attack a fundamental issue that I brought up last week. This is a key to understanding accommodation views. What they will say is that we have two books of God; the book of God's word, which is the Bible and the book of God's world, which is nature. Can we agree with that? Sure, no problem. Then they say if both of these books were written by God then, of course, they've got to agree on the age of the earth. Can we agree with that? Sure. I think any Christian can agree with that. Now, this sounds okay, sort of, for a minute, until we look deeper. What we're being told is that literal hermeneutics are the rules for interpreting the word of God. I can agree with that. That just means we take every passage as straightforward, taking account of figures of speech and so forth. That's a great principle to follow when interpreting the word of God. But then they're saying that the scientific method contains the rules for interpreting nature in an independent, autonomous endeavor of man, assuming the uniformity of natural process.^{vii} And that after we have

investigated these two books independently, when all is said and done, we'll come to the same answer.

What is the issue? The issue is which one takes interpretive priority? Does one book take interpretive authority over the other? Or are they on an equal plane and interpretation of each proceeds on the basis of two sets of principles applied; one to the Bible and the other to nature?

Their view is that the Bible and nature are equal in authority. That both speak on the same plane. Can we go along with that? Did God ever intend for man to autonomously investigate the universe? Let's think about it. Here's the word of God. The word of God is verbal, its language, its propositional speech. The world of God is data, it's mute, it's dumb in the sense that it doesn't speak propositional language. It does speak in the sense of Ps 19, "the heavens declare the glory of God," but the Psalmist also says, "There is no speech, nor are their words;" So nature does carry a message, it's a message embedded in astonishing ways throughout creation and it declares the glory of God; His infinite power, His marvelous brilliance. It's a clear revelation of Him, but it's not a propositional revelation of Him. There's a difference and we must always allow the propositional revelation in the book of the Bible to take precedence over the general revelation in the book of nature. Two books yes, but one takes priority over the other.

To see this turn to Gen 2. This is before the Fall. So by going before the Fall we're alleviating the sin problem and the effects that has on man's interpretive abilities. Sin has tremendous mental effects. That's why Paul said, be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind. Your mind wouldn't need renewing if it wasn't fallen.^{viii} So the way we think as fallen creatures is screwed up. So I'm taking you before man's thinking was screwed up, before he needs mind renewal, we're in a sinless universe, man can think more clearly here than he has ever since. As we read these verses ask yourself, can sinless man interpret nature correctly, independently of the word of God? Gen 2:16, "The LORD God commanded the man, saying, "From any tree of the garden you may eat freely; ¹⁷but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die." Question: could Adam have known which tree not to eat of if God hadn't told him? Let's say God never told him vv 16-17 and Adam goes out and he empirically investigates the trees of the garden. He extracts DNA, he gets a

DNA sequence machine, he analyzes the DNA sequences of various trees of the garden. Is he ever going to conclude that this tree over here is going to kill me if I eat it? He can't discover that by any means of empirical investigation. Everything God made was "very good," and that includes the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There was nothing genetically wrong with the tree; it was a perfectly good tree. What makes that tree different than every other tree? It's that God said this is the interpretation I give that tree and if you eat it you will die. But without the word of God, Adam could have never known it. And if that's true in a sinless universe, how much truer is it in a fallen one? We have got to have the word of God if we're going to interpret nature correctly. That's another critical point in this series; *the proper interpretation of nature is subject to the word of God*. And if science is coming to some conclusions that are inconsistent with what the Bible is teaching then somewhere or another science has gone wrong, not the Bible. This is where the progressive creationists have gone wrong. What they've done is they've reversed this point. They've said that "the proper interpretation of the word of God is subject to nature" which is interpreted according to the scientific method. But how does the scientific method apply to the distant past? It can't unless it presupposes the uniformity of present process. But that's what Peter warned against in 2 Pet 3:4. That's what Peter said is sinful. Peter says that you can't go back before the Flood with uniformitarianism. He says, uniformitarianism could never predict the global Flood of Noah and uniformitarianism can never predict the future coming of Jesus Christ. It excludes catastrophic interruptions in history. So we can't go along with what progressive creationists are doing to the text of God's word or their interpretation of God's handiwork.

Now, man can investigate nature. I want you to see the proper role of the scientist. Science is a Christian endeavor. It would never have arisen independently of Christians who assumed the truth of the Scriptures which teach an orderly nature in the post-Flood world. Sir Isaac Newton at Cambridge worked out the speed of sound by timing the interval of an echo over a known distance. He spent the latter days of his life writing a commentary on Daniel. Blaise Pascal took mercury up a mountain and measured the changes in mercury levels according to the altitude making the first barometer. He believed man was not just a speck of dust in the universe but that he was significant because Christ died on the cross for him. Michael Faraday, the experimental physicist, was a Christian, believed the wonders

of God's creation were for all men to enjoy and so he gave his famous public demonstrations. The physical world was an open book to explore because GOD GAVE IT ORDER AND GAVE US THE DESIRE TO INVESTIGATE IT. It was for all men. All of the first scientists had an interest in investigating nature because they believed God was a rational being and therefore the creation was a rational universe that could be known. You'll notice that's the reverse of the design argument today being made by intelligent design. Intelligent design begins with nature's order to prove God exists. Early Christian scientists began with God's existence and expected to find order in nature. It's exactly the reverse. I'm not an advocate of the intelligent design movement. By proving design you don't prove the God of the Bible. If you don't believe me go study Antony Flew. Flew, an Atheist, accepted the weight of the Intelligent Design argument, but did Flew become a Christian? No, Flew became a deist. Design in the universe does not prove the God of Christianity or Jesus Christ or any of that. It's the God of the Bible that proves that there is design in the universe. The exact opposite argument. Think of this, Gen 2:19. Could Gen 2:19 have ever happened if God didn't first exist? Of course not. Here's the beginning of true science. "Out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the sky, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called a living creature, that was its name." Now what is the science where you call things a name? You classify things? Taxonomy. Here's Adam, a genius, absolutely brilliant, the first man, unencumbered by sin and he taxonomically classifies creatures very rapidly according to their design features, giving them a name that captures its unique essence. And God was the one who told him to do it. Go ahead Adam, investigate My world, scientifically, classify things, that's a biblical mandate. But how is it occurring? Another super point. Is it occurring autonomously? Independent of God? No, it's occurring under God's supervision. Adam is not out from under God's authority. He's functioning under God's authority. He's fulfilling; this is the first picture of man fulfilling his role of dominion that God gave him in Gen 1:26-28. And we can legitimately say from this that science is a God-given activity of man, but we must also say that for it to occur properly it must take place under God's authority. So if we're not investigating under His authority then somewhere we're going to go wrong.^{ix} So that's the relation of God's book of the Bible and God's book of nature. It's God's book of the Bible that must take priority over God's book of nature. Progressive

Creationism reverses that principle, comes back and re-interprets the Bible to fit the conclusions of autonomous investigation of nature.

Let's see how they do that. How long are the days? They're stretched out over billions of years. So what do you think they do with the word day? They make a big deal out of how it can be used four different ways, which no one disagrees with and then they say, oh, look, it can be used for a period longer than 24 hours so we plug that in. Friend, *the issue is not how it can be used, but how it's being used in the context of Genesis 1 at the conclusion of each day.* Just because a word has a meaning in one context or in the dictionary does not mean you can shove that meaning into another context. This is a very dangerous way of interpreting the Bible (or any literature for that matter.) That is not sound hermeneutics and they make this mistake over and over and over. They'll take a word and say, it has these meanings, fine, we all agree. Then they'll take the meaning that leaves room for their interpretation of nature and they ram, jam and cram it into the verse when the context clearly indicates that is not the meaning of the word here. You want to watch this because a lot of people interpret the Bible this way. That's not how you do it. You study the context and the context gives you the meaning of the word being used. In the context of Genesis 1 we already said that when the expression "evening and morning" are used it signals a 24-hour dark-light cycle. If these days are billions of years as Ross suggests then why is the expression "evening and morning" used? Doesn't it make nonsense of the expression "evening and morning?" And if day is being used as a long period of time, why did God not make it clearer by using one of the Hebrew expressions that would make this unambiguous? God could easily have used *olam* which means "a long age." Or He could have used *orek* with *olam* which would mean "a length of days." But God didn't do that, God said "evening and morning, day one; evening and morning, the second day...evening and morning the third day, etc..." making it very unambiguous that indeed He is speaking of a 24-hour dark-light cycle.

Second problem: all the geological ages are crammed into the six days of Genesis. Is there a problem with that? What do you have going on for billions and billions of years before Adam is even created? You've got death.^x The entire fossil record is formed in creation week, billions and billions of creatures died and then at the end of that, in Gen 1:31 God said, "it was very good." So suffering, disease and death in the animal kingdom is very good.

Yes, that's what they say in their writings. There really is no way around it. But now we get to the problem I mentioned earlier. That would mean that God created suffering, disease and death as normal processes in the animal kingdom. You have to say that and they do say that. It's inevitable. But if that is true then what does that tell us about God? How does that impact our doctrine of God? God created things to suffer and die. Does that tell us anything about the character of God? Of course it does. He's not a very good God anymore. Big problem.

A third problem (and this is related): what I want you to learn is that once you pick an interpretation of a verse it has ramifications for every other verse. It will just cascade through the Scriptures and tear it to shreds, so you have to be very careful. It's like one bone coming out of joint, if that happens every other joint compensates. It's the same thing when you pull these verses out of joint. So, if I'm going to say that animal death went on for billions of years before Adam sinned then obviously I've got to divorce man's sin from animal death. There can't be any connection between man's sin and animal death. And they say there is no link between man's sin and animal death. They say that man's sin only affects man and that's why you can have suffering and death going on in nature before man's sin. They have to say it, now let's see if that holds.

Hold your place in Genesis and turn to Rom 8:18. Romans 8:18, the context is present sufferings, sufferings in the believers life. Paul says, "For I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed to us." What a promise! All human sufferings that we experience in the fallen world are nothing more than a candle next to the sun. God one day is going to unveil a fantastic glory. Verse 19 he explains this glory to one day be revealed. "For the anxious longing of the creation," (that's a word that refers to more than just man, that word refers to man and nature, which includes the animal kingdom) "For the anxious longing of the creation waits eagerly for the revealing of the sons of God." There's a day he says when those who are true believers will be revealed. That day is the initiation of the Millennial Kingdom, by the way. So the creation is waiting until the initiation of the Millennial Kingdom because that's the day the sons of God will be revealed and the whole creation will be released from its bondage. Verse 20, another explanation, he wants to explain why the creation is eagerly awaiting this day. "For the creation was subjected to futility," that

word means decrease in value. What was God's valuation of all of creation in Gen 1:31? It was very good. So something happened to cause a decrease in value. "For the creation was subjected to decrease in value, not willingly," or gladly, "but because of Him who subjected it." Who subjected it? God subjected it but why did God subject it? That's the question. Answer. Because of Adam's sin. Hold your place and turn back to Gen 3:14. The Fall has already occurred and Adam and Eve have hidden themselves and made for themselves coverings of fig leaves, trying to solve the sin problem with a human gimmick. God has come and entered into one of the most profound counseling sessions in the entire Bible. God teaches us how to counsel a person living in sin who is playing the blame shifting game here. And in verse 14 He starts with the judgments because of sin. He starts with the serpent, which is a part of what? Nature, the animal kingdom. "Because you have done this, Cursed are you more than all cattle, And more than every beast of the field;" So the serpent is clearly cursed but what else is clearly cursed in that verse? The cattle and every beast of the field. They're not cursed as much as the serpent but the implication is that they are cursed. We don't know the immensity of the changes that took place in the animal kingdom at that time. But we do know that changes took place and these were not willing changes. They were subjected to this by God because of man's sin. Man was to have dominion over nature and nature had dominion over him. So the serpent has anatomical changes as well as biological and physiological, for other animals perhaps lesser changes, but probably still in the same realms of anatomy, biology and physiology. So, profound effects of the curse came upon the animal kingdom because of man's sin. Look at verse 17, here's the curse on the plant kingdom. In the middle of the verse God says, "Cursed is the ground because of you;" that's Adam. "In toil you will eat of it All the days of your life. ¹⁸Both thorns and thistles it shall grow for you;" verse 19, "By the sweat of your face you will eat bread You will eat bread, Till you return to the ground, Because from it you were taken; For you are dust, And to dust you shall return." So we have effects of sin for man, animals and plants. That's what Paul's talking about in Rom 8. Let's go back to Romans 8:20: here's Paul's divinely inspired commentary on those verses from Genesis. "For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope ²¹that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God." So, yes, there is a link between man and nature. As goes man, so goes nature.

Ideas have consequences and if you start with the long ages bit and ram, cram and jam the fossil record into creation week you have to bend and stretch these other passages to make them fit, far beyond their stretchability factor. So our point is simply that you can't separate animal death from man's sin. Animal death is a consequence of human sin. It cannot have been going on for billions and billions of years before human sin. Rom 3:23 says "the wages of sin is death" and that, while it may be speaking merely of human death, also brought animal death.

The second answer to creationists is actually an attack. They argue that even you strict creationist people have to admit there was death before the Fall. Turn to Gen 1:29. What was the food that God gave man and animals to eat? We're during creation week right. "Then God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you; ³⁰and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to every thing that moves on the earth which has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food"; and it was so." So the progressive creationist proudly proclaims, see, I told you, plants died before Adam's fall. Answer. In the Bible, are plants living in the sense that man and animals are living? Do plants have a "living soul?" Do they have *nephesh chayyah*, the breath of life? Do they have blood? Answer: no, plants do not have a living soul, they do not have blood, they are cellular and have biological life as it is defined today by modern science but they are not soul life as it is defined in the Scriptures. God says only men, animals, birds and some sea creatures have the breath of life. That's the whole point of Gen 3 and why the fig leaves wouldn't work and God had to kill the first animal to make coverings for Adam and Eve. That's the whole point of Gen 4 and why Cain's plant offering was unacceptable and Abel's animal offering was acceptable. So, this progressive creationist bit is just not acceptable so far as the exegesis of Scripture is concerned.

We could say more but I think we've adequately shown some serious problems. The major issue is that there are two books of God, the book of the Bible and the book of nature, both reveal God, but the book of the Bible takes precedence over the book of nature and our investigation of nature cannot proceed as an autonomous endeavor under the scientific method applied to the past by the principle of uniformitarianism and then come back and

correct our interpretation of the Bible. Moses never dreamed this stuff when he wrote Genesis. Moses didn't have radioisotope dating or Hutton and Lyell to tell him long ages were required to lay down the fossil record. Another major issue is the fact that once you re-interpret Genesis it begins to re-shape how you handle later Scriptures. For example, they believe in a local Flood. Why? Because they've already said the fossil record was laid down in creation week so I can't have a global flood. And finally, the most major issue is this kind of a view of creation changes and shapes your perception of who God is and radically distorts His all good, all knowing, all powerful, all loving nature.

ⁱ He probably had access to clay tablets or copies of earlier tablets divided by the *toledot* (i.e. generations) formula to write much of Genesis. Observe this formula ("These are the generations of...") in Gen 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10; 11:27; 25:12-18; 25:19; 36:1; 37:2. But as a whole the first five books, the Torah, are attributed to Moses.

ⁱⁱ A hymn about Re from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*. "Homage to thee, O thou who risest in the horizon as Ra, thou restest upon law unchangeable and unalterable. Thou passest over the sky, and every face watcheth thee and thy course, for thou hast been hidden from their gaze. Thou dost show thyself at dawn and at eventide day by day. The Sektet* boat, wherein is the Majesty, goeth forth with light; thy beams are upon all faces; the [number] of red and yellow rays cannot be known, nor can thy bright beams be told. The lands of the gods, and the lands of Punt* must be seen, ere that which is hidden [in thee] may be measured. Alone and by thyself thou dost manifest thyself when thou comest into being above Nu*. May I advance, even as thou dost advance; may I never cease to go forward as thou never ceasest to go forward, even though it be for a moment; for with strides thou dost in one little moment pass over the spaces which would need millions and millions of years [for men to pass over; this] thou doest and then thou dost sink to rest. Thou puttest an end to the hours of the night, and thou dost count them, even thou; thou endest them in thine own appointed season, and the earth becometh light. Thou settest thyself therefore before thy handiwork in the likeness of Ra [when] thou risest on the horizon."

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.touregypt.net/featurestories/re.htm>

^{iv} There is a modified view of uniformitarianism called Neo-Catastrophism or Episodicity, but that this is not to be confused with biblical catastrophism is clear as Derek V. Ager says, "This is not the old-fashioned catastrophism of Noah's flood and huge conflagrations. I do not think the bible-oriented fundamentalists are worth honouring with an answer to their nonsense. No scientist could be content with on very ancient reference of doubtful authorship." (*The New Catastrophism* (Cambridge, UK." Cambridge University Pres, 1993), 231, p. xix.)

^v Yes, it's true that at the end of the first day the Hebrew uses a cardinal number, yom echad, "day one," the rest of the days use ordinal numbers, the second day, the third day, the fourth day, etc...The significance of "day one" has been attributed by Jewish thought to the oneness, aloneness of God on the first day, which they took to indicate that the angels were not created until the second day. What actual significance it has I don't know at this time.

^{vi} <http://www.reasons.org/about-us/faq>. I'm unclear as to how they define a species. If they define a species as the biblical "kind" this has problems as it does not leave room for microevolution. Most creationists think the biblical "kinds" were equivalent to the order or genus level of the modern classification scheme.

^{vii} They make a desperate attempt to prove from the Bible that uniformitarianism is a principle taught in Scripture from Jer 31:34ff.

^{viii} This gets into a fundamental difference between Thomistic thought in both Roman Catholic and Protestant circles where human reason is assumed to be objective and neutral vs Van Tillian thought

where human reason is merely a tool to be used according to one's fundamental nature. According to Scripture the latter is true, the former is a lie.

^{ix} A view that progressive creationism takes to help their position is called the seventh day phenomena. What they observe in the text of Genesis is that the seventh day does not conclude with God saying, "and there was evening and morning, the seventh day," and then they find a verse in Hebrews 4 that mentions the seventh day as the day of God's rest from the work which He had done and putting these together they conclude that we are still living in the seventh day. This is ludicrous and demonstrates my point that they do not interpret the word with sound exegesis. Most of these people are not theologians, they are scientific types, which is fine, but they are not careful with the word. The expression you have not entered My rest is a technical term referring to the Promised Land. Israel at Kadesh Barnea in the OT did not go into the Promised Land because they failed to trust God. They trusted the ten unfaithful spies and said, we just can't do it, there are giants in there and big cities and we're scared. They did not trust God as Joshua and Caleb did. And therefore God says, you forfeited the right to enter into My rest, that is, the Promised Land. If they had trusted God they would have gone into the Promised Land and God would have given them military victory, secure borders, enjoyment of the fruits of their labor, a very restful situation. And all Hebrews 4 is telling those believers is that you are in a similar situation, you are under persecution and your afraid and your backing down and your faith is failing and everything is going to go caput if you don't trust the Lord. If you do trust the Lord then you'll enjoy rest from your works because God will take care of your problems. So don't fail like that generation of Israel failed. It has nothing to do with the seventh day of creation going on and on and on. In fact it says in Heb 4:11, "let us be diligent to enter that rest." If the seventh day has never ended then every human being is already in that rest and the author could not say, let us be diligent to enter that rest."

It is based upon a quote from Ps 95:7-11 that is based upon the events that occurred to Israel at Kadesh Barnea where Israel had the opportunity to go into the land that God had promised them. They failed to enter the land because they failed to trust God. They followed the human viewpoint advice of ten of the spies. They said, "We just can't do it. There are too many walled cities. There are too many people. There are giants. We can't do it." They did not trust God as Joshua and Caleb did.

So God after this whole series of events of disobedience which we have studied finally lowered the boom and said that they would not enter the land. They would all die in the wilderness except for Caleb and Joshua. "You have now forfeited your right to enter into My rest." This is a technical term for the Promised Land.

^x Passages they use to support animal death before the Fall include Ps 104:19-28 which they argue is a poetic commentary on creation week. Since Ps 104 speaks of animals hunting other animals this supports animal death in creation week. However, a better case can be made for this Psalm referring to the Flood and the post-Flood world. Waltke says parts refer to the post-Fall world and to the

Flood. They also use 1 Tim 4:1-5 to say that God created these animals to be food for man and that just because God gave man and animals plants and seeds to eat in creation week does not exclude eating animals and that anyone who says we cannot eat meat during creation week is advocating doctrines of demons. The problem with this is that God Himself under the Mosaic Law prohibited eating of certain meats. No one debates this. Was God advocating doctrines of demons? So what Paul is talking about in 1 Tim 4 must refer to the present time after the Day of Pentecost when Peter had his vision in Acts 10 and the decision was made at the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010