

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**C1015 – April 28, 2010 – Theistic Evolution**

Alright, last week we started a new class called A Biblical Framework of Geology and we opened with a lesson that covered the whole spectrum of what we'll be covering in this course. It's the general picture of the four periods of geological activity that we'll be covering in more detail throughout the course. The four periods are the Creation, a high-energy period where a lot of geological work was happening in a very short period of time (at least that's our suggestion at this point), then we have the pre-Flood world, a low energy period of 1656 years where you basically have normal geological processes of that period taking place, then the Flood, another high-energy period where lots of geological work was occurring and that period exponentially decays into the post-Flood world that we live in where again we return to a low-energy period as the earth is gradually wearing out. Those are the four basic periods, so far as the Bible is concerned, where every geological formation must be explained.

Now we want to start working with the question of the age of the earth. This is a debate about the two high-energy events, the Creation and the Flood, and whether the high energy spikes really exist or not. Evolution says no, that all continues just as it has since the beginning of creation, so that it's just a flat line. Of course they permit local catastrophes like the ones we observe in the present, but they reject these two high-energy events and would just say the overall process, the demarcating feature is gradualism. That uniformitarian processes have given rise to earth's features over 4.6 billion years.

This is where the disagreement begins. It's going to take a few weeks to go through this because the question involves us in over 200 years of discussion and a number of attempts to reconcile biblical creation with evolution. What I've done is divided it into two basic categories. What is the age of the earth

looking through the lens of the Bible? What positions have been taken by those who give lip service to the Bible? And why are some coming to an Old Earth position and others to a Young Earth position? Then we'll look at the age of the earth from the standpoint of the data we find in the earth and analysis of the data done by scientists, Christian and non-Christian. How do we interpret this data and that will involve us in radioisotope dating, the fossil record, sedimentary deposition, etc...That's a general outline of where we're headed in the next few weeks. And when we get to the more technical data I'll do my best to make that understandable.

In this series we want to get a firm understanding of the root issues when it comes to interpreting data. This is an area of confusion for both Christian and non-Christian. It's often thought that one side of the debate has certain data that support his position and the other side of the debate has other data that support his conclusion. That's incorrect. Both sides have the same data. It's not an issue of data; it's an issue of interpretation of the data. And interpretation of data necessarily involves us in a discussion of presuppositions.

Presuppositions are the heart of the issue. I want to clarify that term because it's often misunderstood. It's commonly thought that a presupposition is an assumption. And in the dictionary you can find it used that way. But we're not using the term that way, and neither are the professional theologians who work in this area. What they're referring to is something more deeply held than an assumption. As Van Til said, "We cannot choose epistemologies [ways of knowing] as we choose hats."<sup>1</sup> It's not that simple. Presuppositions are deeply embedded; my presuppositions are what I am ultimately committed to as a way of thinking, as a way of knowing. So presuppositions are what I am ultimately committed to and that involves my entire being or nature. Here's an unbeliever, this is Paul Davies, a popular writer on science, he says, "There is a popular misconception that science is an impersonal, dispassionate, and thoroughly objective enterprise...science is supposed to be constrained by agreed rules of procedure and rigorous tests. It is the results that count, not the people who produce them. This is, of course, manifest nonsense. Science is a people-driven activity like all human endeavor," and he goes on to say science is driven "not so much by choice of subject matter, but the way scientists think about the world." In other words, your presuppositions, your commitment to a way of knowing drives how you

interpret the data, even how you set up the experiment and what data to consider. That is all presuppositionally informed.

A second misconception about the term presupposition is that because of the *pre-* in *pre-supposition*, it just means a prior belief. That's not what it means. The *pre-* in *pre-supposition* refers to the "preeminence" of the belief with respect to our other beliefs. Your presupposition takes precedence over every other thing you believe. So a presupposition is an ultimate commitment in one's thinking that takes pre-eminence over every other belief a person may hold. And everyone has them, you can't get rid of them, they're like fly paper stuck to your foot and you try to get it off with your other foot and it sticks to that one. In other words, there is no neutrality.

Not everyone has agreed down through history that there is no neutrality. John Locke said man came to the table a *tabula rasa*, a "blank slate," that the mind was born neutral, without rules for processing data and that data is then added and rules for processing are formed solely by our sensory experiences. Locke wasn't the first to say this; he's the modern one, but it can be traced back to Aristotle on down through Aquinas and to Locke and modern man.

But what does the Scripture say? Is it true that a man born into the world is a *tabula rasa*? A blank slate? The Scriptures say man is born depraved. In Romans 5:10 Paul says the unbeliever is an enemy of God. In Romans 8 he says the human race has two partitions: the carnally minded who are hostile to God and the spiritually minded. 1 John 2:15-17 says the world and all it contains is against God. James 4:4 says "friendship with the world is hostility toward God." In other words, there are only two ways of thinking, neither of which is neutral. One is carnal, the other is spiritual. One is at enmity with God, the other is a friend of God. But there is no neutrality. We have got to come to grips with the fact that unbelief is not a neutral position. Why do we have to come to grips with that? Because the moment we accept the pretended neutrality of unbelief then we ourselves are tempted to play according to their rules. But God says that's sinful, you're not neutral, you've become His enemy. In Rom 1 Paul says unbelief is on a sinful quest to shield itself from the Creator, to suppress the truth in unrighteousness. And therefore the way the pretended neutrality of unbelief insists that we must know things is a sinful insistence. As Christians can we go along with that?

Reason, used autonomously, as a way of knowing, independent of God's revelation is sinful. That's what Peter says in the theme verses of paganism. What did Peter say in 2 Peter 3:3-4? "they say...all continues just as it was from the beginning of creation." But where is that coming from? Where is that presupposition driven by? What did Peter say at the end of verse 3, "following after their own lusts." It's their unbelief; it's their sinful disposition toward God, its rebellion. As Van Til said in another place. "Their epistemology [way of knowing] is informed by their ethical hostility to God."<sup>ii</sup> In other words, their sinful nature is controlling how they insist we must know things. They're not neutral at all. They're sinful. And we all know that. But are we willing to think like Peter, that if people are sinful then even their way of knowing is sinful? "all continues just as it was..." is an ultimate statement of epistemology, that man's reason and experience are ultimate and man's reason and experience are sufficient, independent of God's revelation, to know the universe.<sup>iii</sup> And that Peter insists is a sinful epistemology.

Unbelief is in ethical hostility toward God and is hiding from God. Part of the hiding involves his sinful insistence that we must know things starting with man and man's senses alone. The Scriptures state that this way of knowing is ethically hostile toward God and that it is hopeless, that God will not permit unbelief to find out the work which God has done from the beginning even to the end.

So then how can we know? What is the proper way of knowing? Coming to God's revelation with a submissive attitude, asking Him to show us from His word. That's where we must start. Paul Henebury says, "From a Christian point of view, it is essential for man to have proper faith if he is to know his creational environment fully." In another place he says the Scriptures demonstrate "that the Christian *must* place faith before reason if reason is to operate correctly. Faith is necessary if we are to please God (Heb. 11:6). If we are neglecting revelation at any point we are, at least in principle, saying that it is okay for the believer to operate independently of God in the world. That is tantamount to refusing to engage "the mind of Christ" that has been made available to us (1 Cor. 2:16; cf. 3:23)." We must take how many thoughts captive to Christ? Every thought. Therefore we must start with God's word as the ultimate presupposition if we are to know anything aright, if we are to use reason aright.

### III. The Age of the Earth

Now to get into the Age of the Earth let's go back in history and do a little overview of the history. This is a debate in our own camp, this is within the church, and this is not an argument with those outside of the church. This is a debate among those who profess their allegiance to the word of God.

#### A. Biblical Age

In the early church some of the most outstanding theologians of the church held to the presupposition of biblical authority, that divine revelation was the key to the past, that the earth was young, and in particular, that the Global catastrophe of Noah's Flood was responsible for changing the earth's surface and laying down sedimentary strata containing fossils. Tertullian, Augustine and Clement.

At the Reformation Luther wrote to this effect. Following the Reformation in the early 1600's Archbishop Ussher published his Annals of the History of the World which from a computation of the data in Scripture said the earth was 6,000 years old.

By the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century a great enthusiasm for Flood geology began, led by three Cambridge scholars. Their writings were so influential that it could be said in 1697 that, quote, "all sober and judicious men are now convinced that the exuviae of sea animals, so plentifully found at this day in the strata of the earth, and in the most hardened solid stone and marble, are the lasting proof of the Deluge itself and of its universality." While they say nothing of the age of the earth a belief in a Global Flood is almost universally in tandem with a belief in a young earth.

Flood geology continued throughout the entire 18<sup>th</sup> century and well into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Gillespie says, "There was no question about the historical reality of the flood. When the history of the earth began to be considered geologically, it was simply assumed that a universal deluge must have wrought vast changes and that it had been a primary agent in forming the present surface of the globe. Its occurrence was evidence that the Lord was a governor as well as a creator."

However, beginning in 1800 a radical shift began as modern geology posited long ages and the principle of uniformitarianism. These geologists claimed that uniformitarian gradual processes observed in the present were the key to interpreting the past. Hager says, “Early geologists fought,” he means uniformitarian geologists around the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, “Early geologists fought to free people from the myths of biblical creation. Many millions still live in mental bondage controlled by ignorant ranters who accept the Bible as the last word in science, and accept Archbishop Ussher’s claim that the earth was created 4004 BC.” L Merson Davies, a prominent British field and laboratory paleontologist and a Christian, writing of the period, said, “And so, after 18 centuries, we at last find the ancient prophecy fulfilled before our eyes;” What ancient prophecy is he talking about? Peter’s prophecy in 2 Pet 3:4, that “all continues just as it was from the beginning of creation.” So he says, “at last find the ancient prophecy fulfilled before our eyes; for here is, as foretold, where opposition to belief in the Flood lies today. There is no mistaking a fact. It stares us in the face, *anyone, today, who argues in favour of belief in the Flood, at once encounters opposition upon these long-foretold lines.*” Davies wrote that in 1930, 80 years ago the Bible was under radical and virulent attack, just as Peter predicted.

## 1. Old Earth

So how did the church respond to this titanic shift in geology around 1800? Before 1800 it was the exclusive belief of the church that the Global Flood explained the data and that we lived on a young earth, in the range of Archbishop Ussher’s 6,000 years. With the rise of modern uniformitarian geology in 1800 what did the church do? The church had two responses. Many churchmen gave up the Bible altogether and relegated the early chapters of Genesis to myth. Others began to re-interpret the Bible based on the assured results of science.

### A. Capitulation Strategy

So let’s look at the first strategy, what we call capitulation. In the Capitulation Strategy the Bible is totally abandoned, officially, completely, and explicitly. I don’t believe the Bible, the Bible has errors, science is infallible. This is the approach of unbelief. That’s what we mean by

capitulate. Representatives of that strategy would be your liberal church men; they had already drifted away from orthodox doctrine so it was very easy for them to buy into evolution in every way. Once they'd done that did they all of a sudden become neutral? No, they put on evolutionary goggles and when they went to Genesis how do you think they read it? As if it evolved over time. The liberal scholars, starting with Julius Wellhausen and some others, began to apply what is technically called "higher criticism." That is, they came to the Bible and tried to explain it in terms of unbelief. They didn't believe in *ex nihilo* creation, they believed in cosmic evolution so what are we going to do with Genesis? Well, it's not God's word; it's just a human book. And they went to ripping the Bible to shreds. Let me show you how they did this in Gen 2 because this is still taught in High School and College, and they do this to undermine your faith. We want to be sure that all Christians are forewarned and forearmed about Gen 2. One of the classic cases of a higher critical assault on the text, the validity of the text, is found here in Gen 2. You can feel it coming when you hear your instructor saying, "Well, in the Bible there are multiple accounts of creation, there's one account in Gen 1 and there's a completely different account in Gen 2." And usually a lot of naïve Christian students sit there in the class and say, "What, there are contradictions in the Bible?" and because they're sensitive enough they think rationally, "Wait a minute, if the Bible has contradictions it can't be true."

Here's what they do. Turn to Gen 2:9 and simultaneously look at verse 19. What they do is they say, "In Gen 1 which came first? Animals or man? Animals. Then man came. But now look in Gen 2:15, man is mentioned, "Then the LORD God took the man and put him into the Garden to cultivate it and keep it." Then verse 19, here's the clicker, "And 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 the instructor joyously, proudly and confidently pronounces, "See, I told you, the Bible has contradictions—in Gen 1 animals then man, and Gen 2 man then animals, a contradiction. Well, there's a problem with that. Let me back up and show you.

When you interpret literature, any kind of literature, you do it all the time, when you get a letter, when you read a piece of literature, what is your first thought when you come to the text? If a guy took the time to write it, he must have meant to communicate, it's not just nonsense. So if somebody wrote the

text, give the guy the benefit of the doubt that he probably intended to mean something coherent. You don't start your interpretation of a piece of literature trying to rip it to shreds; you start your interpretation assuming he meant to communicate something coherent. That's why we write, that's why we talk.

In the case of Gen 1 and 2 we have a style of writing, and we are all acquainted with this if we've ever read a newspaper. We call it journalistic style. Now when you write a news story, when you read a news story, any news story, it records events in time. Does a journalistic style start with a headline and give you strictly chronological events? Think about it when you read a news story. Or, does the journalist summarize in the first paragraph what is going on, goes back to details, summarizes, maybe picks another theme, summarizes that, hops over here and does another theme? Ever see that style done? Does that mean that the AP news writers have contradictions in their stories? Or is it stylistic? Archaeological discoveries of ancient Near Eastern works showed that "doublets" like Gen 1-2 were common stylistic features in the ancient world. The author will give a chronological account and then he will go back and pull out some of those themes and talk about them. That's exactly what Genesis does. In Gen 1 we have the chronology. In Gen 2 the elaboration on specific themes. But the liberals had already capitulated to the conclusions of geology so they didn't approach the text with care, they just ripped it up. That's Capitulation. Now let's turn to the next strategy. This is the one that became mainstream, still is mainstream.

### B. Accommodation Strategy

The second strategy is to accommodate. The Accommodation Strategy attempts to harmonize the short ages in the Bible with the long ages of modern geology. Try to somehow bring these together by re-interpreting the Bible to fit what science is saying. Remember, and it is very important to remember, that these grew out of the claims of long ages by modern geologists. They didn't grow out of a vacuum. They were being influenced, not by exegesis of the word of God but by external influences of the world. So as the majority opinion was shifting and attacking the Bible a tension grew between the Bible and science. On the one hand the assured results of science are saying long ages, on the other my Bible is saying short ages. How did



they handle the tension? Many of them had respect for the Bible so they went to defend it. How did they defend it? By re-interpreting it to fit the findings of science. Look at this: here's a Christian in 1846, an outstanding Christian scholar and he says, "Natural revelation is the basis on which written revelation rests." Do you know what he's saying in that statement? He's saying that we began with the scientific study of the world and then after doing that we interpret Scripture accordingly. This is another critical idea to lock down because Christian scholars are saying the same thing in 2010. Here's one, "God has revealed Himself to humanity in at least two ways—the words of the Bible and the record of nature." Our "mission is to work rigorously to integrate both of God's revelations into one harmonious picture." It sounds fine until you look a little closer and realize they're accepting the pagan presupposition of 2 Pet 3:4, that the present is the key to the past, and then re-interpreting the Bible to fit long ages. Peter said that's sinful. And we'll see a lot of this. I just warn you in advance.

## 1. Theistic Evolution

The first accommodation attempt is called Theistic Evolution (earlier known as Christian Darwinism and sometimes as evolutionary creationism). This is the view that says God used evolution. Most Christians are in this camp. They don't see the implications of this. They haven't thought this thing through clearly. They have bought into a sinful presupposition that is coloring how they interpret the Bible. They don't have a problem saying God exists and God creates the material universe but they also say that God uses the evolutionary process in the never-ending creation process. Notice, creation is a never-ending process. What do you do with Gen 2:1-3? Let's look at this. And as we read it mark the words like completed, finished and other words that indicate that God was through creating. Does it sound to you like creation is a never-ending process? "Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts. <sup>2</sup>By the seventh day God completed His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. <sup>3</sup>Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made." I think if you count you get about seven indications that whatever processes God used to create were turned off on day seven. It's not a never-ending creation process. It's a once for all creation process that stopped on day seven. Evolution says creation of new species is ongoing. So you can see that even if

they pay lip service to the God of the Bible, really they ditched the Bible and went with evolution. All Theistic Evolution views must abandon the literal Genesis view.

Here's another brand of Theistic Evolution. Theodosius Dobzhansky, a Russian said, "I am a creationist and an evolutionist. Evolution is God's, or Nature's, method of creation. Creation is not an event that happened in 4004 BC; it is a process that began some 10 billion years ago and is still under way... Does the evolutionary doctrine clash with religious faith? It does not. It is a blunder to mistake the Holy Scriptures for elementary textbooks of astronomy, geology, biology, and anthropology. Only if symbols are construed to mean what they are not intended to mean can there arise imaginary, insoluble conflicts... the blunder leads to blasphemy: the Creator is accused of systematic deceitfulness." There are a number of issues here, a confusion of God with Nature. By Creator he doesn't mean the Biblical God, YHWH, he means the Laws of Nature. It's nothing more than the Continuity of Being, this is Einstein's God. When Einstein said God doesn't play dice he meant God is the Laws of Nature in the same way Dobzhansky meant.

a. Day-Age Theory (Gen 2:4; 2 Pet 3:8; Exod 20:8-11; Rom 5:12; 8:20; 1 Cor 15:20-22;

Here's a less radical view, the Day-Age Theory. The Day-Age theory means that each day in the Gen 1 is an age. It could be that each day is a thousand years or each day is millions or billions of years. But each day is not a literal 24-hour day.

There are two arguments from the Bible usually given to support each day being an age. First, the Hebrew word *yom*, translated "day" in Gen 1, does not always mean a period of 24 hours. For example, Gen 1:5, "God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." So in this verse "day" is used to refer to only the light portion of the day, which is less than 24 hours and at the end of the verse "day" is used of the entire light-dark cycle of 24 hours. Now look at Gen 2:4. Here they say "day" is longer than a 24-hour period. "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." And so they say "day" here refers to the whole creation week which is longer than a 24-hour period.

And that's true. We don't have a problem with that. "Day" can be used for a period less than 24 hours, for a period of 24 hours or a period more than 24 hours. That is well-known. It's the same in English, we talk that way. Think about it. Don't you sometimes use "day" for a period longer than 24 hours? Have you ever told a story and said, "Back in the day..." You're not referring to a 24-hour period when you say that. So, this is well known in Hebrew and English. The question is not *can* it be used that way, but *how is it being used in the context* of Gen 1?

There are two lines of evidence that show it is being used at the end of each day as a literal 24-hour period (Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23). First, the Hebrew uses a numerical adjective at the end of each "day." There was evening and morning, the first day." There was evening and morning, the second day." There was evening and morning, the third day." Here that numerical adjective, first, second, third, etc...Those are what are called ordinals. Ordinal numbers are a counting measure, it's how you count when you're emphasizing a sequence; when runners run a race you have first, second and third place, you don't use cardinal numbers, one place, two place, three place. Why not? Because ordinals are used of a sequence of events. No theistic evolutionist believes the sequential order of events in the six days of creation. They believe the order of evolution. And the order of evolution is different from the order of creation. Let's put up a chart that shows the differences. People think you can get these together. I used to think that. But there are a number of differences in the order in which things appear in the two positions.

CREATION	vs	EVOLUTION
1. In the beginning God		1. In the beginning gas
2. Cool liquid water		2. Hot condensing matter
3. Sun & stars after plants		3. Sun & stars before plants
4. Life created on earth		4. Life evolves in sea
5. Birds created with fish		5. Birds evolve after fish
6. Man created from dust and woman from man		6. Man evolves from mammals
7. Rain occurs after man		7. Rain occurs millions of years before man
8. Creation processes turned off on day 6		8. Evolutionary processes continue today
9. Differences in kind		9. Differences in degree
10. Death is abnormal		10. Death is normal

Here's the contrast in characteristics. These are some, I could expand. Not a figment of my imagination, this is just the factual material, one starts with God and one starts with gas. That's how we begin. Next we have cool liquid

water – we have hot condensing matter. In Genesis we have sun and stars after plants – in evolution we have the sun and stars before plants. That’s pretty heavy stuff, and it doesn’t require a rocket scientist to see we got a little problem here. In Genesis life created on land – in evolution life evolves in the sea. Birds created with fish before mammals – birds evolve after fish and mammals. Man created directly from the earth and the woman indirectly from man. Try that one on. Explain that one by natural selection! Man evolves from mammals – Rain occurs after man – rain occurs millions of years before man. That’s what I mean you can’t get these together, it doesn’t matter how long you make the days, add a trillion years, and it still doesn’t change the order. And the numerical adjective ordinal numbers at the end of each day give a specific order.

The second reason you have to take these as 24-hour periods is because of the expression “evening and morning.” You read it at the end of each day. The formula does not allow for anything except a 24-hour day, it’s a dark-light cycle and no Hebrew scholar says otherwise. Even the liberal Hebrew scholars, who believe in billions of evolutionary years, admit that this formula means 24-hour days, they just don’t believe it.

A second argument for the Day-Age theory is from 2 Peter 3:8. We’ve already been in this context. So we know it’s about the ultimate presupposition of paganism, that all continues as it was from the beginning of creation. People pull this one all the time, mostly people who don’t have a clue about the Bible. If you asked them where this was found they wouldn’t begin to know where to look. Peter says, “But do not let this one fact escape your notice, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years,” and there it is they say, each day in Genesis equals a thousand years. What’s the problem with that? Keep reading the verse, “and a thousand years like one day.” So now we’re back to a day. Another problem is I don’t know a single evolutionist who says we only need a few thousand years. We need billions of years, not thousands to get these together. So it doesn’t help anyway. Another observation. We’re just observing on the surface. We’re not even going deep into these verses. Does it say “with the Lord one day *is* a thousand years.” No. What does it say? It says “with the Lord one day *is like* a thousand years.” Like or as is - what figure of speech in the English language? A simile. But, we don’t teach kids this stuff in English class anymore because we’re too busy teaching them how to put condoms on bananas. And lastly we’d just say this

context has nothing to do with how long the days of Genesis were. It has to do with the fact that God is timeless, He's not constrained to time. Guess who is constrained to time though? Man. And the Scriptures are written for whose benefit? Man's benefit.

Now turn to Exod 20:8. What I'm trying to do is expose you to a lot of biblical data so as we work through this class these passages will become more familiar to you. There are a lot of accommodation ideas floating around and the more familiar you are with the Scriptures the easier you can evaluate and poke holes in all the baloney. This is in the midst of the Ten Commandments given at Mt Sinai and verse 8 the commandment comes, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. <sup>9</sup>"Six days you shall labor and do all your work, <sup>10</sup>but the seventh day is a sabbath of the LORD your God; *in it* you shall not do any work, you or your son or your daughter, your male or your female servant or your cattle or your sojourner who stays with you." Reason given? Verse 11, "For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and made it holy." Question: how did Moses and the Israelites understand the days of Genesis? I believe they took a rest every seventh day and not every seven years not every seven millennia's. And by the way, "days" here is plural and every use of the plural days in the Hebrew Bible refers to a 24-hour period, always without exception. So, if the Scriptures have any integrity whatsoever then we better take the days of Genesis as six literal 24-hour days and not ages.

Now another way to solve these problems, just think. There are a million ways to refute these things. Thinking is one of them. Let's say that each day is a thousand years, just for the sake of argument. That's minimal, we could say a million. But we'll just say a thousand. Adam lived how long? According to Gen 5:3 he lived 930 years (if that's literal). Adam was created on what day? The sixth day. So the sixth day is a thousand years, right. Evening came first, then morning, on each day evening first, the darkness, then morning, the light. That helps you figure out when the first day began by the way (more on that later). Evening first, then morning. Let's say Adam was created in the morning. Probably the best understanding of the days of Genesis God is doing the creating each day starting in the morning, not in the evening. So let's say half way through the sixth day God creates Adam. By the end of the day Adam has named the animals, he's had surgery, the woman was built out

of his side, he was united to her in marriage and he sang the first love song to her. That's a full day. The guy was worn out. Not only that, if each day is a thousand years then how many birthdays did Adam have on the sixth day? 500 birthdays. Then evening comes, the seventh day, by the morning of the seventh day Adam is already dead, before the sun even rises, before the serpent comes and tempts Eve, Adam is dead. Now do you see how silly it is on the face of it? It just won't work.

What I'm trying to show you is that you can't tug and pull and rip these verses up. There's coherence to Scripture. Every verse and idea penetrates every other verse and idea. It's a total system. People don't like the idea of a system but that's only because they have a pagan concept of system, that you've created the system and you're fitting the Scriptures into your system. That's not what we're saying. We're saying that God comes first and God is a coherent God and God has a systematic way of thinking and therefore if we're thinking correctly we're thinking according to His system of thinking. What's the only other alternative? To say God is an unsystematic thinker, that God is confused, that's obviously not what most Christians want to say. So you can't play around and take one verse or idea and twist it to get it to fit the long ages idea because you cause all sorts of problems every where else.

What other problems does the Day-Age Theory have? We've seen exegetical problems, we've seen logical problems and it also has theological problems. You've got death before sin. This is a serious problem you'll see over and over and over in these attempts to get more time in Genesis 1-2. If Adam is at the end of these millions of years of evolution, which he is since he's the highest evolved animal in evolution, then obviously there has been death for millions and millions of years *before* man sinned. And that means death is not the result of Adam's sin like Romans 5:12 says. "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world," entered where? into the world, "and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—" You can try to limit that to human death entering or spiritual death only but exegetically it just doesn't hold water. This is all kinds of death. Death entered *the world*, the entire cosmos, through one man's sin. Flip over to Rom 8:20. There's a theological link between man and nature, notice, there's not a genetic link, there's a theological link. Man wants to point out the genetic link between man and chimpanzee. Man and chimpanzee share 98% of DNA in common, that's true, by the way that 2% is millions of differences, DNA is

a big molecule. But people reason from the commonality in the genetic code that there must be a common ancestor. Is that logical? We're not working with the argument right now, but what excludes the explanation of a common designer? Why must it be common ancestor? I'm just tempting you to consider an equally plausible explanation, logically. Common structure...common designer of the structure. But the scriptures say the link to pay attention to is theological, not genetic. When man fell under sin, nature fell too. Look at verse 20 and see if you can pick it out. "For the creation was subjected to futility," obviously he's talking about nature here, and he says "the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly," well if it wasn't subjected to futility willingly then why was it subjected? That's the question. And the answer should be obvious. Man's sin. How do we know that? Because v 19 implies that when the sons of God are revealed then nature is set free from the corruption. That's what nature is eagerly awaiting. So by reverse logic we know nature is suffering futility because of man's sin. And so as man sins, nature suffers under the curse of sin. As Paul says it, "because of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption." The Greek word for "corruption" means a break down of organic matter, to deteriorate, to decay. And what Paul is talking about is the fact that nature is also under the curse of sin and that sin causes nature to deteriorate, to break down. Verse 22, Paul says, "For we know," perfect tense, past completed action with ongoing results. What's the past completed action? The fall of man. Adam in the Garden eating that fruit. From that moment all the way to the present he says, "the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now." So its baloney to say that *before* Adam fell in the Garden you had death of animals going on for millions of years.

A second theological problem with death going on before Adam's sin. What did God say at the end of creation week? Gen 1:31, "and God saw all that He had made and behold, it was very" what? "Very good." Is death good? Millions of years of suffering, sickness, disease and death? God can use it for the good, but does God say death is good? I never read that in the Bible.

#### b. Day-Age-Day Theory

Seeing this some people came up with another slick solution, the Day-Age-Day theory. That means rather than add time to the days and make each day

equal a million years or something, I stick an indefinite amount of time in between the days. That way I can have six literal 24-hour days of Genesis and the geological ages in between. Okay, well, you can make stuff up. There's no biblical indication of that. Obviously you still have the ordinal counting measure problem. What does it mean to count first day, second day, third day if in between each day is a billion years? Doesn't that destroy the whole point of counting in the first place? If I'm going to time two events in relation to one another I can't legitimately put a gap of unaccounted time in between. 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 billions 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.

So what's the lesson we take away from this? The church for 200 years has been trying to accommodate to modern science. They assumed that the conclusions of science were correct. What's the problem with the conclusions of science? They're a moving target. Every generation concludes an older age of the earth. They didn't start off in the early 1800's at 4.6 billion years, they started out with tens of thousands of years, and then it went up to hundreds of thousands, then millions and now billions. So, every time science changed and added more time guess what theologians had to do? Go back to Genesis and re-interpret, re-interpret, re-interpret. What does that do to the integrity of the Scriptures? It undermines it. And after awhile, people looked at this and they said, hey, look, every time science moves, you move, it looks to us like science is more valid than the Bible, so why not just give up the Bible altogether?

So, ultimately what happened is that they bought into the infallibility of the scientific speculations of their day. That was the presupposition the church bought into and still is buying into. We have to learn the lesson that either the world will endlessly re-interpret the word of God or the word of God is the thing that's stable and it interprets the world.

---

<sup>i</sup> Cornelius Van Til, *A Survey of Christian Epistemology*, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1969), xiv.

<sup>ii</sup> Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith*, (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1955), 190.

<sup>iii</sup> This is expressed well on a science blog where a man is discussing the degree Harvard issued to Nathaniel Jeanson, an ICR faculty member. He says of the degrees these creationists get from highly



---

acclaimed schools that they “are meaningless since they clearly prioritize the trappings of authority over the substance of knowledge.” But they haven’t escaped the trappings of authority at all. He’s merely claimed that his way of knowing is authoritative. It really seems that many of them do not understand what they are doing. For example, if knowledge is based on empiricism then there must be empirical evidence of this statement. Could someone please show me the empirical evidence that this is true.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010