

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

**C1019 – May 26, 2010 – Young Earth Creationism**

Alright, we've been working through the Accommodation strategy the last four weeks. I told you it would be somewhat of a lengthy discussion. And so we went through in four weeks what the Christian church went through the last 200 years. They're still going through it; unfortunately we have yet to learn that you'd have more integrity just chucking the Bible than trying to hang on by a thread and re-interpret, re-interpret, endlessly. It's my prayer that the Christian church will give up on Accommodating to the conclusions of modern pagan science, but I'm not holding my breath.

Today we come to look at the third approach to Genesis. We've introduced two of the strategies and how they operate presuppositionally. Remember, this is really an issue of presuppositions, it's not an issue of data, and it's not an issue of facts. It's an issue of interpretation of the data, interpretation of the facts. Everyone shares the same data and facts (although some data and facts are carefully tucked away because they're difficult or impossible to explain). But normally the issue is what you do with those data as you run it through your interpretive grid. And that grid is determined by a person's ethical orientation to God. Either a person is in submission to the word of God and God's authority or they are in submission to the word of man and man's authority. There is no third position of neutrality.

Let me show you this presuppositional difference. This is the biblical picture. The vertical axis is the amount of work done and the horizontal axis is the progression of time. So basically this charts the amount of power or work done over specific intervals of time. And the biblical picture, if you just read the Bible straightforwardly, is one of alternating periods of relative tranquility and sudden catastrophism, back and forth, back and forth. And so far in history we've had two momentous catastrophes in Scripture; we called

them high energy events or periods. In these two periods a lot of work was done in a very short period of time, we don't mean by catastrophe, necessarily something bad. Creation wasn't bad, we simply mean lots of work done in short periods of time. The first period was the Creation, then you have a period of tranquility and the second period was the Flood, after which you have this exponential decay curve that applies to all kinds of things: human longevity, earthquake intensity, axis tilt of the earth, radiometric decay rates and so forth. That ushers in another period of relative tranquility on down to our time. This is the way a person who is presuppositionally committed to the authority of Scripture views world history. On the other hand if I'm in rebellion against God and I reject the authority of the Scripture I'm presuppositionally committed to the principle of uniformitarianism, that the present is the key to the past. Then what's my view of history? Say I live at the time of Hutton and Lyell, I live in the late 1700's early 1800's, all the way down to our day, 2010, and I go out and study geological processes and I record the data. I observe erosion rates, I observe radioactive decay rates, I observe all these rates, and I'm looking at this little box of time. Basically the amount of work done over time is fairly uniform. So I go back to my desk with this data taken just from inside this subset of time, and then what do I do? I write a natural history of the past using the present. It's very easy to see that the history I write won't look like the biblical history, there aren't any major catastrophes, all continues as it was forever and ever and so a diagram of their history would just basically be a flat black line. But if I'm a pagan do I really know that? I don't know that. I didn't observe that. That's an extrapolation. My observations are isolated to that little box of time. So really all I can say is that I know that box.<sup>i</sup> Everything before that box that I reconstructed from present processes is a speculation, if we're being honest. And that's what Peter warned against; don't buy into that presupposition, that commitment must, of necessity, reject the future return of Christ. That commitment rejects the Flood and that commitment must also reject the return of Christ. Why? Because that's another disruptive, catastrophic event. When the Lord Jesus Christ comes back it's going to be quite an interruption to pagan man's kingdom building. The system man is building as we speak, that Daniel speaks of, with the economics of fractional reserve banking, with the politics of globalism, with the religion of autonomous rationalism and an imperial military to control it all, is going to be totally destroyed by the return of Christ. So you can see a motive in men's hearts for suppressing the return of Christ. They don't want Jesus Christ to come back and destroy what

man has built, man's empire. That interferes with my life. That knocks my agenda off course. That interferes with these channels of sin that I've generated out of my flesh. So to suppress and hide from that interference I write it off as impossible based on my philosophy of uniformitarianism, the holy grail of modern geology and neo-Darwinian evolution.

So the first strategy of dealing with Genesis is to Capitulate to the presuppositions of modern geology, to capitulate to uniformitarianism as a model of interpreting earth's history. This is the school that rose in the 1800's that said the Bible is wrong, geology is right. These people saw what the Bible was saying, they said, yes, the Bible is saying the earth is young; the Bible is saying a Global Flood came in Noah's day. I just don't believe the Bible. They didn't believe the Scriptures. But at least the unbelievers could read and were willing to admit, that is what the Scriptures say.

Then we had the Accommodationist Strategy. And these are Christians, often well-meaning, who try to somehow bring the Bible together with conclusions of modern science. This strategy has been going on for 200 years and so I took you through the historical discussion. The only thing we didn't go through was Intelligent Design and this was an attempt to re-define the term "science." After the Dover trial in the late 80's where the evolutionists aced them they tried valiantly to re-define science but the evolutionists already knew the game and eventually the ID guys accommodated, leaving the God of the Bible and Jesus out of the equation. Today's ID movement is not taken too seriously. What we learned from it is that 'he who controls the terms, controls the debate.' It's an issue of words and language and the secular world has defined the terms, we've allowed them to do that and every time we allow them to do that more ground is lost. The irony is they haven't even got a philosophy of life that can explain language, how it is we speak, but they control the terms.

What we have gone through is Theistic Evolution. God used evolution, that won't work, the order's wrong, there's death before the Fall, it's inconsistent with God's character. Then we went through Progressive Creationism: God intermittently creates species in the never ending creation process. That has problems, the order's wrong, death before the Fall, also inconsistent with God's character, separation of the book of nature from the book of God's word. Talk about sloppy. How can we fallen beings ever hope to interpret the book

of nature correctly if Adam couldn't even do it in his unfallen state? We tried the Framework Hypothesis. These are the people who say, Genesis is just a literary device and is just to be read figuratively. They accept cosmic evolution as a valid cosmogony. What does that do to our picture of God? People don't think and they run off on these tangents. It's silly. Creation gives you the first picture of the God of the universe. Then we looked at the Old Earth Gap Theory, this is the most popular approach because people think they can get millions of years between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 and that will handle the dinosaurs, geological ages, fossil record, all of that. Lots of problems there both grammatically and textually. The science is bad in the first place (it's assuming uniformitarianism), I read the quotes right out of Scofield's notes. There's no need to get more time in Genesis. And there are texts that simply say there is no gap. Then we have the chronologies of Gen 5 and 11, we saw that last week. There's no way to skirt around the formula in those chapters, it locks things down. All the accommodationist strategies to some degree or another assume the pagan presupposition of uniformity and try to fit the Bible to the conclusions of modern geology. It's just a fact of the last 200 years of history; they're all listening to what modern geology says and assuming that's infallible, and adjusting the Bible to fit.

Finally we come to the Counter-Attack Strategy. Let me give you the history of this movement. What some call the biblical creationist movement, I call it Counter-Attack. This movement really began in the 1960's. Before the 60's there were a few people who held to a literal six-day, 24-hour recent Creation and a Global Flood. The most famous is George McCready Price, a Canadian Seventh Day Adventist who wrote a 726 page college textbook in 1923 called *The New Geology*. You can tell from the title it wasn't a mainstream position, *The New Geology*. Price's position was that the Global Flood of Noah laid down all the fossils. A few others followed his lead like William Jennings Bryan, famous by the Scopes Monkey Trial, though he was an accommodationist, held to the day-age theory, and Harry Rimmer, also an accommodationist, held to the Old Earth Gap View. Basically there were only one or two guys in the early 1900's who held to a Counter-Attack approach. Literally one or two guys.

Then came Dr Henry Morris and Dr John Whitcomb's book *The Genesis Flood* in 1961. This book is undoubtedly the largest catalyst for the young earth creationist movement. The two authors, Morris and Whitcomb, were both

well recognized among their peers in scholarly circles. Dr Whitcomb was at Princeton in the early 1940's and came to Christ in 1943. He was then shipped off to Europe and fought at the Battle of the Bulge, after he returned he finished his degree at Princeton in 1948. He was an accommodationist at the time until he heard Henry Morris deliver a lecture on hydrodynamics of the Noachic Flood in 1953. For the next four years he researched and wrote 500 pages on everything God's word taught about the Flood. In a series of letters back and forth with Henry Morris they wrote and published *The Genesis Flood* in 1961. Whitcomb wrote the theological chapters of the book.<sup>ii</sup> Morris wrote the scientific side of the book, he was a hydrological engineer and chair of the Civil Engineering Department at Virginia Tech. He's known as the father of the modern creationist movement.<sup>iii</sup> He was not a theologian, he was an engineer and he concluded that if the Bible could not be 'adjusted' to fit evolution, and if it was the word of God, then the problem, somehow, must be with the scientific interpretation of data. Somewhere in its development, largely from within the Protestant reformation, science had taken a wrong turn. In other words, in the 50's and 60's the argument was basically this: that 150 years has shown us we can't make the two fit, so now we have to come back to the drawing boards and ask, "What went wrong?" And what he decided went wrong was that the scientific interpretation had been contaminated by pagan belief systems, pagan presuppositions, and that's ultimately what it's all about. You can Capitulate to modern science, you can try to Accommodate with endlessly reinterpreting the text, or you interpret the text as it always has been interpreted by Jesus Christ and the apostles and say "Okay, this is where I start, I don't understand how it fits together, but somehow the other side is making a systematic mistake." It's a titanic claim, and it's extremely offensive in the intellectual world. This is why today creationists are thrown in with the Flat-earth Society, the radical right and all the rest of it.

Today everyone I talk to that is heavily involved in this Counter-Attack strategy has been influenced strongly by Dr Henry Morris. My mentor, Charles Clough, who was at MIT in the early 60's became a Christian and they were using Morris' stuff on the MIT campus. He went off to Dallas Theological Seminary. And here's his personal story, (this will give you an idea of the spiritual dynamics going on in the debate); this is in the 60's; "I decided to write my thesis on the reactions to *The Genesis Flood*. The reviews were vitriolic, vicious, nasty. It was obvious in the tactics, you can disagree

but you can see the energizing power behind them. The thing that cut loose with this book was that Dr Morris was head of the Civil Engineering Dept at Virginia Tech. Dr Morris built that department, he was a credentialed scientist, now you had a book that couldn't be ignored. The book was centered on the Flood not Creation. And here's why that's important. Trying to reconcile the Bible with old earth views involves not just tweaking how we interpret *yom* in Gen 1, it disagrees with chronologies," (remember last week, what did we go through? Gen 5 and Gen 11, those chronologies are tight, you can't squeeze millions or even thousands of years in there). "it disagrees with order of events," (what did we show a few weeks back, the order of evolution and the order of creation differ by orders of magnitude, you can't get the two together, no evolutionist would agree with the order in Genesis). "it disagrees with all kinds of things. So he [Morris] presented the Flood which deals with a whole package of problems. At no point in any review did I see anyone interacting with the exegesis. Everyone just said, it doesn't agree with the consensus. All people try to do is tweak with Gen 1. You haven't worked with longevity before the Flood, you haven't worked with the longevity decay curve." What did we say last week, look at the ages of these men before the Flood, then look at the age curve after the Flood. How do you deal with that? Is that how Hebrew mystics write allegory? With TI-81 calculators? They're concerned about logarithmic decay curves? "My first year at Dallas, Unger retired, Bruce Waltke became head of the dept. He was cordial and gave me a good grade but it really disturbed him. That's when he got into this ruin-reconstruction thing, the framework thing. Those are articles you can read in BibSac. He read those reviews in 1964-65 and it disturbed him because he saw it changed the entire apologetic landscape. But he was uncomfortable because it would put him at odds with his fellow academics at Harvard." Now that gives you some insight into the spiritual dynamics at work from someone inside the movement, who's been involved in the movement for 50 years. We're in a war here. This is a shift, a titanic shift in the Church has been introduced and there are powerful forces at work to shut this down, from within our own camp, that's the irony, not from those outside the Church, of course they don't like it, but those inside the Church are attacking the traditional view of Genesis.

Since the writing of that book in 1961 the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) was formed and a number of creationist organizations both in America and around the world have developed. Answers in Genesis being the most

well-known, that's Ken Ham and company. However, despite the advances made in the return to Genesis and biblical authority, young earth creationism is still a minority view in the Christian church today. What next? Pastors teaching it. Mark my words, we're making history in this class because this is the cutting edge of where the biblical creationist movement is going. One of the hardest things to get going is pastors teaching this stuff from the pulpit. It's one thing to have special speakers, special organizations, special conferences, but if you're ever going to reach the vast majority of Christians you have to get pastors teaching this in local churches. Why must it be done? Because every major doctrine is founded in the early chapters of Genesis. If I'm going to preach the gospel and you're going to preach the gospel, that Jesus Christ died for sin, you might want to be very clear about where sin came from. That's Gen 3. Can I allegorize that? You can tell someone, you're a sinner, but if they say, why am I a sinner and you've rejected a historic Adam and a historic fall what are you going to tell them, well, you just are, accept it. That's a lot of hot air and baloney talk. I want to know why I'm a sinner. If you say homosexuality is wrong and someone asks why and you reject the historical validity of Gen 1 and 2 where marriage is defined, then you have no reason to tell them homosexual unions are wrong. It's just opinion. The basis of all the stuff we believe comes out of early Genesis. So it's critical we get these chapters right.

Well, that's the historical background, the landscape of the last 75 years of what the church has gone through to try to regain ground that it gave up 200 year ago. And you have a choice to make; either you're going to ultimately presuppose the infallibility of modern science and its uniformitarianism, its claim that the past has always operated like the present or you're going to go with the infallibility of the word of God and its catastrophism, that God intervenes.

## 2. Young Earth

Well, we've done enough smashing, now we want to erect and start building a young earth model. To do this we have to answer a critical question; "How should I interpret Genesis 1-11?" Before we get to the specifics we want to point out there are two other young earth views, both are variations of the Gap Theory.

## A. Young Earth Gap Theories

### 1. The Early Gap Theory

These are Jews from about two centuries after Christ that were simply debating when Satan fell. Some concluded that he fell in between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. Gen 1:3-2:4 was a re-creation in six literal 24 hour days. Others since then in church history, such as John Milton who wrote Paradise Lost, held to a gap of time for Satan's fall between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. They did not add a long period of time or fossils into this gap. They only said that this was when Satan fell and sin was introduced into the universe. The problem with this is grammatical; I took you through it, a disjunctive clause cannot be translated "But the earth became..." Exod 20:11, everything God created, including angels was created in six days. God said at the end of the six days everything was "very good." And the Bible doesn't teach that when Satan fell God judged the world.

### 2. Young Earth Gap Theory

Then there is the Young Earth Gap Theory. This view is almost the same as the Early Gap Theory. They hold that Satan fell between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. They say that only the angels were created before Gen 1:2. They have the same problems as the Early Gap Theory.

## B. Strict Young Earth View (Counter Attack)

Now we come to the Strict Young Earth View. Gen 1:1-2:4 is the creation week. A normal six-24-hour day week followed by one normal 24 hour day making a total of seven-24 hour days or 168 total hours. The universe and earth are about 6,000 years old. The Flood of Noah is Global in extent, covering every high mountain on the earth and accounting for most of the fossil record, stratification, and continental positioning...the aftermath, the exponential decay period accounts for most of the rest.

## C. How to Interpret Genesis 1-11

What we want to do is look at three lines of evidence. The first thing we want to look at is the literary genre of Gen 1:1-2:3. Often the argument is that,



well, Genesis 1 is an ancient form of Hebrew poetry. Therefore it's not to be read literally. It's to be taken figuratively and we have special rules for interpreting poetic sections of Scripture. So we want to look at the genre of Gen 1:1-2:3. Then we'll turn to the larger scope of Gen 1-11, the full section of debated Scriptures in Genesis. How is this to be read? And to answer that we'll look at how Jesus and the apostles interpreted Gen 1-11. Do they give us commentary on how we ought to interpret Gen 1-11?

## 1. The Literary Genre of Gen 1:1-2:3

What is the literary genre of Gen 1:1-2:3? Steven Boyd, play 5:58 overview of Boyd's statistical analysis of Hebrew genre in Gen 1:1-2:3.

## 2. How Jesus and the Apostles Interpret Genesis 1-11

How did Jesus and the apostles interpret Gen 1-11? Don't you think that might give us some clues? Here we are 20 centuries later trying to interpret Genesis. Why don't we go back and get some controls on how we are to interpret the text, and we get the controls out of how the NT authors interpreted the text. That's what we're doing here. Did they just interpret it figuratively? Just as proto-historical mythology? First let me show you Gal 4:24. Here's how a NT writer would introduce the fact that he's going to allegorically interpret the text. Gal 4:24, "This is allegorically speaking, for these *women* are two covenants: one *proceeding* from Mount Sinai bearing children who are to be slaves; she is Hagar. <sup>25</sup>Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children." What I want you to see is that he tells you what he's doing. He announces it openly, "Hello, I am allegorically interpreting the text at this point, folks, watch me." That's what he's saying. That's how it looks when the NT authors interpret a text in a non-literal fashion.

Now turn to John 1:1. If we want to know how Jesus interpreted Genesis we might first want to identify who Jesus Christ is. If you've been a Christian for a while you're familiar with these verses. You want to observe as we work our way from verse 1 how John begins his Gospel. Notice the first words, "In the beginning..." where does that verbage come from? Where have you heard that before? Gen 1:1 "In the beginning God created..." same exact words, same exact event in view, the creation of the world. That gives you a hint where the

first day of Genesis begins. It doesn't begin, according to the apostle John, with verse 3, it begins with verse 1. "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God." But we get a little additional material here, a little divine commentary inserted through the apostle John about who was there in the beginning. First we have "the Word" and the word was with God. So we have the Word and we have God. The question is who is the Word? We know who God is, we're fine with that. But who is the Word that was with God in the beginning? John tantalizes you with this stuff in his Gospel. He draws you in. He makes you think. So we have the Word and we have God. The Word turns out to be Jesus Christ in v 14. So let's read a little further, but this time let's just replace the Word with Jesus Christ and see how it reads. "In the beginning was Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ was with God and Jesus Christ was God." Now that's strange, try to pick that one apart. If someone is with you they're not you, they're distinct from you. But Jesus Christ is both with God and is God. Without spending all night on this, John is talking about Trinitarian issues and so from verse 1 John engages you in deep theology. This is not easy stuff. In verse 2, "He was in the beginning with God." What does that tell you about Jesus Christ? In Gen 1:1 is Jesus Christ there? Absolutely He's there. In verse 3 there's more, "All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being." So Jesus Christ is the Creator. Here we have an event, the creation and we know God the Father is the Creator. Now the NT comes along and says Jesus Christ is the Creator. So there's a lot going on in John's commentary. Another thing going on, what is Jesus Christ called in verse 1? The Word. Why do you think He chose that? Because Jesus Christ is the incarnation of Greek Philosophy? Not at all. How did God create in Gen 1? By speaking, by language, so John observes this and in his commentary he says, how can I communicate that Jesus Christ is the one creating in Gen 1? I know I'll call Him "the Word," Speech, Language. This has got Gen 1 written all over it. So the first thing we want to say is that when we read how Jesus interprets Gen 1-2 we're not just reading a second-hand report, we're reading an eyewitness report. Jesus Christ is the Creator in Gen 1. So I think He knows pretty well what He did.

Now, go to Matt 19 where Jesus is using Genesis, and let's see if Jesus tells us this is figurative. Matt 19:4-6. This gives you the model for how Jesus interpreted Genesis. Jesus is dealing with the divorce question, verse 4, "And He answered and said, "Have you not read that He who created *them* from

the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE.” Now, that’s a quote from the OT. Look in your margin and tell me where Jesus is quoting from. What chapter and verse in Genesis? Gen 1:27. Verse 5, “and said, ‘FOR THIS REASON A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER AND BE JOINED TO HIS WIFE, AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH?’” Second quote from Genesis, where’s that one taken from? Gen 2:24. So He quotes Genesis 1; He quotes Gen 2. Notice, Jesus didn’t know we had two accounts of creation. Gen 1 and Gen 2 and they’re in contradiction. Jesus slides from Gen 1 to Gen 2 without concern for the liberal interpretation of Genesis. Do you anywhere in this context get a hint that Jesus is allegorically interpreting the text? What would lead you to believe that far from allegorically interpreting the text He’s literally interpreting it? Because of the issue at hand; divorce. He’s arguing with the Pharisees and the Pharisees are interested in Jesus’ take on the divorce law given by Moses. Jesus takes them one further and directs them all the way back to the original design at creation. And He’s telling them what the original design of marriage was. If Jesus understood Genesis 1 and 2 to be figurative and Adam and Eve to be a figurative couple, He’s not going to have much of a case against the Pharisees. It’s got to be a literal marriage between a literal couple in a literal Garden of Eden.

Let’s look at another text, John 8:44. Jesus again having a discussion with the Jews, probably the Pharisees. They’re out to trap Jesus. And Jesus says, “You are of *your* father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth because there is no truth in him. Whenever he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own *nature*, for he is a liar and the father of lies.” This is what we call an allusion, Jesus isn’t quoting from the OT, but He is clearly alluding to the OT. Did Jesus think the devil was a figment of men’s imaginations? What chapter of Gen is Jesus alluding to? You could argue Gen 4 when Cain killed Abel, the first physical murder. But more likely He has in mind Gen 3 when Satan killed Eve, the first spiritual murder. Jesus says the devil “was a murderer from the beginning” which shows you it wasn’t long after creation that the devil fell and came into the Garden to tempt Eve. What’s the first lie recorded in Scripture? Speaking about the fruit of the tree. “You surely will not die.” Who spoke it? The devil. That’s what Jesus is talking about. So we’ve seen Jesus quote Gen 1 and Gen 2, the Creation event, now He quotes Gen 3, the Fall, do you get any hint in the text that Jesus didn’t believe in a literal Fall? What gives you the impression He took it very literally? He’s

telling the Pharisees who their true spiritual father is. The devil. What kind of nonsense would that be if Gen 3 were allegorical. Jesus would be off his rocker.

Let's move to Matt 23:35. What this exercise does is shows you that if we are to be followers of Jesus shouldn't we follow Jesus' interpretation of Genesis? It gets back to our theme for this course, where Jesus told Nicodemus, "If I told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" Genesis is a lot of earthly things. Are we going to say, well, Jesus didn't have modern insight into origins? We might as well say Jesus is not the Creator, Jesus was completely wrong on the origins issue. Here in Matt 23 there's a little clause, again to the scribes and the Pharisees, but what does it show about Jesus' view of Genesis? Verse 34, "Therefore, behold, I am sending you prophets and wise men and scribes; some of them you will kill and crucify," that's Peter. Peter was crucified upside down, refusing to be crucified in the same position as our Lord, "and some of them you will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city," when is Jesus describing? The Book of Acts. Why is he sending them prophets and wise men and scribes? Verse 35, "so that upon you may fall the guilt of all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, the son Berechiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar." Now, Zechariah was a historical person. Are we going to argue that Abel was just a fantasy of early Genesis? Is that Jesus' view, or is Jesus taking Abel as a historical person on the same level as Zechariah? Of course He is. What chapter of Genesis? Chapter 4. So now we've seen Jesus quote Gen 1, 2, 3 and 4. Jesus clearly accepted the historic account of Genesis, not as allegory, not as myth, not as fantasy as the modern theologian suggests.

Look at the next chapter of Matt, chapter 24, verse 37. This in the Olivet Discourse. Jesus is sketching the character of the "end of the age," what's it going to be like in that last seven years before Christ returns to the earth. "For the coming of the Son of Man will be just like the days of" who? Noah. "For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, <sup>39</sup>and they did not understand until the flood came and took them all away." Now if we argue that Noah, the ark and the Global Flood were allegorical what do we have to do with the second coming of Jesus Christ? It too has to be allegorical. Verse 37 puts Noah and the Flood on the same level of history

as the future second coming of the Son of Man. So Jesus believed in Noah and the Global Flood. What chapters of Genesis? 6, 7 and 8. See how you can't rip and tear Genesis apart. It won't work. Not if you want to be a follower of Jesus. We could show more places Jesus quoted early Genesis. I think you get the idea.

### 3. How the Apostles Interpreted Genesis 1-11

Turn to 1 Tim. 2:13, here's the apostle Paul. The apostles were followers of Jesus, avid followers. What did they think about early Genesis? This one is really hard to get around. The context of the discussion this time is not divorce; it's the role of gender in the church. And the question is, "What is the role of the female gender in church?" Talk about a touchy issue. Boy, this one really ruffles people's feathers. So guess where Paul goes? He goes to Genesis. Why do you suppose he goes to Genesis? Where do you go to get ultimate meaning? Why does everyone get stirred up by origins and the creation/evolution controversy? Because origins is where you get meaning. Origins is the ultimate context for deriving meaning. So if you want meaning, fundamental meaning of anything where do you go? You go to origins because that's where the meaning starts. Your view of man and woman is determined by your view of origins. So Paul comes back to origins and notice in verse 13, "For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve." What chapter is he using, Gen 1 or Gen 2? Where in the text do you learn that Eve was created out of Adam? Gen 2. Then it says in v 14, "And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression." What chapter in Genesis does that come from? What chapter was Eve deceived in? Chapter 3.

Here's another one by Paul I just have to show you. 1 Cor 15. Formerly I was an evolutionist, theistic evolutionist, which was back at the university when I got my biology degree. And when I started looking carefully at the issue, after I graduated and had some time to think, I came across this passage. This is the passage that weighed most heavily in my decision to reject evolution in the large-scale sense of macroevolution. Macroevolution is saying that all of life has come from a single cell. It doesn't explain how you get the first single cell, that's chemical evolution, but assuming a single cell, that single cell gave rise to all living organisms, and that's your tree that you usually see in the textbooks that branches out from this original single-celled organism. Look at

verse 39, Paul is discussing the nature of the resurrection body. And he says, "All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts, and another flesh of birds, and another of fish." You know what that means? Macroevolution is wrong. Macroevolution says all flesh is the same flesh, it all came from the same original cell. And obviously if you read on Paul goes on to deal with the sun, moon and stars. What text is in the back of Paul's mind? Gen 1, the creation of different kinds. And in verse 42 Paul builds the doctrine of resurrection out of Gen 1 to show the nature of the resurrection body is of a different kind than the body we now possess. Similar but different. Just as there are similarities between fish and birds there are also differences. It's the differences that count. Did Paul believe in a literal Gen 1? Obviously he does.

Let's look at James. James was the half-brother of Jesus, so here's someone raised in the same household as Jesus, they sat around the same dinner table, they were taught the Scriptures, they discussed the Scriptures, what did Jesus' family think about early Genesis. James 1:14, "But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. <sup>15</sup>Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death." What's that a commentary on? Look at that description and tell me what passage James had on his mind? It's shocking and commentators have pointed out that James must have been thinking of Gen 3 when he wrote this. It's not a quote, but it's a perfect encapsulation of what happened inside the woman Eve when Satan tempted her in the Garden. And he's warning us, don't be deceived, very practical exhortation. Do you think James took Gen 3 literally?

Here's John, we've seen Paul, James, now we turn to John. We've been in John's Gospel, let's turn to John's first epistle. 1 John 3:11, "For this is the message which you have heard from the beginning," by the way that's not the beginning of creation, that's the beginning of Jesus' ministry, "that we should love one another;" that message is the new thing Jesus taught them in John 13, the Upper Room, that we should love one another, a very serious commandment. What are we supposed to be doing? Loving one another. It doesn't get any higher than that. Then John gives the counter example verse 12, "not as Cain, *who* was of the evil one and slew his brother. And for what reason did he slay him? Because his deeds were evil, and his brother's were righteous." What chapter of Gen do we read of Cain? Gen 4. By the way, we get a little insight about how Cain killed his brother here. That word "slew"

means to cut with a knife. So how about that God, you don't like my grain offering, how about a human offering, here's my brother! The first murder happened in the first family. It doesn't take too long for sin to work its effects. That's how these NT texts add a little divine commentary, they not only affirm Genesis is literal, they give additional details we didn't know strictly from Genesis, they amplify Genesis.

Turn to Luke, we saw this last week, but it's worth repeating. Start in Luke 1. Luke is interesting, he was a doctor and was very meticulous in his research like many doctors are. This is something you want to be sensitive to as you read the Scriptures. The human authors had personality. They're not personal computers and God types on their computer what He wants them to say. He uses their personalities, they bleed through the text. Here's an example. Luke's a doctor, what do doctors do? They research, their meticulous. He says, verse 1, "Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile an account of the things accomplished among us, <sup>2</sup>just as they were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, <sup>3</sup>it seemed fitting for me as well, having investigated everything carefully from the beginning," by the way, the beginning here isn't the beginning of creation either, the beginning here is verse 2, the beginning of the eyewitness testimony. So Luke invested carefully the eyewitnesses of Christ's life and put together a consecutive account. Now come to Luke 3:34, this is the genealogy of Christ, observe who you see in verse 34? Abraham. Now look down at v 38. Who do you see there? Adam. Last week we looked at the chronologies of Gen 5 and 11 and we said those were strict, tight chronology based on the formula we studied. And Luke says, in between Adam and Abraham there are these guys, some of them listed in Gen 5 and others listed in Gen 11. Did Luke take Gen 5 and Gen 11 literally, or were those just allegorical people?

We go through all that to show, you've got a lot of gall to come along 2,000 years after Jesus and the apostles and say, well, they didn't quite have it right, but now we know, with better information what is right. Let's just be honest and chuck the whole thing. Either we believe Jesus in earthly things or we don't believe Jesus. It's an issue of belief or unbelief, it's not an academic issue, it's do you believe the word of God or not?

---

<sup>i</sup> Maybe I have some historical records from eyewitnesses, but then I've got to analyze the trustworthiness of those eyewitnesses according to some criteria, usually the same criteria, uniformitarianism, and if they don't agree with me, they were just writing myth, legend, lore.

<sup>ii</sup> When he wrote the book he was professor at Grace Theological Seminary. Prior, in 1948 all the faculty of that seminary believed in millions of years. He had Alva McClain read *The Genesis Flood* and he was very gracious and encouraging. Samuel Hoyt read it and liked it but didn't understand all the issues. But it won the day and became the official position of Grace Theological Seminary in the 60's.

<sup>iii</sup> Here's what one of Henry Morris' friends, Willard Ramsay said of him, "The holy boldness was the most remarkable thing, in my opinion, about the life's work of Dr. Morris and his early colleagues. To take on the huge intellectual superstructure of the contemporary scientific edifice, to challenge the self-appointed "sovereigns" over the archives of "science," the venerable guardians of the academy of "knowledge," required unique courage and faith. For a hundred years, God had been crowded out of the sciences He had created. When godless men want to invent (with their God-created minds) weapons, rockets, or satellites, they *usurp* the God created principles of order, structure, and predictability in science."

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010