

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***

*107 East Austin*

*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*

*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B1228 – July 15, 2012**  
**Creation & The Fall**

Today we come to point five of our Basics class; the Creation and the Fall. As most of you know this is my area of expertise because of my university studies in Biology and Chemistry. And even though I was a believer when I went to the university the intense indoctrination at the university convinced me of an accommodationist approach to Genesis. I left the university holding to theistic evolution, the idea of creation by evolution. And I didn't think that in any way was contrary to the Bible. Then I met Robin and we were driving around on our first date in the summer of 1998 and she started talking about a pre-Flood canopy around the earth described on day two of creation and this didn't fit with my concept of evolution so we had an argument and finally I just said, you'll have to show me, I'm willing to look at the text, just show me the text. So she did and that's what got me started really studying the Bible. I had been a Christian for years, been in Church for years, been in Sunday Schools, Vacation Bible Schools, Youth Groups, you name it I was involved in it and yet I didn't know the Bible. I didn't know how contrary the creation account was to evolution. I had a lot of questions: what about radiometric dating, what about the dinosaurs, what about fossils, what about speciation. So early in 1999 I started studying these things. I got a hold of some work by Charles Clough who was a believer who had been at MIT in the 60's and he was tackling a lot of these issues and pointed out a lot of information that we simply were not told in the university, information that exposed assumptions and completely undermined the evolutionary premise. I remember, Scripturally speaking, some of the most convincing arguments were the 1 Cor 15 passage where Paul says, not all flesh is the same flesh but there is one flesh of birds and one flesh of beasts and one flesh of fish, because in evolution all flesh is the same flesh, all flesh is derived from prior flesh, birds derive from fish, etc... Another one that really struck me was in Matt 5 where Jesus says blessed are the gentle for they shall inherit the

earth because in evolution the strong survive, the gentle get destroyed. And finally, I had a real problem with death before the Fall, in evolution life comes about by death, in creationism God creates life and death comes only because of rebellion against God. So I found the Bible to be completely at odds with evolution and over a few months I became a young earth creationist. So with that background, notice point five of our doctrinal statement,

5. We believe that God, as absolute sovereign, created man, the universe and all that is in it in six (6) literal twenty-four (24) hour days (Exod 20:8-11).

This statement attempts to protect three things; the nature of God as absolute sovereign creator, a six, 24 hour day creation week and a young earth. The young earth argument from our statement is not as explicit as I'd like it to be; if it came right out and said the earth is somewhere around 6,000 years old I'd be happy with that. Sometimes people say <10,000 but the number 6,000 can be easily calculated by using chronologies in the Bible. Bishop Usher did this, Floyd Nolen Jones has done this, many, many people have done this, and you can do this. And on this note it's important to remember what Leupold, the famous commentator on Genesis said regarding the OT, "Any claim that the Scriptures do not give a complete and accurate chronology for the whole period of the Old Testament that they cover is utterly wrong, dangerous, and mischievous."<sup>1</sup> His point is that anyone who tries to argue for an old earth from the text, are doing extremely dangerous things with the text. The idea of an old earth is coming from outside the text.

That said I'm going to just briefly sketch some of the accommodation strategies Christians have used over the last two hundred years. By accommodation strategies I mean attempts to harmonize Genesis with the conclusions of Modern Science in the areas of geology, biology, chemistry and physics. There are several accommodation strategies that fit under the heading Theistic Evolution, the idea that God used the process of evolution to create or bring about all things. All of these have problems, massive problems. Just take for example this massive problem; the order of evolution and the order of creation are totally different.

## Contradictions between the Biblical View and the Secular View

### Biblical Order of Appearance

1. Matter created by God in the beginning
2. Earth before the sun and stars
3. Oceans before the land
4. Light before the sun
5. Atmosphere between two water layers
6. Land plants, first life forms created
7. Fruit trees before fish
8. Fish before insects
9. Land vegetation before sun
10. Marine mammals before land mammals
11. Birds before land reptiles
12. Man, the cause of death

### Evolutionary Order of Appearance

1. Matter existed in the beginning
2. Sun and stars before the earth
3. Land before the oceans
4. Sun, earth's first light
5. Atmosphere above a water layer
6. Marine organisms, first forms of life
7. Fish before fruit trees
8. Insects before fish
9. Sun before land plants
10. Land mammals before marine mammals
11. Reptiles before birds
12. Death, necessary antecedent of man

Let's just look at a few of these. Number 2 on the evolution side says Sun and stars came before the earth, on the creation side Earth came before the sun and stars, number 3 on the evolution side says Land before oceans, on the creation side, Oceans before land, Number 6, evolution says marine organisms were the first life forms, creation says land plants were the first life forms. Number 11, evolution says reptiles came before birds, creation says birds came before reptiles. Number 12 a very serious one - evolution says death came before man, but creation says man came before death and is the cause of death by rebellion. So you don't have to look at this very long to realize, hey, we have some major differences here in the sequence. So how are we ever going to get these two stories together? What I'm trying to show you is it's not just a matter of time, I can add billions of billions of years but that doesn't change the sequence, the sequence is still radically different.

One group that tried to just add time are the Progressive Creationists. They want to keep the sequence of evolution and just add time, make each day billions of years. A good point is they deny macroevolution, they deny that each specie came from a prior specie, instead they believe God intermittently creates species in the never ending process of creation. However, this does not solve the sequential problem; this does not solve the problem of having death before the Fall of man. It is also inconsistent with God's character, it makes God look like He's going through trial and error, God creates a species, it dies, He creates another species, it dies, in this gradual process of creation. And finally it separates the book of nature, which is creation, from the book of God, which is the Bible and it puts them on an equal authority plane when

God said in Gen 2 that man could not interpret nature correctly apart from His word about nature. God said if you eat of the tree in the garden you will surely die. That information about nature could not have been known by any scientific investigation. So nature and the Bible are not equal authorities, the Bible is a higher authority.

Another strategy to accommodate is called the Framework Hypothesis. These are the people who recognize that no matter how much time we add, the sequence is still wrong. So their solution is to say the days of Genesis are a literary device and not meant to convey a sequence at all. They point out that day one and four are similar, day two and five are similar, day three and six are similar. So then this is not to be read as a historical narrative but simply as a literary device. That's how they get rid of the sequence of creation. Then they can wholesale adopt the order of evolution without creating any tension with Genesis. The problem then is if that is the case we don't have any idea how God created, we have no creation story. And that means we have no picture of God or off how God works! What He's like. Creation is our first picture of who God is. And if you wash all that out then you wash out who God is.

Going through some of these the big issue at creation is not what one of my friends said years ago. He said it doesn't matter how God created, it matters that God created. You hear this ad nauseum but it's a fallacy. You cannot separate how God created from the fact that God created. Why not? Because how God does something tells you who God is? It's the same down here with us. How you do something tells us who you are. For example, if you and I both graduated magna cum laude from High School but I cheated all the way through and you studied. We both got to the same conclusion, magna cum laude, first in the class, but I got there by cheating, you got there by studying. Now tell me it doesn't matter how we got there. Tell me you and I are not very different people. Everyone knows deep down that how we do something is indicative of our character.

The same thing applies to God and origins. So closely linked are God and origins that if you show me your view of origins I can show you your view of God, they are that closely related. Take for example many origins stories which hold that it took millions of years for all things to form. Then your God is a god of process, He's in development, He's weak, He's still learning. Then

take for an alter example an origins story that occurred ex nihilo in just six days. Then your God is a God of power, He's brilliant, He's got all the blueprints in His mind and He merely speaks them into existence. Those are two very different pictures of God. So understand it matters very much how God creates.

Here's another accommodation strategy Christians have used is the Old Earth Gap Theory; this is a strategy to get more time, they think they need more time because of geology, Scofield's note right off the bat says there is a gap of unknown amount of time between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 to accommodate the geologic ages. And other people think they can ram, cram and jam millions of years between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 and that will handle the dinosaurs, that will handle the fossil record. Whew! Now we can breathe again, the Bible is still true. The main reason this form of the gap theory is around is because Thomas Chalmers in 1814 wrote a famous book that posited a gap of time between Gen 1:1 and Gen 1:2 for the purpose of inserting the geological ages Hutton and Lyell were talking about. Prior to Chalmers some Jews posited a gap of time for the fall of Satan, they were trying to answer the question, when did Satan fall, they had no need to add geological ages. And some of them said between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. That answer of course presupposes what? Angels were created before creation, which is a self-contradiction because how could you have something created before creation? If you do that then you have to defend two creations and don't you think we have a hard enough time arguing for one. So I don't see how this helps anything. And further it contradicts several texts, Gen 2:1 and Exod 20:11 both assert that there is only one creation event and everything in the heavens and earth was made during that creation. So that must include angels because angels are dwell in the heavens, they're heavenly hosts. Some people say, well, what about Job 38:7, the angels sang at creation so they must have been there before creation. But all Job requires is that the angels be created and singing sometime during creation week. They could have been singing on day one, day three, day six, it just doesn't say, it simply says they sang when the foundation of the earth was laid. My best guess from comparing that with the creation week is that they sang on day one or day three when the foundations of the earth were laid.

But, to make a long story short, the gap theory isn't necessary to support a pre-Adamic fall of angels, it's not necessary to get more time for geological

ages and it doesn't have any support in Scripture. Absolutely zero. The grammar of Gen 1:2 doesn't support it, the *waw* plus a noun introduces a disjunctive clause, not an independent clause which is required for there to be a gap, and so it cannot be translated, "And the earth became." It is a circumstantial clause telling us the condition of the earth when God created it in verse 1, "And the earth was..." Further, the vocabulary words "formless and void" simply mean the earth in its initial condition was uninhabited and uninhabitable. Then God spent the rest of creation week making it inhabitable and inhabited. It's a picture of a laborer getting supplies together and then forming them into a structure. The other term which throws people is "darkness," they say darkness means evil was present in Gen 1:2. The problem is that Isaiah said God created darkness as well as light. So darkness can't always mean evil is present. And since each day begins with evening and ends with morning then the first day must begin at least with verse 2 when darkness is mentioned and not verse 3 when light was created. The text requires darkness to precede light on day one, evening must precede morning. And if you want all the minutia for why the grammar and vocabulary do not support a gap theory but totally deny it see Lesson 04 in my series, *A Biblical Framework of Geology*, the title of that lesson is *The Gap Theory*. In addition, you might grapple with the fact that the gap theory proposes two creations, an original creation that was judged and re-created in Gen 1; two gardens of Eden, a mineral garden of Eden where angels dwelled and a vegetable garden of Eden where Adam and Eve dwelled and two floods, a global flood in Gen 1:2 and a local flood in Gen 6-8. This is a lot of problems to solve and a lot of exegetical hurdles to jump through. Finally I'd just point out that while originally it was just posited to have a place for Satan's fall there simply is no necessity for more time to insert geological ages in there, the geological column is inconsistent with a judgment in Gen 1:2 prior to the judgment of the flood in Noah's time. And in fact, the geological record as it is is one of the most startling evidences of a young earth and devastating to evolution.

Then we have Christians who try to get more time in the chronologies of Gen 5 and 11. They argue these are genealogies and since genealogies can have gaps then there must be gaps of time in the genealogies. The problem is they're not genealogies, they are chronologies. And chronologies are measurements of time. If you had a gap in a chronology it would cease to be an accurate measurement of time. Yet the Bible insists there are no gaps,

therefore these are not genealogies but chronologies. The reason we insist these are chronologies is because there is a very strict formula used in those chapters. X lived  $n$  years and begat Y, and the days after he begat Y were  $n$  years, and all the days that X lived were  $n$  plus  $n$  years. Let's look at the first one in Gen 5:3. Adam lived 130 years and begat Seth, and the days after he beget Seth were 800 years, and all the days that Adam lives were 130 plus 800 years, they've already done the math in Gen 5:5, how old was Adam when he died? 930 years. Then look at the second one, he takes Seth, Adam's prior offspring as the point of measure and gives his data. Seth lived 105 years and begat Enosh, and the days after he begat Enosh were 807 years, and all the days that Seth lived were 105 plus 807 years. Which equals how many years? 912. Then in number three he picks up Enosh. Where did he get Enosh from? From Seth, so he's connecting real tight. There are no gaps, Jude 14 says Enoch was the seventh from Adam and if you count from Adam you find Enoch the seventh from Adam. So there are no gaps. "There is absolutely no reason to assume the existence of gaps in this record, or that the years are anything other than normal years (except for the likelihood that the original year was only 360 days long." Here's Gordon Wenham. Wenham believes there are gaps but look at his frank admission, "... the Hebrew gives no hint that there were large gaps between father and son in this genealogy." Why did he believe there were gaps? "archaeological discoveries" and "historical problems" compelled him to accept them, thus placing Adam in "very distant times." So, it's not based on exegesis, it's coming from outside the text.

The bottom line in these strategies to accommodate to long ages do more to undermine the integrity of the Bible than they do to help it get a hearing with unbelievers. Why adapt your interpretation of the Bible to the conclusions of modern science? Why not just have the honesty to say the Bible is wrong and toss it! If it's not an accurate testimony it's not the word of God!

Let's turn now, having looked at a young earth and universe, to a six, twenty-four hour day creation week. This is very easy to show and by the way, ICR or AiG, I can't remember which, just came out with an article in a recent publication saying that every major Hebrew scholar in the world holds that the days of Gen 1 are literal 24 hour days, many of them just don't believe it, but they do admit that is what the Hebrew text says. So there may be some

kooks out there who reject it, but in scholarly circles everyone holds that day means day, not age, not millions of years, but a 24 hour day.

To begin let me quickly dismiss one of the most idiot ideas to get around a twenty-four hour day in Gen 1. I hear this coming out of Christian's mouths, I never heard an unbeliever say this. This is Christians, well, you know, to the Lord one day is thousand years, so each day is a thousand years. First of all, not only would that not help at all because that would only make the universe 14,000 years old when evolution is saying the universe is 14 billion years old but secondly, the text does not say "one day is a thousand years," it says "one day is *like* a thousand years." Back in the day when people could read they knew that "like" or "as" meant a simile, a comparison was being made. So the point of the passage is to show a comparison between one of man's days to God. And the meaning is that to God time is nothing, He's timeless. And besides, the context in Peter is coming judgment, not creation. So it's just one of those silly arguments people say that is completely stupid. And even if we grant the argument, you still have solved the sequence problem.

So let's look at why each of the six, consecutive, literal days are twenty-four hour days. The first one is the word day itself, *yom*, 95% of the time refers to a 24 hour day. Notice verse 5, "God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." *yom echad*. We're not saying every single use of the word *yom* means a literal 24 hour day, there is an OT expression, "the day of the Lord" that often refers to a longer period of time. However, we know from the context that this is a literal 24 hour day.

Second, the numbers are cardinal not ordinal. Cardinal numbers means a counting measure, second day, third day, fourth day, etc...they indicate a sequence and you can't have gaps in a counting sequence or it doesn't make sense. If you want to keep the beat in music you use a counting measure, if you add gaps of time you lose the beat.

Third, notice in verse 5 the dark-light cycle. "God called the light day, and the darkness He called night." I don't know about you, but the last time I checked the dark-light cycle was 24 hours. Can you imagine if the cycle was millions or billions of years, we've got a million years of darkness on planet earth



followed by a million of years of light; it might get a little too hot on one side and a little too cold on the other side. So if anything what is being emphasized each day is the dark-light cycle of 24 hours.

Fourth, notice the end of verse 5, at the end of each day it ends with something like this, “there was evening and morning, the first day...evening and morning, the second day,” the cycle of evening-morning signifies a normal Jewish day. The day actually begins with evening and ends with morning. I might point out one of the problems with starting day one with verse 3 is that light is created in verse 3. But if light was the first thing created then where did the darkness come from? According to Isaiah darkness and light were created on the same day. Therefore the darkness that is in verse 2 must also be a part of the first day. And ultimately I would argue that the first day actually begins in verse 1, verse 2 is the original condition of the earth where there is darkness. In verse 3 He creates light on that same day, He then names the light day and the darkness night, by verse 5 he pronounces evening and morning, evening came first, then morning.

Alright, the big idea to come away with in creation week is that this defines who God is, how God does something is directly related to who God is. And lastly, very importantly, in Gen 1:31, “God saw everything that He had made and behold, it was very good.” That’s God’s valuation of His labor. God is assigning value to His work at this point and the valuation is “very good.” There were no flaws in His original creation. It was very good and He is very good. This diagram is very important to take in and digest. At Creation you have only good, there is no suffering, no crying, no pain, no mutations, no cancer, no disease, no evil, only good, and it’s only at the Fall that evil is introduced. Christians can envision a time when evil was naught, when all that existed was good. Paganism does not have this vision at all; it can only look into a distant past of good and evil in an eternal admixture. Christianity alone claims that there was a period of actual history when evil did not exist but God and man did exist and in perfect harmony.

Alright, we’re going to turn now to the point when evil entered. Evil actually entered the creation when Satan sinned but we’re not going to look at Satan’s Fall this week, he’s not mentioned until point 16 of our doctrinal statement so we’ll look at that there. But we’d place Satan’s fall sometime between Gen 2 and Gen 3.

Let's look at the Fall of man. Man fell in Gen 3. We don't know how long after creation man fell. People have speculated; John Whitcomb said the passage in the gospels where Jesus said, "I saw Satan fall like lightning," could indicate the amount of time between Satan's creation and Satan's fall as very short, he speculated that it was not more than about 30 days after creation. But we really don't know. The important point about Satan's fall is that it is after the creation week but before man's fall and when he fell he came to earth and deceived the woman.

Now I think it's interesting the order of our doctrinal statement here because point 5 deals with Creation, then the Fall, point 6 deals with the Cross and salvation. That sequence is telling you something. Creation comes first, that tells you who God is, who man is and what nature is. Then the Fall comes second, that tells you who man is as fallen and that when man fell nature was cursed. Then comes the Cross, that tells you the solution to man's problem and nature's problem. So the sequence follows the order of history and practically speaking, you don't tell someone about the cross and salvation until you've taught them about creation, who God is, and the Fall, who man is under sin. In that light the cross makes sense because it's Christ dying for our sin. Otherwise, what is the cross all about? In a theological vacuum? Maybe He's just a very sincere man dying for his beliefs, a martyr of sorts? But if you encompass the cross with the prior truths of creation and the fall, you avoid leaving the cross up to people's interpretation.

The first expression we have in our statement is that "Man was created originally without sin (Gen. 1:31)" That's true, Gen 1:31 is the end of the sixth day and it says "God saw all that He had made," everything on day one, two, three, four, five and six, He's looking at His completed creation "and behold, it was very good." If man was created without sin then man was very good. Ryrie calls this condition, unconfirmed holiness which is a good statement; He didn't have confirmed holiness, it was unconfirmed. Time would tell if his unconfirmed holiness would be confirmed through positive obedience.

Related to this is the fact that while man was created incorrupt he was corruptible, he had the ability to become corrupt through sin. Otherwise there couldn't be a Fall. Such capability itself, however, is not sinful. The

ability to do something is not the same as doing it. And the ability to sin is not the same as sinning itself. Looked at from the standpoint of Jesus Christ, He was incorrupt but corruptible in His humanity. And He was tempted to sin, but He resisted the temptation and did not sin. Nevertheless, the first Adam and the second Adam share the original created state as incorrupt but corruptible.

So our original condition was one of unconfirmed holiness, incorrupt yet corruptible. There was no death because sin is the cause of death. So theoretically man could have lived forever eating and drinking of all the fruits of the Garden except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Likewise, Jesus Christ could have lived forever in His humanity because He had no sin.

Why do we have death? Turn to Romans 5:12. God said, in the day you eat you shall surely die. When you read the Genesis text you see that Eve ate first and it doesn't appear anything happened, then she gave to her husband who was with her and when he ate it says, "Then both of their eyes were opened." As far as the Genesis text is concerned the Fall did not occur until the man ate. So death entered not through the woman but through the man. Notice Rom 5:12, "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered," not one woman, "through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—" So according to Rom 5:12 why do all men die? Because one man sinned and all men sinned in him. We were all in Adam, Eve included because she was made out of Adam. Somehow the entire human race was in Adam and somehow all of us sinned in Adam. Whether he was our Federal Representative or we were Seminally in Adam or both. In some way we sinned in him and that's why we die. We don't die just because of personal sin, we die because of imputed sin. That's why babies die, babies don't have any personal sin but they still die. How do you explain that if they're not sinful? The explanation is they are born with the imputed sin of Adam, under the curse of sin.

Now imputed means reckoned or credited to your account. So when we say everyone is born with the imputed sin of Adam we mean that sin is reckoned or credited to us at birth. It comes directly from Adam to each human being. So this is not inherited from your father, this is directly from Adam to you. Inherent sin is from your father, it's passed down from father to son, father to

son, etc...But the kind of sin being spoken of here is imputed sin. Adam as our Federal Representative sinned on our behalf or we were in Adam Seminally and sinned in that way, or both. I think both are true and thus we die. This is why there's death.

In conclusion, 5. We believe that God as absolute sovereign, created man, the universe and all that is in it," that's everything including angels, dinosaurs, etc., so I think that is pointing to a young universe and young earth..."in six (6) literal twenty-four (24) hour days. Man was created originally without sin. However, man rebelled and sinned against God thereby sin was imputed to all mankind because in Adam all sinned.

---

<sup>i</sup> That's not just Genesis, that's the whole OT. We've had Bishop Ussher's work, we've had updated works too, especially in recent years Floyd Nolen Jones work *Chronology of the Old Testament*, we've had works done on specific periods, like Edwin Thiele's book, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* and David Down's book on Egyptian Chronology, *The Pharaoh's Unwrapped*. It's absurd to say God didn't intend to give us a precise chronology of the OT period. What are you talking about? Gen 5 is clearly giving us the number of years between Creation and the Flood, it's very specific, a 4<sup>th</sup> grader can do the math, 1,656 years. Gen 11 is giving us the number of years between the Flood and Abraham's birth, again, a fourth grader can do the numbers, 292 years.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012