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Coming to Grips with Genesis
Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth

- Young-earth creationism
- Biblical, historical, and theological arguments
- Written for seminarians and professors (some technical arguments)
- Festschrift for Dr. John Whitcomb
- Forwards from Dr. Henry Morris and Dr. John MacArthur
- Not a book on creation science
1. The Church Fathers on Genesis, the Flood, and the Age of the Earth

Dr. James R. Mook, professor of systematic theology, Capital Bible Seminary

- Response to Hugh Ross
  - Cites Irenaeus, Origen, Basil, Augustine, and Aquinas as day-age proponents

- Some Fathers believed, typologically, that the six-days of creation correspond to the six thousand years of human history, with the seventh “thousand years” being the Millennium.
  - Does not preclude their young-earth view of creation

- Only Origen and Augustine who are really in question, but neither believed in an old universe
Origen on Creation

- Did not believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis 1
  - Due to Neoplatonic allegorism
  - Not a model of exegesis

- Did not believe in an old universe

  “…the world is not yet ten thousand years old, but very much under that.”

~Origen, *De Principiis* 1.19
Augustine on Creation

• Believed in an instantaneous creation, not a six-day creation
  ▫ Still contrary to Day-Age view

“They are deceived, too, by those highly mendacious documents which profess to give the history of many thousand years, though, reckoning by the sacred writings, we find that not 6,000 years have yet passed.”

~Augustine, *The City of God* 12.10
Summary

- The Fathers generally believed in a literal interpretation of Genesis 1.
- The Fathers believed in a recent creation.
- Some believed in a typological view of creation days for eschatology in addition to their literal view of Genesis 1.
- Origen and Augustine did not believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis 1, but they did believe in a recent creation.
- Truth of an interpretation does not ultimately rest with the Church Fathers but with Scripture.
- The Day-Age interpretation, as well as other modern interpretations (e.g., Framework Hypothesis, Gap Theory, etc.) are without precedent in Church history.
2. A Brief Overview of the Exegesis of Genesis 1-11: Luther to Lyell
Dr. David W. Hall, senior pastor, Midway Presbyterian Church, Powder Springs, GA
A Brief Overview of the Exegesis of Genesis 1-11: Luther to Lyell

- Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Westminster divines, and many others
  - Literal interpretation of Genesis 1
  - Calvin rejected Augustine’s view of instantaneous creation
  - “in the space of six days” ~WCF

“No reputable Reformed theologian from Calvin through 50 years after Westminster provides any theological latitude for what are now known as the gap theory, the day-age theory, the analogical days theory, or the framework hypothesis.” ~Hall, page 66
3. ‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

Dr. Terry Mortenson, author/speaker for Answers in Genesis
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

• “Deep time” = long ages of earth history

• Some geologists proposed uniformitarianism for rock layers.
  ▫ James Hutton (d. 1797)
  ▫ Charles Lyell (d. 1875)

• Some geologists believed in numerous catastrophes which caused rock layers.
  ▫ Georges Cuvier (d. 1832)
  ▫ William Buckland (d. 1852)

• “Scriptural geologists” believed that the rock layers resulted from Noah’s Flood.
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

• Problem: uniformitarian, naturalistic assumptions

“...Geological inquiry ought to be conducted as if the Scriptures were not in existence.”
~Lyell (1832), quoted in Mortenson, 90

• Problem: Many scientists at the time were anti-Christian (e.g., Laplace).
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

• Response: alternative interpretations of Genesis 1
  • 1804 ~ Gap Theory (Chalmers)
  • 1823 ~ Day-Age view (Faber)
  • 1826 ~ “tranquil Flood” (Fleming)
  • “local Flood” (John Pye Smith, d. 1851)
  • Liberal theology: Genesis 1-11 is myth
  • Examples: Spurgeon, Hodge, Warfield, Scofield
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

“Can any man tell me when the beginning was? Years ago we thought the beginning of this world was when Adam came upon it; but we have discovered that thousands of years before that God was preparing chaotic matter to make it a fit abode for man, putting races of creatures upon it, who might die and leave behind the marks of his handiwork and marvelous skill, before he tried his hand on man.”

~Charles H. Spurgeon
'Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

“From a superficial reading of Genesis 1, the impression would seem to be that the entire creative process took place in six twenty-four-hour days. If this was the true intent of the Hebrew author...this seems to run counter to modern scientific research, which indicates that the planet Earth was created several billion years ago....”

~Gleason L. Archer
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

“The days of creation may also pose difficulties for a strict historical account. Contemporary scientists almost unanimously discount the possibility of creation in one week, and we cannot summarily discount the evidence of the earth sciences.”

~Bruce K. Waltke
‘Deep Time’ and the Church’s Compromise: Historical Background

• Conclusion: compromise unnecessary (Mortenson)

“My excuse for this lengthy and amateur digression into history is that I have been trying to show how I think geology got into the hands of the theoreticians [i.e., uniformitarians] who were conditioned by the social and political history of their day more than by observations in the field. So it was – as Steve Gould put it – that Charles Lyell ‘managed to convince future generations of geologists that their science had begun with him.’ In other words, we have allowed ourselves to be brain-washed into avoiding any interpretation of the past that involves extreme and what might be termed ‘catastrophic’ processes.”

~Derek Ager (d. 1993), geologist (non-creationist)
4. Is Nature the 67th Book of the Bible?
Dr. Richard L. Mayhue, professor of theology, The Master’s Seminary
“So, God’s revelation is not limited exclusively to the Bible’s words. The facts of nature may be likened to a sixty-seventh book of the Bible. Just as we rightfully expect interpretations of Isaiah to be consistent with those of Mark, so too we can expect interpretations of the facts of nature to be consistent with the message of Genesis and the rest of the canon.”

~Hugh Ross, *Creation and Time*, 56-57
Is Nature the 67th Book of the Bible?

- Ross’ 23 prooftexts do not prove that general revelation is on par with Scripture.

- Special revelation is superior since it alone leads to salvation.

- Ross leaves the canon open since scientific views are constantly changing.

- Man’s interpretations of the natural world are fallible.
  - Scripture must also be interpreted by fallible men.
  - Scripture is clearer because it is a written revelation.

- Modern science is not general revelation since general revelation is that which is accessible to all people’s across time.
Article XX. WE AFFIRM that since God is the author of all truth, all truths, biblical and extrabiblical, are consistent and cohere, and that the Bible speaks truths when it touches on matters pertaining to nature, history, or anything else. We further affirm that in some cases extrabiblical data have value for clarifying what Scripture teaches, and for prompting correction of faulty interpretations.

WE DENY that extrabiblical views ever disprove the teaching of Scripture or hold priority over it.
• Article XXI. WE AFFIRM the harmony of special with general revelation and therefore of biblical teaching with the facts of nature.

• WE DENY that any genuine scientific facts are inconsistent with the true meaning of any passage of Scripture.
5. Contemporary Hermeneutical Approaches to Genesis 1-11
Dr. Todd S. Beall, professor of Old Testament, Capital Bible Seminary
Genesis 1-11 as Myth

- Consistent in interpreting Genesis 1-11 as straightforward, historical account
- Deficient because it denies inerrancy
- Examples: Speiser, Skinner, Gunkel, Wellhausen
Genesis 1-11 as Myth

• Babylonian origin (Gunkel)?
  • *Enuma Elish*
  • *tehom* is not related to *Tiamat*
  • Few similarities compared to differences
  • No cosmic conflict in Genesis 1
  • No detailed creation account of vegetation, animals, birds, or fish in *Enuma Elish*
  • Man created to rule creation in Genesis 1, not to serve the gods
Genesis 1-11 as Myth

- Canaanite Origin (John Day)?
  - Genesis 1:2 demythologizes Canaanite sea dragon myth
  - Baal is not the creator-god in Canaanite mythology.
  - Sea dragon is *Yam*, not *Taham (Tehom)*
  - *Yam* does not appear until Genesis 1:10 alongside of *erets*
Genesis 1-11 as Myth

- **Egyptian Origin (Currid, Johnston)**
  - Israelites spent 400 years in Egypt
  - Moses trained in Egypt
  - Used Egyptian creation myths but demythologized them
    - No unified creation story among pyramid texts, coffin texts, and hymns
    - No mention of creation of man or animals
    - Conflicting accounts of creation (command, semen, spitting, onanism)
    - Cyclical creative events corresponding to seasons, nature, etc.
Genesis 1-11 as Largely Figurative

- Genesis 1-11 is not myth (untrue) but is almost entirely figurative, not literal.
  - Peter Enns
    - Genesis 1-11 is “an ancient, premodern, prescientific way of addressing questions of ultimate origins and meaning in the form of stories: Who are we? Where do we come from?”
  - John Walton
    - Genesis 1-11 is a functional account of creation, not a material account of creation.
    - “It is fruitless to ask what things God created on day one, for the text is not concerned about things and therefore will not address itself to that question.”
  - Cornelius Van Till
    - Genesis 1-11 is an “artistic portrait” or “storied theology.”
Genesis 1-11 as Largely Figurative

- Critique of figurative interpretation
  - God was not obligated to use ANE worldviews.
    - The account of creation would have to be supernaturally revealed anyway since no one was present when creation began.
  - Differences between Genesis 1-11 outweigh the similarities with ANE myths.
    - If the polemic of Genesis 1-11 is so strong, then why think that it is a polemic instead of an original, accurate, historical account?
  - Genesis 1-11 exhibits the same historical features as Genesis 12-50.
    - Toledoths
    - The genealogies connect Abram back to Shem who is connected back to Noah who is connected back to Adam.
    - Gen 12:1 ~ wayomer
• “Genesis 1-11, according to my own rough count, contains sixty-four geographical names, eighty-eight personal names, forty-eight generic names and twenty-one identifiable cultural items such as gold, bdellium, onyx, brass, iron, gopher wood, bitumen or tar, bricks, stone, harp, pipe, cities, and towers.”

~Walter C. Kaiser Jr.
Genesis 1-11 as Partly Figurative

- Genesis 1-11 partly figurative and partly literal.
  - Stek, Collins, Wenham, Hamilton, Kidner, Waltke
    - Exalted prose narrative (Collins)
    - Poetic (Brueggemann, Arnold)
    - Hymn (Wenham)
  - Genesis 1-11 emphasizes theological, not scientific issues.
  - Seven-day structure = non-literal
  - Anthropomorphic language
    - “God lisped so that Israel could mime him, working six days and resting the seventh.” ~Waltke
- Ultimately driven by evolutionary science
Genesis 1-11 as Historical Narrative

- Not discussed by Beall, but is discussed in chapter 6 by Steven Boyd.

Dr. Stephen W. Boyd, associate professor of Bible, The Master’s College

Also a member of the RATE study group
The Genre of Genesis 1:1-2:3: What Means This Text?

• Boyd uses statistics to show that Genesis 1:1-2:3 is historical narrative.
  • Chose 522 texts
    • 295 narrative texts
    • 227 poetic texts
  • Randomly chose 48 narrative texts and 49 poetic texts
  • Used ratio of wayyiqtols to finite verbs
  • Classified texts based on ratio
  • 95-97% accuracy in classifying texts as either narrative or poetic
  • When applied to Genesis 1, Boyd showed that “it is statistically indefensible to argue that this text is poetry.”
The Genre of Genesis 1:1-2:3: What Means This Text?

- Other indications of historical account
  - Customs explained
  - Ancient names traced back to origins
  - Monuments and pronouncements made for an historical purpose
  - Historical footnotes included
  - Written records used as sources are cited.
  - Precise chronological reference points supplied (Gen 7:6, 11; 8:4-5, 13-14)
  - Genealogies given (Gen 5, 11)
  - Past prophetic utterances recalled
  - The use of “time words” (e.g., “since this day”)
  - Historical trajectories present
7. Can Deep Time Be Embedded in Genesis?
Dr. Trevor Craigen, professor of Theology, The Master’s Seminary
Can Deep Time Be Embedded in Genesis?

- The order of events in Genesis 1 and the theory of evolution do not agree.
  - Mortenson points out 26 discrepancies
    - Which came first, the earth or the sun?
    - Which came first, dry land or the seas?
    - Which came first, thorns and thistles or man?
- There is nothing in the grammar or syntax of *yom* in Genesis 1 to indicate deep time.
“The author of Genesis 1 could not have produced more comprehensive and all-inclusive ways to express the idea of a literal ‘day’ than the ones that were chosen. There is a complete lack of indicators from prepositions, qualifying expressions, construct phrases, semantic-syntactical connections, and so on, on the basis of which the designation ‘day’ in the creation week could be taken to be anything different than a regular 24-hour day. The combinations of the factors of articular usage, singular gender, semantic-syntactical constructions, time boundaries, and so on, corroborated by the divine promulgations in such Pentateuchal passages as Exodus 20:8-11 and Exodus 31:12-17, suggest uniquely and consistently that the creation ‘day’ is meant to be literal, sequential, and chronological in nature.”

~Gerhard F. Hasel
Can Deep Time Be Embedded in Genesis?

“The seven days are unquestionably to be understood as actual days and as a unique, unrepeatable lapse of time in the world.”
~Gerhard von Rad

“There can be little doubt that here ‘day’ has its basic sense of a 24-hour period.”
~Gordon Wenham

“Whoever wrote Gen. 1 believed he was talking about literal days.”
~Victor Hamilton

“Naturally, the ‘days’ are days and nothing else.”
~Hermann Gunkel
8. A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week

Dr. Robert V. McCabe, professor of Old Testament, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary
A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week

- **Framework Hypothesis**
  - Genesis 1:1-2:3 is topical, not chronological.
  - Creation “week” has a figurative structure
  - Ordinary providence governed the creation account.
  - The unending seventh day indicates that the six days of the creation week are not normal days.
  - Arie Noordzij
  - N.H. Ridderboss
  - Henri Blocher
  - Meredith Kline & Lee Irons
  - Mark Ross
  - Gordon Wenham
  - Victor Hamilton
  - Bruce Waltke
  - R. Kent Hughes
A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week

- Similarities between creation days 1 & 4, 2 & 5, and 3 & 6 are overplayed

- 55 waw-consecutives indicate sequence of consecutive actions
  - Only 8 of these are epexegetical (offline).
  - Gen 1:12, 16, 17, 25, 28; 2:2[2], 3
  - Only 1 is consequential (offline).
    - Gen 2:1

- Use of “evening and morning” indicates consecutive days
A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week

- Genesis 2:5 does not suggest that all of Genesis 1 was governed by general providence.
  - “and no shrub of the field had yet appeared on the earth and no plant of the field had yet sprung up, for the LORD God had not sent rain on the earth and there was no man to work the ground.”

- Pluperfect use of וָּו (waw) in Genesis 2:19
  - “Now the LORD God had formed out of the ground every beast of the field....”
A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week

• The unending seventh day
  • Omission of the entire five-fold structure, not just “evening and morning”
    • And God said
    • And it was so
    • God saw that it was good
    • There was evening and morning
    • The first, second, etc., day
  • Rhetorical function of “evening and morning”
    • No need to lead into Day 8
    • God’s work finished before (not on) Day 7
  • If the seventh day is unending, then God both rested on the seventh day and cursed the seventh day.
  • Adam lived 930 years, but the sixth and seventh days cannot be long ages since he lived through both.
9. Noah’s Flood and Its Geological Implications
Dr. William D. Barrick, professor of Old Testament, The Master’s Seminary
Noah’s Flood and Its Geological Implications

- Flood waters ceased after 150 days, not just 40 days and 40 nights
  - It took 40 days for the ark to begin to float.
  - All life destroyed in first 150 days
  - 221 days of cleansing and reconstruction
- baqa = “burst open”; cf. Num 16:31; Zech 14:4
- Gen 8:5 ~ halok wasor = “continually receding” or going back and forth
  - May have geological implications
10. Do the Genesis 5 and 11 Genealogies Contain Gaps?

Dr. Travis R. Freeman, professor of Old Testament, The Baptist College of Florida
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Similarities between names in Genesis 4-5 point to common source, and thus fluidity.
  - Cain/Kenan
  - Mahujael/Mahalalel
  - Irad/Jared
  - Methushael/Methuselah
  - Cain, Enoch, Irad, Mehujael vs. Kenan, Mahalalel, Jared, Enoch

- Response: Similarities only apparent
  - Enoch and Lamech in Genesis 4 and 5 are clearly different people.
  - The genealogy in Genesis 5 leads up to the Flood, but the one is Genesis 4 does not.
  - Genesis 5 has a consistent formula of giving the age at procreation and death which is absent in Genesis 4.
  - It was not uncommon in the ancient world to have similar names.
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Symmetrical ten-generation form in Genesis 5 and 11
  - Emphasis on seventh position
  - Like the Sumerian Kings List (SKL)
  - Selective in names like in Matthew 1
  - Evidence of fluidity and thus gaps

- Response
  - Genesis 5 and 11 have ages, unlike Matt 1
  - At least 10 differences between Gen 5 and 11 and the SKL
    - SKL use larger numbers.
    - SKL lists kings, not ancestors.
    - SKL gives years of reign, not life spans.
  - Gen 5 has 10 names; Gen 11 has 9 names
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

• Overlapping lives of the Gen 5 and 11 patriarchs
  • Adam and Methuselah would have liked together for a brief time.
  • Shem would have outlived Abraham.
  • These seem absurd.

• Response
  • There is no reason not to think that their lives overlapped.
  • Many of the patriarchs’ lives overlapped.
  • There is no record of interaction among them possibly because of geography.
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Regularly repeated formulas in Gen 5 and 11
  - When X had lived Y years, he begat Z.
  - Evidence of fluidity
  - No Hebrew word for grandson or grandfather

- Response
  - No other reasonable explanation for the presence of numbers in genealogies
  - No other ancient example of formula X-Y-Z with gaps
  - Definitely no gaps for some
    - Adam and Seth (5:3)
    - Seth and Enosh (4:26)
    - Lamech and Noah (5:28)
    - Noah and Shem (6:10; 10:1; 11:10)
    - Eber and Peleg (10:25)
    - Terah and Abram (11:27-32)
  - Enoch the seventh from Adam (Jude 14)
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Archaeological and scientific evidence for the antiquity of man beyond 6,000 years ago
- Response: based on flawed assumptions in radiometric dating methods
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Luke 3:36 mentions two Cainans
  - One is the son of Arphaxad (Gen 11).
  - One is the son of Enosh (Gen 5).
- MT only has Cainan in Gen 5
- LXX has another Cainan in Gen 11
- Cainan in Luke 3:36 appears in many important manuscripts.
- Evidence of missing names and gaps
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Luke 3:36 mentions two Cainans

35 the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah,
36 the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech,
37 the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan,
38 the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

• Response
  • LXX’s inaccurate numbers in Gen 5 and 11
    • Every age increased by 50-150 years
    • Methuselah would have survived the Flood
  • Jews possibly influenced or pressured by Egyptian king list published just before LXX
    • Cainan from Cain = “acquisition” = superfluous
    • Cainan like kainos = “unknown, strange”
    • Cainan like kenos = “empty”
    • Same numbers assigned to LXX’s Cainan in Gen 11 as his son, Shelah; not a coincidence
Arguments for Gaps in the Genealogies

- Response
  - Some important documents missing second Cainan
    - Codex Beza, Philo, Eusebius
    - Origen marked it as inauthentic
  - Second Cainan not mentioned in 1 Chron 1:18 MT or LXX, nor in some copies of 1 Chron 1:24 LXX, nor elsewhere in Scripture
  - Missing from Vulgate, Targum Jonathan, Targum Onkelos, Syrian text, Samaritan Pentateuch
  - Possibly duplication (Sarfati)
11. Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth
Dr. Terry Mortenson, speaker for Answers in Genesis

- What Jesus affirmed, we should affirm.
- Over sixty commentaries and systematic theologies surveyed.
- Only a few which interact with Jesus’ statements on the age of the earth.
Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth

“But from the beginning of creation God ‘made them male and female.’” Mark 10:6 (cf. Gen 1:27)

• “from the beginning of creation” found in Mark 13:19 and 2 Peter 3:4
  • “For in those days there will be tribulation, such as has not been since the beginning of the creation which God created until this time, nor ever shall be.” Mark 13:19
  • “and saying, ‘Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation.’” 2 Peter 3:4

• “from the beginning” occurs 20 times
  ▫ Never refers to beginning of humanity only

• Jesus was referring to the beginning of the whole creation, not just to the beginning of marriage.
Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth

“For in those days there will be tribulation, such as has not been since the beginning of the creation which God created until this time, nor ever shall be. And unless the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh would be saved; but for the elect’s sake, whom He chose, He shortened the days.” — Mark 13:19-20

- Suffering here is human suffering, so the beginning point must be the beginning of humanity, placing humans at the absolute beginning of creation.
  - Jesus could have said “since Adam” or “since the creation of man until now.”

- Parallel in Matthew 24:21 has “since the beginning of the world” = “beginning of creation.”
Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth

“that the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah who perished between the altar and the temple. Yes, I say to you, it shall be required of this generation.” Luke 11:50-51

- “foundation of the world” occurs 10 times in NT
  ▫ Always refers to beginning of creation

- “blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world” juxtaposed with “from the blood of Abel”
  ▫ Therefore, Abel lived near the foundation of the world.
Jesus’ View of the Age of the Earth

• Summary
  ▫ Jesus placed marriage at the beginning of creation.
  ▫ Jesus used the beginning of creation as a marker for the beginning of human suffering/tribulation.
  ▫ Jesus placed Abel near the foundation of the world.
  ▫ Jesus did not believe in billions of years before the formation of the earth or the creation of Adam and Eve.
12. Apostolic Witness to Genesis Creation and the Flood

Ron Minton, missionary, Ukraine

• The apostles believed in a recent creation.

• Neither Hebrews 4:1-10 nor 2 Peter 3:3-8 teaches an old earth.

“whom heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began.”
Acts 3:21
“God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands. Nor is He worshiped with men’s hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things. And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and has determined their preappointed times and the boundaries of their dwellings, so that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us....”

Acts 17:24–27
“For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse....”
Romans 1:20

“Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned. For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come.”
Romans 5:12-14

James Stambaugh, former librarian, Institute of Creation Research

- In the Bible, death only applies to humans and animals, not to plants.
  - *Nephesh chayyah* creatures
  - Respiration required to be “living”
  - Life is in the blood (Lev 17:11)
  - Job 14:8, John 12:24, Jude 12

- Humans and animals were originally vegetarian (Gen 1:29-30).

- Problems for theodicy if natural evil originally present
Whence Cometh Death? A Biblical Theology of Physical Death and Natural Evil

• Creation was subjected to “frustration” at the Fall.
  “The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed. For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.” Romans 8:19-21
  ▫ “Cursed is the ground” (Gen 3:17)
  ▫ “It will produce thorns and thistles” (Gen 3:18)

• No natural evil in original creation
  ▫ Creation was originally “very good” (Gen 1:31).
  ▫ The new creation will have no death, sickness or suffering (Rev 21-22).
  ▫ Therefore, one can deduce that the original creation did not have natural evil before being subjected to frustration because of the Fall.
14. Luther, Calvin, and Wesley on the Genesis of Natural Evil: Recovering Lost Rubrics for Defending a Very Good Creation

Dr. Thane H. Ury, former professor of theology, Bethel College

- Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and many others believed that death came into the world at the Fall, not before.
  - Relevant for those who value Church history and tradition
  - Not relevant since these men lived before Darwin
Coming to Grips with Genesis
Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth

- Biblical arguments from literal interpretation of Genesis 1-11
- Jesus’ view of the age of the earth
- Biblical arguments for a global Flood
- History of interpretation
- Theological problem of natural evil
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