

communities. Looking back to well-trodden church and denominational pronouncements may prove less helpful than frequently thought, especially where these have not been informed by nuanced scientific input.

Notes

¹R. Boomsma, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 56, no 1 (2004): 38–48.

²A. Teo and D. Calbreath, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View: A Response to Robert Boomsma," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 58, no 3 (2006): 179–88.

D. Gareth Jones

ASA Fellow

Department of Anatomy and Structural Biology

University of Otago

Dunedin, New Zealand

gareth.jones@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman

We continue to seek the emergence of created humans. It has been more than a year since the above article was published in this journal (*PSCF* 58, no. 3 [2006]: 196–215). This theory of human origin was presented, anticipating evaluation from experts in the human-origins fields of study. The article presents evidence for the extinction of *Homo sapiens* during and following the Last Ice Age; and for the repopulation of the earth since 10,000 BC by the descendants of God's created, biblical Adam and Eve. This theory is diametrically opposed to the popular theory that we are all descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

In the year since publication of the article (which combines evolution and God's creation), we have not seen criticism in favor or opposed (except for one expert who supports Young-Earth Creation; and Peter Rüst's consideration of this theory in his article about the nature of Adam in the September 2007 issue of *PSCF*). However, in the meantime, we have gained some related insight into the academic fields of human origins. That insight comes from writings published in *PSCF* as follows:

- The title of Dean Arnold's December 2006 article, "Why Are There So Few Christian Anthropologists? Reflections on the Tension between Christianity and Anthropology," is self-explanatory.
- Two related conference talks in the June 2007 issue are: "Warfare and Wedlock: Redeeming the Faith-Science Relationship" by Ian Hutchinson; applies the term wedlock to the faith-science relationship for the natural sciences, where reproducibility and clarity (universal agreement) prevail; but also suggests that theories in history (his example, and I would add origin fields) where singular discoveries or events from the past cannot be reproduced, do not always have clarity. In my reading in human-origins fields, discoveries can be interpreted by different theories, e.g., there does not seem to be agreement on what caused the drastic cultural changes that came in the Developed Neolithic (beginning c. 9000 BC) or on why they occurred at that time.
- "The Professor and the Pupil: Addressing Secularization and Disciplinary Fragmentation in Academia" by Calvin DeWitt; suggesting that secularization and frag-

mentation in a study field can detract from addressing the big questions in that field and can result in ignoring ethical and spiritual levels.

Can we conclude from the above insights that when considering a major shift in human origins theory that includes creation by God, it could be difficult and inconclusive to attempt to reject or accept the theory and it would be more practical to ignore the theory?

The essence of "Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman" acknowledges God's creation of the universe taken from Gen. 1:1 and God's creation of first life billions of years later; and accepts the theory of evolution combined with God's creation events of first life and a later creation of Adam and Eve. Extinction of *Homo sapiens* was derived from a different interpretation of published discoveries and theories concerning origins covering the last 15,000 years. The usual interpretation of that period supports cultural continuity of *Homo sapiens*. Support for the timely repopulation of the Earth by God's created humans is taken from convincing indications of God's Spirit being present, as seen in the first art works in different regions around the world beginning c. 8000 BC.

The article has now been placed on the ASA website along with the other 2006 journal articles (www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2006/PSCF9-06dyn.html). We continue to seek expert evaluation from origins and faith sources, but with the assumption of silent approval, the next step is promoting internet exposure of this theory of God's creation to an interested public. Discussion seeking the truth about God's creating acts is needed for comparison to the theory that we humans are descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

Robert C. Schneider

ASA Member

66 St. Andrews

Hattiesburg, MS 39401

banddschneider@msn.com

The Gap in Creation

As an old earth creationist, I respond to certain issues raised in the Seely-Ross exchange (*PSCF* 59, no. 1 [2007]: 37–54). My view that Gen. 1:1 refers to the creation of the universe and a global earth (cf. e.g., Pss. 121:2; 124:8),¹ on which there was a succession of different "worlds" (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3); that there is then an undisclosed gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis (cf. the gap in Isa. 61:1,2 till "the day of vengeance," Luke 4:18,19); that Gen. 1:2a describes a destruction event (cf. similar phraseology in Isa. 34; Jer. 4); and that this was followed by the creation of a new world in six literal 24-hour days (Exod. 20:8–11); accords with the majority gap school interpretation (Thomas Chalmers, et al.). However, my view that the flood of Gen. 1:2 was a local deluge, which was then followed by a local creation on the local earth (Gen. 41:56; Matt. 12:42) under the local heaven (Deut. 2:25; Col. 1:23) of Eden's world (Luke 2:1; Rom. 1:8) in six 24-hour days (Gen. 2:10–14), is a minority gap school view (Pye Smith, Henry Alcock, et al.).² The better known majority gap school view, which is contrary to established scientific facts, is that of a global flood and global creation in Gen. 1:2ff.

I note a serious methodological concern with Seely's view "that the sun, moon, and stars were created on the fourth day, not just made to appear," through reference to "qualified Old Testament scholarship," which in turn, Ross says is a "distortion," at which point the exchange between them bogs down. Certainly neither of them refers to the many gap school proponents of this view. But we should not simply abdicate to so called "experts" in academia, since these people sometimes simply maintain an academic normatively due to their own intellectual or spiritual mediocrity, against more intellectually gifted and spiritually discerning outsiders. We must judge such matters *on their merits*.

For example, on a gap school model is "Let there be light" (Gen. 1:3) reasonably something like, "I form the light, and create darkness," "from the rising of the sun" (Isa. 45:6, 7)? Is the "firmament" of Gen. 1:6-8 reasonably something like, though not identical with, "He causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth" (Ps. 135:7; cf. Jer. 10:13; 51:16)? Is the phraseology of the fourth day similar to Job 9:7, 9, where we read that God "commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; and sealeth up the stars" i.e., by covering of cloud or dust storm (e.g., Luke 23:44)? But then God "maketh" the stars such as "Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south" (Job 9:9) i.e., by clearing the sky. The word "maketh" in Job 9:9 is Hebrew '*asah*', the same word used for "made" in Gen. 1:16, "And God made two great lights." It can also carry with it the idea of "appoint," e.g., "He appointed ('*asah*) the moon for seasons" (Ps. 104:19). Likewise, the Hebrew word *nathan* translated "set" in Gen. 1:17, "God set them in the firmament," can mean "appoint" (e.g., Exod. 30:16; Lev. 35:6; Josh. 20:2; 2 Kings 8:6; 1 Chron. 6:48; 16:4; Ezek. 45:6). Thus on the fourth day God appointed ('*asah* and *nathan*) them for their purpose in the world of humans that he was about to create, "for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years" (Gen. 1:14), "and" also "to divide the light from the darkness" in the world humans were to inhabit (Gen. 1:18).

Seely's criticism that a date for Adam "stretches the genealogy in Genesis 5 to unrealistic dimensions" is not a biblically based conclusion. I have previously shown that such dates are within biblical parameters; and that events in Mesopotamia on the genealogies *prima facie* dates are symbolic types pointing backwards e.g., I think the Kish Flood of 2,600 BC (which only covered a part of Kish) types Noah's much earlier flood.³ I also note the teaching of Ps. 105:8 that since a "covenant" was "commanded to a thousand generations," this means that in about 1,000 BC, there had to have been "a thousand generations" who had received the covenant, so that Adam must probably date to somewhere between about 35,000 BC to 70,000 BC. Though I regard this as the covenant of grace, and Jewish interpretations find in it another covenant, I note that one ancient Jewish view, though by no means the only Jewish view of Ps. 105:8, understands it in this type of way.⁴

Seely's criticism that there is a lack of credulity in that "Lamech remembers not only the name of Adam, but the words God spoke to Adam some supposed 45,000 years ago (Gen. 3:17; 5:29)," has a low view of the prophetic gift in Bible times. Why could not God have revealed this to him?

But Seely is on much stronger ground when he says the picture of Gen. 7:19 requires that the mountains be covered with water, upon which the ark comes to rest. He is quite right in recognizing that the Mesopotamian flood plain cannot be meant on Ross' model of the mountains of Ararat. But as I have previously shown, the Flood may be placed in the Persian Gulf which was then dry land.⁵ There are many little islands now there, which may have been the "high hills" first covered, and then uncovered after the Flood. Thus I think "Ararat" originally referred to this region, and was probably later extended to include the Zagros Mountains and present day Ararat mountains. (If anything of Noah's ark survives, and possibly it does not, these islands would be a good place to look for it.)

Another criticism Seely could have made, but did not, of Ross's Mesopotamian flood theory, is that it lacks credibility during the last Ice Age 10,000-70,000 years ago, due to the cold inhospitable Mesopotamian conditions which would not sustain the garden of Gen. 3 or civilizations described in Gen. 4-9. In a manner something like, though not identical with, Eskimos, any human beings in Mesopotamia during the last ice age would have moved in and out of ice conditions as they journeyed around this region.⁶ By contrast, the Persian Gulf was a warm area full of sunshine.⁷

Seely's criticism that Ross's model has "no evidence of" such ancient societies, is not satisfactorily answered in Ross's reply of "40,000 years of natural erosion" in Mesopotamia. But a lost world is a reasonable reply to a Persian Gulf location, since the area has been under water for over 10,000 years in both the region of Eden and Noah's anthropologically but geographically local flood. Researchers reasonably find it hard to investigate anything remaining under the Persian Gulf, so the model can be neither proven nor disproven by present archaeology. But Mesopotamia is sufficiently accessible to archaeology to reasonably disprove the existence of any such society of the type required in Ross's model.

Notes

- ¹All Bible references are to the Authorized (King James) Version.
- ²J. P. Smith, *The Relation between the Holy Scripture and Some Parts of Geological Science*, 5th ed. (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852); E. Hitchcock, *Elementary Geology*, 8th ed., with an Introduction by J. Pye Smith (New York: Newman, 1847), 297-302; H. J. Alcock, *Earth's Preparation for Man* (London: James Nisbett, 1897); J. H. Sailhamer, *Genesis Unbound* (Sisters, OR: Multnomah Books, 1996).
- ³Gavin McGrath, "Soteriology: Adam & the Fall," *PSCF* 49 (1997): 252-3, 257-8. This was written when I was a theistic evolutionist, but I am now an old earth creationist.
- ⁴H. Freedman and M. Simon, eds., *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 9, *Esther & Song of Songs*, *Song of Songs*, trans. M. Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1939), 242-3; Volume on *Ruth & Ecclesiastes*, *Ecclesiastes*, trans. A. Cohen, 211.
- ⁵McGrath, "Soteriology: Adam & the Fall," 258-9.
- ⁶W. C. Brice, *South West Asia: A Systematic Regional Geography*, vol. 8 (London: University of London, 1966), 7, 11.
- ⁷McGrath, "Soteriology: Adam & the Fall," 259.

Gavin McGrath
PO Box 834
Nowra, NSW, 2541 Australia
gmcgrath@easynet.com.au

★