

25 Short Answers to Big Questions About Creation

Ian Taylor



Creation Moments

© 2010, 2012, 2025, Ian Taylor, Creation Moments

25 Short Answers to Big Questions About Creation

CONTENTS

1	Were there Pre-Adamic civilizations?	4
2	What is the Day-Age Theory?	6
3	Was each day of Creation Week 1,000 years?	8
4	What about the Gap Theory (a.k.a. the Ruin and Reconstruction Theory)?	10
5	What are the Tranquil Flood and Local Flood Theories?	12
6	What is the Progressive Creation Theory?	14
7	What color was Adam?	16
8	Why did Adam have to name all the animals?	18
9	How long were Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden?	20
10	Did dinosaurs live in the Garden of Eden?	22
11	Why did God curse the ground and not Adam?	24
12	What was the curse placed upon Eve?	26
13	Did Adam really live for 930 years?	28
14	How many were Adam and Eve's children?	30
15	Did Adam and Eve's children practice incest?	32
16	Why did Cain kill his brother Abel?	34
17	Who was Cain's wife?	36
18	What is wrong with Michelangelo's Creation of Adam?	38
19	Have remains of human giants been discovered?	40
20	Has Mankind evolved or devolved?	42
21	Where did our moon come from?	44
22	Is the light from distant stars proof for millions of years?	46
23	Can the millions of years demanded by geology be refuted?	48
24	How did the birds evolve?	50
25	Can Evolution Theory explain human consciousness?	52

Theories used by Christians to reconcile the Creation account with evolution.

1. Were there Pre-Adamic civilizations?

For the past century or so, the North American Christian has had a selection of Bibles from which to make a personal choice. Very often that choice will have been the Bible with the most extensive footnotes perceived to be study-helps for the many difficult passages. Based upon the King James version, *The Scofield Reference Edition*, published in 1907 and revised in 1917, has been one of the most popular. A more recent alternative with even more footnotes is *Dake's Annotated Reference Bible*, also based upon the KJV and first published in 1961. The footnote to Isaiah 45:18 in Scofield's edition suggests that Genesis 1:1-2 refers to a pre-adamic age ruled by Satan, judged by God then left desolate for an indefinite interval before a re-creation of the earth. Dake rehearses the same account more forcefully directly under Genesis 1:1-2. Although both Scofield and Dake claim to reject evolution, their footnotes silently claim its possibility by adopting all the billions of years for the first "day." Today's new Christian has been indoctrinated with evolution and naturally tends to adopt these footnote interpretations without question. It is therefore important to be aware of the source and especially the implications for the idea of a pre-adamic civilization.

The Dutch ecclesiastic, Isaac de la Peyrère [1596-1676], published his *Systema Theologicum ex Prae-Adamitarum Hypothesi* in 1655. In this book he claimed that the Bible is only concerned with the history of the Jews. Peyrère argued that God separated one man from His pre-adamic stock, and he became Adam, the father of the Jewish nation. The Gentiles of all colors today were said to be descended from that pre-adamic race. Even so, Peyrère argued that salvation was available to all men but he had problems explaining the original sin. Recalling that there were only eight individuals on the ark, all of Noah's family and reasonably of the same color, Peyrère had to face the fact that a global flood would have drowned the Gentile stock; therefore, he concluded the Genesis Flood had to be local – somewhere in

Mesopotamia. Isaac de la Peyrère was severely condemned by the Church of his day, and his name is now generally forgotten. The notion that the Genesis Flood was merely local is popular today and this will be addressed in Question 5. However, there are problems associated with a pre-adamic age theory. In the first place, the creation account specifically tells us that the sun, moon and stars were created on the fourth day [Genesis 1:14-19]. Therefore, unless every one of those days of creation was a normal 24-hour day, including the first day, that pre-adamic civilization would have been in total darkness where no living thing could survive. Nevertheless, the belief in a pre-adamic age lingers on usually together with some belief in evolution among a great many Christians today.

In the face of continuing difficulties to explain the spontaneous origin of life on early Earth by evolutionary processes, the scientific community today is pursuing a new theory. It is being argued that ancient earth was “seeded” with life from outer space via the comets. This effort is being aided by influential writers convincing their readers that sophisticated building complexes have been discovered on Earth. These are usually at the bottom of the sea or remote “observatories” such as that at Nazca, Peru. Most of this is merely speculation grasping for evidence to support it. Unfortunately, in the absence of sound teaching there are those who wish to believe all this and even claim it as the remains of that pre-adamic world. As far as the Christian is concerned, a pre-adamic world complements the theory of evolution, relegates to myth God’s creation of planet Earth in six days and therefore denies the fourth Commandment [Exodus 20:11].

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Documented essay paper: *Pre-Adamic Man* by Ian Taylor, obtainable from Creation Moments.

Theories used by Christians to reconcile the Creation account with evolution.

2. What is the Day-Age Theory?

Following the publication of Darwin's theory in 1859 and the apparent support from Charles Lyell's geological studies, there have always been Christians prepared to go only so far with their faith in Scripture. The point of departure usually begins with Noah, the animals, the Ark and the Genesis Flood. If that Flood was global, Noah and his Ark were absolutely necessary, and the first compromise was to declare the Flood to be local. Secondly, it was the interpretations given to geological findings that made it seem more rational to believe that the Earth was created millions of years in the past rather than only a few thousand years ago.

The Scottish popular writer Hugh Miller [1802-1856] was an evangelical Christian and very familiar with rocks and fossils. In his book, *The Testimony of the Rocks*, he argued that the creation days spoken of in Genesis chapter one were actually the days when Moses received his revelation of the creation on Mount Sinai! In this way, Miller believed he had reconciled the six days claimed by Scripture with the millions of years demanded by geology. After completing his manuscript, he was deeply troubled and shot himself on the eve of Christmas, 1856. Miller's book appeared from the publisher the following month. His was one of the first Day-Age theories and was short-lived.

Miller's suicide had discredited his theory, but another more successful and longer-lived Day-Age theory soon appeared. This new theory argued that the Hebrew word YOM, meaning "day," can be used either literally or figuratively in Scripture. While this is true, the theory adds that in the case of Genesis chapter one, YOM is used in the figurative sense to mean long ages. Then, with this understanding, it is claimed there is no conflict of Scripture with science. There is, however, plenty of conflict with common sense: For example, if those "days" were each millions of years, then we might wonder how the grasses, herbs and fruit trees created on the third "day" survived until the sun was created on the fourth "day"? In the matter of the Genesis Flood, this is

placed either in the remote past before the creation of Man or it was local. However, if it took place before the creation of Man, it could not have been a judgment upon Man's wickedness while Noah and his Ark become mere fiction. Alternatively, if the Genesis Flood took place in historic time, then it is said to be actually local but global in the minds of the people of the day.

Perhaps the most serious objection to the Day-Age theory is the fact that the creation account concludes each day's events with the formula: "So the evening and the morning were the first day," second day, etc. The Jews have always counted each day to be from sunset to sunset rather than from mid-night to mid-night as most Western nations do today. Either the words of Scripture are meaningful and there for good purpose or they are not. If those words are claimed to be simply a Hebrew colloquialism and not what is plainly stated, then Scripture as a means of revealing what could not otherwise be known has totally lost its purpose.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Theories used by Christians to reconcile the Creation account with evolution.

3. Was each day of Creation Week 1,000 years?

Genesis chapter one is a summary of God's creation and begins in verses one and two with the creation of space, then the Earth with the waters. Later that same day [YOM], God created light [OR], saw it was all good and declared the evening and the morning to be the first day [YOM]. The chapter progresses with the creation of the Earth's atmosphere and seas on the second day [YOM], the grasses and fruit trees on the third day [YOM], then the sun, moon – and, in that greatest of all understatement – “He made the stars also” – on the fourth day. The light created on that fourth day [YOM] is given in the Hebrew as MAOR, related to but not the same as OR on the first day. After describing the creation of the sea creatures, birds and then land animals, the chapter then states that God created man in His own image, “male and female He created them” [1:27] and concludes [1:31] by declaring that everything on that sixth day [YOM] was “very good.”

By making an appeal to two Scriptures, some Christians claim that the “days” of creation week were actually each of a thousand years. This is made in the hope of reconciling Scripture with the doctrine of evolution. The two scriptures used are:

Psalm 90:4. “For a thousand years in Your sight are like yesterday when it is passed, and like a watch in the night.”

2 Peter 3:8. “But beloved, do not forget this one thing, that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.”

The context of the first passage is to teach us to number our days while that of the second passage is to show that the Lord is long-suffering, calling all to repentance before the Earth and the works in it are burned up. There are a number of other objections to this “day is as a thousand years” theory:

1. The Hebrew word YOM used in the Genesis context means a normal 24-hour day.
2. The context for each of the passages claimed for the theory is not appropriate.
3. The grasses and fruit trees created on the third “day” could not possibly survive for a thousand years without the sun created on the fourth “day.”
4. The theory would require Adam and Eve to be created during the 1,000 years of the sixth day and possibly be hundreds of years old with no children before the normal 24-hour days began.

The academic and scientific establishments are convinced that multiple-millions of years were necessary for evolution to have taken place. Suggesting that the creation of heaven and Earth all took place in six-thousand years would definitely not be accepted by the establishments as a hopeful reconciliation between the two ideologies represented by geology and Scripture.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Theories used by Christians to reconcile the Creation account with evolution.

4. What about the Gap Theory (a.k.a. the Ruin and Reconstruction Theory)?

As early as 1812, Thomas Chalmers [1780-1847], evangelical professor of theology at Edinburgh, proposed a gap of as many millions of years as geology then demanded between Genesis 1:2 and 1:3. He argued that initially there had been a Pre-Adamic age that had been destroyed by a flood and that the strata and fossils found today were the remains of this former world. The Earth was said to have remained “unformed and unfilled” for millions of years; then the biblical account continues with the restored Earth. In 1812, the 1769 King James Bible then in use had the command “replenish the earth” in Genesis 1:28, and at that time “replenish” simply meant “fill.” Years later, the word “replenish” came to mean “fill again” and now left the impression that the Earth had once been filled with life, then became empty and required to be filled again. This change in word-meaning became a fortuitous and powerful argument for the Gap Theory. Later translations of the KJV correctly gave “fill the earth,” leaving no place for a gap.

The theory today is argued from the fact that in Genesis 1:1 the word “created” is from the Hebrew word BARA and means “created *ex nihilo*” – that is, created from nothing. Then, in Genesis 1:7, 16, 26, etc. the Hebrew word ASAH is used, meaning to make from pre-existing material. Here it is argued that a re-creation had taken place. However, Gesenius and other Hebrew scholars have pointed out that the two words, BARA and ASAH, are interchangeable in their contexts. Another proof text is the Hebrew words, TOHU WO BOHU used in both Genesis 1:2 and in Jeremiah 4:23. The Jeremiah passage is correctly translated “without form and void” since it refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. However, in some of the older Bibles, the passage in Genesis 1:2 was often translated as “without form and void” but is now usually given as “unformed and unfilled” – that is, it had never been formed in the first place. This avoids the possibility of a pre-Adamic age but, in any case, Genesis

1:14-19 tells the reader that the sun was not created until the fourth day, so there would be no sun to sustain life in that pre-Adamic age!

The Gap Theory is not only one from silence but has the further problem that destruction of the pre-Adamic world by God places the responsibility for introducing sin and death upon Satan and is thus not a consequence of Adam's sin [Romans 5:12-19]. The Gap Theory also introduces millions of years into the history of our Earth whereas Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 clearly state, "in six days [YOM] the Lord made the heavens and the earth and on the seventh day He rested."

The Gap Theory was promoted by G. H. Pember [1876], then, from 1909 onwards, was slipped into the notes to the Scofield edition of the KJV. It was also promoted by *Dake's Annotated Bible*. Commentators Henry Thiessen [1949], Grey Barnhouse and Arthur Custance [1970] as well as radio Bible teacher J. Vernon McGee and TV evangelists Jimmy Swaggart and Benny Hinn also promote this theory.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Theories used by Christians to reconcile the Creation account with evolution.

5. What are the Tranquil Flood and Local Flood Theories?

Following the introduction of Christianity and for the next eighteen centuries, Christians and most non-Christians believed that there had been a great Earth-destroying flood in the long distant past. The account of one man and his family having been saved from this flood together with many animals in a large vessel was an essential part of the narrative. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when world exploration on behalf of the British government was underway, care was taken to record the verbal history, beliefs and customs of each tribe and nation not yet touched by western civilization. All these records from every continent were archived in Cambridge University libraries. Sir James Frazer published his summary of all this work in 1918. This included 137 accounts of the great flood found in tribes and nations around the Earth. It is emphasized that these accounts pre-existed any missionary work.

A world-wide catastrophic flood in human history stood as a major barrier to any other belief system regarding man's origins except that found in the Book of Genesis. That barrier was removed step by step to permit the alternative belief system introduced by Charles Darwin in 1859. A preliminary step was taken in 1669 in Italy by Nicolas Steno who proposed that the sedimentary layers of rock were laid down sequentially from a series of extensive local floods; he did not specify the time between each local flood. Then in 1814 Georges Cuvier in Paris claimed that each of these floods was large, local, catastrophic and separated by very long periods of time; they all took place before the advent of man. Shortly after this, in 1826, Scottish minister John Fleming proposed that the last of these floods was the Genesis Flood but, while this was global, it was entirely tranquil as indicated by the olive leaf plucked by the dove [Genesis 8:11]. This allowed the Christians to believe in the Genesis Flood but not to expect to find evidence for it! Scripture is clear that the Flood was catastrophic, was global and the world

perished [Genesis 6:13]. Olive plants have been shown to recover from a flood and burial within weeks.

The next step was taken in 1830 by Charles Lyell who denied that there had ever been any catastrophic events in Earth history. This doctrine was called uniformitarianism and expanded the time frame of earth history immensely. In effect, Lyell had given scientific credence to the idea that the Genesis Flood had been simply one of a number of local floods. However, it needed an English theologian to convince the Christian public in England that Lyell's proposal was correct. John Pye Smith was that man, and he began to advocate the local flood theory by lectures and a book in 1839, then with greater boldness posthumously in 1854. A moment's thought by anyone, including Christians, shows the fallacy of suggesting that the Genesis Flood was local. In the first place, Noah would have been a fool to spend a century building a huge vessel for animals who would have moved out of the area. Secondly, the remaining areas of the world would contain many more of the same animals and wicked people and thus negate the purpose for the ark. Finally, Jesus and Peter acknowledged Noah and the Genesis Flood [Matthew 24:37-39 and 2 Peter 3:3-6]. Nevertheless, the Local Flood Theory is essential for individuals and churches that have adopted Darwin's theory of evolution.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.

Reference

Frazer, James. 1918. *Folklore in the Old Testament*.

London: Macmillan. 3 vols. Vol. 1, pages 104-361.

6. What is the Progressive Creation Theory?

Progressive Creation embodies at least three of the previous historical attempts to reconcile Scripture with evolution as given in the first five chapters of this booklet. The difference is that the Progressive Creation theory is, from a cosmological perspective, making appeals to all the latest theories such as black holes, warped 11-dimensional spaces and invisible dark energy. Not one person in ten-thousand understands these theories but believes everyone else does! Nevertheless, Progressive Creation appears to bring the explanation of our origins into the 21st century with the unquestioned belief that the universe is billions of years old; unstated is the fact that this provides the foundation for the theory of biological evolution.

The major proponent of the theory of Progressive Creation is the *Reasons to Believe* ministry which has been represented on several Christian TV talk and radio shows throughout the U.S. This ministry very often draws large crowds at university and seminary venues. *Reasons to Believe* was founded by a Christian with a Ph.D. in astrophysics. He is the author of *The Finger of God*, published in 1989. In this book he attempts to persuade the reader that the universe began with a Big Bang 15 billion years ago. The author also claims that Adam was formed by God from a member of a previously existing race of soul-less men. However, this makes God responsible for death and not Adam, and it denies Genesis 3:19, Romans 5:14-19 and 8:20-21.

Roman Catholic priest and professor of astrophysics George Lemaître [1894-1966] introduced his Big Bang theory for the origin of the universe in 1927. Since that time and to this day, a small cadre of astrophysicists convinced of the Big Bang have been working towards a unified theory to explain the universe in terms of Newton's Law of Gravity. However, gravity is simply insufficient to hold the universe together, and arcane inventions such as "Dark matter" and "Invisible energy" have been added to leave the Big Bang theory intact. But by 2003, "Dark matter" – for which there is not a shred of evidence – had to be subdivided into six types:

1. Cold collision-less, 2. Strongly self-interacting, 3. Warm and dark, 4. Repulsive dark, 5. Self-annihilating dark and 6. Fuzzy dark. Other incomprehensible ideas such as String Theory have been added to this mix, but few scientists really understand it and none of it is observable or testable. By 2006, a small number of astrophysicists were willing to speak out in the name of good science. They were joined by other scientists, including Nobel Laureates, and an open letter was issued to the scientific community. Within the first year, there were over 400 signatories to this letter demanding that there be greater freedom to explore other avenues towards understanding the universe. The demise of the Big Bang theory may be at hand, but we can expect face-saving measures in a desperate attempt to save the billions of years.

Peter warned Christians [2 Peter 2:5] that “there will be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in destructive heresies.” The teaching of evolutionary compromises is now endemic to most Christian colleges and certainly to society in general. In consequence, many churches are now dying or closed entirely while the former Christian culture – as in Europe or, say, in New England – has become almost entirely secular. The litmus test for choice of college or church hinges upon the universality of the Genesis Flood. When making inquiry at a prospective college or church, ask the question: “Was the Genesis Flood local or universal?” When the reply is “local,” then without further question it is certain that some form of evolutionary compromise requiring billions of years is being taught while the associated Scriptures are being reinterpreted to accommodate it.

Reference:

Scott, Donald E. 2006. *The Electric Sky*. Portland, Oregon. Mikamar Publishing.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

7. What color was Adam?

In western countries nearly every imaginative painting of Adam and Eve depict two adult Caucasians with fair skin and blue eyes. These images, even used as Bible illustrations, tend to shape the reader's mental image of the first man and woman. Sometimes the Sunday-school origin of the dark races is that they were descendants of Adam and Eve who had migrated to a hot climate where the suntan eventually became an inherited characteristic. These images and explanations discredit Christianity.

The true explanation began to be resolved in 1913 when it was shown that human beings carry two genes for color, while each gene consists of "black" or "white" alleles. One allele was received from the mother and the other from the father. The allele is part of the gene, and the gene is part of the DNA, while the DNA resides in the nucleus of every cell in our body. Our skin color is caused by the pigment melanin, and this is controlled by two pairs of genes that geneticists refer to using the letter designations **Aa** and **Bb**, where the capital letter represents dominant genes and the small letters represent recessive genes. Genes **A** and **B**, being dominant, produce melanin in good quantity while recessive genes **a** and **b** produce only a minor amount of melanin. Hence, our coloration depends upon the number of black and white alleles we received from our parents. The color genes express themselves in only one place, called the melanocytes that are specialized skin cells, and these produce granules of melanin that are delivered to neighboring cells.

Eve was made from Adam's rib; she was thus a clone of Adam [Genesis 2:21-22]. They would therefore have had identical genes for melanin production. If they were both **AABB** they would have been Negroid and produced children of only the darkest of Negroid coloration, while the world's population today would be entirely Negro. In fact, only about 10% of the world's population is Negro, so we can be certain that our first parents were not of the **AABB** combination. By a similar argument, if Adam and Eve had both been **aabb**, all their children would have been **aabb**, meaning that all their descendants would be the lightest Caucasoid possible – there would be no other colors.

Clearly, this is not the case, so by a process of deduction we can conclude that Adam and Eve were heterozygous, each having two dominant and two recessive genes, **AaBb**. They would thus have been middle-brown in color, and from them and in one generation all the various shades of brown would have been produced.

These color differences were likely amplified following the business at the Tower of Babel [Genesis 11:1-9] when the human gene pool was divided. Loss of genetic information in an isolated population is well known and a problem to breeders of pure-bred dogs and horses, etc. It seems that one population group that migrated from the Tower of Babel suffered a greater loss of the genetic information required to produce the melanin and became the Caucasians. The bottom line of this brief dissertation is that Adam was not white, nor black, but a good middle brown.

Reference

Harrub, B. and Bert Thompson. 2003. *The Truth About Human Origins*. Alabama: Apologetics Press, Inc. Pages 444-445.

8. Why did Adam have to name all the animals?

It was probably in the morning of the sixth day – that is, Friday of Earth’s first week – when God created Adam. God had spent the early part of that day overseeing the creation of the cattle, the beasts and the creeping things from the earth [Genesis 1:24-25]. God then formed man from the dust of the ground and put him in the Garden of Eden to tend and keep it” [Genesis 2:7, 8, 15]. After remarking that “it is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him”, God then brought “every beast of the field and bird of the air to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called each living creature that was its name ... But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him” [Genesis 2:18-20]. From the way these Scriptures read, some have suggested that God was offering Adam a “helper” from among the animal kingdom, but this is not at all the case. God was, in fact, teaching Adam a human language; some commentaries argue that it was Hebrew. The noun, the name of a person, place or thing, is the basic element of any language, and we all learned to speak beginning with the nouns, [e.g., mamma, papa, dog, etc.].

It takes the average young person immersed in a second language at least a year to be proficient in that language. However, Adam was created in perfection and this would include a perfect mind with total memory retention. So how long would it have taken Adam to learn a language of say 5,000 words? Recalling that “*every* beast of the field and bird of the air...”[Genesis 1:30] would include all those now extinct and involve many thousands of species. However, “species” is a unit of Man’s classification system, but the Scripture uses the word “kinds” where each kind would include several species. For example, fox, coyoté, fennec, wolf, jackal, colishé and domestic dog are each given different species names but can all interbreed and are thus all one “kind.” Therefore, during creation week, just the ancestral “kinds” were created, greatly reducing the numbers involved to perhaps a few thousand. In addition, Adam had the best of all possible teachers, and we might suggest it took him half a day to learn a language. That this is not impossible we cite as our example William Sidis

[1898-1944], an American born of Russian immigrants. Sidis could learn a language of 5,000 words and the grammar in a single day and, as an adult, he could speak over forty languages. Like the man born blind, from time to time there are such exceptional people today and, as Jesus explained, this is so that “the works of God can be revealed in him” [John 9:3].

So Friday looks like a very busy day for Adam; yet the day also had to accommodate the making of Eve. Interestingly, the Scripture speaks of the “creation of Adam” [Genesis 1:27; 2:19] but the “making of the Woman” [Genesis 2:22, 23] – she was named Eve by Adam after the Fall [Genesis 3:20]. Likely this is a reflection of the fact that the man was created from inanimate material and therefore required God’s spirit of life while “the Woman” was made from Adam’s living bone and tissue. Faced with the apparent difficulty of cramming all these activities into that busy first Friday, some of the early commentaries, such as *The Book of Jubilees*, have argued that Eve was made on the Friday of the following week. This, however, is believed to be an unnecessary expedient. We are told that everything God made was within the first six days [Genesis 1:31] and reminded of this in the fourth commandment: “For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth and all that is in them ...” [Exodus 20:11].

References

Charles, Robert Henry [translator]. 2005. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. Original publishers: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, N.Y. in 1917. Published 2005 by Ibis Press, Berwick, Maine, USA.

Sidis, William. Biography and photo-portrait given in Wikipedia.

9. How long were Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden?

Genesis chapter one provides the account of God's creation of the heavens and the earth, while at the end of that chapter the creation of man and woman is introduced. The second chapter is more specific about the man now named Adam, while at the end of that chapter some details are given about the making of Woman, later called Eve. As the reader passes from chapter two to chapter three, we find in the very first verse Eve being tempted by the serpent at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The reader is inclined to think that the passage of time has been extremely short, say a day or two, a month at most. After all, it is commonly argued, there were no children, and Eve could not even have been pregnant or there would have been more than two souls involved in the business at the tree. However, Scripture does not say how long they were in the Garden, but there are reasons for thinking that it was possibly several years and a lot longer than that before there were children.

Surely everyone has seen artists' impressions done in ink or oils of Adam and Eve in the Garden. Adam is always Caucasian, tall and muscular, sometimes with a full beard, while Eve, though modest, is definitely not immature. These images unconsciously tend to color our interpretation of the text. Consider for a moment Adam created as a dark, pre-pubescent youth of say, 12 years of age. Perfect in mind and body and living in a totally safe environment, Adam had much to learn from the Lord God as they walked in the cool of the day [Genesis 3:8]. Adam had to begin the human language by naming the animals. Adam had to know the signs and the seasons – essential later for planting crops. Adam had to know the star constellations and the message they proclaim; he had to know what was good to eat and what was good for medicine and, as a potential parent, he had to know how to handle the complex issues relating to children going through puberty. Finally, it may be significant that the last Adam began His ministry at 12 years of age [Luke 2:42].

While not inspired, *The Book of Jubilees* was written in the second century BC and claims that Adam and Eve were in the

Garden for seven years [pp. 46-48]. If they entered the Garden with the appearance of being 12 years of age as suggested above, it poses the following scene: We have two nubile teenagers, naked and in an earthly paradise with God's first commandment "to be fruitful and multiply" ringing in their ears [Genesis 1:28]. After seven years, why were there no children and Eve not even pregnant? A similar question was asked by St. Augustine of Hippo. The answer seemingly resides in the extreme longevity of pre-flood mankind. From the record in Genesis chapter five, we can deduce that the average longevity of the father [Enoch excluded] was 907 years, while the average age of the father for his first or principal son was 117 years. *The Book of Jubilees* [p. 51] maintains that Eve was aged between 64 and 70 years when she gave birth to her first child, Cain. Surely, the Genesis record is telling us that not only did people live much longer in that pre-flood world but they also matured correspondingly much later.

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 12 and 14.

References

Charles, Robert Henry [translator]. 2005. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. Original publishers: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, N.Y. in 1917. Published 2005 by Ibis Press, Berwick, Maine, USA.

10. Did dinosaurs live in the Garden of Eden?

The dinosaurs and all the other animals, but not the great sea creatures or the birds, were created in the early morning of the sixth day of Earth's first week [Genesis 1:24-25]. The word "dinosaur" immediately brings to mind a fearsome *T. rex* or a mega-ton diplodocus, but those first created on the sixth day did not have to be fully grown. The dinosaurs were part of the reptile family, and fossil discoveries have shown that they hatched from eggs; thus, they were initially about the size of a puppy. Nevertheless, like every other created creature, they arrived with the appearance of age and need not have been larger than, say, a sheepdog. As reptiles, they would have grown slowly and could have lived even beyond the ages of the patriarchs in that pre-flood age. For example, some of those created on the sixth day may even have survived longer and died in the Genesis Flood.

Just an hour or so after the creation of the dinosaurs, Adam was created necessarily with the appearance of age; possibly, about twelve years [See Question 9]. Eve was not created but made] after the creation of Adam as the very last item of God's work. Reasonably, she had the same apparent age as Adam – she was, after all, his twin. Later, God took Adam and Eve and put them in the beautiful Garden of Eden to "tend and keep it" [Genesis 2:15]. Living in this perfect environment there was no danger to these children whose only duty was to learn from the very best teacher.

Finally, described as the "Garden" of Eden, we may tend to think of it being about the size of the average backyard, but the brief description given of it [Genesis 2:8-14] includes a major river sufficiently large to divide into four other rivers. The "Garden" is thus better thought of as a small but beautiful country with very large natural springs or even a mountain as the source of all the water.

Adam had been commanded to have dominion over the fish, the birds and the animals [Genesis 1:28], but he had not been given permission to kill and eat them. Under these circumstances and

certainly in the Garden of Eden, the animals were likely quite harmless to their human neighbors. Permission for man to eat the flesh of birds, beasts and fish for food – but not the blood – was given to Noah by God after the Great Flood. When Noah left the ark he built an altar to the Lord. Then God blessed him and said: “And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be on every beast of the earth, on every bird of the air, on all that move on the earth and on all the fish of the sea. Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you” [Genesis 9:2-3]. With the exception of a few domesticated species, the animal kingdom still has the fear and dread of man.

In summary, then, it seems possible that there could well have been dinosaurs in the Garden of Eden, although, like the other animals, they were most likely small, young and friendly.

11. Why did God curse the ground and not Adam?

The account of the creation of the universe, the Earth, and the first human couple is given as a brief overview in the first chapter of Genesis. The second chapter provides more details about the creation of Adam and the making of his “helper,” later named Eve. The second chapter also introduces the first commandment to Adam: “... of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat” [Genesis 2:17]. Chapter three concerns the temptation of the couple at the tree by Satan through the agency of the serpent. The same chapter relates their refusal to seek forgiveness when challenged and the curses placed upon each party by God. God placed the first curse upon the serpent who had permitted his body to be used by Satan [Genesis 3:14-15]. God then imposed a curse upon the woman – that we will attempt to explain in Question 12 – and finally, God did not curse Adam but instead “cursed the ground for your [Adam’s] sake” [Genesis 3:17-19]. Why did God curse the ground and not curse Adam directly?

Genesis chapter nine provides the clue in the account of Noah’s curse upon his grandson Canaan [Genesis 9: 20-27]. The chapter tells us that Noah made wine and became drunk and, overheated, he removed his clothes and fell asleep in his tent. Noah’s son Ham, the father of Canaan, regarded the sight of his drunken father an object of ridicule and told his brothers. They reverently averted their eyes and covered the naked and sleeping Noah. When Noah discovered what had happened, he cursed not Ham, the culprit, but Ham’s son Canaan, the innocent. The principle here is that a wicked son reflects a poor father who has failed to provide the appropriate discipline. The principle is found again in 1 Kings 11:11-12 where God defers the punishment for Solomon because it would reflect upon his father, David. But in Adam’s case his father was God Himself and, in a very real sense, the ground was his mother. By cursing the ground, God thus prevented any adverse suspicions from falling upon Himself but rather

directed them upon “Mother earth.” However, there was an even more profound reason for cursing the ground.

Adam was created in perfection and destined to live forever. So far, only God is immortal and, while Adam was destined to live forever, the location was not specified! Moreover, to this point everything Adam ate was also perfect, since it grew from the perfect ground. However, following the curse, perfection was ruined and every living thing – including plants, animals and mankind – slowly changed, cell by living cell, from eternal to mortal [i.e., subject to death]. To this day, every descendant of Adam is born to one day die. This life would otherwise be a meaningless existence except for the fact that God has provided not only a way of forgiving the inherited sin of Adam, but also the possibility of inheriting immortality.

Finally, there are two other relevant observations that may be added to this brief commentary. The first concerns Adam’s curse. Matthew 14:19 tells us that Jesus blessed the loaves and fishes, and they multiplied. Does blessing our food, produced from the cursed ground, remove the effects of the curse and even cause it to multiply in its effective nutritive value for us? The second observation concerns Noah’s drunkenness. Noah was a righteous man, and we presume that he never previously drank to excess. So is Genesis 9:20-21 telling us that the environment had changed after the Flood? The Swiss take delight in the fact that the effect of alcohol is far greater on the unwary tourist when he is taken to a mountain-top hotel! Noah had to have grown his vine in a sheltered valley to produce the wine but quite likely consumed it in his home in the Ark upon Mt. Ararat – today, 17,000 ft. at its peak.

Recommended reading in this series:

Question 12.

12. What was the curse placed upon Eve?

Genesis chapter three begins with the temptation of Eve at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Before God made [not created] the woman later called Eve, He had commanded Adam not to eat the fruit of this tree [Genesis 2:16-17]. During the time that they were in the Garden [see Question 9] Adam would surely have conveyed this warning about “the tree” to Eve. It would appear, then, that during Eve’s temptation [3:1] Adam was near at hand but did not hear her conversation with the serpent. If he had heard the conversation, he would certainly have heard Eve’s addition to God’s Word: “nor shall you touch it” [3:3]. Nevertheless, Eve took the fruit and ate it, an act that was not only disobedient to Adam but disobedient to God. Adam came to Eve’s side, and she offered him one of the fruits. It was at this moment that Adam – seized with doubt, unbelief and pride – resolved to join her [3:6]. For the first time in their short lives these two naked “teen-age twins” had a sense of guilt, while this new emotion triggered feelings of shame and a need to “cover-up” [3:7]. God’s actions that followed included the introduction of the sacrifice of atonement for sin given cryptically in 3:20.

It was evidently the Lord’s habit to walk in the garden in the cool of the day, and this time He offered the guilty pair an opportunity to confess their disobedience and ask for forgiveness. Pride did not permit them to do so, and God had little choice but to first curse the serpent, then Eve, and finally, the ground for Adam’s sake [3:14-19]. Many commentaries argue that the curse placed upon the serpent caused him to lose his brilliant colors and his legs so he had to slither “on his belly and eat dust” [3:14]. This was intended as the uttermost degradation imposed upon what had been a very proud creature. Adam’s curse has been addressed in Question 11, and we now come to the curse placed upon Eve.

The curse is given in Genesis 3:16: “I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception ...” However, the Hebrew word for “conception” is HERON, and it has been shown that while Scripture uses the word only once, it has the pointing: HER’ON. Scholars say that the meaning in this case is “capable of conception.” In other words, the frequency of her menstrual cycle

was multiplied from, say, once every seven years to once every 28 days – this is surely a curse and, indeed, it is called exactly by that name in some English-speaking countries even today.

Recalling that Eve was made to be Adam’s “helper comparable to him” [2:18], she was also the means by which Adam could continue his race [i.e., “the mother of all living” (3:20)]. We will see in Question 14 that the number of Eve’s children during her long period of fecundity was quite reasonably over fifty, and in each case she probably endured the pain of childbirth as women still do today and just as God had promised. The final part of the curse God imposed upon Eve was: “Your desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you” [3:16]. In the first place, husband and wife are expected to work together in harmony, while in the case of final decisions, there can only be one captain to the boat, and Eve was to be obedient to Adam. Gentlemen are reminded that having authority means taking responsibility!

Recommended reading in this series:

Questions 9, 11 and 14.

13. Did Adam really live for 930 years?

Genesis chapters 5, 9, 11, 25, 35, 47 and 50 contain all the essential genealogies for the beginnings of the human family. From Adam through to Moses, we are told who was related to whom, the age of the father at the birth of the principal [first] son and the age of these individuals when they died. In this way, and without using calendar dates, we are told not only who was contemporary with whom but we can learn something about mankind's changing physiology.

In the first place, death was not part of God's creation. Adam was created to be eternal and not, as mistakenly claimed, immortal because: "He who is ... King of kings and Lord of lords *who alone has immortality*" [1 Timothy 6:15-16]. God placed Adam in the Garden of Eden and, on that first Friday, invited him to eat the fruit of any tree except "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil ... for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die" [Genesis 2:15-17]. Neither Adam nor Eve died on the day they ate the forbidden fruit, but rather Scripture records that Adam died at the age of 930 years [Genesis 5:5]. The traditional explanation is an appeal to 2 Peter 3:8: "With the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." None of the pre-flood patriarchs lived more than a thousand years – thus, they all died within one of God's "days."

Following Adam and Eve's Fall, God's punishment for Adam was to "curse the ground for your sake" [Genesis 3:17]; everything that Adam and Mankind has since eaten has come from the cursed ground. The immediate effect on Adam, and every other living thing, was to slowly change every body-cell from eternal to mortal. Death was thereby introduced for plants, animals and Man. Each mortal cell in our body grows and is then replaced at a definite rate. The rate of replacement depends upon the particular organ. For example, cells in the human brain are replaced every few decades, while the cells on the tongue are replaced every day. The number of times cells can be replaced is pre-programmed and thus effectively determines our life-span or longevity. In Adam's pre-Flood world, the average longevity of man, excluding Enoch, was 907 years. After the Flood, the

longevity of man steadily decreased, while the record stops at Moses who died at 120 years [Deuteronomy. 34:7].

Is it credible that any biological thing could have lived for almost a thousand years? While this may be difficult to prove in the case of man and those of the animal kingdom, there are plenty of examples from the plant kingdom and these are still alive today [e.g., Giant sequoia trees of California and the Bristlecone Pines]. Wikipedia lists thirteen trees alive today over 2,000 years old, while the oldest – a bristlecone Pine in California – is 4,800 years old.

14. How many were Adam's and Eve's children?

The early chapters of the Book of Genesis are concerned with the origin of the Earth and all life, including Man. The Author's intention is seemingly to present the grand picture first, then add certain details throughout the rest of Scripture; this is called Progressive Revelation. All we are told about Adam's offspring is that the first son was named Cain, the second son named Abel [Genesis 4:1-2], another son named Seth was born when Adam was 130 years old and after that he "begot sons and daughters" [Genesis 5:3-4]. This same passage also tells us that Adam lived for 930 years [5:5]. Therefore, in addition to Cain, Abel and Seth, Adam must have had a minimum of two other sons and two daughters indicated by the plural, giving a total of seven children. However, accepting that Adam, and likely Eve, lived for 930 years, seven children would only be the minimum number.

Genesis chapter five gives the genealogies of the descendants of Adam, where we are simply given the father's name, his age when he "begot" the first son and the total number of years he lived. With the exception of Enoch, all these pre-flood descendants of Adam lived a minimum of 777 years, while most were over 900 years. In each instance, the record simply gives the name of the first son, then adds, "... and begot sons and daughters." With these words, the minimum number of children per family then becomes five. But what was the likely total number? Living over 900 years means living ten times longer than we do today. Accepting that the female period of fecundity today occurs between ages 13 to 48 years – say, 35 years – then the corresponding period in that pre-flood age would be 350 years. At a rate of only one child every seven years, this would result in about 50 children for Adam's immediate family. In his *City of God*, Saint Augustine thought it incredible that men would abstain from sexual intercourse for a hundred years or more for the first son and suggested that puberty occurred much later in life [p. 498]. Indeed, other writers before Augustine indicate that must surely have been the case, and this has been suggested in Question 9.

Although not having the authority of inspired Scripture, *The Book of Jubilees*, written in the second century BC, claims that Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Eden seven years [p. 49]. Eve gave birth to her first child, Cain, between the ages of 64-70, or the same numbers as the age of the earth, *anno mundi*. Eve's second child, Abel, was born seven years later, between the years 71-77 *anno mundi* [p. 51]. The total number of Adam's children is not given in this work; however, it is found as a footnote in *The Works of Josephus* where it states: "The number of Adam's children, as says the old tradition, was 33 sons and 23 daughters" [p. 27]. In view of their pre-flood longevity, these appear to be reasonable figures with seven years between each child. Finally, it would have to be said that sinners though they were, Adam and Eve had faithfully obeyed God's first commission: "to be fruitful and multiply ..." [Genesis 1:28].

References

- Dods, Marcus [translator] 1950. *The City of God* [*De civitate Dei* written A.D. 413-426 by St. Augustine of Hippo, 354-430]. N.Y.: The Modern Library. Book XV, section 15.
- Charles, Robert Henry [translator]. 2005. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. Original publishers: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, N.Y. in 1917. Published 2005 by Ibis Press, Berwick, Maine.
- Whiston, William [translator] 1804. *The Works of Josephus*. [Written A.D. 93 by Flavius Josephus]. Published 1985 by Hendrickson Pub.: Book 1, Chapter 2, verse 3, footnote.

15. Did Adam and Eve’s children practice incest?

The Genesis account of Creation provides Mankind with just the bare facts we need to know about our origin; further facts are revealed progressively throughout Scripture. Since Eve was made from a rib-bone of Adam [Genesis 2:21-22], she would have been a genetic clone of Adam and, had there been any genetic mutation in Adam, this would have been reproduced in Eve and expressed in their offspring. However, the creation account then concludes with: “Then God saw everything that He had made and indeed it was very good” [Genesis 1:31] so we can be sure there were no mutations.

The very first commandment given to Adam and Eve was “to be fruitful and multiply” [Genesis 1:28]. However, the business at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil took place long before there were any children. The account then continues where God confronted the guilty pair at the tree, but they did not confess their guilt or plead for forgiveness [Genesis 3:1-13]. God then cursed the serpent, imposed reproductive difficulties upon Eve and “cursed the ground for [Adam’s] sake” [Genesis 3:17]. From that moment, everything that Adam – and Mankind since – ate has grown in the cursed ground. Cell by living cell Adam began to very slowly change from his initial state of eternal perfection to mortal imperfection, and he finally died at the age of 930 years [Genesis 5:5]. Nevertheless, Adam and Eve’s immediate offspring would have been very close to physical perfection while brother/sister marriages were the only unions possible!

Further, according to the genealogies given in Scripture, pre-flood longevity was about the same as that for Adam so that families were very large compared to those of today. Brother/sister unions were therefore not only unavoidable but undoubtedly became traditional and expected.

Following the Genesis Flood, other sources of genetic defects – such as harmful radiation – were also imposed upon Mankind until almost nine-hundred years after the Flood. At this point God gave Moses a list of near-relatives, including brother and

sister, who were forbidden to marry [Leviticus chapter 18]. The leaders of many ancient nations had always married their eldest sister as first wife to ensure the kingdom stayed in the family. For example, Pharaoh Akhnaton [reigned 1379-1362 BC] had been the product of such a union and from his preserved image he is recognized as having been genetically deformed. Over three thousand years later Charles Darwin married his first cousin and had ten children, three of whom suffered very early deaths. The cause was most likely a case of expressed defective genes and nicely confirmed Darwin's own dictum of the "survival of the fittest." First-cousin marriages have long since been declared illegal in England.

Today, we all carry those mutated genes, and when two people marry who by chance have the same defective gene, that gene will be expressed in their offspring. The chances are increased enormously when the married couple is closely related, especially when brother and sister.

16. Why did Cain kill his brother Abel?

God created Adam and Eve on the same day; thus, they were the same age. Following their disobedience and Fall, God cursed the serpent, placed a curse on Eve and cursed the ground for Adam's sake [Genesis 3:14-19]. While they were still in the Garden, we are then given the cryptic words: "For Adam and his wife the Lord God made tunics of skin, and clothed them" [Genesis 3:21]. "Tunics of skin" tells us that a lamb or a goat was killed and, while unstated, what else could this mean except that God instructed Adam in the matter of the atonement sacrifice? The skins were to "cover their shame." Adam thus became the priest of the family, and this has always been the birthright of the eldest son – that is, the first-born son who enjoyed the "double-portion" blessings.

The Genesis account is very brief, and details are only revealed as we progress through the rest of Scripture. Now in exile from the Garden of Eden, Eve conceived and bore Cain, then conceived again and bore Abel [Genesis 4:1-2]. The brevity of the narrative tends to collapse the time frame of these events in our thinking. However, while not inspired, the apocrypha claims that Adam and Eve were in the Garden for seven years while Eve was in her late sixties when Cain was born; Abel was born seven years later. The Genesis account continues: "... Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground and Cain brought an offering of the fruit of the ground to the Lord [while] Abel also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat. And the Lord respected Abel and his offering but He did not respect Cain ... and Cain was very angry" [Genesis 4:2-5].

Adam, the priest of the family, had evidently appointed the tasks for his sons. Cain, the first son, evidently had little interest in the priesthood or understanding of the atonement sacrifice, and Adam had given him the harder task, working in the sweat of his face amid the thorns and thistles tilling the ground [Genesis 3:17-19]. His younger brother, Abel, was given the task of looking after the sheep for his father's sacrifices. The situation was similar to that of young David [1 Samuel 17:28]. A rising resentment in Cain's mind against Abel eventually turned to

murder and, when confronted by God, denial and anger that led to Cain's exile. Scripture provides the reason for the murder: "Cain who was of that wicked one, and killed his brother ... because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous" [1 John 3:12]. The "evil" in this case was a careless attitude towards God.

The plain reading of Scripture tells us that Abel's death was the first human death and would have a greater shock to Adam than we might suppose. One aspect would have been that there was now no suitable man to continue Adam's priesthood. At the time, Adam had no idea of his longevity and could not know if there would be another child to replace Abel. Therefore, Adam had once more to go about the tedious business with Eve of siring another child that would, hopefully, be male.

Following Abel's death, "Adam knew his wife again and she bore him a son and named him Seth, 'For God has appointed another seed for me instead of Abel, whom Cain killed'" [Genesis 4:25]. In Adam's genealogy we are told that Adam was 130 years old when he begot Seth [Genesis 5:3], so that Cain was a "mere youth" of little more than sixty years when he was sent into exile.

Recommended reading in this series:
Questions 14 and 17.

17. Who was Cain's wife?

Cain was Adam and Eve's first son [Genesis 4:1], and as he grew it became evident to his father that Cain's interests were more earthly than heavenly. Adam, the priest of the family, gave Cain the task of "tilling the ground" to provide vegetables for the only human beings on Earth. In the meantime, a second son, Abel, had been born, and he was given the task of looking after his father's sheep. The sheep [or goats, since they are related] were not used for food but used by their father, Adam, for the atonement sacrifice, while their skins were used for making clothes. Sheep or goat's milk may have been used to make cheese, but it would be sixteen centuries before God would give Noah permission to eat meat [Genesis 9:2-4]. Cain became jealous of Abel, murdered him in the field and was confronted by God. Cain denied the crime, God cursed him, then sent him into exile to live in the land of Nod [Genesis 4:3-16]. The very next verse [v. 17] declares, "And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch. And he built a city ..."

In order to find out who was Cain's wife, we begin with Scripture as the primary source, then search the non-inspired apocryphal literature for other clues and make a judgment. In those early days, Man lived almost a thousand years [e.g., Adam lived to 930 years, Genesis 5:5]. Consequently, Man matured much more slowly, as we have seen from the age of the fathers at the birth of their first son. Adam and Eve were, of course, the same age and, according to *The Book of Jubilees*, Eve gave birth to Cain in her late sixties [in round numbers say, 70], then Abel was born seven years later [when Eve was 77]. From Genesis 5:3, Adam was 130 years old when Seth was born, leaving 53 years [$130 - 77 = 53$] between Abel and Seth for other children to be born. The data in *The Book of Jubilees* shows that Eve had one birth every seven years during her period of fecundity so that it was possible for her to have had seven other children [$53 \div 7 = 7$] between Abel and Seth. The fact that this was not mentioned and their names not given in Scripture indicates that they were probably females. So it is entirely possible that Cain, now about sixty, would have chosen his nearest sister who would have been 46 years old [$130 - (77 + 7) = 46$] years old and not yet mature.

According to *The Book of Jubilees*, her name was Awan meaning “iniquity.”

Recommended reading in this series:

Question 9.

References

Charles, Robert Henry [translator]. 2005. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. Original publishers: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, N.Y. in 1917. Published 2005 by Ibis Press, Berwick, Maine, USA.

18. What is wrong with Michelangelo's Creation of Adam?

Michelangelo's fourth panel on the famous Sistine Chapel ceiling is the well-known depiction of God creating Adam. The Adam figure has his left arm raised, reaching to touch the forefinger of God's out-stretched right hand. The moment is supposedly when God infused His just-created figure of Man with the spirit of life. However, this does not follow the account of the creation of Adam as given in Scripture: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and *breathed into his nostrils* the breath of life; and man became a living being" [Genesis 2:7]. Nevertheless, the two forefingers almost touching on a background of blue sky has now become an icon of creation and is even used in this manner by Christian ministries! The significance of this may be understood by the interpretation long given to this image by the Jesuit teaching arm of the Roman Catholic Church. They have generally taught that the Adam figure in this painting is actually a pre-Adamic anthropoid or higher ape at the moment of being infused with the soul of man! While Michelangelo was influenced by Neoplatonism in his early life, it is highly unlikely that this evolutionary interpretation of the creation of Adam would have been Michelangelo's intention.

Michelangelo Buonarroti [1475-1564] was born into a poor Italian Catholic family and had only three years of schooling where he learned to read Italian. The only Bible available to Catholics in those days was the Latin Vulgate, and Michelangelo could not read this. He quickly became a very successful artisan and began his heroic work on the Sistine Chapel ceiling in 1508 at the age of 33. Working 68 feet above the marble mosaic floor of the Sistine Chapel, Michelangelo had it completed four exhausting years later. However, throughout this time, none of the clergy could see what was being done on the other side of the scaffolding that supported the artist and the tubs of wet plaster.

As famous as it is, Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel fresco contains a number of errors. For example, there are two anachronisms. In the first panel, Michaelangelo has the sun, moon and stars created on the first day, not the fourth day. In the seventh panel, here the

sacrifice of Noah takes place before the Flood instead of after the Flood [Genesis 8:20-22]. There are several other errors in his enormous output of work, albeit they were unlikely to have been intentional. For example, the famous life-size Pieta [1499], carved from one solid block of marble when he was only 24, shows the dead Christ in the arms of his proportionately oversized mother and maidenly-looking mother. While this is a reflection of the Catholic teaching, more serious is the Christ figure. Here the spear incision appears on the traditional right-hand side of the body rather than the obvious left where the Roman soldier had speared the heart to ensure death [John 15:34]. However, more subtle are the fully inflated veins, indicating a still-functioning heart. Both features cast doubt on the death of Christ and follow the prediction given in Matthew 28:11-15. A more obvious anatomical error appears in Michelangelo's huge 1504 sculpture of the naked David who is clearly a Greek rather than a Jew.

In the later part of his life, Michelangelo appears to have given up Neoplatonism, while his written poetry expresses a genuine love for Christ. He may even have embraced the Christian faith. Nevertheless, Christians should avoid using reproductions of his unscriptural works – particularly those from the Sistine Chapel ceiling. By very subtle means this popular image promotes the possibility of evolution in at least two major ways. First, creation of the sun on the first day permits at least that day to be greater than 24-hours, inviting millions of years and the acceptance of the pre-adamic world theory. Secondly, and more obvious, the “Creation of Adam” scene promotes the belief in man's evolution from the ape.

19. Have remains of human giants been discovered?

The Book of Genesis is careful to show that the events described are given in historical order. Further, while calendar dates are not given, the ages of the principal characters are instead recorded so that the reader can get a reasonable grasp of the time-line. The King James translation of Genesis 6:4 speaks of there being “giants” in the earth before Noah’s Flood: “There were giants [NEPHILIM]” in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.” Then, about a thousand years after the Genesis Flood when the Israelites had sent spies into the promised land, they reported: “And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, who come of the giants [NEPHILIM];” [Numbers 13:33]. The early Scofield edition promoted an old theory that fallen angels had become incarnate and were polluting the human gene pool to prevent the coming of the Messiah. However, the more scholarly Bible commentary by Keil and Delitsch spends eleven tightly-argued pages to show that the theory is not valid. In the meantime, Scofield’s 1967 edition now downplays this theory, but the Dake Annotated Bible continues to promote it vigorously. The following accounts are some of the means by which the old “giant theory” has been kept alive.

Medieval churches often had fossil bones on display purporting to be part of some ancient giant and in this way sustain belief among their congregation that there were “giants” of long ago. In the late 1700s in England, a living giant appeared known as “The Irish Giant,” while in 1869 in Cardiff, New York, a fossil giant was dug up and given the name “The Cardiff Giant.” Both were used and are still sometimes used by Christians to support their belief in the old misinterpretation. The following are the facts:

Charles Byrne was born in Littlebridge, Ireland, in 1761. By the time he was 20, he had grown so tall that he came to the attention of a showman, Joe Vance. Vance took him to Edinburgh, where he was able to light his pipe at the then new street lamps. Promotional advertising often claimed the “Irish giant” was

thirteen feet tall. At this time, two other claimants to the title “giant” were made by men who also happened to be from Ireland, so that there were now three “Irish Giants”! Charles Byrne fell into bad company, drank very heavily and finally died in his twenty-second year [1783]. Fortunately for our account, his body was quickly acquired by surgeon John Hunter, and Byrne’s skeleton is one of the prized possessions of the Royal College of Surgeons of England. In 1909, Dr. Harvey Cushing was able to determine the correct etiology of Byrne’s abnormal growth and, vital for our story, we have an exact measure of the Irish Giant’s actual height. It is seven feet, seven inches, meaning he was no more that seven feet, ten inches in life. And the Cardiff Giant? It was a ten-and-a-half-foot piece of carved stone, a pure fake that for a short time made one promoter a little money!

References

Bonderson, Jan. 1997. *A Cabinet of Medical Curiosities*.
NY.: Cornell University Press. Pages 90, 193.

20. Has Mankind evolved or devolved?

Has Mankind evolved upward from the ape, or has he fallen from some higher state? In our computer-conscious world, we might become convinced that we are indeed evolving to “supermen.” Idealists such as Friedrich Nietzsche and Adolf Hitler thought as such. However, both Scripture and the historical facts show that far from evolving ever upward Mankind is “devolving” both physically and mentally.

According to Genesis 1:31, God declared that everything He had created was “very good,” and we can reasonably assume that prior to their Fall Adam and Eve were each perfect in mind and body. They were, in fact, created to live forever since death had not yet entered God’s creation. However, after the business at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, God cursed the ground and thereafter Adam and Eve became mortals – that is, subject to death. The Genesis record shows that Adam and his extended family lived ten times longer than anyone today [Genesis chapter 5]. We are told Adam lived for 930 years [Genesis 5:5], and just this fact indicates that he and others of that pre-flood age must have been in exceptionally good physical shape. Following the Genesis Flood, the biblical record shows that man’s longevity decreased to 120 years [Deuteronomy 34:7]. Today, it is only the very exceptional person who makes it to 120 years, while no one seems to exceed it. Indeed, those exceptional cases are likely to become even more exceptional because the human gene pool is accumulating genetic defects or mutations at an alarming rate.

What about the mental abilities of those antediluvians? Genesis chapter five describes the activities of Cain’s family. By the seventh generation, only 500 years after the creation of Adam, Jubal had developed the harp and the flute, while his half-brother, Tubal-Cain, was working with bronze and iron! In the first place, with the possible exception of mercury and gold, they had never seen metals before, much less did they know what ores to mine and how to extract them. In the case of extracting iron, this meant: Locate a certain ore deposit, extract it, mix in the right proportions with limestone and coal, then heat to an extremely high temperature with forced air. Bronze requires two ores and

lower temperatures, but the chemistry is more complicated. These achievements could not have been made by a long series of “evolutionary accidents” over the years with no end view in sight. Clearly, either these half-brothers or, perhaps Adam, had been instructed by a Higher Intelligence. In other words, they had to know beforehand what they were trying to achieve. The obvious fact that they were successful means that they, too, were intelligent but there must have been a Higher Intelligence to tell them in the first place.. Many today would argue that the Higher Intelligence was indeed God Himself Who also gave us His Word to answer those three eternal questions: Where did we come from? Why are we here? and Where are we going?

The historical evidence also indicates that Man in the most ancient civilizations was a lot smarter than textbooks lead us to believe. For example, we still have no idea how or even why the ancient Egyptians built their pyramids. The armchair critic may scoff at the rough-cut packing stones that today form the outside of the pyramids but is silenced when faced with the precision of the much larger cut-to-fit stones on the inside. Finally, there is the historical fact that when members of a tribe who had the skills to produce crops, clothing and metal tools were killed in internecine warfare, those who remained were quickly reduced to naked barbarism. Such was the state of the American Indian and the African when discovered and seemingly gave evidence for Man’s evolution.

21. Where did our moon come from?

In 1848 Édouard Roche [1820-1883] at the Paris Observatory wrote a paper that became known as The Roche Limit. It is still valid today and is defined as the distance between a planet's center and its satellite within which the satellite cannot approach [or leave] the planet without becoming broken up. This is caused by the difference in gravitational attraction that produces tension between the far-side and the near-side of the smaller satellite. Three theories have been proposed for the origin of the moon:

1] The Fission or Break-Away Theory. Proposed in 1879 by George Darwin, son of Charles Darwin, this theory says that very early in Earth's history the moon had spun off from the rapidly spinning molten earth. There were several difficulties with the theory, but principally the molten moon would necessarily have had to pass through the Roche Limit and, like water from a garden hose, would have broken up into smaller "droplets." George Darwin should have known this, yet, although officially rejected, the theory is still trotted out to students.

2] The Capture Theory. Introduced in the light of deficiencies with Darwin's Fission Theory, the Capture Theory argues that as it wandered through the solar system, the moon was captured by the Earth's gravitational field. Of course, this only removes the problem of the lunar origin beyond man's reach for it.

3] The Nebular or Condensation Theory. Proposed in 1951, this theory calls for an independent accretion/growth of the Earth and moon from dust and gases in the same region of space. That is, gases in space are said to condense first from a nebula and then eventually into a dense body. We might be reminded that this same explanation is offered today for the evolution of stars of which our sun is one. However, it is openly admitted that this theory is highly unlikely because the conditions must be so precisely balanced.

On July 21, 1969, part of the Apollo 11 program was to place a box of mirrors on a flat surface of the moon for the laser-ranging experiments. A large telescope on earth was aimed at the mirrors,

a pulse of laser light sent out and the time interval between leaving and returning gave a measure of the distance between the Earth and the moon. That distance was obtained to within a few centimeters, and the measured result is that the moon is steadily drifting away from the Earth by four centimeters – almost two inches – per year. In 1982, just over a century after Darwin's Break-Away Theory, Stephenson concluded that at this rate of separation from the Earth, the initial break-away took place less than one billion years ago. Once again, the subsequent effect of the Roche Limit has been overlooked but worse is the one billion years. According to every textbook, the Earth is 4.5 billion years old, so that one billion years ago the Earth would not have been spinning so rapidly and would also be solid so that nothing would spin off and become the moon!

The origin of our moon, and every other moon in our planetary system, is a total and confessed mystery to those who attempt to ascribe it to evolution. While no man was there to witness the origin of the moon, the Creator of every celestial body in the universe was there and has left us with His description to accept or reject. According to Scripture, the moon was created just three days after the Earth [Genesis 1:1, 16-19] and only a few thousand years ago.

References

Stephenson, R. 1982. *Scientific American*. Pub: San Francisco, Vol. 247 [October] p. 173.

22. Is the light from distant stars proof for millions of years?

One of the prime evidences claimed for an old universe and, by implication, an old Earth is that light from the most distant stars can be observed on Earth today. It is argued that at the known speed or velocity of light it will have taken a great deal longer than say, 6,000 years, for it to have traveled from the distant stars to Earth. There is an inherent assumption in this seemingly rational argument that flies in the face of real science. There are a few well established laws of physics agreed to by every scientist including astrophysicists. Of these laws, the Second Law of Thermodynamics states that everything in the known universe is slowing down or going to a state of lower energy. Put another way, everything known about the Earth and the universe is running downhill, e.g., a common experience is that our cars rust and wear out. In contrast, evolution is a theory far removed from yet becoming a Law, but it assumes that the velocity of light is and always has been the same [i.e., it is constant]. So is the velocity of light really constant and are all the other related physical constants also constant? The answer is no.

The velocity of light was first determined in 1675 when measurements were made using the eclipses of Jupiter's moons. Other, more refined, methods have been employed since 1874, and between that date and this there is a statistically significant but small decrease in velocity. Interestingly, all the other related physical constants are also changing – either increasing or decreasing very slightly according to their relationship to the velocity of light. Furthermore, velocity with respect to time is a hyperbolic function. In the case of light, this means that at Creation the velocity was extremely high, and it then began fall – very rapidly at first, then, as time progressed, becoming less rapid. Today, it is virtually constant, i.e., the curve has become almost horizontal.

We may ask what caused the light from distant stars to lose their velocity? Dr. Russ Humphries has proposed a most interesting theory that is well supported by Scripture. Referring to the very early stages of Creation, the following Scriptures all speak about

God “stretching out the heavens”: Job 9:8, Psalm 104:2, Isaiah 40:22, Isaiah 42:5, Isaiah 44:24, Isaiah 45:12, Jeremiah 10:12 and Zechariah 12:1. In their contexts, these passages are not just hyperbole. Moreover, God claims that He stretched out the heavens “all alone ... by Myself” [Isaiah 44:24]. In other words, there was no second “God” to hold one end! We have to admit that our vision of God is often far too small.

From the biblical viewpoint, the light from the most distant stars probably reached the Garden of Eden within a few days of creation. In other words, Adam’s night sky became brighter progressively until it reached the grandeur seen today on a cloudless night in the dry deserts of Egypt. To anyone having experienced this sight, it is still as difficult to express the awe and wonder of the mighty God Who created this universe in the first place and recall that it has been there to proclaim His glory since the creation of Man.

References

Humphreys, Russell. 2001. *Starlight and Time*. New Leaf Press.

23. Can the millions of years demanded by geology be refuted?

The belief in evolution demands the concomitant beliefs that the Earth is billions of years old and that the Genesis Flood was local. The arguments used to claim these unimaginable eras of time are based upon early geological speculations of the history of the Earth; they are seldom, if ever, made clear even to students of geology. Seventeenth century observers noted that layers of similar types of rock [facies] could be traced continuously from country to country across Europe. These rocks were correctly perceived to consist of sediments deposited from flood waters. Further, the sediments contained the remains of once-living marine creatures and, less often, of land creatures. In the nineteenth century no one knew the actual extent of those sedimentary layers, but it was certain that local rivers could not have provided all the flood water – the sea was the only possible source. Further, it was argued that the sediments resulted from sequential floods, i.e., they were deposited one after another from multiple inundations from the sea. However, for sea water to cover the land, either the sea waters rose or the land sank. Those offended by the biblical account of Noah and his Ark concluded that it was the land that sank, because rising sea waters would eventually make any flood global. A major problem is that to this day, no one knows what possible mechanism or evidence there is for sinking and rising continents! Volcanoes cause very small and local vertical movements.

The evolution of terrestrial life forms supposedly took place over millions of years between each flood and is represented by the shrinkage crack between the sedimentary rock layers. The fossil remains of these life forms are said to appear in the succeeding or upper sedimentary layer. Unfortunately for the theory, the actual extent of the world's sedimentary layers is now well published. For example, the Cretaceous limestone with its identifying index fossils, e.g., *micraster*, extends in a continuous layer from Ireland to Australia via Europe and Russia [Ager]. There is also a large area within the United States. The problem is known as “the persistence of facies”; it is an irritant to believers in evolution and a good argument for one global flood with simultaneous

deposition of sediments. Based upon the historical position set out above, there are at least four evidences that refute the millions of years demanded by geology:

1) The “persistence of facies” is plain evidence that at least two thirds of the Earth’s surface was at one point in Earth’s history underwater at the same time. This supports a global flood.

2) Synclines and anticlines are cases where multiple layers of sedimentary rock are folded, accordion fashion, while the sharp bends show no signs of having been cracked. Clearly, these multiple sedimentary layers were still soft and plastic while the bending took place and were therefore laid down simultaneously. This denies the millions of years between layers.

3) Sometimes a fossil tree trunk is found to pass through two or even three sedimentary layers or facies representing millions of years. This, too, denies the millions of years between layers.

4) The upper surface of sedimentary layers are sometimes found to be absolutely flat even over many miles; spectacular examples are found in the Grand Canyon. If millions of years of evolution had actually taken place between a given layer and the one above it, the upper surface of the given layer at the interface would not be flat but marked by pot-holes and erosion gullies. This also denies all the millions of years between layers.

References

Ager, Derek V. 1973. *The Nature of the Stratigraphical Record*. Macmillan Press. Page 1.

24. How did the birds evolve?

For over a century, the origin of birds and thus of flight was said to be the *Archaeopteryx*. It was confidently asserted that a now-extinct reptile called the *Compsognathus* – about the size of a small chicken with small fore-legs and large hind running legs – would climb trees and occasionally jump off. By chance, some of these creatures developed a skin membrane around the front legs, and they could glide from the trees. Further mutations led to feathers, and so to the birds as we know them today. The Berlin fossil specimen of the *Archaeopteryx*, discovered in 1861, is shown in every high-school biology textbook and offered as the classic example of “evolution in action.”

The more discerning student will detect a flaw in this argument: At each stage of the transition from reptile to bird there must be a chance beneficial mutation in order to produce the feathers *and*, say, change from the reptilian cold blood to avian warm blood. However, mutations are almost invariably harmful, leaving the individual *less* fit to survive. Beneficial mutations are extremely rare or non-existent, but should one occur, the fortunate recipient is then faced with having to locate another just like itself but of the opposite sex in order to reproduce “after its kind.” Not only that, but the season for mating is usually limited, thus reducing the chances of success to virtually zero! Of course, this is a fundamental question relevant to the evolution of every kind of living creature.

Most of us who have had to take biology at high school are aware that foundational questions such as this have always been most carefully avoided by our teachers and certainly by our school textbooks. Nevertheless, the time may now be very close when truly inspired and insightful answers to such profound questions will finally be offered. We have discovered exciting evidence of this by a pearl of wisdom found in a 1998 edition of a high school biology textbook used in New York State public high schools. Moreover, it does concern the origin of birds and therefore of flight. That textbook is *Biology Principles and Explorations* by professors Johnson and Raven, 1998. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. We quote from page 772:

“Crocodiles resemble birds far more than they resemble other living reptiles. For instance, crocodiles are the only living reptiles that, like birds, care for their young. They are also the only living reptiles that have a four-chambered heart like that of birds. In many other points of anatomy, crocodiles differ from all other living reptiles and resemble birds. Why are crocodiles so much more like birds than are other living reptiles? Most biologists now think that birds are the direct descendants of dinosaurs. Crocodiles and birds, then, are far more closely related to dinosaurs than are lizards and snakes. That is why crocodiles and birds appear so similar; they are more closely related to each other than they are to lizards and snakes.”

Of course, tree-climbing crocodiles were the bird’s ancestors! So perfectly obvious now that the professors have spelled it all out so clearly. Creation Moments’ reaction is best expressed by the words from the sainted Paul in his letter to the Romans, 1:22-23:

“Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man – and birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things.”

25. Can Evolution Theory explain human consciousness?

The 1996 edition of Webster's dictionary defines consciousness as "the quality or state of being aware especially of something within oneself." Of course, animals also have a degree of consciousness but Man has something more. In modern editions of English dictionaries, "consciousness" is also said to include "moral compass" while exceptionally the definition includes, "a need to worship a Being greater than oneself." Yes, religion is what separates Man from the animal kingdom and indeed, religion as a cause of war, also separates man from man.

Since the time of Aristotle, men have grappled with the mystery of the human soul. By the mid-seventeenth century Descartes claimed that only humans had a soul while the "seat of the soul" was in the brain's pineal gland. By the end of the nineteenth century in staunchly evangelical England, the medical profession, influenced by Darwinism, had quietly dismissed the existence of the soul! In 1907, Dr. Duncan Macdougall, attempted to prove the existence of the human soul by weighing dying patients on a sensitive beam balance; he claimed to have recorded an average weight loss of 21 grams following the moment of death. The experiment was generally regarded as having no scientific merit, but Dr. MacDougall's finding that the human soul weighed 21 grams has since become a meme in the public consciousness. We are now more than a century later, and virtually every aspect of consciousness – including the ability to reason, memory, emotions, etc. – are unquestionably ascribed by the medical profession to biochemistry and as such are largely treated by chemistry.

Examining this new wisdom further, we go to the highest authority in America. Nancy Andreasen, M.D., PhD, director of research at two centers, author of numerous books and in 2000 awarded the National Medal of Science. In her book, *The Neuroscience of Genius*, she puts in layman's language how we remember: "I can be DNA inside a neuron, sensing that my cell is being repeatedly stimulated and deciding to express one of my genes that will send protein messengers out to build synapses and

create new connections so that my human ‘owner’ can remember.”¹ The author is saying that in the human brain there are complex molecules – in this case, DNA – that make decisions and therefore must also have a brain. But logically it follows that that brain must have a smaller brain and so on *ad infinitum*! Other neuroscientists have openly questioned the explanations offered for consciousness by their peers. University of California, Berkeley, Professor John Searle asks: “What exactly is the character of neurophysiological processes and how exactly do the elements of neuroanatomy – neurons, synapses, synaptic clefts, receptors, mitochondria, glial cells, transmitter fluids etc. – produce mental phenomena?”² Another specialist in the neurosciences, Professor Alva Noë also of the University of California, philosopher and cognitive scientist, complains that after decades of concerted effort by neuroscientists, psychologists and philosophers: “Only one proposition about how the brain makes us conscious ... has emerged unchallenged: we don’t have a clue.”³

What is the Christian answer to the problem of consciousness? We might be reminded that consciousness takes its place beside light and gravity, for science understands neither for what they are. We need, then, to turn to Scripture to see that the attributes of consciousness are the same as those for the soul ... but first, some cautionary words about Bible commentators.

Plato wrote that the human soul was immortal. Later, many of the early Christian fathers such as Tertullian and Origen were influenced by Plato’s writings and erroneously drew the same conclusion. Other early writers such as Justin Martyr said that souls were not immortal, while Clement of Alexandria made the important point that souls are only made immortal by the grace of God. 1 Timothy 6:16 tells us that God alone has immortality. Next, we need to caution about some of John Calvin’s writings. Calvin was a Catholic trained by the Jesuits to be a lawyer; then, at age 24, he had a conversion experience and immediately began to write a treatise on systematic theology; it was titled *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Later on, this work became the foundation document for the Church of England’s *Westminster Confession*, then subsequently was used by several other

mainline denominations.

Calvin did not question Plato's immortal soul and got confused about the soul and spirit of man. He wrote: "... man consists of body and soul, meaning by soul, an immortal though created essence ... sometimes he is called a spirit. But though the two terms, while used together, differ in meaning, still when this is used by itself it [i.e., the spirit] is equivalent to the soul."⁴ The result is that Calvin's man is dichotomous, i.e. consists of two parts – the body and the soul/spirit. More mature Christian readers will know that man is trichotomous, and, made in God's image, consists of three parts [i.e., body, soul and the spirit of life]. The spirit of life is not the Holy Spirit but a necessary part of all living creatures. Genesis 2:7 describes the creation of Adam, and we note use of the plural "nostrils", not the singular "nose." This makes it clear that the breath of life from God was necessarily divided upon entering man, and, for the same reason was also divided in the animal kingdom. Upon death, the spirit of life for the body returns to God Who gave it [Ecclesiastes 12:7] while the spirit of life for the soul remains, since Jesus pointed out that God is not the God of the dead but the living [Matthew 22:32].

With this preamble we may rightly conclude that science based upon biological evolution has no clue what constitutes human consciousness. On the other hand, the mature Christian, basing his answer upon Scripture, can reasonably declare that consciousness is man's eternal soul energized and guided by God's spirit of life. In the larger context, the soul may be defined as the actual person temporarily provided with a mortal body in order to be able to function in a material world.

References

1. Andreasen, N. 2005. *The Creating Brain*. Dana Press. p. 167.
2. Searle, J. 1992. *The Rediscovery of the Mind*. MIT Press. p. 1.
3. Noé, A. 2009. *Out of Our Heads*. Hill & Wang Press. p. xi.
4. Calvin, J. 1536. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 1:15:2.

