

vested with His person, it glows with glory immeasurable, a touch of which earthlings beheld at times in His *shekinah* presence.

With the entrance of revolt into the universe, God adapted the functions in His command center to make it a place of reconciliation where fallen creatures, half-blind but repentant under the plying ministry of His Spirit, could approach Him for healing all transgressions. From that grand center our Lord left for this dark, rebellious world. Paul's glorious passage in the *kenosis* of Philippians 2:7, describes this in its stark contrast. Emptying Himself, He becomes obedient, even to the death of the cross. Wherefore God has highly exalted Him, that at His name every knee should bow and tongue confess—Jesus Christ is Lord. Received back into the presence of the Father, He ever lives to make intercession, and soon will return to receive us in power and glory.

Conclusion

One may ask, does the sanctuary message diminish the worth of the cross? God forbid, it enhances the cross, for here its cosmic glory at last is clear. Adventists need to hold fast to the message of Christ in His sanctuary. As with no other message, it opens to us the remnant the reality of full salvation. "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in" (Ps 24:7). Soon ours will be the unspeakable joy of stepping into the throne room. Nothing must rob us of that experience!

PROGRESSIVE CREATIONISM AND BIBLICAL REVELATION: SOME THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

By John T. Baldwin

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Introduction/Background

The purpose of this essay is to examine the intellectual roots and the current status of the discussion concerning progressive creationism and to identify and evaluate eight theological implications of affirming the presence of death for millions of years prior to the appearance of *homo sapiens* in the geologic column as required by progressive creationism. This piece can be methodologically likened, in the language of a fine arts painter, to a limited palette endeavor. This means that the article is an academic account informed, in this instance, by the presuppositions of a high view of Scripture, *sola scriptura*, and Christ's death understood in a forensic substitutionary sense.¹ However, as an objective theological, reflective exercise, the author hopes that the work will reach a wide academic audience, including readers holding alternative theological presuppositions.²

Progressive Creationism Defined. Progressive creationism, popularized in 1954 by Bernard Ramm in his book *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, is a form of broad concordism between the biblical creation texts and science which invokes God's intervention to effect vertical radiation of species, that is, to obtain

macroevolution over a period of approximately six hundred million years.³

Human Destiny: Biblical View. This investigation concerning the historical roots and current status of the discussion about progressive creationism is best introduced by considering a momentous divine desideratum articulated in Exodus 25:8 as follows: "Have them make a sanctuary for me, and I will dwell among them."⁴ The Hebrew word *shākan*, translated "to dwell," means that, contrary to Aristotle's unmoved mover who does not concern himself with human affairs,⁵ the true God desires to dwell permanently in nearness and closeness⁶ with His created beings; hence, God's faithful, forgiving, loving acts in the Old Testament, the exodus, the cultic system, the atonement, the gospel commission, and the consummation actualized by the Second Advent of Christ.

Jesus amplifies this same desire in His famous discourse in the upper room: "I will come back and take you to be with me that you also may be where I am" (John 14:3). Through these words Christ presents a truth of personal destiny upon which Christians, as it were, "hang their souls."

Origins: Biblical View. Connected with this truth about destiny, however, is the biblical teaching about origins. The following words introduce the issue at stake: "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth . . . and all that is in them" (Exod 20:11). In these words God outlines the method employed in the creation of humanity.

Christians eagerly accept the truth of Christ's destiny statements; however, statements concerning origins from the same source are not accepted with equal readiness. Does a faulty origin statement impact upon the certainty of the destiny statement? For example, if science falsifies the divine claim about origins, on what basis does the Christian rely upon Jesus' statement about destiny?

Can the Christian scholar legitimately accept the destiny statement in a literal sense while at the same time discounting the truthfulness of the origin statement in a literal sense? The implication seems to be that the truthfulness of Jesus' destiny statement, interpreted in a literal sense, stands or falls upon the truthfulness of the origin statement. Thus, the basic underlying issue of biblical authority is at stake in the discussion of progressive creationism

and of the theological and philosophical implications stemming from its claims.

Contemporary Denial of Scriptural Data Lays Foundation. Leading contemporary liberal and evangelical theologians respond similarly to the underlying issue of this study. Historically, their work forms the intellectual basis upon which the concepts of progressive creationism are grounded. For example, perceiving the serious implication of the eschatological claims of Jesus noted above, Rudolph Bultmann introduced his epoch-making demythologizing method.

In what may be the most theologically influential forty-some pages written in this century, namely, the famous 1941 address "New Testament and Mythology: The Problem of Demythologizing the New Testament Message,"⁷ Bultmann deals precisely with biblical elements which he believes to be falsified by science. As a consequence, Bultmann makes use of helpful existential concepts, as he says in an earlier letter (1926), from "phenomenology, into which my colleague and friend, Heidegger introduced me,"⁸ in order to ascertain what he considered to be authentic human existence "exhibited by the text."⁹

The result of applying this method is well-known. For Bultmann and other liberal scholars and theologians, the literal, historical Fall of Adam, the entrance of sin interpreted according to a literal reading of Genesis, the literal return of Christ, and so on, are no longer tenable. Here are Bultmann's challenging words regarding the last point: "We can no longer look for the return of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven or hope that the faithful will meet him in the air."¹⁰

Current Status of the Progressive Creationism Debate. The current status of the discussion about progressive creationism is in flux. Because of convictions concerning origins analyzed above, not only liberal scholars, for example John Polkinghorne¹¹ and Arthur Peacocke, but even leading evangelical thinkers such as J. I. Packer, Clark Pinnock, and Davis A. Young are advancing beyond progressive creationism.¹² These thinkers do so because they already agree with Polkinghorne's recent claim that at the popular level the concept of the "God-of-the-gaps" as employed in progressive creationism is dead.¹³ Consequently, these scientists, scholars,

and theologians are now championing non-concordist, theistic evolution.¹⁴

Nevertheless, both theistic evolution and progressive creationism require the constant operation of the death and life cycle for over six hundred million years prior to the appearance of *homo sapiens* in the geologic record, that is, before the appearance of the biblical Adam. What are some of the theological implications of affirming death prior to Adam? What is the theological price of adopting either theistic evolution or progressive creationism? We turn to this task in the discussion below.

The following reflections are divided into two parts. First, space permits only a summary of Paul's discussion in Romans concerning the origin of death, and a brief analysis of selected treatments by contemporary scholars of this Pauline material. Second, I shall explore eight significant theological implications of the admission by progressive creationism that death necessarily existed prior to Adam for approximately six hundred million years.

Origin of Death: Pauline Position. Important Pauline passages which treat the origin of death are located in Romans chapters 5 and 8. In brief outline, one can say that the former chapter links the appearance of death to human sin, while the latter chapter links human sin causally to the phenomenon of death within the brute animal kingdom. Paul states that "Sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men" (Rom 5:12).

In this passage Paul makes the crucially important causal linkage between the original appearance of sin and the first entrance of death. Death is placed in an unqualified perspective, suggestive of a universal all-encompassing meaning of the term. However, the most important theological point to notice is the relationship between human sin and death, because it is upon this connection that the atonement is based.

What about the origin of the life-and-death process in the lower animal kingdom? Does Paul link the origin of death in the animal kingdom in some sense to the sin of Adam? Romans 5:14 states that death reigned from Adam, not from a time long before Adam. Again, does this beginning of the reign of death at the time of Adam include death in the lower animal kingdom as well? If

Paul's words can be properly viewed as responding in the affirmative to this question, then he is in effect establishing the affinity between human beings and the natural world in opposition to forms of essential dualism prevalent in the Hellenistic world.¹⁵

Romans 8:20 suggests a positive response to this query by stating that "the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it." Moreover, the creation is subjected not only to frustration but to "decay" (vs. 21, *phthora*), that is, to that which implies death. In this context the "creation" which is subjected to decay or death refers to the lower animals and not to human beings, because in Romans 8:22-23 Paul contrasts the said "whole creation" that groans for liberation from this subjection to decay and to death with himself and other Christians (humans) who also groan for liberation from the bondage to death. John Murray underscores this point by stating that the scope of the term "creation" (vs. 21) is limited to the nonrational creation and that the subjection within this realm means the "mortality of the body,"¹⁶ that is, the death of lower animals.

Thus, two domains—comprising a single unified totality of God's creation—groan for liberation from death stemming from the sin of Adam and God's consequent subjection of both realms: first, the human race subjected to death by divine action because of human sin;¹⁷ and second, the lower brute creation, subjected to death by God because of human sin.

Furthermore, Paul's position concerning the entrance of biological death in the lower animal kingdom because of the sin of the first human beings is consistent with important biological inferences from a prelapsarian philosophy of nature gained by a literal reading of Genesis 1:30. In this creation text God states that "to all the beasts of the earth and all the birds of the air and all the creatures that move on the ground—everything that has the breath of life in it—I give every green plant for food." These important words, giving the nature of the diet of land and air creatures, carry significant biological implications.

This dietary insight suggests that the uncursed first dominion consisted in a predation-free habitat, that is, a habitat free of the life and death cycle in the creatures noted. This shows why the lower animal creation mentioned by Paul in Romans 8 groans to be

liberated from a cursed dominion, because the second dominion is death-dominated. In other words, Paul may view all forms of death as phenomena which are ultimately foreign elements, something which a loving God must have temporarily superimposed because of the sinful action by the human overseer of the lower animal kingdom.

Understandably, not all scholars share the same interpretation of the meaning of death in Paul's discussion. Some evangelical scholars interpret what they consider to be Paul's own understanding and meaning of the word "death" as not conflicting with modern evolutionary biology.

Hugh Ross, for example, believes that Paul limits the meaning of the term "death" in Romans 5 and 8 to human spiritual death, thereby excluding the concept of biological death either of humans or of the lower animals from the meaning of the term "death."¹⁸ In this fashion he harmonizes the Bible and science by interpreting Paul's original intent and meaning in a way which accedes to the claims of science. In other words, he believes that Paul's own, original meaning in Romans 5 and 8 does not conflict with a progressive creationist point of view requiring physical death prior to Adam.

By contrast, with nothing theologically to fear, one liberal theologian understands that Paul's own, original meaning in Romans 5-8 clashes with the claims of progressive creationism. However, this theologian simply reinterprets what he sees as Paul's original meaning of the connection of sin and death stated in Romans 6:23 in a way as to be in harmony with modern science. Thus, Arthur Peacocke, eminent Oxford scholar and author of many recent, influential books on science and religion,¹⁹ makes the following assumption when discussing death in relation to Christian anthropology:

Biological death was present on the earth long before human beings arrived. It is the prerequisite of our coming into existence through the creative processes of biology which God himself has installed in the world God had already made biological death the means of his creating new forms of life. This has to be accepted, difficult though it may be for some theologies.²⁰

I appreciate Peacocke's honesty in perceiving and admitting

the potential theological difficulties of his evolutionary assumption about the presence of death prior to Adam, who for Paul is "a historic personage and not just the mythological personification of every human being."²¹

However, notice how Peacocke reinterprets Paul's corollary message (to Rom 5:12) in Romans 6:23 about the wages (or the "soldiers pay")²² in light of what he has written above: "So when St. Paul says that 'the wages of sin is death,' that cannot possibly mean for us, now, *biological* death [In] that phrase St. Paul can only, for us, mean 'death' in some figurative sense of, [perhaps], the death of our relationship to God as the consequence of sin."²³

Peacocke's words "for us, now," and "for us" indicate that Peacocke understands that Paul in Romans 6:23 is speaking literally about the causal linkage between sin and death of all kinds, perhaps even about the origin of death of all kinds; and that Paul is, therefore, saying something in Romans 6:23 which is unacceptable to modern theology. Above all, Peacocke's words "for us, now," and "for us" indicate that he is deliberately reinterpreting Paul's original meaning to conform with modern anthropology.

This illustrates that in some cases, though not in all instances, a liberal scholar may ascertain the original intended meaning of a biblical writer more adequately than some evangelical scholars, even though the scholar who employs higher criticism may not consider the original meaning normative for contemporary theology.

Having completed the summary of Paul's discussion in Romans concerning the origin of death, and an analysis of contemporary responses to Paul's position, we turn now to a brief consideration of eight theological implications of the claim by either theistic evolution or progressive creationism that death existed prior to Adam for long ages.

Death Prior to Adam: Implications of Claim

First. The claim impacts upon the literal and historical trustworthiness of the Bible in general. One can, for example, trust neither the historicity of the fall of Adam nor the actuality of a universal "wet flood" if the literal biblical statements about these

events are countered by the statement that death existed prior to Adam.

Second. To assert the ongoing cycle of life and death prior to Adam for millions of years deeply affects our perception of the character of God in at least two important ways. On the one hand it necessarily leads to the conclusion that the God, who purportedly notices when a sparrow falls (Matt 10:29), countenanced and intended the suffering and death of animals for millions of years prior to Adam. Thus, the merciful character of God is compromised.

On the other hand the claim of death before sin destroys the integrity of God's character. If indeed millions of years of death existed before Adam, then God, knowing this fact, articulates in the fourth commandment of Exodus 20 a creation methodology in direct opposition to the truth. The irony of this conclusion is that in the original presentation of the Ten Commandments as recorded in Exodus 20, the ninth prohibits the bearing of false witness. But the progressive creationism theory causes God Himself to tell a lie in the fourth commandment, thereby transgressing His own law.

Of course, this action clearly contradicts the honesty of God acclaimed both in the Old and New Testaments. God inspired Balaam with the following words, "God is not a man, that He should lie" (Num 23:19). Paul praises the God "who does not lie" (Titus 1:2), while in Hebrews we find these famous words, "It is impossible for God to lie" (Heb 6:18).

Third. If death existed before Adam for millions of years, then the crucial causal linkage between sin and death is broken. If the connection between sin and death is severed, then the basis for Christ's atonement is also destroyed. For example, if death is not related to sin, then the wages of sin is not death. Consequently, Christ's death as a wage for sin loses its power to save the believer from death.²⁴ Thus, a most serious implication of this aspect of progressive creationism is that it undermines the concept of the saving, atoning blood of Christ, that is, the heart of the gospel, the cross of Christ.

In light of this implication a passage in Hebrews is notably relevant, warning all investigators against lessening in any way the value of the blood of Christ: "How much more severely do you think a man deserves to be punished who has trampled the Son of God

underfoot, who has treated as an unholy thing the blood of the covenant that sanctified him, and who has insulted the Spirit of grace?" (Heb 10:29).

Fourth. The claims of progressive creationism require a reinterpretation of some of Jesus' teachings. This can impact upon a Christian's willingness to accept the full Lordship of Christ if the believer does not experience complete confidence in all the teachings of his Lord and Saviour. For instance, an exegete would need to reinterpret Jesus' own understanding of the historical truthfulness of Cain's murder of Abel presented as follows:

Therefore this generation will be held responsible for the blood of all the prophets that has been shed since the beginning of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who was killed between the altar and the sanctuary (Luke 11:50-51).

These words indicate that Jesus regarded the account of the murder of Abel to be a reliable, historical fact. Because the account of Abel's death is recorded in Genesis 3, this implies that Jesus regarded the chapter as giving dependable historical facts. Abel, of course, had a very famous father, whose historical existence by implication Jesus also endorses by these words. However, progressive creationism would require Jesus' own understanding in this case to be reinterpreted to harmonize with science.

Moreover, these claims force the Christian scholar to reinterpret the original monogamous nature of marriage as described by Jesus in the following language: "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because your hearts were hard. But it was not this way from the beginning" (Matt 19:8).

The statement, "it was not this way from the beginning," indicates that Jesus accepted the historical reliability of the creation account recorded in Genesis 2, outlining the ideal character of marriage as monogamous, and that this ideal was in fact illustrated by the first pair of human beings to exist on earth. The claims of progressive creationism require radical reinterpretation of these teachings of Jesus, thus undermining total confidence concerning some of Christ's instruction.

Fifth. The claims of progressive creationism negatively impact the theology of worship in sabbatarian Christian communions. Recent scholarly discussions of the theological meaning of the

Sabbath for contemporary Christians include works by Jürgen Moltmann,²⁵ Niels-Erik Andreasen,²⁶ and James B. Ashbrook.²⁷ Ashbrook concludes that the "Sabbath rest-and-reorganization are built into our very being. The basic cycle of rest/synthesis/activity is the means we have for the making of meaning, and meaning-making is the making of soul."²⁸

These general studies indirectly raise a corollary issue of the divine will regarding the identity of a contemporary Sabbath day of rest and worship which is negatively impacted by the tenets of the progressive creationism theory. If death existed before Adam, including millions of years of evolution, this renders untenable the concept of a literal six-day creation as the basis for a seventh-day Sabbath. Thus, a contemporary believer who understands the New Testament to teach that the seventh-day Sabbath remains unchanged from Old Testament practice could not base his/her selection of a day of worship upon the Genesis creation texts or the fourth commandment. This demonstrates how progressive creationism can impact upon contemporary worship.²⁹

Sixth. If death existed before Adam, death is a divinely intended part of life. This significant conclusion raises the following question: If death is part of the divinely-instituted economy of life, how can death be properly viewed as the last enemy to be destroyed as Paul states (1 Cor 15:26)? In light of the implied negative answer to this question, in the view of progressive creationism death would be a reality neither to be changed nor removed by means of some future new creation in which "there shall no longer be only death" (Rev 21:4, NASB).

Thus, how does the concept of the integral part of death in the natural world and in its life processes impact on the *parousia*? Viewing death in this perspective, are we to conclude that the early Christians mistakenly expected the Second Advent of Christ to put an end to death and suffering as outlined in Revelation 21 and 22? It would seem so. However, a literal reading of Scripture shows that these early Christians correctly looked for the *parousia*, enjoying a strong biblical basis for their hope in the return of their Lord. Thus, Christians today who adopt progressive creationism differ from the early Christians in this respect.

Seventh. The notion of the existence of death before Adam

impacts on the conflict between Christ and Satan over the final salvation of humanity. If death existed before Adam, then Christ ultimately redeems no one, as noted above, and thereby fails to achieve His great longing to dwell with His people. Consequently, Satan succeeds in preventing reconciliation between God and His people, thereby achieving his goal.

Eighth. Even if a return of Christ were possible in view of the six hundred million year development of life claimed by progressive creationism, God's promise in Isaiah 65:17 to create a new heaven and a new earth is thrown into serious confusion. For example, What length of time will be required to accomplish this new creation? Will God take another six hundred million years in creating the new earth as He allegedly needed to guide the evolution of the first earth to completion according to the claims of progressive creationism? Are the meek to be kept waiting in the New Jerusalem for six hundred million years while their promised inheritance, the new earth, evolves into a habitable place like it did the first time? Such concepts, of course, mock the creative power of the God of the Bible. However, this possible conclusion is a serious implication of progressive creationism viewed in light of the presuppositions of this paper.³⁰

Conclusion

These eight evaluations show a few of the important theological implications of affirming death prior to Adam and his transgression. From the perspective of this study, the Christian scholarly community stands before two mutually exclusive alternatives. Although reluctant to cast positions into either/or terms, the author discovers no *tertium quid* in this instance.

On the one hand the scholar may accept the complete canonical witness in a fashion similar to the way in which Jesus viewed the authority of the Old Testament, namely, as authoritative, reliable, propositional revelation. On the other hand if the Christian scholar accepts the six hundred million years of death prior to Adam, then he/she may as well adopt Bultmann's methodology and conclusions in order to remain consistent.

In the ongoing scholarly discussions of these and related issues, however, those involved need to exercise continually the

utmost respect, genuine love, and courtesy to one another, and an openness to new ideas lest we deny our caring Christ, the author of all interpersonal relationships worthy of His name.

Considered in the light of the reflections presented in this piece, the admonition of Hebrews 10:35-37 is appropriate for all Christian scholars, theologians, and scientists working within the academy. In this passage believers are encouraged not to cast away their confidence which has great recompense of reward, because, as verse 37 promises, "yet a little while, and he that shall come will come" (KJV). This hope means that John 14:1-3 has yet to be fully realized, that Christ will indeed take human beings to Himself, thereby achieving His deepest desire.

Endnotes

1 A high view of Scripture is here assumed to mean one which accepts the unity, reliability and authority of the entire Bible as divinely-revealed, propositional revelation. In this view, for instance, chapters 1-11 of Genesis are assumed to be straightforward factual accounts of historical events concerning the way in which God created this world as a life-sustaining habitat, and concerning the entrance of sin and death into the world.

2 In chapters 1 and 2 of *The Analogical Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), David Tracy distinguishes three kinds of theology: fundamental, systematic, and practical. Concerning these distinctions, Robert Neville observes that practical theologies are those associated with movements of social change, and their audience is the participants in these movements. Fundamental theologies are those that ask the basic questions in a wholly pluralistic, perhaps even secular, context with little or no regard for communities of faith, and their audience is mainly the academy. Systematic theologies are those oriented to the self-understanding and guidance of "communities of faith" (*A Theology Primer* [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991, xiv]). The current essay addresses the audiences Tracy calls systematic and fundamental.

3 Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1954; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1984). See particularly the section called "Progressive Creation" (76-79) in this book, and above all Ramm's comments on page 191 about the limits of the natural biological process with respect to horizontal and vertical radiation of species within the paradigm of progressive creation.

4 Scripture quotations are taken from the *New International Version* unless otherwise noted.

5 *Metaphysics* Bk. XII: Ch. 9.

6 R. Laird Harris, ed., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), p. 925.

7 See Werner Georg Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 456, n. 466.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 457, n. 468.

9 *Ibid.*

10 Rudolph Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," in *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch and trans. Reginald H. Fuller (London: S.P.C.K., 1952), p. 4.

11 John Polkinghorne, "God's Action in the World," *Cross Currents* 41:3 (Fall 1991): 293-307.

12 J. I. Packer, "The Challenge of Biblical Interpretation: Creation" in *The Proceedings of the Conference on Biblical Interpretation 1988* (Nashville: Broadmann Press, 1988), 21-33; Clark Pinnock, "Climbing Out of a Swamp: The Evangelical Struggle to Understand the Creation Texts," *Interpretation* 43: 1 (January 1989): 145; Davis A. Young, "Scripture in the Hands of Geologists," Part II, *Westminster Theological Journal* 49 (1987): 303.

13 John Polkinghorne, "God's Action in the World," *Cross Currents*, 41:3 (Fall 1991): 295; cf. Nancy M. Malone, "The Silence Speaks," *Cross Currents*, 41:3 (Fall 1991): 291. In basic support of this concept Daniel L. Migliore of Princeton Seminary states that because the grammar used by science and theology are two different languages, and because the stories of Genesis 1 and 2 are not scientific descriptions, "the purposive activity of the creator and the purposefulness of the world cannot be directly 'read off' what we perceive and experience. It is an affirmation of faith, not an empirical observation." See Daniel L. Migliore, "The Ecological Crisis and the Doctrine of Creation," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* n.s. 22:3 (1991): 275.

14 The current scholarly drive toward accepting either non-concordist, theistic evolution, or a broad concordist progressive creationism seems to be unnecessary. The endeavor is unwarranted because recent paleontological, biological, geological, philosophical, and geochemical evidence can be correctly interpreted as strongly consistent with a faith position which accepts as true the Scripture's assertions of an origin *de novo* of biological forms by some causality other than random causes and an origin occurring within a relatively recent time. But these assertions are topics for other papers with extensive evidentiary documentation.

However, anyone interested in an introduction to some of the more recent studies presenting evidence in support of these claims may consult the following sources: Robert H. Brown, "Correlation of C-14 Age with Real Time," *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 29:1 (June 1992): 45-47; Harold Coffin, *Origin by Design* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983); Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, Publishers, 1986); Gerhard F. Hasel, "Genesis 5 and 11: Chronogenealogies in the Biblical History of Beginnings," *Origins* 7:1 (1980): 23-37; Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Why Neo-Darwinism Does Not Work* (Wales, United Kingdom: University College Cardiff Press, 1982); Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1991); Michael J. Oard, "Evidence for Only One Ice Age," in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism 1990: Volume II Technical Symposium Sessions and Additional Topics*, ed. Robert E. Walsh (Pittsburgh: Creation Science Fellowship, 1990), 191-200; Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 381-405; Ariel A. Roth, "Those Gaps in the Sedimentary Layers," *Origins* 15:2 (1988): 75-92; A. E. Wilder-Smith, *The Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory: Information Sources & Structures* (Costa Mesa, California: TWFT Publishers, 1987); G. E. Snow and G. T. Javor, "Atmo-

spheric Oxygen Rules Out Biochemical Evolution," in *Our Real Roots*, ed. Leo R. Van Dolson (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1979); William H. Shea, "A Comparison of Narrative Elements in Ancient Mesopotamian Creation Flood Stories with Genesis 1-9," *Origins* 11:1 (1984): 9-29; Kurt P. Wise, "Baraminology: A Young-Earth Creation Biosystematic Method," in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism 1990: Volume II Technical Symposium Sessions and Additional Topics*, ed. Robert E. Walsh (Pittsburgh: Creation Science Fellowship, 1990), pp. 345-360.

For a useful treatment of the implications of theistic evolution for Christians see L. Jim Gibson, "Theistic Evolution: Is It for Adventists?" *Ministry* (January 1992): 22-25.

15 For comments concerning such forms of dualism in the Hellenistic world, see Paul W. Meyer, "Romans," in *Harper's Bible Commentary*, ed. James L. Mays (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), p. 1153.

16 John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968), p. 304.

17 It should be noted that a recently published dissertation focusing on these passages of Romans 8 takes an alternative point of view arguing that Paul does not have Genesis 3 and the fall of Adam in mind in this context, but rather the Genesis flood-tradition. See Olle Christoffersson, *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature: The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18-27* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990).

18 Hugh Ross, *The Fingerprint of God* (Orange, California: Promise Publishing Co., 1989), p. 154.

19 See the following works by Arthur Peacocke: *Science and the Christian Experiment* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), and *Creation and the World of Science: The Bampton Lectures, 1978* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

20 Arthur Peacocke, "The Challenge of Science to Theology and the Church," in *The New Faith-Science Debate*, edited by John M. Mangum (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 16.

21 Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 142.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 185.

23 Peacocke, "The Challenge of Science to Theology and the Church," p. 16.

24 A similar point is made in an article by John D. Morris entitled, "Evolution and the Wages of Sin," appearing as the No. 209 *Impact* topic (November 1990): iv-iv, available from the Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, California.

25 See chapter 10 entitled, "The Sabbath: The Feast of Creation" in Moltmann's *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 276-296. This work comprises Moltmann's Gifford Lectures, 1984-1985.

26 Niels-Erik Andreasen, *Rest and Redemption: A Study of the Biblical Sabbath* (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1978).

27 James B. Ashbrook, "Making Sense of Soul and Sabbath: Brain Processes and the Making of Meaning," in *Zygon* 27: 1 (March 1992): 31-49.

28 Ashbrook, p.46.

29 The thrust of this article is not to determine the divine will concerning the proper day of worship for contemporary Christians. However, the seriousness of implication number five above is, of course, particularly significant for Chris-

tians taking seriously the creation account as the basis for a selection of a worship day.

Readers may be interested in a brief outline indicating the basis upon which some Christians understand the New Testament teaching concerning a day of worship in contemporary times. According to Hebrews 8:7-13 and 10:15-18, it is the privilege of Christians living in the gospel period to participate, by means of the Holy Spirit, in the new covenant experience.

That the seventh-day Sabbath forms part of the new covenant terms is strikingly demonstrated by the fact of Jesus' death for sin (Romans 6:23; 1 Cor 15:3; Matthew 26:39-45; and Matthew 27:50) as follows: If it were possible that the definition of sin (the Ten Commandments [1 John 3:4], which are the same thing as the terms of the new covenant [Hebrews 10:16, Romans 13:8-10]) could be changed in any sense, then God would have done so in order to do away with sin in order that His son would not have had to die, because the Scripture states that Christ died precisely because sin existed (1 Cor 15:3). The Son in effect asked God the Father whether that kind of change in the law was possible (Matthew 26:39-45) while at the same time saving humanity. If the law could have been changed, the cup (the cross) could have passed from the lips of Jesus as He requested. That in the mind of God the Father the law could not be changed in any respect is shown by the subsequent death of Jesus. For this reason some Christians believe that the costly fact alone of Jesus' death establishes the perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath, the fourth precept of the Decalogue.

Moreover, in Romans 3:31 Paul suggests the perpetuity of the law. In addition, Our Lord says that the Sabbath was not given to the Jews but to mankind universally (Mark 2:27; Genesis 2:2-3). Finally, the women who wished to anoint the body of Jesus kept the Sabbath "according to the commandment" after the burial of Jesus, thus showing that the author of the gospel of Mark believed that the death of Jesus did not abolish this beautiful term of the new covenant (Luke 23:55-56). For a fuller exposition concerning this issue see, "The Sabbath" in *Seventh-day Adventists Believe . . .*, Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (Hagerstown, Maryland: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1988), pp. 248-267.

30 From a confessional perspective, one might conjecture whether God will create the new earth within a time frame analogous to the original creation of the first earth, viz., in one week. In any case and by God's grace it will be a high privilege for Christians to witness the creation of the new earth in what ever fashion the event occurs.