

5-1-1960

# An Evangelical Approach to the Problem of the Antiquity of Man in the Light of Biblical and Scientific Evidence

Richard T. Burdine

---

## Recommended Citation

Burdine, Richard T., "An Evangelical Approach to the Problem of the Antiquity of Man in the Light of Biblical and Scientific Evidence" (1960). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 275.  
[https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes\\_theses/275](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/275)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Nobel V. Sack

Co-operative Reader: F. H. H. H. H.

Professor of Thesis Form: Nobel V. Sack

AN EVANGELICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN  
IN THE LIGHT OF BIBLICAL AND SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

by

Richard T. Burdine

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

Portland 22, Oregon

May, 1960

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	2
A. The Problem . . . . .	2
B. Justification of the Study . . . . .	2
C. Basic Assumptions. . . . .	3
D. Elements of the Problem . . . . .	3
E. Objectives . . . . .	3
F. Sources of Data . . . . .	4
G. Method of Procedure . . . . .	4
H. Definition of Terms Used . . . . .	5
II. THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN SCIENCE . . . . .	7
A. The Basic Philosophy of Science . . . . .	7
B. The Evangelical's Attitude toward Modern Science . . . . .	9
C. The Acknowledged Limitations of Modern Science . . . . .	17
D. Summary . . . . .	22
III. THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVANGELICALISM . . . . .	26
A. Evangelical Tenets . . . . .	26
B. Summary . . . . .	34
IV. BIBLICAL PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN . . . . .	37
A. Introduction . . . . .	37
B. The Integrity of the Scriptures . . . . .	41
C. The Origin and Antiquity of Man . . . . .	54
1. Sources of Data . . . . .	55
2. The Evolution of Man . . . . .	68

3. The Origin of Races . . . . .	78
4. The Fall of Man . . . . .	82
D. Summary . . . . .	85
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	89
A. Summary . . . . .	89
B. Conclusions . . . . .	90
C. Areas for Further Research . . . . .	93

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Problem. Some contemporary Evangelical views concerning the antiquity of man are problematic in the light of modern scientific claims. Science presents a view of the age of man that is different from that presented by some scholars who feel they are representing the Biblical view. The sciences tend to look upon man as being hundreds of thousands of years old. Some Biblical scholars feel that such a view is out of harmony with the Scriptures. The purpose of this study is to present an evangelical approach to the problem of the antiquity of man in the light of Biblical and scientific evidence.

Justification. A great many people have accepted the claims of science as fact. The antiquity of man which science has presented is very different from that which has been presented from many of the evangelical pulpits. The sincere Christian is faced with making a choice between a traditional so-called-Bibilical view of the antiquity of man and the view which science offers. Since the God of the Bible is the same God of Nature, to the evangelical, there must be harmony and agreement between these two fields of study. If the evangelical pastor or theologian attempts to show agreement between these two fields, he will be making a valuable contribution to the thinking of evangelicals. It ought to be obvious that the integrity of the Scriptures is involved in this study. The evangelical view holds to the integrity of the Holy Scriptures and hence desires to show har-

mony between the recognized facts of modern anthropology and Scripture. Some have endeavored to do that but have left untouched some of the problems which are involved. This study will attempt to articulate many of the problems involved and view various approaches made toward agreement.

Assumptions. The Bible, God's special revelation to man, does not contradict His revelation as found in Nature; however, interpretations of these two records may differ sharply. As Wiley has noted:

The Earth and the Bible are God's two texts, each having its place, time and function in progressive revelation. Nature is the primary source of knowledge, the Bible is the supplementary source. . . . The Bible furnishes us with ideals, Nature gives us the tools with which to work them out.<sup>1</sup>

Elements of the Problem. Some Bible students are responsible, through faulty hermeneutics, for unnecessary criticism of the Biblical position. This misinterpretation of scripture has caused many educated men to look upon the Bible as being unreliable. The plea of this paper is for a view of Biblical hermeneutics that will not do injustice to the Scriptures. Where the Bible has spoken loud and clear, may its interpreter do likewise; where it speaks softly, or not at all, let him tread carefully.

Objectives. It is not the objective of this paper to effect a reconciliation between Science and Scripture relative to man's antiquity, but rather to uncover some of the problems involved in such a reconciliation. There are two main reasons why the writer will not

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, I, 140.



attempt a direct reconciliation. First, as will be noted in the paper, the total data of science, relative to man's antiquity, is not complete; this makes a complete harmony impossible at this time. Second, it is the author's observation that an approach to the problem is what is needed first and foremost. Hence, an attitude of approach will be advocated in the conclusion to this work. There are theological implications of the highest magnitude involved in this study and as a student of theology the writer desires that these problems be recognized as having serious theological overtones.

Sources of data. This investigator has felt it wise to rely on authorities who are recognized as such by others in their respective fields. An attempt was made to go directly to original sources when available.

Method of procedure. In order to bring into sharp focus the real issues involved in the tension existing between Science and the evangelical's view of the Scriptures, the student must be aware of the philosophy of each of these systems of thought. The method undertaken here will be to first consider the philosophy which underlies modern anthropology as a science. The self-imposed limitations which science applies to itself will be discussed. Space will be given to consider a correct attitude toward modern anthropology. Next, the writer will consider the basic philosophy of Evangelicalism. Special attention will be paid to the consideration of the evangelical view of the Bible and its purpose. It may be that here the crux of the problem will be pointed out. After laying this background, the problems inherent in

the science and Scripture tension relative to the anthropological aspect primarily will be enumerated and briefly discussed. Only as such problems are recognized as vital and are dealt with in that light will an adequate solution be effected.

Definitions of terms used. Certain terms may be obscure and for the sake of clarity and communication must be defined as used in this paper.

(1) Evangelical. This term will refer to the person who holds to the supremacy of Scripture as a rule of faith and practice and to justification by faith in Jesus Christ.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Antiquity. This is the quality of "great age". When the antiquity of man is referred to, the author is discussing the age of man.

(3) Science. When this term is used it refers to the physical sciences.

---

<sup>2</sup>J. Marcellus Kik, Ecumenism and the Evangelical, p. v.

## CHAPTER II

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN SCIENCE

## CHAPTER II

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN SCIENCE

The many and varied achievements of modern science have elevated it to a place of authority in the mind of the average individual. As Smethurst has observed, "Science and technology are among the dominant influences on life at the present time."<sup>1</sup> The evangelical Christian, if he desires to gain audience today, must understand not only the operations of modern science but also the basic philosophy behind the conclusions drawn as a result of the operations of the scientific method.

It is mostly with the anthropological section of modern science that this paper will deal, due to the fact that in this area lies the greatest problem to evangelicals.<sup>2</sup> However, the basic philosophy of science in general can also be applied to anthropology since the latter is a subdivision of the former.

#### A. THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

The basic philosophy of science can readily be seen in its fundamental objective; as stated by Smethurst, it is "the search for truth."<sup>3</sup> He goes on to define truth as meaning "true knowledge about

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur F. Smethurst, Modern Science and Christian Beliefs, p. xv.

<sup>2</sup>William A. Smalley and Marie Fetzer, "A Christian View of Anthropology," Modern Science and Christian Faith, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup>Smethurst, op. cit., p. 45.

the natural world."<sup>4</sup> The evangelical has no quarrel with such an aim. Anthropology seeks to discover the truth about man via the scientific method of investigation; hence, it is called "the science of man."<sup>5</sup> The anthropologist must be a man of integrity, the same as any competent scientist. The discoveries of anthropology cannot be dismissed by the evangelical as being the results of "biased research." Although it may be true that a person's presuppositions enter unconsciously into his work, yet the laymen must recognize the tools with which the modern anthropologist works today. Those who work diligently to discover the answer to man's antiquity have such tools as fluorine dating method and the carbon isotope 14 method.<sup>6</sup> These tools enable the anthropologist to accurately date fossils up to 50,000 years, so it is believed. The integrity of modern anthropologists was recently displayed by the revealing of the Piltdown forgery. It was the scientist who discovered the Piltdown hoax. Many of these men were disturbed by the inconsistencies relative to this "find" when it was first announced.<sup>7</sup> The skull and the jawbone seemed to be from two different creatures. The importance of all this to the evangelical is that many scientists could not work this find into their system of study. The fact that the forgery could not be forced into their systems seems to give weight to the validity of their studies.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Smalley and Fetzer, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 173-174, see for a discussion of this method.

<sup>7</sup>Bernard Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture, p. 311.

## B. THE EVANGELICAL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MODERN SCIENCE

### The Necessity of Agreement

If the evangelical embraces the belief that the God of revelation in Nature is the same as the God of the revelation of the Bible, then he must conclude a necessity for harmony between these two revelations. When science uncovers facts pertaining to the Universe, the evangelical is under obligation to recognize these "facts" and to correlate them with the Scriptures. Draper, in speaking of the Koran, set forth a principle which applies to the Scriptures also.

Considering the asserted origin of this book, indirectly from God himself, we might justly expect that it would bear to be tried by any standard that man can apply, and vindicate its truth and excellence in the ordeal of human criticism. . . . As years pass on and human science becomes more exact, more comprehensive, its conclusions must be found in unison therewith.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps this is not the crux of the matter, since most evangelicals would wish agreement. The problem lies perhaps in determining what is factual and what is theoretical. This problem is rooted in the evangelical's attitude and spirit toward the sciences. The evangelical must not view the scientist with distrust. It is true that science has made errors, but it is also true that science, in due time, tends to correct its own errors. Scientists who are men of integrity and honesty concerning their research gain recognition from their colleagues. The evangelical who is disturbed by some new scientific discovery cannot simply write it off as being the "biased conclusions of dishonest researchers." The evangelical must listen in

---

<sup>8</sup>J. W. Draper, Intellectual Development of Europe, quoted in Charles B. Warring, Genesis I and Modern Science, p. 37.

the same spirit as he himself desires to be heard.

Since science and Scripture, to the evangelical, both find their source in God, they must complement, not contradict, each other. This must be the attitude of the evangelical toward the facts of modern science and its philosophy. Let the sciences major on how God made the universe and theology major on why He made it. Warren C. Young observed:

The various sciences, such as Physics, Chemistry, Psychology, Sociology, and so on, deal with particular areas or fields of study. Philosophy endeavors to relate and integrate the information which the various sciences are able to discover. . . . The sciences are concerned with the discovery and investigation of factual data, while philosophy is concerned with the meaning and significance of that data. In general, the scientist is a discoverer, while the philosopher is an interpreter.<sup>9</sup>

Undue problems may arise when the Christian philosopher, who is limited in the sciences, endeavors to speak on science; likewise, problems may arise when the scientist who is untrained in philosophy endeavors to speak on philosophical problems. Bernard Ramm pointed out:

We are to pay due respect to both science and Scripture. Neither adoration of one nor bigoted condemnation of the other is correct. We must be as ready to hear the voice of science as we are of Scripture on common matters. The spirit of mutual respect for both science and Scripture preserves us from any charge of being anti-scientific or blindly dogmatic or religiously bigoted; and from being gullible, or credulous or superstitious in our religious beliefs as they pertain to Nature.<sup>10</sup>

Evangelicalism has a definite and vital contribution to make to modern science. That contribution is teleological. The God of the Bible is presented as the "Ultimate Reality" of the Universe. He is presented

---

<sup>9</sup>Warren C. Young, A Christian Approach to Philosophy, p. 26.

<sup>10</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 32.

as supreme intelligence and personality. Hence, the evangelical can account for the orderliness and purposiveness of the Universe. Science tells man what the work of the Creator is like; the Bible tells man what the Creator is like. The evangelical will gain an audience with the scientist when his attitude of hostility and distrust is removed.<sup>11</sup> Had Darwin been fully understood by the evangelical, perhaps less distrust concerning organic evolution would have arisen. In his conclusion to The Origin of Species, Darwin posits the idea that God breathed into original life the powers of development and that what he was proposing was not a substitute for the Creator but rather a theory of development. He states:

There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one.<sup>12</sup>

The prestige of modern science. In this age of rockets, satellites, and many other scientific advancements, one observes that mankind is scientific minded.<sup>13</sup> In the face of such achievements, only a person who fails to face reality would say that science has little prestige in the eyes of the average civilized person. In fact, so great is the prestige of modern science in the minds of the American public today, that Charles Clayton Morrison has stated:

If Protestantism is to win America, it must win science. I say it must win science, not win America away from science. Science

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>12</sup>Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species, p. 429.

<sup>13</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 25.



is solidly entrenched in its position.<sup>14</sup>

Science has won an audience by its products such as antibiotics, television, rockets that circle the moon, and other notable achievements. The strides of modern science were staggering during the first half of the twentieth century and it is very likely that these strides will continue and accelerate. The evangelical could applaud these achievements more enthusiastically if it were not for the popular belief that science and the Bible are at odds. Many people are not prone to listen to the voice of the Bible on any matter for they believe "that science has broken the credibility of Scripture."<sup>15</sup> The evangelical who will gain a hearing from the average educated person in this generation must take a wholesome attitude toward the sciences of his day.<sup>16</sup> Science has attained prestige in the minds of thinking people. The evangelical cannot gain similar prestige, it has been suggested, until he ceases his biased attacks against science.

#### The Dangers of Extremism

Controversies seem to have the genius for driving the participants to extreme positions. It is possible to "sin to the right as well as to the left."<sup>17</sup> A theologian can be just as guilty by

---

<sup>14</sup>Charles Clayton Morrison, "Protestantism and Science," Christian Century, April 24, 1946, p. 524.

<sup>15</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 24.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

having too narrow a view of Biblical interpretation as he can by having too broad a view. Both extremes have implications which are injurious to a wholesome approach to the solution of the science-Scripture problem.

The dangers inherent in the hypertraditional attitude.

Those who are bound by tradition to such a degree that they fail to distinguish between the central and the peripheral truths of the Scripture are called "hypertraditionalists" by James Buswell.<sup>18</sup> They have created many problems for the evangelical, so Buswell implies. The evangelical who speaks out negatively against science is, in Ramm's opinion, widening the gap between the Scriptures and science and making it almost impossible for the scientist to accept the credibility of the Scriptures.<sup>19</sup> John Pye Smith goes so far as to say that these men are actually playing into the hands of the enemies of the Bible.

(Evangelical castigators of science) are unwittingly serving the designs of (Christianity's) enemies (and are) secret traitors to the cause of Christianity.<sup>20</sup>

Scientists, as a general rule, are not trained in the method of the interpretation of the Scriptures and hence are likely to accept a traditional theory as being a Biblical fact. Such was the case,

---

<sup>18</sup>James O. Buswell, III, "A Creationist Interpretation of Prehistoric Man," Evolution and Christian Thought Today, ed. by Russell L. Mixer, pp. 168-169 footnote.

<sup>19</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>20</sup>John Pye Smith, On the Relation Between the Holy Scriptures and Some Parts of Geological Science, quoted by Ramm, Ibid.

seemingly, when Glyn Daniel equated a theory of creation with the act of it. In conclusion to an article, he stated:

The catastrophist theory was once and for all to be discarded and with it the Biblical notion that the world and man represented unalterable acts of special creation.<sup>21</sup>

Bernard Ramm makes a contribution at this point. He makes a sharp distinction between what the Bible actually says and what some men have said that it says.<sup>22</sup>

The literalist, who believes that every word of the Bible must be interpreted as coming direct from the mouth of God, finds great difficulty in harmonizing his view of the Scriptures with science. The evangelical who holds to the position that God inspired the writers of the Scriptures and they wrote in the cultural and linguistical settings of their day in order to be understood, is freed from the extreme difficulties of literalism.<sup>23</sup>

The dangers inherent in some modern religious attitudes.

Those theological systems which endeavor to appeal to the scientific mind by dismissing the Bible as a purely human development are creating, perhaps, more serious problems for themselves than they realize. Although Neo-orthodoxy takes a more serious view of the Scriptures than either Liberalism or Modernism, it still has a concept of the Scriptures which seemingly destroys the integrity and validity

---

<sup>21</sup>Glyn E. Daniel, "The Idea of Man's Antiquity," Scientific American, November 1959, p. 173.

<sup>22</sup>Ramm, op. cit., pp. 40-41

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 65-80 for an excellent discussion on this issue.

of Scriptural truth.<sup>24</sup> As George Turner observed, the reader becomes the final authority to determine what is "truth" in the Scriptures and what is "myth."<sup>25</sup> The Bible reader is compelled to "select the inspired and authoritative utterances in the Bible from those which are uninspired, unauthoritative and erroneous."<sup>26</sup> While accepting the person of Jesus Christ as ultimate authority, the neo-orthodox would not accept Jesus' view of the Old Testament where it disagrees with the results of higher criticism. Logically, any system of theology which makes man the ultimate authority actually eliminates the necessity of the Scriptures. Some systems apparently have endeavored to elevate the subjective aspect of revelation and yet not destroy the objective aspect. Would not one be correct in observing that whenever the objective is made subservient to the subjective, the objective, in reality, is eliminated as the authority? Religious experience then becomes authoritative. Obviously this frees "religious modernism" from the bonds of Scriptural authoritarianism—but not without great cost. How is one to determine what is of value in the Scripture and what is not? To simply say that "their [Apostles'] witness is valid, absolutely binding, in so far as it really witnesses to Him [Jesus Christ],"<sup>27</sup> does not solve the problem. It merely directs it into another channel. How is one

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 32-34.

<sup>25</sup>George Turner, "The Emancipating Word of God," The Asbury Seminary, XLII, no. 1, p. 23.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God, I, 47.

to know what "really" witnesses to Christ? Is not this another argument for total subjectivism? Apparently the reader is to determine what is "truth" and what is not through his encounter with the Holy Spirit. Brunner, has represented this view when he wrote:

The word of Scripture is not the final court of appeal, since Jesus Christ Himself alone is the ultimate authority; . . . the Scripture, not . . . as an authority, but as the source of all that which possesses absolute authority.<sup>28</sup>

Brunner recognized that it is in the Scripture that one learns of Jesus Christ, the "ultimate authority." One wonders if it is consistent to accept this part of the record as being truth while refusing to accept another part of the same record, often written by the same Apostle. Instead of untying the "Gordian Knot," it appears that this system of thought cuts it.

In such systems of thought as this, there is no problem relative to science and Scripture tension. Where there is a conflict, the Bible is ruled out as being "pre-scientific." These writers were simply mistaken at that point. One cannot help but wonder if they were not mistaken at other points also, if this theory be true.

It appears to this investigator that both the hypertraditionalist and the religious modernist have problems of greater magnitude than the evangelical. The evangelical has tried to effect an agreement between the sciences and the Scriptures. Both the hypertraditionalist and the religious modernist need not bring the two together; the hypertraditionalist dismissed the claims of science while the religious modernist dismissed the claims of Scripture when

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

they spoke to anything but Jesus Christ.

### C. THE ACKNOWLEDGED LIMITATIONS OF MODERN SCIENCE

If there is to be agreement between the evangelical and modern science, one must recognize the limitations of modern science. These limitations are not those proposed by the evangelical but rather by men who are students of the sciences; therefore, the limitations should be carefully noted as not being the products of anti-scientists.

The limitations of the study of reality. There are some aspects of reality which cannot be measured or weighed in the scientific manner. The soul of man is one such aspect. Professor Paul Amos Moody, whose text Introduction to Evolution was used in the Oregon State higher educational system, recognizes the existence of this facet of reality which is immeasurable.

We . . . have said nothing about the human soul. The reason for the omission lies in the fact that the soul is outside the province of science. Science deals with phenomena which can be detected, studied, and measured by use of scientific instruments. The soul is not amenable to this approach. It cannot be seen, or weighed, or analyzed chemically; nor can it be studied--as yet, at least--by the methods of the psychologist. Thus discussion of the soul would be out of place in a book of science. This may not always be true, but for the present we must look to religion and philosophy for knowledge of the soul.<sup>29</sup>

So also has Arthur F. Smethurst, a Canon in the Church of England and a student of the sciences, stated.

---

<sup>29</sup>Paul Amos Moody, Introduction to Evolution, p. 202.

Science is essentially the study of the material world. . . . Thus, it will not give us information about spiritual reality nor about such things as aesthetic and moral values. These things are not within the proper scope of science and the methods of science are quite unqualified to give us information on them. Science depends upon such procedures as weighing and measuring; therefore such things as are imponderable or immeasurable cannot be identified or studied scientifically.<sup>30</sup>

Until the scientist has recognized the spiritual realities as well as the material, he will not be able to agree with the evangelical. Many, if not most, scientists recognize this limitation to the scientific method. Concerning this dual aspect of reality, Smethurst has written these words:

There is a part of reality which can, as it were, be caught, studied, and observed by the scientific method; and there is another part which will always elude this method. But the second part is no less real and no less important than the first.<sup>31</sup>

Professor A.V. Hill, past president of the British Association and Nobel prize winner in 1922 for scientific research, pointed out in his presidential address to the British Association in September, 1952 that "science in itself is strictly neutral, in so far as ethical judgements are concerned."<sup>32</sup>

Limitations due to the availability of instruments. That science works with tools and instruments is an obvious fact. That science is limited by the tools available to the scientist, is also a fact. Certain tools have been discovered in the past years which

---

<sup>30</sup>Smethurst, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 59, (Italics not in the original).

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 51, (quoted by Smethurst).

have radically changed some of the previous conclusions of science. Before the recognition of the fluorine-dating method, the Piltdown skull was dated at up to a million years; by the application of the fluorine test the date was reduced to not more than 50,000 years and this in turn led to the exposing of the Piltdown hoax.<sup>33</sup> Paul Moody wrote a year or so before the exposure of the Piltdown hoax, that the fluorine method of dating for the Piltdown man indicated that it "may be of more recent age than was formerly supposed."<sup>34</sup> Kenneth Oakley, authority in the fluorine method, stated that before the application of the fluorine test the popular estimates ranged from 200,000 to one million years.<sup>35</sup> After the fluorine test the range was cut to from 10,000 to 100,000 years, Oakley noted.

The carbon 14 method of dating has proved to be very useful to the paleontologist. As recent as 1955 the limit of the carbon 14 dating was estimated at between 30,000 to 50,000 years. However, only three years later, discoveries were made in this method of dating which has pushed the limit up to as high as 70,000 years, under certain conditions:

Most American laboratories find 35,000 to 45,000 years about maximum for their equipment. But Dr. de Vries at the Groningen laboratory has worked out a method of concentrating his samples until he can detect radiocarbon with as little as 1/2000 of the original radioactivity left. He has dated 60,000 year-old wood unearthed at Amersfoort in the Netherlands, and he

---

<sup>33</sup>Ramm, op. cit., pp. 311-312.

<sup>34</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 130.

<sup>35</sup>Kenneth Oakley, "Dating Fossil Human Remains," Anthropology Today, ed. by A. L. Kroeber, p. 47, written before exposing of the hoax.



reports that his instruments are delicate enough to go back 70,000 years.<sup>36</sup>

Science has made tremendous strides in the development of tools to guide its research. Just as scientists were limited twenty-five years ago by the lack of present-day tools, so the scientist of today is limited by the lack of tools which will be developed in the near future.

Science limited by lack of data. Professor Moody has given a very valid account for the lack of fossil data. He concluded by saying, "The wonder is, not that the geological record is incomplete, but that it is as complete as it is."<sup>37</sup> One might conclude that absence of data in other fields of science, besides paleontology, is very likely and that such absence is a logical limitation.

It is because of these, and other limitations, that science has not reached a final conclusion as to the origin of life, the antiquity of man and other related subjects. In many areas science has not turned in its final interpretations; they are still in a state of flux. Moody, in discussing the South African ape-man, stated:

Well-preserved pelvic bones clearly indicate erect posture. In fact the pelvis is strikingly like that of modern man and unlike that of apes. This fact has been established only very recently; it affords an example of the rapidity with which interpretations change as new facts become available.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>Lyman J. Briggs, "How Old Is It?" The National Geographic Magazine, August, 1958, CXIV, no. 2, p. 254. For explanation, pp. 234-255.

<sup>37</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 126, pp. 124-126 for this discussion.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 212, (Italics not in the original).

Professor Ramm commented on the finality of modern-day science by saying:

"True science" means "the best we have to date as developed by our best scientists." In this sense, "true science" is not final nor infallible.<sup>39</sup>

What does this mean to the evangelical? What is its significance? If the evangelical tried to reconcile his theology with that of current science, relative to man's origin, age, and development, and succeeded to do so, his position may well be laughed at in future decades by both scientists and theologians. If science is not final as yet in some of these areas, the evangelical cannot hope to reach full agreement with it. As carbon dating and fluorine dating reach their final stages and their conclusions are accepted as final and infallible, then, and only then, can the evangelical hope to relate the Scriptures and science in agreement in full. Such attempts were made in the past to interpret the Scriptures in the light of the contemporary sciences. Martin Luther believed Moses said that the world was 6,000 years old.<sup>40</sup> John Calvin stated that the world was created in the space of six days.<sup>41</sup> One wonders what would have been the public reaction if these reformers had proposed a cosmogony current with modern scientific views. Perhaps four centuries from now some of the modern-day theological

---

<sup>39</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>40</sup>Martin Luther, Luther's Works, ed. by Jaroslav Pelikan, I, 3.

<sup>41</sup>John Calvin, Calvin's Commentaries, trans. by John King, Genesis, I, 78.

cosmogonies will look as foolish. The lesson to be learned should be obvious; the theologian should be wary about offering his cosmogony as being infallible and final. Bernard Ramm, in discussing mistakes common to both the theologian and the scientist, said:

First, theologians and scientists may pronounce some scientific theory as final, and this can cause conflict. The theologian may presume a hypothesis to be a fact, and then have later developments in science demonstrate its falsity; the scientist may prematurely accept a hypothesis as true and find himself in conflict with the theologian. There have been no less than ten theories as to the origin of the solar system as listed in W. M. Smart's The Origin of the Earth (1951). Which is the true one? Which is the Biblical one? Premature judgments by either scientist or theologian may cause unnecessary friction.<sup>42</sup>

#### D. SUMMARY

The scientist seeks truth about the world in which he lives. The evangelical has no quarrel with such a quest for he also is a searcher after truth about this world. Although some of the scientists and theologians have made premature conclusions concerning the theory of creation--which have led to disagreements--there should be a great degree of harmony and understanding between the two. When there has been disunion because of ignorance, it appears the evangelical has been the loser in the eyes of the general public;<sup>43</sup> science has gained a threshold in the minds of educated people today. The advancements of medical science, as well as the achievements in technology, have proved of immense practical value to humanity. To deny that science has gained great prestige because of its value, is

---

<sup>42</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 49.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 18-26 for this discussion.

to close one's eyes to reality.

Much of the tension between science and the Bible has come as a result of an improper attitude on the part of hypertraditionalists who evidently feel called to guard the faith against the atheistic attacks of modern-day science. This extremism has brought more harm to Christianity than good. There is another extreme attitude, which is held by religious modernism, that has overtones of serious theological consequences. Although this attitude has endeavored to "marry" science and the Church, it has "divorced" itself from objective authority. To such a person the Bible is looked upon as a mixture of error and truth; it is up to the Bible reader to determine what is error and what is truth. This results in a subjectivism, the results of which are all too obvious to the thoughtful theologian.

To propose a theory of cosmogony that would be in agreement with the final conclusions of science, would at the present be extremely difficult since science has not as yet reached finality at this point. Were one to work out a system that would harmonize with the science of this day, it would no doubt be obsolete in another century or less. Hence, the evangelical attitude toward science is of supreme importance--it will always be in vogue. Although he may or may not agree with certain hypotheses of some scientists, he can agree with their method and objective. This is a matter of attitude. The evangelical must not be guilty of using the limitations of science as a scapegoat, arguing that any theory which is uncomfortable to the theologian can be excused simply because science has

not reached total finality. Total agreement between science and Scripture may not be possible at this time; however, the evangelical must not be guilty of causing greater dissension.

Unless the evangelical has a wholesome attitude toward science, he will not gain the hearing of either his congregation or the scientist; and the evangelical needs to be heard today.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVANGELICALISM

## CHAPTER III

### THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVANGELICALISM

Evangelicalism is not an organization and hence does not have an organized system of thought or theology. Nevertheless, there are certain cardinal beliefs which underlie this system called by the name "evangelicalism." This chapter will present the view which is generally recognized as "evangelical" as evidenced in publications representing it. If one keeps in mind the distinction drawn in the last chapter between the hypertraditional and the evangelical, it will help clarify the issues.

#### A. EVANGELICAL TENETS

Among the basic assumptions of evangelicalism are assumptions which are common to religious thought in general. Wiley lists four universal religious characteristics. They are: (1) a thought of a supernatural power, (2) a sense of need, (3) an idea of reverence or worship, and (4) an assurance of some sort of the manifestation of this supernatural power.<sup>1</sup>

Other assumptions may come under the framework of the Christian religion alone. Still others may be rejected by some who would call their system "Christian". The following list of evangelical tenets are offered as basic to a wholesome approach to the tension existing between science and the Bible.

---

<sup>1</sup>Wiley, op. cit., pp. 119-121.

Truth. The evangelical shares the objective of most all, if not all, religions and that is a relating of self to truth. While this quest includes the material aspect of reality, it is primarily a quest for spiritual knowledge. As noted before, the scientist is a searcher after truth also, although his goal may be natural truth.

God and truth. Most religions believe that God, or Ultimate Reality, is truth. Many differ in their concept of God but still they feel that whoever or whatever He is, is Truth. Christianity is no different at this point. The evangelical thus agrees with the rest of Christianity in asserting that God is Ultimate Reality. One writer expressed what seems to be commonly accepted when he stated:

. . . there can be no question among religious people, that the authority is God. . . . If God exists, He is the ultimate criterion and power of truth and reality.<sup>2</sup>

Herein, however, has not been the problem. The question has been, ". . . in what way does God make known Himself, His mind and His authority to men generally?"<sup>3</sup> This question leads to the next tenet of the evangelical.

God and revelation. The evangelical would no doubt agree with professor Wiley relative to his view of revelation in general when he stated, "By general revelation as the term is used in theology, we mean that disclosure of Himself which God makes to all men--in nature,

---

<sup>2</sup>T. Rees, "Authority," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, 334.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.



in the constitution of the mind, and in the progress of human history."<sup>4</sup> Concerning special revelation he stated, "By special Revelation we refer to the redemptive purpose of God manifested in Christ Jesus."<sup>5</sup> The evangelical who would agree with professor Wiley would conclude that revelation is a self-disclosure of God to man, whether it be general or special.

Revelation and the Scriptures. This subject is in itself worthy of much greater consideration than will be given at this point. Certain conclusions have been reached by present-day-scholars, who have written on the problem of revelation, and these conclusions will be noted here. Wiley stated:

The Scriptures Contain and Are the Word of God. Christ was Himself the full and perfect revelation of the Father. . . the last word of all objective revelation.<sup>6</sup>

Wiley, evidently referring to a statement by MacPherson wrote:

Christianity thus owes its existence to Christ, the revealer of God, but the knowledge of Christianity is immediately set forth in the Scriptures, which must be received and understood by the heart and mind of the believer (cf. MacPherson, Chr. Dogm., p. 27).<sup>7</sup>

Wiley continued, showing clearly the relationship between the revelation found in the Scriptures, Nature and Jesus Christ.

To rightly understand, then, the nature and function of the Bible, it must be viewed as occupying an intermediate position between the primary revelation of God in nature, and the perfect revelation of God in Christ--the Personal Word. If

---

<sup>4</sup>H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, I, 126.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 137.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

we place at the very center of Revelation the idea of the Eternal Word, and draw about it a series of concentric circles, the first and nearest would represent the Word incarnate or the revelation of God in Christ the Personal Word. The second circle farther removed would represent the Bible as the written Word. It is in this sense that the Bible is at once the Word of God and the record of that Word. . . The third and outer circle would represent the revelation of God in nature and the created universe. In order, therefore, to correctly understand the Bible as the Written Word, we must estimate it in its relation to nature on the one hand, and the Personal Word on the other.<sup>8</sup>

Though many scholars from different theological systems may disagree just as to how the Bible is or contains the Word of God, yet they do seem to agree on this one point, "The Bible is indispensable to the Christian faith." Karl Barth said:

The revealed Word of God we know only from the Scripture. . . The proclaimed Word of God we know only by knowing the revelation attested through Scripture.<sup>9</sup>

Georgia Harkness pointed out that "among top-ranking scholars of the ecumenical movement [there is] . . . great unanimity of appeal to the Bible as authority."<sup>10</sup> Harry Fosdick believes that his approach to the Bible is such that it restores "what once our fathers had and what recently the church has lost: ability to see the Bible in its entirety and to use it as a whole."<sup>11</sup> While some may disagree with Fosdick's method of Biblical study it is noteworthy that he wishes the entire Bible restored for use.

The purpose of the Bible. If the Bible is a revelation from

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 139. (Italics not in the original).

<sup>9</sup> Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, I, 1, 136.

<sup>10</sup> Georgia Harkness, Foundations of Christian Knowledge, p. 96.

<sup>11</sup> Harry Emerson Fosdick, The Modern Use of the Bible, p. 29.

God of Himself to man, then one can conclude that the major purpose of the Bible is to reveal God to man. It will help the Bible student if he will remember that the primary purpose of the Bible is a religious purpose and not a scientific one. Apparently the Bible is not a textbook on the sciences of man but rather on the sinfulness of man. There may be times, however, when the Bible seems to speak on matters pertaining to the sciences. What should be the student's attitude toward such statements? An attempt to answer this question will be made at this time.

The Language of the Bible. One's view of the interpretation of the Bible will be governed by his view of its inspiration. Since language is indispensable to communication--and revelation is communication--it is logical to conclude that the language of the revelation in the Bible is of utmost importance. How one approaches the language of the Bible will determine, perhaps, his interpretation to a great degree.

C. Peter Wagner, in answer to the charge that the evangelical is a Bibliolater, sets forth in Eternity magazine eight levels of Scripture-truth. The first is "historical" truth; by this he means the simple recording of an event or statement made by a person. The statement may or may not have been true, but the recording of that statement is accurate. "Poetical" truth is another level of truth which refers to language which does not even assume to be understood in a literal or scientific sense. Even today poetic language is not scientific. Do trees really "cry"? Why must some of the poetical language in the Bible be interpreted as being literal? Next he lists

"phenomenal" truth as being closely related to poetical truth; it does differ, however, in that while it is not scientifically accurate, yet it is true from the point of view of the observer. Men say, even today, "The sun rose this morning." Scientifically this is inaccurate, yet from the standpoint of the observer, it is phenomenally true. "Symbolical" truth is truth which is clothed in symbols. Wagner cites prophetic visions as a good illustration of this "level" of truth. When Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou art this head of gold," he was speaking symbolically. Another is "proverbial" truth. The book of Proverbs would be an illustration of this type of truth. This type is not to be pressed literally. "Cultural" truth refers to that which can only be fully understood or interpreted in the light of the culture in which it was written. While containing principles that may pertain for all cultures, it still cannot be fully understood outside of the culture in which it was written. Wagner lists next "spiritual" truth. Although not written for doctrinal purposes, this truth may well teach doctrine. From such passages one learns of the spiritual conflicts of men in their experiences. The interpreter would not want to imitate the writers at every point, but can certainly learn from their experiences. David's writings are given as an example here. The last level is "theological" truth. Paul's writings are vital here. Stated Wagner:

We are bound to know them and follow them literally within the bounds of sound historical-grammatical exegesis because they're theological truth.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>C. Peter Wagner, "Bibliolatry," Eternity, IX, no. 11, pp. 14-16.

When one recognizes these various "levels" of truth—not levels of inspiration—then many of the problem passages relative to science diminish. Bernard Ramm feels also that the "keypoint of the entire approach to the problem of harmonizing the Bible and scientific knowledge"<sup>13</sup> lies in this area of language. He noted that the language of the Bible is popular, not scientific, in reference to natural matters. This language is phenomenal and non-postulational. Though the language of the Bible is "pre-scientific" it is not "anti-scientific."<sup>14</sup> One of the remarkable features of the Bible is the obvious omission of theorizing relative to natural things. W. Bell Dawson set this forth clearly when he said:

A remarkable point in Biblical references to nature, is that we find no definite explanation anywhere of natural things. The writers of the Bible do not go beyond the description of what they actually see around them, and the correct way in which they describe what they do see, is beyond praise. This is the more noteworthy when we find so many mistakes in references to nature, in the poets of all times, and even in modern writers. We may see good reason why the Scriptures avoid explaining natural phenomena, when we consider that the only explanations current during the centuries in which the Bible was written, were full of mythological ideas. . . . The writers of the Bible show more than severe self-control, and must indeed have been divinely guided, in thus keeping to description and avoiding theoretical explanations of natural things. For scientists<sup>15</sup> have now come to adopt this attitude as the only safe way.

Some authorities felt that the Genesis account of creation was a myth which the Hebrews borrowed from their kinsmen, the Babylonians. This was a conclusion drawn from the observation that the

---

<sup>13</sup>Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture, p. 72.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 65-80 for an excellent discussion.

<sup>15</sup>W. Bell Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, pp. 32-33.

two accounts supposedly resembled each other.<sup>16</sup> A superficial reading of the two accounts may give that impression to some.

We may suppose that the ancient Chaldeans had intelligence enough to understand that such accounts were in reality myths: not to be taken literally.<sup>17</sup>

On the other hand there is nothing in the description of the creation, and of early man, as recorded in the Scriptures, which "cannot be taken just as it stands written, without any such outrage to common sense as these myths demand."<sup>18</sup> A portion of the Babylonian myth will be noted here so that the reader may judge for himself the "resemblance" of the two accounts.

Apsu and Tiamat were water Deities and typified chaos; to these were born Lahmu and Lahamu, and later appeared Amshar and Kishar, and still later Anu and other gods came into being. . . .Aspu disliked the new order of things. . . .Marduk slew her [Tiamat] and split her body into halves. . . .one half of the body of Tiamat formed a covering for heaven [the other half formed earth] . . .Marduk, or Bel, instructed Ea to cut off his (Marduk's) head, and the man was formed out of the blood which flowed from the god's body.<sup>19</sup>

Theorizing relative to other natural things, such as where the sun went at night, is prevalent in ancient literature. It is conspicuously absent in the Scriptures. This can be accounted for when one takes into account the superintending work of the Holy Spirit in the inspiration and guidance of the writers of the Scriptures.

It appears wise to hold a view of inspiration which will allow

---

<sup>16</sup> "Creation," The Encyclopedia Americana, VIII, 170.

<sup>17</sup> Dawson, op. cit., p. 29.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> "Creation", loc. cit.

latitude to the Biblical writers in the language employed by them; otherwise, it seems as though many problems will arise during interpretation. The view which holds that the Holy Spirit inspired the writers and they in turn wrote in the language of their day and in their own personal style, is not in disagreement with the Scriptural reference to inspiration; ". . . men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit."<sup>20</sup> This view, that the writers were "given extraordinary aid without any interference with their personal characteristics or activities"<sup>21</sup> is held by such theologians as Wiley, Pope, Miley, Strong, Watson, Wakefield, Summers, Ralston and Hills.<sup>22</sup> It is this view of inspiration which this investigator feels is conducive to an agreement between science and Scriptures. Those who held to a rigid verbal or dictation theory have had difficulty in accounting for the popular language of the Bible as well as the various linguistic stylings of the Biblical writers.

#### B. SUMMARY

Christianity is a religion of revelation. The Bible is indispensable to revelation. Language is an essential element in any communication, and hence is essential to the revelation found in the Christian Scriptures. Therefore, a study of the philosophy of the use of language in the Scriptures is a keypoint to a true interpretation

---

<sup>20</sup> II Peter 1:21. A.S. Version.

<sup>21</sup> Wiley, op. cit., p. 176.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

of Scripture. The student who has a coherent system of inspiration and interpretation will be saved many pitfalls relative to what the Bible actually says and what some say that it says. Only a philosophy of inspiration which allows flexibility in the language used by the Biblical writers will save the interpreter from conclusions which conflict with the reliable findings of science. Wiley noted:

The Earth and the Bible are God's two texts, each having its place, time and function in progressive revelation. Nature is the primary source of knowledge, the Bible is the supplementary source.<sup>23</sup>

As such they compliment, not abrogate, each other. Due to his unwarranted insistence on literal accuracy, the strict literalist immediately becomes involved in a conflict between the results of geology and the language of Genesis I. The evangelical who holds the "dynamic theory," herein advocated, is free to interpret the seemingly "scientific" language of the Bible as being simply popular language. When the Bible speaks of the "four corners of the earth"<sup>24</sup> this is neither scientific nor anti-scientific language; it is obviously popular or phenomenal language. This concept of Biblical language is essential to an understanding of the following pages of this paper.

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 140.

<sup>24</sup>Revelation 20:8. A. S. Version.



#### CHAPTER IV

#### BIBLICAL PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN

## CHAPTER IV

### BIBLICAL PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN

#### A. INTRODUCTION

The evangelical Biblical interpreter faces many problems when he endeavors to effect agreement between the Scriptures and the reliable findings of modern science. The reason for these problems are enunciated by Pratt:

The book of Nature and the Word of God emanate from the same infallible Author, and therefore cannot be at variance. But man is a fallible interpreter, and by mistaking one or both of these Divine Records, he forces them too often into unnatural conflict.<sup>1</sup>

The evangelical's view that the Scriptures are accurate and reliable necessitates an attempt on his part to bring the two "records" as closely together as is humanly possible.

The anthropological problem. The point of greatest concern in the science-Scripture tension is located in the area of the study of man. There is not the problem in botany, astronomy, or even geology, that there is in anthropology. Those who have scientific training recognize this as the vital area of apparent conflict. In a work presented by the American Scientific Affiliation, William Smalley underscores the importance of the anthropological implications to the Bible student:

Few Christians realize, however, that most of the crucial points

---

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Pratt, Scripture and Science Not at Variance, quoted by Ramm, op. cit., p. 50.

of the science-Scripture conflict center in anthropology, and that concepts of the evolution of man and the development of civilization are both in the sphere of anthropology.<sup>2</sup>

Many Bibles, observed Smalley, have listed in their margins a date of 4004 B.C. for the creation of man; however, many human fossils date back beyond 4004 B.C. by thousands of years, so the scientist claims. Here the evangelical faces a vital problem.<sup>3</sup> An answer needs to be given those who are confronted with the claims of modern anthropological discoveries and the claims of theologians whose dates appear in the margins of Bibles. The problem of dating the earth and plant life does not present similar problems if the "day" of Genesis I is taken in the broad sense of a "period of time." Problems arise, possibly, when one tries to arrange chronologically the events of Genesis I with the process proposed by modern science. Ramm pointed out that the problems inherent in the anthropological conflict were "far more pressing to evangelical Christianity than those of geology or astronomy."<sup>4</sup> This chapter will endeavor to show why there is a greater problem in anthropology than any of the other sciences relative to an agreement with past Biblical interpretations.

The observation has been made that the Scripture places no time limit on the creation of the world--which involves geology, paleontology, and astronomy. The flexibility of the Hebrew word

---

<sup>2</sup> Smalley and Fetzer, "A Christian View of Anthropology," Modern Science and Christian Faith, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>4</sup> Ramm, op. cit., p. 305.

01<sup>2</sup>, translated "day" in the Genesis account of creation, easily allows the scientist latitude in estimating the antiquity of the earth. Can this same flexibility be used as an answer to the anthropological dating of 50,000 to 500,000 for man's age?

The recognition of problems. Evidence that problems exist between science and Scriptures, relative to the dating of man, can be found in the multitude of books written concerning the science-Scripture conflict. Harold W. Bernard, an educator in Oregon State's system of higher education, stated that the first step in problem solving was a "felt need."<sup>5</sup> Many evangelicals are aware of a need of harmony between the books of science and Scripture. This is evident by such articles as, "A Fresh Look at Evolution," and "Evolution or Creation?" appearing within a year in an evangelical periodical.<sup>6</sup> One may either agree or disagree with the conclusions of these articles, but he cannot logically dismiss the idea that a problem exists in this realm.

Educator Bernard lists as the next step in a problem solving situation the "locating or recognizing a problem situation."<sup>7</sup> The importance of recognizing and understanding the problem is seen in these words: "The more clearly one can state the nature of his difficulty the more likely he is to solve it."<sup>8</sup> Hence, if the evangel-

---

<sup>5</sup>Harold W. Bernard, *Psychology of Learning and Teaching*, p.155.

<sup>6</sup>Christianity Today, 11, no. 23 and 111, no. 16 issues.

<sup>7</sup>Bernard, loc. cit.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

ical is to attempt to solve the science-Scripture tension for himself and for others, he must first recognize what is involved in the problem and what the nature of the difficulty is. This chapter is an attempt to lay bare the problems inherent in the evangelical view of man's antiquity in the light of modern anthropology and paleontology. The investigator observed that only as all of the ramifications of the conflict are duly recognized will the evangelical position be spared embarrassment in the future as well as the present attempts at agreement.

A counterfeit solution. At this point the reader is asked to recall the discussion earlier concerning the modern religious view that the Bible is but the result of man's development. To the casual reader this may seem to be the utopian answer. It certainly is a solution to the science-Scripture problem. If the Bible is but the product of ancient men, it cannot be expected to agree with the sciences of this day. To the evangelical, apparently, this looms up as a destructive, counterfeit solution. He dare not take this leap in logic if he desires to retain the Scriptures as a rule of faith and conduct. In the definition of an evangelical offered in this paper, it was noted that an evangelical holds to the Bible as the rule of faith and conduct. If the Bible is full of scientific error, what guards it against the possibility of being full of theological and religious error? To simply state that the Bible is not a scientific book but rather a religious book does not solve this problem. Dawson has said essentially the same thing.

In the mean time I wish to enforce the important principle that,

with respect to the history of creation and the subsequent references to it, we cannot rest in the general statement that the Bible is not intended to teach Science, any more than we can excuse inaccuracy as to historical facts by the notion that the Bible was not intended to teach history.<sup>9</sup>

If the Bible is errant scientifically, it may well be errant doctrinally.

Some new involvements in the problem of man. The writer has tried to include in this paper the main problems involved in the anthropological problem. Perhaps some new aspects of this problem have been brought to light in this work that have not been handled by all the authors who have written on this subject. It has been his desire to show how these involvements must be taken into consideration by the person who endeavors to bring harmony at this point. What will be noted herein is not new to the theologian; however, some of these problems may not have been considered as being vital to the anthropology-Scripture harmony. This chapter will compose the main body of this work. That which has been written up to now is introductory and preparatory.

#### B. THE INTEGRITY OF THE SCRIPTURES

While it may have appeared to a reader of the present volumes on the science-Scripture tension that the primary goal of these evangelical authors was to bring into agreement the two records of science and Scripture, it seems that the underlying motivation is the maintenance of the integrity of Holy Scripture. F. Alton Everest,

---

<sup>9</sup>J. W. Dawson, op. cit., p. 26.

President of the American Scientific Affiliation in 1950, spoke to this point:

It is the earnest prayer of each author that this volume will prove to be an able witness to the veracity of the Word of God in order that the claims of Christ on the lives of men may be effectively proclaimed in this science-minded age.<sup>10</sup>

John W. Dawson implied that he was concerned about proving the integrity of the Scriptures when he desired "to show more in detail that the Bible is true to nature."<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps it would be well to mention at this point the relationship between a belief in the reliability of the Scriptures en masse and one's personal salvation. While it seems inconsistent to accept the teaching of the Bible relative to Christ's redemptive work and then to reject its teaching relative to the historical data, it has obviously been done. How many pastors, when leading a person to accept Christ as Savior, first of all led the person to an acceptance of the historical authenticity of all the data in the Scriptures? The evangelical could possibly conclude then that there are theologians who know Christ as personal Savior and yet who do not view the Scriptures in total as historically reliable. Thus, while it may be possible to be converted and yet deny the integrity of all Scripture, it is certainly dangerous. It appears that a distrust would grow toward all Scripture if only part of it was viewed as being reliable. The theologian who accepted Jesus as his Savior from sin and yet denied Moses, would seem to be a living paradox;

---

<sup>10</sup> F. Alton Everest, Modern Science and Christian Faith, vii.

<sup>11</sup> Dawson, op. cit., p. 43.

his system would seem paradoxical also. The evangelical should be able to show why such a view is paradoxical, but must do it with charity. Even though the evangelical may feel that the integrity of the Scriptures is a very central tenet of any system of religious thought that claims to be "Christian," let him view those who differ with him at this point with genuine Christian love and understanding. Let the evangelical remember that one may still be a Christian and yet not agree with him on the issue of Scriptural integrity.

On the other hand, the evangelical may reason that since the acceptance of the historical reliability of the Bible is non-essential to one's personal salvation, he will ignore the problem completely and concern himself with the "saving of souls." The motive is commendable, but the outcome will be disastrous when such a person is confronted with an inquiring, scientific-minded young person who feels there is conflict between the science of Genesis and the science of the classroom. The evangelical who has not bothered himself with the problem will, in all probability, lose such a young person from his influence. The greater tragedy is that all too often the youth loses faith in the Church and its Christ as a result. One wonders if it ever is wise to refuse to face any problem squarely? The evangelical must not be accused of obscurantism.

Agreement between Scripture and nature. As noted before, it has been generally held among theologians that the Scriptures are somehow connected with God's revelation of Himself to man. The contemporary Lutheran theologian, F. Pieper, stated the position which



could well be that of the evangelical relative to the inspiration of Holy Scripture:

Inspiration covers not only a part of Scripture, e.g. the chief matters, the doctrines, and such things as were before unknown to the writers, etc., but the entire Scriptures. Every part of Scripture is inspired. That, and nothing less, is the meaning of "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."<sup>12</sup>

Professor Berkhof, present-day reformed theologian, shows the relationship existing between nature and Scripture by observing, "All our knowledge of God is derived from His self-revelation in nature and in Scripture."<sup>13</sup> Although one may not have agreed with professors Berkhof and Pieper, in total, yet if he is to be an evangelical he will agree with the essential truths of these two statements. Namely, that it is through His self-revelation in nature and Scriptures that God is known; and that the entire Scriptures are inspired. The evangelical is urged to recall at this point the words of C. Peter Wagner when he stated that while there are not levels of inspiration in the Bible there are levels of truth.

Pertinent to the revelation of God found in nature and the Bible, Berkhof commented:

The Bible testifies to a twofold revelation of God: a revelation in nature round about us, in human consciousness, and in the providential government of the world; and a revelation embodied in the Bible as the Word of God. It testifies to the former in such passages as the following: "The heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament [sic] showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge," Ps. 19:1,2.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics, p. 220.

<sup>13</sup>L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology, p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

J. H. Wythe, apparently a doctor of medicine and a minister, concluded pertaining to the two books of nature and Scripture, "Thus the Record of Moses and Nature's Record bear each other witness."<sup>15</sup> As to why two records are necessary, Berkhof has stated concerning the position of Scholasticism:

But while it [natural revelation] enabled man to attain to a scientific natural knowledge of God as the ultimate cause of all things, it did not provide for the knowledge of the mysteries, such as the Trinity, the incarnation, and redemption. This knowledge is supplied by special revelation.<sup>16</sup>

Benjamin Warfield, noted theologian, said essentially the same thing concerning the distinction and yet the unity of these two forms of revelation:

The one has in view to meet and supply the natural need of creatures for knowledge of their God; the other to rescue broken and deformed sinners from their sin and its consequences. But, though thus distinguished from one another, it is important that the two species or stages of revelation should not be set in opposition to one another, or the closeness of their mutual relations or the constancy of their interaction be obscured. They constitute together a unitary whole, and each is incomplete without the other.<sup>17</sup>

Wythe, referring to the results of geology and paleontology, keenly observed:

The gradual unfolding of these facts was witnessed on the one hand by weak-minded theologians with dread, lest the foundations of Scripture faith should be overturned,—as if Nature, properly interpreted, could ever contradict God's Word!—and on the other hand was prematurely hailed by half-educated infidels as a contribution to their cause. The great masters of

---

<sup>15</sup>J. H. Wythe, The Agreement of Science and Revelation, p. 172.

<sup>16</sup>Berkhof, op. cit., p. 37.

<sup>17</sup>Benjamin B. Warfield, "Revelation," I.S.B.E., IV, 2575.

science and humble Christians remained unmoved, being fully persuaded that "the word of the Lord endureth forever."<sup>18</sup>

Perhaps he expressed the position of evangelicalism when he stated that nature, properly interpreted, will not contradict God's Word. Could one not add here that God's Word, properly interpreted, will not contradict nature either? Thomas Aquinas, according to Berkhof, agreed.

He [Thomas Aquinas] held, however, that there could be no conflict between the truths of natural and those of supernatural revelation. If there appears to be conflict, there is something wrong with one's philosophy.<sup>19</sup>

This appears to be very much the opinion of evangelical scholars today.

In regard to the agreement between geology and the Scripture, Wythe quotes a professor Guyot. Wythe called Guyot "one of the most distinguished physical geographers" of his day. Professor Guyot stated:

To a sincere and unsophisticated mind, it must be evident that the grand outlines sketched by Moses are the same as those which modern science enables us to trace; however imperfect and unsettled the details furnished by scientific inquiries may appear on many points. Whatever changes we may expect to be introduced by new discoveries, in our present view of the universe and the globe, the prominent points of this vast picture will remain. And these only are traced out in this admirable account of Genesis.<sup>20</sup>

This observation, made during the nineteenth century, is still held by evangelicals conversant in the fields of theology and geology.

---

<sup>18</sup>Wythe, op. cit., p. 152.

<sup>19</sup>Berkhof, loc. cit.

<sup>20</sup>Guyot, quoted by Wythe, op. cit., pp. 154-155.

Such a person is Edwin K. Gedney. In his contribution to the American Scientific Affiliation's publication he stated that "geology serves as a complement to the Bible by providing a wealth of detail to amplify the outline of Genesis."<sup>21</sup> He also gave a chart as a suggested harmony between the two records. Wythe has summed it up when he said:

The deductions of Natural Science being regarded as fixed facts, men are inclined to make them a standard of all truth. It is therefore necessary to show the harmony and consistency existing between the Book of Nature and that volume which claims to be the Book of God's revelation in human language.<sup>22</sup>

The matter has been squarely set before the evangelical. Science has made its impress upon the thinking of modern man. If the Bible is to speak to modern man, it would seem that agreement must be shown between the sciences of the day and this Bible.

In the preface to Modern Science and Christian Faith, F. Alton Everest clearly laid forth the necessity of vindicating the Bible when it speaks relative to historical and scientific matters. If it is found to be unreliable at these points, how can one help but wonder about the reliability of the rest of Scripture?

The Bible states that it is a message from God to man containing information as to the past, present, and future course of events, the full significance of which man cannot discover by himself. Its message is primarily a spiritual one; yet its sweeping scope treating man and his home, the earth, from creation to the end time inevitably touches upon points of great historical and scientific significance. Surely if this Book is found untrustworthy in these incidental contacts, the

---

<sup>21</sup>Edwin K. Gedney, "Geology and the Bible," Modern Science and Christian Faith, p. 54.

<sup>22</sup>Wythe, op. cit., p. 29.

spiritual message might be viewed with suspicion.<sup>23</sup>

The uniqueness of the Genesis account of Creation. Before leaving the subject of the integrity of the Scriptures, it may be well to note the uniqueness of the account of creation as found in Genesis as compared with the sciences of mankind up until the advent of modern science. Doctor Charles Warring observed that this uniqueness was a definite sign of the Divine origin of the Bible and especially this account of creation.

Whatever may be thought of certain prominent theories of so-called science--mostly pertaining to biology--there is no doubt that vastly more of the world's actual history is known now than, for example, in the days of Milton; and, consequently, we are to that extent in a better position for the comprehending the story of creation. On the other hand, if the account in Genesis were of human invention it would easily square with the science of the times in which it was written.<sup>24</sup>

The significant aspect of this Genesis account is that it does not square with the science of its day, but rather is more in line with modern-day science. Doctor Wythe suggests that the brief history of the creation, as found in Genesis I, was "for centuries the plainest, most rational, and most consistent known to mankind."<sup>25</sup> The Biblical account stands out strangely isolated from the ancient philosophies of creation.

The creation of the world out of nothing by the power of God, its globular form and suspension in space, and its gradual

---

<sup>23</sup> Everest, op. cit., p. vi.

<sup>24</sup> Warring, op. cit., p. 21.

<sup>25</sup> Wythe, op. cit., p. 149.

preparation as a habitation for man, were clearly taught by the Bible when all the ancient philosophies and systems of heathenism were full of the crudest and most absurd theories.<sup>26</sup>

Some of these theories may be found in books of mythology and in encyclopedias. Wythe lists a few of the ideas current in ancient ideas relative to the earth and the heavens which are "strangely" absent in the Biblical account. "Thus, in Greek and Latin philosophy the heavens were considered a solid vault, studded with stars."<sup>27</sup>

It was interesting to note that the Hebrew word  $\text{רָקִיעַ}$ , translated "firmament," means literally "an expanse." The word  $\text{שָׁמַיִם}$ , translated "heavens," also fails to carry with it any idea of solidness.

Hence, while some other ancient systems of creation make the heavens a solid covering in which the stars are firmly imbedded, this connotation is miraculously absent from the language of the Biblical creation account. Regarding the earth, Wythe wrote:

. . . and to account for the motion of the planets, men fancied that there existed a strange machinery of cycles and epicycles. . . Mohammed taught that the mountains were created to prevent the earth from moving, and to hold it as by anchors and chains.<sup>28</sup>

A wise word of caution for the evangelical is noted in the following reference to the speculations of former church writers who wandered from the text of the Scripture itself.

Even the Fathers of the church, as they are called, neglecting the study of the Scriptures for the speculations of the old philosophers, taught doctrines scarcely less absurd; and

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

Galileo was condemned by the Inquisition for teaching the motion of the earth.<sup>29</sup>

Warring stated that there was ample reason for accepting the Genesis account as having a Divine origin when he penned these words:

But when men acquired larger and more accurate knowledge of the past it [Genesis account] would diverge more and more from the current "science," until, at last, the contradiction would become so apparent that no sane man could accept both as true. This has been the fate of all cosmogonies save the Mosaic.<sup>30</sup>

Wythe concurs with the position of Warring when he stated:

But as the truths of natural science have been developed by experiments and observation, and rational views of creation have been established, they have been found consistent with, and often anticipated by, the language of Holy Writ.<sup>31</sup>

He went on to say that other portions of the Scripture allude to the creation of the world and that none of them are at variance with the science of modern day.

Scriptural misinterpretations. The integrity of the Scriptures will always be in doubt as long as men's interpretations of the Bible are equated with the Scripture itself. Many of professor Huxley's objections to the Genesis account of creation during the latter part of the nineteenth century, were in reality leveled against Milton's interpretation as found in his "Paradise Lost."<sup>32</sup> A list of some of the commonly accepted views of "Scriptural truth," which in reality were merely the interpretations of men, were set forth by

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Warring, op. cit., pp. 21-22. (Italics not in the original).

<sup>31</sup>Wythe, loc. cit.

<sup>32</sup>Warring, op. cit., p. 12.

Warring.

"The universe was made six thousand years ago." "Light and darkness are substances." "There is a solid dome or arch above the earth." "The sun and moon are supported by that arch." "The earth is the largest body in the universe." "The continents and seas were made in a few hours." "These were all completed before any plants or animals existed." "There were no plants or animals before grasses, herbs, and fruit-trees." "The sun was created after these plants." "The earth is larger than the sun or the stars." "There was no animal life on land, or in the water, before whales and birds." "There were no land animals before cattle, beasts, and other living creatures." "There were no men before Adam."

Not one of these statements is found in this account. Each is merely an inference by somebody from what he thinks Moses meant. Mostly they are bare interpolations.<sup>33</sup>

That the Church has erred in its interpretation of Scripture in some areas is evident by her treatment of such scientific advances as the discovery of the rotation of the earth as proposed by Copernicus.

Galileo was condemned by the pope because of his astronomical discoveries.<sup>34</sup> Navigators circumnavigated the earth, thereby proving

its spherical shape. However, "the Catholic Church continued obstinately to refuse to accept the truth which the adventurous navigators had proved."<sup>35</sup> Such an attitude on the part of the Church

caused men to ask the question, "If the Church stands against the great discoveries of these men, in what other ways is she resisting the truth and teaching falsehoods?"<sup>36</sup> One might well apply that

same question to the Church today, evangelical or otherwise.

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 212.

<sup>34</sup>Henry Hallam Saunderson, The Way Called Heresy, p. 315.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 314.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.



The attitude of Pieper seems very unwise at this point. He states very dogmatically that

the time in which creation was completed was six days. . . these six days are neither to be shortened, for pious reasons. . . nor. . . extended, for impious reasons. . . to six periods of indefinite length.<sup>37</sup>

Pieper continued to say that these can only be interpreted correctly as being twenty-four hour days. One wonders if such an attitude is either safe or scholarly.

Benjamin Warfield's attitude at this point should be contrasted with that of Pieper's. Pieper seemingly had little use for the claims of modern geology when he stated:

Men who presume to correct God's record of the creation through conclusions drawn from the recent condition of the world are playing the role of scientific wiseacres, a procedure unworthy of Christians, as well as of men in general. The discord among professional geologists, for example, as to the age of the earth and of man is so great that only he will speak of "assured results" of geology who has completely renounced the use of what reason is left to man after the Fall.<sup>38</sup>

The reader is asked to contrast this attitude with that taken by Benjamin Warfield who stated that evolution "cannot act as a substitute for creation, but as best can supply only a theory of the method of the divine providence."<sup>39</sup> If one had to choose between these two attitudes, the evangelical would do well to look upon the sciences as a complement to theology, rather than its enemy. To equate one's view of interpretation with the truth itself, as apparently

---

<sup>37</sup> Pieper, op. cit., p. 468.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 467.

<sup>39</sup> Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, Biblical and Theological Studies, p. 238.

Pieper has done, only widens the gap between the scientist and the theologian.

If the Bible is allowed to speak dogmatically only on those points where it is clearly dogmatic, it will vindicate itself. An illustration of this is found relative to the origin of the universe. There was a time when matter was viewed as indestructible. This led to the conclusion that matter was eternal.<sup>40</sup> However, now that atomic energy has come into being we know that mass can be changed into energy and energy into mass; this points to a beginning of things, so some scientists reason. Peter Stoner, Christian astronomer, stated that "science has now set tentative ages for many things."<sup>41</sup> In a recent article of Science News Letter the universe was dated at between seven to thirteen billion years. The author stated that for the first time this jibes with the age of the universe found as a result of radioactive dating.

Dr. Allan R. Sandage of the Observatories' [Mount Wilson and Palomar] staff said the large variation in the estimated age of the universe is due to uncertainties that still exist in the measurements. The figures are significant, however, because for the first time they are consistent with the age set by geologists based on the decay of radioactive elements in rocks and meteorites.<sup>42</sup>

The scientists now speak of the "birth" of the universe. This agrees with the dogmatic statement of the Scriptures that God brought the universe into being at a certain time.

---

<sup>40</sup>Peter Stoner, "Genesis I in the Light of Modern Astronomy," The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe, p. 139.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>"Universe Age Now Jibes with Radioactive Dating," Science News Letter, November 15, 1958, LXXIV, 307.

The evangelical should ever keep before him the thought that Genesis does not attempt to describe the process of nature. "I read that there was light; that an expanse was made in the midst of the waters. . . that the waters brought forth water animals," wrote Charles Warring. And he continues, "But not one word do I see as to 'the infinitely complex processes involved.'"<sup>43</sup>

### C. THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN

Since man is the object of God's revelation and redemption, he thus becomes a very central figure in any system of theology or soteriology. Hence, any system of theology which endeavored to find common ground with modern science had to reckon with the problem of man. An interesting observation was made by this investigator. In the publication, Modern Science and Christian Faith, more than twice the space was given to the consideration of anthropology than to any other one subject in the book. And this is rightly so. No other field of science touches the nerve center of theology more than modern-day anthropology, which includes human paleontology. In the conclusion of his study on anthropology, Ramm stated:

We have now surveyed Genesis and anthropology and found the problems more severe than Genesis and geology. The most uncomfortable problem is the relationship of the antiquity of man, the Fall of man, to the advanced state of culture in Genesis

---

<sup>43</sup>Warring, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

<sup>44</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 342.

### Sources of Data

To the evangelical there are two main sources of knowledge concerning the antiquity of man. That is knowledge which is contained in the record of God's revelation as found in the natural world and that which is contained in the special revelation of His Written Word. The former shall be called "scientific data" and the latter, "Scriptural data."

Scientific data. In the past some evangelicals have disregarded the finds and conclusions of human paleontologists on the basis that these finds were meager and widely scattered. This can no longer be a valid argument against such data. "Between eighty and ninety individuals are represented by skeletal remains of varying completeness," wrote Professor Moody concerning the remains of the "Neanderthal man."<sup>45</sup> The paleontologist is not accumulating data from only one or two pieces of bone, as some have previously thought.<sup>46</sup> This investigator desires to make it plain that he does not approach the subject of the antiquity of man with a theory of man's age that he intends to vindicate. His purpose is to correlate the generally accepted date for the age of fossils out of which a theory may be developed at some future date.

Kenneth P. Oakley, recognized authority in the field of fluorine dating, sets forth in an encyclopedic inventory, Anthropology

---

<sup>45</sup>Moody, Introduction to Evolution, p. 217.

<sup>46</sup>Smalley and Fetzer, "A Christian View of Anthropology," op. cit., p. 161.

Today, the modern methods of dating human fossil finds. As one reads Oakley's work, he is made aware of the meticulousity of the science of fossil dating. He gave a table showing the types of dating:

#### Relative Datings

- R.1.--The age relation between the specimen and its containing deposit or associated fossils.
- R.2.--The stage in the local or regional stratigraphical sequence to which the containing deposit (or fauna or culture undoubtedly contemporary with the specimen) can be referred.
- R.3.--The inferred position of that stage in terms of world stratigraphy.
- R.4.--The geological or archeological age of a specimen inferred from its morphology in the absence of reliable evidence of its association.

#### Absolute Datings

- A.1.--Direct determination of the age of a specimen itself from internal evidence (e.g.,  $^{14}\text{C}$  radioactivity of charred bone).
- A.2.--Direct determination of the age of the source deposit from internal evidence (e.g.,  $^{14}\text{C}$  radioactivity of charcoal or shells in the bed.)
- A.3.--Age in years inferred by correlation of the source bed (or its "horizon") with a deposit whose actual age is known.
- A.4.--Age in years inferred from theoretical considerations (e.g., dates obtained by matching the geological record of glacial fluctuations with the curve of past insolation as calculated by Milankovitch or Spitaler).<sup>47</sup>

Oakley then went on to show how certain fossil remains are labeled as having a "R.1. age" or an "A.2. age" depending on the above detailed table. Obviously a "R.1. age" is much more reliable than a "R.4. age." An "A.1. age" also is obviously better than a "R.1. age." All of this shows the evangelical the great pains taken by the sci-

---

<sup>47</sup>Kenneth Oakley, op. cit., p. 43.

entist to be accurate and honest in the dating of material.

"The days of morphological dating, judging the antiquity of a fossil by its differences from modern forms, are past,"<sup>48</sup> stated James Buswell. In the past few weeks, Science News Letter (January 16, 1960) reported a new method of dating prehistoric objects up to about 100,000 years. Preliminary studies and tests using this new "thermoluminescence" method have proved very successful. It is expected that this method will help unravel the chronological mysteries surrounding civilizations that have left pottery behind. Pottery cannot be dated by the carbon isotope  $14\text{C}$  method; it can be dated by this new and complex method. The evangelical who desires to be heard in the age of such discoveries cannot dare make light of such tools available to the anthropologist. May the theologian, who is tempted to ridicule such tools, remember that it was the carbon  $14\text{C}$  method of dating that was instrumental in the accurate dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Arthur Smethurst, Canon in the Church of England and Doctor of Philosophy (for research in geology and geochemistry) emphasized the reliability of the chronology of the data found in rock formations:

Therefore, by comparing the biological remains in each successive system of rocks, it is possible to trace the development of living organisms on this earth from their earliest appearance up to the present time; and the evidence so obtained is not a matter of dispute but of fact, and must be accepted by all unbiased and unprejudiced Christian people. The record of the

---

<sup>48</sup>James O. Buswell, III, "A Creationist Interpretation of Pre-historic Man," Evolution and Christian Thought, p. 173.

rocks is undeniable. The question of the process by which the development took place is a matter of some speculation, but that there has been such development or evolution is not a matter of theory. It is an obvious and unquestionable fact. . . . We must, therefore, say that any Christian who rejects this evidence, is refusing to accept the witness of God's own handiwork.<sup>49</sup>

What is the witness of the rocks and fossil finds? What do they say relative to the number of years man has inhabited this earth? Paul Moody's textbook on evolution sets forth dates that are recognized as being reliable not only by anthropologists and paleontologists but also by several evangelical scientists. The first group of prehistoric men mentioned by professor Moody is the South African Ape-man. These combine some apelike features with some human ones. "We know now that they were not apes,"<sup>50</sup> wrote Moody. The South African Ape-men were of small stature, about four feet tall, and walked upright. The upright posture of these "creatures" was established only recently.<sup>51</sup>

The level of civilization attained by any peoples cannot be known simply from their human fossil remains; artifacts seemingly hold the clue to the advancement of any peoples. When such artifacts are absent, interest has apparently centered on the size or capacity of the fossil's brain case. It seems that there has been a measurable increase in the size of man's brain case throughout the

---

<sup>49</sup>Smethurst, op. cit., pp. 105-106.

<sup>50</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 211.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 212.

course of human development. "We may note here," stated Moody, "that throughout human evolution there has been an increase in brain size relative to total body size."<sup>52</sup> This increase has not been true in the development of the great apes. This leads some scientists to believe that the increase of man's brain capacity may have a direct bearing on the increase of man's intelligence and hence civilization.<sup>53</sup> The brain capacity of the South African Ape-man ranged from 450 to 640 cubic centimeters. The range found among modern man is from 900 c.c. to about 2400 c.c. Did this South African Ape-man use tools? "At present there is little evidence upon which to base an answer,"<sup>54</sup> commented professor Moody. He does not suggest an approximate date for these men other than suggesting that they lived "just before and/or just after the beginning of the ice age."<sup>55</sup> He does feel that they lived before the Java and Pekin men, who appeared about 500,000 years ago.<sup>56</sup>

The Java men were about five feet in height and also walked upright. They had an average brain capacity of about 1350 c.c. to 1400 c.c. "Thus their cranial capacity," observed Moody, "was intermediate between that of modern man and that of the South African apemen."<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 213.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 217.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 214.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 223.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 216.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 215.



It is believed that the Pekin men were contemporary with the Java men. When professor Moody wrote his book, he stated that fifteen skulls and skull fragments had been found. They were similar to the Java men with the exception that their average brain capacity was only 1075 c.c.<sup>58</sup>

Next appeared Neanderthal man. His date is given as about 100,000 years. His appearance was made in Europe. His brain capacity was at least as large as modern man, with an average of about 1400 c.c.<sup>59</sup> The culture of these men was that of old stone age. Crude carvings and chipped flint remain as evidence of this culture.

"The immediate successors of the Neanderthal peoples" were the Cro-Magnon men.<sup>60</sup> A little more is known about these men.

The Cro-Magnon people were characterized by a rather high type of Stone Age culture. In addition to stone, bone was used as material for the manufacture of implements. These people buried their dead with some elaborateness. But they are best known for the expertly drawn, colored pictures of contemporary mammals found on the walls of caves in France and Spain. These marvelous examples of primitive art are located in regions of the caves that are perpetually dark, which fact indicates that the artists must have employed artificial illumination.<sup>61</sup>

How do some evangelical writers who have investigated this area of human history, view such datings? Professor Fetzner stated that

Authentic, carefully examined fossil deposits date from the Third Interglacial period, and it is probable that some may

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 216.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 217.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

date from the Second Interglacial period.<sup>62</sup>

The Third Interglacial period has been dated 220,000 years ago and the Second period near 600,000 years. Miss Fetzner dated Neanderthal man at 100,000 years also.<sup>63</sup> Professor Bernard Ramm was willing to grant the anthropologist his 200,000 or 500,000 or even 900,000 years.<sup>64</sup>

Any adequate solution to the Scriptural account of the creation of man must take into account the scientific data mentioned above. One must remember that the fossil data will never be complete, since fossilization is a very complex process.<sup>65</sup> The marvel is not that the paleontologist has so few fossils with which to work, but rather that he has as many as he does.

Scriptural data. The Bible does not set a date for the origin of man. All of the dates that have been proposed as being Biblical are but inferences from the Scripture itself. This the student must continually keep in mind. Warfield observed that the Scripture gives man no guidance relative to estimating the antiquity of man.

In a word, the Scriptural data leave us wholly without guidance in estimating the time which elapsed between the creation of the world and the deluge and between the deluge and the call of Abraham. So far as the Scripture assertions are concerned, we may suppose any length of time to have intervened between these events which may otherwise appear reasonable.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Smalley and Fetzner, op. cit., p. 162.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 185.

<sup>64</sup> Ramm, op. cit., pp. 314-315, 328.

<sup>65</sup> Moody, op. cit. See chapter 7 for a discussion of fossils.

<sup>66</sup> Warfield, op. cit., p. 247.

One wonders if the 200,000 or 500,000 or even 900,000 years interval is "reasonable" or not? The genealogies of Scripture, from which all the Biblical inferences relative to man's antiquity are drawn, were not constructed for a chronological purpose; those who endeavor to construct a time table from them create many problems. Ussher's chronology is a prime example of this. His date of 4138 B.C. for the creation of man<sup>67</sup> is generally regarded as not "tenable" among modern scholars.<sup>68</sup> Foster felt that 8,000 years was ample allowance for the creation of man.<sup>69</sup> The reader must remember that when Foster made this observation there were no tools available for the "absolute" dating of fossil data, such as exists today in the carbon 14 and the thermoluminescence methods. J. I. Marais, writing in The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia in 1915, felt that from 12,000 to 15,000 years date for man's antiquity was sufficient in the light of the discoveries of his day.<sup>70</sup>

Professor Warfield was perhaps correct when he stated that "the question of the antiquity of man has of itself no theological significance."<sup>71</sup> He continued to show that the reason it has become a theological problem is due to the contrast that has been drawn between the seemingly short time allotted in the Scriptures to human history and the tremendously long time allotted by the sciences.

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 239.

<sup>68</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>69</sup>Randolph Foster, Studies in Theology, IV, 300.

<sup>70</sup>J. I. Marais, "Anthropology," I.S.B.E., I, 151.

<sup>71</sup>Warfield, op. cit., p. 238.

How can the student bring together these two records in closer agreement? Can the genealogies of Genesis 3 to 5 be flexible enough to allow for the great time span of science? What do the genealogies tell us, relative to the age of man?

Is Buswell correct when he states that the Creationist "need have no quarrel with an antiquity of hundreds of thousands of years"?<sup>72</sup> Or is Ramm correct when he states that "we might stretch the tables of ancestors a few thousand years, but can we stretch them 200,000 years?"<sup>73</sup> Ramm was referring to the ancestors of Genesis. Warfield made an interesting and significant discovery pertaining to the genealogies when he found "their symmetrical arrangement in groups of ten is indicative of their compression."<sup>74</sup> This discovery bore out a conclusion reached by this investigator some months past relative to the genealogies of Jesus Christ as found in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew. When a comparison was made between the two gospel records, differences were obvious; when a comparison was made with the records of genealogies as found in the Old Testament, omissions were evident. The clue to these problems may perhaps be the clue to the Genesis genealogical problem. Matthew's account holds a clue:

So all the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away to Babylon

---

<sup>72</sup> Buswell, op. cit., p. 181.

<sup>73</sup> Ramm, op. cit., p. 327.

<sup>74</sup> Warfield, op. cit., p. 247.

fourteen generations; and from the carrying away to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations.<sup>75</sup>

Whatever one may feel Matthew's reason for arranging the genealogies into groups of fourteen or for eliminating certain persons in the genealogies, this fact remains clear; this is not a chronologically pure arrangement, but rather a logical one. To try to construct a time table from this record would result in error. The same principle may hold true in Warfield's discovery. The arrangements in groups of ten is significant and suggest a logical, not an all-inclusive record. Therefore, Warfield concluded:

. . . and for aught we know instead of twenty generations and some two thousand years measuring the interval between the creation and the birth of Abraham, two hundred generations, and something like twenty thousand years, or even two thousand generations and something like two hundred thousand years may have intervened.<sup>76</sup>

This may seem like a neat solution which solves all the problems relative to the antiquity of man. This may be a partial answer, but there are still some questions existing which must be recognized as being crucial. Ramm was no doubt correct when he observed that the chief problem lies in the connection of the genealogies of Genesis 3 with 4 in the light of an antiquity of 200,000 or 500,000 years.

In the fourth and fifth chapters of Genesis we have lists of names, ages of people, towns, agriculture, metalurgy, and music. This implies the ability to write, to count, to build, to farm to smelt, and to compose. Further, this is done by the immediate descendants of Adam. Civilization does not reveal any evidence of its existence till about 8000 B.C. or, to some, 16,000 B.C. We can hardly push it back to 500,000 B.C. It is problem-

---

<sup>75</sup>Matthew 1:17, A.S.V.

<sup>76</sup>Warfield, loc. cit.

atic to interpret Adam as having been created at 200,000 B.C. or earlier, with civilization not coming into existence till say 8000 B.C.<sup>77</sup>

Perhaps it will not be too long until scientists unravel the secrets of early civilization; when this is done, no doubt the evangelical will be able to use this data in his own system. If Adam was created hundreds of thousands of years ago, how can man account for the recency of the birth of civilization, as we know it through history? This question will have to be shelved for the time being until science uncovers more information.

Another question that needs to be answered eventually, which relates to the above one, is the mathematical problem of the present world population in view of a high antiquity of man. Bishop Foster accentuates this problem in his Theology volumes. He set forth several laws of human propagation and then concluded showing that if the flood was universal and if it occurred 4,200 years ago:

Our difficulty is not to account for all present peoples in so brief a time, but rather the time is more than we know what to do with. If we reduce the scale of increase, to double once in five generations, we have as the result 28 doublings. That would show the present population of the globe to be each of four lines 254,179,775 of women alone. This sum, multiplied by four, the number of the lines would show 1,016,716,000; double this to account for the men, and we have for our present population 2,033,432,200—two thousand and thirty-three millions and nearly a half. That is at least 400,000,000 more than the existing population.<sup>78</sup>

If man's antiquity is pushed back to 200,000 years instead of 4,000 the problem is greatly multiplied. The present population of the

---

<sup>77</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 327.

<sup>78</sup>Foster, op. cit., p. 339. For full discussion see pp. 335-340.

earth would seem to indicate a much more recent date for man's origin than fossils indicate. Perhaps there was an unknown factor at work in the early days of man's life that is unknown to man today that would account for his slow reproduction. The flood cannot be used as a satisfactory answer to this mathematical problem. Ramm made a very sane appeal for a local flood. He concluded that geologists have not found evidence of a universal flood.<sup>79</sup> He expressed that "most of the recent conservative scholarship of the church defends a local flood."<sup>80</sup> This only adds to the mathematical population problem; however, it must be taken into account by the honest investigator.

Another problem involved in a high antiquity of man for the evangelical who believes that Adam was the first man, is the slow progress of man up until the last few thousand years. If the anthropologist is granted his 500,000 antiquity, why was progress for the first 490,000 years so slow? The anthropologist who does not believe that the Adam of the Bible was the first man, can easily answer this by saying that it has taken man this long to develop intellect and to evolve to this civilization. The person who holds to Adam as being the first man and Eve the first woman, cannot resort to this answer because the Bible clearly shows that Adam and his immediate descendants were intelligent; also the Genesis chapters four and five discussion just mentioned seem to argue for a culture very soon after Adam. These are a few of the problems the evangelical must face in

---

<sup>79</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 242. For full discussion see pp. 229-249.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 238.

the light of science's high antiquity for man.

Another question, which relates indirectly to the problem of man's antiquity, is the age of the Old Testament individuals who lived during the first few chapters of Genesis. Some were said to have lived over 900 years. Eve did not give birth to Seth until Adam was 130 years old. Some type of time reduction factor is needed in order to explain this in the light of modern science. It could be that the word "year" is not the same as today's solar year, but is rather a term used to express an unknown (to men today) amount of time. It seems unlikely that Adam was 130 solar years old when Seth was born. Ramm gave one answer to this problem when he stated that instead of the years being solar years they could have been "epochs" in the lives of these antediluvians.<sup>81</sup> Perhaps the archeologist's spade will likewise unravel this mystery for the evangelical in the future. The pious answer that men lived longer at first because the effects of sin had not taken their toll as yet, is not a direct answer from the Scripture, but rather a bold inference. William Vis, practicing physician, made such an inference and claimed it was clearly taught in the Scripture when he said, "The spiritual message of the Bible is clear: the length of life decreased because of the entry of sin into the human family."<sup>82</sup> He offered, however, no Scripture as proof of the "clear" message of the Bible at this point. The view that the shortened life span was due to some great climatic change

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 341.

<sup>82</sup>William R. Vis, "Medical Science and the Bible," Modern Science and Christian Faith, p. 242.



due to the flood can only be held by those who would posit a universal flood. Some have offered as a solution to the longevity of the antediluvians that instead of the years referring to the age of the men themselves, it referred to the dynasty which was represented by this man's name.

The longevity is the period during which the family had prominence and leadership; the age at the son's birth is the date in the family history at which a new family originated that ultimately succeeded to the dominant position.<sup>83</sup>

The student again must be reminded of the danger in equating his own theories with Scriptural data. One must not make the Bible say more than it clearly states; else, undue friction will be caused between systems of theology as well as between theology and science.

#### The Evolution of Man

A study of the antiquity of man logically includes a study of the evolution of man. The evangelical is being continually confronted by the problem of where to fit in the prehistoric men of science with the Scripture account. Involved in this study is the question of Pre-Adamic man and the problem surrounding the person of Cain. One cannot escape the question of the origin of the moral quality of man if he proposes the origin of man due to the natural process of evolution. Can the evangelical look upon evolution as a friend or must he continue to view it as an arch enemy? What implications are involved, relative to the fall of man and the origin of sin in every

individual's life? These are some of the questions inherent in an evangelical study of human evolution.

Organic evolution. The word "evolution" simply means "change."<sup>84</sup> The evolution with which this paper is concerned is a special aspect of evolution called "Organic evolution."

This subdivision of evolution deals with change undergone by living things, plants and animals. For our purposes we may define organic evolution as the theory that plants and animals now living are the modified descendants of somewhat different plants and animals which lived in times past.<sup>85</sup>

With this definition of organic evolution in mind, the question is asked if there is anything contained in it with which the evangelical must disagree? This is quite different from the common conception that organic evolution means that man came from monkeys. That there have been modified changes since the creation is evident in the record of the rocks.

This geological record demonstrates that hosts of animals not present in the modern world formerly lived. What became of them, and what was their relationship to modern animals?<sup>86</sup>

Hence, modern scientists accepted organic evolution as a fact.

Paleontology gave strong support to the theory of organic change to such a degree that many modern scientists and evangelical theologians make creationism and organic evolution compatible. The theory of organic evolution holds no threat to the evangelical; however, some of the conclusions drawn from it, such as a mechanistic view of the

---

<sup>84</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid. (Italics not in the original).

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

origin of life which rules out a creator, must by its very nature be in conflict with the evangelical position. One of the earliest capable theologians to take a wholesome attitude towards organic evolution was James Orr. The evangelical would do well to consider carefully the approach of Orr to this problem.

In reality, the facts of evolution do not weaken the proof from design, but rather immensely enlarge it by showing all things to be bound together in a vaster, grander plan than had been formerly conceived. . .

On the general hypothesis of evolution, as applied to the organic world, I have nothing to say, except that, within certain limits, it seems to me extremely probable, and supported by a large body of evidence.<sup>87</sup>

John Wesley, who had a great deal of respect for the scientific method and who was deeply interested in science, held to a type of evolution which he called "gentle ascent."

The whole process of nature is so gradual, that the entire chasm from a plant to man is filled up with divers kinds of creatures, rising one above another, by so gentle ascent that the transitions from one species to another are almost insensible.<sup>88</sup>

Frank Collier, who has written a book on the scientific nature of

John Wesley stated:

In the words of Aristotle as in the words of Wesley, we have the essential idea of evolution--continuous, gradual, orderly, and, on the whole, progressive change.<sup>89</sup>

That Roman Catholic theologians face much the same problem relative to an agreement of science and Scripture is evident in this

---

<sup>87</sup> James Orr, The Christian View of God and The World, p. 99.

<sup>88</sup> John Wesley, Survey, II, 185-186, quoted by Frank Collier, John Wesley Among the Scientists, p. 150.

<sup>89</sup> Collier, loc. cit.

statement found in The Catholic Encyclopedia: "One of the most important questions for every educated Catholic of to-day is: What is to be thought of the theory of evolution?"<sup>90</sup> Apparently the typical Roman Catholic position is a theistic evolution.<sup>91</sup> From this Roman Catholic authority again we read:

That God should have made use of natural, evolutionary, original causes in the production of man's body, is per se not improbable, and was propounded by St. Augustine (See AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, SAINT, under V. Augustinism in History).<sup>92</sup>

The evangelical should be able to agree with Wasmann's conclusion that

The human soul could not have been derived through natural evolution from that of the brute, since it is of a spiritual nature; for which reason we must refer its origin to a creative act on the part of God.<sup>93</sup>

Warring held to a type of theistic evolution also. In answering an accusation that Moses disagreed with the theory of evolution, Warring gave this comment:

I read that the plants sprouted forth from the ground; that the waters swarmed with certain kinds of life; and that the earth brought forth cattle, beasts, etc.; but nothing whatever as to the way in which it was done. . . .and hence that present animals and plants sprang from the nearest preceding species rather than from raw water and earth.<sup>94</sup>

It has been observed that many feel that organic evolution is

---

<sup>90</sup> E. Wasmann, "Evolution," The Catholic Encyclopedia, V. 654.

<sup>91</sup> Buswell, op. cit., p. 185.

<sup>92</sup> Wasmann, op. cit., p. 655.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Warring, op. cit., pp. 162-163.

not incompatible with the Scriptures; however, there were some so-called-logical conclusions drawn from evolution (such as mechanistic origin of life) which are at variance with the Scriptures. The evangelical need not fear the advance of evolution per se in light of these observations made; but he need be alert to answer the inferences drawn from organic evolution which in turn are presented as fact.

Human evolution. Reference has been made indirectly to the involvement of man in the total process of evolution. However, it seems advisable to consider this under a special section, since the major subject of this paper is the age of man.

There are two popular theories as to the evolution of man as listed by Marie Fetzter: (1) The Classic Theory and (2) The Weidenreich's Theory. The classic theory views the human process like unto a tree which produces "steadily diverging branches and twigs." She continued, "The various known fossil types are considered to represent branches for the most part, and not the main phylogenetic trunk."<sup>95</sup> All of these various branches became extinct (except the one which emerged as the present species). This one existing branch in turn split into diverging twigs which are represented by the present human races. The Weidenreich's theory holds to a polycentric origin. Several races were developing at the same time at various speeds during the Pleistocene period.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup>Smalley and Fetzter, op. cit., p. 163.

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 164.

Something should be said concerning the notion that evolution teaches that "man came from monkeys." Moody brings out clearly that one modern form cannot descend from another. Man and monkeys are contemporaries.

It is as incongruous to speak of one as the descendant of the other as it would be to speak of one member of the sophomore class in college as the descendant of another member of that class. What, then, is the evolutionary interpretation of the relationship existing between monkey and man? Rather than being a father-to-son relationship, it is more comparable to a cousin-to-cousin relationship. You and your cousin have a pair of grandparents in common. Modern man and modern monkey are thought of as having shared a common ancestor in the distant past.<sup>97</sup>

That there has been some change, or evolution, over the span of man's history is a well established fact. How significant these changes have been is another matter. A student can readily see the changes when observing the skulls and jaw bones of the South African Ape-man, the Java and Pekin man, the Neanderthal man, and the Cro-Magnon man. The external differences are easily observed. Other differences appeared after close examination. One such example was the decrease in the thickness of the bones comprising the brain case. The further back human fossils date, the thicker this brain case. The Java men had brain cases that measured an average of about 10mm. The Pekin men had brain cases measuring 9.7mm. The Neanderthal men averaged about 7.2mm. Modern man averages about 5.2mm. in thickness.<sup>98</sup> Someone may ask the significance of all this. It is simply to point out that organic evolution, or change, of some sort took place be-

---

<sup>97</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., pp. 215-217.

tween early man and modern man. The significance of this change is not in the realm of facts but rather in the realm of theories. It must be remembered:

Museum reconstructions of pre-historic man, picturing forms with hairy bodies and bestial facial expressions, are certainly the imagination of the reconstructionist.<sup>99</sup>

Pre-Adamic man. Closely related to the question of the antiquity and evolution of man is the question, "Were there men before Adam?" Does the Bible plainly state that Adam was the first man or is this an inference drawn from the Scriptures? What do present-day scholars in the evangelical system of theology believe pertaining to this question? What have evangelical theologians of the immediate past held relative to Pre-Adamic man?

Various views have been held by evangelical men. Warfield gave a brief history of the doctrine of Pre-Adamic or Co-Adamic men.<sup>100</sup> He emphatically stated that the Bible clearly teaches that Adam was the first man and Eve the first woman and all other human beings descended from these two.<sup>101</sup> While he may have been correct in this statement, it appears he is still drawing inference from the Scripture when he stated that "the unity of the old man in Adam is the postulate of the unity of the new man in Christ."<sup>102</sup> This kind of postulating could lead to serious theological problems in the future.

---

<sup>99</sup> Smalley and Fetzer, op. cit., p. 168.

<sup>100</sup> Warfield, op. cit., p. 256.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., p. 259.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., p. 261.

Foster felt, as Warfield, that the Biblical impression is that Adam was the first human being created. However, he did throw in a word of caution at this point.

This impression is not, however, more universal than was the impression that the world was created in six natural days about six thousand years ago, based also on what seemed to be an explicit declaration. That has been compelled to yield to the force of counter evidence, and better learning has shown that the common impression rested upon unsound interpretation. A conviction equally strong as that which supports the Adamic headship of the race gave way before proof to the contrary, and has well-nigh entirely disappeared from the world. No well-informed person now entertains it. Universal impression and most profound conviction are neither proof of the soundness of interpretation nor the certainty of the truth of what is believed. Both may be compelled to give way.<sup>103</sup>

This word of caution is wisdom for the student of theology and science.

It appears only logical that for a person to accept some type of human theistic evolution, he would also accept some type of Pre-Adamic being, human or animal. Hence when Buswell rejected theistic evolution, one assumes he was also rejecting the possibility of Pre-Adamic creatures. While he may have been correct, his reason for rejecting these theories was very questionable to this writer. He felt that the main problem was a theological one and hence could not go along with theistic evolution. Note his words:

This I find at present, impossible to accept, on theological as well as on anthropological grounds. Theologically, the fundamental doctrines of the original perfection and subsequent fall of man and his consequent need of redemption; and the role of the Saviour, Jesus Christ, the Son of God in dying on the cross to pay the penalty for the fall, for all who will accept him, are seriously jeopardized by a first man having descended or-

---

<sup>103</sup>Foster, op. cit., pp. 325-326.



ganically from pre-human parents.<sup>104</sup>

This investigator could find no Scripture which stated that Christ came to pay the penalty for the fall; rather there is ample Scripture to support the belief that Christ came to pay the penalty for the sins of every individual. There is a distinction that needs to be kept in mind between the "fall" and the "sins" of the individual. "The penalty of the fall" is another inference upon which it is dangerous to build a criterion for judging scientific data. Ramm also felt that to lose the unity of the race would involve the theologian in serious implications relative to the fall of man.<sup>105</sup> The subject of the fall will be dealt with briefly later on in this chapter.

Foster referred to a Dr. Winchell as being a man who has great reverence for the Bible and whose system has "no necessary collision with the sacred book in its main features."<sup>106</sup> Foster listed Winchell's theory as holding to the idea that

Biblical Adam is not the head man of the race, but only the head man of the Hebrew race and those branches of the human family that are traced to that common root.<sup>107</sup>

Foster observed that in Dr. Winchell's book, Preadamites, he

Points out some Biblical facts to justify his conclusion that there as [sic] already existing a numerous race, or races of men when Adam was introduced.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Buswell, op. cit., pp. 185-186. (Italics not in original).

<sup>105</sup> Ramm, op. cit., p. 317.

<sup>106</sup> Foster, op. cit., p. 323.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

Evidently Foster is referring to Winchell's book when he gives several arguments offered as proof that the Bible teaches there were Pre-Adamic humans. In listing these proofs, it was stated that the Bible account of Adam was simply an account of the creation of the man Adam and a history of his descendants. The problem relative to Cain and his mark is listed as proof that others were living at the time of Cain, besides his brothers and sisters.<sup>109</sup> This is a question that must be dealt with by the evangelical who endeavors to answer the question of man's antiquity.

Warring allows room for Pre-Adamic man in his own thinking. He stated that it was possible that there may have been races of people in existence long before Adam and that these races became extinct.

This the first chapter of Genesis neither affirms nor denies. Elsewhere in the Bible there are statements which look as if there were other men besides the children of Adam.<sup>110</sup>

But he felt that in his day there was little evidence to support Pre-Adamic man, geologically speaking.

Man's moral quality. Somewhere in the study of the evolution of man, space must be given to discuss the moral quality in man which the lower animal life does not possess. Only the most rigid mechanistic evolutionists would hold that man's moral quality is purely and simply a development of the naturalistic process of evolution. Evolutionists, such as Moody, who allowed for the work of

---

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., p. 326, for a full discussion see pp. 326-328.

<sup>110</sup> Warring, op. cit., pp. 169-170.

a Creator working in the evolutionary process, recognized the fallacy of ascribing the origin of the human soul to the evolutionary process solely. In speaking of the Roman Catholic Church, Moody stated:

That church does not officially oppose evolution, even of man, so long as no attempt is made to explain the origin of the human soul by this means. This is a restriction readily accepted by the present author since in his opinion the soul does not come within the province of science.<sup>111</sup>

This is also the opinion of Dr. A. R. Wallace, a strong upholder of the theory of natural selection.<sup>112</sup>

Thus Dr. A. R. Wallace, though vigorously maintaining the "essential identity of man's bodily structure with that of the higher mammals and his descent from some ancestral form common to man and the anthropoid apes," discards the theory that "man's entire nature and all his faculties, moral, intellectual, spiritual, have been derived from their rudiments in lower animals."<sup>113</sup>

### The Origin of Races

The problem of the origin of the various races has no doubt crossed the minds of most thinking people today. Does the Scripture speak to this origin or diversity? What has science contributed to a solution of this question? Many anthropologists differ as to the exact number of races in existence today. Dobzhansky, in the Encyclopedia Americana, showed the difficulty in trying to establish an accurate measurement of race. Such characteristics as skin color, form of head hair, shape of nose, measurements of various body parts,

---

<sup>111</sup> Moody, op. cit., pp. 5-6. (Italics not in the original).

<sup>112</sup> Marais, op. cit., p. 149.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

shape of the head, and languages spoken were all used as measurements for the classification of the races at different times in the past 200 years.<sup>114</sup> This became a part of the total problem of the antiquity of man when the evangelical had to take into account the divergent races and the common fatherhood of mankind as seen in Adam. Some Bible students have held that Noah had three sons of different colored skins. "It is pious fiction," wrote Ramm, "to believe that Noah had a black son, a brown son, and a white son."<sup>115</sup> If one has accepted a universal flood, then all of the races must be derived from Noah. If the flood were local to the Mesopotamian valley then there is no necessity of concluding Noah to be the father of all races.

Scientific data. What does scientific data have to say regarding the origin of races? Does it have anything to contribute at this point? There has seemed to have been valid evidence that the North American Indian inhabited this Northern continent some 10,000 years ago. Moody stated in 1953 that carbon 14 dating tests showed that the "earliest known Americans lived about 10,000 years ago."<sup>116</sup> Among the material dated by Dr. Libby, a nuclear chemist, was a pair of hand-woven sagebrush-bark sandals found in Fort Rock Cave, Oregon.

---

<sup>114</sup> Th. Dobzhansky, "Races, Nature and Origins of," Encyclopedia Americana, XXIII, 108.

<sup>115</sup> Ramm, op. cit., p. 336.

<sup>116</sup> Moody, op. cit., p. 129.

These sandals were dated at 9,000 years.<sup>117</sup> The famous Russell Cave in Jackson County, Alabama has been the site of many excavations made under the auspices of the National Geographic Society and Smithsonian Institution. A campfire uncovered there has been dated back to 9,020 years (plus or minus 350 years) by the carbon 14 method.<sup>118</sup> These dates must be taken into account in an attempt to answer the problem of the origin of the races.

A noteworthy observation about the origin of races is the general agreement among anthropologists of this day that the races are from one common stock. The unity of the human race is generally accepted in scientific circles as being a fact. Henry V. Vallois, in Anthropology Today, wrote:

Contrary to the opinion formerly held by some authors, anthropologists now more or less agree that all living human populations belong to one and the same species.<sup>119</sup>

Moody stated, "Modern men all belong to one species and. . .all men living at one time in the past history of the earth belonged to one species."<sup>120</sup> Some felt that this unity had great theological significance and received it with open arms.

But the question still remains, "How can one account for the racial differences if all men have a common ancestor?" Some people today still voice the opinion that the African has dark skin because

---

<sup>117</sup> Briggs, The National Geographic Magazine, op. cit., p. 239.

<sup>118</sup> Carl F. Miller, "Russell Cave: New Light on Stone Age Life," National Geographic Magazine, March, 1958, CXIII, 428.

<sup>119</sup> Henri V. Vallois, "Race," Anthropology Today, p. 145.

<sup>120</sup> Moody, op. cit., p. 229.

of the external climate in which he lives. Perhaps Lamarck's principle that the "effects of use and disuse to environmental influences were in some degree inherited" had something to do with such ideas.

Smethurst noted

It may, however, be fairly said that the great majority of biologists today reject the idea that acquired characteristics can be<sup>121</sup> inherited, though there are still notable exceptions to this.

Moody mentioned,

One source of diversity in a population, then, lies in the mechanism of inheritance by which thousands of pairs of dominant and recessive genes are reassorted and reassembled generation after generation.<sup>122</sup>

The estimated number of genes which each human being possesses is 24,000 pairs.<sup>123</sup> Ramm felt that the answer to racial differences could be due to these richly stocked genes. "Over a period of time peoples who have migrated from a common center will commence to develop their own individualities."<sup>124</sup> He concluded:

The laws of heredity plus principles of separation or selection operating over a period of time will produce the various races of the world.<sup>125</sup>

Scriptural data. The Bible does not state definitely how or when the races originated. Some have inferred that this is the teaching of Genesis 10 and 11. Smalley goes so far as to say that just

---

<sup>121</sup>Smethurst, op. cit., p. 114.

<sup>122</sup>Moody, op. cit., p. 303.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid.

<sup>124</sup>Ramm, op. cit., p. 339.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid.

the opposite is the case.

The long-invoked rationalization of the origin of the three races in the three sons of Noah obviously will not hold for the following two reasons: (1) the sons were genotypically the same, and Biblically recorded groups of descendants remaining into historical times were Caucasian in race, (2) as nearly as can be determined, all areas inhabited by groups mentioned as being descended from the sons of Noah were inhabited by Caucasian peoples until relatively recent times.<sup>126</sup>

Here, as in other areas of scientific study, the evangelical must be extremely careful not to make the Bible say more than it is intended to say by its Author.

### The Fall of Man

In a work dealing with the antiquity of man, a consideration of his spiritual fall, as recorded in Genesis 3, must be mentioned, even though the space given to it cannot be great. This subject itself can easily be the subject of a whole volume. It shall be treated briefly here in an endeavor to show its relationship to man's antiquity in the light of scientific data.

Man before the fall. Much is made, in some theological circles, of the perfect condition of man before the fall. This perfection is extended to his physical, mental, and emotional as well as spiritual being. Luther believed Adam to have been a superman prior to the fall. This is based on what Luther conceived the "image of God" in man to be.

Therefore the image of God, according to which Adam was created was something far more distinguished and excellent, since obviously his inner and his outer sensations were all of the

---

<sup>126</sup>Smalley and Fetzner, op. cit., p. 114.

purest kind. His intellect was the clearest, his memory was the best, and his will was the most straightforward--all in the most beautiful tranquillity of mind, without any fear of death and without any anxiety. To these inner qualities came also those most beautiful and superb qualities of body and of all the limbs, qualities in which he surpassed all the remaining living creatures. I am fully convinced that before Adam's sin his eyes were so sharp and clear that they surpassed those of the lynx and eagle. He was stronger than the lions and the bears, whose strength is very great; and he handled them the way we handle puppies. Both the loveliness and the quality of the fruits he used as food were also far superior to what they are now.<sup>127</sup>

Luther made the fall effective on even the fruit which God created for man. Does the Bible support Luther's view? Obviously some think so, but the Bible is significantly silent as to the condition of man prior to the fall. Only his moral condition is mentioned in the Bible--not his physical or intellectual qualities. These are inferences from the idea of what the "image of God" in man was. Geology has proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that death existed in plant life and animal life long before the appearance of man on the face of the earth. To make all death and decay a result of man's fall is neither Scriptural nor safe. Ramm believed that only ideal conditions existed "within the Garden. There was disease and death and bloodshed in Nature long before man sinned."<sup>128</sup> As proof of this statement he offered that "life can live only on life. All diet must be protoplasmic."<sup>129</sup> The person who has accepted theistic evolution as a fact, cannot hold that physical death of man was due to the fall--unless he holds that the "Adam" of Genesis 2 was the first human

---

<sup>127</sup> Luther, op. cit., p. 62.

<sup>128</sup> Ramm, op. cit., p. 334.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., p. 335.



form which evolved some hundreds of thousands of years ago. Those who hold to the recency of Adam and to theistic evolution of man from lower animal form, must then propose that when God breathed into Adam the breath of soul life he also changed him biochemically; else he would still have been subject to physical death. While God could have done this, it seems hardly logical that He would.

Some have sought to answer these problems by interpreting the "death" of Genesis 3, Romans 5:12, and I Corinthians 15:21-22 as "spiritual" death. Further exegesis on these passages will, it is hoped, help to solve this problem.

Man after the fall. Some, such as Luther, have sought to make the fall effective on man's physical and cultural life. Others oppose such an imposition. Is the evangelical to assume that Adam had a culture higher than today's? The Biblical picture of the Garden seems to be one of simple culture.<sup>130</sup>

It is true to the Scriptures to state that "by one man sin entered into the world." The problem of today is, "How is this sin transmitted to the succeeding generations?" Some have believed that it was transmitted through inheritance. Others that it is imputed to man. Can sin be inherited? Is sin a substance carried through the genes, or is it a relationship? Smalley attempts an answer to this perplexing problem.

The important problem of man's essentially sinful nature could well be clarified in a culturological approach. Man's

---

<sup>130</sup> Smalley and Fetzer, op. cit. For an excellent discussion see pp. 125-148.

sinful nature cannot be only a biologically inherited factor as the lay-Christian's interpretation of original sin seems to be. Obviously, the propensity for sinning is at least channeled and organized by the culture into which he is born. . . .

Culture may be, furthermore, a major causal force in the sinful nature of mankind.<sup>131</sup>

The evangelical would be wise, it would appear, if he were to major on the fact of sin and minor on its origin. A view of imputed or inherited sinfulness seems to get the individual off the hook. He may feel that he is not responsible for his sin if it was passed on to him, anymore than he is responsible for the color of his eyes. This has serious overtones to the evangelical who deals with sin as an individual moral problem. These are implications which the evangelical needs to think through today.

#### D. SUMMARY

The theological problems inherent in a view of the antiquity of man have many serious implications. Some evangelicals feel there is a wide chasm between the data of science and that of the Scriptures. This seems to be true when one considers what some have made the Bible say. When the Bible is allowed to speak for itself, many of the problems seem to fade away.

The anthropological area of science is where the greatest concern in the science-Scripture tension is located.

The recognition of problems is the first step towards a whole-some solution. An effort was made to show the many problems involved

---

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

in the study of man's antiquity.

The integrity of Holy Scripture is a basic concern in an evangelical approach to any science-Scripture problem. Since both Nature and Scripture find their source in God, they harmonize and complement each other. Many students of both science and the Bible feel that there is harmony between science and Scripture. A correct interpretation of Scripture will help immensely to alleviate existing tensions.

A study of the origin of man is obviously an integral part of the study of his antiquity. Scientific data, relative to man's antiquity, seemingly indicates man is hundreds of thousands of years old. The Scriptural data does not indicate clearly how long man has inhabited this globe. However, a serious problem arises when one studies the genealogies of Genesis 3 to 5; for the impression given is that the time span was not as great as that presented by science.

One cannot escape a discussion of the evolution of man in considering his antiquity. Human fossils provide ample evidence that man has changed somewhat down through the ages of his existence. The implications of these changes do not come under the study of "data" since they are speculative. Some evolutionists, such as Paul Moody, propose that the soul of man is not a product of organic evolution.

Some students of the Bible feel that the theory of Pre-Adamic man is not totally inconsistent with Scripture. As yet, one cannot state dogmatically that the Pre-Adamic theory is false or unbiblical.

The origin of the races naturally comes under a discussion of man's origin and antiquity. The Bible does not outline the origin of

racess for the student. General agreement among anthropologists today suggests that all present races have their origin in one common stock. Some feel that racial differences can be fully accounted for by the richness of human genes and the principles of separation.

The fall of man must be considered in a work of this sort since the Bible presents this fall close to the time of Adam's creation. One must be careful not to make the fall more than the Bible makes it. The fall was spiritual, that much is clearly taught. The fall of man, which plays such a large part in Arminian theology as well as in Augustinianism, is not mentioned directly in the New Testament. While it is referred to in Romans 5 and I Corinthians 15, yet the word "fall" does not occur in the New Testament as meaning the event of Genesis 3.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As stated in the Introduction of this work, this has not been an attempt to harmonize the Scripture with the accepted facts of modern science. If the reader finds that some harmony has been reached as a result of this work, the investigator will rejoice.

#### A. SUMMARY

An attempt has been made to effect in the thinking of the evangelical a correct attitude toward the sciences of this day. Special attention has been given to the anthropological area of science because herein lie the most serious problems. Only as the evangelical is aware of what these problems are, will he be able to effect harmony. The evolution of man is not inherently evil nor does it present disastrous consequences relative to man's creation as proposed in Scripture. The Bible does not clearly state how long man has existed on the earth, nor does it give any reference to the origin of races. The fall of man, as presented in the Bible, is a spiritual fall. The Bible majors on the reality of sin in man's life but minors on how it originates in the individual. Could this not be a clue to the major emphasis which the evangelical should make?

The evangelical should recognize that the objective of science is to discover truth about the natural world. The integrity of the scientists is revealed in their achievements. Due to these achievements science has gained prestige in the eyes of the average educated

person today. If evangelicalism endeavors to discredit science, it will be hindering its own cause. On the other hand, a simple dismissal of Biblical evidence as being the product of human development, solves nothing and creates problems of greater consequences.

An attempt has also been made to let the Bible speak for itself in order to vindicate itself. Often the most ardent friends of the Bible have become its unwitting enemies when an attempt has been made to press the Bible into some mold of interpretation.

The language of the Bible holds a key to much of the tension existing between evangelicalism and science. When the Bible is read and interpreted in its historical, cultural, and grammatical setting, many of the problems vanish. The evangelical believes that there will be no final disagreement when all the facts of science and exegesis are in. In the mean time, one must view science as a friend, not as an enemy. The revelation of God in the book of Nature will agree with the revelation of God in the book of the Holy Bible. Hence, the scientist who faithfully uncovers the facts of Nature is complementing and not destroying the integrity of the Scriptures.

## B. CONCLUSIONS

An attempt was made to show that by and large the scientists of today are men of integrity and honesty in the use of the scientific method of research. Therefore, this writer concluded that evangelicalism will only be heard in this day of satellites, moon rockets and other scientific achievements when it takes a positive attitude toward the sciences and the scientists.

This investigator concluded that there were three main approaches to the science-Scripture problem. While the theories of basis for harmony are legion in number, these can be grouped into three main approaches or attitudes.

(1) Scripture wrong, Science right approach. This is the view proposed by the so-called-religious moderns of the day. The Bible is viewed as a purely human developmental product and hence cannot be expected to be in agreement with the science of today. While many, both within and without theological circles, may hold this view, it cannot be held by the evangelical. If the Bible is viewed as a simple product of human evolution, then it can no longer be "the rule of faith and conduct" that the evangelical believes it to be. To remove the Scriptures as a guide is a cost far too great for the evangelical to pay. To do so is neither safe nor necessary. A problem for those who would take this way out is the uniqueness of the Biblical account when compared with the other ancient books of history. Only a book which had Divine guidance and inspiration could be so ancient and yet so advanced.

(2) Science wrong, Scripture right approach. There are many who express this approach in their writings. They distrust the scientist and hence view all scientific contradictions as being biased. However, these same individuals will utilize scientific discoveries to their own benefit while castigating the sciences which have produced these benefits.

Science is here to stay; science has gained prestige in the



eyes of the world. If the evangelical is going to gain audience in this age, he must not take a negative approach to the sciences. The person who decries science as "wrong" and "evil" will soon lose his youth to the churches that recognize the contributions of science. This is not a safe approach for the evangelical either.

(3) Science right, Scripture right approach. This may seem like an over-simplification of the problem, but somewhere within this approach lies the secret. This allows the evangelical to keep the achievements of science and not discard the Scriptures while doing it. This is the hardest place of all. It is the area of real, honest, hard work. To throw out the Bible takes little work. To throw out the sciences takes as little, for some. To correlate both science and the Scripture will be an endless process of hard exegesis and investigation. Herein lies, perhaps, the answer why some do not wish this approach. In the light of this third approach one is reminded of the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take what you please--you can never have both."

Although Science may offer a solution for the problem of the antiquity of man which seems out of harmony with the traditional so-called-Biblical view, the evangelical can retain his confidence in both the Bible and the sciences. However, he must clearly distinguish between what are the dogmatic statements of Scripture and what have been interpreted as such by men. When all the data of science, relative to man's antiquity, are in, this investigator is convinced they will harmonize with accurate, scholarly, Biblical interpretation.

In the meantime, the evangelical should maintain a wholesome positive attitude toward modern science. Only such an attitude will commend the evangelical position to the increasingly-scientific modern mind. This is the approach to the problem of the antiquity of man that this writer has reached as a result of this study. He offers it as the only safe evangelical approach today.

### C. AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There were many areas upon which this paper touched that are vital but which could not be fully handled herein. The writer feels they are interesting as well as important to the evangelical position.

(1) The Word of God. A study needs to be made as to what is included in this phrase, The Word of God. It is the conviction of this investigator that much of the confusion as to revelation lies at this point.

(2) The Fall of Man. An investigation into what the Bible says concerning the fall of man and what Biblical students have said that it says, would prove interesting and profitable.

(3) The Flood. Was the flood of Genesis universal or local? Was the entire world engulfed by water or was it only the known world of Moses? What does modern science tell of a universal deluge?

(4) Pre-Adamic Man. Were there men living before Adam, or was he the first human being? Was he the head of all races or only the Hebrew line?

(5) Age of the Antediluvians. Did these men prior to the flood

actually live over 900 solar years or was there a different method of dating from what is known today?

(6) The Image of God in Man. How was man created like God? What was his original condition before the fall? Does regeneration restore one to this first condition?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barth, Karl. The Doctrine of the Word of God. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1949, I, 1.
- Berkhof, L. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- Bernard, Harold W. Psychology of Learning and Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954.
- Briggs, Lyman J. "How Old Is It?" The National Geographic Magazine. August, 1958, CXIV, no. 2.
- Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of God. Trans. by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Buswell, III, James O. "A Creationist Interpretation of Prehistoric Man," Evolution and Christian Thought. Ed. by Russell L. Mixer, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959.
- Calvin, John. Calvin's Commentaries, Genesis I. Trans. by John King. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- Christianity Today. September 1, 1958, vol. 11, no. 23 and May 11, 1959, vol. 11, no. 16.
- Collier, Frank. John Wesley Among the Scientists. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1928.
- "Creation," The Encyclopedia Americana, VIII, 170. New York: American Corporation, 1951.
- Daniel, Glyn E. "The Idea of Man's Antiquity," Scientific American. November, 1959.
- Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1883.
- Davis, John D. "Antediluvian Patriarchs," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, 143.
- Dawson, J. W. Nature and the Bible. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1875.
- Dawson, W. Bell. The Bible Confirmed by Science. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd., 1936.

- Dobzhansky, Th. "Races, Nature and Origins of," Encyclopedia Americana, XXIII, 108.
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson. The Modern Use of the Bible. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Foster, Randolph. Studies in Theology, IV, New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1895.
- Gedney, Edwin K. "Geology and the Bible," Modern Science and Christian Faith. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1950.
- Harkness, Georgia. Foundations of Christian Knowledge. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- Luther, Martin. Luther's Works, I. Ed. by Jaroslav. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.
- Marais, J. I. "Anthropology," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, 151. Chicago: 1915.
- Miller, Carl F. "Russell Cave: New Light on Stone Age Life," The National Geographic Magazine, March, 1958, CXIII, 428.
- Moody, Paul Amos. Introduction to Evolution. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1953.
- Morrison, Charles Clayton. "Protestantism and Science," Christian Century, April 24, 1946.
- Oakley, Kenneth P. "Dating Fossil Human Remains," Anthropology Today, Ed. by A. L. Kroeber. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Orr, James. The Christian View of God and the World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Pieper, Francis. Christian Dogmatics. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950.
- Pratt, J. H. Scripture and Science not at Variance, quoted by Ramm.
- Ramm, Bernard. The Christian View of Science and Scripture. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.
- Rees, T. "Authority," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, 334, 1915.
- Saunderson, Henry Hallam. The Way Called Heresy. Boston: Starr King Press, 1956.

- Smalley, William A. and Marie Fetzner. "A Christian View of Anthropology," Modern Science and Christian Faith.
- Smethurst, Arthur F. Modern Science and Christian Beliefs. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955. Printed in England.
- Smith, John Pye. On the Relation Between the Holy Scriptures and Some Parts of Geological Science, quoted by Ramm.
- Stoner, Peter. "Genesis I in the Light of Modern Astronomy," The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe. Ed. by John Clover Monsma. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.
- Turner, "The Emancipating Word of God," The Asbury Seminarian, Fall-Winter, 1959, Vol. XIII, no. 1, p. 23.
- "Universe Age Now Jibes with Radioactive Dating," Science News Letter, November 15, 1958, LXXIV, 307.
- Vallois, Henri V. "Race," Anthropology Today. Ed. by A. L. Kroeber.
- Vis, William R. "Medical Science and the Bible," Modern Science and Christian Faith.
- Wagner, Peter. "Bibliolatry," Eternity, November, 1958, vol. IX, no. 11, p. 14-16.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. Biblical and Theological Studies. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revelation," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, IV, 2575.
- Warring, Charles B. Genesis I and Modern Science. New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1892.
- Wasmann, E. "Evolution," The Catholic Encyclopedia, V. 654. Albany: 1913.
- Wesley, John. Survey II., 185-186 quoted by Collier, p. 150.
- Wiley, H. Orton. Christian Theology, I, p. 126. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1940.
- Wythe, Jos. H. The Agreement of Science and Revelation. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1883.
- Young, Warren C. A Christian Approach to Philosophy. Wheaton, Ill: Van Kampen Press, Inc., 1954.