

In regard to the questions that Mr. Bernitt raises, I would say that God was in charge of the Flood and likely orchestrated the catastrophe so as to avoid the crust turning into a magma ocean, the ocean boiling away, and a direct hit on the ark by an asteroid or by a huge tsunami in shallow water. He did this only for the earth because of His creation, while he allowed the full assault on the other solid bodies of the solar system because there was no life on those bodies. Direct supernatural control of the Flood is indicated by Psalm 104:6–9, where God describes how He covered the mountains with the deep, and that at His rebuke and the sound of His thunder the waters fled. This praise psalm refers to the Flood because in verse 6 God “covers” the mountains. On Day 3, God “uncovered” the mountains. In verse 9, God set a bound so that the ocean will not return to cover the earth.

Yes, I believe the impact model challenges the CPT model, which really only begins in the middle of the Flood according to Baumgardner because of the Mesozoic dates of the ocean floor basalts (which means that CPT is not a Flood mechanism but a Flood consequence, if CPT really occurred). The impact model also challenges the hydroplate model. Such a huge number of impacts during the Flood must mean that many geological and geophysical features have been caused by impacts.

Michael J. Oard
Bozeman, MT
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

- 1 Barlow, N.G., Effect of impact cratering on the geologic evolution of Mars and implications for Earth; in: Chapman, M.G. and Keszthelyi, L.P. (Eds.), *Preservation of Random Megascale Events on Mars and Earth: Influence on Geologic History*, GSA Special Paper 453, Geological Society of America, Boulder, CO, pp. 15–24, 2009.
- 2 Walker, T., A biblical geological model; in: Walsh, R.E. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Creationism*, technical symposium sessions, Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA, pp. 581–592, 1994.
- 3 Oard, M.J., *Flood by Design: Receding Water Shapes the Earth's Surface*, Master Books, Green Forest, AR, 2008.
- 4 Spencer, W.R. and Oard, M.J., The Chesapeake Bay impact and Noah's Flood, *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 41(3):206–215, 2004.

Christ as the last Adam

I was pleased to read Lita Cosner's paper “Christ as the last Adam...” in *Journal of Creation* 23(3), 2009. I hope it is the forerunner of more theological work on matters related to creation.

She quoted Barrett's consideration of the unimportance of the historicity of Adam, and rightly, to my mind, disagreed with it.

I fear that Barrett's sentiments are widely held by Christians, if without clear articulation; that is, I think they are held unconsciously by many people, lead by those theologians who do make their case clearly.

There is a thread running through much of Western theology that seemingly rests on a view of the world that is perversely not biblical. Why I say this is that I read the Bible itself seems to have “concrete realist” regard for the world and relations within it. Much theology is in debt to some form or other of philosophical idealism: the upshot of idealism is that one can hold one set of axioms applying to the real world where we live and shop (try being an idealist in the supermarket), and refer to another set with application only to a world (the “ideal” world) whose intersection with this world is purely verbal, or ideal, to allow the idealists to be consistent.

Idealists can believe any number of contradictory things before breakfast, and particularly in theology can believe that the Bible at once has God creating, and at the same time the cosmos bringing itself into being, but argued from differing premises.

I don't think that this stands up to biblical scrutiny, let alone logical analysis.

So, Barrett's view fails: while it is true that “sin and death” are empirically established as part of human experience, this is not Paul's point. His point in tracing it back to Adam is to do two things (if not three!).

1. He refers us to the Genesian creation account to remind us that death and sin were not part of the creation, they are the result of a breach in the relationship between God and his image-bearing creation, man and therefore as not inherent in the creation are theoretically correctable! In Christ, of course, they are actually corrected and will be shown to be corrected in the new creation. If they were inherent, then we are stuck with them (and stuck with death, contradictorily from him in whom is life: John 1:4 and on whose creation death is an intruder: Gen 2:17 in the light of Gen 1:26a and 1 Cor. 15:26!).

2. He reminds us that Adam's history, including the fall and thus sin, Christ, and our experience today (his day ... our day by induction) are ontologically contiguous. There is no idealist breach in the coordinates of their contiguity; to suggest that there may be ontological discontinuity between them would suggest that reality is other than revealed in the Bible, that there are elements to it that are either not revealed to us, or might be also “given” and independent of God. Such elements might introduce something between God and man other than Christ (some “principle” such as may be required by theistic evolution), or tell us that there is more to creation (that which will have an influence on us) than is shown between God and his creation as explained in the Bible ... but how would or could we know ... it takes us to the endless and fruitless speculation that has often dogged Christian theology with mysticism, for example.

2a (or maybe 3). He must needs reference the creation as from God's hand by God's will and done by his Word as also sharing time and space coordinates that place it in the same structured reality as that we occupy, and in the same terms as our experience:

that is, the events that constituted creation are events as we know events, and do not, probably cannot, refer to another type of event that does not have the same time-space participation that is had by events that follow from will as we know them. This also indicates that our relationship with God, as personal, is personal in equivalent terms to other relationships: our engagement with God, through Christ, is real and substantially concrete; it is to have effects in our life and is not just an “idea” with no relational or existential consequence within the concrete terms of our world.

The converse, that Barrett would have us entertain, must, I think, undo all this.

But it is not only Barrett who suggests that we need to take Genesis, and the way it frames reality, differently from how we frame the everyday world. Almost every theologian who wants to accommodate the dictates of materialism must do the same thing; perhaps unwittingly, but maybe not.

This comes to the fore in the incoherence of the claim that Genesis 1 tells us a whole bunch of things about the creation, which are implicated in the text, but deny that the text means anything in the terms that it uses, and that its scope is not concordant with the world that it on its face it describes and refers to (I was particularly struck by this line when I received an invoice from my child’s Jewish pre-school; the year was noted as being well into the five thousands). So one wonders at the basis for such an alternative philosophical framework: where does the account touch the real if at every point its content is denied in real terms; but maintained in some other terms whose reference frame is never articulated, nor given any basis in the only world that we have access to, and which is the world of encounter between God and us. That is the creation which provides the setting for covenant between God and us.

Discontinuity between the reference frames necessarily flows from denial of the congruence of the Genesis 1 text with the world it seemingly has in its sights. But the discontinuity is self

refuting, at least at some level, because it cannot make reference to anything that would sustain the discontinuity apart from a view of the world which at the outset denies the biblical world-conception (hardly a commendation for an approach to the Bible) and has more in common with a paganistic removal of the creator from our world of interaction, or with materialist failure to accommodate the non-material in so much of our lives.

So, is the choice then that Barrett and his ilk must entertain an imagined world to mount their criticism of the historicity of Adam and hope they maintain a Christian theology, or reject the Bible in the terms in which it couches itself, and therefore ask as to believe them with no adequate basis for such belief, but in doing so render such a theology un-Christian and counter-biblical.

David Green
Turramurra, NSW
AUSTRALIA

The Bible’s high view of women—letter 1

In the article “The Bible’s high view of women rooted in the creation account”, Lita Cosner argues that “God is described in male terms because that best describes how God relates to His creation”. Might I suggest another possible reason for the Bible’s use of male imagery when describing God? Could it be that the *imago Dei* should be understood *literally*, and that the male human form is a closer approximation to the divine form than the female human form? There is much apparent scriptural support for this position (see Exodus 24:9–11, Exodus 33:21–23, Numbers 12:6–8, Psalm 17:15, Ezekiel 1:25–28, Daniel 7:9–14, John 5:37–38 and Revelation 4:2–3). Christians have no problem with the fact that the Lord Jesus has form, but there is a great deal of resistance to the possibility that God *the Father* might *also* have a form or likeness. But if the

Lord Jesus can have a literal form and still retain all the attributes of deity (Colossians 2:9), why could the same not be true of God the Father? It should be noted that the descriptions in Daniel 7:9–14, John 5:37–38 and Revelation 4:2–3, are clearly describing God *the Father*—not God the Son. In fact, there is an intriguing asymmetry in Genesis 1:27 that has been overlooked by most commentators: the fact that God created man is stated *three* times, but the claim that man is made in God’s image is only stated *twice*. Could this be a hint that, although all *three* members of the Godhead participated in man’s creation, only *two* of the members of the Godhead (God the Father and God the Son) actually possess form or likeness?

Despite the apparent scriptural support for a literal understanding of the *imago Dei*, this possibility is usually dismissed due to perceived intellectual and/or theological difficulties. However, these difficulties are more apparent than real. The following are some of the justifications usually given for rejecting a literal understanding of the *imago Dei* (each followed by a brief rebuttal):

1. *God is Spirit, and spirits do not have form.* God is Spirit (John 4:24), but spirits clearly *can* have form. *Our* spirits certainly have form; in fact, our spirits are such detailed replicas of our bodies that they actually have fingers and tongues (Luke 16:24). Hence, this argument is unconvincing.
2. *God the Father cannot have a form, because this would imply that He has flesh and bones and even reproductive organs.* A literal divine form does not necessarily imply these things (*our* spirits do not have flesh and blood), and it seems unthinkable that God would have reproductive organs. I am simply arguing that God the Father has a form which, although gloriously and perhaps indescribably brilliant, is somewhat similar to the male human form. Saying that God the Father has a literal form is *not* equivalent to saying that He has a literal body.