

cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden”).

So I believe the following instructions in 5:22–6:9 tells exactly how to assume responsibilities and carry each other’s burdens (cf. Gal 6:2) in the husbands/wives, masters/slaves and parent/children tandems.

Sergei L. Golovin
Simferopol, Crimea
UKRAINE

Lita Cosner replies:

It is true that sometimes people like to take a biblical teaching to either one extreme or the other; it’s important for people on both sides to realize that there are passages that challenge their own view. Of course, I agree that any biblical view of gender issues has to take the Fall into account; whatever they were like before the Fall, they were seriously impacted by Adam’s sin.

Genesis 3:20 does not say anything about a change of a name, but it was not unheard of for people in that day to have more than one name; for instance, God named Solomon Jedidiah, but it did not replace his original name (2 Samuel 12:24–25). Genesis 2:22 may simply be referring to the woman by the name Adam would call her later; perhaps she had no name at all before Adam named her. I’m not saying that Golovin’s interpretation is absolutely untenable; but this is how I interpret it from a more complementarian point of view; I would argue that 2:23 is a classical naming formula. It’s an imperative, not a declarative statement, and has a reason for her being named.

I was certainly not excluding Ephesians 5:21 from the Bible, but saying that when it is taken in context, it reads like this: “Submit to one another: wives to husbands, children to parents, and slaves to masters.” There is no indication that husbands are to submit to their wives, parents to their children, or masters to their slaves. The context must inform the interpretation, and that means that to

get what 5:21 is saying, one needs to read the whole section from 5:21 to 6:9 (this is one of the places that proves the chapter breaks were definitely not inspired!). The revolutionary thing about this passage is that husbands are told to love their wives, fathers are told not to exasperate their children, and masters are entreated to treat their slaves well because they are slaves of God. The wives, children, and slaves were simply being told to do what their society already demanded of them; husbands, fathers, and masters were being told to take a radical new step in their treatment of those “under” them.

Lita Cosner
Deerfield, IL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Colorado Plateau sandstones derived from the Appalachians?

Mike Oard recently published an article discussing the uniformitarian idea that many sandstone members and formations found in the American Southwest were possibly sourced from the Appalachian Mountains.¹ His support for this idea is not completely firm due to the reliance on the radiometric ages of zircons within the sandstones. However, if this concept can be supported by other evidence, then he may be right that the Genesis Flood offers a better explanation for the transport of the original sands across North America.

I published an article on this same topic² in this same journal several years ago and I came to the same conclusion:

... if the sandstones can be linked to the Appalachian Mountains by greater evidence than the radiometric dating of zircons. The sheer size and lateral extent of the Navajo Sandstone is best interpreted within the context of the Flood. Sedimentary material derived from the uplifting

Appalachian Mountains may have been transported, sorted and deposited in massive sandstone layers during the Middle Flood Division of the Flood Event Timeframe. The Navajo Sandstone would then testify to the power and energy of the Genesis Flood.³

The concept of transcontinental transport of geologic materials is not new. This topic is certainly worth investigating, and the articles are valuable as an object lesson for all of us. However, authors need to be careful to cite prior work. It is now easier to find such prior work with the availability of search engines such as <http://bryancore.org/celd/index.html> [and <http://www.creationeducation.org/cer/search.asp?offset=1>].

Carl R. Froede Jr.
Snellville, GA

United States of America

References

- 1 Oard, M.J., Colorado Plateau sandstones derived from the Appalachians? *Journal of Creation* 23(3):5–7, 2009.
- 2 Froede, C.R., Jr., Eroded Appalachian Mountain siliciclastics as a source for the Navajo Sandstone, *TJ (Journal of Creation)* 18(2):3–5, 2004.
- 3 Froede, ref. 2, p. 3.

The evolution of the horse

Todd Wood recently commented on my *Journal of Creation* article¹, as a study of “bad scholarship”². I will briefly refer here to some of his points.

Comment one by Wood:

“There are two ‘evolutionary gaps’ in the horse series.

As far as ‘evolutionary gaps’ go, he never defines what they are or how to recognize them. To support his claim of ‘evolutionary gaps,’ he cites papers by MacFadden, who would (probably passionately) disagree with the idea that there are real, hard gaps in the evolution of the horse.”

Well, either Wood uses a different language, or otherwise he did not read the articles I referred to (quite a few more than MacFadden). Even Wood's own work (Cavanaugh *et al.*) shows gaps.³ Otherwise the data should not have grouped the animals in different subfamilies. I am just using the published data. What MacFadden, Wood and others believe is one thing, the data which is published is another thing.

Comment two by Wood:

"Hyracotherium is not monophyletic.

1) The monophyly of Hyracotherium is interesting but not relevant to our original paper.

2) We were dealing with a dataset from 1989 that treated Hyracotherium as a single taxon, based primarily on H. vasaccense with supplementary material coming from H. leporinum.

*3) Garner published an abstract on that question in the 2004 BSG conference proceedings (PDF available at #4 on this list). Molén didn't cite Garner's abstract."*²

- 1) How can it be of no relevance that the original paper is based on a mixed animal group?
- 2) It is also relevant that only two "species" of the c. 15 species of *Hyracotherium* was used in the original data set. But that was not evident from the original Cavanaugh *et al.* paper.³ The *H. vasaccense* is still in the evolutionists horse series, and appear to have been re-labelled *Eohippus* or *Protorohippus*, and the original name is probably not longer much in use by specialists.⁴ *H. leporinum* is a rare fossil which is regarded as a palaeothere, and not an equid taxa,⁵ but the only one which has kept the original genus name.
- 3) Concerning Garner, Wood himself did not refer to him in his latest internet publication.⁶ So, the problem is then with Wood and not with Garner and me.

Comment three by Wood:

"'Early' horses have been preserved in strata from the same evolutionary age as several 'later' horses.

1) The question of horses co-occurring in the same strata is irrelevant.

2) For example, he claims that the Cavanaugh et al. hypothesis is that 'the horse series ... shows real (post-Flood) "microevolution."' That's not in the Cavanaugh et al. article. In fact, I have repeatedly denied that microevolution could possibly account for this, in my book (Understanding the Pattern of Life), my AGEing paper, my genomic modularity paper, and most recently here on my blog. ... No one has ever based a post-Flood interpretation of these fossils on 'horse evolution.'

*3) Molén also claimed that Cavanaugh et al. (that's me) 'constructed their own horse evolution tree.' I just checked the paper, and there was no 'evolutionary tree' to be found."*²

- 1) I can cope with all "horses" occurring in a mixed population. The evolutionists can not easily do that, even if they have to do it all the time with all kinds of fossils. They need a time series.
- 2) This is very peculiar: The conclusion from the Cavanaugh *et al.* paper is that the "horse" series is a time series. Their discussion of a stratomorphic series is built on just that, i.e. real (micro)evolution (or "linear/progressive variation" or diversification). And, even more peculiar, Wood wrote in his AiG-publication that "the horse kind" ... "I believe that Noah had something like a *Hyracotherium* with him on the ark".⁶ Can it be said more clearly? If Wood has changed his mind, he had not done that in his 2008 publication, (even if he added a note of caution there) and now it appears that he has not read even his own publication? And, the last statement is simply

not true—the Cavanaugh *et al.* paper uses the "stratomorphic" series of the horse as one piece of evidence for a post-Flood diversification succession. If some "horses" were from the Flood and some from after the Flood, it would be very peculiar if the data would show up as a stratomorphic serie.

- 3) The ANOPA diagram (fig. 4 in the Cavanaugh *et al.* paper), is used as a basis for the microevolution/variation (use any word you want!) for the stratomorphic series, and therefore they made a "horse evolution tree" similar to the ones used by evolutionists.

There are other mistakes in Wood's blog, but I do not have space here to go into all the details. My only error, at least that I can see, was to write "easily"⁷ but that is a language problem and not a scientific problem.

Mats Molén,
Umeå
SWEDEN

References

1. Molén, M., The evolution of the horse, *Journal of Creation* 23(2):59–63, 2009.
2. Wood, T. C., Beating a dead horse..., <http://toddcwood.blogspot.com/2009_07_01_archive.html>, Monday 20 July 2009. Wood was invited to reply on Wednesday 26 August 2009.
3. Cavanaugh, D.P., Wood, T.C. and Wise, K.P., Fossil equidae: a monobaraminic, stratomorphic series; in: Walsh, R.E. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism*, Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA, pp. 143–149, 2003.
4. Froehlich, D.J., Quo vadis eohippus? The systematics and taxonomy of the early Eocene equids (Perissodactyla), *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 134:141–256, February 2002; pp. 151–157, 163, 177–178, 181–182.
5. Froehlich, ref. 3, pp. 148, 183.
6. Wood, T.C., Horse fossils and the nature of science, 2008; <www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n4/horse-fossils>.
7. Molén, ref. 1 p.61: "The animals that have been interpreted as different horses are therefore, with the above facts at hand, easily identified as belonging to three completely different animal kinds".