

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 topic<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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* article<sup>1</sup>, as a study of “bad scholarship”<sup>2</sup>. 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.”