

Another Look at Mature Creationism

Davis A. Young

The critique¹ of my paper² on the geological application of mature creationism failed to come to grips with the issue discussed in that paper. My purpose was not to review exegetical arguments³ relating to the validity of mature creationism, but “to demonstrate the severe difficulties of applying the mature creation doctrine to the realities of the rocks.”⁴ In particular it was maintained that mature creationism cannot “locate in the rocks a hypothetical boundary line or interval which separates the periods of creation and history from one another.”⁵ Nowhere was it said that proof of the arguments advanced would disprove the mature creation doctrine. “Only the text of Genesis and of other relevant Scriptures can settle that question.”⁶ The paper sought only to pose a *practical* difficulty with mature creationism.

WTJ 37:3 (Spr 75) p. 385

If it were granted that all exegetical arguments advanced by the mature creationists were convincing,⁷ that Scripture taught beyond any shadow of a doubt that the days of creation were each of 24 hours duration, and that all Bible-believing Christians believed in mature creationism, the fact would still remain that practical problems exist in applying the supposed doctrine of Scripture to the phenomena of nature. The consistent Christian mature creationist geologist should seek to resolve those problems. He should seek to resolve the problem of where in the rocks is the “boundary line” between created rocks and rocks formed in history subsequent to creation so that he can properly examine created rocks as created rocks and rocks formed subsequent to creation as such. This is a problem which, though perhaps not so bothersome to the professional theologian, is very bothersome to the professional field geologist who continually works with rocks. Mature creationists of all stripes have not recognized the seriousness of this problem let alone successfully solved it.

This problem has not been posed in order to destroy the mature creationist position, but to stimulate those who might be mature creationists to *recognize* and tackle the problem. It may be that a successful solution can in time be developed. Although I do not favor the mature creationist interpretation of Scripture, it is a plausible interpretation that has been held by many outstanding theologians and myriads of lay Christi...

You must have a subscription and be logged in to read the entire article.

[Click here to subscribe](#)

visitor : : uid: ()