## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	11
The Need for Re-examination of These Men	12
How This Book Is Organized	16
THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT	19
Intellectual and Religious Background	19
The Galileo Affair	19
Baconian Science	21
The Enlightenment	24
Historical Developments in Geology, Palaeontology, and Cosmology	25
Neptunist-Vulcanist Debate	27
Reinterpretations of Genesis	33
The Early 19th Century Social and Religious Milieu	36
A Time of Revolution	36
The Make-up of the British Church	36
The Cambridge Network	37
The Oxford Movement	38
The Bridgewater Treatises	38
The BAAS and Other Scientific Organizations	39
Biblical Interpretation	40
Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley	40
Commentaries in the Early 19th Century	43
Assessing Geological Competence	45
SEVEN INDIVIDUAL PORTRAITS	55
Granville Penn (1761-1844)	57
Geological Competence	58
Geology and Geologists	61
The Relationship Between Scripture and Geology	62
The Philosophical Foundation of Comparative Estimate	65
Creation According to Scripture	70
The Flood and Geological Changes Since the Creation	
Conclusion	75

George Bugg (1769–1851)	77
The Relationship Between Scripture and Geology	79
Geological Competence	82
Geologists and Geology	82
Creation and the Age of the Earth	84
The Flood	88
On Human Fossils	90
His Argument against Cuvier	90
Conclusion	96
Andrew Ure (1778–1857)	99
Geological Competence	102
Geology and Geologists	102
The Relationship Between Scripture and Geology	104
His Book on Geology	106
Creation and Pre-Flood History	106
The Flood	108
Reviews of His Geology	110
Conclusion	112
George Fairholme (1789–1846)	115
Scientific Work and Geological Competence	116
The Relationship Between Scripture and Geology	122
On the Laws of Nature	123
Summary of His Two Books	128
Conclusion	130
John Murray (1786?–1851)	131
Geological Competence	135
General View of Geology	139
On the Laws of Nature	140
On Scripture	144
Creation and the Age of the Earth	147
The Flood	151
On the Fall of Man	154
Conclusion	155

George Young (1777–1848)	157
View of Geology and Geological Competence	160
Attitude toward His Geological Opponents	164
Reference to Other Scriptural Geologists	164
View of the Relationship of Scripture and Science	165
View of the Laws of Nature	
The Argument of Geological Survey (1828)	166
The Argument of Scriptural Geology (1838)	168
Defense of a Global Flood	172
Conclusion	177
William Rhind (1797–1874)	179
Scientific and Geological Competence	180
Attitude Toward Geology and His Geological Opponents	182
The Relationship Between Scripture and Science	183
His Geological Arguments Against an Old Earth	185
Creation and the Flood	190
Conclusion	192
GENERALIZATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	195
Collective Portrait	195
Similarities of the Scriptural Geologists	195
Differences Between the Scriptural Geologists	198
Key Objections of the Scriptural Geologists	200
Theological Objections	200
The Ignoring of Scripture	200
The Problem of Evil	202
Geological Objections	203
Insensible Transitions	203
Polystrate Fossil Trees	205
Shells and Dating the Strata	206
Human Fossils	209
Infant State of Geology	210
The Nature of the Debate	213
Motivations of the Scriptural Geologists	213
Contemporary Reactions to the Scriptural Geologists	215
Appreciation	215
Misrepresentation	
Disregard	217

Marginalization: Contributing Factors	219
Social Problems	220
World View Conflict	221
The Problematic Nature of Geological Science	228
Conclusion	233
BIBLIOGRAPHY	239
Reference Works	
19th Century Periodicals	240
Primary Sources	240
Secondary Sources	253
SCRIPTURE INDEX	261
NAME INDEX	265
SUBJECT INDEX	269



### INTRODUCTION

Geologist H.H. Read prefaced his book on the granite controversy a few decades ago with these words, "Geology, as the science of earth history, is prone to controversy. The study of history of any kind depends upon documents and records. For the history of the earth's crust, these documents are the rocks and their reading and interpretation are often difficult operations."

This book analyzes one such controversy, and an extremely important one at that, during the first half of the 19th century in Britain, which has sometimes been called the "Genesis-geology debate." At that time a tenacious and denominationally eclectic band of scientists and clergymen (and some were both) opposed the new geological theories being developed at the time, which said that the earth was millions of years old. These men became known as "scriptural geologists," "Mosaic geologists" or "biblical literalists."

The label "scriptural geologists" is preferred since three of their book titles used these terms and it was the most common label used by their contemporaries and by later historians. However, we need to be aware of the label's liabilities. It has not always been used carefully, resulting in confusion and inaccurate analysis. Calling them scriptural geologists obscures the fact that some of them were competent geologists while others were not (and did not claim to be). Conversely, it sometimes is and was used by opponents to imply, erroneously, that these men all developed their objections to old-earth geological theories solely on the basis of Scripture. Also, at least one of their contemporary critics, an old-earth geologist, also described himself by the same title.2 Finally, a few of their contemporary critics and several later historians have lumped scriptural geologists together with their opponents under

<sup>1</sup> H.H. Read, The Granite Controversy (1957), p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> For example, see various letters by a Christian geologist, to the editor of the *Christian Observer* in 1839: Jan. (p. 25–31), Mar. (p. 145–148), April (p. 210–216), June (p. 346–348), July (p. 471–474). He obviously wanted to be considered by his fellow Christians as a "scriptural" geologist, even though he advocated an old-earth view.



# THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Before considering some of the individual scriptural geologists, we need to consider the intellectual and religious background and the history of geology leading up to the early 19th century, the cultural milieu at that time, what the Bible commentaries on Genesis were saying, and the marks of geological competence in the early 1800s.

#### INTELLECTUAL AND RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

The controversies in early 19th century Britain regarding the relationship of the early chapters of Genesis to the geological discoveries and theories did not, of course, take place in a vacuum. They were part of a complex movement of thought with philosophical, theological, social, political, and ecclesiastical dimensions, which pulsed through the educated minds of Europeans in general and of Britons in particular. The following highlights some of the most important people, events, and currents of thought leading up to and contributing to a revolution in world view which profoundly affected the 19th century Genesis-geology debate.

#### THE GALILEO AFFAIR

Shortly before his death in 1543 and with some hesitation, Nicholas Copernicus (1473-1543), the Polish mathematician and astronomer, published On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres, in which he argued that the earth was not the center of the universe, as generally believed, but rotated on its axis and revolved with the other known planets around the stationary sun. Over the subsequent decades, opposition to his theory (as a description of physical reality, rather than merely as an alternative mathematical description) arose because it seemed contrary to common sense, was opposed to Aristotelian physics, lacked convincing astronomical evidence, and was contrary to a literal interpretation of various Scriptures. Approximately 150 years passed before his theory was generally accepted. But it was soon embraced by Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) and Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), though the latter was at first reluctant to publicize his views.

In 1613, Galileo finally came out in the open in his *Letters on Sunspots*. He argued that his observations of the heavens by means of the recently



# THE GREAT TURNING POINT

"Whenever a group of people is so severely castigated by contemporaries and later historians, the student of history can be excused for being just a little suspicious that maybe there could be another side to the story."

ropaganda is usually a term that we associate with foreign enemies. It suggests a slanted version of the truth. In its milder forms, propaganda can be termed "bias," and can come from within the Christian community.

Bias is a good word to describe the various positions taken within the Church regarding creation and evolution. We're all biased. The question is, whose bias is the truth?

Since the rise of the modern creationism movement, the attempt to remind clergy and laity that God's Word is not in conflict with science, it has been popular in some circles to charge that "young-earth creationism" is a recent invention, as if it were not the dominant view of the Church for centuries, rooted in Scripture itself. The Great Turning Point sheds light on a time when dramatic and dangerous compromise weakened Christendom.



Dr. Terry Mortenson has published an explosive body of research that proves young-earth creationism is not "young," so to speak, but was believed by Bible-believing scientists in Europe and America hundreds of years ago. This is the opposite story told by leading scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. It is a story that will open eyes and hearts to the veracity of God's Word.



Dr. Terry Mortenson was born and raised in Owatonna, Minnesota. He studied math and was led to Christ at the University of Minnesota. In 1975 he joined the staff of Campus Crusade for Christ and ministered to college students, first in America for four years and then for nearly two decades in Eastern Europe. He earned an M.Div. from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Chicago (1992) and a Ph.D. in the history of geology from Coventry University in England (1996). In 2001 he became a speaker, researcher, and writer for Answers in Genesis in Kentucky. He and his wife, Margie, have five daughters and three sons.

Master Books
A Division of New Leaf Press www.masterbooks.net

GENERAL INTEREST / GENERAL TOPIC / HISTORY

