



# BioLogos: House of Heresy & False Teaching

BioLogos is a false teaching organization that platforms teachers who do not believe the Bible or the gospel of Jesus Christ.

by Calvin Smith [<http://answersingenesis.org/bios/calvin-smith/>] on January 17, 2022  
Featured in Calvin Smith [<http://answersingenesis.org/blogs/calvin-smith/>]

## Preamble: Why All Christians Should Read This Article Regarding the False Teachers at BioLogos

If Jesus as a finite human being erred from time to time, there is no reason at all to suppose that Moses, Paul, John wrote Scripture without error.

—BioLogos contributor Kenton Sparks

[E]ven though the Bible assumes a certain way of looking at the cosmos, from a scientific point of view the Bible is wrong.

—BioLogos contributor Peter Enns

First, the incarnation is not primarily about the cross. God does not send Jesus to die. God does not require Jesus' death in order to forgive humanity's sin. I argue that God did not will the cross . . .

Christ's death was not part of God's divine plan.

—BioLogos contributor Joseph Bankard

## AiG vs. BioLogos

Regardless of whether Christians agree with our stance on Genesis as real history, most fair-minded believers would concede that Answers in Genesis is sincere in its mission to uphold the authority of the Bible and further the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Indeed, our **Mission Statement** [<http://answersingenesis.org/about/mission/>] clearly outlines Why Answers in **Genesis** [<http://answersingenesis.org/genesis/>] exists:

Answers in Genesis (AiG) exists to proclaim the authority of the Bible—from the very first verse—without compromise by using apologetics in its world-class attractions, dynamic resources, and creative media to communicate the message of God’s Word and the gospel so that believers are equipped to defend the Christian faith and nonbelievers are challenged with the truth of the Bible and its message of salvation.

Many AiG articles and videos clearly proclaim the gospel, and we feature a **Good News** [<http://answersingenesis.org/good-news/>] link quite prominently as well.

In contrast, an extensive search on the BioLogos website reveals they do not emphasize or explain the **gospel** [<http://answersingenesis.org/gospel/>] in any detail. Their Mission Statement simply states,

BioLogos explores God’s Word and God’s World to inspire authentic faith for today. Our vision is faith and science working hand in hand.<sup>1</sup>

Further, their “What We Believe” section is summarized by the statement,

BioLogos invites the church and the world to see the harmony between science and biblical faith as we present an evolutionary understanding of God’s creation.”<sup>2</sup>

Born-again believers should be appalled at what Biologos and their contributors have stated in clear

contradiction to the revealed word of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ, as we will show. We encourage you to read the following article and share with others to warn against this organized and influential group of false teachers that so often *teach at Bible Colleges and seminaries all over the world*.

---

## Necessarily Divisive

Many people seeing the title of my article will likely consider it overly provocative and extremely uncharitable according to **Christian** [<http://answersingenesis.org/christian/>] standards. After all, declaring a professing believer or ministry to be heretical and guilty of false teaching is a serious charge. **Jesus** [<http://answersingenesis.org/jesus/>]’ warning against insulting your brother (comparing insults to murder) seems similarly applicable here, so it should admittedly never be done lightly.

*You have heard that it was said to those of old, “You shall not murder; and whoever murders will be liable to judgment.” But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother will be liable to the council; and whoever says, “You fool!” will be liable to the hell of fire.*  
*(Matthew 5:21–22)*

Understanding the full weight of leveling such an accusation, however, I maintain that the BioLogos organization is guilty as charged, and I ask my fellow Christians to weigh the biblical arguments laid out within this brief thesis and examine whether this claim is well founded—especially those who are interacting with, collaborating with, or supporting BioLogos in any way.

## What Is BioLogos?

BioLogos is an organized group of professing Christians consisting of scientists and theologians dedicated to convincing the Christian **church** [<http://answersingenesis.org/church/>] to adopt

evolution [<http://answersingenesis.org/evolution/>] as the creative mechanism **God**

[<http://answersingenesis.org/god/>] used to bring about the world. This is reflected in the first “Core Values” and their ‘What we believe’ page on their website.

We embrace the historical Christian faith, upholding the authority and inspiration of the Bible.<sup>3</sup>

We believe that God created the universe, the earth, and all life over billions of years . . .

We believe that the diversity and interrelation of all life on earth are best explained by the God-ordained process of evolution with common descent . . .<sup>4</sup>

Most people, when they hear the word *evolution*, really think of apelike creatures to man. But that is just part of it. Evolution is a **secular** [<http://answersingenesis.org/what-is-science/is-science-secular/>] humanistic (think atheistic, naturalistic, materialistic view) and pagan view (think of pantheism) of origins—more on this in a moment. There are really four types of evolution that make up that word:

- **Cosmological/Astronomical Evolution:** Big Bang (everything came from nothing) and stellar evolution
- **Geological Evolution:** millions of years [<http://answersingenesis.org/age-of-the-earth/how-old-is-the-earth/>] of slow, gradual accumulations of layered rock
- **Chemical Evolution:** initial simple life came from non-living matter, also called abiogenesis
- **Biological Evolution:** a single-celled simple life form changed onward and upwardly to evolve all other life forms through time

BioLogos was founded in 2007 with Francis Collins (the former head of the National Institutes of Health, appointed by former US President Barack Obama) at the helm and was largely funded with a grant from the theistic evolutionary Templeton foundation.

Although BioLogos purports to “embrace the historic Christian faith,” one looks in vain for robust defenses of Christian doctrine, especially as historically understood. Rather, their statements about the **Bible** [<http://answersingenesis.org/bible/>] are couched in equivocal language; for instance, “Christian doctrine is broadly compatible with scientific accounts of our origins.”

In contrast, statements about the “truth” of the story of evolution are always made with absolute authority. For example,

Fossils provide a window into the distant past, revealing how life has changed across vast periods of Earth’s history.<sup>5</sup>

In the last couple of decades, our understanding of genetics has grown dramatically, providing overwhelming evidence that humans share common ancestors with all life on earth.<sup>6</sup>

They have even admitted in a 2010 article, “On What Grounds Can One Claim that the Christian God Is the Creator?” (since removed from their website) that their view of origins is not distinctly Christian. This revealed that what they believe about **creation** [<http://answersingenesis.org/creation/>] was not derived from God’s Word and has nothing to do with the text of Scripture—which is the key element to my argument, as we’ll see.

The creation story of BioLogos is compatible with many faith traditions. Muslims, Jews, and Christians alike can align their faith with the BioLogos account of our origins, and there is no way to give a scientific proof for one monotheistic faith over another.<sup>7</sup>

Indeed, an exploration of what BioLogos contributors believe will demonstrate that what they teach is actually in *contradiction* to the Word of God, which is a demonstrable example of false teaching.

## The Bible’s Warning Against False Teachers

In Romans, the apostle Paul’s final instructions contain a serious warning for both the church of his

time and our churches today:

*I appeal to you, brothers, to watch out for those who cause divisions and create obstacles contrary to the doctrine that you have been taught; avoid them. For such persons do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by smooth talk and flattery they deceive the hearts of the naive. (Romans 16:17–18, emphasis mine)*

## An Analysis of Romans 16:17–18

In verse 18, Paul warns against those who *don't* serve the cause of Christ, even though they were among the church (and presumably might have identified as believers). Instead, they serve themselves and deceive the naïve.

In verse 17, Paul makes it clear that believers should avoid them and not associate with them (the Greek word here is *ekklinete*, which means to deviate from [avoid], shun, or decline). **Titus 3:10** reiterates the same conclusion regarding divisive teaching: “As for a person who stirs up division, after warning him once and then twice, have nothing more to do with him.”

These divisive people clearly reject what Jesus taught in his high priestly prayer in John 17: that believers should be united. Paul had just reiterated this earlier in **Romans 15:5–6** (also laid out in **Ephesians 4:1–6**).

*May the God of endurance and encouragement grant you to live in such harmony [unity] with one another, in accord with Christ Jesus, that together you may with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. (Romans 15:5–6)*

## Who Are These People (False Teachers)?

To sum it all up, Paul (under the influence of the Holy Spirit) identifies false teachers here as anyone that *teaches doctrines contrary to what the church had been taught*. In historical context, this would have been what the disciples were teaching the church at large at the time, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, that was later recorded in the Bible. Today, this means the entire Bible (with this article maintaining an emphasis on the New Testament).

The Apostle Peter also warned against false teachers, reminding the fledgling Christian church that false prophets were already among God's people and would plague the church from within throughout history. His warning regarding their ultimate fate is also severe:

*But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many will follow their sensuality, and because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed. And in their greed they will exploit you with false words. Their condemnation from long ago is not idle, and their destruction is not asleep. (2 Peter 2:1-3)*

See also the short book of Jude, where these things had already become a reality. Furthermore, Jesus said,

Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves.  
**(Matthew 7:15)**

Jesus and other New Testament authors commanded Christians to "not be deceived."

*Take heed that you not be deceived . . . (Luke 21:8)*

*Do not be deceived . . . (1 Corinthians 15:33)*

*Do not be deceived . . . (Galatians 6:7)*

*Do not be deceived . . . (James 1:6)*

This is stated because Christians *can* be deceived. This is why it is imperative to be discerning and test things against the Scriptures. It's obvious the NT writers wanted believers to be wary of false teachers infiltrating the ranks of church leadership and influencing people negatively. Considering the admittedly difficult nuances the church has dealt with over the years, teaching error unknowingly versus teaching falsely, debating non-essential doctrines (e.g., eschatology and baptism) versus non-negotiable truths that strike at the very heart of the authority of Scripture and the gospel itself (e.g., Christ's deity, virgin birth, sinless life, substitutionary death, and resurrection), some may ask, is there a definitive way to define false teachers with absolute certainty?

## **Clear Biblical Definitions of "False Teacher"**

Here are two clear criteria for determining false teaching.

1. If it can be shown that a professing Christian teaches in direct contradiction to what the writers of Scripture communicated (especially concerning doctrines that directly affect essential doctrines and the gospel), with no possible room for other interpretations, he or she is a false teacher.

This first criterion can be contested by arguing that the false teacher believes the biblical writers *were* actually teaching the view he or she is promoting. In other words, the false teacher might be wrong, but if the false teaching is based on misinterpretation rather than outright denial, the false teacher might not be a full-blown heretic. In that case, he should certainly be corrected and kept from teaching error to others. But if a false teacher is open to correction, he wouldn't be subject to the same level of exclusion by the church.

2. The second criterion is much clearer. If a supposed Christian teacher *admits* that what he is teaching is contrary to what the biblical authors, apostles, and Jesus himself taught, he is a false



teacher. At that point, there is no question about it. No matter how much grace or benefit of the doubt one may apply to someone's teaching, this is an unequivocal and undeniable way to identify a heretical false teacher.

Clearly, if a professing Christian says, "Yes, I believe Jesus/Paul/Peter etc. was teaching XYZ doctrine in Scripture, but I don't believe what they taught regarding XYZ is true," then he is a false teacher promoting heresy.

As a matter of fact, according to Romans 16, denying this argument itself would be considered false teaching, as this would be denying Paul's clear teaching to avoid those that teach against what the Apostles taught! And this is so self-evident that anyone arguing against this should simply give up on ever trying to be able to identify false teachers, in which case why does the Bible repeatedly say to do so?

It should also be noted that Scripture's commands in regard to separating from false teachers apply to *all* believers and have implications for those they *associate* with. The direct implication is that if a true believer in Christ should discover he is partnering, associating, supporting, or collaborating with a false teacher (assuming he has had time to examine the evidence for such a charge), he should immediately disassociate himself from that person or group.

It is serious to accuse either an individual or an organized group of professing Christians as being false teachers, so we must have biblical reasons for doing so.

## What Does BioLogos Teach?

BioLogos is a self-described Christian ministry that declares, "We embrace the historical Christian faith, upholding the authority and inspiration of the Bible," yet it promotes the idea that God used evolutionary processes to create over billions of years.<sup>8</sup> In **Part 1** [<http://answersingenesis.org/blogs/calvin-smith/2022/01/17/biologos-heresy-and-false-teaching-part-1/>], we examined how to identify false teachers. Does BioLogos fit this designation?

To determine whether their teaching is compatible with what the Bible teaches, we must understand the “**evolutionary creation** [<http://answersingenesis.org/theistic-evolution/can-evolutionist-be-creationist/>]” viewpoint and what makes it differ from both biblical creationist views and other old-earth creation positions. Although there are numerous topics we could explore, for the sake of brevity, let’s just look at three to make the case: creation, Noah’s flood, and Adam as a historical figure.

## Creation

First, it must be understood that BioLogos accepts the **secular understanding of origins** [<http://answersingenesis.org/world-religions/is-evolution-a-religion/>] (the story of evolution) wholeheartedly. They actively promote the concept that there is no conflict between science and Scripture, but what they mean by *science* is secular evolutionist interpretations in astronomy, geology, biology, and anthropology, with God somehow behind it all.

These beliefs include a “microbes-to-man” understanding of how life supposedly evolved in a constant struggle for survival involving death and disease over billions of years, as opposed to the Bible’s description of a **six-day ex-nihilo creation** [<http://answersingenesis.org/days-of-creation/could-god-really-have-created-everything-in-six-days/>]. A closer look at the evolutionary order is in stark contrast to Genesis.<sup>9</sup>

And although BioLogos’ website features a variety of opinions from its contributors that allow for various nuances regarding Genesis 1–11 (as I’ll demonstrate more thoroughly further on), those chapters are treated by most of their contributors as non-literal—merely teaching theological truths but not describing literal, historical events.

## Noah’s Flood

Old-earth proponents almost always claim that Noah’s flood was not global but rather a localized flood. BioLogos realizes that the sedimentary rock layers seen around the world either had to be laid down over vast eons of time *or* over a short period of time in the worldwide deluge. It can’t be both.

Because they need the geologic column to give supposed evidence for millions of years, they argue for a local flood that would have left relatively few geological traces. But why a huge Ark to save animals or birds from a local flood? How did the Ark float against the downstream current and somehow land in the high mountains (of Ararat) way above the little flood plain in which this supposedly took place?

However, while some BioLogos contributors may entertain this local flood view, they tend to strip Noah's Flood of any real historical/physical context by making it mythological/non-literal. As one BioLogos article that criticizes biblical creation and the AiG Ark Encounter exhibits explains,

[T]he story of Noah's flood does not recall a literal series of historical events. Although the biblical story might be based on an actual flood in the Mesopotamia region, its ultimate message is to proclaim God's sovereignty over nature and his justice, love, and grace, not to provide information on historical cataclysms.<sup>10</sup>

## Adam and Eve as Real Persons

Like it or not, the debate on if Adam (and, by default, Eve) was a real historical person has now become mainstream in Christian academia, with BioLogos at the forefront and contributing much published material in support of "alternative" views.

Although some of their contributors allow for the idea that perhaps God assigned two individuals human status from among a pool of evolved hominids as mankind's progenitors, many of them would say that there was no literal **Adam and Eve** [<http://answersingenesis.org/adam-and-eve/>] and that the first humans were descended from apelike ancestors, which in turn had descended from lower organisms—in compliance to secular pagan evolutionary thought, rather than the Bible.

One of the BioLogos website articles explains the "common, traditional view" in contrast to the evolutionary creation view they espouse.

In a common traditional view, Adam and Eve were created *de novo*—they were created by God as fully formed humans (*Homo sapiens*), roughly 6,000 to 10,000 years ago. God made them quickly and completely as fully formed humans with no biological ancestors. In this traditional *de novo* view, Adam and Eve are “sole progenitors”: they were the first two humans, and they alone gave rise to all other humans. The Genesis account is taken to be a record of real events similar to the way a journalist would record them today.<sup>11</sup>

One of BioLogos’ featured contributors and ‘resource’ collaborators, Dr. Denis Lamoureux, has outright declared, “Adam never existed.”<sup>12</sup>

(Readers should understand that one does not have to be a biblical creationist to be justifiably concerned about BioLogos’ radical rejection of Adam as a real historical figure. Many mainstream evangelicals have commented on the massive theological problems created by jettisoning the biblical Adam.) A leading atheist, Richard Bozarth, understood this far better than the writers at BioLogos. He once commented,

Christianity has fought, still fights, and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus’ earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the son of god. Take away the meaning of his death. If Jesus was not the redeemer that died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing.<sup>13</sup>

## What Do the NT Writers Say

### About Creation?

Let’s begin with the fact that Bible authors consistently took Genesis as a literal historical narrative.<sup>14</sup> Jesus is the highest of authorities in the NT (even though all Scripture is “God breathed,” inspired, and God’s Word). In his discussion of the topic of divorce and defense of marriage, Jesus quotes Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 as real history when he states,

*But from the beginning of creation, "God made them male and female." "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh." So they are no longer two but one flesh. (Mark 10:6–8)*

This interaction is also mentioned in Matthew's Gospel, with Jesus beginning the statement with the question, "Have you not read?" which emphasizes the authority and historicity he assigned to the Old Testament Scriptures regarding the Genesis account.

*He answered, "Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate." (Matthew 19:4–6)*

It makes no sense to assume that Jesus was saying, "Have you not read the mythological story about God creating people male and female from the beginning of the creation?" to emphasize the authority of his argument. Yet, that is precisely what he would have been doing if God had used billions of years of evolutionary processes to create and if Adam and Eve weren't real.

Also, notice Jesus' reference to "from the beginning of creation" (looking back at day six of the creation week). Jesus' statement only makes sense when taking Genesis literally and within a young-earth timeframe. If there were millions of years of earth history before the creation of Adam and Eve, it makes no sense to say, "from the beginning." Because Jesus is Creator, he knows how he created!

*He [Jesus] is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. And*

*he is before all things, and in him all things hold together. And he is the head of the body, the church. He is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in everything he might be preeminent.*  
(Colossians 1:15–18)

Jesus also refers to Adam and Eve's son Abel with the same historicity as he does Zechariah, both in Luke's Gospel and the parallel in Mathew 23:35.

*[F]rom the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, it will be required of this generation. (Luke 11:51)*

On what consistent hermeneutical basis could it be argued that Jesus' statement here could be somehow referencing a mythological figure alongside a historical one?

## **About Noah's Flood?**

Matthew's Gospel records Jesus' words comparing Noah and the flood as well with his inevitable return. Notice his straightforward reference to Noah/the deluge as a real historical figure/event.

*For as were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of Man. For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day when Noah entered the ark, and they were unaware until the flood came and swept them all away, so will be the coming of the Son of Man.*  
(Matthew 24:37–39)

And in Luke's Gospel, Jesus referenced Lot and the destruction of Sodom (which are generally taken as real history, even by the BioLogos group) along with Noah and the flood:

*Just as it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of Man. They were eating and drinking and marrying and being given in marriage, until the day when Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Likewise, just as it was in the days of Lot—they were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, but on the day when Lot went out from Sodom, fire and sulfur rained from heaven and destroyed them all—so will it be on the day when the Son of Man is revealed.*  
(Luke 17:26–30)

Again, how could a serious exegetical study of these passages ever conclude that Jesus was saying “The real event of the coming of the Son of Man will be similar to the mythological story of Noah and the ark and like the real historical account of Lot and the destruction of Sodom”?

The Apostle Peter also refers to the Genesis account of Noah’s flood this way:

*[H]e did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven others, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly. (2 Peter 2:5)*

Notice that there is nothing in this or the surrounding text to indicate anything other than a literal reference to the Genesis account. And notice how the author of Hebrews refers to the same event:

*By faith Noah, being warned by God concerning events as yet unseen, in reverent fear constructed an ark for the saving of his household. (Hebrews 11:7)*

These two NT passages encapsulate the details of the Genesis account of Noah’s flood by stating Noah, a righteous man, built an ark at the behest of God’s warning, that a flood would come and destroy the world, and that Noah and his family (his wife and three sons with their wives) escaped.

*This section of Scripture also lists Abel, Cain, and Enoch prior to Noah as genuine people, leading up to the mention of Abraham and Sarah in verse 8, with no differentiation between any of them being anything other than real, historical figures.*

This section of Scripture also lists Abel, Cain, and Enoch prior to Noah as genuine people, leading up to the mention of Abraham and Sarah in verse 8, with no differentiation between any of them being anything other than real, historical figures.

BioLogos contributors, in general, have no objections to Abraham and Sarah being real historical figures. Why would some then differentiate between persons in Genesis 1–11 as non-historical figures and those mentioned afterward as real people? The names of Noah’s descendants in Genesis 10 are found in place names all over the world.<sup>15</sup>

## **About Adam and Eve as Real Historical Persons?**

In Acts 17, the Apostle Paul refers to Adam as a real historical figure when he declares that all nations were descended from one man.

*And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth. (Acts 17:26)*

Paul again emphasizes the reality of Adam as a real person in **Romans 5:12–21**, where he explains that Adam and Jesus constitute two heads of humanity: the first and last Adam.

*Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned—for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like*



*the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come.*

*But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift by the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many. And the free gift is not like the result of that one man's sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brought justification. For if, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ.*

*Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men. For as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous. Now the law came in to increase the trespass, but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. (Romans 5:12-21)*

The "one man" to whom Paul refers is absolutely clear each time he mentions it because of the context (either Adam or Jesus). Death (both physical and spiritual) came because of one man's (Adam's) **sin** [<http://answersingenesis.org/sin/>], but life came through one man's (Jesus Christ's) sacrifice.

And Adam as a real person is similarly critical to Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15, where he defends the physical resurrection of the dead (i.e., because we believers are *in* Christ, we will also rise

in Christ).

*Now I would remind you, brothers, of the gospel I preached to you, which you received, in which you stand, and by which you are being saved, if you hold fast to the word I preached to you—unless you believed in vain.*

*For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me. For I am the least of the apostles, unworthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace toward me was not in vain. On the contrary, I worked harder than any of them, though it was not I, but the grace of God that is with me. Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed.*

*Now if Christ is proclaimed as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then not even Christ has been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain. We are even found to be misrepresenting God, be-*

*cause we testified about God that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, not even Christ has been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in Christ we have hope in this life only, we are of all people most to be pitied.*

*But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. (1 Corinthians 15:1-22)*

Notice the linking of the gospel Paul preached to the reality of the resurrection from a physical death—and where that state of death came from in the first place: “For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.” This reiterates **Romans 5:12**: death came by one man, Adam, but Christ’s sacrifice brings life.

Paul also mentions Eve as a real person who was deceived by the serpent influenced by **Satan** [<http://answersingenesis.org/sin/original-sin/who-sinned-first-adam-or-satan/>] in **2 Corinthians 11:3**:

*But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ.*

***It is an unquestionable, demonstrable fact that the vast majority of Christians (church fathers, Reformers, pastors, and laypersons) throughout history believed and taught this to be true until evolutionary***

## *interpretations of history became popularized.*

As plainly read in context, Scripture indicates that there was a real historical couple, Adam and Eve. Those who would disagree need to bring forward an overwhelmingly strong case to disprove that. It is an unquestionable, demonstrable fact that the vast majority of Christians (church fathers, Reformers, pastors, and laypersons) throughout history believed and taught this to be true until evolutionary interpretations of history became popularized. Even one of BioLogos' most prominent spokespeople has admitted,

Most expressions of Christianity, from Augustine to Al Mohler, have never been without a historical Adam and Eve, despite more liberal Protestant traditions moving in that direction as early as the nineteenth century. And even as evolution was tentatively embraced by sophisticated evangelicals over the course of the twentieth century, Adam and Eve were inserted somewhere.<sup>16</sup>

Considering the above, does BioLogos truly represent the Christian faith?

## *Considering the above, does BioLogos truly represent the Christian faith?*

### **So, Does BioLogos Teach (Embrace) the Historical Christian Faith?**

**Does BioLogos teach what the New Testament writers actually taught and believed?** For BioLogos to claim any kind of orthodoxy in regards to Paul's clear teaching in **Romans 16:5-6**, they would have to argue that Jesus and the Apostles (under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit) *were* teaching from an "evolutionary creation" viewpoint.

If they claim that Jesus and the Apostles were *not* teaching from a theistic evolutionary viewpoint, then they would have to agree that they (BioLogos) are teaching *in contradiction* to what the New Testament (NT) writers taught, *thus identifying themselves* as false teachers per Romans 16.

Does an examination of the NT ever indicate that the authors believed God the Father used evolution

over billions of years to “create”? The answer is an unequivocal *no*. The NT writers overwhelmingly referenced Genesis as a historical document by quoting Genesis directly or alluding to Genesis 60 times.

Considering the size of the body of literature in the NT compared to the entire scope of God’s Word, the sheer number of references shows the NT writers did not consider it a minor portion of biblical theology. Indeed, as Answers in Genesis has always pointed out, Genesis is the seedbed of all Christian doctrines, as all of them are founded (directly or indirectly) in Genesis 1–11.

It is in this context that we must ask the following questions about BioLogos’ teachings.

- Does the Bible indicate that its authors believed the people and events they reference were real historical figures and narratives?
- Does BioLogos have a logical reason based on sound exegetical hermeneutics to claim that the biblical writers were somehow saying they *did not* believe the Genesis accounts and that these weren’t real, historical people and events?
- Based on the text of Scripture, can BioLogos affirm the following statement? The NT writers did NOT believe that the people and events being referenced in Genesis by them ever existed in a true, physical historical sense.

Unless they can provide sufficient biblical evidence to show that the writers of the NT actually believed that God had used evolution to “create” and that the events and people they mentioned weren’t real persons in actual historical events (in essence, that the NT authors agree with what the BioLogos authors say that seems contrary to what the NT authors wrote!), they are guilty of *teaching contrary* to what the NT writers taught—which is false teaching!

### **Have BioLogos Contributors Admitted They Believe the NT Writers Believed a Literal Genesis but Were Wrong?**

Another way for BioLogos to attempt to justify themselves against the charge of false teaching would

be to admit the NT writers sincerely believed the people and events of Genesis they referenced were real but were in fact *wrong* about what they believed.

But that would mean that BioLogos is doing exactly what Paul warns about in Romans 16: they are *teaching contrary* to what the NT writers taught (which by definition is false teaching)! Have BioLogos contributors admitted that they believe the NT writers believed a literal Genesis but were wrong? Yes, they have. And although there are many, we need to demonstrate only a few examples to prove the point.

### **Dr. Peter Enns**

Let's begin with Dr. Peter Enns, who has several articles and interviews on the BioLogos website. Interestingly, far from "embracing historical Christianity" like the BioLogos website declares, the top of Dr. Enns' blog page says he is "rethinking biblical Christianity."

In his book *The Evolution of Adam*, Enns wrote the following regarding Adam as the first human:

Still, as I see it, the scientific evidence we have for human origins and the literary evidence we have for the nature of ancient stories of origins are so overwhelmingly persuasive that belief in a first human, such as Paul understood him, is not a viable option.<sup>17</sup>

Notice that Enns admits that the Apostle Paul believed that Adam was the first literal human, yet Enns *teaches contrary*. Enns goes on to say,

Evolution demands that the special creation of the first Adam as described in the Bible is not literally historical.<sup>18</sup>

***It also demonstrates the true authority that drives Enns' so-called "theology" when he declares "Evolution demands."***

Here is an even more clarifying admission that Adam was the specially created, literal, historical, first human. Why else would Enns refer to this creation of man “as described in the Bible”? It also demonstrates the true authority that drives Enns’ so-called “theology” when he declares “Evolution demands.” And when evolution demands, its followers must unquestioningly obey (even if the Bible objects), apparently.

This is further confirmation that prior to the popularity of evolution, no one would have any reason to conclude with Enns and BioLogos that Adam wasn’t a real, historical person just as Genesis and the New Testament teach. Therefore, Enns *teaches contrary* to the NT writers.

In addition, in his chapter on evolution in *The Sin of Certainty*, Enns again admits the validity of Genesis when he says,

The problem for biblically centered Christians is that the Bible, right in the very beginning, tells us clearly that God created all life forms with a simple “Let there be . . .” No common descent, natural selection, or billions of years required.<sup>19</sup>

***But Enns says that he believes in an evolutionary understanding of common descent and natural selection over billions of years, which means that he’s not a “biblically centered Christian” by his own admission.***

But Enns says that he believes in an evolutionary understanding of common descent and natural selection over billions of years, which means that he’s not a “biblically centered Christian” by his own admission. Again, he admits that the literal Genesis creation is biblical and commonly understood—yet he doesn’t believe it. In another BioLogos article, he says,

Most Christians understand that, even though the Bible assumes a certain way of looking at the cosmos, from a scientific point of view the Bible is wrong.<sup>20</sup>

For Paul, Adam certainly seems to be the first person created from dust, and Eve was formed from him.<sup>21</sup>

According to Paul's warning in Romans 16, Enns identifies himself as a false teacher who should be avoided in the Christian church. But is he the only BioLogos contributor to fall into this category? Sadly, no, he's not.

### **Dr. Dennis Lamoureux**

Dennis Lamoureux is also a major contributor to the BioLogos website. In one of his articles, he makes the following statement:

The greatest problem with evolutionary creation is that it rejects the traditional literal interpretation of the opening chapters of Scripture. . . . Even more troubling for evolutionary creation is the fact that the New Testament writers, including Jesus Himself, refer to Genesis 1–11 as literal history (**Matthew 19:4–6; Romans 5:12–14; Hebrews 4:4–7; 2 Peter 2:4–5**). Therefore, the burning question is: "How do evolutionary creationists interpret the early chapters of Holy Scripture?"<sup>22</sup>

Notice his clear admission that BioLogos' stance on creation is in direct opposition to the traditional interpretation of the Christian church, despite their declaration that they "embrace" traditional Christianity. Their embrace seems more like a hug goodbye than any kind of close relationship with it.

Notice that Lamoureux rejects a plain-reading interpretation of Genesis yet admits that the Apostles and "Jesus Himself" referred to Genesis as literal history, making him a false teacher according to NT standards.

### **Dr. Karl Giberson**

Karl Giberson has been a major contributor to BioLogos from its inception, having co-written the



book *The Language of Science and Faith: Straight Answers to Genuine Questions* with Francis Collins (available on the BioLogos website.)<sup>23</sup>

In his book *Saving the Original Sinner*, Giberson admits that the Bible describes Adam and Eve as historical figures, the fall as a real event, and so forth, yet he also explains why he teaches evolutionary science:

[G]enetic evidence has made it clear that Adam and Eve cannot have been historical figures, at least as described in the Bible. More scientifically informed evangelicals within the conservative traditions are admitting that the evidence is undermining creation, fall, redemption theology.<sup>24</sup>

It's no wonder then that Giberson references Ian Barbour as a major influence in his and BioLogos' attempt to reconcile science and religion. An endnote on one of his articles says,

All such conversations take the seminal work of Ian Barbour as the starting point. Barbour—arguably the first true scholar of science-and-religion—identified four ways that science and religion could relate. His analysis first appeared in 1988 and was expanded in 1990 with his influential Gifford lectures.<sup>25</sup>

What then is Barbour's opinion on these matters?

You simply can't any longer say as traditional Christians that death was God's punishment for sin. Death was around long before human beings. Death is a necessary aspect of an evolutionary world. . . . One generation has to die for new generations to come into being. In a way, it is more satisfying . . . than to see it as a sort of arbitrary punishment that God imposed on our primeval paradise.<sup>26</sup>

And understand, Giberson has revealed his adoption of Barbour's position wholeheartedly. He references his pushback from the evangelical community because of his attempt to redefine biblical

terms to make them fit the story of evolution:

I suggested that what is labeled theologically as sin remains a useful insight into human nature, even after we abandon a historical Adam, his fall, and the original sin he passed on to us. . . . The story of Adam is thus the story of Everyman, unable to resist temptation, ignoring the better angels of his nature.<sup>27</sup>

Adam and Eve, as described in Genesis, cannot have been historical figures. Recent work in genetics has established this unsettling conclusion beyond any reasonable doubt.<sup>28</sup>

BioLogos paints itself as “embracing traditional Christianity” while embracing major influencers like Barbour and Giberson, who contradict the church and God’s Word. They are truly wolves in sheep’s clothing.

### **Kenton Sparks**

Let’s examine this quote from another of their contributors, professing evangelical Kenton Sparks:

If Jesus as a finite human being erred from time to time, there is no reason at all to suppose that Moses, Paul, John wrote Scripture without error. Rather, we are wise to assume that the biblical authors expressed themselves as human beings writing from the perspectives of their own finite, broken horizons.<sup>29</sup>

A breakdown of a blasphemous statement like this seems almost unnecessary, yet for the sake of argument, I’ll point a few things out. The fact that Sparks suggests Jesus “erred from time to time” is blasphemous indeed on many levels, in particular, because Jesus declared,

*For I have not spoken on my own authority, but the Father who sent me has himself given me a commandment—what to say and what to speak. (John 12:49)*

If Jesus spoke what the Father said and yet erred, then the Father must have erred and so cannot be the God of the Bible, the Alpha and the Omega who knows everything (error can only be spoken by someone who doesn't have all knowledge or is being deliberately misleading). And if God knowingly erred, then he is not the God of the Bible, because God is not a man that he should lie. And if Jesus is not God, then he cannot forgive our sins, and he is not the unblemished perfect sacrifice for our sins.

Sparks' statement is a deconstruction of the gospel and the concept of biblical inerrancy, as well as Christ's deity. If Jesus, Paul, Moses, John, and every other author of the Bible did not write without error, how could we ever know truth? Which parts of the Bible could be trusted with absolute certainty? How would we ever know if we are saved or not?

Yet Jesus and the Apostles all taught that the Bible was authoritative, with Jesus himself frequently prefacing his teaching with statements like "Have you not read?" and "It is written," both clear indications of his submission to the authority of God's Word. Paul taught that

*All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work. (2 Timothy 3:16-17)*

How could Scripture be useful in teaching spiritual or moral truths if it were possible that any portion might be tainted with error? Why would Jesus quote Moses if Moses may have written error into the body of Scripture? Why would Jesus have said,

*For if you believed Moses, you would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words? (John 5:46-47)*

And **Hebrews 1:3** says,

*The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven.*

I emphasize, if BioLogos contributors can suggest that Jesus, the exact representation of who God is (**Hebrews 1:3**), made errors, then God has made errors. And it would be logically consistent to assume that Jesus was not divine, which destroys the gospel, because if Jesus isn't divine, then his earthly human sacrifice couldn't *and didn't* pay for the sins of mankind. And these are the types of blasphemous concepts iterated through the BioLogos group and the teachers they promote.

Notice how Sparks contradicts Jesus and other NT writers when he urges readers to let evolutionary interpretations of science guide our interpretations of Scripture.

The verdict is in. One way or another, it is not a good idea to use the book of Genesis as a guide for our modern scientific queries, or even to expect it to enter into modern scientific conversation. Rather, our science should be deduced mainly by carefully studying God's world and by receiving the results as a "word" from God and as evidence of his majesty and creativity. I freely admit that this "conclusion" leaves us with more theological work to do. We still have the apparent problem that death entered the cosmos before human beings existed, and also the pressing question of how the "Adam" of Genesis, and more importantly of Romans, should be understood in light of theological orthodoxy and the evolutionary process.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, Sparks *is also a false teacher*.

## **Joseph Bankard**

An incredibly incriminating article from Joseph Bankard (who teaches philosophy at a Christian university) posted on the BioLogos website demonstrates that, despite their professed commitment to traditional Christian belief, any and all Christian doctrines are 'open season' to interpretation

because of their evolutionary views. Its preface states

This post is part of a series of perspectives on how to understand the atoning work of Christ in light of evolutionary science. Readers are encouraged to browse the series introduction by Jim Stump for an explanation of how BioLogos approaches these sorts of issues. Here, we feature the thoughts of theologian Joseph Bankard. We want to encourage our readers to approach his ideas with an open mind, and even if you disagree with him, we hope it stimulates you to think more deeply about how to integrate science and Scripture in a faithful way.<sup>31</sup>

Bankard, of course, assumes there was no literal Adam who committed a literal original sin, and therefore is willing to totally reinterpret the atoning work of Christ's death on the cross of Calvary because of it. He argues the following:

How does the view I've sketched differ from substitutionary atonement? First, the incarnation is not primarily about the cross. *God does not send Jesus to die. God does not require Jesus' death in order to forgive humanity's sin.* As a result, God is not motivated by retribution or righteous anger. Instead, the incarnation is motivated by love. God wanted humanity to know him in a new and robust way. God wanted to be present to humanity in the midst of its sin and isolation. God desires right relationship. As a demonstration of God's immense love and compassion, God takes on flesh and bone. He becomes a vulnerable child relying on humans for his every need. He learns what it is to hunger and thirst. He experiences torture, humiliation, and isolation on the cross. In the end, Jesus experiences death. And in so doing, Christ connects to humanity in a new and powerful way. His compassion both shows us the way of our salvation (revelation) and inspires us to follow after him. [emphasis mine]

I argue that God did not will the cross . . . Christ's death was not part of God's divine plan.<sup>32</sup>

Of course, this flies in the face of biblical revelation in **Acts 2:22–23** and **Acts 4:27–28**, where it says,

*Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs that God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know—this Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men.*  
(Acts 2:22–23)

*for truly in this city there were gathered together against your holy servant Jesus, whom you anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, along with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, to do whatever your hand and your plan had predestined to take place. (Acts 4:27–28) [emphasis mine]*

Bankard summarizes his “big idea” and reveals his motivation for considering such a heretical view of Christ’s sacrifice by saying

The view sketched above does not require a historical Adam and Eve or a traditional concept of original sin, *making it more compatible with evolution* [emphasis mine].<sup>33</sup>

In his effort to overturn an essential doctrine of Christianity (the atoning work of Christ), Bankard clearly reveals himself as a false teacher.

Inevitably, BioLogos’ teaching leads to a “faith” that has little to do with Christianity but everything to do with a naturalistic, pagan, and secular view of life. A clear example is from BioLogos’ own Karl Giberson, who testifies that by his third year in college, he “was now wearing scientific spectacles almost all the time.” As a result, non-evolutionary explanations for life “looked a little too convenient to me.” Giberson writes that he “had come to the point where, by definition, nothing could ever be explained by reference to God.”<sup>34</sup>

No wonder the atheist William Provine once commented,

One can have a religious view that is compatible with evolution only if the religious view is indistinguishable from atheism.<sup>35</sup>

## Calling BioLogos to Account

***The conclusion that the BioLogos group as a whole promotes heretical teaching is incontrovertible. Paul's command in Romans 16 is abundantly clear that cutting off false teachers is a biblical mandate.***

The conclusion that the BioLogos group as a whole promotes heretical teaching is incontrovertible. Paul's command in Romans 16 is abundantly clear that cutting off false teachers is a biblical mandate. Therefore, once they have been identified, believers no longer have an excuse to associate with them whatsoever.

*Now I urge you, brethren, note those who cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine which you learned, and avoid them. (Romans 16:17 NKJV)*

The Christian community should distance itself from BioLogos. Supporters, contributors, and any true believers in Christ associated with the BioLogos organization should repent and disassociate themselves and denounce the heretical views espoused by this group.

## Truly Guilty by Association

The church must consider the absolute seriousness of this matter. Some of the most influential Christian leaders contribute to BioLogos, and BioLogos speakers are regularly invited into Bible colleges, seminaries, Christian homeschool events, and churches under the guise of "intellectual discourse" within the church.

*This must stop as Christians are commanded by Paul to avoid them. Why bring a group into a Christian setting that openly attacks the truth of God's Word? Christians must confront contributors and supporters of BioLogos with their heresy.*

## **A Serious Warning to Anyone Professing Faith in Christ**

Professing believers should consider Christ's warning concerning false teachers and the devastation their teaching causes:

*Enter by the narrow gate. For the gate is wide and the way is easy that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard that leads to life, and those who find it are few. Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves. You will recognize them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thornbushes, or figs from thistles? So, every healthy tree bears good fruit, but the diseased tree bears bad fruit. A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a diseased tree bear good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Thus you will recognize them by their fruits. (Matthew 7:13–20)*

Believers need to understand that despite the droning mantra from evolutionists who declare that evidence for naturalism is overwhelming, the facts we all observe in God's world are far better interpreted according to the plain reading of God's Word (e.g., **Proverbs 8:8–9**, **2 Corinthians 4:2**) than according to the story of evolution. As a BioLogos author admits,

[T]he evidence for evolution is not readily "visible." Rather, evolutionists tell us that it is only through well-informed familiarity with the details of the evidence—the fossils, the distribution and variety of living species, the biochemistry, the ecological issues, the genetic evidence, etc.—that one can see how convincing the evidence for evolution actually is.



Because most of us will never be able to “see” this evidence for ourselves, we are forced to decide whose testimony to believe. On one side we have practically all scientists, and also many confessing Christians—including even many evangelical Christians—who attest to the cogency of evolution as an explanation of the evidence. On the other side we have the testimony of fundamentalist science, which represents a very small minority of the scientific community.<sup>36</sup>

This is exactly what Answers in Genesis has been saying since its inception. Whose testimony (word) **do you believe** [<http://answersingenesis.org/blogs/calvin-smith/2021/06/21/who-do-you-trust/>]? The real argument here is whether we trust man’s word or God’s Word. The world (and many in the Christian community) seem to be taking the broad way toward siding with a naturalistic pagan explanation for our existence, while there is a narrow contingent that holds fast to the authority of God’s Word.

Pastors, parishioners, parents, and young people, do not be deceived by false teachers. Be careful which “Christian” academics and teachers you listen to and accept instruction from. Be careful what colleges you support and attend. **Satan is cunning** [<http://answersingenesis.org/angels-and-demons/satan/revisionist-history-satans-original-trick/>]. He understands that a “Christian” organization is often much more effective at indoctrinating believers towards faith-destroying beliefs than atheists are. After all, Satan has been known to quote Scripture—albeit he twists it (e.g., **Matthew 4:5–6** with **Psalm 91:11–12**).

## Conclusion

Let’s face it; many sincere and God-fearing believers have come to many different conclusions about certain doctrines—baptism, eschatology, and observance of days, to name a few. But mature Christians in various camps still break bread with one another in Christian unity because they know that their **differing beliefs are rooted in a sincere reverence for God’s Word** [<http://answersingenesis.org/bible-questions/where-do-we-draw-the-line/>].

They are arguing over what Scripture means in context. Calling someone a heretic or false teacher because they have a different conclusion regarding doctrine is a dangerous proposition because sincere believers can simply be sincerely wrong.

***We do not consider those who have accepted Christ as their Savior but do not hold to biblical creation to be apostate.***

And this is why Answers in Genesis has always been very clear that **we do not consider those who have accepted Christ as their Savior but do not hold to biblical creation to be apostate** [<http://answersingenesis.org/age-of-the-earth/does-the-gospel-depend-on-a-young-earth/>] or suggest they be “cast from the kingdom,” so to speak.

Although we have been continuously accused of that over the years, whenever we have challenged those who have leveled this accusation to provide a written statement, article, or presentation from AiG staff making that declaration, they have always been unable to produce one. We have gone out of our way to repeatedly say, on record, that we do not assert that belief in a “**literal**” [<http://answersingenesis.org/hermeneutics/is-genesis-1-literal-literalism-or-literalistic/>] (we prefer the term *plain* or *straightforward*) reading of Genesis is a **salvation** [<http://answersingenesis.org/gospel/salvation/what-does-it-mean-to-be-saved/>] issue.

We understand those we consider to be in error concerning their interpretation of Genesis are quite different from false teaching.

Having said this, Romans 16 identifies BioLogos as a house of heresy and false teachers by their contributor’s own words, who openly and admittedly *teach contrary to what the Apostles, Holy Spirit, and Jesus have taught*. Anyone who has been deceived into believing the false teachings that have been coming from this group needs to repent and return to the authority of God’s Word starting from the very first verse of Genesis. There is no greater authority than God. There is no reason to put yourself at risk on judgment day as being counted as supporters of false teachings (**Romans 16:17; Titus 3:10**).

# Footnotes

1. "About Us," BioLogos, accessed December 30, 2021, <https://biologos.org/about-us#our-mission>.
2. "What We Believe," BioLogos, accessed December 30, 2021, <https://biologos.org/about-us/what-we-believe>.
3. "The Identity of BioLogos Core Values," BioLogos, accessed December 27, 2021, <https://biologos.org/about-us#our-mission>.
4. "What We Believe," Points 8 and 9, BioLogos, accessed December 27, 2021, <https://biologos.org/about-us/what-we-believe>.
5. "Common Questions: What Does the Fossil Record Show?," BioLogos, last updated July 9, 2021, <https://biologos.org/common-questions/what-does-the-fossil-record-show/>.
6. "Common Questions: What Is the Genetic Evidence for Human Evolution?," last updated March 11, 2019, <https://biologos.org/common-questions/what-is-the-genetic-evidence-for-human-evolution>.
7. "On What Grounds Can One Claim that the Christian God Is the Creator?," BioLogos, last updated March 10, 2012, <http://web.archive.org/web/20150905184500/https://biologos.org/questions/biologos-and-christianity> [<http://web.archive.org/web/20150905184500/https://biologos.org/questions/biologos-and-christianity>].
8. "About Us," BioLogos, accessed 27 December 2021, <https://biologos.org/about-us#our-mission>.
9. See abridged chart in Terry Mortenson, "Evolution vs. Creation: The Order of Events Matters!," *Answers in Genesis*, April, 4, 2006, <https://answersingenesis.org/why-does-creation-matter/evolution-vs-creation-the-order-of-events-matters/> [<http://answersingenesis.org/why-does-creation-matter/evolution-vs-creation-the-order-of-events-matters/>].
10. Ted Davis, "Flooding the World with Creationism," BioLogos, June 30, 2016, <https://biologos.org/articles/flooding-the-world-with-creationism>.
11. "Were Adam and Eve Historical Figures?," BioLogos, last updated February 18, 2020, <https://biologos.org/common-questions/were-adam-and-eve-historical-figures/>.
12. Denis O. Lamoureux, "No Historical Adam: Evolutionary Creation View," in *Four Views on the Historical Adam*, eds. Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Academic, 2013), 37–38.
13. G. Richard Bozarth, "The Meaning of Evolution", *American Atheist*, 20 September 1979, 30.
14. Terry Mortenson, "Did Bible Authors Believe in a Literal Genesis?," in *New Answers Book 3*, gen. ed. Ken Ham (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2010), <https://answersingenesis.org/genesis/did-bible-authors-believe-in-a-literal-genesis/> [<http://answersingenesis.org/genesis/did-bible-authors-believe-in-a-literal-genesis/>].
15. See Bodie Hodge, *The Tower of Babel*, Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2013.
16. Karl Giberson, *Saving the Original Sinner* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2015), 10.
17. Peter Enns, *The Evolution of Adam* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2012), 122.
18. *Ibid.*, xvi.
19. Peter Enns, *The Sin of Certainty* (San Francisco, California: Harper One, 2016).
20. Peter Enns, "Evangelicals, Evolution, and the Bible: Moving Toward a Synthesis," The BioLogos Foundation, 1, [https://recursos.facultadseut.org/gestion/opac/doc\\_num.php?explnum\\_id=170](https://recursos.facultadseut.org/gestion/opac/doc_num.php?explnum_id=170).
21. *Ibid.*, 4.
22. D. O. Lamoureux, "Evolutionary Creation: Moving Beyond the Evolution Versus Creation Debate" *Christian Higher Education* 9, no. 1 (2010): 28–48.
23. "The Language of Science and Faith," BioLogos, March 15, 2011, <https://biologos.org/resources/the-language-of-science-and-faith>.
24. Giberson, *Saving the Original Sinner*, 167–168.
25. Karl Giberson, "The Relationship Between Science and Religion," BioLogos, February 19, 2011, <https://biologos.org/articles/the-relationship-between-science-and-religion>.
26. Ian Barbour, professor emeritus at Carleton College and Scientist/Recipient of the 1999 Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion, *Dayton*

*Daily News*, March 13, 1999.

27. Karl Giberson, *Saving the Original Sinner*, 170.
28. Ibid., 173.
29. Kenton Sparks, "After Inerrancy, Evangelicals and the Bible in the Postmodern Age, Part 4" BioLogos Forum, 26 June 2010, [https://web.archive.org/web/20100620103938/https://biologos.org/uploads/static-content/sparks\\_scholarly\\_essay.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20100620103938/https://biologos.org/uploads/static-content/sparks_scholarly_essay.pdf).
30. Kenton Sparks, "Scripture, Evolution and the Problem of Science," BioLogos, February 6, 2010, <https://biologos.org/articles/scripture-evolution-and-the-problem-of-science>.
31. Joseph Bankard, "Substitutionary Atonement and Evolution," BioLogos, June 9, 2015, <https://biologos.org/articles/series/atonement-and-evolution-a-biologos-conversation/substitutionary-atonement-and-evolution>.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Karl W. Giberson, *Saving Darwin: How to Be a Christian and Believe in Evolution* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2008), 110.
35. W. B. Provine, "No Free Will" in *Catching up with the Vision*, ed. Margaret W Rossiter (Chicago, Illinois: Chicago University Press, 1999), S123.
36. Sparks, "Scripture, Evolution and the Problem of Science."

---

Support the creation/gospel message by **donating** or **getting involved!**

---