

It Is All About Teeth
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation



First Published 17 January 2003
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/teeth.htm

One of the claims by young-earth creationists is that there was no death before the fall of man. This is based upon several Bible verses. The first is Genesis 1:29-30, which states, "And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. ³⁰And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, where-in there is life, I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so." We will discuss a second verse, Romans 5:12, a little later.

I'm sure you will agree with me that God created all the animals. And, you must also agree with me that since God created them, then they must be created perfectly to fit into the ecosystem the way that God designed. So far, this is all perfectly logical.

In the garden of Eden, man and beast were given plants to eat as their food. This is critical to the belief of a young-earth creationist. If carnivores were given plants to eat, then they must have eaten only plants. This is why they believe there was no death before the Fall of man, because even the carnivores were plant-eaters.

I agree, the Bible clearly states that all animals were given the plants of the earth to eat. However, the interpretation of this verse to mean that "all animals" did in fact eat nothing but grass causes a huge problem for the young-earth creationist. The problem it raises is this...if all the animals were created as plant-eaters, then there must have been lions, tigers, etc., that had molar teeth for chewing plants. You may laugh, but think about it. God created perfect animals, right? If they were created as perfect animals, then God would not have given them inefficient teeth for eating plant material. He intended all animals in the Garden to eat plants, and they could not have been efficient plant-eaters with their canine teeth. So, has anyone found any fossil skeletons of lions with molars? Absolutely not!

You may say that there are animals today with canine teeth, that eat nothing but plants. Yes, this is true, however this is the exception, and not the rule. And in most cases, these animals are omnivorous, eating both plants and animals. Is it possible that the lion (and others) ate nothing but plants before the Fall? Sure, anything is possible. Is it probable...not very likely.

Moving on now, lets consider this possibility. If they were created as perfect plant feeders, then how did so many animals come to have canine teeth? Did they evolve after they were kicked out of the Garden of Eden? If so, are we are talking about an

evolutionary rate of development for the molar teeth-to-canine teeth that is faster than what most non-Christian evolutionists propose? This would sink any theory that evolution is not possible. I don't know, and can't speak to this 'evolution' problem...I simply offer it as food for thought. And you can't say that God changed all their teeth to canines immediately after the Fall of man, because after the Fall we are in the seventh day, God's day of rest after the creation was completed. Would this be new creation event occurring on God's day of rest? More food for thought.

At this point, it is important to consider that many young-earth creationists deny the evolution of molar to canine teeth, instead opting to believe that the animals prior to the Fall of man ate plants with their canine teeth. Some, such as Ken Ham of Answers in Genesis, in his book *The Answers Book*, talks around the issue of teeth (and claws), proposing several possible scenarios, ending with the conclusion that there isn't enough evidence to conclusively prove either of the proposals (Page 105-110).

It is obvious to me that the carnivores we have today were designed by God, in the Garden of Eden, to eat meat. Of course, young-earth proponents may try to explain that there was a meat-bearing plant (???) or that God knew that the fall would occur, and thus created them for the post-fall environment. We can't confirm this because we have no idea how long Adam and Eve were in the Garden before the fall occurred. If this is the case, these meat-eating animals starved until after the fall! And given the number of animals that Adam had to name, they probably would have died before the Fall.



Let's take this even farther. Young-earthers say the dinosaurs were here from the Garden of Eden until the Flood, or sometime after the Flood. So now we have a 10-ton Tyrannosaurus Rex, which has teeth and jaws specifically designed for killing, eating nothing but grass from the time it was created until after the Fall of man. Of course, the T-Rex in the Garden of Eden would have needed molars to survive the pre-Fall of man. And then you have Raptors, which God designed with sharp teeth and a recurved claw designed specifically for tearing flesh during an attack. This claw was useless when it comes to eating grass! Nobody has ever discovered a T-Rex with molars, nor a raptor with molars and no recurve claw. Could these

animals have survived by eating only plants as young-earth creationists claim...sure they could. However, being created as plant eaters with canines, they would be imperfect creations. (Some claim that God was looking ahead to the Fall of man, and created them for the post-fall world, knowing in advance that it would not take man long to sin.)

Of course, I haven't even mentioned the many other carnivores with canine teeth...all cats, dogs, wolves, raccoons, etc. Oh, and what about sharks? If there was no death

before the Fall, and God created sharks on Day 5, then what did they eat? I suppose they could have eaten plants also, in the form of seaweed.

Now that you have heard the logic of this argument, what is the answer?

Some young-earth proponents argue that these carnivorous animals developed (i.e. evolved) within a few hundred years after the fall of man (John D. Morris of the Institute for Creation Research)¹. (It is important to note that he has apparently gone away from this belief...see footnote). However, it is hard to believe that these young earth creationists propose that the animals "evolved" in order to make it fit into the young-earth model. In doing so, they violate their belief that evolution is impossible by actually using evolution to explain this problem. (I realize they claim that evolution means no new genetic material. Some YECs have introduced a theory which says these features were part of the original genetic material, but were dormant until after the fall.) (NOTE: Not all YECs think canine teeth developed after the Fall of man...some believe they processed plant material with their canine teeth prior to Adam's sin)

Before we conclude, lets also consider musculature. For an example, let's consider the Cheetah. It is built for speed, to catch its prey. That is the only reason for its specific muscle and bone design. Unless there were plants that it ate in the Garden of Eden that could run 60 miles an hour, it had no need for this design. If it were designed perfectly by God, it didn't need this for plants, therefore it must have developed this musculature after the Garden.

Of course, there's one oversight in the argument that there was no death before the fall. The Bible says that God gave the green plants to all animals to eat. Nowhere does the Bible say that animals "cannot" eat meat...it only says they were given grass to eat. Also, nowhere does the Bible claim that there was no physical death before sin...it is inferred from this text and from Romans 5:12, which states, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Why many theologians have interpreted this to mean "all" death, including physical death, is beyond my understanding.

However, it is obvious that this passage means spiritual death, not physical. Here's a simple logical answer...when Adam ate the apple, he entered into spiritual death...he did not physically die when he bit the apple. We know this because he had children with Eve after he ate the apple. Adam did not introduce physical death, but spiritual death. In fact, if you read Satan's dialogue with Eve, then you will see the answer plain as day. He told Eve she would not die, but all the while Satan knew that he would be introducing spiritual death to the world. How else was Satan to prevent people from following God...killing them physically did not end their spiritual relationship with God. By introducing spiritual death, Satan knew he could prevent people from worshiping God. (It has been pointed out that Satan, as the father of lies, could not have told the truth to Eve in this instance. I disagree, for in telling the truth Satan undermined the authority of God.)

Conclusion

The existence of animals with canine teeth is apparently contrary to the belief that there was no death before the Fall of man. Is the development of canine teeth from molar teeth in a few hundred years, as proposed by some young-earth creationists, feasible? And, would this be considered evolution? Clearly, there are issues here for the young-earth creationist to address.

Concerning this article, critics have said teeth do not indicate diet. However, this is an argument from necessity. Young earth creationists must prove this point, or else their world collapses. It is not science driving their conclusions, it is the requirement that their conclusion support their cause. They have already determined, before examining the evidence, that teeth do not indicate diet. This is science in reverse. Scientists are supposed to examine the evidence, and then come to a conclusion...not the other way around!

1 "If All Animals Were Created as Plant Eaters, Why Do Some Have Sharp Teeth" by John D. Morris, *Back to Genesis*, No. 100, April 1997, page d. (NOTE: The original web article this is based on has been condensed, as of 22 October 03. The portion that claims that teeth developed after the Fall of Man is no longer available on the ICR website. Note the original reference was for Page D, but there is no longer a page D available! (icr.org/pubs/btg-b/btg-100b.htm). For another alternative to this removed article, see this ICR article (icr.org/bible/bhta46.html), and this Creation Evidence Museum article (creationevidence.org/fa_questions/124vicous_anml.html).