

Creation and the Book of Genesis

By: Dallas Burdette¹

Email: dburdette22@charter.net

Phone: 334-467-7029

Consider the dogma of evolution, for example. The notion that natural evolutionary processes can account for the origin of all living species has never been and never will be established as fact. Nor is it “scientific” in any true sense of the word. **Science deals with what can be observed and reproduced by experimentation. The origin of life can be neither observed nor reproduced in any laboratory.** By definition, then, true science can give us no knowledge whatsoever about where we came from or how we got here. **Belief in evolutionary theory is a matter of sheer faith.** And dogmatic belief in any naturalistic theory is no more “scientific” than any other kind of religious faith.²

¹ I was born July 4, 1934. I have been a serious student, teacher, and preacher of the Bible for just a little over sixty-eight years, supporting myself for many years as an agent for AFLAC. I have written numerous articles for religious journals, as well as many essays and sermons which are available on my website (www.freedominchrist.net). I am also the author of fourteen books. Within my ministry, I developed a keen interest in promoting unity among God’s people through a more accurate reading of the Word of God. I hold the B.A., M.S., and M.Div. degrees from Amridge University (formerly Southern Christian University), and I hold the Doctor of Ministry degree (1999) from Erskine Theological Seminary. Also, I was the Director of Extended Learning with Amridge University for about five years.

² John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam* (Nashville, TN: W Pub. Group, 2001), 12. **John MacArthur** (b. 1939) is a Calvinist theologian, author, editor, and teacher. He is a popular conference speaker and the president of both The Master's College and The Master's Seminary. He has also served as pastor-teacher of Grace Community Church in Sun Valley, California since 1969. Best known for his expository exegesis of the Bible, Logos has collected more than 3,000 of his sermons in the John MacArthur Sermon Archive and offers the complete MacArthur New Testament Commentary. **It is my desire to write an individual study on “evolution” as well as an essay on the world-wide flood of Noah’s day. The primary focus of this study deals with a literal interpretation of the day in Genesis 1:1-2:3.** See “Why Genesis Is History,” by Steve Boyd on UTube. Hebraist Steve Boyd looks at some ancient manuscripts. With the various manuscripts, he explores the evidence that Genesis is narrative history, which includes his own statistical analysis of Chapters 1 and 2 of Genesis. I added this video to my FACEBOOK: DALLAS BURDETTE. In this video, he demonstrates, from the manuscripts, that God created everything in six literal twenty-four hour days. He also affirms that Adam and Eve were real person, not fictitious characters.

In our approach to the Book of Genesis, we must deal with naturalism as a philosophy of life, which viewpoint denies the supernatural in the creation of the universe. God is totally ruled out as mythological. **This philosophy of naturalism results in a renunciation of the six-day Creation account in the Book of Genesis and the Book of Exodus 20:11.** The biblical explanation of creation as reported in the Book of Genesis is God’s account since He was there. On the other hand, the Genesis account is rejected by evolutionists and atheists, who were not there. Even today, many who profess faith in Jesus reject God’s description of Creation and accept the words of the Scientists who were not there. For example, **John Anderson** is a classic example of an individual who has been influenced by so-called “scientific discoveries,” which influence resulted in his denial of the literal six-day creation as presented in Genesis 1:1-2:3. In the following citation, he finds it difficult to accept the Genesis account of Creation as historical:

Scientific discoveries have made it difficult to accept the Genesis creation accounts as historical, especially since the Bible does not limit its portrait of creation to a singular event or story³

He rejects the biblical account in favor of the so-called “scientific discoveries.” It is my firm conviction that the “days” in Genesis 1-11 are as historical as Genesis 12-50. In the study of Creation, we must begin with an eternal God or with eternal matter. The Book of Genesis stands behind all created reality. Douglas F. Kelly’s⁴ comments are on target as he writes: video

God provides us such **information** in the first three chapters of Genesis, for **since only God was there**, we have to get our information about it from Him. Nothing could be more logical or more intelligent than to accept the information from the **One who**

³ John E. Anderson, “Creation,” ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

⁴ **Douglas F. Kelly** received his B.A. from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Diploma from the University of Lyon, his B.D. from the Union Theological Seminary, and his Ph. D. from the University of Edinburgh. He is the author of many written works including, *If God Already Knows, Why Pray?*, *Preachers with Power: Four Stalwarts of the South*, *New Life in the Wasteland*, *Creation and Change*, and *The Emergence of Liberty in the Modern World*. His firm grasp of multiple languages and his theological competence are capably demonstrated in translating such works as *Sermons by John Calvin on II Samuel*. He is serving with David Wright of the University of Edinburgh as a general editor for a revision of Calvin’s *Old Testament Commentaries*. Dr. Kelly travelled extensively throughout the world preaching and teaching. He was also enlisted to serve on the Jurisprudence project of The Christian Legal Society and serves on the Credentials Committee of the Central Carolina Presbyter

made it, from the One who was the eye-witness, from the One who is truth itself. It is to these early chapters of God’s Word that we now turn.⁵ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

The Book of Genesis begins with “in the beginning God,” not “in the beginning evolution.” The controversy among some Christians within the Christian community assert that the meaning of the word “day” in Chapter 1 of Genesis does not represent a literal 24-hour day but rather, the word “*day*” represents millions or billions of years, which belief involves a conviction that upholds the theory of evolution. It is my firm conviction that Genesis 1-11 constitutes a forthright historical account of Creation that is not compatible to the theory of evolution nor an old earth philosophy. The following comments by Robert Gurney⁶ are extremely helpful in examining the factualness of the Genesis account of Creation, which Creation was miraculous:

Here are some of the underlying reasons why many Christians in the Western world have difficulty accepting that Genesis 1–11 is straightforward history. **First**, they have been led to believe that such an interpretation is incompatible with the facts of science. **But the theory of evolution and billions of years are not facts of science.** They are fallible *interpretations* of the scientific evidence.

Second, many people fall into the trap of thinking *naturalistically*, as the world does. **They try to explain the original creation naturalistically, whereas the Bible depicts it as a series of awesome, stupendous miracles.** There is nothing ‘natural’ or ‘normal’ about the creation of a whole universe in six days! When I understood this and accepted it, I found that many things became clearer to me.

Third, Genesis 1–11 deals with extraordinary and unique events which are not part of normal experience now. Again, many people are trapped into thinking naturalistically, and they refuse to accept that these events were historical because they do not happen today. **They seem to forget that there were times in history, such as the time of the Exodus, when extraordinary, unique, miraculous things happened.** Is it too hard to believe that such things happened when the world began?⁷ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining.)

⁵ Douglas F. Kelly, *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1 – 2.4 in the Light of Changing Scientific Paradigms* (Great Britain: Christian Focus Publications, 1999), 30.

⁶ **Robert Gurney** was born in Burma to missionary parents. After qualifying in medicine at Bristol University, he worked in a hospital in Nazareth, Israel, as a medical missionary in Tanzania and Kenya, and as a general practitioner in Devon before his retirement. He is the author of a book and a number of articles in theological journals on the subject of Daniel’s prophecies. He has been interested in creation and evolution since his school days, and this booklet has been written after many years of searching for the truth concerning this issue.

⁷ R. J. M. Gurney, *Six Day Creation: Does It Matter What You Believe?* (Leominster, UK: Day One Publications, 2007), 49–50. I highly recommend this book as a must read for a greater understanding of the biblical account of Creation. On page 36, his remarks about eschatology are not in harmony with the “last days” as set forth by the Hebrew Scriptures and the

Why is it essential to accept the biblical account of Genesis rather than the so-called scientific account of creation as set forth by those who deny the existence of God? If we accept the theory that the word “*day*” represents thousands or billions of years, we are contradicting the biblical account of Creation. When we postulate a theory that challenges the Holy Spirit’s account of Creation, this denial has severe consequences in ethical behavior within our society that also leads to the philosophy of atheism among many individuals. I am very much concerned that countless devout Christians have been taken in by the so-called theory of evolution and the denial of God’s Revelation about how He accomplished His Creation within six literal 24-hour days.

There are many Christians who accept scientists over what God Himself revealed to Adam and Eve. Just a brief survey of the malicious, hateful, and cruel behavior of the twentieth century, as well as the beginning of the twenty-first century, is an example of a life lived without God. If the God of the Bible does not exist, then every individual becomes his or her own god.⁸ If we cannot accept Genesis 1:1-2:3 as trustworthy, then why should we believe anything else in the Bible? The following remarks by Robert Gurney set the stage for the negative effect that the theory of evolution has created. Just a glimpse of the side-effects of this denial of God and His Creation, as revealed in the Book of Genesis, reveals the dark side of our past history as well as the painful present century of carnage—killings, bloodshed, slaughter, and genocides. Gurney draws attention to the “good fruit” produced **by rejecting** the theory of evolution and, on the other hand, the “evil fruit” produced by accepting this flawed theory of evolution, not the literal creation account in Genesis:

Incidentally, biblical creationist teaching has borne good fruit spiritually, as well as scientifically. Through it, many have come to faith in Jesus Christ for the first time, and many have been strengthened in their faith. **Evolutionists claim that it would hinder the progress of science if creationism were adopted generally;** but that is the opposite of the truth. Many of the founders and pioneers of modern science were Bible-believing Christians who took Genesis to mean what it says. By contrast, the theory of evolution has been of no benefit to humanity whatsoever, either

New Covenant writings. We must keep in mind that all of us are in a state of growth (1 Corinthians 8; Romans 14). I, too, at one time, misunderstood Genesis 1-11 as well as the teachings on eschatology. Absolute perfection in knowledge is not a condition of salvation. If it were, none of us could be saved. For a detail study of eschatology, see Dallas Burdette, “Last Days As Foretold in the Old Testament and Fulfilled in the New Testament. For a request of this study, write to Dallas Burdette through email: dburdette22@charter.net.

⁸ See Dallas Burdette, Chapter 1: “God and the Cell: Evidence of Design” for a refutation of evolution and a defense for the God of the Bible.

scientifically or spiritually. **It has borne much evil fruit**, as described earlier, and there is good reason to believe that it has actually *hindered* the progress of science.^{2 9} (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

Before we address more concretely the meaning of the word “day” in Genesis 1:1-2:3, I wish to turn our attention to the “evil fruit” as mentioned by Robert Gurney in his book on *Six Day Creation*. The theory of evolution, as set forth by Charles Darwin, has had dire consequence in the twentieth century. For example, both Stalin and Hitler accepted Darwin’s philosophy, which belief system wrought devastation upon millions of people. **When we seek to live our lives without love, we live our lives without God.** An absence of biblical love and a denial of the Genesis account of Creation brought about the theory of evolution, which philosophy lead to a Stalin (1878-1953), a Hitler (1889-1945), a Mussolini (1883-1945), a Hussein (1937-2006), a Gaddafi (1942-2011) and an Idi Amin (1925-2003).

When these particular men rejected the biblical account of Creation, they then lived their lives without the God of the Bible. As a result of their atheism, we saw the horrifying, sickening, appalling, and shocking atrocities committed by these individuals who advanced the philosophy of Nietzsche¹⁰ (“God is dead”), which background is surrounded by the theory of evolution that denies

² **J. Bergman**, www.creationontheweb.com/content/view/482; J. Sarfati, www.creationontheweb.com/message. Footnote “2” is the footnote within footnote “8” by Gurney.

⁹ R. J. M. Gurney, *Six Day Creation: Does It Matter What You Believe?*, 56.

¹⁰ **Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche** (1844-1900) began his career as a classical philologist before turning to philosophy. He became the youngest ever to hold the Chair of Classical Philology at the University of Basel in 1869 at the age of 24.^[20] Nietzsche resigned in 1879 due to health problems that plagued him most of his life; he completed much of his core writing in the following decade.^[21] In 1889, at age 44, he suffered a collapse and afterward a complete loss of his mental faculties.^[22] He lived his remaining years in the care of his mother until her death in 1897 and then with his sister Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche. Nietzsche died in 1900.

After his death, his sister Elisabeth became the curator and editor of Nietzsche's manuscripts, reworking his unpublished writings to fit her own German nationalist ideology while often contradicting or obfuscating Nietzsche's stated opinions, which were explicitly opposed to antisemitism and nationalism. Through her published editions, Nietzsche's work became associated with fascism and Nazism; 20th century scholars contested this interpretation of his work and corrected editions of his writings were soon made available. Nietzsche's thought enjoyed renewed popularity in the 1960s and his ideas have since had a profound impact on 20th and early-21st century thinkers across philosophy—especially in schools of continental philosophy such as existentialism, postmodernism and post-structuralism—as well as art, literature, psychology, politics and popular culture.

God's account of His own Creation. **This kind of atrocious behavior is the outcome of those who seek to live their lives without God. If Genesis' account of the Creation is not true, then anything goes, which is one of the side-effects of a denial of the biblical account of Creation as set forth in Chapters 1—2.** To illustrate what life without God can lead to, I call attention to a quote from one of Ravi Zacharias' books about a sign that hung on a wall at Auschwitz and Birkenau (death camps). **The following words, by Hitler, appeared on the plaques with a coldness that envelops the mind with horror:**

I freed Germany from the stupid and degrading fallacies of conscience and morality.... We will train young people before whom the world will tremble. **I want young people capable of violence—imperious, relentless and cruel.**¹¹ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

In Christ, we can escape from the jungle of individualism—individuals who have no concept of absolute moral values, which philosophy of life stems from a rejection of God as the Creator of the world (Genesis 1—11) and the Atoning sacrifice of Jesus upon the Cross (Romans 3:21-31). **The twentieth century as well as the twenty-first century is ample testimony to the jungle of individualism—I am my own God.** On the other hand, we have the world of those who accept God with His absolute moral values. **In order for these truths of God to be taught, God ordained a collective body of people to proclaim these truths (the church, see Ephesians 3:10).** This body of believers is often referred to as the church. The church is the community of Christ. This fellowship is a worshipping community as well as a praying and working community for the advancement of God's kingdom (Philippians 2:12-13). Ken Ham¹² captures the very core of the evolutionary philosophy and the denial of Genesis 1-11's effect on society:

¹¹Ravi Zacharias, *Can Man Live without God*, 23. **Ravi Zacharias** (b. 1946) is the Founder and President of Ravi Zacharias International Ministries, headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, with additional offices in Canada, Hong Kong, India, Singapore, the United Kingdom, Austria, South Africa, Spain, and Turkey. Zacharias and his wife, Margie, have three grown children. He is the author of many books, including *Can Man Live Without God* and *Why Jesus?* He is also an evangelical Christian apologist.

¹² "Ken Ham, international speaker and author on biblical authority, examines how compromise starting in Genesis, particularly in regard to the six days of creation and the earth's age, has filtered down from Bible colleges and seminaries to pastors—and finally to parents and their children. This erosive legacy is seen in a generation of young people leaving the church. Get the facts, discover God's truth, and help bring a new reformation to the Church and to the authority of God's Word." These comments are from the back cover of Ham's book on the *Six Days*.

When we add man's word to God's Word, our starting point is no longer God's Word—it becomes man's word, because now fallible ideas have been inserted into the infallible Word. And that is what many churches are teaching the coming generations to do. If we remove the foundation of the absolute authority of the Bible, we will see the collapse of Christian morality and increasing moral relativism. I believe we are seeing much of that played out in our culture before our very eyes.¹³

This community founded by Christ is a city of God. Within this community of the Resurrected One, God's people seek to turn people back to the God of absolute truth. Today, we live in a world where the concept of absolute truth is on the wane. Our schools and universities, as a whole, advance the notion that everything is relative—no absolutes. Since the concept of an eternal God is denied, every person becomes his or her own god. **The following comments by Ravi Zacharias are on target as he calls attention to our rejection of God and His moral values, which moral values are based upon absolute truth, not relativism:**

We default to the belief that ultimate cause is something physical, even though no physical entity, however sectioned, explains its own existence. **We hunger** for love and meaning, even though we believe they are constructs of the mind and of culture or conditioning. **We believe** that only the empirical world is true, yet we posit this belief in metaphysical terms. **We believe** that matter has produced mind but that the mind transcends matter. **We believe** that everything that comes into being must have a cause, yet we believe the universe is causeless. We assume intelligence behind intelligibility—except for the universe. **We believe** in humanity's ability to totally transcend the mind but are forced to concede that we are subject to an unbreakable determinism. **We deny the absoluteness of good and evil, yet we fill our prisons with relativists who have believed this—often highly educated and successful citizens.**¹⁴ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

With scientific knowledge and the so-called higher education of no absolutes—truth is relative—one quickly realizes that humanity has not arrived at the glorious age of utopia. Knowledge and the wisdom of the world have not overcome the great enemies of human life. The world is **not** becoming better and better with the passing of time. **War and hate still plague this world.** World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945) reveal the so-called

¹³ Ken Ham, *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2013), 22. See also, 45-63. His commentary on “Which Worldview Will Win?” is exceptionally informative concerning the “two worldviews: moral absolutism versus moral relativism” (p. 63).

¹⁴Ravi Zacharias, *Has Christianity Failed You?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 78.

wisdom of the world, **a world without God**. During WW I, there were over 8,528,831 who were killed or died as a result of this atrocity.¹⁵ **These statistics do not suggest that one should do away with science, but rather to remind individuals that the modern world does not touch the problem of humanity—sin**. The only thing that will correct the problems of the world is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Crucified One. Dr. Ravi Zacharias relates a story that he heard from Dr. Billy Graham (1918-2018), an American evangelical Christian) about Jesus and His Resurrection.

Dr. Billy Graham told of an occasion when German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer was in conversation with him. Mr. Adenauer asked Dr. Graham, “Do you believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead?” When Dr. Graham immediately answered that indeed he did, there was a long silence from the Chancellor, and then he said, “**Outside of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, I know of no other hope for mankind.**”¹⁶ (Emphasis mine—bold)

There are many scientists who accept the Genesis account of Creation in six literal days.¹⁷ Once more, Robert Gurney calls attention to God’s testimony about the Creation of the universe rather than accept scientists who were not there. Hopefully, his words will resonate with us as we approach God’s written Revelation of Himself and the universe that He spoke into existence. The following comments by Gurney calls attention to James Barr’s, who was **not a creationist**, candid confession as to what the author intended to convey in the Book of Genesis:

Many evangelicals in the West think along the following lines: The Bible *appears* to say that God created the universe in six literal days just over 6000 years ago, and that the Flood was global. But science has proved evolution and/or billions of years; **therefore the Bible does not mean what it *appears* to say**. They remember the Galileo affair. They remember that some Christians refused to believe that the solar system is heliocentric [,hē-lē-ō-'sen-trik, “relating to the sun as center”], because they thought (wrongly) that the Bible says it is geocentric [,jē-ō-'sen-trik, “relating to the earth as center”]. They fear that they would be making the same kind of mistake if they were to reject evolution and/or billions of years. Therefore, they have invented

¹⁵ “Table 4: Armed Forces Mobilized and Casualties in World War 1” [CD-Rom]. Deluxe Edition 2002. Prepared by John Graham and Royde-Smith, editors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, copyright 1994-2002.

¹⁶ Ravi Zacharias, *The Real Face of Atheism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, [1990] 2004), 148.

¹⁷ Recently, a very devout Christian told me that he could not believe in a literal 24-hour day in Genesis since he is a scientist. My question is, why? It is in this vein that I recommend two books that deal with scientists and the creation account: (1) John F. Ashton, editor, *In Six days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2002); and (2) John F. Ashton, editor, *On the Seventh Day: Forty Scientists and Academics Explain Why They Believe in God* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2004).

various theories which try to harmonize the Bible with evolution and/or billions of years. **They search for evidence to prove that the Bible does not really mean what it appears to say.**

Ironically, non-evangelical Hebrew scholars like James Barr may be better judges of what the author intended us to understand. They are not worried about trying to harmonize the creation account with science, because they do not believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. They are free to concentrate solely on *what the text actually says.* **As Hebrew scholars, they have no doubt whatsoever that the author intended us to understand that God created the universe in six literal days a few thousand years ago, and that Noah's Flood was worldwide.** Young-earth creationists agree that this is what the text says, and is what the author intended us to understand. The difference is that *we believe it!*¹⁸

Unfortunately, many Christians do not study the context of a particular text or chapter or chapters in order to determine what the text actually says. It is not uncommon for those who profess Christianity to read into the text their own exclusive theological slant. Berkeley Mickelsen expresses, what amounts to, imaginary presuppositions asserted by numerous professors of theology and pastors as they approach a given text with “an axe to grind in the form of a strongly held interpretative scheme”:

To ignore context increases the possibility of “discovering” a meaning that is not really there, that is, of practicing eisegesis. Scholars, teachers, and pastors can be as guilty of eisegesis as any ordinary reader of the Bible—if **they do their work too hastily or have an axe to grind in the form of a strongly held interpretative scheme.**¹⁹ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

Once again, I wish to cite the comments of John E. Anderson as a classic illustration and reminder of the liberal mindset of many professors of theology, as well as scientists, who deny the biblical account of Creation. He draws a distinction between “scientific discoveries” versus the “Genesis creation” account revealed to Adam and Eve:

Scientific discoveries have made it difficult to accept the Genesis creation accounts as historical, especially since the Bible does not limit its portrait of creation

¹⁸ R. J. M. Gurney, *Six Day Creation: Does It Matter What You Believe?*, 11-12. **Robert H. Gundry** is an American New Testament scholar and Westmont College’s scholar-in-residence. He received his PhD from Manchester University in 1961 and taught for several decades at Westmont College in California. He is also the author of *A Survey of the New Testament, Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution, 2nd ed.*, and *Jesus the Word According to John the Sectarian.*

¹⁹ A. Berkeley Mickelsen, “Bible, Interpretation of The,” *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 310.

to a singular event or story. **There are creation *stories* in the Bible, and not all of them can be reconciled from a scientific or historical perspective.**²⁰ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

In order for the biblical account of Creation to coincide with the supposed scientific authority over God’s written Revelation, some scholars have adopted what is known as the “framework hypothesis.”²¹ Mark Futato,²² who is a devout Christian, holds to this view. John MacArthur’s comments concerning this particular philosophy unravels the modern-day motive behind this position:

The simple, rather obvious fact is that no one would ever think the timeframe for creation was anything other than a normal week of seven days from reading the Bible and allowing it to interpret itself. The Fourth Commandment makes no sense whatsoever apart from an understanding that the days of God’s creative work parallel a normal human work week.

The framework hypothesis is the direct result of making modern scientific theory a hermeneutical guideline by which to interpret Scripture. The basic presupposition behind **the framework hypothesis is the notion that science speaks with more authority about origins and the age of the earth than Scripture does.** Those who embrace such a view have in effect made science an authority over Scripture. **They are permitting scientific hypotheses—mere human opinions that have no divine authority whatsoever—to be the hermeneutical rule by which Scripture is interpreted.**²³ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

My objective in this study is to examine what the Scriptures teach concerning creation. As a conservative Christian, I accept the Genesis account of Creation as

²⁰ John E. Anderson, “Creation,” ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

²¹ For a detailed study of the “Framework Hypothesis,” see Ken Ham, *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church* (Green Forest, AR: Master Boks, 2013), 119-120; for a fuller treatment of the “Framework Hypothesis,” see Tim Chaffey and Bob McCabe, “Framework Hypothesis,” in Ken Ham & Bodie Hodge, General Editors, *How Do We Know the Bible Is True*, Volume 1 (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2011), 189-199. The “Framework Hypothesis” asserts that the first chapter of Genesis is not to be taken as literal history.

²² **Dr. Mark D. Futato** joined Reformed Theological Seminary (RTS) in 1999, and serves as the Robert L. Maclellan Professor of Old Testament. He teaches core classes on Hebrew and Old Testament books. Dr. Futato served as academic dean of RTS Orlando from 2004 to 2012. Dr. Futato’s research interests include biblical Hebrew, the book of Psalms, and the role that elements of creation, such as climate and geography, play in Scripture. Dr. Futato has published multiple books on the Psalms, as well as an /Introduction to Biblical Hebrew/. He is currently finishing a commentary on Jonah. **MacArthur’s comments represent the logical outcome of this theory even though Futato would not likely express it this way.**

²³ John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam* (Nashville, TN: W Pub. Group, 2001), 22.

more authoritative than the scientific community, which advances the theory of evolution as well as many other theories that deny Genesis 1:1-2:3 as historical (for example, “The Gap Theory,” “Historic Creation,” “the Day-Age View,” and the “Framework Hypothesis”).²⁴ As stated above, when we abandon the biblical view of creation, we open the door to the start of a disastrous society, which is what we see on a daily basis in our cities and in the world as a whole. **If we cannot accept the biblical account of creation as reliable then the rest of the Scriptures also stand on an unstable foundation.** The first three chapters in Genesis set the background for God’s scheme of redemption “in” and “through” Jesus. As we peruse the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures, we discover that the Old Testament writings, as a whole, announced the coming of the Messiah to rescue sinful humanity, which view is announced in Genesis 3:15 (see also Romans 16:20). Again, John MacArthur is on target when he writes:

Again, a biblical understanding of the creation and fall of humanity establishes the necessary foundation for the Christian world-view. Every-thing Scripture teaches about sin and redemption assumes the literal truth of the first three chapters of Genesis. If we wobble to any degree on the truth of this passage, we undermine the very foundations of our faith.

If Genesis 1–3 doesn’t tell us the truth, why should we believe anything else in the Bible? Without a right understanding of our origin, we have no way to understand anything about our spiritual existence. We cannot know our purpose, and we cannot be certain of our destiny. After all, if God is not the Creator, then maybe He’s not the Redeemer either. **If we cannot believe the opening chapters of Scripture, how can we be certain of anything the Bible says?**

Much depends, therefore, on a right understanding of these early chapters of Genesis. **These chapters are too often mishandled by people whose real aim is not to understand what the text actually teaches, but to adjust it to fit a scientific theory.** The approach is all wrong. Since creation cannot be observed or replicated in a laboratory, science is not a trustworthy place to seek answers about the origin and fall of humanity. **Ultimately, the only reliable source of truth about our origin is**

²⁴ See Jonathan Sarfati, (1) *Refuting Evolution 2* (Power Springs, GA: Creation Book Publishers, 2013); (2) Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Compromise: A Biblical And Scientific Refutation of “Progressive Creationism” (Billions of Years), As Popularized by Astronomer Hugh Ross* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2004); (3) Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution (Brisbane, Australia: Creation Ministries International, 2007)*; and (4) Jonathan Sarfati, *The Greatest Hoax on Earth?: Refuting Dawkins on Evolution* (Powder Springs, GA: Creation Ministries International (US), 2010). **Jonathan Sarfati** obtained his Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand, and has written numerous technical papers in his field. A former New Zealand national chess champion, Dr. Sarfati now works full time for *Creation Ministries International-USA* (Creation.com) as **a research scientist** and editorial consultant for **Creation** magazine and the associated **Journal of Creation**.

what has been revealed by the Creator himself. That means the biblical text should be our starting place.²⁵ (Emphasis mine—bold)

We now turn our attention to Genesis 1. Do we accept what God has revealed or do we accept the naturalist's formula of the universe—the “big bang” theory. Which is the most plausible to believe—in the beginning God or in the beginning the “big bang.” If the “big bang” is true, we must deal with numerous questions. For instance, “what touched off the ‘big bang’”? Could an explosion out of nowhere possibly be the beginning of all things? There are many unanswered questions that science cannot deal with, which believers or unbelievers must confront. If we reject the Genesis account of Creation, we are still confronted with many more questions to which every individual must seek an answer—where did matter come from? Where did energy come from? What holds everything together? What keeps the universe going? Where did intelligence come from? Where did self-consciousness come from? How could intelligence originate from inanimate matter? Where did design come from? Science cannot tell, but God can and has, as found in the Book of Genesis.

WHERE DID THE IDEA OF GOD COME FROM?

Before probing additional information in Chapter 1 concerning the meaning of the word *day*, we must deal with another question first: where did the idea of God come from? Did it come from one's imagination or from Divine revelation? Richard Dawkins wrote a book about *The God Delusion*. My question to him is, where did the idea of God come from that he does not believe in? Yet, he can write about God. The Christian community maintains that God **revealed** Himself to Adam and Eve: “In the beginning **God created** the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1). In other words, **belief in God did not come from one's imagination**. The Genesis account is the record of God revealing Himself to Adam and Eve. As a result of this **supernatural revelation**, Adam, apparently, wrote a record of this act of creation and about the God who revealed Himself. Adam's belief in the existence of God came to him through **supernatural revelation, not through his imagination**. Where did the concept of “God” come from? This question concerning a knowledge of a Supreme Being and His existence was presented by Alexander Campbell in his debate with Robert Owens in 1829.²⁶ If

²⁵ Ibid., 29.

²⁶ See Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—*(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 123. This book is just a little over 500 pages. I have read this book twice. I highly recommend

the God of the Scriptures does not exist, then how do we account that “something” exists rather than “nothing”?

GOD’S EXISTENCE REVEALED THROUGH SUPERNATURAL REVELATION

A World of Five Worlds

God’s initial revelation of Himself came through supernatural means, not through nature. Since everyone has a concept of God, the question is: where did this idea come from? Did the notion of God **originate within one’s imagination** or did the idea of God originate from a **direct revelation from God** Himself? Since humanity lives in a world of five worlds—**seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling**—, the idea of God had to come to us from outside our five worlds of sense perception. **Since human beings have an idea of God, where and when did the inspiration of an eternal First Cause who is uncaused enter into the world of the human race?** Where did the idea of One who is outside of space and time originate? The Christian proposal of an Eternal First Cause uncaused is the only answer for human existence and the creation of the Universe.

The question that confronts everyone is: how did the impression of God come into existence. The answer: **When God created Adam and Eve, He revealed Himself directly.** Since we are confronted with God’s existence, we ask, again, the question, where did the impression of God come from? The only answer is that God revealed Himself through supernatural revelation. Neither man nor woman could have invented the concept of God through imagination or reason. In spite of those who deny God’s existence, we still observe that all of these individuals have a concept of the God that they repudiate; otherwise, they could not write about God.

Why? Humanity lives, as stated earlier, in a world of five worlds—**seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling**. It is quite evident that human beings could not have initiated the brainstorm of God through the five senses. The thought of God had to come from outside the sphere of this world of time and space. On the other hand, it is through the five senses that we acquire our theories of the Universe; it is not through the senses that our thoughts, or perceptions, of God exist. Men and women could never, without the aid of Divine Revelation, have originated the idea of Deity.

this book as one of the most informative books to deal with the concept of Deity that is prevalent in every society.

God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, and this revelation came to them through direct disclosure from God, not their five senses. God's existence had to come to both (Adam and Eve) through direct revelation, not through the five worlds of nature. Once the idea of God originated through divine revelation, then nature proves the existence of God. All nations have derived their idea of Deity from traditions handed down from Adam and Eve, not from the light of nature. Since humanity possesses only five senses, humankind could not have originated the idea of Deity. With no other guide but the light of nature, we know that men and women could never have invented or imagined Deity.

After God revealed Himself through direct interaction (supernatural revelation), we then see God in creation (natural revelation). The five senses, in and of themselves, do not reveal the existence of God by themselves. God had first to make Himself known through supernatural means. Today, all humanity has some belief about God's existence, which notion came through God disclosing Himself to Adam and Eve. Once God unveiled Himself, mankind is then able to see evidence of God's reality through His creation of the Universe with Planet Earth as unique in our Galaxy. Also, within the five senses of humanity, we discover design, which design suggests the idea of supreme intelligence. We witness the handiwork of God in the world of our five senses. For instance, without the sense of **smell**, life oftentimes would be destroyed. Second, next to that is **taste**. Through the world of taste, we are able to discriminate between that which is agreeable to our well-being and that which is disagreeable to our health.

The Author of nature (God) wisely ordered the locale, or geographical location, of the sense "taste." If this sense had been located somewhere else, this world of "taste" would be valueless to humankind. Within this world of taste, one is also cognizant that saliva is associated with the world of taste. This action enables the tongue to discriminate the qualities of the food, or substance, as pleasing or displeasing. **Feeling** is another world of humanity that exhibits design in creation. We, through this sense, are able to determine the roughness, smoothness, hardness, softness, coolness, hotness, and so on, of objects, which ability is essential to our well-being. If we were born without these three avenues of intelligence, these three worlds would be closed and we would remain forever in ignorance. Without these three worlds, we could never originate the idea of material tangibility, that is to say, something that is sensible, touchable, verifiable, graspable, well-rounded, and so on.

The fourth world of the five senses is **hearing**. With this faculty, we are able to discriminate vibrations and motions of the air. Every impression made upon the outward ear reaches the middle ear. If one is born deaf, that person has no idea of the nature of sound; therefore, this one cannot learn the art of speaking. One who is deficient of this world of hearing cannot communicate his or her ideas to others.

Finally, the fifth world is **seeing**. This world is one of the most perfect and delightful of all senses. This is the avenue of intelligence through which all our ideas of color, magnitude, and distance are derived. The impressions made upon this sense reach the sensorium, or brain, through the optic nerve. Our ideas of colors, sounds, odors, tastes, and touch are derived through these five senses.

This study of the five senses is important in answering the question: where did the idea of God come from? It is obvious that there is nothing in the five senses that could have revealed God without God having first revealed Himself through Divine Revelation. We could not acquire such knowledge without direct revelation from God, which revelation was passed on to the descendants of Adam and Eve. **It would be just as rational to talk of seeing by the hand, or hearing by the tongue, as for us to talk of knowing God without a communication from God Himself.**

REVELATION OF GOD: SUPERNATURAL

Thomas Paine

What is revelation? Revelation cannot be applied to anything done upon the earth. Thomas Paine (1737-1809) wrote his *Age of Reason* as an attack against Christianity.²⁷ In spite of his attack against Christianity and the Bible, he, nevertheless, correctly defined “revelation” in his assault against the Bible, which confrontation originated from his reaction to the clergy of his day as a pretentious, power-seeking priesthood. He raised his cry against ecclesiasticism and Roman Catholicism that shackled the human mind with its thralldom of relentless systems of bondage. Yet, he failed to grasp that the religious climate of his day was not biblical Christianity. **The following words on “revelation” by Paine add clarity to the concept of “where did the idea of God come from”:**

As it is necessary to affix right ideas to words, I will, before I proceed further into the subject, offer some observations on the word *revelation*. Revelation, when applied to religion, means something communicated *immediately* from God to man.

No one will deny or dispute the power of the Almighty to make such a communication, if He pleases. But admitting, for the sake of a case, that something has been revealed to a certain person, and not revealed to any other person, it is revelation to that person only. When he tells it to a second person, a second to a third, a third to a fourth, and so on, it ceases to be a revelation to all those persons. It is revelation to the

²⁷For a refutation of Paine’s book, see Richard Watson, *Reply to Paine; or, An Apology for the Bible: in Letters to Thomas Paine* (New York: American Tract Society, 1796, 1825).

first person only, and *hearsay* to every other, and consequently they are not obliged to believe it.²⁸

Revelation is a communication of something that the person to whom it is revealed did not know before. Revelation is supernatural. It means Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things—a knowledge that we could never have attained by the exercise of our own reason upon material, or sensible, objects. The human intellect has no creative powers. It can only rearrange in new images the data already received through the world of our five senses. The world of spirits is outside our world of five senses. Once more, the words of Paine are on target as he seeks to clarify the meaning of *Revelation*:

Revelation is a communication of something which the person to whom that thing is revealed did not know before. For if I have done a thing, or seen it done, it needs no revelation to tell me I have done it, or seen it done, or seen it, nor to enable me to tell it, or to write it.

Revelation, therefore, cannot be applied to anything done upon earth, of which man himself is the actor or the witness; and consequently all the historical and anecdotal parts of the Bible, which is almost the whole of it, is not within the meaning and compass of the word revelation, and, therefore, is not the Word of God.²⁹

Paine is correct in his definition of the word *revelation*, but, at the same time, he fails to understand that the written Word of God does contain information concerning the coming of the Messiah that, of necessity, did take direct supernatural revelation from God, which understanding did not come through the world of our five senses. So, the Bible is still the Word of God, which revelation He revealed through supernatural means to make public His scheme of redemption through Christ.

Alexander Campbell

The following remarks by Alexander Campbell³⁰ in his debate with Owen, are informative and, at the same time, uphold the integrity of the Old and New Testament writings, which writings, Paine denied as being the Word of God. Campbell accepted the first chapters of Genesis as well as the entirety of the whole of God's written Word:

²⁸Thomas Paine, *The Age of Reason* (New York: Citadel Press, Inc., reprint, 1948, 1974), 51-52. Paine was not an atheist, but rather, a deist.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 59.

³⁰Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), an early leader in the Second Great Awakening of the religious movement known as the Stone/Campbell Movement.

Mr. Campbell continues: Mr. Chairman—I have just now found on my desk a few questions from some unknown hand, which, I suppose, have been presented to me from my own invitations given during the discussion. As these questions bear upon our discussion, I beg leave to give a brief answer.

The first is, Are the books composing the Old and New Testaments the only books of divine authority in the world?

I answer positively, Yes. I have already said, that the books composing the two Testaments contain more than what is properly called a *Divine Revelation*. They contain much history which can with no propriety be called a Divine Revelation; for example, the history of the deluge—the confusion of human language—the dispersion of the human family—the biography of the patriarchal judges, and kings of Israel—the chronicles of Judea and Israel. **All the things recorded in these sections were written, and therefore could not be REVELATIONS.** But it was necessary that these important facts, because of their intimate connection with the people to whom Divine Revelations were made, should be recorded and divinely authenticated. Hence the Pentateuch, in addition to all the revelations which it contains, presents us with a historic record of the first ages of the world, divinely authenticated.³¹ (Emphasis mine—underlining and bold)

We can state categorically that the name of God first entered the human family by revelation, not through the five senses. Over again, Campbell drives home the point of supernatural revelation in his famous debate on atheism. Listen to him as he explains:

The term revelation, in its strict acceptation among intelligent Christians, means nothing more or less than a Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things, a knowledge of which man could never have attained by the exercise of his reason upon material and sensible objects: for as Paul says, “Things which the eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive, has God revealed to us apostles, and we declare them to you.” **Now the corollary [outcome] is, that, to a man to whom this divine revelation has never been made, it is as impossible to acquire ideas of spiritual and eternal things, as for a blind man to admire the play of colors in a prism.**³² (Emphasis mine—underlining and bold)

Once more, the idea of supernatural “revelation” is extremely important in our discussion of our knowledge of God’s existence. Yet again, we call attention to Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Robert Owen in 1829, as he read from his

³¹Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany College, VA*—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829 (reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 380-381.

³²*Ibid.*, 152.

Christian Baptist his remarks to Owen's *New Harmony Gazette* newspaper concerning the question of where the idea of God originated. **Owen's band of unbelievers maintained that the idea of God did not originate through reason nor did the idea of God originate from the Bible.** Since Owen's paper represented "the official news organ of Owen's experimental City of Mental Independence at New Harmony, Missouri,"³³ Campbell presented the following problem to this group of atheists:

A PROBLEM

To the Editors of the *New Harmony Gazette*

You think that reason cannot originate the idea of an Eternal First Cause, or that no man could acquire such an idea by the employment of his senses and reason—and you think correctly. You think also that the Bible is not a supernatural revelation—not a revelation from a Deity in any sense. These things premised, gentlemen, I present my problem in the form of a query again.

The Christian idea of an Eternal First Cause uncaused, or of a God, is now in the world, and has been for ages immemorial. You say it could not enter into the world by reason, and it did not enter by revelation. Now, as you are philosophers and historians, and have all the means of knowing, how did it come into the world?³⁴ (Emphasis mine—underlining and bold)

PRINCIPLES OF IMAGINATION

Owen, upon listening to Campbell's remarks, responded by saying that this concept of God originated through one's imagination.³⁵ Campbell replied by saying,

Imagination, all writers agree, **has not the power of creating any new idea**. It has the power of analyzing, combining, compounding, and new-modifying all the different ideas presented to it; but imagination has no creative power.³⁶ (Emphasis mine)

³³Robert Frederick West, *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 67. See also Richard J. Chero, *Debating for God: Alexander Campbell's Challenge to Skepticism in Antebellum America* (Abilene, Texas: Abilene Christian University Press, 2008), 41, for the beginning of *New Harmony Gazette*. He writes: "Owen initiated the publication of a weekly Newspaper, the *New Harmony Gazette*, on October 1, 1825."

³⁴Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA*—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 123.

³⁵*Ibid.*

³⁶*Ibid.*

In other words, Campbell is simply saying that from all the known principles of mental philosophy the “imagination” cannot create anything. It can only combine and rearrange in new forms the images already derived through the five senses—in other words, the “imagination has no creative power.” Campbell called upon Owen to disprove his remarks by calling upon him to imagine something in the sixth sense. Listen to Campbell as he comments upon the sixth sense:

Let us try the faculty of imagination, and prove, by our own experience, its creative power. We have but five senses: I would therefore ask Mr. Owen, and every one present, if you can, by any exertion of your faculties, imagine a sixth sense? What would it be? If you were to imagine any other sense, it must be analogous to those you already possess. You might imagine a being like a fabulous Argus [Gk. Myth. A hundred-eyed giant who was made guardian of Io and was later slain by Hermes.], with a hundred eyes; but fancy that you possessed an organ, like that of Fame, that would enable you to hear from a greater distance than the eye could reach to but could you have imagined this unless you had derived the simple idea of hearing from your organ of hearing. But a sixth sense, unlike those possessed, cannot be imagined. **Now, Mr. Owen cannot, from his five senses, imagine a sixth, how can he assert that a savage or philosopher could imagine a God?** But I call upon Mr. Owen to imagine and report to us a sixth sense.³⁷ (Emphasis mine)

John Locke

John Locke³⁸ wrote a monumental essay [actually this essay is a book] “Concerning Human Understanding” in which he discusses the limits of human perception in respect to God. His comments reaffirm Campbell’s arguments concerning human comprehension and imagination. I cite his observations, even though lengthy, in order to drive home the importance of recognizing the five senses in our knowledge of the world in which we live:

2. *The mind can neither make nor destroy them.* These simple ideas, the materials of all our knowledge, are suggested and furnished to the mind only by those two ways above mentioned, viz. sensation and reflection. **When the understanding is once stored with these simple ideas, it has the power to repeat, compare, and unite them, even to an almost infinite variety, and so can make at pleasure new complex ideas.** But it is not in the power of the most exalted wit, or enlarged understanding, by quickness or variety of thought, to *invent* or *frame* one new simple idea in the mind, not taken in by the ways before mentioned: nor can any force of the understanding *destroy* those that are there.

³⁷Ibid., 125.

³⁸John Locke (1632-1704), British philosopher, Oxford academic and medical researcher.

The dominion of man, in this little world of his own understanding being much the same as it is in the great world of visible things; wherein his power, however managed by art and skill, reaches no further than to compound and divide the materials that are made to his hand; **but can do nothing towards the making the least particle of new matter, or destroying one atom of what is already in being.**

The same inability will every one find in himself, who shall go about to fashion in his understanding one simple idea, not received in by his senses from external objects, or by reflection from the operations of his own mind about them. I would have any one try to fancy any taste which had never affected his palate; or frame the idea of scent he had never smelt: and when he can do this, I will also conclude that a blind man hath ideas of colours, and a deaf man true distinct notions of sound.³⁹

The Original Concept of God

Humanity is confronted with a search for the original concept of God. Where did the idea of God come from? The answer: God revealed Himself through supernatural revelation. Neither man nor woman could have originated the concept of God through imagination or reason. Why? Humanity lives in a world of five worlds—seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling. It is quite evident that human beings could not have invented the idea of God through the five senses. The idea of God had to come from outside the sphere of this world of time and space. In addition to the concept of God, we are also confronted with other things identified with God. For example, **where did the idea of priest, altar, sacrifice, and so on, originate.** Campbell related these spiritual concepts to an audience of approximately 1200 in order to illustrate his comments of supernatural revelation versus the world of the five senses. Owen did not refute Campbell's logic concerning the spiritual realm. Listen, once more, to Campbell as he presents another dilemma for unbelief:

I am apprehensive that it will be necessary for me to do one of two things—either to institute a regular argument demonstrative of this position, viz: **“That it is impossible for man to originate any of those supernatural ideas which are developed in the Christian religion;”** that is to say, I shall have to undertake to prove philosophically that man could not invent, or originate the idea of a God, a Spirit, a future state, or any of the positive institutions of religion; that he never could have invented or originated the ideas inseparably connected with the word *priest, altar, sacrifice*, etc., ergo [hence], that these ideas and the words used to express them, are derivable only from an immediate and direct revelation; man having no power,

³⁹John Locke, “An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,” in Robert Maynard Hutchins, Editor in Chief, *The Great Books of the Western World*, Volume 35 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1937, 1971), 128. I divided this long paragraph into three paragraphs for ease of reading.

according to any philosophic analysis of his intellectual powers, to originate any such ideas.⁴⁰

In Campbell's twelfth reply to Mr. Owen, he again spoke of five worlds within humanity:

[A] world of colors, cognizable by the eye; a world of sounds, cognizable by the ear; a world of odors, cognizable by the olfactory [relating to the sense of smell] sense; a world of savors, cognizable by the taste; and a world of tacts [something tangible], that is, of the tactile [proceeding from the sense of touch] properties of bodies, all the ideas belonging to which world are cognizable only by the sense of feeling....

But then there is the world of spirits, which no man could imagine, and of which these five worlds do not afford an archetype [model], or sensation, or perception. Of this world we have many ideas, thoughts, terms, and conversations, and the question is, How did we come by them? No window or door has been opened to us in the department of sense. Where are the organs, the senses, the media, through which we have derived these ideas? Not by the eye, the ear, nor the taste; for these are our corporeal [physical, bodily] senses, and cannot take cognizance of spiritual existences. **For all our ideas of spiritual and eternal things we must, therefore, be indebted to some other power.**⁴¹ (Emphasis mine—bold)

Divine Revelation versus Five Senses

It is through the five senses that we acquire our ideas of the Universe; it is not through the senses that our ideas, or concepts, of God exists. We could never, without the aid of Divine Revelation, have originated the concept of **Deity, angels, spirits, altars, priests,** and so forth. God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, and this disclosure came to them through direct introduction from God, not Adam's and Eve's five senses. God's existence had to come to both through direct supernatural revelation, not through the five worlds of nature.⁴² Bill J. Humble summarizes Campbell's argument for the perception of God, which argument

⁴⁰Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA*—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 89.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 161.

⁴²See Dinesh D'Souza, "The World beyond Our Senses: Kant and the Limits of Reason," in Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great about Christianity* (Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 2007), 171-182. The arguments in this chapter are essentially the arguments sets forth by Alexander Campbell and John Locke, except D'Souza tackles this problem with Kant's terminology—noumenon ('nü-mə- nän. independent of the world of perception) versus phenomenon (fi-'nä-mə- nän, something known through the senses rather than by thought or intuition. This is a powerful chapter that lends validity to our belief that God exists—not through our five senses, but rather through supernatural revelation.

refuted “natural theology” that taught that nature revealed the existence of God. Humble writes:

One of the most interesting events in the first half of the debate occurred when Campbell, attempting to bring the skeptic into a clash of issues, asked Owen how the concept of God had originated. **This question involved Campbell’s belief, which he had expressed as early as 1826 in his letters to the young skeptic that man could not originate the concept of God by any faculties of the intellect, but once that concept had been revealed by the divinity, it could be confirmed by many evidences in nature.** In taking this position Campbell was actually admitting one of the stock arguments of skeptics; for the natural theology of the period taught that nature revealed the existence of God. Skeptics denied this, and Campbell was convinced that they were right. This position furnished him with one of the most effective and original arguments which he could utilize against skepticism, and the unbelievers found one of their most powerful weapons turned against them.⁴³ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

THE WORD “DAY” IN GENESIS ONE

Not until certain theories in modern geology, biology, paleontology, anthropology, and physics gained wide acceptance in various Western intellectual communities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did debates about the Genesis days begin to roil [ˈrɔi(ə)], “to stir up: disturb”] the Church.⁴⁴

Upfront, we need to bear in mind that Genesis 1:1-2:3 deal with the supernatural. As we seek to draw attention to the biblical account, we must separate “science” and “creation.” In other words, “science” is associated with natural laws, but “creation” deals with the supernatural, which is miraculous in nature—it is outside of natural laws. We know about how Creation came about since God revealed this directly to Adam and Eve. **One cannot apply science to the supernatural. Science is based upon observation, verification, and repetition. The Creation is outside of observation, verification, and repetition since Creation took place by God’s spoken word, which is outside of natural laws.**

In the Book of Exodus, God gave to Moses the Decalogue in His own handwriting on stones. Since God was there “in the beginning,” God was able to dictate to Moses how long He took to bring everything into existence. Moses

⁴³Bill J. Humble, *Campbell & Controversy: The Debates of Alexander Campbell* (Joplin, MO.: College Press Publishing Co., Inc., 1986), 98.

⁴⁴J. Ligon Duncan III & David W. Hall, “The 24—HOUR VIEW,” in *The G3N3SIS Debate: Three Views on the Day of Creation*, Edited by David G. Hagopian (Mission Viejo, California: CruXpress, 2001), 22.

recorded God's own statement about how many days He chose and the length of the days, at His own discretion or pleasure, to create everything:

Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. ⁹ **Six days you shall labor and do all your work,** ¹⁰ but the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns. ¹¹ **For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day.** Therefore the LORD blessed the **Sabbath day** and made it holy. (Exodus 20:8-11)

One's interpretation of Genesis 1:1-2:3 concerning the word "*day*" (literally—twenty-four hours) should not be isolated from other statements that deal with the same scenario. Since God is the author of both the Book of Genesis and the Book of Exodus, we should read each account of creation in light of each other concerning the meaning to be attached to the word "**day**." Chapter 1 of Genesis is quite explicit as to how the word "**day**" is employed: "and there was **evening** and there was **morning**—the **first day**" (1:5). Exodus 20:8-11 is God's own commentary on the word "**day**" in Genesis 1:1-2:3.

God said He did it all in **six** days. Each day consisted of twenty-four hours, not millions or billions of years. Chapter 3 of Genesis records the origin of sin and God's design for its remedy, namely the "seed" of the woman, which is none other than Jesus Himself. Why is Genesis 1 important for the believer? Genesis 1:1-3:24 is the starting point of salvation, not Matthew 1:1. If we deny Chapters 1 through 11 of Genesis, we destroy the very foundation of Christianity that Matthew draws attention to in the first three chapters of his Gospel. The church today is faced with a problem concerning the origin of the Universe.

It is not uncommon for Christian academics, Bible scholars, and church leaders, which includes preachers and pastors who reject the biblical account of Creation as set forth in the Genesis account, to reject the Genesis account of Creation as mythological. As a result of this mindset, Some Christians adhere to the so-called "gap theory," which advance millions of years between 1:1 and 1:2 in order to accommodate so-called scientific findings. On the one hand, some are hesitant to interpret the "days" of Genesis 1:1-2:3 as if they do not know what the word "day" really means. As a result of this repudiation of 1:1-2:3, many have chosen to reject a world-wide flood view for a so-called local flood theory (Genesis 6-9). Still others rely upon the dating of the fossils, which presuppositional beliefs are reputed to be millions of years old. Ultimately the renunciation of Genesis 1-11 is employed to uphold evolution as the means of bringing Adam and Eve into existence over millions of years.

Since many Christians are confronted with this section of Scripture, some assert that Genesis is a poem (not historical). It is not uncommon for some believers to go so far as to repudiate that Adam and Eve were real people, and finally, some set forth the theory that Genesis is not about our origins (Chapters 5 and 11 in Genesis). Within these eleven chapters, we are introduced to astonishing and exclusive events surrounding the Creation account. It is in this vein that Robert Gurney explains:

Genesis 1–11 deals with extraordinary and unique events which are not part of normal experience now. Again, many people are trapped into thinking naturalistically, and they refuse to accept that these events were historical because they do not happen today. They seem to forget that there were times in history, such as the time of the Exodus, when extraordinary, unique, miraculous things happened. Is it too hard to believe that such things happened when the world began?⁴⁵

As a result of renouncing the biblical account of Creation, the world-wide flood and the genealogical tables, this belief system has led many to believe that the Universe began 15 billion years ago. Today, we are witnessing an exodus from the Church as a result of this atheistic philosophy. Has the above teaching resulted in chaos within our society? The answer is YES!! Ken Ham explains what is happening among the millennials in our generation as a result of snubbing Genesis 1-11:

No wonder there is a mass exodus of young people from our churches! They begin to doubt the Bible in Genesis, based on the compromised teachings of church leaders (or the absence of biblically based apologetics), reject it as God’s Word, and then leave the Church. The Bible declares, “For if the trumpet makes an uncertain sound, who will prepare for battle?” (1 Corinthians 14: 8). **The Church does not have a unified view on origins, because so many want to be unified around man’s beliefs in evolution and/ or millions of years — instead of being unified on what God’s Word teaches so clearly in Genesis.**⁴⁶ (Emphasis mine—bold)

⁴⁵ R. J. M. Gurney, *Six Day Creation: Does It Matter What You Believe?* (Leominster, UK: Day One Publications, 2007), 50.

⁴⁶ Ham, Ken, *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2013), 9. I highly recommend the following books in which a survey initiated to discover the culprit by this exodus: (1) Ken Ham & Britt Beemer with Todd Hillard *Already Gone: Why Your Kids Will Quit Church and What You Can Do to Stop It* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009); (2) Ken Ham & Greg Hall with Beemer of America’s Research Group, *Already Compromised: Christian Colleges Took a Test of the State of Their Faith and The Final Exam Is In* (Forest, AR: Master Books, 2011); and (3) Ken Ham, Jeff Kinley, research by Britt Beemer, *Ready to Return: Bringing Back the Church’s Lost Generation* (Forest, AR: Master Books, 2015).

Many Christians who profess theistic evolution as well as atheists have destroyed the very foundation upon which Christianity is founded. The psalmist David wrote a Psalm for the director of music. In this Psalm, he addressed the foundation of ethical behavior, which statement is also true concerning the acceptance of God’s Word about His creation. The psalmist penned the following words: “When the **foundations are being destroyed**, what can the righteous do?” (Psalm 11:3). **Joseph A. Pipa** (six day creationist) presents an excellent analysis of Genesis 1:1-2:3 in his lecture produced by Faithlife (Logos) with four other scholars: (1) **Mark Futato** [Literary Framework], (2) **John Collins** [Analogical Days View], (3) **Tremper Longman** [Evolutionary Creationism], and (4) **John Walton** [Identity Accounts]. In section 3 of the video course (“Assessing the Importance”), Pipa states that the “Nonliteral Approaches Violate Exegetical Principles” that is to say, the nonliteral approach contradicts the basic principles of exegesis. The “literal approach” in Genesis 1 is according to context. The following citation disproves, according to the context of Genesis 1:1-2:3, the “nonliteral approach”:

Nonliteral Approaches Violate Exegetical Principles

And then a fourth reason why a literal approach in Gen 1 is so important is the nonliteral approaches violate a number of exegetical principles.

- In first place, the interpretations seem to be forced. We really should take the literal sense of the text unless such is clearly a figurative text or contradicts the context or the clear teaching of Scripture.
- Second, the nonliteral views seem to neglect that they’re based upon the essential spadework of grammatical, historical exegesis.
- Third, the nonliteral views do not really pay close attention to Gen 1 (at least it seems to me)—its relationship to the remainder of the book. It’s a prologue of a very factual historical book.
- And then fourth, the methods also seem to fail in letting Scripture be the interpreter of Scripture. It’s very important that we interpret Scripture by Scripture and the rest of Scripture treats Gen 1:1–2:3 as normal, literal days.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Joseph A. Pipa Jr. et al., *TH331 Perspectives on Creation: Five Views on Its Meaning and Significance*, Logos Mobile Education (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2017). Citation located under Segment 3. I highly recommend his lecture. In my judgment, the other four views negate or deny the credibility of the Scriptures as a whole. For a clear and concise study of the “six days,” I highly recommend Ken Ham’s book: *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2013). This book will acquaint you with several scholars who profess Christianity and, at the same time, deny the biblical account of creation, Adam and Eve, and the Global flood. In Section 3 of his Logos course, Pipa concludes this section by affirming the historical account of Genesis 1:1-2:3:

GOD'S AUTHORITY OR MAN'S AUTHORITY?

Once more, since the basic foundation of Christianity is being destroyed, we are now witnessing the collapse of our moral fabric in society. What is being attacked by atheists and many Bible scholars is the foundational book of our sixty-six books of the Bible, namely, the Book of Genesis. The Book of Genesis reveals the beginning of Creation and, at the same time, sets forth the coming of the Messiah to redeem lost humanity, which begins with Genesis 3:15. As we continue to explore the teachings of Genesis 1:1-2:3, we are confronted with the problem of authority. Are we relying upon the authority of God who was there when He created time, space, and matter (Genesis 1) or are we relying upon the authority of fallible men and women who are known as biblical scholars or scientists who also may be believers or unbelievers. Some scientists believe in God, but, at the same time, they advance the theory of evolution and are known as theistic evolutionists. For the believer, the Bible is the final authority on any subject that it addresses. Edward J. Young⁴⁸ is on target when he writes:

It is of course true that the Bible is not a textbook of science, but all too often, it would seem, this fact is made a pretext for treating lightly the content of Genesis one. Inasmuch as the Bible is the Word of God, whatever it speaks on any subject, whatever that subject may be, it is accurate in what it says.⁴⁹

It is amazing that individuals are more willing to trust a fallible human being who was **not** there when God spoke this Universe into existence than God Himself who **was** there. No scientist has all the information; yet, for some reason, his or her so-called credentials elevates them above **God who was there**. Remember, **THE SCIENTISTS WERE NOT THERE**. Their view of the creation is a man-made story. If we are willing to hedge or evade our positive response to biblical

So I think it's a very important issue. I am increasingly convinced that we should hold to a literal reading of chronological normal days in Gen 1. When I left seminary, I was of the opinion that it really didn't matter as long as you believe the Bible and that God created all things, and I deliberately preached in Genesis because I wanted my people to get a basis for covenant theology. And I wasn't but halfway through chapter 1, and I realized it is important and the exegesis demands a literal approach to Gen 1.

⁴⁸ **Edward J. Young** (1907–1968) was an Old Testament scholar and professor at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He earned an AB from Stanford University, a ThB and ThM from Westminster Theological Seminary, and a PhD from Dropsie College. Young wrote *The Book of Isaiah, An Introduction to the Old Testament*, and many other academic works.

⁴⁹ Edward J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One* (New Jersey: P and R Publishing, 1964), 43.

Creation, how can we convince anyone that Jesus was born of a virgin or was resurrected from the grave on the third day following His Crucifixion? Both of these activities were supernatural just as the miracle of Creation reported in the first two chapters of Genesis. Remember, the Creation is based on the supernatural, not natural law.

Are we, as Christians, giving an uncertain sound when we fail to defend what God said He did? What about the miracles recorded in the Book of Exodus? These events were outside of natural law; they were supernatural. The Genesis account of Creation is also supernatural. Over again, Gurney is on target as he writes about the twenty-four hour day:

The biblical answer is that the account makes it perfectly clear that they were *literal* days, but the first three days were not normal *solar* days. **All that is needed for a twenty-four-hour period of day and night is a rotating sphere and a directional light source. Both were there.** The creation of the sphere, which must have been rotating, is recorded in Genesis 1:1–2, and the creation of the light source is recorded in 1:3–5: ‘Then God said, “Let there be light”; and there was light ... and God divided the light from the darkness. God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night.’ ***This light was not the sun, because the sun was created later.*** We are **not** told the exact nature of the light source; but we do not need to know. Remember that the creation of the universe in six days was *miraculous*. We do not have to explain it naturalistically.

Why did God take six days to create the universe, when he could have done it in an instant? The answer seems to be in Exodus 20:8–11, where it is stated, ‘For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.’ **God accommodated himself to man, and set up an example for us to follow.**⁵⁰ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

It is not uncommon for those who believe in the Day-Age Theory to discount the biblical account of the day as consisting of a literal twenty-four hour day. The following commentary by Weston Fields⁵¹ is well-worth citing as he exposes the fallacies in this line of reasoning concerning the Day-Age Theory:

⁵⁰ R. J. M. Gurney, *Six Day Creation: Does It Matter What You Believe?* (Leominster, UK: Day One Publications, 2007), 51.

⁵¹ **Weston W. Fields** has been executive director of the Dead Sea Scrolls Foundation in Jerusalem since 1991. He taught at Grace College and Theological Seminary for 10 years and at the Institute of Holy Land Studies (now Jerusalem University College) for seven years. For the past 18 years, he has worked closely with the editors of the official publications of the scrolls, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Since 1999, he has traveled extensively in the Middle East, Europe, and the United States in order to interview everyone from the first generation of scholars then alive, including those who discovered scrolls in the 1950s or were the first to examine and reconstruct them. As a result of these personal meetings, he has amassed a large and

Proponents of the Day-Age Theory usually go to great lengths to show that the word [יָוֶם] *yôm* (day) can be used figuratively, as if no defenders of the traditional view recognized that fact. This is simply not so. Everyone who knows anything about any language knows that nearly every word in a language has *at least* two nuances of meaning. To say that one word can only have one meaning in *all* contexts is absurd. Accordingly, we recognize that “day” is used “figuratively” in many Scripture passages. But the point is really not how it is used elsewhere; the point is—how is it used in Genesis 1, where its use is qualified by “evening and morning” and “one day,” “second day,” etc.? To argue from its usage outside this context is really just begging the question. That is why we examined the lexicon and text in such detail.⁵²

In addition to this insightful commentary on the use of the word *day*, Fields adds additional information concerning the use of adjectives associated with the word *day*, which **adjectives** reinforce his comments above on the word *day* in its normal use—twenty-four hours. I encourage every reader to reflect upon the following comments by Field on **God’s use of words** as revealed to Adam and Eve:

The *numerical adjective*—Every single occurrence of the word *yôm* where it is used to summarize one of the creative days is accompanied by the numerical adjective. It is always, the evening and morning were “one day” (*yôm ’ehād*, [אֶחָד יוֹם]) or (*yôm šē-nî* [שְׁנַיִם יוֹם]). This is very significant because throughout the Old Testament *yôm* is never used *figuratively* (that is, to refer to something other than a normal day *with the numerical adjective*).⁵³

In concluding his remarks on the Day-Age Theory, Field proposes a question:

What Else could God say?—Perhaps the most telling argument against the Day-Age Theory, “what else could God say to convey the idea that the days of creation were *literal* days?” He used the *only* terms available to him to communicate that Idea. There was a word, on the other hand, which Moses could have used had he wanted to signify *ages*, or *vast periods of time*. He could have used the word *dôr* [דֹר], which

diverse collection of personal letters, papers, and archives related to the first scrolls scholars, especially the famous Qumran Cave 4 Team. He is also the author of *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative*.

⁵² Weston Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled: A Critique of the Gap Theory* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1976, 2005), 175.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 176.

has that very meaning [see BDB, Lexicon, p. 189⁵⁴]. But instead he used the word “day,” and we think the reason he did is very obvious to the unbiased reader: He wanted to tell his readers that all of creation took place in six literal 24-hour days!⁵⁵

Another scholar, John C. Whitcomb,⁵⁶ responded to an article (“Some Practical Geological Problems in the Application of the Mature Creation Doctrine,” by David A. Young in *Westminster Theological Journal* XXXV (1973), 268-280, which response unravels the fallacies set forth by Young. Before we note Weston Fields’ reply to Young concerning the biblical concept of “days,” perhaps, it would be helpful to read Fields’ comments on Young’s belief:

Let us begin where every true Bible student must begin, namely, with the Biblical data. What does Scripture really say about the creation of the earth and of living things? In spite of his professed concern for the priority of Scripture, Dr. Young seems to be uneasy and hesitant at this crucial point. After mentioning three prominent approaches to Genesis 1 (theistic evolutionism, **progressive creationism**, and strict or mature creationism), he immediately states his preference for the second view, *progressive creationism* (“**Genesis 1 and 2 are strictly historical, but the ‘days’ may be interpreted as long periods of time,**” p. 268) because this view “permits Christian geologists to view the earth as being old and having undergone geological development without requiring them to subscribe to the general theory of organic evolution” (*ibid.*).⁵⁷ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

⁵⁴ *dôr* [דֹר] “1. *period, age, generation*, mostly poet.: a. of duration in the past, *former age(s)*” in Francis Brown, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs, *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 189.

⁵⁵ Weston Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled*, 177-178.

⁵⁶ **John C. Whitcomb** (1924-2020) served as professor of theology and Old Testament at Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana, for 38 years. Throughout his time there, he served as director of doctoral studies, editor of *Grace Theological Journal*, and chairman of the department of the Old Testament and department of Christian Theology. He earned his BA from Princeton in ancient and European history, and his ThD and ThM from Grace Theological Seminary.

From 1962 to 1990, he was president of the board of Spanish World Gospel Missions, and served on the board of trustees of Grace Brethren Foreign Missions (now Grace Brethren International Missions) for 20 years, several of these years as chairman of the board. He has lectured in Canada, Latin America, Western Europe, Central African Republic, the far East, and in most states of the United States. Currently, just before he died, he was president of Whitcomb Ministries, and founder and professor of Christian Workman Schools of Theology.

⁵⁷ John C. Whitcomb Jr., “The Science of Historical Geology in the Light of the Biblical Doctrine of a Mature Creation,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 36, no. 1 (1973): 65–66.

Young’s position about the “days” may be interpreted as representing long periods of time, not simply 24-hour days. We should read and reread Fields’ remarks very carefully:

Does a careful exegesis of Scripture lead us to any definite conclusion as to the length of the days of creation? Note the following considerations. ***First***, the use of the **numerical adjective** with the word “day” in Genesis 1 limits it to a normal day. It is true that the word “day” is used in two or even three different senses in the creation narrative (of a 12-hour daylight period in 1:5, 14, 16, 18; of a 24-hour day in the rest of the chapter; and of the entire creation week in 2:4, though this verse may refer only to the first day of creation), but in each case the context shows in which sense it is to be understood. **In historical narratives the numerical adjective *always* limits the word to a 24-hour period** (cf. Numb. 7 for a remarkable parallel).

Second, the qualifying phrase, “there was **evening** and there was **morning**,” attached to each of these days points to a 24-hour day-night cycle. The same phrase appears in Daniel 8:26 (cf. 8:14 ASV), and orthodox interpreters have understood this as referring to 2,300 literal days. ***Third***, a creation week of six indefinite or long periods of time would hardly serve as a valid and meaningful pattern for man’s cycle of work and rest, as given to Israel in the fourth commandment (Exod. 20:11, 31:17). **It is certainly true that God could have created the world in six seconds or in six billion years, but the fourth commandment suggests that He chose to do so in six literal days to serve as a pattern of Israel’s work and rest periods.**⁵⁸ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

If one leaves behind the clear meaning of the word *day* in Genesis, we undermine the very foundation of the Gospel. How do we know when the word *day* means an ordinary day? One of the best illustrations that I have read concerning an “ordinary day” is found in Ken Ham’s book *Six Days*. He presents two encounters, one with a pastor and another from an individual who called him. The following are his comments along with their reaction as he seeks to get both parties to let him know when the word *day* means an “ordinary day”:

The Hebrew word for day is *yôm*. Now *yôm* can actually have a number of different meanings. **A pastor once said to me**, “The word day in Hebrew can mean something other than an ordinary day.” I said, “Yes, but it can also mean an ordinary day.” He responded, “But it can also mean something other than an ordinary day.” And what he said is true. But the fact is, the main meaning of the word *yôm* is an ordinary day. He was using the fact that the word day can mean something other than an ordinary day as the reason it did not mean an ordinary day in Genesis! Not very sound logic!

A man called me once and said, “Look, I agree with you that evolution is not true, but we don’t know what the days of creation were in Genesis 1. We don’t know what

⁵⁸ Weston Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled*, 66–67.

the word *day* means there, but it doesn't mean an ordinary day." I said, "Can you tell me when the word *day* does mean an ordinary day?" He asked, "What do you mean?" I told him, "Well, if you know it doesn't mean an ordinary day in Genesis 1, you must know when it does mean an ordinary day. I'd like to know why it doesn't mean an ordinary day, and to do that, I need to know when the word *day* does mean an ordinary day so I can see why it doesn't mean an ordinary day in Genesis 1. So can you tell me when the word *day* does mean an ordinary day?" He said, "Huh?"⁵⁹

On the other hand, John Skinner⁶⁰ calls attention to the interpretation of the word *day* as "*aeon*" in order to harmonize science and God's Revelation in Genesis 1:1-2:3. Even though, Skinner seems to support the Documentary Hypothesis Theory, nevertheless, he is honest enough to correct those who distort the Hebrew text to substantiate their allegations about the word *day* as signifying ages, not a 24-hour day. We should weigh his words carefully as he explains the word *day* in Genesis 1:

The interpretation of יום as *aeon*, a favourite resource of harmonists of science and revelation, is opposed to the plain sense of the passage, and has no warrant in Heb. usage (not even Ps. 90:4). It is true that the conception of successive creative periods, extending over vast spaces of time, is found in other cosmogonies (De. 55); but it springs in part from views of the world which are foreign to the OT. To introduce that idea here not only destroys the analogy on which the sanction of the sabbath rests, but misconceives the character of the Priestly Code. **If the writer had had æons in his mind, he would hardly have missed the opportunity of stating how many millenniums each embraced.**⁶¹ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

Another scholar, E. A. Speiser's⁶² comments are well worth noting, especially dealing with the Hebrew text of Genesis 1:5. He explains that the Hebrew word יָמִים ('*ehād*) should be translated as "one" rather than "first," which

⁵⁹ Ham, Ken. *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church* (Green Forest: AR: Master Books, 2013), 81.

⁶⁰ **John Skinner** (1851–1925) studied in Scotland and Germany at the end of the 19th century. He held pulpits in the Free Church of Scotland from 1880 until 1890, when he was elected to the faculty of what is now Westminster College, Cambridge.

Note 1: De. F. Delitzsch, *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis* (5th ed. 1887).

Note 2: OT Old Testament.

⁶¹ John Skinner 1851-1925, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, International Critical Commentary (New York: Scribner, 1910), 21. See two notes above for explanation (De. 55) and (OT). These two notes are associated with footnote # 56.

⁶² **Ephraim Avigdor Speiser** (1902-1965) was a Jewish Polish-born American Assyriologist. He discovered the ancient site of Tepe Gawra in 1927 and supervised its excavation between 1931 and 1938.

translation is not uncommon. The text in the Hebrew is “**day one**” (יֶוֶם אֶחָד, *yôm 'ē·ḥād'*)

Heb. repeats the verb with “morning.” **The evening marks the first half of the full day. first day.** In Semitic (notably in Akkadian, cf. Gilg., Tablet XI, lines 215 ff.) the normal ordinal series is “one, second, third,” etc., **not** “first, second, third,” etc.; cf. also 2:11.⁶³

It is in this same vein that Andrew E. Steinmann⁶⁴ wrote an excellent essay on the Hebrew word יֶוֶם אֶחָד (*'ē·ḥād'*, (“one”)) as a **cardinal number** and its meaning in Genesis 1:5. He writes:

It has long been noted that the Hebrew **cardinal number** אֶחָד, “one,” can also be used in place of the **ordinal number** ראשון, “first.”¹ In addition, it has also been noted that Gen 1:5 uses the cardinal number for the first day of creation, whereas the other days are numbered using ordinal numbers (Gen 1:8, 13; 19, 23, 31; 2:2, 3). Most contemporary English translations understand the use of the cardinal number in Gen 1:5 as a case of the cardinal functioning as an ordinal, translating, “the first day.”² Most commentators support this understanding.³ The Jewish Publication Society’s *Tanak* follows the Hebrew more closely, noting that no article is used in Hebrew, translating, “a first day.”⁴ **A minority of English translations, however, does not view this as an instance of אֶחָד [יֶוֶם אֶחָד] functioning as an ordinal number and**

Note 1: Heb. Hebrew.

Note 2: Gilg. The Epic of Gilgamesh

⁶³ E. A. Speiser, *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 1, Anchor Yale Bible (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), 5–6. See two notes above for explanation (Heb.) and (Gilg.). These two notes are associated with footnote # 57.

⁶⁴ **Andrew E. Steinmann** is the university marshall and a professor of theology and Hebrew at Concordia University in River Forest, Illinois. He received his BS from the University of Cincinnati, his MDiv from Concordia Theological Seminary, and his PhD in Near Eastern studies from the University of Michigan.

¹ **Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor**, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 274, §15.2.1b.

² NRSV, NIV, NKJV; *The English Bible in Basic English* (Ontario: Online Bible Foundation and Woodside Fellowship, 1964); *The New Jerusalem Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1985).

³ **Victor P. Hamilton**, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990) 118; **C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch**, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes* (1: The Pentateuch: Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1976) 50; **Kenneth A. Mathews**, *Genesis 1–11:26* (NAC 1A; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996) 149; **Gordan J. Wenham**, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco, TX: Word, 1987) 4; **Claus Westermann**, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* (trans. John J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984) 114.

⁴ *The TANAKH* (n.p.: Jewish Publication Society, 1985).

translate “one day.”⁵ This, in fact, is the translation found already in the LXX (ἡμέρα μία, [hēmera mia, “**day** one”]).⁶⁵

Once more, in the following citation by Steinmann, he translates Genesis 1:5 and then follows his translation with his comments, which commentary highlights the literal translation as “one day”:

“God called the **light** “day,” and the **darkness** he called “night.” There was an **evening** and there was a **morning: one day.**” (This is his translation of Genesis 1:5)

The answer may lie in the use of the terms “**night**,” “**day**,” “**evening**,” and “**morning**.” Gen 1:5 begins the cycle of the day. With the creation of light it is now possible to have a cycle of light and darkness, which God labels “day” and “night.” Evening is the transition from light/day to darkness/night. Morning is the transition from darkness/night to light/day. Having an evening and a morning amounts to having one full day. Hence the following equation is what Gen 1:5 expresses: **Evening + morning = one day.**

Therefore, by using a most unusual grammatical construction, **Genesis 1 is defining what a day is.** This is especially needed in this verse, since “day” is used in two senses in this one verse. Its first occurrence means the time during a daily cycle that is illuminated by daylight (as opposed to “night”). The second use means something different, a time period that encompasses both the time of daylight and the time of darkness.⁶⁶ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

I wish to cite his specific comments on Genesis 1:5 since he makes reference to some scholars who violate the basic principles of how the word אֶחָד is utilized. This article by Steinmann is a must read for anyone who wishes to grasp the significance of the word יוֹם (yôm):

III. אֶחָד In Genesis 1:5

How, then, are we to understand the use of אֶחָד in Gen 1:5? The verse reads, וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם אֶחָד. If this means, as most translators and commentators understand it, “There was an evening and a morning, the first day,” we can find no precedent for the use of אֶחָד here. It cannot be the use of a cardinal number as an ordinal to enumerate a time period, since this only applies to days of a month or the years of a king’s reign. Neither of these is the case here, **despite the references to the**

⁵ NASB, NLT; *JPS Holy Scriptures* (n.p.: Jewish Publication Society, 1917).

⁶⁵ Andrew E. Steinmann, “**אֶחָד** As an Ordinal Number and the Meaning of Genesis 1:5,” in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 45, no. 3 (2002): 564. The above footnotes (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) are his notes embedded within this citation.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 583.

use of יום as an ordinal to denote a first day by some commentators.^{16 67}
(Emphasis mine—bold)

For the benefit of those reading this essay by Steinmann, I wish to cite his conclusion to this in-depth study on Genesis 1:5. Since many readers may not have easy access to Steinmann’s article, I made the decision to include his “Conclusion” to his study. He issued a caveat to his readers about the use of Lexicons. He called attention to the Lexicographers as men and women who are “fallible”. He explains why the word *day* in Genesis 1:1-2:3 represents a regular solar day, not eons of time:

IV. Conclusion

יום, like the English word “day,” can take on a variety of meanings. It does not in and of itself mean a twenty-four hour day.²¹ This alone has made the length of the days in Genesis 1 a perennially controversial subject.²² **However, the use of יום in Gen 1:5 and the following unique uses of the ordinal numbers on the other days demonstrates that the text itself indicates that these are regular solar days.**²³

Just as important as this conclusion is another one: **appealing to Hebrew grammar must be done with a thorough investigation of the grammatical usages themselves.** The contention that יום is used in Gen 1:5 as an ordinal number has been **based on grammars** that noticed a general phenomenon in Hebrew usage, but did not collate all of the evidence and carefully examine the situations under which יום could be used as a substitute for the ordinal number הַיּוֹם הַרִאשׁוֹן. **While grammars are useful tools, they are fallible.** When interpreting an especially critical text such as Genesis 1, it is necessary to investigate any grammatical assertions of the grammars before relying upon them.⁶⁸ (Emphasis mine—bold and underlining)

¹⁶ Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* 118, n. 4; Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary* 50; Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (trans. Israel Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961) 30.

⁶⁷ *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45, no. 4 (2002): 582. Footnote above (# 16) is found within this citation.

²¹ For instance, compare the two different meanings in Gen 1:5 with another meaning in Gen 2:4.

²² Note the disagreement on the meaning of “day” in Genesis 1 among otherwise conservative scholars committed to the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. E.g., Wenham (*Genesis 1–15* 6) argues that “day” must mean a twenty-four hour period, while Mathews (*Genesis 1–11* 149) argues that “day” is to be understood in a non-literal sense.

²³ **Whether or not one believes in the veracity of the Genesis account of creation in six solar days is another matter altogether.**

⁶⁸ *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45, no. 4 (2002): 584. The footnotes (21, 22, and 23) are embedded in footnote # 64. In my citations from Steinmann, I decided to leave his footnotes for the benefit of my readers. By leaving his footnotes, this gives the reader a

Marcus Dods⁶⁹ comments on the word *day* in Genesis 1:1-2:3 are right on target. He goes right to the heart of the matter concerning the word *day*: “If, for example, the word “day” in these chapters, does not mean a period of twenty-four hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless.”⁷⁰ Douglas F. Kelly cites a source that was published in 1984 in the *Creation Research Quarterly* by James Barr⁷¹ in a

wide range of other sources to inspect in his or her studies. Footnotes are invaluable for more in-depth studies.

⁶⁹ **Marcus Dods** (1834–1909) was born in Belford, Northumberland. Dods went on to study divinity and theology at Edinburgh Academy and Edinburgh University, where he graduated in 1854. He is a highly respected scholar, publishing over a dozen books of theology recognized for their expansive critical research.

⁷⁰ Marcus Dods, “The Book of Genesis,” in *The Expositor’s Bible: Genesis to Ruth*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. 1, Expositor’s Bible (Hartford, CT: S.S. Scranton Co., 1903), 5. See following remarks by J. Ligon Duncan III & David W. Hall concerning Dods and Barr in *The G3N3SIS Debate*, 59, footnote 4:

Modern **liberal theologians** ranging from **Marcus Dods** to **James Barr** support the fact that only very recent formulations twist the original intent on this issue. Regrettably, many of these recent innovations have flowed from evangelical pens more interested in swiftly conforming to the ideas of passing scientific trends than in defending classical orthodoxy.

⁷¹ **James Barr** (1924–2006) was an Old Testament scholar noted for his contributions to the study of biblical languages. His book *The Semantics of the Biblical Languages* remains one of the most influential books on the subject. He held professorships at the University of Edinburgh, University of Manchester, Princeton University, and Vanderbilt University. Born in Glasgow, Scotland (although one reference claims he was born in Edinburgh), on 20 March 1924,^[citation needed] educated at Daniel Stewart’s college in Edinburgh and the University of Edinburgh, Barr was ordained to the ministry of the Church of Scotland in 1951. He held professorships in New College in the University of Edinburgh, University of Manchester, in Princeton Theological Seminary and at Vanderbilt University in the United States. He was Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford from 1976 to 1978 and Regius Professor of Hebrew from 1978 to 1989.

Following service in World War II in the Fleet Air Arm of the Royal Navy where he was a pilot of torpedo bombers and took part in air-sea rescue missions, he studied at Edinburgh University, obtaining a first-class honours degree (Scottish MA) in Classics (1948) and the BD with Distinction in Old Testament (1951). After ordination (1951) and service as minister in the Church of Scotland in Tiberias, Israel (1951–53), during which time he acquired fluency in modern Hebrew and Arabic, he was appointed Professor of New Testament in the Presbyterian College, Montreal (1953–55). Then he was appointed Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature & Theology in Edinburgh University (New College, 1955–61). He then moved to the US as Professor of Old Testament in Princeton Theological Seminary (1961–65), followed by appointments in the University of Manchester (1965–76) as Professor of Semitic Languages and

personal communication to David C. C. Watson in April 1984. The following is Barr's remarks about Genesis 1-11:

So far as I know there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world-class university who does not believe that the writer(s) of Genesis 1-11 intended to convey to their readers the ideas that (a) creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience; (b) the figures contained in the Genesis genealogies provided by simple addition a chronology from the beginning of the world up to later stages in the Biblical story; and (c), Noah's flood was understood to be world-wide and to have extinguished all human and land animal life except for those in the ark. Or to put it negatively, the apologetic arguments which suppose the 'days' of creation to be long eras of time, the figures of years not to be chronological, and the flood to be a merely local Mesopotamian flood, are not taken seriously by any professor, as far as I know.⁷²

CONCLUSION

CONTEXT. Many times, the meaning of a word is defined by its context. This is especially true in biblical Hebrew, but we see it in the English language as well. For example, the word day has multiple meanings. It could mean a 24-hour day, the daylight portion of a day, or a certain period of time. If I said, "The drive home took two full days," the context makes it clear that the meaning of day there is a 24-hour period of time. But in the sentence, "We worked all day long," the context tells us that day is only referring to the daylight portion of the day. And if I said, "Back in my father's day," the context indicates that day is referring to a historical time period.⁷³

Literatures, and in Oxford University, initially as Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture (1976–78) and then as Regius Professor of Hebrew (1978–89).

After his retirement from Oxford, he was appointed Professor of Hebrew Bible in Vanderbilt University (1989–98). Barr received many honours. He served as President of the Society for Old Testament Study (1973) and of the British Association for Jewish Studies (1978), and was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1993. **James Barr "rejected the traditional supernatural Christianity with its high view of Scripture." Yet, in spite of his concept of Scripture, yet, he understood the Hebrew grammar taught six literal days.**

⁷² Cited by **Douglas F. Kelly**, *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1 – 2:4 in the Light of Changing Scientific Paradigms* (Great Britain: Christian Focus Publications, 1999), 50-51. I highly recommend the following book by **Tim Chaffey & Jason Lisle**, *Old-Earth Creationism on Trial: The Verdict Is In* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009); **Paul F. Taylor**, *The Six Days of Genesis: A Scientific appreciation of Chapters 1-11* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009); see also, *The G3N3S1S Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation* (Mission Viejo, California, 2001, Edited by **David G. Hagopian**): (1) J. Ligon Duncan III & David W. Hall, "The 24-Hour View"; (2) Hugh Ross & Gleason L. Archer, "The Day-Age View"; and (3) Lee Irons with Meredith G. Kline: "The Framework View."

⁷³ Ken Ham, *Six Days: The Age of the Earth and the Decline of the Church*, 72.

As we approach the conclusion of this subject, we, as conservative Christians, do **not** read Genesis 1:1-2:3 with a blind faith. In this study of the six days of Creation, we are to be like the Bereans in that they searched the Scriptures daily to see if what Paul was preaching and teaching was in harmony with the Hebrew Scriptures. We, today, are to put into practice the study of God's Word in **context** on a daily basis. If we seek to nullify the days of Genesis as a literal 24-hour day, the genealogical tables of Genesis 5 and 11 as accurate, and the world-wide flood of Noah's day as an actual event, we weaken God's written Revelation. This denial has led to an exodus of many of our young people from Christianity. If the happenings in Genesis 1-11 are not historical, why do some cite Chapters 12-50 as historical? In finishing this short study, the following comments by Tim Chaffey⁷⁴ and Jason Lisle⁷⁵ in their introduction to their book on the *Old-Earth Creationism on Trial: The Verdict Is In* is well worth citing:

Our faith is not "blind." Our trust in God's Word is not *despite* careful analysis, but rather because of it! **Scripture is clear that God expects His people to study and think.** Paul set the example for us as he went to synagogue after synagogue and reasoned with the Jews from the Scriptures that Jesus is the Messiah (Acts 17: 2– 3, 18: 4). **God challenged His rebellious people to "Come now, and let us reason together"** (Isa. 1: 18). It is not sinful for Christians to have sincere questions about their faith. God is up to the challenge, and His Word will provide the answers. **We should be like the Bereans**, who were commended by Luke because they "searched the Scriptures daily" (Acts 17: 11).⁷⁶ (Emphasis mine—bold)

⁷⁴ **Tim Chaffey** taught Bible and science classes at the junior and senior high levels for the past six years. He also served as a pastor for four years. He holds a BS and MA in biblical and theological studies. He earned a Master of Divinity degree specializing in theology and apologetics at Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary. This information on Chaffey and Lisle is taken from their book published in 2008.

⁷⁵ **Jason Lisle** is a research scientist and speaker with Answers in Genesis Ministries. He holds a bachelor's degree in physics and astronomy from Ohio Wesleyan University, and a master's degree and PhD in astrophysics from the University of Colorado in Boulder. He is also the planetarium director at the Creation Museum, and has written several of the programs now available, including "The Created Cosmos" and "Worlds of Creation." He has written extensively on the topics of creation and astronomy, in secular and creation literature. He is the author of the book *Taking Back Astronomy, Understanding Genesis: How to Analyze, Interpret, and Defend Scripture, Ultimate Proof of Creation: Resolving the Origins Debate, Discerning Truth: Exposing errors in Evolutionary Arguments, Why Genesis Matters: Christian Doctrine and the Creation Account*, and is a coauthor of The New Answers book, volumes I and II. For more information on Dr. Lisle, including his speaking schedule and information on the latest planetarium shows at the Creation Museum, visit www.answeringenesis.org.

⁷⁶ Tim Chaffey and Jason Lisle, *Old-Earth Creationism on Trial: The Verdict Is In* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books 2009), 16.