

AN OVERVIEW & CRITICISM OF THEORIES ON CREATION

A Paper

Presented to



Grace Research Room

by

Rich Keller

November, 2019

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is three-fold; the first is to *briefly* present and critically examine various views regarding creation as described in Genesis. The second is to defend a literal six twenty-four hour day interpretation (which I will call the literal view) and why it's critical to do so, and the third, is to graciously move believers to have a consistent Biblically based worldview.¹ The major theories presented will be Framework Hypothesis, Theistic Evolution, Gap Theory, Progressive Creation (a.k.a. Day-age), and literal six day creation. I will provide a description, history, and critical evaluation of each and how each aligns itself with a Biblical world view.

Before beginning though, it's important to understand why all these views exist. This is often overlooked and critical to understanding why this is not simply and solely a disagreement about interpretation, as it's so often framed. It's an issue about one's world view and the authority of scripture. Satan asked Eve in the garden, "did God really say" (Gen. 3:4-5), bringing into question God's simple and straightforward instructions to Adam and Eve. Adam and Eve chose to believe Satan over the word of God. This same mindset is followed by all those who believe man's fallible scientific theories over the perfect word of God. This then is the key to understanding why the various views exist.

It's often been asked whether or not mankind can live without God. It is at this philosophical level that we find the answer as to why the various views exist. Thus the debate is one of starting points, *God* versus *no God* axioms.

¹ Paul in 2 Corinthians 10:4-5 reminds us to demolish every pretense that sets itself up against the knowledge of God and to take captive every thought and make it obedient to Christ. Paul doesn't say demolish every *person* that sets themselves up against the knowledge of God. My goal is not to attack anyone in particular, though I will mention proponents of the various views.

Neither axiom can be proven,² but because mankind doesn't know everything, we have to assume a starting point and determine whether or not, based on observation, facts, and logic if our starting point makes best sense of the evidence. One's starting point combined with evidence and conclusions is referred to as a paradigm, or one's world view.³

But there are two issues to take away from this; the first is that when dealing with the topic of creation, the argument is not over the evidence, it's about one's paradigm. Does one start solely with God's word as their bias and draw the meaning out, a.k.a. exegesis; or does the individual start outside of scripture and read into the text their bias, which is external from scripture, otherwise known as eisegesis. Every believer commits eisegesis on one topic or another, the goal is to do it less frequently as we grow in Christ.⁴

Secondly, Creationist views such as Theistic evolution, Gap Theory, Framework Hypothesis and Progressive Creation are a product of taking axioms from one worldview and applying them to another worldview. As will be shown in this paper, any attempt to compromise between the two axioms will result in compromising the Biblical account given in Genesis.⁵

Framework Hypothesis

The Framework Hypothesis is a metaphorical interpretation of Genesis 1-2 which seeks to place the focus on the meaning or impetus behind the text, not on the details of the text itself. In other words, what's written in Genesis 1-2 is a literary 'framework' within which God teaches us about Himself and His creation. The notion that "God made it" is essentially all that matters with this viewpoint; the details are inconsequential and thus relegated to uncertainty

² Atheism means "no God" which is a definitive claim. This is self defeating because how can one make the definitive claim that there is no God unless they know everything?

³ It's not wrong to have a starting assumption, in fact everyone has a bias. The only difference between those who don't and those who do is whether or not one admits they have a bias.

⁴ It's up to the individual to study and conform themselves to Christ and present their bodies, which includes their minds, as a living sacrifice to God. Romans 12:1-2

⁵ Judges 21:25 - In those days Israel had no king; everyone did as they saw fit.

which, in their minds, conveniently eliminates the discussion about the age of the earth, how God did it, and whether or not it even matters. This is seen as a strength not a weakness in their view.⁶

Two notable advocates of the view are Lee Irons and Meredith Kline; they state that the

Framework Hypothesis is:

That interpretation of Genesis 1:1-2:3 which regards the seven-day scheme as a figurative framework. While the six days of creation are presented as normal solar days, according to the framework interpretation the total picture of God's completing His creative work in a week of days is not to be taken literally. Instead it functions as a literary structure in which the creative works of God have been narrated in a topical order. The days are like picture frames.⁷

The writers also emphasize that the days of creation are...

...narrated in a nonsequential order within the literary structure or framework of a seven-day week. Thus there are two essential elements of the framework interpretation: the nonliteral element and the nonsequential element.⁸

This view was first proposed by a Dutch theologian by the name of Arie Noordtzij in his work *Gods word ender Eeuwen Getuigenis*, published in 1924.⁹ Framework Hypothesis has since gained popularity today with many evangelicals for several reasons. First is due to the parallels seen between the literary style that Moses used and pagan ancient near-eastern (ANE) writings of the day, second is in part to the supposed insurmountable issues with a literal reading, and third, because it allows one to believe what they want, bringing apparent harmony between believers and bridging the gap to non-believers.

The key to this view as Kline noted above, is that Genesis 1 and 2 are to be read non-literally. In a similar vein, the theologian Bruce Waltke states that "a non-literal view is consistent with the text's emphasis on theological, rather than scientific, issues."¹⁰ And that the

⁶ David G. Hagopian, *The Genesis Debate* (Mission Viejo: Crux Press, 2001) 217.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁹ Dr. Terry Mortensen, *Coming To Grips With Genesis* (Green Forest: Master Books, 2009) 151.

¹⁰ *Coming To Grips With Genesis*, 151.

author of Genesis' intent was "not scientific or historical but theological and indirectly polemical against pagan mythologies."¹¹ A more recent work entitled, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, by Dr. Walton from Wheaton, supports this idea as well but with some expansion on the premise.

The major premise of Walton's book is that Genesis 1 should be interpreted in a strictly functional sense; to interpret it in a material sense would be tantamount to "cultural imperialism;"¹² Which he defines as forcing our modern culture and modern thinking into the text (a form of eisegesis). Walton supports a corollary to this that the amount of time that matter took to physically materialize is unimportant; a fact he says we cannot know.¹³

Since discoveries of ANE literature, many theologians have rightly observed similarities between the ANE's and Moses' work in the Pentateuch. Walke observes that Genesis' use of "widely attested seven-day typology" of the ANE shows that the narrator is using a stereotypical formula that is not intended to be taken literally."¹⁴ Walke also observes that the structure of Genesis 1 is symmetrical; days 4-6 parallel days 1-3 "and that this symmetry demonstrates its non-literal nature."¹⁵

But are these assumptions warranted? Should Genesis 1-2 be read non-literally because the ANE's were written in similar vein, does the literal approach have insurmountable problems, and is this the best solution to bring peace among believers and allow for God's word to remain untarnished?

The emphases placed on the ANE's by those who espouse framework in my opinion exceed basic hermeneutical methods. One aspect of proper Biblical interpretation is the historical

¹¹ Ibid, 76.

¹² Dr. John Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One* (Downers Grove: 2009), 9. The accusation of cultural imperialism should really be directed at himself for placing pagan religious culture into God's Word. He's committed "literary form imperialism." I think it would be best if we all had scriptural imperialism!

¹³ Although ironically he makes the claim that the material was created in the distant past prior to Genesis 1.

¹⁴ *Coming To Grips With Genesis*, 76-77.

¹⁵ Ibid, 156.

nature of it and we should try to immerse ourselves completely into a culture as best we can, then to view a text from that perspective. But to what degree should we allow the pagan writings of the past to drive our interpretation. Also, do the pagan ANE's provide enough insight into the overall cultural relevance of the Israelites of the time as Walton and others have assumed? I posed this question to Dr. Bing¹⁶ and he had this to say:

I think knowledge of those forms can give us insight into meaning, but the scripture must be allowed to speak for itself, sometimes at odds with contemporary form. For example, many interpret Deut. by ancient king-vassal treaties. But when you think about it, any treaty or covenant is going to have a basic form (preamble, conditions, etc). Any epistle is going to have a basic form (but why then does Hebrews not follow it?). I think many have overcooked the Psalms by putting them into tight literary categories. So Scripture has to trump form, but form can sometimes add insight.¹⁷

Dr. Rene Lopez concurs when commenting on the relationship of ANE's to the covenants God made with the Israelites:

Finally, it is clear that God sought to clarify the meaning and relevance of the Israelite covenants by modeling them after ancient Near Eastern covenants. By using a well-known ancient model, God successfully communicated His meaning and intention.¹⁸

The ANE's then can add depth to an interpretation, but they are not required for us to understand the scripture, nor should they be pressed into scripture so-as-to be eisegetical rather than exegetical.

Another reason framework advocates are compelled to take a non-literal approach is they believe there are several inconsistencies and difficulties implicit in a literal reading of Genesis, e.g. the earth being 6000 years old. The Framework Hypothesis makes a many claims against a literal reading. I will analyze a few of the key claims in the following discussion.

¹⁶ Dr. Bing received his ThM. and PhD. from Dallas Theological Seminary. He is an author and was the pastor of Burleson Bible Church for 19 years. He is currently the head of GraceLife Ministries.

¹⁷ From a personal e-mail discussion with Dr. Bing on ANE's, June 7, 2009.

¹⁸ Dr. Rene Lopez. *Israelite Covenants in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Covenants*. (CTS Journal, Spring 2004) 106.

Lastly, I believe they are attempting to seek harmony among believers and non-believers with regards to creation. This is certainly a noble and Biblical admonition. Paul says in Ephesians 4:11-13 that we should all seek to attain “unity of the faith” within the body of Christ. This does not mean that we should accept all views as true; it means that we’re to understand God’s truths in the same way. If one’s goal is to stop the infighting and character assassinations it's certainly a worthy one, but I argue that compromise with paradigms will almost always result in fighting and more importantly result in undermining the authority of God's word.

Another question that gets raised with this view is who determines where the metaphor begins and ends? Genesis is clearly a historical narrative from beginning to end but the implications of a non-literal interpretive method, suggests that we’ve misinterpreted it for the last 2000 years. This raises more questions than it has answers.

Theistic Evolution

Theistic Evolution is simply the idea that God used ‘goo-to-you’¹⁹ evolution as His method of creating all that exists. Dr. White notes that “evolution has supposedly occurred, with God controlling the processes. They [theistic evolutionists] also believe that God still controls these processes and that evolution is still proceeding.”²⁰ In other words Theistic Evolution is identical to atheistic evolution except they have added God to the mix. Dr. Werner Gitt summarized Theistic Evolution succinctly in the following formulas:

Evolution = matter + evolutionary factors (chance and necessity + mutation + selection + isolation + death) + very long time periods.

Theistic evolution = matter + evolutionary factors (chance and necessity + mutation + selection + isolation + death) + very long time periods + God.

But just what is evolution? Evolution is not just a theory, it is a religion for an individual with a No God paradigm. Religion is “a set of beliefs concerning the cause, nature,

¹⁹ This phrase along with microbes-to-men, particles-to-people, were coined by Dr. Jonathan Sarfati.

²⁰ <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v1/n1/future-of-humans> last accessed Feb. 12, 2011.

and purpose of the universe.”²¹ Scientifically speaking evolution ultimately means the change of one kind of animal to another; in their own words,

Modern evolutionary theory incorporates these concepts: species **change over time**; genetic **mutations** are responsible for the changes; individuals with beneficial genetic mutations will survive preferentially compared with their competitors, in a process known as **natural selection**;²² [emphasis mine]

In other words, it is simply change over time; an undirected process whereby death disease, mutation and time determine the change. But it begs the question, what type of change?

The problem with evolutionists is one of equivocation.²³ They have two definitions they use interchangeably, and setup a straw-man against opponents. One definition is scientifically reasonable, like speciation and natural selection;²⁴ the other definition is going from one kind of animal to another, *goo-to-you*. Darwin’s problem, as is the problem with all evolutionists, is that they only focus on outward appearances (definition 1) as proof of *goo-to-you* (definition 2) evolution. The problem is they seem to deny the underlying instruction manual, DNA,²⁵ and its critical role.

Each animal has a blueprint that instructs itself to form eyes, ears, even hooves on a horse. DNA is the blueprint²⁶ which contains this information.²⁷ The DNA is not the information, it’s just the information storehouse, just like a book is a sequence of dots, letters, and sentences which can be deciphered if one has the translation package. The information contained in the DNA for a bug is decidedly different than one for a horse. While they both contain similarities,

²¹ <http://www.Dictionary.com>, Last Accessed, February 9, 2011.

²² LiveScience is an ardent supporter of evolutionary thought. <http://www.livescience.com/topics/evolution/>

²³ Equivocation, is using a word to mean one thing, and then later using it to mean something different.

²⁴ Often referred to as Micro-evolution, but I don’t prefer that term because it incorporates the word evolution and can add confusion to a discussion. I hesitate to give any sort of credence to this hollow and deceptive philosophy.

²⁵ Deoxyribonucleic acid

²⁶ DNA contains not only the instruction manual for the organism, but also for translating itself. The code is meaningless unless it has a translation packet. When and how this chicken-before-the-egg process got started is unknown to the evolutionist. Both had to be in place at the same time.

²⁷ I highly recommend Dr. Werner Gitt’s book, *In the Beginning was Information*.

both have eyes and feet, they have very different manuals. The problem is, nothing in nature has ever shown an increase of information in the genome, and that's exactly what you'd need in order to go from a "simple single cell" organism to human. Speciation, mutations, and natural selection, the three pillars of goo-to-you, can only act upon the available information; none of the pillars of evolution, including *time* can add information to the genome. It is not scientifically possible.²⁸ Neither is going from non-living matter to living matter, this is referred to as Abiogenesis a.k.a. spontaneous generation, and was proven wrong by Louis Pasteur.²⁹

Several other issues arise and Dr. Gitt again notes that;

1. God used evolution as a means of creating.
2. The Bible contains no usable or relevant ideas which can be applied in present-day origins science.
3. Evolutionistic pronouncements have priority over Biblical statements. The Bible must be reinterpreted when and wherever it contradicts the present evolutionary worldview.³⁰

Based on the last statement, it's a wonder why anyone want to hook their cart up to this mutated horse.

To summarize, God used a slow, tumultuous process where death and suffering are said to bring about new created kinds. Unfortunately the idea behind goo-to-you evolution is a non-directed process, unguided and unloving. God is the polar opposite, He is about meticulous design and He is love. Often time's people will say "God could have done it this way," but that's not the point. It's not an issue about what God could have done, He could have created in any way He chose to, the issue is about what God said He did!

²⁸ Information is key; this is Achilles heel of the goo-to-you axiom.

²⁹ Not just the inventor of pasteurization but also a creation scientist.

³⁰ Dr. Werner Gitt. *Did God Use Evolution?* (Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2006.) 13-16, 24.

Gap Theory

While not all Gap Theorists agree on all points, they do agree that there's an unknowable amount of time that took place between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. Weston Fields, in his book *Unformed and Unfilled*, notes that...

...the one unifying principle of all gap theorists is that Genesis 1:2...records the ruin of a once-perfect earth, and a lengthy time-gap between the original creation and the restoration recorded in Genesis 1:3 to the end of the creation narrative.³¹

This "Gap" was first introduced by pastor theologian Thomas Chalmers in 1804.³² It wasn't until 1814 when Chalmers entertained a larger audience that this view became widely accepted for the next 50 years.³³

Many modern-day theologians have espoused this view such as R.B. Thieme.³⁴ He held that Genesis 1 represented a creation that "was instantaneous from the hand of God"³⁵ and that "the six-day period recorded in Genesis 1:3-31 is not a description of the original creation."³⁶ but that it represented a "preparation of the earth for habitation"³⁷

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss every detail³⁸ as "embellishments are neither essential to the theory, nor universally held by all gap theorists."³⁹ One primary argument in support of a Gap is the Hebrew phrase *tohu waw bohu*, often translated as "without form and void." According to Gap theologians, this means that there was chaos on the earth that "represents a sinful, and therefore, not an original state of the earth."⁴⁰ This is an unwarranted

³¹ Weston Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled, A Critique of the Gap Theory*. (Collinsville, IL: Burgener, 2000). 7.

³² Dr. Terry Mortensen. *The Great Turning Point*, (Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2004). 33.

³³ *Ibid.*. 34-35.

³⁴ Retired Colonel Thieme was a graduate of Dallas Theological and pastor of Berachah Church.

³⁵ Augustine also held the idea of an instantaneous creation.

³⁶ R.B. Thieme Jr. *Creation, Chaos, and Restoration*. (Berachah Church: 1973). 12.

³⁷ *Ibid.*. 12.

³⁸ For a full discussion on every aspect of the Gap theory, see Weston Fields unparalleled work *Unformed and Unfilled: A critique of the Gap Theory*.

³⁹ Fields, 7.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

expansion of the meaning and has no support contextually or lexically. Fields again notes that “*tohu* is used in a morally neutral state, describing something unfinished, and confused, but not necessarily evil.”⁴¹ So why then does a Gap theologian attempt to add millions of years? The reason is two-fold, first, Gap theorists, like Chalmers realized they had no other place to add millions of years, the second is that Gap theorists are reacting to secular influences.

It’s commonly believed that Gap was a reaction to Darwinism,⁴² when in fact it was a reaction to secular geologists like Lyell⁴³ and publications on geology claiming that the earth was millions of years old, or in the case of Lyell, infinitely old. Many theologians such as Chalmers succumb to these claims and the outside pressure to conform to what old earth geologists were advocating, lest they appear foolish for not believing science, falsely so-called.

Theologians incorporating uniformitarian Geology into scripture is confirmed by Dr. Mortensen in his book, *The Great Turning Point*:

Such rationalism insisted on explaining everything...by the supposedly inviolable laws of nature, which was a view often accompanied by a total denial of miracles. It also insisted on a completely natural...rather than supernatural origin of the Scriptures. This in turn affected how the Scriptures were interpreted. The Bible was believed by some to contain either historical errors or only theological and moral truths conveyed through myth or some other symbolic literary genre, just as other ancient religious literature contained...All of this was contributing to a gradual, but profound, shift in world view in society and a radical redefinition of Christianity.⁴⁴

Gap Theory epitomizes eisegesis in allowing outside ideas to guide one’s theology and it often results in absurd claims. Thieme notes that “between verses 1 and 2, a catastrophe occurred...this catastrophe includes the fall of Satan...in the course of the angelic conflict it turned the pre-adamic world into chaos...between verses 1 and 2 the earth was packed in ice, underneath the ice

⁴¹ Fields, 129.

⁴² Dr. Constable makes this claim; (Notes on Genesis, 12). See Mortensen’s discussions on Chalmers in *The Great Turning Point*.

⁴³ *Principles of Geology*

⁴⁴ *The Great Turning Point*. 235-235.

was “tohu waw bohu”, over the ice darkness!”⁴⁵ None of these events are in scripture, thus the Gap Theory, extends beyond what scripture clearly teaches in an attempt to meld two opposing paradigms.

Progressive Creation / Day Age

This is arguably one of the more widely accepted views of creation today and has been around in evangelical circles since the mid 1850’s.⁴⁶ The term Day-Age and Progressive Creation (PC) are somewhat synonymous; although PC is really a subset of Day-Age. The commonality between the two is that the days described in Genesis 1 were of an unknown age, perhaps millions of years. Progressive Creationism is an expansion of that idea and is currently championed by Dr. Hugh Ross of Reason’s to Believe Ministry.

Progressive Creation (PC) espouses that each day given in Genesis 1 is not a literal 24-hour day. The days spoken of each represent an unspecified amount of time in which God progressively created new species of animals while others became extinct. This is what is meant by the term ‘progressive.’ Ross also adds that even the seventh day is not yet completed.⁴⁷ With respect to ages, Dr. Ross stated that:

‘Therefore it allows me to make an interesting paraphrase of John 3:16, if you’ll permit—For God so loved the human race that he went to the expense of building a hundred-billion trillion-stars and carefully shaped and crafted them for sixteen-billion years so that at this brief moment in time we could all have a nice place to live.’⁴⁸

PC’s come to this conclusion not because of any perspicuous reading of scripture, but because of the geologic uniformitarian⁴⁹ assumptions and Big Bang cosmology which holds to an age of the

⁴⁵ Theime, 14-15.

⁴⁶ *The Great Turning Point*. 35.

⁴⁷ Hagopian, 64.

⁴⁸ Dallas Theological Seminary Chapel Service, September 13, 1996, presented in the article <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4077.asp>, last accessed Feb. 15, 2011. He needs to reread John 3:16.

⁴⁹ Uniformitarianism, popularized by Lyell, simply means that the present is the key to the past, it’s the assumption that the geologic events/processes occurring today have always occurred and at the same rate. (See *The Great Turning Point* p. 32) I contend that the past is the key to the present!

universe of approximately 10-15 billion years. In like manner, their order of events in the creative process does not follow scripture, but follows a secular timeline. For example, the sun and stars were created before the earth and land animals preceded flying creatures, there is also overlap in the creation and extinction of species.

PC's must be given credit as they are correct on two accounts; firstly, they deny a purely naturalistic creative process, and secondly, they are consistent in their beliefs and follow their logic throughout scripture. However, this is also to their detriment, namely because of the sheer amount of scriptural gymnastics that must go on in other theological areas in order to arrive at a self consistent view. Thus it quickly diverts from the issue of how long the day is in the first chapter of Genesis.

With regard to the order of events in creation, a leading Day-Age proponent named Davis Young recognized this issue.⁵⁰ He came to the conclusion that no harmony between the order of events in Genesis and secular theories existed. Young noted:

Ingenious as all these schemes may be, one is struck by the force nature of them all. While the exegetical gymnastic maneuvers have displayed remarkable flexibility, I suspect that they have resulted in temporary damage to the theological musculature.⁵¹

Unfortunately Davis Young left the faith and accepted evolutionary thought. Young is not alone in his observation of a conflict between secular theories and the Biblical text, and it has driven many away from the faith.

Another good example of gymnastics is the fact that PC's are logically forced to hold to a local flood event because they assume that uniformitarian geologists are correct regarding the sources and ages of the strata. Naturalists are forced into this corner because they deny catastrophism, especially on the scale that the Scripture discusses regarding the flood. But this

⁵⁰ Davis Young was a geologist and son of orthodox Old Testament scholar, Edward J. Young. See *Refuting Compromise*, p. 144.

⁵¹ Sarfati, 145.

isn't because of lack of evidence;⁵² it's again a paradigm issue. Interestingly, Dr. Ross when asked during a debate if the Noachian flood was global replied that it was "universal." Which of course begs the question, what is universal? His explanation was that the Bible describes Noah's 'universe', all that he knew, being decimated.⁵³

It can clearly be seen then that PC and Day-Age place science above scripture. In fact even atheists recognize what PC's are doing, and joyfully so. Ken Nahigian of the Nation Center for Science Education⁵⁴ remarked that:

"Ross's belief that true theology must conform to true science cheers me greatly;...Dr. Ross seems more in league with British evangelicals of the 1830's who wrote that if "sound science appears to contradict the Bible, we may be sure that it is our interpretation of the Bible that is at fault."⁵⁵

One area of focus in criticism of PC's is their claim to be reading Genesis literally, yet they place a different definition on the Hebrew word *yom* in the first chapter. I will address this in the next section.

Literal Six-Day

This is by far the least accepted view in Christendom today, but ironically the view that is most consistent Biblically and Scientifically.⁵⁶ It is also the most widely held by theologians throughout history.⁵⁷ Literal Six-day is just as it espouses, that the creation of the universe was performed by God in six 24hr days, the same as we experience today, and this occurred about 6000 years ago based on a simple addition of genealogies. Literal Six-day also holds to a world-wide, global flood that covered the entire planet and destroyed all life with the

⁵² If there really was a worldwide flood, what would you expect to find? Billions of dead things buried in rock layers all over the earth.

⁵³ This view was espoused by Dr. Ross during the Great Debate on the Ankerberg television show. It is a common tactic and belief espoused by Dr. Ross.

⁵⁴ Technically they're the national movement to keep God out of science and indoctrinate in naturalistic philosophy.

⁵⁵ Sarfati, 48.

⁵⁶ I make a distinction between historical science (science dealing with past) and observational science (science dealing with the present). The former requires many assumptions, thus the need for a starting point.

⁵⁷ See *Refuting Compromise*, p 121 for a table listing statements made by early church theologians.

exception of life on the Ark. The latter, according to scriptural geologists, say that this accounts for the better part of the geologic strata and sedimentary rock found all over the earth. Again, it's important to note, this view differs from all others in that it starts with the description given in Scripture. Where the scriptures speak, interpretation of science, especially historical, must come secondarily to God's Word. This is the strength of the view and even opponents of the view recognize this fact. Hebrew scholar, Dr. James Barr of Oxford University noted that:

'... probably, 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:

- 1) creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience.
- 2) 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.
- 3) Noah's flood was understood to be world-wide and extinguish all human and animal life except for those in the ark.'⁵⁸

The literal view is also consistent in that it places death, disease, and struggle after Adam's sin; death is a consequence not an antecedent of sin. All views, other than a literal view, place death before Adam's sin. This is untenable; Romans 5:12 says that death was a consequence, a result of Adam's sin. In addition, Romans 8:19-22 tells of God frustrating the entire creation as the result of sin.

Thus far I have purposefully strayed from a discussion of the Hebrew word *yom* in order to emphasize the point that the debate on views is not simply a discussion about semantics per say; but a brief discussion is in order. The Hebrew word *yom* is a critical point of contention, *yom* means day, and just like in the English language the word can have many meanings. For example in the sentence, "back in my father's day, it took 6 days to cross the outback during the day."⁵⁹ The word day is used three times in one sentence, but all with a separate meaning. As can

⁵⁸ Sarfati, 289.

⁵⁹ Ken Ham, *Answers Academy Curriculum*. Answers In Genesis-US DVD, 2005.

be seen in this example, the context determines the meaning. If I were to say “I made this car in three days, on the first day I put together the chassis, then in the evening I went to bed and then woke up in the morning. The second day I placed the engine, then evening and morning came; then on the third day I put the body on.” Everyone would know that I was outlining a specific sequence of events in three consecutive 24-hour days, not some unknowable epoch of time.

These descriptions are analogous to the description given in Genesis. Moses used *yom* with two qualifiers (evening and morning) and an ordinal (first, second, third etc.), which makes it exceedingly clear. In addition, Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 support a literal six-day reading as this was the framework for the workweek for the Israelites. The ministry Answers In Genesis, in a word study, found that;

“whenever the word day is used with a number, or with the words evening or morning, or with the word night, or whenever the phrase 'evening and morning' is used, outside of Genesis 1 the Hebrew word for day always means an ordinary day, or the phrase evening morning means an ordinary day”⁶⁰

It is inconsistent that when less of a context is given to define *yom* critics of a literal view assume it's a 24-hour period of time. Nobody ever questions day outside of Genesis 1. It begs the question of how long Joshua walked around Jericho, or Jonah remained in the fish, or Christ in the grave.

Consequences and Conclusion

It's often been said that “the time of Creation is not as important as the fact of creation.”⁶¹ This is a straw-man argument that seeks to divert attention from the very point and issue at hand, which is that compromise with secular paradigms' ultimately injure the authority of the word of God. Jesus said in John 3:12, “If I told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?” In other words, if one cannot trust what the

⁶⁰ http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/overheads/pages/oh20020208_104.asp, last accessed Feb. 9, 2011.

⁶¹ Hagopian, 12.

Bible says about history and physical matters which we can see and touch, then how can one trust the things that are immaterial or spiritual? Norman Geisler in the forward of *The Genesis*

Debate stated that:

“the church needs to shift its focus to the real enemy-evolutionism-not to other forms of creationism that remain true to the historicity of the events recorded in Genesis... Evangelicals need to start turning their cannons on naturalists, not on other supernaturalists.”⁶²

While well intentioned this thought fails at various levels. As we’ve seen, no view except the literal view remains true to the historicity of the events as they’re actually described in scripture and all other views attempt to compromise or outright deny a literal interpretation. The danger of compromise cannot be understated. Hitler understood this and sought to use it as a weapon against the church, he says:

It’s “not opportune to hurl ourselves now into a struggle with the Churches. The best thing is to let Christianity die a natural death.” Hitler explained to his aides. “A slow death has something comforting about it. The dogma of Christianity gets worn away before the advances of science. Religion will have to make more and more concessions. Gradually the myths crumble. All that’s left is to prove that in nature there is no frontier between the organic and the inorganic.”⁶³

Hitler, a devout atheist, understood the importance about concessions from an antagonistic viewpoint; I just pray that more Christians would see its importance as the protagonist. My attempt was to present a brief but accurate view of each while at the same time sounding a warning Paul sounded to the church of Colossae, that is, to not make compromises between man’s opinion and God’s word;

“See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ.” – Col. 2:8

⁶² Hagopian, 12.

⁶³ Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism, The secret history of the American left from Mussolini to the politics of meaning*, (Doubleday, 2008). 363.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Answers In Genesis. PowerPoint Illustrations, http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/overheads/pages/oh20020208_104.asp (accessed Feb. 9, 2011).

Answers In Genesis. Dr. Monty White, 2006: Theistic Evolution and the Future of Humans, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v1/n1/future-of-humans> (accessed Feb. 12, 2011).

Answers In Genesis. Ken Ham, 2008: What's wrong with 'Progressive Creation?' <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4077.asp> (accessed Feb. 7, 2011).

Constable, Dr. Thomas L.. *Notes on Genesis*. Dallas, Texas: Sonic Light, 2004. <http://www.soniclight.com>.

Fields, Weston. *Unformed and Unfilled, A Critique of the Gap Theory*. Collinsville, IL: Burgener Enterprises, 2000.

Gitt, Dr. Werner. *Did God Use Evolution? Observations from a Scientist of Faith*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2006.

Gitt, Dr. Werner. *In the Beginning Was Information*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2006.

Goldberg, Jonah. *Liberal Fascism, The Secret History of the American Left from Mussolini to the Politics of Meaning*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2008.

Ham, Ken. *Answers Academy Curriculum*. Answers In Genesis-US DVD, 2005.

Hagopian, David G. *The Genesis Debate, Three Views on the Days of Creation*. Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001.

LiveScience. LiveScience Topic: Evolution, 2010: <http://www.livescience.com/topics/evolution/> (accessed Feb. 12, 2011).

Lopez. Dr. Rene. *Israelite Covenants in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Covenants*. CTS Journal, Spring 2004, 106.

Morris, Dr. John D. *The Young Earth*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2002.

Mortenson, Dr. Terry. *The Great Turning Point, The Church's Catastrophic Mistake on Geology – Before Darwin*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2004.

Mortenson, Dr. Terry, Ury, Dr. Thane. *Coming To Grips With Genesis, Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2009.

Ross, Hugh. *The Fingerprint of God*. Orange, CA: Promise Publishing, 1989.

Sarfati, Dr. Jonathan. *Refuting Compromise*. Green Forest, AK: Master Books, 2004.

Thieme, R.B., Jr. *Creation, Chaos, and Restoration*. Berachah Church: 1973.

Walton, Dr. John. *The Lost World of Genesis One*. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 2009.
