

Ask the Pastor

Theo-Library

Introduction

It is impossible to escape the influence of evolutionary theory.[1] Anthropology, biology, sociology, philosophy, and religion are just a few of the fields of study which have felt its influence. Indeed, very few areas of study have been unaffected by the advance of evolutionary theory. Rarely in history has a theory found such eager acceptance and enjoyed such pervasive influence.[2] Evolutionary theory currently enjoys such an unrivaled predominance that "much of modern academic thought [is] driven by the assumption that all phenomena can be understood in terms of evolutionary theory." [3]

In light of the extensive influence of evolutionary theory in so many different areas, it is mandatory that one develop a clear Christian position concerning creation. It is with this goal in mind that I present this position paper.

#### PHILOSOPHICAL FRAMEWORK

##### General and Special Revelation

All intellectual speculation takes place within an epistemological framework. All hold to certain presuppositions (assumptions, ultimate truths) that are beyond the realm of mere empirical tests of truth. These presuppositions are often so ingrained in one's thinking that they are taken for granted. Thus, their effect on one's conclusions in interpreting reality often go unnoticed. This is why many differing truth claims based on the same observable facts can appear to be true.

One's assumptions play a primary role in determining the meaning of objective facts. Two people with completely different presuppositions could view the same objective data and come to radically diverse conclusions. For example, a naturalist could look at the stars and galaxies through a telescope and conclude that "chance" and "natural laws" are amazing. A theist could look at the same stars and conclude that God, the Creator and Sustainer, is amazing. Both star-gazers observed the same objective data, but their different epistemological frameworks resulted in two completely different interpretations of the facts.

Because of the effect of presuppositions on one's interpretation of objective facts, I will clearly state mine from the beginning. I believe it is self-evident that a supernatural and transcendent God exists and that He has revealed Himself to His creation. He does this through two primary means--creation and the Holy Scriptures. Theologians have generally distinguished between these two means of revelation with the terms general revelation and special revelation. General revelation is communicated primarily through God's physical creation and special revelation is communicated primarily through God's spoken word. These are the two primary means God uses in communicating His nature, His work, and His will.

These two means are similar in many ways. Both are significant and valuable. Both truly reveal something concerning their Author. However, there is a crucial difference between the two--special revelation communicates more fully than general revelation. Because of this, God's special revelation has primacy over general revelation. General revelation is limited in its communicative content. The intent, purpose, and end of God's creation cannot be known from creation alone. It is God's special revelation through His word which communicates His ultimate intents, purposes and plan.

However, we must not forget that special and general revelation are interdependent. God discloses His word (special revelation) in the context of creation (general revelation) and creation (general revelation) reveals God and the obvious need for God's word (special revelation). We could view it this way: Creation is God's painting and God's word is the description of the painting by the author Himself. Although creation can tell us much concerning the author, it is only the author himself that can truly reveal all the details concerning the painting. Thus, special and general revelation supplement one another. They augment and enhance their respective messages.

In summary, both general and special revelation speak truly concerning God,[4] but not equally--God's special revelation has the preeminence and priority. They are interdependent in that God's special revelation is revealed in the context of His general revelation. God's general revelation in creation provides the foundation and backdrop for the fuller unfolding of His redemptive purposes for mankind[5] (known only through special revelation).[6]

##### The Relation of Revelation and Reason

As noted, God's special revelation in propositional form (i.e. the Bible) is given preeminence and priority in understanding and interpreting general revelation (creation). Mankind is part of God's creation and his reason and reasoning abilities are subject to the limitations of general revelation and must be understood in light of the special revelation of God. In other words, man's reason is inferior to, and dependent upon, God's special revelation. Mankind's inherent moral bias (unbelief being a form of enmity against God) and the noetic effects of sin (biasing the mind against pure objectivity) mandate that God's revelation precede human reason. Human reasoning powers are not supreme. They must take second-place to God's special revelation.[7]

In light of the reality of God's existence and the priority of special revelation over general revelation, one can reasonably attribute highest authority to the Scriptures. Indeed, it is only reasonable that reality would transcend unaided reason. Pascal placed reason in its proper place: "Reason's last step is to recognize that there is an infinite number of things which surpass it. It is simply feeble if it does not go as far as realizing that. If natural things surpass it, what will we say about supernatural things?" [8]

In order to remain consistent within one's epistemological framework, one's highest authority cannot be proved or validated by an appeal to a higher authority. This would be to reject one's highest authority and make it subservient to another authority. By declaring that God's special revelation in Scripture is my highest authority, I am acknowledging that all other claims to authority must be viewed in light of the ultimate claims of Scripture. In other words, Scripture validates or invalidates other authorities, and not vice versa. "If we ultimately appeal to human reason, or to logic, or to historical accuracy, or to scientific truth, as the authority by which Scripture is shown to be God's words, then we have assumed the thing to which we appealed to be a higher authority than God's words and one that is more true or more reliable." [9]

I readily admit that this argument is circular in nature. Yet this does not discount the argument as faulty or invalid. Grudem writes,

[A]ll arguments for an absolute authority must ultimately appeal to that authority for proof: otherwise the authority would not be an absolute or highest authority. This problem is not unique to the Christian who is arguing for the authority of the Bible. Everyone either implicitly or explicitly uses some kind of circular argument when defending his or her ultimate authority for belief.[10]

John Frame makes similar comments concerning the circularity of "using scriptural standards to prove scriptural conclusions":

"Does that procedure deserve to be condemned as 'circular'? Everyone else reasons the same way. Every philosophy must use its own standards in proving its conclusions; otherwise, it is simply inconsistent. Those who believe that human reason is the ultimate authority (rationalists) must presuppose the authority of reason in their arguments for rationalism. Those who believe in the ultimacy of sense experience must presuppose it in arguing for their philosophy (empiricism). And skeptics must be skeptical of their own skepticism (a fact that is, of course, the Achilles' heel of skepticism). The point is that when one is arguing for an ultimate criterion, whether Scripture, the Koran, human reason, sensation, or whatever, one must use criteria compatible with that conclusion. If that is circularity, then everybody is guilty of circularity." [11]

#### My Personal Presuppositions

One's epistemological framework goes a long way in interpreting the so-called "facts" of creation. The epistemological framework with which I approach reality is the framework of monotheism. A framework in which God preserves, sustains, and guides the world He has created. I thus believe that the universe is an open system--open to a transcendent God and His supernatural influence and involvement. I freely, willingly, and openly admit my presuppositions from the beginning, for they will radically and reasonably impact my view of creation.

Although it is often left unstated, those who hold to the theory of evolution also work within an epistemological framework and philosophical structure. That framework is positivism[12] and the structure is naturalism,[13] which by definition is unopen to God's intrusion or involvement. Thus, natural causes and explanations are sought for everything. My worldview does not confine me to such reductionism.

I realize that my position is open to abuse. Hyper-spiritualizers will attempt to see the supernatural in everything and forget God's sustaining providence and great wisdom in overseeing His creation.[14] However, the alternative to me is more frightening. Reality is greater than reason.

But what about the objective, quantifiable, observable facts which are the appropriate subject of scientific investigation? Can these facts be used to overthrow Scriptural authority? If the observable facts of creation cannot be harmonized with my position,[15] I am content to wait for further developments in the field of natural science before I abandon my allegiance to the primacy of special revelation.[16] Scientific paradigms change with the seasons--they are constantly formed, amended, and disregarded.[17] I also remain aware that many alleged scientific "facts" are laden with naturalistic interpretation and are not nearly as objective and unbiased as they appear.

Does this view confine me to the category of "creation scientist"? Personally, I am uncomfortable with this description and with the undertaking on the whole. I am not willing to align the Biblical position with any science--even creation science. I believe that an attempt to develop a distinctively Christian science, though having a noble appearance on the surface, is contrary to the intent of Scripture. This is also true of the attempt to develop a Christian "brand" of any particular field of study, whether science, philosophy or government. Obviously, Christians take part in scientific endeavors, Christians philosophize, and Christians take part in government. However, this is not the same thing as attempting to develop a definitive Christian science, philosophy, or government.[18] Ultimately, the intent of Scripture is not to develop any of these areas exhaustively, but to give full and sufficient revelation concerning God and His salvation.[19]

#### The Insufficiency of Natural Science & Creation Science to Explain Origins

It may be asked how the philosophical thoughts above pertain to the subject matter at hand. Such thinking reflects an inability to see that all knowledge (natural science or otherwise) is affected by historical considerations, cultural situations, and philosophical presuppositions. Thus, the study of origins transcends the scope and boundaries of natural science. Neither natural science nor scientific creationism is sufficient to explain the origin of all things.

Scientists--creationist or naturalistic--must recognize the limitations of their respective discipline. In order for science to be science it must remain within the boundaries over which it has authority. As Van Till states "the object of study by the natural sciences is the physical universe, no more, no less." [20] We surely can't fault those involved in the natural sciences if they do what their job purports. Unfortunately, the boundaries are often overstepped. Creation science also errs at this point. Though they often fault naturalistic evolutionists of overstepping boundaries (and rightly so, for some surely do), they themselves are often guilty of the same transgression.

Van Till defines scientific creationism as "that perspective which proceeds from the claim that it is possible to employ the results of natural science to demonstrate that the universe was recently created in a mature and fully functioning form; that is, that the religiously derived concept of special creation can be validated by the results of scientific investigation." [21] This is an inadequate basis for belief in special creation. A conviction of God's special creation through the Word and Spirit of God begins with faith and not with scientific fact: "By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible" (Hebrews 11:3).

One clear example of science overstepping boundaries can be found in Carl Sagan's popular Cosmos series. In this series he purports that the only consistently reliable way to learn about reality is through natural science (a position called exclusivist

scientism). Sagan masterfully weds materialistic monism[22] with exclusivist scientism to produce a blend of folk science of religious proportions. The opening line to *Cosmos*, "The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be"[23] is a philosophical/religious statement. It is anything but natural science. In Carl Sagan's *Cosmos* television series, he sings the praises of the limitless boundaries and unrestricted applicability of science.

Its [Science] only sacred truth is that there are no sacred truths. All assumptions must be critically examined; arguments from authority are worthless. Whatever is inconsistent with the facts, however fond of it we are, must be discarded or revised. Science is not perfect. It's often misused. It's only a tool. But it's the best tool we have, self-correcting, ever-changing, applicable to everything. With this tool we vanquish the impossible.[24]

It is my contention that natural science is incapable of answering all the meaningful questions of life, of which the question of origins is primary. It also falls short in interpreting significance and meaning. Van Till writes, "Natural science is an appropriate and powerful tool for investigating and gaining knowledge about the physical features of the object of its study, but is wholly incapable of discovering its meaning".[25] He goes on to state that "the natural sciences are not capable of dealing with all conceivable questions about a physical object; only certain categories of questions lie within its domain." [26]

#### The Issue of Origins is Religious and/or Philosophical

The Biblical doctrine of creation is so foundational to Christian theology that it cannot be left to naturalistic scientists and secular philosophers, as if they have sole claim to this territory. Morton Smith writes,

It is on the basis of this doctrine alone [the doctrine of creation] that we can have an understanding of any facts found in the universe. The opening words of the Bible declare the fact that there is a two-layered view of reality. God is set forth as the self-existent, self-contained and self-sufficient Being who eternally existed prior to the creation of all else that exists. The phrase "heavens and the earth" is an all-encompassing phrase of all that exists besides God. Everything that exists outside of God is created. It is, therefore, created and dependent reality, while God is uncreated, self-contained Being.... Thus we have the Creator-creature distinction in the area of metaphysics that describes all of reality.[27]

This Creator-creature distinction is foundational to all self-understanding and especially relevant in an intellectual exercise on the grand scale of determining origin and destiny. God is the sole active agent in creation. Creation is necessarily related to the study of origin. Therefore, the study of creation is the proper domain of theologians. The issues involved in a study of origins are too important to be the exclusive domain of natural science.[28] I agree with Sid Dyer when he writes, "The author of Hebrews explains that the method and process of creation are understood by faith. It is a matter of revelation, not scientific investigation." [29]

#### MAJOR THEOLOGICAL POSITIONS ON CREATION

At least five major positions concerning the manner and mode of creation have developed within Christian theology. Although each position maintains that it is exegetical in origin, it is obvious in light of modern evolutionary theory that many of the positions have been developed in order to make room for this prevalent paradigm. Evolutionary theory, by definition, demands long periods of time.

Before briefly examining each view, a caution is in order. One of the key elements of disagreement between the views has to do with the length of the creation days. Many views either directly advocate, or allow for, the possibility of an old earth. This factor carries the advantage of corresponding to an old earth, thus harmonizing with the findings of natural science. In analyzing each respective view, one must not make the mistake that long periods of time require evolution. A Christian could hold to a view which advocates long periods of time without subscribing to evolutionary theory. Merely believing in an old earth does not necessarily brand one an evolutionist.

It must also be noted that all of the following positions claim to ground their views in an exegetical treatment of the creation account in Genesis 1. They all believe that Genesis 1 is special revelation from God and they all maintain that it is historical, relating to matters that actually occurred. The difference between the views is not one of origin, but one of differing conclusions concerning the details of creation. Thus, it is unfair to maintain that any one view is the "Biblical" view. All the views lay claim to this. The two most important questions that must be asked of each view are: (1) Which view is more exegetically consistent, treating the text with integrity and accuracy? (2) Which view more harmonizes with the totality of scriptural revelation?

#### Gap Theory or The Ruin-and-Restoration Hypothesis

This theory, made popular by the Scofield Reference Bible study notes and defended by Arthur Constance[30] attempts to provide room for the long amounts of time represented in the geological layers by explaining that there is a lengthy chronological gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. Gap-theorists translate Genesis 1:2 as "And the earth became formless and void" rather than the traditional reading "And the earth was formless and empty." The "formlessness (Heb. *bohu*) and void (Heb. *tohu*)" of Genesis 1:2 is explained as God's judgment on the first world he created (some speculate that this was a judgment in connection to Satan's rebellion). This is defended by calling attention to the other two times the phrase "formless and void" is found in the Hebrew Bible. In both cases it describes God's judgment and the desolating consequences that follow. Gap-theorists maintain that God's second creation of the ruined universe is then described in Genesis 1:3-2:3. This creation involved six 24-hour days and occurred between 10,000 to 20,000 years ago.

An obvious strength of this position is that it helps explain the apparent age of the earth while continuing to adhere to six 24-hour creation (or better, re-creation) days. The fossil record, as presently understood by secular scientists, is no problem for Gap-theorists. "The ancient fossils found on the earth, many of which are said to be millions of years old, stem from the first creation (4,500,000,000 years ago), which is mentioned only in Genesis 1:1." [31]

There are three weaknesses of the Gap Theory. First, the necessary translation "became formless and void" is based on a marginal reading of the Hebrew. The construction is grammatically possible but not likely. Second, the other two uses of the phrase "formless and void" do not necessarily refer to a destruction of a supposed "primordial" creation. They merely highlight that sin de-creates rather than creates and ultimately leads to chaos rather than peace. Third, the phrases used to speak of God's creation appear full and complete, leaving no room for a previous creation: "God saw all that He had made" (Gen. 1:31) and "Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts" (Gen. 2:1). This is later confirmed in Exo. 20:11: "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them."

In contrast to the marginal reading advocated by Gap-theorists, the first two verses of Genesis should be read as a unit. This description of God's original creation and its unformed state is the backdrop for the rest of the creation account. The phrase "formless and void" denotes an unformed condition, not a destructive condition resulting from God's judgment. There is no hint that God was displeased with these initial conditions. The words "formless" and "empty" simply describe the condition that things were in at this early stage of creation. In the state of bohu and tohu the earth is uninhabitable for human beings. This does not connote an evil condition, it merely speaks of an unformed condition that must be renovated for the sake of human habitation. In short, it is impossible to overlook the fact that to Gap-theorists, Genesis 1 does not describe the "Creation-Week" but rather the "Restoration-Week." The account of "primordial" creation thus remains an impenetrable mystery to advocates of the Gap Theory.

#### Day-Age Theory

Advocates of this view maintain that the days of Genesis 1 represent long "ages" of time. Many of the Princeton Theologians of old held to this view as well as other notable theologians.[32] In this view, the sequence of the six days is maintained, but the length of the days is expanded. This theory does provide an explanation for time issues related to the apparent age of the earth, but it doesn't solve seemingly unnatural chronological issues in the biblical text (e.g. the survival of vegetation [created in Day 3] apart from the light of the sun [created in Day 4]) nor does it adequately deal with the immediacy of creation by divine fiat.

Advocates of this position often use Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8[33] to defend the view that the days of creation can be understood to be extended periods of time. This is to miss the point of the texts: "In both of these texts... day is to be taken literally. Otherwise there would be no comparison. The texts simply show that with respect to the eternity of God there is no difference between a day and a thousand years." [34] In other words, God's perspective of time differs considerably from ours. Those who focus on the phrase "one day is as a thousand years" rarely develop the implications of the contrasting phrase "a thousand years is as one day." This verse is not a warrant to come up with a mathematical formula to discover "God's time-clock". Rather, this verse teaches that time has both a brevity and an intensity beyond our appreciation.

In passing it must be noted that many try to claim that Augustine advocated the Day-Age Theory by quoting the well-known phrase from *The City of God*, "What kind of days these were it is extremely difficult, or perhaps impossible to determine." [35] David Hall, in his article, *The Evolution of Mythology*, has done an outstanding job of debunking this claim with Augustine's own quotes.[36] As it turns out, Augustine did not hold to long days. Instead, he wrote in support of an instantaneous creation.

#### The Framework Hypothesis

This view has found increasing support in the evangelical world. Advocates of this position believe that the intention of Genesis 1 is not to give information concerning time, but to present an orderly, theological explanation of origins. "[T]he six days of Genesis 1 are not intended to indicate a chronological sequence of events, but are rather a literary 'framework,' which the author uses to teach us about God's creative activity." [37] The use of six days is merely a literary device the author of Genesis used to teach that God created everything. This interpretation does not focus on the chronological elements in the text, making it compatible with an old earth. Popular advocates include Meredith Kline, Henri Blocher, and Mark Futato.

Proponents of this view strongly believe their position is solidly rooted in an exegetical treatment of the creation account. Mark Ross writes,

The Framework Hypothesis argues, on exegetical grounds, that the organizing principle of the creation account is topical rather than chronological. It denies, on exegetical grounds, that the seven-day week is intended as a chronological unfolding of the separate acts of creation limited in duration to one calendar week.[38]

Framework advocates claim that Genesis 1 is structured in a poetical or strophic framework. Each day is presented as a frame or picture in and of itself. Two sets of three days in parallel are used to demonstrate creation.

Dwellings/Kingdoms

Dwellers/Kings

Day 1 - Earth, Day/Night

Day 4 - Luminaries

Day 2 - Sky/Seas

Day 5 - Birds/Fish

Day 3 - Dry Land/Plants

Day 6 - Animals/Man

Those who hold to the Framework Hypothesis claim unnecessary and insurmountable difficulties emerge if Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 are both considered to be in chronological sequence and compared with one another. In Genesis 1, the creation of mankind (1:26-27) follows the creation of vegetation (1:11-12) and the animals (1:24-25). In Genesis 2, it appears as if the creation of man precedes the creation of vegetation (2:5) and the animals (2:19). Because of the difficulties in harmonizing the two accounts, it is maintained that neither Genesis 1 nor Genesis 2 are structured chronologically and sequentially.[39] As Mark Ross states, "Not chronology, but theology structured the narrative, despite its sequential, chronological appearance." (emphasis

his).[40] Ross concludes that "it would appear that neither Genesis One nor Genesis Two is to be taken as a strictly sequential, chronological order of events. In both cases, the narrative order seems to be determined by topical, theological interests" (emphasis his).[41] This by no means discounts the historical nature of the narrative, it just calls into question whether the author intended to inform us of the exact sequence of the separate acts of creation.[42]

Ross admits that, on the surface, the creation account truly appears to be sequential and chronological. There is no reason to abandon that which is such a major component of the structure of Genesis 1 and 2. The differences between Genesis 1 and 2 can be explained without throwing away their chronological structure. In Genesis 2:4[43] the author focuses our attention on a particular place on earth, the garden of Eden. The focus shifts from the universal focus of Genesis 1:1-2:3 to a localized focus on a particular area in Genesis 2:4-23. Perhaps the reversal of the phrase "heavens and the earth" to "earth and heaven" in Genesis 2:4 draws attention to this shift.

In regard to the vegetation in Genesis 2:5,[44] Pipa notes that "Moses does not describe all the plants of the earth, but two categories: 'shrub of the field' and 'plant of the field.'"[45] This passage is not an exhaustive or complete account of the creation of vegetation as found in Genesis 1:9-13. Rather it involves the local situation in the Garden of Eden, describing the immediate environment and Adam's importance in it. In regard to the appearance of the animals in Genesis 2:19, the reading the NIV adopts is not only grammatically correct, but also corrects the problem that older translations present. The KJV and NASB make it appear that God created the animals in the presence of Adam ("out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast..."). The NIV is translated in such a way that it is obvious the animals God parades before Adam are the result of God's prior creative work ("Now the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the beasts..."). The text emphasizes God's previous creation of the animals in order to highlight the impending creation of a mate for Adam. In so doing, God taught Adam that only God's provision can satisfy Adam's needs and desires.

In light of the arguments above, there is no reason to abandon the chronological and sequential components of the creation account. Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 can be harmonized while removing their respective chronological sequence.

Another problem with the Framework Hypothesis is the framework itself. Difficulties arise upon further examination of the proposed framework. Elements within the framework structure do not fit quite as nicely as it would first appear. Dr. Wayne Grudem gives a summary of difficulties from which I quote highlights:

"[T]he proposed correspondence between the days of creation is not nearly as exact as its advocates have supposed. The sun, moon, and stars created on the fourth day as 'lights in the firmament of the heavens' (Gen. 1:14) are placed not in any space created on Day 1 but in the 'firmament'... that is created on the second day...

Moreover, the parallel between Days 2 and 5 is not exact, because in some ways the preparation of a space for the fish and birds of Day 5 does not come in Day 2 but in Day 3. It is not until Day 3 that God gathers the waters together and calls them 'seas' (Gen. 1:10), and on Day 5 the fish are commanded to 'fill the waters in the seas' (Gen. 1:22). Again in verses 26 and 28 the fish are called 'fish of the sea,' giving repeated emphasis to the fact that the sphere the fish inhabit was specifically formed on Day 3... Flying things created [on Day 5] (the Hebrew word would include flying insects as well as birds) not only fly in the sky created on Day 2, but also live and multiply on the 'earth' or 'dry land' created on Day 3. (Note God's command on Day 5: 'Let birds multiply on the earth' [Gen. 1:22].) Finally, the parallel between Days 3 and 6 is not precise, for nothing is created on Day 6 to fill the seas that are gathered together on Day 3." [46]

#### Theistic Evolution

This position holds that most, if not all, living organisms developed by the process of evolution. At crucial times of development, God intervened, guiding the process for His own ends. Some theistic evolutionists would maintain that God intervened at three crucial points: (1) the creation of matter at the beginning; (2) the creation of the simplest life form; and (3) the creation of man.[47] God's creating power and evolutionary theory are both upheld. God merely begins the evolutionary process and so guides it in order to produce His desired results. Thus, evolution was the primary means by which God created.

The strength of this position is that it claims the best of both worlds--theism and naturalism. The immediate problems with this position are numerous. First, God's ordered creation seems at odds with the randomness inherent in the evolutionary process. Second, the commands of God in the creation account appear to bring immediate and complete results. Third, and most importantly, the special creation of Adam and Eve does not appear to be a mere breathing of rational life into two primitive apelike creatures. Instead, the special creation of Adam and Eve presents us with beings who possess linguistic, moral, and spiritual abilities.

In my opinion, this perspective is a capitulation to evolutionary theory--an attempt to satisfy both creationists and evolutionists, yet rarely satisfying either group. It is a minimalist version of creation, requiring little more than the supernatural origin of a single cell. Progressive Creationism, a variant form of theistic evolution tries even harder to be all things to all people. It teaches that God spoke in 24-hour periods, but the events he spoke of were not fulfilled until ages later.

#### The 24-Hour Day View

This view advocates that the days of the creation account represent normal 24-hour days. Advocates include G. Vos, H. Bavinck, A. Kuyper, Dabney, C. F. Keil, Louis Berkhof, H. C. Leupold, and John Currid. It is this view which I will attempt to defend in the remainder of this paper.

#### A Personal Disclaimer

It must be stated at the beginning that I have no particular axe to grind in certain key areas which usually pressure theologians to advocate a certain view.

Historically, Seventh Day Adventists have led the pack in developing a literal one week, 24-hour day view in order to preserve their particular emphasis on Sabbath-keeping.[48] Recently, Reformed Theologians, who are equally concerned to preserve Sabbath-keeping,[49] viewing it as a necessary element of God's unchanging moral law, have vigorously defended the 24-hour day view as well.

I am not convinced that the application of Exodus 20:9-10 stands or falls on seven 24-hour days in the creation account. It is obvious that the main thrust of the command is that we are to imitate God in His pattern of work and rest. It is also obvious that our work and rest are in no way identical to God's work and rest--especially His work and rest during the first week of the universe!

I believe our obedience to this command has an analogy to God's actions in creation. There is a point of similarity. We are to copy God's pattern. This can be done without demanding that the original creation days were normal 24-hour periods. I agree with Harris[50] when he writes that "our particular six 24 hour days of labor are symbolic of, not equivalent to, God's six long days of creative labor." [51] We are to follow a six-plus-one pattern in our work and rest as demonstrated by God in the six-plus-one pattern of creation.[52] Work and rest are still highly elevated with or without an exact one-to-one correspondence with the days of creation. Franz Delitzsch writes, "When the name 'work' [Heb mlkh] is given to God's six days' creation, human work [designated by the same word in Exodus 20:9-10] is ennobled to the highest conceivable degree, as being the copy of this model." [53]

Fundamentalists often feel a need to defend the literal 24-hour day view in order to defend the second coming of Christ and their literal interpretation of Revelation.[54] However, the 24-hour days of Genesis have little bearing on how one treats Revelation for one overriding reason: the documents are two different literary genres altogether! Genesis is narrative literature and Revelation is apocalyptic literature. These two different genres demand two different kinds of reading. For example, one could easily believe in the day-age or gap theory and still hold to a literal second coming of Christ.

Because I have no hidden agenda concerning Sabbath-keeping or literalizing Revelation, my sole focus in Genesis 1 is to treat the creation account with exegetical integrity and seek to harmonize it with the remainder of scriptural revelation.

#### A DEFENSE OF 24-HOUR DAYS

##### What Type of Literature is Genesis 1?

Any good exegetical treatment of Scripture must involve defining the literary genre of the text under analysis. Those who hold to the Framework Hypothesis advocate that Genesis 1 is poetry. However, Genesis 1 is not poetry, nor is it wisdom literature. It is clearly narrative literature. If one compares the poetic accounts of creation in Job 38:8-11 and Psalm 104:5-9 with Genesis 1, the difference between poetry and narrative will be readily apparent.

The grammar and sequence of the text clearly indicate its narrative construction. "[T]he text has the grammatical mark of sequential narrative, the waw consecutive. Moses uses the waw consecutive 55 times in these 31 verses." [55] The wayyqtl [vav-consecutive] is used primarily to indicate temporal sequence of events. The most obvious and frequent use of the vav-consecutive is that of simple chronological succession. It is not a feature of poetry, but of prose.

##### What is the Context of Genesis 1?

Genesis 1 must be considered in light of its position in the book of Genesis. As Pipa comments, it "must be seen as part of the whole. It introduces a book that is historical narrative. What reasons are there to suggest that the first chapter is not in the genre of that which it introduces?... the book of Genesis is sequential, narrative history, therefore our analysis of the genre of chapter 1 ought to begin with the genre of the entire book." [56] Genesis 1 must be related to the entire book of Genesis which is fashioned around the 10 "these are the generations" sayings (Genesis 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:20, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9; 37:2). The creation account "sustains an intimate relationship with the remainder of the book. The remainder of the book (i.e., The Generations) presupposes the Creation Account, and the Creation Account prepares for what follows. The two portions of Genesis are integral parts of the book and complement one another." [57]

The narrative proceeds from the less complex aspects of creation to the more complex aspects. In the process, the point of focus constantly sharpens throughout the narrative. Initially God creates the entire universe and immediately attention is shifted to a water-covered earth. Then God separates the waters (by means of the heavens) and attention is shifted again to the earth. Finally, God separates the waters under the heavens from the dry land. At this point, attention is shifted once again to focus primarily on the dry land of the earth.

##### A Survey of the Text of Genesis 1:1 - 2:3

##### Beginnings and Background

(1:1) In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Two renderings are possible: the traditional (reflected above) or the alternative "When God began to create the heavens and the earth." Not only do the accents in the Hebrew text favor the first, but this reading is found in the Septuagint and is also alluded to in John 1:1. The alternative reading holds open the possibility of eternal or pre-existing matter that God molds for His purposes, an idea found nowhere else in Scripture. The traditional reading presents a creation ex nihilo (from nothing), a doctrine in harmony with the rest of Scripture (Isa. 40:26; Heb. 11:3; Rev. 4:11). Finally, the Hebrew verb *barah*, meaning "to create," is always used with God as the subject and always involves a creation from nothing. Thus, based on textual arguments and the analogy of Scripture, the first reading is to be preferred.

God created all that exists as evidenced by the Hebrew all-inclusive phrase "heavens and the earth." [58] In short, we could say that God created everything out of nothing. Time is included in this. Indeed, one could say that time was God's first creation,

followed by space and matter. At the end of the creation account, God will sanctify time by sanctifying the seventh day. To admit that this text describes the first step in time is important when it comes to defining "day".

The small space accorded the origin of the universe in the creation account (it is dispensed with in one verse!) reveals its relative purpose to the overall meaning of Genesis 1. The rest of the creation account will begin to describe God's particular work on the earth. Obviously, cosmogony is not the purpose of Genesis 1. Rather, one of the major purposes of Genesis 1 is to describe "the making and shaping of the earth as a place for humans to live in fellowship with their Maker." [59]

Finally, it must be noted that the primary subject of Genesis 1 is the Creator, not the creation. God is continually active throughout the entire account. The text reveals a God who creates, sees, speaks, divides, calls, blesses and counsels. The central character is undoubtedly God. Everything is created in order to be a revelatory instrument of God. It goes without saying that God is sovereign over all creation, being the Creator of all that exists.

(1:2) And the earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters.

As stated above, the perspective now changes from the entire universe to a particular focus on the earth. This change in perspective does not demand a break in the text. Gap-theorists maintain that there is a time-gap between verses 1 and 2. They would render this text "and the earth became formless and void." This does not accord with the syntax of the two verses. C. John Collins writes, "the verbs of vv. 1-2 are not wayyiqtol, i.e. they are not the normal narrative tense. Instead the verbs are in the perfect tense; the normal function of this verb form at the beginning of a narrative segment is to give what is called 'background information.'" [60]

Verse 2 is the controlling framework of the entire chapter. Three circumstantial clauses simply describe a condition: "earth was... darkness was... Spirit of God was..." They do not speak of any action but provide the background to the main verb in verse 3: "Let there be light." From this point God will progressively shape, order and fill the formless void and dark mass.

The words formless (Heb. bohu) and void (Heb. tohu) occur together in only two other passages (Isaiah 34:11 and Jeremiah 4:23). Both passages clearly allude to Genesis 1:2. Shaw writes, "These terms make it clear that the earth, at its beginning, was empty, uninhabitable and dark. The following narrative then recounts the manner in which the darkness is removed; the emptiness is filled; and the earth is made habitable for man." [61]

Those who hold to the Framework Hypothesis view this text as presenting two defects (unformed and unfilled) which God respectively addresses in Days 1-3 (forming) and Days 4-6 (filling). Pipa presents a further defect. "I think it best to see a threefold deficit which God remedies in reverse order: unformed, unfilled, and dark. Darkness is remedied on day 1; formlessness on days 2 and 3; and void on days 4-6." [62] This threefold deficit wreaks havoc on the tidy two-fold division of Days 1-3 and 4-6 of the Framework Hypothesis.

Framework advocates also consider many elements of the text to be metaphorical (e.g. evening, morning, day). However, the only hint in the entire chapter of metaphorical language is found in this verse. The "Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of these waters." Like an eagle brooding over her children, the Spirit of God is revealed as brooding over God's creation.

#### Day One

(1:3-5) Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light. And God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.

This particular text reveals a pattern that is repeated throughout the Genesis account. The pattern involves five stages:

- Announcement: And God said... (3, 6, 9, 14, 20, 24, 26)
- Command: Let there be... (3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26)
- Report: And it was so (3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 24)
- Evaluation: And God saw that it was good (4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31)
- Temporal Framework: And there was evening and morning, Day \_\_\_\_\_ (5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31)

Pipa writes, "[T]he structure within each day asserts that each distinct part of the creation was made immediately and absolutely by God. Each day is, so to speak, a self-contained unit, whose structure implies completion." [63] By mere verbal fiat, light breaks into the dark world. In an instant, God creates something from nothing. The text presents a spontaneity and immediacy between God's command and its result. We find this to be true: God imposes His will by His word. This truth is in accord with the entirety of scriptural revelation.

If the text is viewed chronologically and sequentially, an apparent problem arises at this point: light exists apart from the sun. Those troubled by this "miss the point of the narrative, that light is not necessarily connected with the luminaries. Rather, light is necessarily connected with God himself." [64] Dr. Currid maintains that this light was the "effulgent splendor of the divine Presence." [65] The idea that light can exist independent of the sun is not unique to Genesis. In Job 38:19-20, light and darkness are presented as dwelling in a place that Job cannot reach or understand. In the new heavens and new earth, there is no need for the sun or moon "for the glory of God illumines the city, and its lamp is the Lamb" (Rev. 21:23). We find this glorious reality described further in Revelation 22:5: "And there shall no longer be any night; and they shall not have need of the light of a lamp nor the light of the sun, because the Lord God shall illumine them; and they shall reign forever and ever." In redeemed creation, the presence of God provides the light. According to Biblical revelation, the presence of light does not demand a created light-bearer. "God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5).

God announced that the "light was good." The phrase "was good" is used seven times in the creation account, symbolizing a completeness and fullness. In this act, God clearly reveals His prerogative as Creator to define what is good. He then proceeds to name that which He has created, further revealing His sovereignty and authority over His creation.

In the final analysis, every different creation theory is distinguished by its interpretation of the following phrase: "and there was evening and there was morning, one day." More specifically, the interpretation of the word "day" (Heb. yom) is the focal point of disagreement and debate.

There are three primary meanings for yom: (1) the period of daylight; (2) a period of 24 hours; and (3) a period of time of unspecified length; an epoch, season, or time.[66] Definitions 1 and 2 reflect the word's primary meaning. The fact that the writer describes the days as composed of the natural parts of morning and evening seems to validate the natural reading of a normal day.[67] Shaw develops the implications of the reference to evening and morning further: "'And there was evening' indicates the end of the first daytime, and 'and there was morning' indicates the arrival of the second morning, hence the end of the first complete day." [68]

#### Day Two

(1:6-8) Then God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters." And God made the expanse, and separated the waters which were below the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse; and it was so. And God called the expanse heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day.

The simple word "expanse" has led to a wildly speculative theory. In *The Genesis Flood*, authors Henry Morris and John Whitcomb regularly allude to "a great vapor canopy" that enveloped the antediluvian earth.[69] They claim that this canopy produced a "green house effect" that "gave the entire world a relatively mild and uniform climate, protected antediluvians from the harmful effects of cosmic radiation and thus greatly extended their lives, and provided a vast reservoir of water that deluged the earth during the flood of Noah." [70]

The "expanse" (KJV, firmament) could better be translated the "extended surface." [71] Collins writes "This is a way of describing what we call the atmosphere as if it were 'the semi-spherical vault of heaven stretched over the earth and its water.' Many have tried to take this as some sort of 'cloud cover,' but the Hebrew does not invite such a reading, since the word 'extended surface' appears in Psalm 19:2 and Daniel 12:3 as a designation of the 'sky' as we know it." [72] The immediate context suggests otherwise. On Day 4, the sun and moon were placed "in the expanse of the heavens" (repeated three times in 14, 15, 17). Later, we find birds flying "in the expanse of the heavens" (20). As Shaw states, those who want to impose the idea of a solid water vault covering the earth make "the mistake of substituting etymology for context" [73] and completely ignore the consistent usage of the term within the creation account.

Curiously, the second day is the only day which does not receive a positive evaluation from God ("And God said, 'It is good'"). Shaw gives some insight on the possible reason for this deficit: "The work of the second day is, as it were, an intermediate work, incomplete; and the pronunciation of the 'benediction' here is out of place." [74]

#### Day Three

(1:9-13) Then God said, "Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear"; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good. Then God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit after their kind, with seed in them, on the earth"; and it was so. And the earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit, with seed in them, after their kind; and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a third day.

The last major environmental separation occurs as God separates the waters under the heavens from the dry land. From this point forward, the attention of the text is shifted primarily to the dry land of the earth--the dominant region of mankind's habitation.

Like the preceding fiat pronouncements, there is an immediacy between God's command and its fulfillment. According to Robert Jamieson, the picture presented in this text "conveys an impression that the change was effected, not by a slow and gradual process, but with the violent impetuosity of an overwhelming torrent...a volcanic convulsion by which great changes were wrought on the earth's surface;--the upheaving of some parts, the depression of others, and the consequent formation of vast hollows, into which the waters impetuously rushed." [75]

The different plants are described as containing the necessary means for their own propagation and continuance in the form of "seed". The word "kind" (Heb. myn), reveals the order God innately places in His creation from the beginning.[76] Shaw writes, "The recognition of divinely imposed order, even on the lesser parts of creation, is of significance in the law (the prohibition of 'mixing') and of significance for Christian ethical reflection." [77] Caution must be taken in using this word for any other purpose. It is not a precise scientific term and not meant to be used as such.

Mark Ross maintains that since "there is no sun at this point in time (nor moon, nor stars), in days one through three, we have a non-standard, a somewhat metaphorical or extended use of the terms involved, since they are being used without some of their normal implications." [78] In light of this, he concludes that "we are dealing with some element of metaphor or analogy within the passage." [79] He uses this argument to reject the uniformity of all six days. R. Laird Harris employs a similar argument. "The fact remains that the daily round of sunlight and darkness is not mentioned before the fourth day and therefore to insist that the first three days were like our days runs into quite a problem." [80] In my opinion, this is still not sufficient reason to abandon the apparent uniform structure of the creation days. Textually, there appears to be no difference in the description of the days.

#### Day Four

(1:14-19) Then God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so. And God made the two great lights, the greater light to govern the day, and the lesser light to govern the night; He made the stars also. And God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.

Preceding this time, the alternation of darkness and light occurred apart from the instrumentation of the luminaries. Now that task of illumination and division is assigned to the "lights in the expanse of the heavens." God's creatures now differentiate between night and day, dark and light.

The purpose of the luminaries is not limited to giving light, they also function to mark time, dividing day from night. In this way, God once again sanctifies time. "It is really at this point that God's sanctification of time, which becomes more pointed in day seven, begins to be evident." [81]

#### Day Five

(1:20-23) Then God said, "Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens." And God created the great sea monsters, and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth." And there was evening and there was morning, a fifth day.

God creates "every living creature." The fact that each category of creature replicates after its "kind" again points to its particular place in God's divine order. God pronounces a blessing upon the animals consisting primarily in reproduction after their kind.

#### Day Six

(1:24-25) Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind"; and it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good.

More space is allotted to day six than to all other days of creation (day four is second). The day begins with the creation of three major types of land animals. "The types of land animals, not including the birds, are considered to be of three general kinds: the *hyt h'rts*--a term generally used to refer to wild animals; the *bhmh*--a term specifically referring to cattle, but often used to refer generally to domestic, or tamed animals; and the creeping animals--small animals, or animals that live and move close to the ground." [82]

Again the creatures have a prominent and appointed place in God's creation as designated by the use of the term "kind." Unlike previous days, God evaluates the situation as "good" before the end of the day, preparing the way for the climax of creation.

(1:26) Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth."

God's divine counsel precedes the climax of creation. The creation of mankind is set apart from the creation of everything else and introduced in a unique fashion. Up until now, God has spoken with authority, now we trace an element of affection in His speech.

Who is this God who creates? The use of the first person plural ("Let us make man") has led to many theories concerning the meaning of this plurality. Liberal critics contend that this is a remnant of primitive polytheism. These critics would contend that religion itself is evolutionary and progressed from polytheism to monotheism. This conclusion, however, is unwarranted. [83] Some contend that God is speaking to the angels in a heavenly court. This explanation has to be rejected due to the fact that human beings are not created in the image of angels, but in the image of God (cf. Heb 2:14-18). If God were deliberating with the angels concerning making man "in Our image" it would follow that human beings would be fashioned in the image of God and the image of angels. Others argue that God is speaking in the "plurality of majesty." However, at the time of the writing of Genesis 1, this lofty style used by kings speaking of themselves was not yet known. It appears that the best view is to recognize an early hint at a plurality within God that will come into full view as the doctrine of the Trinity is revealed and developed in the New Testament. This accords with the language of the text as well as with the remaining testimony of Scripture. "Who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor?" (Romans 11:34; cf. Isa. 40:14)

(1:27) And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Collins comments on the significance of this verse: "The threefold repetition of 'created'; the poetical parallelism of the lines; the divine self-consultation in verse 26; and the fact that 'day six' gets the most space in the narrative, all show that this is the peak. This helps us to see that the communicative purpose of this account is to describe the preparation of the earth from the perspective of its being a habitation for humans to live and to serve their glorious Creator." [84]

If the creation of man is contrasted with the previous creation of vegetation and animals, an immediate contrast is revealed. The vegetation was formed "after their kind" (Gen. 1:12). Likewise, the animals were formed "after their kind" (Gen. 1:21). Only man is dignified with the glorious quality of being formed "in [God's] image; after [God's] likeness" (Gen. 1:26). The image of God in man is the capstone of man's exalted status. Mankind resembles God more than any other creature.

The image is not dominion itself; dominion is the result and function of bearing God's image. The image is not the possession of gender; this indicates the broad scope of the image, embracing both men and women. The image involves being uniquely equipped to commune with God and represent Him on earth as His unique image-bearer.

(1:28) And God blessed them; and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky, and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

God speaks words of blessing and words of command. Even in a sinless paradise, mankind does not live on bread alone, but on every word which proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord. God gives positive commands to the humans in paradise and charges them to multiply and rule over the earth as His vice-regents and representatives. They are given the task of faithful stewardship over all that God has given them. They are uniquely suited to the task in that they are created in God's image and blessed and privileged by His word.[85]

(1:29-30) Then God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you; and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to every thing that moves on the earth which has life, I have given every green plant for food"; and it was so.

The earth is given to mankind (Psalm 115:15-16). Mankind is given the preeminent and dignified position of ruling under the authority of God, representing Him to His creation (Psalm 8). God gives man all things richly to enjoy, providing a beautiful and bountiful variety for his pleasure.

(1:31) And God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.

God's word of benediction ("behold, it was very good") refers to all the previous six days of work ("all that He had made"). At this point in the narrative, God had clearly finished His work of special creation. His final pronouncement of pleasure, delight, and satisfaction proclaims that the universe was precisely what He wanted it to be.

It is significant that this supreme benediction does not occur until the creation of mankind. Albert Baylis writes, "The Bible does not view humanity as an accident, nor as an unnecessary appendage to life. We are God's crowning achievement. Without mankind the world would be incomplete and unfinished. In the story of creation, the refrain after each stage is, 'And God saw that it was good.' But not until the climax of the story, the creation of humanity, does the writer say, 'God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good.'"[86]

This ends the supernatural creation of God's universe. "Out of desolation, emptiness, and chaos, God creates order and beauty and makes a habitation fit for a king--his royal creation and representative, mankind." [87]

#### Day Seven

(2:1-3) Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts. And by the seventh day God completed His work which He had done; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made.

The climax of God's act of creation is not found in an even higher and more intense flurry of supernatural activity, but in a divine rest of enjoyment in His creative work. Just as at the beginning of the text, the focus is on God and his activity, here His activity takes on a new dimension. God rests from His work of special creation and actively takes delight in His accomplishment. The outworking of His plan gives Him pleasure while simultaneously declaring His glory! This theme will carry through the entirety of the Scriptures.

Many make a big deal of the fact that the seventh day does not include the formula of the preceding six: "and it was evening and it was morning, day \_\_\_\_." Some use this to prove that "day" should not always be considered a 24-hour period. Claiming that the seventh day is an eternal day, they argue that it is reasonable to question whether the previous six days represent 24-hour days. Pipa gives the reason: "The absence of the formula used for the other six days is in part explained grammatically. The phrase 'evening and morning' links the day that is concluding with the next day. For example the morning that marks the end of day one also marks the beginning of day two. Thus, we do not find the formula at the end of the seventh day, since the week of creation is completed." [88] He goes on to say, "even though it lacks the conclusion of the other six days, it is still designated seventh in sequence by the ordinal number." [89] Furthermore, Pipa also calls us to note that God does not bless His eternal rest per se, but rather, He blesses a day (Gen. 2:3), again calling attention to the possibility that the day is a normal 24-hour day.

#### THE ANALOGY OF SCRIPTURE

One important element of biblical hermeneutics is the principle of the "analogy of Scripture". This is more popularly known as the principle that Scripture is its own best interpreter and thus Scripture interprets Scripture. This principle stems from the belief that ultimately, behind the minds of the various human authors, there lies one divine mind. God's authorship of the Holy Scriptures through His Spirit assures that His revelation will be consistent and harmonious. Since all of Scripture is not equally clear, this principle teaches that clearer Biblical texts should be used to interpret more obscure or ambiguous texts.

Using this principle, one can amass the relevant Scriptural testimonies concerning creation in order to better understand the original creation account. I believe that the unanimous witness of Scripture vindicates God's definitive creation from no previously existing matter by means of His word alone. I believe that all the passages also concur completely with the six 24-hour day theory of creation. Not one Scripture introduces a conflict or challenge to the 24-hour day view I have defended.

#### Old Testament Texts

Numerous Scriptures draw attention to God's act of creation. In Isaiah, God prefaces his announcements and commands by reminding the people of his initial work of creation (Isaiah 42:5; 45:7, 12). In contrast to the Gap Theory, God clearly states that

He "formed the light and created the darkness" (Isaiah 45:7), a clear allusion to Genesis 1:2--further evidence that Genesis 1:2 is not the ruinous result of God's judgment.

Repeatedly throughout the Psalms, the psalmists evoke praise by recounting God's work of creation (e.g. Psalm 95:3-6; 100:3; 104:5-9; 148:1-6). The psalmists focus on the fact that it was God's word alone which brought into being all that exists.

By the word of the Lord the heavens were made,  
And by the breath of His mouth all their host.  
He gathers the waters of the sea together as a heap;  
He lays up the deeps in storehouses.  
Let all the earth fear the Lord;  
Let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of Him.  
For He spoke, and it was done;  
He commanded, and it stood fast. (Psalm 33:6-9, italics mine)  
Praise the Lord!  
Praise the Lord from the heavens;  
Praise Him in the heights!  
Praise Him, all His angels;  
Praise Him, all His hosts!  
Praise Him, sun and moon;  
Praise Him, all stars of light!  
Praise Him, highest heavens,  
And the waters that are above the heavens!  
Let them praise the name of the Lord,  
For He commanded and they were created.  
He has also established them forever and ever;  
He has made a decree which will not pass away. (Psalm 148:1-6, italics mine)

In response to Job's cry for vindication, God reveals His glory by reminding Job of the greatness of His creation (38:1-7). In response to God's display, Job is humbled and repentant (Job 40:3-5). God's argument rests on divine design, the free exercise of His sovereignty, and His mighty oversight over all created things. This argument does not seem too convincing if God merely presents to Job the result of natural evolutionary processes.

Finally, Exodus 20:11 clearly states that "in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth." The burden of proof rests on those that would deny the creation days were completely different than days as we now experience them.

#### New Testament Texts

In the introductory words of John's Gospel, John alludes to the opening words of Genesis. In John's account of "the beginning"--in contrast to Genesis--he writes of "the Word" who was both "with God" and "was God". He then writes of the instrumentality of the Word in creation. The terms he uses to define God's creation through the Word are all-inclusive and all-embracing: "All things came into being by Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being" (John 1:3). John goes even further into the Genesis text when he states that it is the Word who is "the light" that "shines in the darkness" (John 1:5). Just as the primordial light of God's effulgent glory shone into the chaos of the unformed void, now God's Word becomes the light which shines in the darkness.

Christ Himself appears to infer the recent creation of the universe in His teaching concerning marriage. "Christ's use of 'from the beginning' to refer to the time of the institution of marriage in Matthew 19:4 and Mark 10:6 suggests that God made man chronologically close to the events of Genesis 1:1-25. The phrase "From the beginning" seems to be a linguistic tag to Genesis 1:1." [90] In other words the phrase "from the beginning" does not refer to the beginning of mankind, but to the beginning of creation itself, implying a close chronological connection between the creation of the universe and the creation of mankind.

In the book of Acts, Paul calls Jews to repent of their sin and turn to the "living God, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that is in them" (Acts 14:15). Later in Acts, Paul begins His proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentile philosophers by beginning at creation:

The God who made the world and all things in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands; neither is He served by human hands, as though He needed anything, since He Himself gives to all life and breath and all things; and He made from one, every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed times, and the boundaries of their habitation. (Acts 17:24-26)

Paul clearly speaks of God's creation of all things, God's self-sufficiency, God's gracious gifts to all mankind, and the common bond that all human beings from every nation have in the person of Adam ("He made from one"). Apparently, Paul viewed these truths as foundational to the development and proclamation of the gospel. [91]

In 1 Corinthians 11:7-12, Paul teaches that man was created by God and that the woman originated from the man, thus treating the Genesis 2 account literally.

In 2 Corinthians 4:6 Paul considers the work of regeneration in the heart of lost sinners to have its origin in the creative command of God. Just as God's word, "Let there be light" immediately and instantaneously caused light to shine in the darkness, so it is that God's proclaimed word--the Gospel--sheds light into the hearts of God's elect, giving "knowledge of the glory of God

in the face of Christ." Again, just as in Genesis 1:3 and John 1:5, a light that does not have its origin in the physical sun is demonstrated to have powerful effects.

In Romans 1:19-20 Paul teaches that God has revealed Himself to all mankind through creation so that "His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that [all people] are without excuse."

The author of Hebrews highlights special creation and the reason for belief in God's action in it. "By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible" (Hebrews 11:3). The source of creation is clearly and exclusively God's divine fiat, not pre-existing matter or natural causes. And the reason that one would advocate such a supernatural origin is found in faith--a trust in God's integrity and the truthfulness of His word. In any discussion of origins, it is vital to note the order presented in Hebrews 11:3. It is not scientific facts which lead to a knowledge of special creation, rather, it is through faith that we understand these truths. This is a classic example of "faith seeking understanding." As Augustine wrote, we don't see in order to believe, but we believe in order to see. Or, more simply, in the words of Paul, "We walk by faith, and not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7).

The dominant teaching of the New Testament is that God created the material universe through the Son and for His glory (John 1:3; Eph. 3:9-11; Col. 1:15-16; Heb. 1:2). The doctrines of creation (general revelation) and redemption (special revelation) are united in the Person of the Son. God created with the purposes of redemption in mind. Prior to the act of creation, the divine intention of God was to redeem His people through Christ (Eph. 1:4; 2 Tim. 1:9). Thus, the eternal purpose of, and for, creation is (and always has been) redemption and restoration.

In short, the "Scripture, in the Pentateuch, the Poetical books, the Prophets, and the New Testament, uniformly treats the events of the creation account as discrete, factual events." [92] An allegiance to the principle of the analogy of Scripture seems to demand that God has created all that exists and that He has done it in such a way that the only way to disbelieve it is to suppress what is obviously true. The historicity of Adam and Eve is also embraced. [93]

#### WEAKNESSES OF THE 24-HOUR DAY VIEW

Every view has its share of problems. The 24-hour Day view is no exception. Following are two of the biggest criticisms of the 24-hour Day view.

##### The Apparent Age of the Earth

The 24-hour Day view precludes belief in an old earth. Its conclusions naturally lead to belief in a young earth. All exegetical arguments aside, if we consider creation on the basis of natural science alone, it does truly appear that the earth is of great age. A number of reasons can be given to answer a portion of the criticisms laid against a young earth, but no matter how hard one tries, reasonable objections still remain.

One solution involves explaining that God created all things with "apparent age." This answer is satisfactory to a point. Sid Dyer writes, "Obviously, the Lord created Adam with apparent age. Why should we not assume that He created the universe with apparent age? He undoubtedly created Adam mature with facial hair, molars, wisdom to exercise dominion over the animals, and the ability to reproduce (Gen. 1:28). The first trees would undoubtedly have had internal rings and their height would also have given the impression of age. A mature earth was the result of God's creative power, not ages upon ages." [94] It may be added that the trees were mature enough to bear fruit, and the light from the stars was such that Adam and Eve could view it.

Does this appearance of age make God a deceiver, as objectors contend? Grudem answers this challenge well:

But is God a "deceiver" if he creates a mature man and woman in a day and then tells us explicitly that he did it? Or if he creates mature fish and animals and full-grown trees and tells us that he did it? Or if he allows Adam and Eve to see the stars, which he created in order that people might see them and give glory to him, on the first night that they lived? Rather than manifesting deception, it seems that these actions point to God's infinite wisdom and power. This is particularly so if God explicitly tells us that he created everything in "six days." According to this position, those who are deceived are those who refuse to hear God's own explanation of how the creation came about. [95]

Though this explanation accounts for many things, it still falters in light of the fossil record. The fossil record not only presents the 24-hour Day view with the problem of appearance of age, but the fact that the fossil record presents a record of death, apparently from long ages ago, is also problematic.

Though some would attribute a large amount of the fossil record to Noah's flood, I remain unconvinced of this solution. [96] I am not convinced that "flood geology" is adequate to fully explain the problem of apparent age that stems from the fossil record. [97] In spite of my suspicion of flood geology's scientific veracity, I am convinced that the Scriptures speak clearly concerning the relation of suffering and death to God's universe.

The destiny of man and the earth are intimately related. From the beginning, God made the earth for mankind to possess and rule (Psalm 115:15-16). Mankind is responsible for its care and preservation. The fate of human beings and the earth is inextricably interlinked.

The fall of mankind introduced suffering and death into God's good creation (Gen. 2:16-17; Rom. 5:12-14). This subsequently brought a curse upon the earth (Gen. 3:17) and introduced suffering, decay, disease, difficulty, and ultimately, death. God immediately promised that deliverance from the effects of the fall would come through another man ("the seed of the woman"). However, he would come through and in the midst of a fallen and suffering creation (cf. Genesis 3:15-21).

Currently, creation groans in anticipation of the final redemption of the sons of God in order that it might be set free from its slavery to decay and corruption.

For the anxious longing of the creation waits eagerly for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now. (Romans 8:19-22)

Creation will experience a regeneration (Matthew 19:28) and be restored (Acts 3:21) to pristine glory in the new heavens and new earth. It is the fulfillment of this promise which is the goal of all the believer's longings and wishes. "But according to His promise we are looking for new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells" (2 Peter 3:13). In this restored cosmos, universal peace will reign on earth once again. This peace will extend over man, animal, and environment.

For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; And the former things shall not be remembered or come to mind...The wolf and the lamb shall graze together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and dust shall be the serpent's food. They shall do no evil or harm in all My holy mountain," says the Lord. (Isaiah 65:17, 25; cf. 11:6-9)

The culmination of redemption in the new heavens and new earth will introduce a whole new existence forever free from the curse of sin. "He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and there shall no longer be any death; there shall no longer be any mourning, or crying, or pain; the first things have passed away" (Revelation 21:4) for "there shall no longer be any curse" (Revelation 22:3).

Theologically, suffering and death are so intimately related to sin that I remain unconvinced that death, in any form, preceded the fall.

#### Similar Physical Features in God's Creatures

Under the influence of evolutionary theory, it is argued that man is simply an advanced version of an ape. The only truly distinctive quality about man is that he is more evolved than other creatures. Different aspects of the human body share similar design with other animals. Does this imply that humans possess no higher distinction than that they are more highly evolved than all of the many hundreds of thousands of species that exist on planet earth?

Dr. Robert Gange gives the following answer:

If a man is nothing but his body, then the anatomical and physiological similarities as the lever arm in frog, a bat, and a man might be considered evidence that man is nothing more than an animal at an elevated plan. This kind of argument, however, is analogous to saying that an airplane is merely an automobile at a higher level, because they both have wheels and engines; or that a television set is simply a radio at a higher level, because they both use the same transistors and speakers and operate by electricity. The point is that both human and animal life do share a common existence regarding physical things, such as running and seeing and hearing and breathing. But that's where the similarity ends.[98]

Obviously, there are similarities on a physical level. However, "the important thing is the differences, not the similarities. The similarities exist at the same functional level, whereas the differences introduce a completely new dimension." [99] As Gange convincingly argues, "Common structures represent optimum designs." [100]

There are grand differences between humans and the animal kingdom. Even if we limit ourselves to general revelation, we clearly observe qualities that make human beings unique. We see a creativity that is unlike anything else in the entire animal kingdom. Birds have sung the same song since the beginning of time; spiders have spun the same webs; ants have built the same hills. There is no originality, no creativity, no imagination or fancy invention within the animal kingdom. The bird does not write a special song for its mate, nor sing a sad, mournful dirge for the dead. His song remains the same millennium after millennium. Yet, with man we see a creativity that is matchless with its continued originality, imagination, and intrigue. Songs, poems, novels, paintings and other forms of art display man's creativity. Our intellectual capabilities, without equal in the animal kingdom, display our uniqueness. Our linguistic capabilities, our stature and uprightness, and our connection with the past and concern for the future, reveal our incomparable uniqueness.

#### Answering Evolutionary Theory

As a theologian, my areas of specialty do not extend into the fields of natural science, biology, anthropology or geology. However, I do not need to be a specialist in these areas to understand that a controversy currently rages within academic circles concerning evolutionary theory. The final word on evolution still has not been spoken. Significant books have been written (some from authors professing no adherence to religious belief) that have roundly criticized evolutionary theory. Among the more notable books are Micheal Behe's *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, [101] Michael Denten's *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, [102] and Phillip Johnson's *Darwin On Trial*. [103]

Michael Denten is an interesting case in point. After thoroughly criticizing various aspects of evolutionary theory, he concludes his book by stating,

Neither of the two fundamental axioms of Darwin's macroevolutionary theory--the concept of the continuity of nature, that is the idea of a functional continuum of all life forms linking all species together and ultimately leading back to a primeval cell, and the belief that all the adaptive design of life has resulted from a blind random process--have been validated by one single empirical discovery or scientific advance since 1859. [104]

Denten laments what he terms "the priority of the paradigm" [105] and expresses amazement concerning "the extraordinary lengths to which members of the scientific community will go to defend a theory just as long as it holds sufficient intrinsic appeal." [106] While acknowledging that evolutionists can be blinded by the "error of a priorism," [107] an error evolutionists usually ascribe to creation scientists, Denten still self-admittedly remains within the paradigm of evolutionary thought because he presently sees no other valid alternative.

Undoubtedly, one of the major factors which contribute to the immense appeal of the Darwinian framework is that, with all its deficiencies, the Darwinian model is still the only model of evolution ever proposed which invokes well-understood physical and natural processes as the causal agencies of evolutionary change. Creationist theories invoke frankly supernatural causes... Darwinism remains, therefore, the only truly scientific theory of evolution. It was the lack of any obvious scientific or any obvious scientific alternative which was one of its great attractions in the nineteenth century and has remained one of its enduring strengths ever since 1859. Reject Darwinism and there is, in effect, no scientific theory of evolution.[108]

Denten ends his book with a frustrated acceptance of Darwinism as the only consistent framework for scientific research, primarily because no other competing paradigms are feasible. He holds out hope for the possibility that "living systems could possess some novel, unknown property or characteristic which might conceivably have played a role in evolution." [109]

Denten's example proves that significant differences and disagreements still remain within the scientific community over evolutionary theory. History proves that scientific paradigms change with the seasons. Because of the many problems inherent within evolutionism, I reject it as a reasonable explanation of human origin.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 24-HOUR DAY VIEW

There are particular benefits in holding to the 24-hour Day view of creation. I will briefly list a few. Each thought deserves extensive treatment, but I will refrain myself from developing them too much (This paper has already run on far longer than anticipated!). I readily concede that some of the following benefits are true of any position that is committed to God's special creation, regardless of the way it frames all the particular details.

##### The Creative Force of God's Word

Although many objectors to the 24-hour Day view contend that the Scriptures do not tell us how God created the universe, merely that He did, I contend that the Scriptures clearly tell us how he created--by divine fiat. God's chief means of creation in Genesis 1 was through the means of His word of command. The picture painted of God is one of majestic, awe-inspiring, inimitable might and power. A God who creates from nothing merely by a word! If the chief point of Genesis 1 is to reveal the nature and character of God, then creation by the means of divine fiat clearly unveils an incomparable God of infinite power. Other views of creation seem to undermine this truth.[110]

##### Creation Displays God's Omnipotent Power and Purpose

As God created by word and Spirit, His infinite perfections were on display. God spoke and it was done. His statements were pregnant with divine purpose and power: "Let there be..." Not only did His Word create, it also explained. Immediately after calling elements of creation into existence, God named them.

His progressive and orderly creation calls attention to an overarching purpose and plan. His sovereignty over all creation further evidences that nothing can thwart His intentions. "Ah Lord God! Behold, Thou hast made the heavens and the earth by Thy great power and by Thine outstretched arm! Nothing is too difficult for Thee" (Jeremiah 32:17; cf. 32:27)

##### Creation Declares God's Glory

It must never be forgotten that creation's primary task is God-centered. Creation is revelational. It unveils and discloses God's excellencies and perfections. (Psalm 19:1-2; 97:6; Acts 14:17). It bears the stamp of its Maker. Being creatures ourselves, we cannot think of ourselves or anything in creation without considering God. We must always view ourselves as creatures.[111] This self-knowledge should constantly prompt us to glorify God in all things.

A proper understanding of our creatureliness should provoke worship and adoration. It was Job's view of the sovereignty, power, and wisdom of God in creation that provoked him to bow in humble worship (Job 38:1-7). The saints in heaven declare the glories of God because of His work of creation (Rev. 4:10-11).

##### Creation Upholds the Unity of Mankind

There is a distinct equality that stems to all members of the human family because all have descended from one pair of human parents (Matt 19:4; Acts 17:26). Though all have sinned, the Gospel is applicable to all--people of every tribe, tongue, and nation.

##### The Similarity Between God's Means of Creation & Means of Redemption

In Scripture, God's means of creation is presented as a pattern for His means of redemption (e.g. John 1:1-5; 2 Cor. 4:6; 5:16-17; cf. Genesis 1-3 & Revelation 20-22). God could have made all that exists in a split second or less. After the fall, He could have restored it instantly. In redemption, God progressively molds and fashions His people into the image of Christ, thus inaugurating the dawn of a new creation.

##### The 24-Hour View Seems to Best Suit a Natural Reading of Genesis 1

The plain reading of Genesis 1 seems to highly favor a 24-hour view of the days of creation. Every other view seems to come to its conclusion, not out of scriptural necessity, but in order to accommodate some other item outside of biblical revelation. If the accommodation merely had to do with harmonizing Genesis 1 with the rest of Scripture, this attempt would seem innocent and harmless. However, it appears that the accommodations are usually for reasons beyond the biblical text. I believe that C. Stuart Patterson is correct when he states that "every old-earth creationist... makes no argument from scriptural necessity but rather leans on the possibility that some word or phrase may be being used with other than its acknowledged predominant meaning." [112]

Exegetically, the non-literal views raise more problems than solutions. Two questions remain unanswered: "Is there any way Moses could have more precisely indicated six, normal sequential days?" is there any way Moses could have more deftly taught a schematic arrangement?" The answer to the first question is "No." The answer to the second is "Yes." A sequential, normal day approach to Genesis 1 is the most consistent with the data of the text.[113]

#### A WORD ON HUMAN DIGNITY

Outside of declaring man the most highly evolved creature, evolutionary theory is unable to provide a sense of significance to individual lives. What good is it to know that one is at the top of the evolutionary heap, if the forces that drive evolution are no more than impersonal matter plus time plus chance.

Very few evolutionists are willing to be consistent when it comes to human significance. Evolution relegates the origin of man to impersonal and purposeless chance. Evolution has no intended goal. In this system, humans have no apparent significance. Man is the most special creature perhaps, being the most complex, but in the final analysis, he is the greatest tragedy of creation, for he remains utterly insignificant in spite of his special status. And to add misery to woe, unlike anything else in known creation, he has the capacity to be conscious of, and reflect on, his insignificance.

In his book, *The Creation*, P. W. Atkins expresses his belief in the futility of the universe. He writes, "All change... arises from an underlying collapse into chaos. We shall see that what may appear to us to be motive and purpose is in fact ultimately motiveless, purposeless decay." [114] Indeed, "Everything is driven by motiveless, purposeless decay." [115] In Atkins' opinion, the complexity of the universe lies behind its façade of purposefulness. "That this motiveless, purposeless, mindless activity emerges into the world as motive and purpose, and constitutes a mind, is wholly due to the complexity of its organization." [116]

Human beings, being part of this futile creation, are not exempt from the same charge.

If there are atoms there will in due course be molecules; and if there are molecules on warm, wet platforms, there will in due course be elephants... Some of the things resembling elephants will be men. They are equally unimportant... Their special but not significant function is that they are able to act as commentators on the nature, content, structure, and source of the universe and that, as a sideline, they can devise and take pleasure from communicable fantasies. [117]

We are left with the frightening conclusion that "Humanity is an intriguing but insignificant assemblage of atoms arranged into a structure of sufficient complexity to experience the illusion of significance." [118]

Leave it to Carl Sagan to find some glimmer of hope in this sad state of affairs:

I am a collection of water, calcium and organic molecules called Carl Sagan. You are a collection of almost identical molecules with a different collective label. But is that all? Is there nothing in here but molecules? Some people find this idea somehow demeaning to human dignity. For myself, I find it elevating that our universe permits the evolution of molecular machines as intricate and subtle as we are. [119]

The Christian doctrine of special creation ennobles human beings. Sagan may live in awe that the impersonal, uninterested universe is gracious enough to make such marvelous molecular machines, but this is hardly a basis for human dignity.

If some molecular machines are functioning below normal (due to disability, age, accident, etc.) do they possess less worth? In the words of the marketplace, "A broken machine ain't worth much!"

Sagan's view limits human significance to the ability to function as a complex chemical composite. In contrast to this leap from nothing to nowhere, the Christian view of special creation expands human significance to embrace not merely function, but rather, being itself. To be a human--in any condition, in any state, under any circumstance--is to have intrinsic worth and value.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the great difficulty involved in coming to a position in this debate, I think that it is wise to recognize that many good and godly people will disagree with the conclusions presented in this paper. And in doing so, they are not necessarily undermining the historicity, authority, or integrity of the Bible. Charity toward others is necessary in continuing dialogue concerning these issues. This does not undermine or take away from one's convictions, it rather calls on those with convictions to lovingly embrace others who differ.

I thoroughly agree with Grudem's convictions and appreciate his balance in this area:

At present, considerations of the power of God's creative word and the immediacy with which it seems to bring response, the fact that "evening and morning" and the numbering of days still suggest twenty-four-hour days, and the fact that God would seem to have no purpose for delaying the creation of man for thousands or even millions of years, seem to me to be strong considerations in favor of the twenty-four-hour day position. But even here there are good arguments on the other side: To the one who lives forever, for whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Peter 3:8), who delights in gradually working out all his purposes over time, perhaps 15 billion years is just the right amount of time to take in preparing the universe for man's arrival and 4.5 billion years in preparing the earth. The evidence of incredible antiquity in the universe would then serve as a vivid reminder of the even more amazing nature of God's eternity, just as the incredible size of the universe causes us to wonder at God's even greater omnipresence and omnipotence. [120]

Though we must hold to our convictions in charity, we should firmly cling to them with resolution and integrity. It is no slight thing to believe the word of God in spite of opposition. The creation account is not prefaced with "Once upon a time..." One may hold to special creation without shame or embarrassment. Edward Young writes, "When you are tempted to doubt the first chapter of Genesis, as though to believe it were something childish and naive, remember that there are problems that stare the evolutionist in the face, problems to which he has no answer." [121]

In light of the countless advances in science and theology, I find it appropriate to give the final word to an eighteenth century Puritan commentator named Matthew Henry:

"[T]he world was, in the beginning of time, created by a Being of infinite wisdom and power, who was himself before all time and all worlds. The first verse of the Bible gives us a surer and better, a more satisfying and useful, knowledge of the origin of the universe, than all the volumes of the philosophers. The living faith of humble Christians understands this matter better than the elevated fancy of the greatest wits." [122]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atkins, P. W., *The Creation*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Company, 1981.
- Baylis, A. H. *From Creation To The Cross: Understanding the First Half of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996
- Behe, M. J. *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. New York: The Free Press, 1996
- Blocher, H. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1984
- Currid, J. D. *Ancient Egypt and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1997
- Custance, A., *Without Form and Void: A Study of the Meaning of Genesis 1:2* Brockville, Ontario: Doorway Papers, 1970
- Denten, M. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1985
- Erickson, M. J., *Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986
- Frame, John M. *Apologetics to the Glory of God*. New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 1994
- Gage, W. A. *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology*. Winona Lake: Carpenter Books, 1984.
- Gange, R. *Origins and Destiny*. Waco: Word Books, 1986.
- Grudem, W. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.
- Henry, M. *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible, Volume 1*. McLean: MacDonald Publishing Company.
- Jamieson, R. *A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical, Volume One*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, reprint 1984.
- Johnson, P. E. *Darwin on Trial*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991.
- Keeley, R., editor. *Eerdmans' Handbook to Christian Belief*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- Kuhn, T., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Maatman, R. *The Impact of Evolutionary Theory: A Christian View*. Dordt College Press, 1993.
- Moreland, J. P. *Christianity and the Nature of Science: A Philosophical Investigation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Morris, H. M., and J. C. Whitcomb. *The Genesis Flood*. Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1961.
- Pascal, B., trans. By H. Levi. *Pensees and Other Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Pipa, J. A., and D. W. Hall, editors. *Did God Create in Six Days?* Taylors, SC: Southern Presbyterian Press, 1999.
- Numbers, R. L. *The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Titus, H. H., and M. S. Smith and R. T. Nolan. *Living Issues in Philosophy, Eighth Edition*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986.
- Van Till, H. J., and D. A. Young and C. Menninga. *Science Held Hostage*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988.
- Young, E. *In The Beginning: Genesis 1-3 and the Authority of Scripture*. Carlisle, P.A.: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984.

[1] The word evolution can be used in different ways. In its broadest sense evolution refers to "the process of development from one form into another." M. J. Erickson, *Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986), 52. Micro-evolution refers to small incremental progressive developments within one species. Innumerable examples of this abound and are observable so that this is denied by no one. Macro-evolution is the view that "nonliving substance gave rise to the first living material, which subsequently reproduced and diversified to produce all extinct and extant organisms." W. Friar and P. Davis, *A Case of Creation* (Norcross, Ga.: CRS Books, 1983), 25. In this paper, whenever I refer to evolution I am referring to macro-evolution.

[2] "The influence of evolutionary theory on fields far removed from biology is one of the most spectacular examples in history of how a highly speculative idea for which there is no really hard scientific evidence can come to fashion the thinking of a whole society and dominate the outlook of an age." M. Denten, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1985), 358.

[3] R. Maatman, *The Impact of Evolutionary Theory: A Christian View*, (Dordt College Press, 1993), i.

[4] God's general revelation in creation provides enough information regarding God to leave people without excuse in regard to their responsibility to thank and glorify Him. The Bible always assumes and never questions the existence of God (Gen. 1:1). Enough is discernible through creation to leave men without excuse in relation to God's existence (Psalm 19:1-6; Rom. 1:19-20), power (Rom. 1:20), goodness (Acts 14:17; Rom. 2:14-15), wrath (Rom. 1:18), and the certainty of judgment (Rom. 1:32). Although God's existence is obvious, human beings suppress this truth. Ungodliness, unrighteousness, and immorality are the result of this suppression (Rom. 1:21-32). "The point is not that unbelievers are simply ignorant of the truth. Rather, God has revealed himself to each person with unmistakable clarity, both in creation (Ps. 19; Rom. 1:18-21) and in man's own nature (Gen. 1:26ff.). In one sense, the believer knows God (Rom. 1:21). At some level of his consciousness or unconsciousness, that knowledge remains. But in spite of that knowledge, the unbeliever intentionally distorts the truth, exchanging it for a lie (Rom. 1:18-32; 1 Cor. 1:18-2:16 [note especially 2:14]; 2 Cor. 4:4). Thus, the non-Christian is 'deceived' (Titus 3:3). He knows God (Rom. 1:21) and does not know him at the same time (1 Cor. 1:21; 2:14)." Frame, J. M. *Apologetics to the Glory of God*, (New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 1994), 7-8.

[5] Throughout the entirety of this paper I will use the terms mankind, humankind, and man as synonyms. Although the first two terms are more acceptable in our current culture (being perceived as less sexist than the following term), the generic "man" still retains its classical use in referring to all human beings in general--both men and women. The use of this term does not imply

a latent sexism on my part. Rather, it facilitates easier writing, making it easier to use a singular pronoun ("he") to refer to universal concepts that apply to both men and women equally.

[6] It must be noted that mankind's need for special revelation is not contingent upon the Fall. Before the Fall, God revealed Himself through words to Adam (Gen. 1:28-30; 2:16-17). Thus, even in perfection, there were matters that mankind could not learn from creation without the word of God.

[7] Desire for autonomy in one's ability to reason is itself a display of rebellion against God.

[8] B. Pascal, trans. By H. Levi. *Pensees and Other Writings*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 62.

[9] W. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 78.

[10] *Ibid.*, 78-79.

[11] J. M. Frame, *Apologetics to the Glory of God*, (New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 1994), 10.

[12] Positivism is defined as "[t]he tendency to base knowledge on sense perceptions and the investigations of objective science and to discard metaphysical world views... Positivism limits knowledge to statements of observable facts and their interrelations." H. H. Titus, M. S. Smith, R. T. Nolan, *Living Issues in Philosophy* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986), 363.

[13] In the book *Science Held Hostage*, authors Van Till, Young, and Menninga define naturalism as "that philosophical and religious perspective which is based on the assumption that the physical world is all there is, that there exists no divine being capable of influencing physical phenomena." They define evolutionary naturalism as "that form of naturalism which claims that the scientific concept of evolution provides a sufficient basis for rejecting the idea of divine governance of natural processes." H. J. Van Till, and D. A. Young and C. Menninga. *Science Held Hostage*. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 11.

[14] Even evolutionists must admit that natural laws are only descriptive and not determinative. In other words, the laws themselves do not provide the impetus to carry themselves out, for laws do not govern, they merely describe. This is a necessary limitation in the study of natural science that is often transgressed. See Van Till, 23-24.

[15] Assuming my position can be shown to be clearly derived from the Scripture, meeting the requirements of exegetical integrity and harmonization with the entire Bible.

[16] I agree with Mark Ross when he writes, "a conflict with science may prompt a reexamination of our doctrine (i.e., our conclusions as to what the Bible actually teaches) but it can never, by itself, demand a re-interpretation of the Bible and an alteration in our doctrine." Mark Ross, "The Framework Hypothesis: An Interpretation of Genesis 1:1-2:3," in *Did God Create in Six Days?* Editors J. A. Pipa, and D. W. Hall (Taylors, SC: Southern Presbyterian Press, 1999), 117.

[17] Thomas Kuhn, in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) documents this.

[18] Attaching the label "Christian" to anything beside people is always dangerous. In Scripture, Christians are people united to Christ Jesus through faith. No lifeless object, philosophy, or practice is given the label. In short, the word "Christian" is never used as an adjective in Scripture, it is always used as an appositive to describe living beings.

[19] Some will object, thinking that my position undermines the Lordship of Christ in all areas of life. I strongly advocate Christ's present kingship. The chief area that this kingship is to be displayed in is the church of Jesus Christ. When the church's house is in order, then perhaps she will have the time, abilities, and resources to try to "Christianize" the world. Until then, I believe the church should remain true to the one unique calling she has: to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ with the boldness and authority that stems from a faithful adherence to that same gospel in her conduct and practice.

[20] Van Till, *Science Held Hostage*, 11.

[21] *Ibid.*, 11.

[22] Materialistic monism is the belief there is only one ultimate substance of principle, namely, matter.

[23] Sagan, C., *Cosmos* (New York: Random House, 1980), 4.

[24] Sagan, *Cosmos Television Series*, Episode 12.

[25] Van Till, *Science Held Hostage*, 16. Emphasis his.

[26] *Ibid.*, 16.

[27] Morton Smith, "The Theological Significance of the Doctrine of Creation," in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors, Pipa and Hall, 244.

[28] Warren Gage's comment may be overly caustic, but his point is well made, and worth quoting at length. "Though the doctrine of creation is the cornerstone of biblical revelation, to unbelief it has ever been a stone of stumbling... Those who would follow presently popular "scientific" alternatives to biblical creationism inevitably find themselves transferring these two universals from the Creator to the creation, for to accommodate their theories they ascribe a practical eternity to the creation (cf. the numberless ages presupposed by secular cosmogonies) and invest the impersonal universe with notions of purposive progress (cf. the teleology implicit in the natural selectivity and 2 Peter 3:3-4). Thus the creation itself is invested with the eternal power and divine person of the Creator and the glory of the incorruptible God is changed for the image of man, birds, beasts and creeping things. Professing to be wise the secularists become vain in their reasonings and their new science merely perpetuates the ancient mysteries. The priest of nature survives in the evolutionist, the priest of mammon masquerades as the naturalist, and the priest of man has become the secular humanist. Thus has the idolatry of yesterday become the secularism of today and the dawn of the

modern scientific age finds the sun rising upon nothing new." Gage, W. A., *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Carpenter Books, 1984), 76.

[29] Sid Dyer, "The New Testament Doctrine of Creation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 242.

[30] Culance, A., *Without Form and Void: A Study of the Meaning of Genesis 1:2* (Brockville, Ontario: Doorway Papers, 1970).

[31] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 287.

[32] Advocates include Charles Hodge, B. B. Warfield, J. Gresham Machen, Oswald Allis, Macrae, Oliver Buswell and, more recently, Hugh Ross.

[33] "But do not let this one fact escape your notice, beloved, that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Peter 3:8)

[34] Joseph Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos: A Critique of the Non-Literal Interpretations of Genesis 1:1-2:3," in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, edited by Pipa and Hall, 180.

[35] Augustine, *City of God*, 11.7.

[36] David Hall, "The Evolution of Mythology: Classic Creation Survives As the Fittest Among Its Critics and Revisers" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors, Pipa and Hall, 274-282.

[37] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 301.

[38] Ross, "The Framework Hypothesis" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 114. Emphasis his.

[39] Advocates of the Framework Hypothesis maintain the structure of Genesis revolves around two texts which emphasize incompleteness and deficiency. "The earth was formless and empty" (Gen. 1:2) and thus God precedes to give the world form (Gen. 1:3-13) and substance (Gen. 1:14-31). Likewise, "the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth; and there was no man to cultivate the ground" (Gen. 2:5) and thus God sends rain (Gen. 2:6) and forms man (Gen. 2:7). In both cases, the two deficiencies are removed. Ross emphasizes that God did these things through the means of ordinary providence. *Ibid.*, 125-126.)

[40] *Ibid.*, 125.

[41] *Ibid.*, 129.

[42] *Ibid.*, 130.

[43] "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven" (Genesis 2:4).

[44] "Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth; and there was no man to cultivate the ground" (Genesis 2:5).

[45] Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 159.

[46] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 302.

[47] *Ibid.*, 276.

[48] Numbers, R., *The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 74.

[49] In contrast to Seventh Day Adventists they maintain Sabbath observance under a New Covenant economy, changing the particular day from Saturday to Sunday.

[50] My one area of disagreement with Harris is that I don't believe the days were "long" as he describes them. Below I will develop my defense of seven 24-hour days.

[51] R. Laird Harris, "The Length of Creative Days in Genesis 1" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 110.

[52] Grudem points out that the next sentence in the Ten Commandments uses the term "day" to mean "a period of time"-- "Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you" (Exodus 20:12).

[53] C. John Collins "Reading Genesis 1:1-2:3 as an Act of Communication: Discourse Analysis and Literal Interpretation," in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 142.

[54] Henry Morris has stated, "If you take Genesis literally, you're more inclined to take Revelation literally." (*Numbers, The Creationists*, 339).

[55] Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 182.

[56] *Ibid.*, 182.

[57] *Ibid.*, 195.

[58] The Hebrews did not have a single term to describe the cosmos.

[59] C. John Collins "Reading Genesis 1:1-2:3 as an Act of Communication" in *Did God Create in Six Days?* Editors, Pipa and Hall, 140.

[60] *Ibid.*, 134.

[61] Benjamin Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 203.

[62] Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 188.

[63] *Ibid.*, 188.

[64] Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 205.

[65] Genesis - Deuteronomy class notes. Summer, 1999.

[66] Though definitions 1 and 2 reflect yom's primary meaning, it is not admitted as strongly as it should by advocates of the 24-hour Day Theory, that the third reading is also used quite regularly in the Old Testament text. "In favor of viewing the six days as long periods of time is the fact that the Hebrew words yom, "day," is sometimes used to refer not to a twenty-four-hour literal

day, but to a longer period of time. We see this when the word is used in Genesis 2:4, for example: "In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," a phrase that refers to the entire creative work of the six days of creation. Other examples of the word day to mean a period of time are Job 20:28 ("the day of God's wrath"); Psalm 20:1 ("The Lord answer you in the day of trouble!"); Proverbs 11:4 ("Riches do not profit in the day of wrath"); 21:31 ("The horse is made ready for the day of battle"); 24:10 ("If you faint in the day of adversity, your strength is small"); 25:13 ("the time [yom] of harvest"); Ecclesiastes 7:14 (In the day of prosperity be joyful, and in the day of adversity consider; God has made the one as well as the other"); many passages referring to "the day of the Lord" (such as Isa. 2:12; 13:6, 9; Joel 1:15; 2:1; Zeph. 1:14); and many other Old Testament passages predicting times of judgment or blessing." Grudem, Systematic Theology, 293-294.

[67] Three other times the phrase "evening and morning" is used by Moses. Each use refers to a normal 24-hour day. In Exodus 27:21 and Leviticus 24:3 he writes of the priests' responsibility to trim the lamps of the tabernacle during the night. In Numbers 9:21 he writes of the glory cloud that appeared over the camp of Israel throughout the night.

[68] Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 206.

[69] H. M. Morris, and J. C. Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1961), 240, 255, 265, 375, 399.

[70] Numbers, *The Creationists*, 204.

[71] Collins, "Reading Genesis 1:1-2:3" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 135.

[72] *Ibid.*, 136.

[73] Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 207.

[74] *Ibid.*, 207.

[75] R. Jamieson, *A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical, Volume One* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, reprint 1984), 5.

[76] As complexity increases, order increases. One could define complexity as "the degree to which something is organized." In God's order, life makes life; plants make plants; animals make animals; and people make people.

[77] Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 209.

[78] Collins, "Reading Genesis 1:1-2:3" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 120. Emphasis his.

[79] Ross, "The Framework Hypothesis" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 120.

[80] Harris, "The Length of the Creative Days" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 108.

[81] Shaw, "The Literal Day Interpretation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 212.

[82] *Ibid.*, 214.

[83] A clear example of evolutionary theory impacting religious studies.

[84] Collins, "Reading Genesis 1:1-2:3" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 137.

[85] Contrary to evolutionary theology, we don't find a primitive brute beast of a man at the head of the human race. Instead we find man at the peak of righteousness, holiness, and intellectual capabilities in perfect communion with God, himself, and nature due to the image and likeness of God within him. After his Fall, things will progressively go downhill.

[86] R. Keeley, editor., *Eerdmans' Handbook to Christian Belief* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), 228.

[87] A. H. Baylis, *From Creation To The Cross: Understanding the First Half of the Bible*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), 30.

[88] Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 168.

[89] *Ibid.*, 168.

[90] *Ibid.*, 185.

[91] This is a clear case of the interdependence of general and special revelation. The gospel (special revelation) is proclaimed in the context of God's creation (general revelation). God's creation is the stage for the working out of God's redemptive purposes.

[92] *Ibid.*, 191.

[93] In Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 45-59, Paul contrasts and compares the actions of Adam with the work of Christ. The point of comparison is so strong that it would be ludicrous to hold to the historicity of Christ while simultaneously denying the historicity of Adam.

[94] *Ibid.*, 238.

[95] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 305.

[96] This statement should not be misconstrued to imply that I reject the historicity of Noah and the flood. I completely embrace Genesis 6-9, as I do the rest of the Bible, as a trustworthy account of past events.

[97] Walter Hearn legitimately questions why creation scientists would even bother to attempt to discredit the accuracy of dating techniques, since they believe that God created the earth with the appearance of age. "Why not assume that the methods are essentially reliable for determining the apparent age which God structured into the rocks on the particular 24-hour day of their creation?" Numbers, *The Creationists*, 206.

[98] R. Gange, *Origins and Destiny* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986), 104-105.

[99] *Ibid.*, 106.

[100] Ibid., 108. "Our understanding of God should lead us to believe that He created the world in such perfect harmony that the symbiotic relationships between organisms reflected His infinite wisdom and power." Dyer, "The New Testament Doctrine of Creation," in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 242.

[101] M. J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: The Free Press, 1996).

[102] M. Denten, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1985).

[103] P. E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991).

[104] Denten, *Evolution*, 345.

[105] Ibid., 355.

[106] Ibid., 348.

[107] Ibid., 355.

[108] Ibid., 355.

[109] Ibid., 355.

[110] "Forsaking the literal interpretation of Genesis 1 reduces its revelatory significance. The literary framework hypothesis reduces the entire chapter to a general statement that God created everything in an orderly fashion." Dyer, "The New Testament Doctrine of Creation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 237.

[111] Morton Smith, "The Theological Significance of the Doctrine of Creation" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 253.

[112] C. Stuart Patterson, "Evidences for a Young Earth" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 311.

[113] Pipa, "From Chaos to Cosmos" in *Did God Create in Six Days?*, editors Pipa and Hall, 186.

[114] Atkins, P. W., *The Creation*, (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Company, 1981), 21.

[115] Ibid., 23.

[116] Ibid., 37.

[117] Ibid., 5, 3.

[118] Van Till, *Science Held Hostage*, 148.

[119] Sagan, *Cosmos*, 127.

[120] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 297.

[121] E. Young, *In The Beginning: Genesis 1-3 and the Authority of Scripture* (Carlisle, P.A.: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984), 57.

[122] M. Henry, *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible, Volume 1* (McLean: MacDonald Publishing Company), 2.

© Richard J. Vincent, October 15, 1999