

Compromises Of Creation #1

Introduction. Without a doubt, Genesis is the single most vilified book in all the Bible. While men of every age have mocked and attacked the Bible as a whole, no single book has taken the brunt of such attacks more often than the book of Genesis. Genesis not only provides the only inspired account of the origin of the Universe available to man, but in doing so introduces for the first time on written record the Bible's theme -- the redemption of man through reconciliation to God. Genesis tells man how to interpret the physical world in which he lives.

In fewer words than an average sportswriter would use to present his account of a Friday night high school football game, Moses, by inspiration, discussed in Genesis 3 the breaking of the covenant between man and God, the entrance of sin into the world, and the need for a coming Redeemer. Were it not for the book of Genesis, man forever would be forced to ask -- yet never be competent to answer -- such questions as "Whence have I come?" or "Why am I here?" or "Where am I going?" Only in Genesis can the information be found to formulate answers to these questions, which linger in the heart of almost every person.

In the interpretation of the book of Genesis, much is at stake, for if the theistic evolutionists, progressive creationists, and their kind are correct, we who have understood the biblical record to be taken as a literal, historical account of our ultimate origin are wrong. Our adversaries defend a view which suggests that the account is not to be taken in such a fashion, but instead is to be viewed as a mythical, poetical, or allegorical story that is perfectly consistent with most of the tenets of organic evolution.

What good ultimately results from the teaching of such falsehood? Can we legitimately convert the lost through the teaching of error? Can one be taught wrongly and obey correctly? The teaching of error may comfort where truth offends. A person who believes that God created the Universe and populated the Earth via the process of organic evolution can be allowed to think that such a view is correct. But in the end, three things have occurred. First, as a result of having believed error, the sinner may not be truly converted. Second, the church has been filled with theistic evolutionists, progressive creationists, and others who hold to false views. The church will be weakened, and others may be lured into accepting the same error through association with those who believe it and teach it to be true. Third, the person who perpetrated the false teaching has placed his soul, and the souls of those he taught, in jeopardy because of his error.

These two lessons will address the popular compromises made before, during, and after the creation week in Genesis 1-2. The biblical chronology is about a million times shorter than the evolutionary chronology. This is not

a peripheral issue that can be dismissed with some exegetical twist, but is central to the very integrity of the scriptures.

I. **Before The Creation Week**

- A. For over 100 years those who want to hold to the teachings of evolution and the Bible at the same time, have been trying insert evolutionary timetables into the text so they can have an old earth. This is often called the "Gap Theory" because people reason that there is a "gap" between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. It has often been called "Ruin and Reconstruction" or "Pre-Adamic Cataclysm." It was made popular by *The Scofield Bible*, Robert Milligan's *The Scheme Of Redemption*, Arthur Custance's *Without Form And Void*, and Alfred Edersheim's *Old Testament Bible History*.
- B. This theory states that in between that long period of time between the two verses, Satan came to Earth and rebelled against God and there was a great war that took place with much devastation. Satan was defeated by God, but in the conflict the Earth was destroyed. Some variations of this theory say that vegetation existed during that time and was destroyed, and some even say there was a race of people prior to Adam who were also destroyed during this period of time.
 - 1. There are several "proof texts" offered in support of the "Gap Theory" (Ezekiel 28:12-17; Isaiah 14:12-14; 45:18; Jeremiah 4:23-26).
 - 2. So the six day creation you read of in Genesis 1 is a reconstruction or a re-creation, not an original creation.
 - 3. Those who hold to this theory say this is where many of the fossils that we have today came from. The fossils can be easily dated in the millions of years because this theory can allow for the passage of massive amounts of time.
- C. Those who hold to the "Gap Theory" want to change some of the words in the text, for example, the word for "was" in Genesis 1:2 is to be translated "became." That is, after God created the heavens and the Earth, there came that great war between God and Satan and the Earth "became" formless and void. But no known translation says "became." In the magazine, *Modern Science And Christian Faith*, a poll of twenty Hebrew scholars were asked regarding the possibility of a "gap" between the two verses. The answer was a resounding, "No."
- D. Scriptural refutation of this theory:
 - 1. Exodus 20:11 states that God made "all that is in them" which includes everything. The heavens, Earth, and the sea and all that is in them, God said He put it there in six days.

- a) This one verse would be enough from the Bible to demolish the "Gap Theory." But those who hold to the "Gap Theory" have tried to get around this by retranslating this verse. They make a false distinction between "created" (*bara*) and "made" (*asah*).
 - b) If "made" (Exodus 20:11) is different from "created" (Genesis 1:1), then proponents of this theory avoid the necessity of complete "creation" in 6 days. But these definitions are not contrasting; in fact, they overlap. Furthermore, the words are used interchangeably:
 - (1) "Bara" great sea creatures (Genesis 1:21) and "bara" animals, creeping things, and birds (Genesis 6:7)
 - (2) "Asah" the beast (Genesis 1:25) and "asah" them (Genesis 6:7).
 - (3) "Asah" man (Genesis 1:26) and "bara" everyone and "asah" them (Isaiah 43:7).
 - (4) "Bara" man (Genesis 1:27) and "bara" and "asah" all His work (Genesis 2:3).
 - (5) "Bara" and "asah" man (Genesis 5:1) and "bara" heavens and the earth (Genesis 2:4).
 - (6) "Bara" male and female (Genesis 5:2) and "asah" earth and heaven (Genesis 2:4).
 - c) Before the six days there were no heavens or earth (Psalm 33:6, 9; 148:1-5).
2. In 1 Corinthians 15:45, Adam was called "the first man" by the inspired apostle Paul. So this passage tells us that there was not pre-Adamic race that existed between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. There was no death before Adam (1 Corinthians 15:21-22). That idea is totally foreign to the scripture, in fact it makes the inspired writers liars.
 3. The "Gap Theory" violates the scriptures as it has death reigning even before Adam's sin. Was there death prior to Adam's sin among humans as the "Gap Theory" would suggest? That is impossible (Romans 5:12-14). The scriptures teach that death began with Adam, but the "Gap Theory" would have us to believe that death and destruction existed on a massive scale before Adam was even created. That makes Paul a liar.
- E. A slight modification of this theory states that God initiated the Big Bang and the Universe developed according to evolutionary theories. In essence, they say the Bible says God "created" (or really "prepared"), an Earth for man. Additionally, God did not create everything to exist on that "first" Earth. For example, according to them, there were no warm-blooded creatures, including man.

II. ***During The Creation Week***

- A. One theory is often called the "Day-Age Theory." This theory was popularized by Wilbur M. Smith's *Therefore Stand*, Davis A. Young's *Creation And The Flood*, Jack Wood Sears, and John Clayton.
1. This theory states that a day is not actually a day, but is a vast geological epoch of time. This is a theory that is accepted by many who want to claim to be a Bible believer and still hold to the old age theory of the Earth so they can also accept the evolutionary geological time table.
 2. The first time the Hebrew word for "day" is used is in Genesis 1:5 and it is defined there as well. God did not just use the word "day" and leave it ambiguous as to what He meant by the word, so that it could be taken to mean how ever long a period you want to make it. He used the word and then defined the length of the period.
 3. God tells us that the period of light is called "day," and the period of darkness is called "night," and the period of light to darkness, is one day. God's own definition of what a day consists of tells us that long geological periods of time cannot be placed in the creation week.
 - a) In fact it is interesting to notice that God made this very plain by defining this each time throughout the text, there was evening and morning a second day, third day and so on.
 - b) But we also find that anywhere in the Bible where this word for "day" is used and is preceded by a numeral, it always refers to a literal day, and is used that way over 100 times in the Old Testament and always refers to a literal day. No where in the scripture do you find the word "day" referring to anything else than a 24 hour period when preceded by a number.
 - (1) James Barr, a Hebrew scholar, said, "So far as I know, there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world class university who does not believe that the writer of Genesis 1 through 11 intended to convey to their readers the idea that: (a) creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience; (b) the figures contained in the Genesis genealogies provided by simple addition a chronology from the beginning up to the latter stages of earth history."
 - (2) Marcus Dods, a Hebrew scholar, said, "If the word 'day' in this chapter does not mean the period of 24 hours, the interpretation of scripture is hopeless."
 - c) If God through Moses would have wanted us to understand that these days were actually long eons of geological periods of time,

do you think he could have used some other word to get the point across?

- d) In fact, there are two Hebrew words he could have used. One means a vast expanse of time. The other means indefinite periods of time. But he did not use them. He wanted us to understand that creation was accomplished in six literal days.
4. Just as God worked six days and rested on one, so were the Israelites to work for six literal days and rest on one (Exodus 20:11).
- a) The Jew was to understand Genesis 1:5 just like he understood Exodus 20:11. And no Jew read this to be saying that you are to work for six indefinite periods of time and then rest for one indefinite period of time.
 - b) God could have created everything in a second, but in His wisdom He did it over a period of six days to serve as a pattern for man's cycle of work and rest.
 - c) The same Moses who wrote the first 11 chapters of Genesis also wrote binding regulations regarding days, months, seasons, and years. How can we say that all the time references in Genesis 1-11 are somehow different than those found in the rest of the Pentateuch?
 - d) Those who argue for an old Earth must contend that the seven days of creation are something other than seven literal, successive twenty-four hour days. But if their position is true, at what point did Moses switch gears from a symbolic to a literal usage of the term?
- B. Another theory is the "Multiple Gap Theory" which suggests that the creation days were, in fact, six literal, 24-hour days during which God actually performed the special creative works attributed to Him in Genesis 1.
- 1. However, these literal days tell only a small part of the whole story. Rather than representing the totality of God's work in creation, they instead represent "breaks" between the geologic ages.
 - 2. In other words, after God's activity on any given literal day, that day then was followed by long ages of slow development according to historical geology. Actually, this theory is a hybridization of the "Day Age" and "Gap" theories. Instead of making "ages" out of the days of Genesis 1, it merely inserts the ages between the days. And instead of putting a single gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, it inserts multiple gaps between the days of Genesis 1.
 - 3. The "Multiple Gap Theory" has the advantage of allowing someone, when asked, to assert that they do, in fact, believe the days of creation to be 24-hour periods. And, if they are asked if they

believe in the "Gap Theory," again, they can decline, insisting that they do not.

4. At the very least, this theory requires a most "unnatural" reading of the creation account, which apparently is continuous and meant to describe the creation of "heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." The context of the creation record suggests continuity. There is absolutely no exegetical evidence to document the claim that in between each of the (literal) creation days there were millions or billions of years. In fact, such evidence is conspicuously missing. It is wrong to build a doctrinal theory on the basis of the silence of the scriptures.
 5. If the acts of creation are left on their respective days, then there is no possible way to make the creation account agree with the geological system -- gaps or no gaps. The Genesis sequence and the alleged geologic sequence do not agree.
- C. A final theory that will be considered is the "Framework Hypothesis."
1. The framework hypothesis contends that the treatment of creation in Genesis was logical, not chronological. The particular "framework" in which these ideas are developed varies according to the particular expositor. Some speak of Genesis as "allegorical," others as "liturgical," others as "poetic," others as "supra-historical." All agree, however, in rejecting it as "scientific" or "historical." They concur that Genesis teaches the fact of "creation" and the "fall," but deny that it has anything to say concerning the method. They hope to retain whatever biblical significance it may have while, at the same time, avoiding scientific embarrassment.
 2. Proponents of this theory believe that the creation account in Genesis 1-2 was a scheme designed to aid the mind to remember the account because it was based on everyday life. According to those who hold this view, Genesis 1 is merely a part of a framework for the narrative of creation; it is a "literary device." They claim that the chapter does not indicate historical sequence, but instead depicts the glory of the creatures in the light of the great redemptive purpose of God.
 3. They state that the framework of Genesis 1-2 copies the work of man. The Hebrew people worked during the day, stopped working at night, resumed again in the morning, and this was done for six days to be followed by a seventh day of rest.
 - a) In the text of Genesis itself, there is not a single allusion to suggest that the days are to be regarded as a form or mere manner of representation and hence of no significance for the essential knowledge of the divine creative activity. The events of Genesis 1-11 are recorded in simple narrative form, as though

the writer or writers fully intended to record a series of straightforward historical facts; there is certainly no internal or exegetical reason for taking them in any other way.

- b) In Exodus 20:11 the activity of God is presented to man as a pattern, and this fact presupposed that there was a reality in the activity of God which man is to follow. How could man be held accountable for working six days if God Himself had not actually worked for six days?

Conclusion. There are many people who accept unreservedly the Bible's teaching on matters of both a spiritual and a physical nature. Yet when it comes to the Bible's teaching on the age of the Earth, they simply shrug their shoulders (as if they do not quite know what to do with the information) and are content to take a somewhat "agnostic" stance. Apparently, they are undecided about what to do with the Bible's teachings in this area, especially since "science" seems to be offering them a conclusion diametrically opposed to the one dictated by the Bible. In the end, "science" wins as they set aside biblical instruction in favor of current scientific theory.

But why is this the case? The Bible does address the topic of the age of the Earth. If a person is willing to accept the Bible's instructions on a whole host of matters, why, then, can that same person not accept the Bible's simple, straightforward teaching on the age of the Earth? Is one set of instructions any more difficult to believe than the other? Our plea is for such Bible believers to be consistent and to abandon the concept of an ancient Earth that is so foreign to the scriptures. Accept all that the Bible has to say, including its plain statements and clear implications regarding the age of the Earth.

No doubt there also are many Bible believers who simply do not know what to do regarding the problem of the age of the Earth. They "lean" toward belief in an old Earth, but only because they never have stopped to consider that one of the the most compelling reasons for belief in an old Earth is to legitimize the concept of evolution (without an ancient planet, evolution obviously is impossible). But were someone to ask, "Do you believe in evolution?," their answer likely would be, "No, I do not." Then why believe in an old Earth? Why not simply examine what the Bible says regarding the age of the Earth and accept it forthwith? On occasion, the person who starts out conceding an ancient Earth eventually ends up in the evolutionists' camp. At some point, he or she is led to think, if the Earth really is billions of years old, then perhaps evolution has been going on for all that time after all.

How old is the Earth? Biblically speaking, it is five days older than man! Relatively speaking, it is quite young -- with an age measured in

thousands, not billions, of years. Yet even some Christians have ridiculed such an idea. Faithful Christians should not be stampeded into accepting the compromising views of evolutionists -- or those sympathetic with them.

I am deeply indebted to Bert Thompson for the use of his material.