

The Days of Creation (Gen 1)

I. Introduction —

- A. The big bang theory and the theory of macro-evolution (define) depend upon two *unproven* and *unprovable* events:
 - 1. The spontaneous generation of matter...
 - 2. And the spontaneous generation of life from non-life (i.e., abiogenesis).
 - 3. In fact, the latter has been repeatedly *proven impossible*, and codified in the scientific world as the the Law of Biogenesis (define).
- B. **So** how do these theorists attempt to circumvent these insurmountable obstacles?
 - 1. “**However** improbable we regard...any of the steps it involves, *given enough time*, it will almost certainly happen at least once . . . *Time is the hero of the plot . . .* Given so much time, *the ‘impossible’ becomes possible, the possible becomes probable, and the probable becomes virtually certain.* One has only to wait; *time itself performs miracles.*” (George Wald, “The Origin of Life,” *Scientific American*, 191:45-53, August 1954, emp. added)
 - 2. Time, i.e. billions and billions of years.
- C. This same thinking that has infected the minds of otherwise God-fearing, Bible-believing people...
 - 1. i.e. *Where can we find all this time in Genesis 1?*
 - 2. *Science says the earth is billions of years old...*
 - 3. *So how do we reconcile what we “know” from science with what the Bible says in Genesis 1?*

II. Attempts to harmonize Genesis 1 with “science” —

- A. **Theistic** evolution.
 - 1. The idea that God’s creative work was accomplished by evolutionary processes, i.e. that He started the process then allowed the process to take its natural course.
 - 2. Entirely incompatible with the Genesis account.
 - a) God’s hands-on involvement in all creation.

- b) Plant life created two days prior to marine life, but evolution postulates marine organisms millions of years before plant life.
 - c) Creation of woman after man, but evolution postulates the simultaneous development of the sexes.
3. And entirely incompatible with other passages (see below).

B. Gap theory.

- 1. i.e. A gap of time between Gen 1.1 and 1.2, or 1.2 and 1.3
- 2. Proposed for the allowance of a “pre-Adam” world of dinosaurs, etc.
- 3. i.e. Before the start of the six days, that entire world died out and left not the slightest vestige of its existence (1.2a).
- 4. Others subscribe to this position to help explain the earth’s apparently very old age.
- 5. “There is not the slightest evidence that there was a gap between verse one and verse two . . . there is no basis in the language of Genesis for a gap between the verses. The conjunction translated ‘and’ at the beginning of verse 2 is used to continue a narrative, implying there was no gap. Nowhere in the Bible is there the slightest evidence of such a gap.” (Waldron 17)

C. Long-day creation / day-age theory.

- 1. i.e. The “days” described in Genesis 1 are not literal 24-hour days, but actually represent long periods of time.
- 2. Proposed to explain the earth’s apparently very old age.
- 3. Others, likely a minority, subscribe to this position to accompany theistic evolution.

III. Specifically answering long-day creation (and gap theory) —

A. Non-textual arguments —

- 1. **The** only reason to question the literalness of six-day creation is an effort at reconciliation with “science.”
 - a) Real scientific research has been done and evidence compiled that supports a relatively young earth, consistent with literal six day creation.
 - b) Inspired Scripture must be accepted as truth regardless of what extra-Biblical “evidence” may suggest.

2. **The** interdependence of ecological systems.
 - a) Any “pre-Adam” life forms would have existed without the existence of light.
 - b) Plants would have accomplished pollination and reproduction without the benefit of animals and insects. (cf. Gen 1.12, 21, 25)
3. *Note:* Neither of these prove anything, but worthy of note.

B. **Contextual** arguments —

1. **Language** is to be interpreted as literal unless the context demands a figuration interpretation.
2. **The** cycle of light and darkness, day and night was established on the first day of creation and repeated throughout the creation account. (Gen 1.5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31)
3. **Whatever** period of time designated by “day” must also be applied to “evening” — if years, then that means years of darkness for vegetation.
4. **Throughout** the rest of the O.T., “day” invariably refers to a literal 24-hour day when used in conjunction with numerical designations.
5. **Days** are clearly distinguished from other measurements of time — note especially “years.” (Gen 1.14-19)
6. **Adam** was created on the sixth day, God rested on the seventh day, yet Adam’s age was only 120 years when Seth was born (Gen 5.3).
7. **Creation** of all things with immediate maturity, apparent age.
 - a) Ability of seas/land to sustain life. (Gen 1.2, 10, 11, 20)
 - b) Appearance of light from distant stars. (Gen 1.14-19)
 - c) Reproductive abilities of plants and animals. (Gen 1.11, 12, 20-25)
 - d) Mankind’s implied maturity. (Gen 2.15-23; 3.2-3, 6-7)

C. **Other** textual arguments —

1. **Earth’s** apparent age and geological anomalies can be accounted for by the flood of Genesis 7 (v 11-12, 19-20).
2. **Divine** commentary on the creation days in Exodus 20.8-11.

- a) The terms “day” and “days” in verses 8-10 are understood to be literal 24-hour days.
 - b) For contextual consistency, those same terms in verse 11 must be understood to mean the same.
 - c) The creation of the heavens and the earth was included in the six days of creation.
3. **Divine** commentary on the creation of man and woman in Mark 10.6 and Matthew 19.4, 8.
- a) Jesus said that “from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female” (Mk 10.6; cf. Mt 19.4).
 - b) This could not be legitimately said if long ages passed between Gen 1.1 and Gen 1.27.

IV. **Inherent** dangers of loose interpretation —

- A. **It** necessarily supplants divine wisdom as it has been revealed with the “wisdom” of men. (cf. 1Cor 1.25)
 - 1. i.e. It accommodates the Bible to the theories of men.
- B. **If** the days of creation cannot be taken at “face value,” then what else deserves to be questioned or doubted:
 - 1. The flood in Genesis 7?
 - 2. The parting of the Red Sea for Israel in Exodus 14?
 - 3. The fall of Jericho’s walls in Joshua 7?
 - 4. The virgin conception / birth of Jesus in Matthew and Luke?
 - 5. The bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ in Matthew 28 et al?

V. **Concluding** observations —

- A. Recognition of the sensitivity of this issue.
- B. A matter of individual study and conscience, not affecting the collective activities of this local church.
- C. The response of a local church, under the oversight of her elders, may depend upon attitudes exhibited and the extent of proselytization.
- D. The intent of this material is to simply provide information in defense of literal six-day Biblical creation. Each must evaluate the evidence and decide his or her own position.