

## **Abbreviated Internet Version of the Extended Notes for the Paper on Genesis Chapters 1-3**

“Scripture Quotations taken from the New American Standard Bible®,  
Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1953, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973,  
1975, 1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation  
Used by permission.” ([www.Lockman.org](http://www.Lockman.org))

The Extended Notes are listed on the following page. I’m not including Extended Notes J or K here, but I believe both of the Notes are very important and interesting. I recommend you get a copy of the original paper; I still have some copies. The primary purpose of Extended Note J (“When Was the Universe Created?”; 46 pages in the original paper) was to demonstrate that the scientific evidence for an old universe (apparently something like 14 billion years old) is overwhelming. The primary purpose of Extended Note K (“Intelligent Design, Not Evolution”; 53 pages in the original paper) was to discuss the importance of knowing and believing that God (the God of the Bible) is the Creator of all that exists (not that He created rebellion and sin), very much including man (who was created in His image) and rejecting godless evolution. The scientific evidence against godless evolution is strong and getting stronger all the time.

One of my reasons for not including Extended Notes J and K here is that it would be impossible to abbreviate some of the lengthy excerpts and do justice to the topic. Although the information contained in these Notes is very important to the interpretation of Genesis Chapters 1-3 (especially Note J in that it deals with the age of the universe and earth), it doesn’t deal hardly at all with the interpretation of Genesis Chapters 1-3. Extended Notes J and K are packed with scientific information, information that I found to be very important and interesting.

## Extended Notes

<b>A. Excerpts Dealing with the Gap View of Creation.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Excerpts Dealing with a Modification, or Two, of the Gap View of Creation.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>C. Ezekiel 28:1-19.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>D. The Symbolic Use of the Words <i>Light, Darkness, Night, and Day</i> in the Bible.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>E. A Study of the Hebrew Verb <i>Badal, To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart</i>.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>F. The Use of <i>Day</i> and the <i>Seven Days</i> in the Creation Account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, Using an Artificial Literary Structure.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>G. Galileo’s Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>H. The Bible and Science.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>I. When Was Adam Created?</b> In this Extended Note we also consider the question, When was Noah’s Flood? It includes “A Discussion Regarding Carbon 14 Radiometric Dating and the Accuracy of this Method.”.....	<b>68</b>
<b>J. When Was the Universe Created?</b> This Extended Note contains extensive excerpts from Hugh Ross. It also includes excerpts from “The Dynamics of Dating: The Reliability of Radiometric Dating Methods” by Roger C. Wiens	
<b>K. Intelligent Design, Not Evolution.</b> This lengthy Extended Note consists almost entirely of excerpts from scholars involved in the Intelligent Design movement.	

# EXTENDED NOTE A

## Excerpts Dealing with the Gap View of Creation

### Excerpts from James Montgomery Boice's Expository Commentary on Genesis<sup>1</sup>

I'll quote part of what Boice says in the chapter titled "Views of Creation: The Gap Theory" that deals with Gen. 1:1, 2, under the heading "A Popular Viewpoint." Boice doesn't fully endorse this view, but he has many positive things to say about it. "This theory is also called the restitution or recreation theory. Arthur C. Custance, who has written an excellent book in the theory's defense, traces it to certain early Jewish writers.... [I'll include several excerpts from Arthur Custance later in this Extended Note.] ... It was in Scotland at the beginning of the last century [beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century], through the work of the capable pastor and writer Thomas Chalmers, that the idea gained real coherence and visibility.

Chalmers was anxious to show that the emerging data concerning the geological ages was not incompatible with sound biblical exposition. So according to him, Genesis 1:1 tells of God's creation of an *original* world in which all things were good, for God cannot create that which is bad. Lucifer ruled this world for God. Lucifer sinned. God judged the world along with Lucifer, as a result of which the world became the formless, desolate mass we discover it to be in Genesis 1:2.... The earth continued like this for indeterminate ages in which the various rock strata developed. It was only at the end of this period that God intervened to bring new order out of the prevailing chaos, which is what Genesis 1:3-31 describes. These verses actually describe a recreation.

... [Those who hold the gap view typically hold to six twenty-four hour days of creation.] ... The single most effective teacher of this view was C. I. Scofield, who included it in his notes on Genesis in the astonishingly popular Scofield Reference Bible. [This is the Bible I used for several years after I became a born-again Christian in 1964.] From there it became the almost unquestioned view of fundamentalism.... In more recent times various forms of this theory have been held by C. S. Lewis, M. R. DeHaan, Donald Grey Barnhouse, and others. Francis Schaeffer acknowledged parts of it as a possibility<sup>2</sup>" (pages 57, 58).

I'll also quote part of what Boice says under the heading "When Did Satan Fall?" from this same chapter. "From Genesis 3 we learn that evil was already in existence at the time of Adam and Eve's creation, for Satan was there to tempt Eve. Besides, there are texts that suggest, not always clearly, that there was an earlier fall of Satan, followed by a judgment on Satan and those angels (now demons<sup>3</sup>) who sinned with him.<sup>4</sup> Of course, the fall of Satan may have occurred without any relationship to earth. But he is called 'the prince of the world' and seems to have a special relationship to it. ..." (page 60).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, Vol. 1 (Baker, 1998; originally published in 1982 by Zondervan).

<sup>2</sup> "Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, page 62."

<sup>3</sup> I don't agree that *angels* equal *demons*, neither does G. H. Pember (see the quotation from him in Extended Note C).

<sup>4</sup> Boice discusses Ezek. 28:12-15 on pages 151, 152. I'll quote a few sentences from what he says there. "... ..if [these verses] describe the original state and subsequent fall of Satan, as we may assume they do (though not with total certainty), they do tell us some important things about him." He discusses Isa. 14:12-15 on pages 152-155.

Excerpts from Donald Grey Barnhouse, *The Invisible War*<sup>5</sup>

“...” (pages 9, 10). At least we can say that the Bible evidence is quite strong for the viewpoint that the chaotic state pictured in Gen. 1:2 did not result from God’s work of creation, but from sin and God’s work of judgment.

“That something tremendous and terrible happened to the first, perfect creation [of Gen. 1:1] is certain. We know that later the earth which had become waste and empty was re-formed and refashioned in the six days and peopled by the newly created beings, Adam and his wife; and that this renewed and restored earth...was later cursed on account of man’s sins. We have every right to argue from analogy that the original creation...fell into chaos because of the righteous judgment of God upon some outbreak of rebellion. We believe that there is sufficient light in the Word of God to give us more than a few details. ...

... God may well have created the earth over the course of millions or billions of years; or He may have done it in the flash of a second and then allowed it to go on in its perfect form for untold millions of years. We do not know. Again, after the earth was blasted in judgment and had become a wreck and a ruin, it may have remained in that state for another period of ages. We do not know. ...” (page 18).

“...in the third chapter [of Genesis we come] to the introduction of a new character, a malignant being who is immediately revealed as the bitter enemy of both God and the newly formed and created man. ... ..if, as some would have it, the Lord created the heavens and the earth in the six days and saw that all was good, whence did this enemy creep in? There is no place in such a theory for the origin of evil and the beginning of rebellion against the Creator. When we see, however, that ‘In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,’ and that ‘He created them not a chaos,’<sup>6</sup> but that they became that way as a result of judgment, we have the truth, and are both instructed and satisfied. ...

[After mentioning that the high level being who became the devil and Satan originally had significant authority in God’s original perfect creation of Gen. 1:1, he says:] There came a time when this being, filled with pride because of his own power and attainments...set up an independent rule.... As a result of this proud revolt against the will of God, the Lord God Almighty blasted the material universe...and the earth became without form and void, a wreck and a ruin, a chaos, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. Much later...God moved to re-form, to refashion, this earth. ...” (pages 21, 22).

As Barnhouse continues he discusses quite a few verses on the fall of Satan and on the fact that the Bible shows that Satan has a world government (including Ezekiel 28; 1 Tim. 3:6; Luke 4:6; Eph. 6:12; and the angelic princes of Persia and Greece mentioned in Daniel 10. It’s clear that Satan has substantial authority on the earth (cf. John 12:31, “ruler of this world”; 14:30, “ruler of the world”; 2 Cor. 4:4, “god of this world”; and Eph. 2:2, “the prince of the power of the air”).

---

<sup>5</sup> Zondervan, 1965. Boice mentioned Barnhouse as one who taught the gap view.

<sup>6</sup> Barnhouse is referring to Isa. 45:18, which he discussed on page 16. I do not believe the line that Barnhouse quoted from Isa. 45:18 is sufficient to demonstrate that Gen. 1:2 could not be interpreted as an intermediate step in God’s creative work, though I agree with Barnhouse that that is not the correct way to interpret Gen. 1:2. The primary point made in Isa. 45:18 was that God did not create the earth to be a chaos, empty, etc.; He “formed it to be inhabited” (Isa. 45:18).

Excerpts from Arthur C. Custance, *Without Form and Void:*  
*A Study of the Meaning of Genesis 1:2*

Earlier in this Extended Note, James Montgomery Boice spoke highly of this work by Custance. I was able to obtain this book (211 pages; published by the author in Canada in 1970) through the InterLibrary Loan. Dr. Custance shows that the view that the chaotic state pictured in Gen. 1:2 resulted from God's judgment is ancient, and he argues at length for the translation, "But the earth had become a ruin and a desolation" (or the equivalent) for the first part of Gen. 1:2. (I don't agree that the author/Author intended this translation, so I won't quote anything dealing with that issue.)

I'll include a few excerpts from what Custance says in Chapter 1, "A Long-Held View" (pages 10-40). "...[The] early literature (the Midrash [defined as we continue] for example) reveals that [the Jewish commentators] had some intimation of an early pre-Adamic catastrophe affecting the whole earth. Similarly, clear evidence appears in the oldest extant Version of the Hebrew Scriptures (the Targum of Onkelos).... [See below.] ...

...the idea of a once ordered world having been brought to ruin as a consequence of divine judgment just prior [I believe it would have been better to skip the word "just" here.] to the creation of Adam, was apparently quite widespread. It was not *debated*: it was merely held by some and not by others. ...

Now after or during the Babylonian Captivity, the Jewish people gradually accumulated the comments and explanations of their best known teachers about the Old Testament for some 1500 years - or well on into the Christian era. This body of traditional teaching was gathered together into the Midrash which thus became the oldest pre-Christian exposition of the Old Testament. ...

... In his great work, *The Legends of the Jews*, Louis Ginsberg [Ginzberg] has put into continuous narrative a precis [summary] of their legends, as far as possible in the original phrases and terms. In Volume 1 which covers the period from the Creation to Jacob, he has this excerpt on Genesis 1.

Nor is this world inhabited by man the first of things earthly created by God. He made several other worlds before ours, but He destroyed them all, because He was pleased with none until He created ours.<sup>7</sup>

Clearly this reflects the tradition underlying the translation which appears in the Targum of Onkelos to be noted below. [The Targum of Onkelos doesn't mention "worlds" (plural). It is possible, of course, God destroyed more than one world, but the key issue when it comes to the interpretation of Gen. 1:2 is whether there was an earlier world on the earth that was destroyed (by God's judgment) leading to the chaotic state pictured in that verse.] ...

Another piece of substantiating evidence is to be found in the Targum of Onkelos, the earliest of the Aramaic Versions of the Old Testament written by Hebrew Scholars. ... the Targum attributed to him must...be placed early in the second century B.C. As his translation into Aramaic of Gen. 1:2, Onkelos has the following [I won't quote the Aramaic]. ... 'and the earth was laid waste,' an interpretation of the original Hebrew of Gen. 1:2 which leaves little

---

<sup>7</sup> "Jewish Publication Society of America, Phila., 1954, Vol. 1, p. 4. In Vol. 5 (the critical notes and documentation) Ginsburg references the following sources for the quotation above...(The Great Midrash on 'The Beginning') 3:7; and 9:2. Also Koheleth 3.11; and Tehillim 34, 245."

room for doubt that Onkelos understood this to mean that something had occurred between verse 1 and verse 2 [or, better yet, from my point of view, something had occurred before Gen. 1:1] to reduce the earth to this desolated condition. It reflects Ginsberg's Jewish legend.<sup>8</sup>

[After briefly discussing Akiba, an influential Jewish rabbi who was executed by the Romans in 135 AD, Custance says:] The ancient work known as *The Book of Light*...sometimes simply *Zohar*, was traditionally ascribed to one of Akiba's disciples, a certain Simeon ben Jochai. In this work, which thus represents an opinion held towards the end of the first century and the early part of the second, there is a comment on Gen. 2:2-4 which...reads thus:

These are the generations (i.e., this is the history of...) of heaven and earth.... . . . And these are the generations of the destruction which is signified in verse 2 of chapter 1. The earth was Tohu and Bohu. These indeed are the worlds of which it is said that the blessed God created them *and destroyed them*, and, *on that account*, the earth was desolate and empty"<sup>9</sup> (pages 11-15).

---

<sup>8</sup> I recently came across the book *Unformed and Unfilled* by Weston W. Fields (Collinsville, IL: Burgener Enterprises reprint of the 1976 edition). Fields, a young-earth creationist, deals with a few other topics in this book, but his primary purpose for the book is to refute the gap view of creation. Fields interacts extensively with the book by Custance that I'm quoting from. I agree with many points that Fields makes, but I believe Fields is far too quick to dismiss the relevance of some of the writings cited by Custance. It seems to me that Custance effectively demonstrates that some held the view that the state pictured in Gen. 1:2 was caused by a judgment of God long before geology began to insist (starting about 1800) that the earth was much older than a few thousand years.

Fields takes two full pages (pages 15-17) to discuss what Custance says regarding the Targum of Onkelos. Fields refers to *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* by M. Jastrow (Pardes, 1950) to argue that a more probable translation (than the one given by Custance) would be "And the earth was desolate." With the translation suggested by Fields, which is a good translation, the Targum of Onkelos still supports the idea that the earth had been desolated (undoubtedly by the judgment of God) to cause the chaotic state pictured in Gen. 1:2. Although the translation suggested by Fields doesn't fit the gap view well, it fits very well with the view I prefer, that Gen. 1:2 shows the state of the earth at the time the creation (recreation) spoken of in Gen. 1:1 began.

Fields takes a page and a half (pages 14, 15) to discuss what Custance says in his preceding short paragraphs (which I quoted) regarding *The Legends of the Jews*. For one thing, Fields contends that this quotation by Custance "does not connect sin with the destruction of the worlds." That it was sin that led to the destruction of those worlds is a very reasonable inference, and when these words quoted by Custance are read in context with the preceding paragraph (which was quoted by Fields) and especially with the words that follow (which were not quoted by Custance or Fields), it seems clear that it was sin that led to the destruction(s). I'll quote the sentences that immediately follow the sentences quoted by Custance. "But even this last world [the world that started with Adam and Eve] would have had no permanence, if God had executed His original plan of ruling it according to the principle of strict justice. It was only when He saw that justice by itself would undermine the world that He associated mercy with justice, and made them rule jointly. Thus, from the beginning of all things prevailed Divine goodness, without which nothing could have continued to exist. If not for it, the myriads of evil spirits had soon put an end to the generations of men. ...."

Fields also contends that "this legend does not posit any necessary connection between our own earth and the previously created and destroyed worlds." It seems to me that the word "earthly" in the words quoted by Custance show that the other worlds spoken of were associated with the earth. I agree with Fields (and Custance would agree) that the fact that something is written in *The Legends of the Jews* does not prove that it is true.

<sup>9</sup> "Quoted by Joseph Baylee, Principal of St. Andrews College, Birkenhead, in a paper entitled, 'On the Nature of Language' in the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, London, Vol. III, 1868-69, pp. 260, 261." Fields takes a page (pages 19, 20) to discuss the Zohar, "a multivolume collection of Jewish traditions and interpretations." Even if the Zohar wasn't actually written by Simeon Ben Jochai in the

From the end of page 25 to the end of this chapter (page 40), Custance discusses many Christian scholars who lived from about 1800 onward who support the gap view in one form or another. Also, his Appendix I (pages 117-127) is entitled, "Excerpts from Some Supporting Authors." I'll include a brief excerpt from his Appendix I. "Ramm, Bernard, in his *Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Eerdmans...1954, p. 196) has a footnote in which he gives the following information: 'Dr. Anton Pearson sets forth the history of the gap interpretation as follows: "It was first broached in modern times by Episcopius (1583-1643), and received its first scientific treatment by J. G. Rosenmuller (1736-1815) in his *Antiquissima Telluris Historica* (1776). ... It was picked up by such theologians as Buckland, Chalmers, J. P. Smith and Murphy (*An Exegetical Study of Gen. 1:1-3*, Bethel Seminary Quarterly, 11.14-33, November, 1953).

This theory was also defended by J. H. Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy* (3<sup>rd</sup> German edition, 1857) and in the footnote of p. 236 is traced from Edgar, King of England in the tenth century, to modern scholars as Reichel, Stier, G. H. von Schubert, Knieval, Dreschler, Rudleback, Guericke, Baumgarten and Wagner."'

Other men listed include Adam Sedgewick, *Discourses on the Studies of the Universe*, Cambridge, President of the Geological Society (England); and Pratt, *Scripture and Science Not at Variance*" (pages 126, 127).

#### Excerpt from Arno C. Gaebelein.<sup>10</sup>

"The original earth passed through a great upheaval. A judgment swept over it, which in all probability must have occurred on account of the fall of that mighty creature, Lucifer, who fell by pride and became the devil. The original earth, no doubt, was his habitation and he had authority over it which he still claims as the prince of this world. Luke 4:5, 6 shows this. The earth had become waste and void; chaos and darkness reigned. What that original earth was we do not know, but we know that animal and vegetable life was in existence long before God began to restore the earth. The immense fossil beds prove this. But they likewise prove that man was not then on the earth. Between the first and second verses of the Bible there is that unknown period of millions of years of which geology gets a glimpse in studying the crust of the earth. ...."

---

second century but by Moses De Leon hundreds of years later (Fields says it appeared in Spain at the end of the thirteenth century), as Fields suggests, it would still confirm the existence of the view(s) found in the Targum of Onkelos and *The Legends of the Jews*.

<sup>10</sup> *Gaebelein's Concise Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Loizeaux Brothers, revised edition 1985), page 17.

## EXTENDED NOTE B

### Excerpts Dealing with a Modification, or Two, of the Gap View of Creation; For One Thing, Genesis 1:1 Doesn't Speak of the Absolute Beginning of God's Creative Work

When (some ten to fifteen years ago) I first came across the viewpoint that Gen. 1:1 does not refer to God's initial creation of the universe out of nothing, but to His creation (it could be called a recreation) spoken of in Gen. 1:3-2:3, a creation that starts with the earth being in the chaotic and dark state pictured in Gen. 1:2, I tended to favor this viewpoint. (This viewpoint doesn't deny the important fact that God did initially create what exists out of nothing – before the time of Gen. 1:1.) After further study, I'm convinced this viewpoint is correct. This viewpoint fits these verses much better than the gap view. The gap view and this modified viewpoint both interpret Gen. 1:2 the same way, which (from my point of view) is the correct way.

#### Excerpts from what Allen P. Ross Says Regarding Gen. 1:1, 2 in the *Bible Knowledge Commentary-Old Testament*<sup>11</sup>

"These verses have traditionally been understood as referring to the actual creation of matter, a Creation out of nothing and therefore part of day one. [Ross agrees, of course, that God did create matter in the beginning (cf., e.g. John 1:1-3; Heb. 11:3), but he doesn't believe that Gen. 1:1 is speaking of the absolute beginning of God's creative work. The creative work spoken of in Gen. 1:1 begins with the earth already existing and being in the chaotic state pictured in Gen. 1:2, a chaos that resulted from God's judgment of Satan's earlier kingdom.] But the vocabulary and grammar of this section require a closer look. ... [The creation (recreation) doesn't actually begin until Gen. 1:3 when God says, "Let there be light." ... The word *bara* ('created') [which was used in Gen. 1:1] may express creation out of nothing, but it certainly cannot be limited to that (cf. Gen. 2:7). ...

But Gen. 1:2 describes a chaos: there was waste and void, and 'darkness was over the surface of the deep.' ... It was a chaos of wasteness, emptiness, and darkness. Such conditions would not result from God's creative work (*bara*); rather, in the Bible they are symptomatic of sin and are coordinate with judgment. Moreover, God's Creation by decree begins in verse 3, and the elements found in verse 2 are corrected in Creation [recreation], beginning with light to dispel the darkness. ...

Some [many Christians] have seen a middle stage of Creation here, that is, an unfinished work of Creation (v. 2) that was later developed (vv. 3-25) into the present form. But this cannot be sustained by the syntax or the vocabulary.

Others have seen a 'gap' between the first two verses, allowing for the fall of Satan and entrance of sin into the world that caused the chaos. It is more likely that verse 1 refers to a relative beginning rather than the absolute beginning (Merrill G. Unger, *Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament*, 2 vols., Chicago: Moody Press, 1981, 1:5 [which means Vol. 1, page 5]). The chapter would then be accounting for the Creation of the universe as *man* knows it, not *the* beginning of everything, and verses 1-2 would provide the introduction to it. The fall of Satan and entrance of sin into God's original Creation would precede this. ..." (page 28).

---

<sup>11</sup> Victor Books, 1985.



Excerpts from what Merrill Unger (Just Mentioned by Ross) Says Under Gen. 1:1, 2<sup>12</sup>

“...there are cogent reasons to believe a *relative* rather than an *absolute* beginning is envisioned [in Gen. 1:1]. This view sets God’s creative activity of the earth in a much later geological period in preparation for the latecomer, man. The meaning of ‘in the beginning’ depends on the context. ... The Hebrew verb *bara* (‘to create’) may mean ‘ex nihilo [out of nothing],’ but it may also mean ‘to fashion or make of existing material.’ Man, for example, was not created out of nothing, but out of the dust of the earth (1:26 [1:27]; 2:7).

... Verse 2...apparently...tells the earth’s condition *when* God began to recreate it, and specifically to separate light from chaotic darkness. It ‘was’ a chaos of wasteness, emptiness, and darkness. God did not create it in this state (Job 38:4, 7, cf. Isa. 45:18). It was reduced to this condition because it was the theater where sin began in God’s originally sinless universe in connection with the revolt of Lucifer (Satan) and his angels (Isa. 14:12-14; Ezek. 28:13, 15-17; Rev. 12:4).

The chaos was the result of God’s judgment upon the originally sinless earth. If Genesis 1:1-2 describes original creation, a theological problem arises. Where did Satan and sin originate (cf. 3:1-15)? There is no room in the seven days for the creation of angels, much less the angelic fall producing original sin and the fallen angels or demons. Also, a scientific problem arises. If Genesis 1 describes original creation, how can the account be reconciled with the earth’s great antiquity and man’s comparative late appearance on earth? Genesis 1, we conclude, describes the beginning of *man’s* earth and the *history of man upon it*” (page 5).

I’ll also quote several sentences from what Unger says under Gen. 1:3-5. “...Sin began on the earth. God would deal fully and finally with it upon earth, in and through a new order of created beings [man] to live on the earth. ... His goal of an eventual sinless universe would be realized” (pages 5, 6).

Regarding the *days* of Gen. 1:1-2:3, Unger doesn’t decide between literal twenty-four hour days of recreation, days of the divine *revelation* of recreation, or days of extended geologic ages. Ross mentions these three but favors the first view. Many of the Christian scholars who hold the “title view” of Gen. 1:1<sup>13</sup> do not believe that God created the world in six literal twenty-four hour days.

Excerpts from *Creation & Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis* by Allen P. Ross (Who Was Quoted Above)<sup>14</sup>

“It is clear from the contents of verse 2 that something is drastically wrong at the outset. Two clauses set down the circumstances as chaotic; the first states that the earth was ‘waste and void’ (*tohu wabohu*<sup>15</sup>), or ‘formlessness and emptiness.’ ‘Void’ (*bohu*) is a relatively rare word, occurring only two other times in Scripture, in both cases joined with ‘waste’ (*tohu*) to describe a judgment of God (Jer. 4:23; Isa. 34:11). [Sin and God’s judgment of that sin had reduced a fruitful ordered state to a state of chaos and emptiness.] ...

<sup>12</sup> Unger’s *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Vol. 1 (Moody Bible Institute, 1981).

<sup>13</sup> This view holds that Gen. 1:1 functions as a “title” for the creation account of Genesis chapter 1.

<sup>14</sup> Baker Books, 1996, 1998.

<sup>15</sup> The Hebrew *wa* here means “and.”

...according to the second circumstantial clause [of Gen. 1:2], 'darkness' (*choshek*) was upon the face of the deep. Darkness throughout the Bible represents evil and death.... .." (pages 106, 107).

"That which God calls into existence at the outset is light.... It is natural light, physical light; but it is much more [my emphasis here, and throughout this paragraph]. The Bible shows again and again that light and darkness signify mutually exclusive realms, especially in spiritual matters of good and evil. Throughout Scripture light is the realm of God and the righteous; darkness is the domain of the Evil One and death. Light represents that which is holy, pure, true, life-giving, and gladdening. ...

After the creation of light God announced his evaluation: it was good. ... That which is good is conducive for and enhances life – so light is good, not the darkness [my emphasis]. ..." (page 108).

### The "Title View" for Gen. 1:1

The viewpoints of Unger and Ross regarding Gen. 1:1 could be listed under this heading, but many (or most) of the Christian scholars whose views are listed under this heading don't subscribe to what the "gap" view teaches regarding Gen. 1:2; they don't speak of the rebellion and judgment of Satan and his followers before Gen. 1:1 (as Unger and Ross do, and rightly and significantly so, in my opinion).

#### Excerpts from Kenneth A. Matthews<sup>16</sup>

I'll quote part of what Kenneth A. Matthews says regarding the "title" view. (Matthews doesn't subscribe to this view.) "In the title view v. 1 is the summary heading of the whole account [Gen. 1:1-2:3], announcing the subject matter, and 1:2-2:3 presents the details.<sup>17</sup> ...

The most formidable argument for interpreting v. 1 as a summary is the phrase 'the heavens and the earth,' which uniformly means in Scripture the universe as a completed organization—the cosmos as we know it.<sup>18</sup> [In other words, Gen. 1:1 speaks in summary form of God's work of creation spelled out in Gen. 1:3-2:3.] ... .. 'created' (*bara*) always designates a completed product; thus 'created' in v. 1 summarizes the whole process described in vv. 3-31. Moreover, it does not mean *creatio ex nihilo* [creation out of nothing] by itself; therefore the prologue's summary statement that God 'created' the cosmos does not preclude that God used precreated matter (v. 2) in shaping the preexisting earth (vv. 3-31). ... [Significantly, there is no creative word of God mentioned in Genesis chapter 1 before His "Let there be light" in 1:3.] Finally, this arrangement of 1:1-3 has support from the parallel patterns in 2:4-7....<sup>19</sup> ..."

<sup>16</sup> *Genesis 1-11:26* (Broadman & Holman, 2001), pages 140-143.

<sup>17</sup> "Among commentators who hold this view are H. Gunkel, S. R. Driver, Cassuto, von Rad, Westermann, and Hamilton. Also see the defense by Waltke, 'The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3, Part III,' 216-228." Cassuto is a Jewish scholar. Hamilton and Waltke are evangelicals.

<sup>18</sup> "E.g., Gen. 2:1, 4; 14:19, 22; Psalms 8:6[7]; 121:2. For the following arguments see Waltke [same as in preceding footnote]."

<sup>19</sup> "Summary heading

1:1 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'

2:4 'This is the account of the heavens and the earth [when they were created]...' ...

Circumstantial Description (*waw* disjunctive + noun + verb)

1:2 'Now the earth was without form and void...' (footnote continues on the next page)

Excerpts from Bruce K. Waltke, from the Chapter Titled “Prologue (1:1-2:3)”<sup>20</sup>

Commenting on the words “In the beginning” (Gen. 1:1), Waltke says, “ ‘Beginning’ refers to the entire created event, the six days of creation, not something before the six days<sup>21</sup> nor a part of the first day. Although some have argued that 1:1 functions as merely the first event of creation, rather than a summary of the whole account, the grammar makes that interpretation improbable”<sup>22</sup> (page 58). I’ll also quote Waltke’s first sentence commenting on the verb “created [*bara*]” of Gen. 1:1, “This telic verb refers to the completed act of creation”<sup>23</sup> (page 58). Waltke also points out that in all the uses of the expression “the heavens and the earth” in the Old Testament, very much including Gen. 1:1, “this phrase functions as a compound referring to the organized universe” and he discusses this point in a footnote (page 59).

“The narrator chooses not to explain the origins of what we call the planet earth and of its states hostile to life (darkness and depth), that is, evil.<sup>24</sup> ... Here the narrator is only concerned with the relative beginning of creation. He wishes to establish the creative power of God and his relationship to humanity as well as the covenant community. ...” (page 68).

Excerpts from John H. Walton<sup>25</sup>

“... Does it [Walton is speaking of Gen. 1:1, 2a, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was...(NIV).”] refer to some creative activity that preceded the six days (in which something that can be designated heaven and earth were created), or does it introduce and summarize the activity of the seven days (during which heaven and earth were created)? There are two evidences that I believe offer support for the second option. (1) The book of Genesis typically operates literarily by introducing sections with a summary statement. Thus, for example, beginning in 2:4 and ten additional times throughout the book, a toledot statement introduces a section...[See under Gen. 2:4 in this paper]. (2) Even more persuasive is that the account of the six days closes with the comment that ‘the heavens and the earth’ were completed (2:1).

---

2:5-6 ‘Now no shrub of the field had yet appeared...’ ...

Main clause (*waw* consecutive + verb)

1:3 ‘Then God said...’

2:7 ‘Then the LORD God formed man...’ ...

<sup>20</sup> *Genesis* (Zondervan, 2001). Waltke wrote the book “with Cathi J. Fredricks.”

<sup>21</sup> In a footnote Waltke says, “This is a relative beginning. As verse 2 seems to indicate, there is a pre-Genesis time and space.”

<sup>22</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “Those who hold to that view believe that 1:2 clarifies 1:1, that is, God creates the earth as an unformed mass. Martin Luther, arguing for this view, said, ‘heaven and earth are the crude and formless masses...up to that time’ (*Luther’s Works*, Vol. 1, *Lectures on Genesis Chapter 1-5*, ed. J. Pelikan [Saint Louis, Concordia, 1958], 6). John Calvin also took this position (*A Commentary on Genesis*, ed. and trans. J. King [London: Banner of Truth, 1965], 69-70).”

<sup>23</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “A telic verb (i.e., die or sell) only finds meaning at the end of a process. The Hebrew term *bara*, meaning ‘to create,’ only refers to a completed act of creation (cf. Deut. 4:32; Ps. 89:12; Isa. 40:26; Amos 4:13), so it cannot mean that, in the beginning, God *began* the process of creating the cosmos.”

<sup>24</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “As we shall see in Gen. 3, Satan is the expression of moral evil. Where or how this evil originates, the narrator also does not explain.”

<sup>25</sup> *Genesis* (Zondervan, 2001).

Thus Genesis uses literary introductions, and the six days accomplished the creation of heaven and earth. It can therefore be concluded that the text is not suggesting that anything was actually created in 1:1; rather, the verse is a literary introduction, a summary of what follows. The 'initial period [the "initial period" of time in which God created our present world]<sup>26</sup> indicated by...["in the beginning" of Gen. 1:1] is not described in verse 1 but in chapter 1" (page 70).

"... Later Scripture supports our belief that God made all of the matter of which the cosmos is composed (and that he made it out of nothing, Col. 1:16-17; Heb. 11:3), but that is not what Genesis means by the use of *bara*. The origin of matter is what our society has taught is important (indeed, that matter is all there is), but we cannot afford to be so distracted by our cultural ideas. The existence of matter was not the concern of the author of Genesis.

The author's concerns were much like others in the ancient Near East, where the greatest exercise of the power of the gods was not demonstrated in the manufacture of matter but in the fixing of destinies. [Walton has a footnote here, "Fixing destinies was the means of regulating roles and functions." ] ..." (page 71).

---

<sup>26</sup> On pages 68, 69 Walton discusses the fact that other uses of the Hebrew noun (*reshith*, the noun translated "beginning" in Gen. 1:1) in the Old Testament support the view that the "beginning" in Gen. 1:1 refers to "an initial period or duration rather than to a specific point in time."

## EXTENDED NOTE C

### Ezekiel 28:1-19

Introduction. We are looking at these interesting verses from the prophet Ezekiel here, in conjunction with our study of Genesis chapter 1, because Ezek. 28:11-15 (apparently) reveal very important information about the high-level angelic being (one of the *cherubim*) before he sinned through pride and became Satan/the devil. That is a common interpretation of these verses (including, it seems, essentially all those who hold the gap view of Gen. 1:1, 2 and Unger and Ross, who are quoted at the beginning of Extended Note B),<sup>27</sup> and I believe it is the correct interpretation. In Ezek. 28:1-10

---

<sup>27</sup> I'll quote part of a footnote from the Scofield Reference Bible that relates to these verses in Ezekiel chapter 28 (Oxford University Press, copyright 1909, 1917). "Here (vs. 12-15), as in Isa. 14:12 [As I mentioned in my paper dated August 2000 when dealing with Isaiah chapter 14, I don't believe Isa. 14:12 directly addresses Satan, though we can certainly see the pride and fall of Satan as the background for the pride and fall of the king of Babylon spoken of in Isaiah chapter 14.], the language goes beyond the king of Tyre to Satan, inspirer and unseen ruler of all such pomp and pride as that of Tyre. Instances of thus indirectly addressing Satan are: Gen. 3:14, 15; Matt. 16:23. [I believe Satan is *directly* addressed in Gen. 3:14, 15.] The unfallen state of Satan is here described [in Ezekiel chapter 28; we also see his fall in Ezekiel chapter 28]; his fall in Isa. 14:12-14. (See Rev. 20:10, *note.*) ...."

I'll quote part of the note at Rev. 20:10 just mentioned, "Satan, Summary: This fearful being, apparently created one of the cherubim (Ezek. 1:5 *note*; 28:12-14, *note*) and anointed for a position of great authority, perhaps over the primitive creation (Gen. 1:2, *note* 3 [Scofield saw a gap between Gen. 1:1 and 2. In his view the "primitive creation" would have existed before the judgment that brought about the desolate state pictured in Gen. 1:2.]; Ezek. 28:11-15), fell through pride (Isa. 14:12-14). His 'I will' (Isa. 14:13) marks the introduction of sin into the universe. ... After the creation of man he entered into the serpent (Gen. 3:1, *note*), and, beguiling Eve by his subtilty, secured the downfall of Adam and through him of the race, and the entrance of sin into the world of men (Rom. 5:12-14). The Adamic Covenant (Gen. 3:14-19, *note*) promised the ultimate destruction of Satan through the 'Seed of the woman.' Then began his long warfare against the work of God in behalf of humanity, which still continues. The present world-system (Rev. 13:8), organized upon the principles of force, greed, selfishness, ambition, and sinful pleasure, is his work.... Of that world-system he is prince (John 14:30; 16:11), and god (2 Cor. 4:4). As 'prince of the power of the air' (Eph. 2:2) he is at the head of a vast host of demons (Matt. 7:22, *note*). ...."

I'll list the commentators on Ezekiel, of the commentaries that I have, who understand Ezek. 28:11-15 (or 28:11-19) to speak of the fall of Satan, or who at least favor this interpretation. (Some who see Satan's fall in these verses don't see him on the "primitive" earth before his fall; Charles Feinberg, for example, seems to only see him in heaven before his fall.); Lamar Eugene Cooper, *Ezekiel* (Broadman and Holman, 1994; Cooper says, "[The interpretation] favored by several of the church fathers is to understand for the background of the lament an account of the fall of Satan not given in Scripture but alluded to elsewhere, especially in Isa. 14:12-17. Ezekiel would have been relying on his listeners/readers' familiarity with such an account, and they would have understood the comparison between the fall of Satan and the fall of the king of Tyre. The difficulty of the text makes it unwise to insist upon a particular interpretation, but the traditional view [the view seeing the fall of Satan] appears to the present writer to account best for the language and logic of the passage" (pages 264, 265). By virtue of the fact that these words are a direct prophetic word from God (Ezek. 28:11), we don't have to assume that Ezekiel was "relying on his listeners/readers' familiarity with such an account."); Paul P. Enns, *Ezekiel* (Zondervan, 1986); Charles H. Dyer, "Ezekiel" in the *Bible Knowledge Commentary - Old Testament* (Victor Books, 1985); Merrill F. Unger, *Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament* (Moody Press, 1981); Charles Lee Feinberg, *The Prophecy of Ezekiel* (Moody Press, 1969); Elmer A. Gantz, "Ezekiel" in the *Liberty Bible Commentary - Old Testament* (Old-Time Gospel Hour, 1982); H. A. Ironside, *Ezekiel* (Loizeaux Brothers, copyright

God was speaking (through Ezekiel) to the literal king of Tyre. His words dealt with the fact that the king had become extremely proud and sinful and that judgment was on the way. Then in 28:11-15 God apparently spoke to Satan, the one behind the literal king of Tyre and the one the king of Tyre was emulating.

Satan was behind the king of Tyre in that he is the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4), and the king of Tyre had much in common with Satan. They both had positions of substantial authority under God; they both fell through pride and began to sin; and they both end up being judged by God. (I'm not suggesting, of course, that the authority, pride, sin, or judgment of the literal king of Tyre came close to equaling the authority, pride, sin, or judgment of Satan. Furthermore, we certainly wouldn't say that the literal king of Tyre had not sinned in the years before he fell through pride, as was the case with Satan.) After speaking to Satan in Ezek. 28:11-15, God spoke again to the literal king of Tyre in Ezek. 28:16-19. Many take 28:11-19 of Satan. Some of the words of the second half of Ezek. 28:16 perfectly fit Satan.

It happens fairly often in the Old Testament prophets (including many of the psalms) that a message/prophesy shifts perspective and begins to speak on a higher, more important level. Isaiah chapter 13, for example, begins and ends speaking of God's judgment of literal ancient Babylon, but in Isa. 13:6-13 it rises to speak of His end-time judgment of the world. This is a natural shift to make in that *Babylon* (a world kingdom) is a symbol for the world.<sup>28</sup>

**The word of the LORD came again to me, saying, (2) “Son of man [These words were spoken to Ezekiel, who was to speak God’s word to the king of Tyre. “Having announced judgment on the city of Tyre in chapter 26 and sung a funeral lament over the city in chapter 27, likening it to an overloaded ship that was sunk by the east wind of Babylonia, God commanded Ezekiel to deliver a final judgment speech against the ruler of Tyre—perhaps Ittobaal II [many say Ethbaal III, who ruled from 591/590-573/572 BC]—of those days, though the speech is in many ways not against any one particular king but Tyre’s kings per se.”<sup>29</sup>], say to the leader of Tyre, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD, “Because your heart is lifted up and you have said, ‘I am a god [or, God (Hebrew *el*)], I sit in the seat of gods [or, God (*elohim*)] in the heart of the seas’; yet you are a man and not God [or, a god (*el*)], although you make your heart like the heart of God [or, gods (*elohim*)]—(3) Behold, you are wiser than Daniel [The most common view is that this**

---

1949; Ironside says, “The prophet says of this spirit leader, ‘Thou wast in Eden, the garden of God.’ This would seem to suggest that before man himself was created, this glorious being had charge of the lower creation. ... He may have been the one appointed from the beginning to take charge of this world. ... He dwelt in the very presence of Deity, walking up and down in the midst of the stones of fire....” (page 192.); and Arno C. Gaebelien, *The Prophet Ezekiel* (1918). Although Patrick Fairbairn (AD 1805-1874) in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (1989 Kregel reprint) doesn't agree with this viewpoint, he says, “...most of the earlier commentators have supposed that the words here [Ezek. 28:1-5], and afterwards in vers. 12-14, were not properly used of Tyre, but were rather to be understood mystically of Satan. [Then in a footnote he says:] The views of the Fathers who held this opinion, comprehending those of Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, are carefully brought together in Villalpandus, who himself agrees with those who took a middle course, ascribing what was said [in Ezekiel chapter 28] partly to the prince of Tyre and partly to Satan” (pages 315, 316).

<sup>28</sup> Isaiah chapter 13 is discussed on page 22 of my paper that deals with selected eschatological passages from Isaiah dated August 2000. Isaiah chapter 14 is discussed in that paper too.

<sup>29</sup> Ralph H. Alexander, “Ezekiel” in the *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, Vol. 6 (Zondervan, 1986), page 880.

refers to the Daniel of the Old Testament book of Daniel.]; **there is no secret that is a match for you. (4) By your wisdom and understanding you [the king of Tyre] have acquired riches for yourself and have acquired gold and silver for your treasures. (5) By your great wisdom, by your trade you have increased your riches and your heart is lifted up because of your riches—(6) Therefore thus says the Lord GOD, ‘Because you have made your heart Like the heart of God [or, gods (*elohim*). Tyre, a key seaport city on the Mediterranean Sea, gained great fame and wealth through trading with her fleets of ships. It isn’t surprising to learn that the king of Tyre had a serious problem with pride.], (7) Therefore, behold, I will bring strangers upon you, the most ruthless of the nations. And they will draw their swords against the beauty of your wisdom and defile your splendor. (8) They will bring you down to the pit [BDB (Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew Lexicon), rightly I believe, says this of the *pit* of Sheol], and you will die the death of those who are slain in the heart of the seas [The NIV has, “And you will die a violent death in the heart of the seas.” Note the words “in the heart of the seas” in 28:2. These words clearly speak of God’s judgment of the king of Tyre, not of Satan.]. (9) Will you still say, “I am a god [or, God (*elohim*)],” in the presence of your slayer, though you are a man and not God [or, a god (*el*)], in the hands of those who wound you? (10) ‘You will die the death of the uncircumcised by the hand of strangers, for I have spoken!’ declares the Lord GOD!” ’ ’ ’ [Ezekiel chapter 26 dealt with the fact that God would bring Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, against Tyre with a great army. The siege lasted a long time (585-573 BC). “Ethbaal III was removed from his throne by Nebuchadnezzar in 573-572 B.C. and Baal II was put in his place. Ethbaal III paid a high price for rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar. In fact Ethbaal would ‘die the death of the uncircumcised at the hands of foreigners.’ While the Phoenicians [Tyre was a Phoenician city] practiced circumcision,<sup>30</sup> Ezekiel’s words conveyed a meaning that went beyond this cultural practice. To ‘die the death of the uncircumcised’ meant to die in shame (cf. 32:30; 1 Sam. 17:26, 36). This king who claimed to be a god would suffer an ignoble death as a man.”<sup>31</sup>**

“[Dying] the death of the uncircumcised by the hands of strangers” here undoubtedly had much to do with the fact that the king would be denied a proper burial, which would have been considered very important. “...the force was that the Tyrians would die a death of shame. The strong language was expressive of Hebrew scorn (1 Sam. 17:26; 31:4) and was used of those whose bodies were either unburied or cast into the earth without funeral rites.”<sup>32</sup> “...for this man to be sentenced to join the uncircumcised meant being consigned to the most undesirable compartment of the netherworld, along with other vile and unclean persons.”<sup>33</sup> (11) **Again the word of the LORD came to me saying, (12) “Son of man, take up a lamentation over the king of Tyre and say to him** [The fact that the Hebrew noun *melek* was used for “king” here and the noun *nagid* for “leader” in verse 1 doesn’t, in itself, demonstrate that two different persons are being spoken to. The noun *melek* was appropriate for the literal king of Tyre too; Moshe Greenberg points out that these two Hebrew nouns are used in parallel in Psalm 76:13.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, although I believe Satan is the one in view in verses 12-15, the words of those verses have some

<sup>30</sup> The Egyptians also practiced circumcision, but not the Assyrians or Babylonians.

<sup>31</sup> Charles H. Dyer, *Bible Knowledge Commentary*, pages 1282, 1283.

<sup>32</sup> Charles L. Feinberg, *Prophecy of Ezekiel*, page 160.

<sup>33</sup> Daniel I. Block, *Book of Ezekiel, Chapter 25-48* (Eerdmans, 1998), page 99.

<sup>34</sup> *Ezekiel 21-27*.

application for the literal king of Tyre too.], **‘Thus says the Lord GOD, “You had the seal of perfection** [“You were the model of perfection” NIV], **full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. (13) You were in Eden,**<sup>35</sup> **the garden of God** [If this passage speaks of Satan’s being in *Eden, the garden of God* on the “primitive” earth (before Gen. 1:1), which it seems to do, this is a significant revelation.]; **every precious stone was your covering** [“every precious stone adorned you” NIV]: **the ruby, the topaz and the diamond; the beryl, the onyx and the jasper; the lapis lazuli, the turquoise and the emerald; and the gold, the workmanship of your settings and sockets** [“mountings” NIV], **was in you.** [Apparently the idea here is that the precious stones were set and mounted in gold. The kings of the ancient world frequently adorned themselves with gold and precious stones. Perhaps more relevant is the fact that the Jewish high priest wore a breastplate that included precious stones and gold. (There is some apparent correspondence between the Satan’s original office and the office of the high priest.) “The list of precious stones [here in Ezek. 28:13], arranged in three sets of three, contains—in differing order—nine of the twelve stones of the high priest’s breastplate in Ex. 28:17-20, omitting the third set of the breastplate. ... Exod 28:20b concludes the enumeration of the stones with the sentence: ‘They shall be framed in gold in their settings,’ thus clearly distinguishing the gold work from the precious stones.”<sup>36</sup>] **On the day that you were created** [These words about being *created* obviously don’t fit the literal king of Tyre in any literal sense, but they perfectly fit Satan. Verse 15 repeats the fact that this being *was created*.] **they were prepared. (14) You were the anointed** [He was anointed by God to carry out his assignments.] **cherub who covers, and I placed you there.** [In that we already know from the Bible that Satan was a high-level angelic being before his fall, it is easy to accept the idea that he could have been one of the cherubim. We read of the cherubim in Genesis (Gen. 3:24), in the book of Ezekiel (in 9:3; often in Ezekiel chapter 10; they are also spoken of in Ezekiel chapter 1, but the words “cherub/cherubim” are not used; Ezek. 11:22; 28:14, 16; 41:18, 20, 25), and in quite a few other places in the Bible. I assume the words “who covers” refer to the fact that this cherub had authority (under God) to watch over God’s garden on the earth, which probably included all that was happening on the earth. For one thing, he would undoubtedly have guarded the way into the presence of God from the garden/earth.] **You were on the holy mountain of God; you walked in the midst of the stones of fire.** [I understand these words to mean that this cherub, though he was on the earth, having been placed there by God, also had full access to the presence of God. He lived in two worlds.] **(15) You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created until unrighteousness was found in you.** [The things said in verses 13-15 seem to perfectly fit Satan in the days before his fall, but they could only be applied to the literal king of Tyre in an extremely exaggerated, figurative sense, except for his being adorned with gold and precious stones.] **(16) By the abundance of your trade you were internally filled with violence, and you sinned** [These words, especially the

<sup>35</sup> I’ll quote what Merrill Unger says regarding *Eden* here (*Unger’s Commentary*, page 1550), “It is inconsequential whether Eden, the garden of God (Gen. 2:8; Ezek. 31:8-9, 16; 36:35), refers to a primal [before Gen. 1:1] Eden or the Eden of Genesis 3. Satan has been in both. But who will venture to say that any king of Tyre ever was?”

<sup>36</sup> Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37* (Doubleday), pages 582, 583. Leslie C. Allen (*Ezekiel 20-48* [Word Books], page 94) points out that “the LXX [Septuagint] reinforces the reference [to the high priest’s breast piece mentioned in Exod 28:17-20; 39:10-12] by listing all twelve stones.”



word *trade*, seem to rather strongly switch the discourse back to the literal king of Tyre. The same Hebrew noun for *trade* was used in 28:5, and it is used again in 28:18. On the *trading* of ancient Tyre, see Ezekiel chapter 27.]; **therefore I have cast you as profane from the mountain of God.** [These words, like the following words of verse 16, though they are apparently intended for the literal king of Tyre, strongly build on what was just said regarding the cherub (apparently Satan). They also serve to confirm what we already knew from the Bible, that Satan, having lost his right relationship with God through rebellion, was (in most senses) cast out of the presence of God. God couldn't have let things continue as they had been after this high-level being rebelled against Him and His divine order. *Unrepentant* rebels, whether angels or men, cannot dwell in the presence of God. However, Satan still has some (temporary) access to God after the fall (cf. Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6; and Rev. 12:10).] **And I have destroyed you, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.** [I understand these words in the sense that the literal king of Tyre (who, as the previous verses have shown, has so much in common with Satan that he can figuratively be called "the covering cherub") is judged and destroyed by God. As we have seen already, God's judgment of the literal king of Tyre resulted in his ignominious death at the hands of the Babylonians.

The BDB Hebrew Lexicon gives "cause to perish, destroy, kill (in judgment)" as the meaning of the Hebrew verb used here (*abad*). The verb *destroyed* (or caused to perish/killed in judgment) doesn't fit well with God's initial (preliminary) judgment of Satan. Although Satan lost his right relationship with God and the privilege to dwell in His presence, he still has some access to God, and he hasn't been *destroyed* (or *perished/been killed in judgment*). In a sense Satan will be destroyed by God's judgment at the end of this age when he is cast into the eternal lake of fire, but he will not cease to exist (Rev. 20:10).] **(17) Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom by reason of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I put you before kings, that they may see you.** [The first sentence here could fit Satan or the king of Tyre, but the second sentence fits the king of Tyre, but not Satan. When the king of Tyre was dethroned and put to death by the Babylonians, the kings (and peoples) of the earth could see his ignoble end.] **(18) By the multitude of your iniquities, in the unrighteousness of your trade you profaned your sanctuaries.** [“[They profaned their sanctuaries] by dedicating in them treasures acquired by violence and injustice.”<sup>37</sup> These words fit well with the king of Tyre, but not Satan.] **Therefore I have brought fire from the midst of you; it has consumed you, and I have turned you to ashes on the earth in the eyes of all who see you.** [I suppose these words fit God's judgment of the city of Tyre better than they fit the king himself, but he is destroyed with Tyre.] **(19) All who know you among the peoples are appalled at you; you have become terrified and you will cease to be forever.” ’ ’**

Excerpts from G. H. Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*<sup>38</sup> Dealing with Ezekiel Chapter 28

Commenting on Ezek. 28:13, Pember says "Now Satan was indeed in Adam's Eden: he did not, however, appear there as a minister of God, but as an apostate and malignant spirit eager

<sup>37</sup> F. F. Bruce, "Ezekiel" in *New Layman's Bible Commentary* (Zondervan, 1979), page 886.

<sup>38</sup> 1975 Kregel reprint, originally published in 1876. Some of the excerpts from Pember (who taught the gap view of creation) go beyond Ezekiel 28:1-19.

for the ruin of the new creation. Hence the Eden of this passage [Ezek. 28:13] must have been of a far earlier date. ...

He is also said to have been on the Holy Mountain of God, and to have walked up and down in the midst of the Stones of Fire (Ezek. 28:14). The Mountain of God is the place of His presence in visible glory, where His High Priest [Pember is speaking of Satan in the days before his fall. It seems clear that Satan (before his rebellion) did had a high position under God.] would, of course, stand before Him to minister. The Stones of Fire may, perhaps be explained as follows. ... Now when Moses took Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, up the mountain of Sinai to see the God of Israel, 'there was under His feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone.... And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire upon the top of the mount' (Exod. 24:10, 17). This paved work of sapphire glowing with devouring fire, is perhaps, the same as [or at least similar to] the Stones of Fire [of Ezek. 28:14]: and if so, Satan's presence in the midst of them would indicate his enjoyment of the full Cherubic privilege of nearness to the throne of God" (pages 50, 51).

" ... So, probably, in remote ages [in the "preadamite world," which for Pember would have existed between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2, and for me would have existed before Gen. 1:1], before the first whisper of rebellion against God, Satan, as the great governing head and the viceroy of the Almighty, assisted by glorious beings of his own nature, ruled over the sinless dwellers upon earth. At the same time he directed the worship of his subjects, and expounded to them the oracles of the all-wise Creator.

But his weight of glory was more than he could bear: pride lifted up his heart, and he fell from his obedience. Then, doubtless, corruption appeared among his angels,<sup>39</sup> and so descended to those who were in the flesh.<sup>40</sup> ...

We are...apparently able to discern in the New Testament clear traces of the two orders of Satan's subjects, the spiritual, and those who were in the flesh [in the preadamite world]. For there are three distinctive terms applied to the dwellers in the Kingdom of Darkness.

The first is...the Devil.... ... In the second place we find mention of the angels of Satan (Matt. 25:41), who are doubtless the spiritual intelligences which God appointed to assist him in his government, and who chose to follow him into sin. ... But another class of Satan's subjects is much more frequently brought before us, that of the...demons.... ... Now these demons are the same as evil and unclean spirits, as we may see from the following passages. 'When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with *demons*; and He cast out the *spirits* with His word' (Matt. 8:16). ...

But they [demons] must be carefully distinguished from angels, bad as well as good. [It seems clear that a large number of *demons*, not a large number of *angels*, were possessing the man spoken of in Mark 5, for example.] For angels are not mere disembodied spirits [demons are "disembodied spirits," according to Pember, and I believe he is right], but—as we may learn from our Lord's declaration that the children of the resurrection shall be equal to the angels—are clothed with spiritual bodies [bodies designed for living in the heavenly dimension], such as are promised to us (compare Phil. 3:21; Luke 24:39) if we 'shall be accounted worthy to obtain that age and the resurrection from the dead' (Luke 20:35). ...

---

<sup>39</sup> Revelation 12:4 with 12:7-9 indicates that a third of God's angels followed Satan in his rebellion.

<sup>40</sup> I suppose it's possible that the beings that lived on the "primitive/preadamite" earth (assuming there was such an earth and there were such beings) were all spiritual beings (like the angels), but it seems probable that many of them had more substantial bodies (more like the physical bodies of our present world).

... ..may not these demons be the spirits of those who trod this earth in the flesh before the ruin described in the second verse of Genesis, and who, at the time of that destruction, were disembodied by God, and left still under the power, and ultimately to share the fate, of the leader in whose sin they acquiesced? Certainly one oft-recorded fact seems to confirm such a theory: for we read that the demons are continually seizing upon the bodies of men, and endeavoring to use them as their own. And may not this propensity indicate a wearisome lack of ease, a wandering unrest, arising from a sense of incompleteness; a longing to escape the intolerable condition of being unclothed—for which they were not created—so intense that, if they can satisfy its cravings in no other way, they will even enter into the filthy bodies of swine? (Matt. 8:31). [Based on what Mark 5:10 says about the demons imploring Jesus earnestly not to send them out of the country, we can speculate that they may have lived in that same territory on a “primitive/preadamite” earth. Although it’s undoubtedly true that demons (at least some of them) have a craving to appropriate a physical body, Satan’s use of them certainly involves fighting against God’s kingdom and the destruction of men, not satisfying demonic cravings.]

We find no such propensity [to dwell in the bodies of men or animals] on the part of Satan and his angels. They, doubtless, still retain their ethereal bodies—for otherwise, how could they carry on their conflicts with the angels of God? [which is pictured, for example, in Dan. 10:13, 20; Rev. 12:7-9]—and would be likely to regard with high disdain the gross and unwieldy tabernacles of men. They may, indeed, possibly enter human frames; not, however, from inclination, but only because such a course is absolutely necessary for the furtherance of some great conspiracy of evil” (pages 55-59).

## EXTENDED NOTE D

### The Symbolic Use of the Words *Light, Darkness, Night, and Day* in the Bible

#### The Symbolic Use of the Word *Light*

For the most part I'll limit this study to the verses where the NASB translated the Hebrew noun *or* (which is the noun translated *light* in Gen. 1:3 [twice], 1:4 [twice], 1:5, and 1:18) as *light* and the verses where it translated the Greek noun *phos* as *light*. This Hebrew noun is translated light 105 times in the Old Testament; this Greek noun is translated light 68 times in the New Testament.<sup>41</sup>

The primary procedure I used for this study (for all the words being studied) was to read through the listing of these words in the *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* for the NASB looking for examples of symbolic uses. When a verse looked promising, I turned to the Bible to look for the meaning of the word in its context. I didn't spend as much time on this study as I could have, but I did spend quite a bit of time. I believe this Extended Note is quite important for the interpretation of Genesis chapter 1; furthermore, the words *light* and *darkness*, when they are used in a symbolic sense as they very often are, are two of the more important words in the Bible. I may have missed a few verses where these words are used in a symbolic sense, and some may not agree with every single verse that I have listed as symbolic (most of the uses are so obvious that it would be hard to disagree), but this study is more than sufficient to acquaint the reader with the extensive and important symbolic uses of these words.

I knew that the word *light* is often used in a symbolic sense in the Bible, but I was somewhat surprised by the numbers I discovered in this study. For the Hebrew noun, which was used 99 times in the Old Testament (not counting the 6 uses found in Gen. 1:3-5, 18), I found 69 uses (about 70 percent of the uses) to be symbolic. The percentage was even higher for the Greek noun we are looking at here. Over 80 percent of the uses are symbolic. Such a high percentage helps demonstrate that it is quite reasonable to see a strong symbolic/spiritual component for the word light in Gen. 1:3-5.

I'll quote quite a few verses where the word light is used in a symbolic sense in the Bible and comment on many of these uses; I'll also list more such verses for further study.

Job 24:13 NIV. "There are those who rebel against the light, who do not know its ways or stay in its paths." The "light" here is a symbol for God's truth, divine order, and righteousness.

---

<sup>41</sup> The Hebrew noun was also translated broad (1), dawn (1), dawn\* (1), daylight (1), daylight\* (1), early morning (1), lightning (5), lights (2), sun (1), sunlight (1), sunshine (1) for a total of 121 uses in the Old Testament. The Greek noun was also translated fire (1), firelight (1), and lights (2) for a total of 72 uses in the New Testament. These numbers were taken from the Hebrew-Aramaic Dictionary and the Greek Dictionary in the back of the *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* for the NASB (Foundation Publications, 1981, 1998). The asterisks\* show that the Hebrew behind the English translation has two or more words.

Job 30:26. "When I expected good, then evil came; When I waited for light, then darkness came." "Light" here is a symbol for "good," for God's blessings. It is contrasted with "darkness" and "evil [referring to the trials that came upon Job]."

Psalm 4:6. "Many are saying, 'Who will show us any good?' Lift up the light of Thy countenance [face (presence)] upon us, O LORD!" "The light of [God's] countenance" brings "good" to His people and the blessings of His divine order.

Psalm 27:1. "The LORD is my light and my salvation..." The "light" of God is the source of "salvation" and of every blessing for God's people.

Psalm 36:9. "For with Thee is the fountain of life; In Thy light we see light."

Psalm 43:3. "O send out Thy light and Thy truth, let them lead me; Let them bring me to Thy holy hill, And to Thy dwelling places."

Psalm 44:3. "For by their own sword they did not possess the land; And their own arm did not save them; But Your right hand, and Your arm and the light of Your presence, for You favored them."

Psalm 56:13. "For You have delivered my soul from death, Indeed my feet from stumbling, So that I may walk before God In the light of the living." The "light" of God goes with the life of God, very much including spiritual life (cf., e.g., John 1:4, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men"). It is contrasted with "death," very much including spiritual death, and with "stumbling" (sin).

Psalm 89:15. "How blessed are the people who know the joyful sound! O LORD, they walk in the light of Your countenance."

Psalm 97:11. "Light is sown *like seed* for the righteous And gladness for the upright in heart." Here "light" includes the blessings of God for those who are "righteous" and "upright in heart" (by His light/grace).

Psalm 104:2. "Covering Yourself with light as with a cloak, Stretching out heaven like a tent curtain." This verse takes on added importance for our study in that this psalm speaks of God's creation of the heaven and the earth in the beginning, as does Genesis chapter 1. Apparently God Himself is the source of the light of Gen. 1:3.

Psalm 112:4. "Light arises in the darkness [the place of trials] for the upright; *He is* gracious and compassionate and righteous." The "light" here includes all the blessings of salvation that God pours out on "the upright/righteous."

Psalm 119:105. "Your word is a lamp to my feet And a light to my path."

Isaiah 2:5. "Come, house of Jacob, and let us walk in the light of the LORD." Here the main idea is that God's people must repent and begin to walk in the *truth* and *righteousness* of "the light of the LORD," in accordance with His word. It was to be understood that

repentance and righteousness would bring forth the blessings that accompany dwelling in the light.

Isaiah 5:20. "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; Who substitute darkness for light and light for darkness; Who substitute bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." "Good," "light," and "sweet" go together; they are opposite "evil," "darkness," and "bitter." The "light" here includes God's truth and righteousness; the "darkness" includes the absence of truth and sin.

Isaiah 5:30. "And it [the nation God brings against Judah in judgment] will growl over it [Judah, the prey] in the day like the roaring of the sea. If one looks to the land, behold, there is darkness *and* distress; Even [AND] the light is darkened by its clouds [the clouds of the day of God's judgment]." The "darkness" here symbolizes God's judgment. "The light" of God's peace and blessing will be darkened by the clouds of judgment.

Isaiah 9:2. "The people who walk in darkness Will see a great light; Those who live in a dark land, The light [of God that brings truth, righteousness, and every blessing through salvation in Christ] will shine on them."

Isaiah 13:10. "For the stars of heaven and their constellations Will not flash forth their light; The sun will be dark when it rises And the moon will not shed its light." This verse (with 13:9-13) speaks of God's end-time day of judgment, as do Joel 2:31; 3:15; Matt. 24:29; Acts 2:20; Rev. 6:12; and quite a few other verses. These verses have added significance for this study because the *darkness* pictured in these verses has both a literal component and a far-more-important figurative/symbolic/spiritual component.

Isaiah 42:6, 7, 16. "I am the LORD, I have called you [You] in righteousness, I will also hold you [You] by the hand and watch over you [You], And I will appoint you [You] as a covenant to the people, As a light to the nations [Also see Isa. 49:6], (7) To open blind eyes, To bring out prisoners from the dungeon And those who dwell in darkness from the prison. (16) I will lead the blind by a way they do not know, In paths they do not know I will guide them. I will make darkness into light before them And rugged places into plains. These are the things I will do, And I will not leave them undone." The "light" here includes God's truth, righteousness, and blessings of salvation. Isaiah chapters 42, 49 are discussed verse-by-verse in my paper dated August 2000.

Isaiah 45:7. "The One forming light and creating darkness, Causing well-being and creating calamity; I am the LORD who does all these." God does not create darkness in the sense of creating sin, but He does create darkness in the sense that He judges sin. The words "causing well-being and creating calamity" are used in Hebrew poetic parallelism with the words "forming light and creating darkness." "Creating darkness" is parallel in meaning with "creating calamity" (calamity<sup>42</sup> that results from the judgment of God).

---

<sup>42</sup> The Hebrew noun (*ra*) translated "calamity" here is normally translated "evil." The KJV has "create evil" here. (This translation can be misunderstood to teach that God is the author of sin.) Throughout the Bible the *good* of God's blessings is contrasted with the *evil* of His judgments (not that He does evil by judging, of course), and His people are continuously exhorted to choose that which is right and good. It's true, of course, that God's judgments work for *good* if the help motivate people to repent.

Isaiah 58:8. "Then your light will break out like the dawn [As the context shows, Israel's light will break out like the dawn *if* His people repent. Here the light seems to refer to God's blessings that will result from their repentance and righteousness. The light here is closely related to the "recovery" mentioned in the next line of this verse], And your recovery will speedily spring forth; And your righteousness [which includes the blessings that come with being righteous before God] will go before you; The glory of the Lord will be your rear guard."

Isaiah 59:9b. "We hope for light, but behold darkness, For brightness but we walk in gloom." They hope for the light of God's blessings, but they walk in the gloom of darkness because of their sins. Their sins were spoken of in the preceding verses.

Isaiah 60:1-3, 19, 20. "Arise, shine; for your light has come, And the glory of the LORD has risen upon you. (2) For behold, darkness will cover the earth And deep darkness the peoples; But the LORD will rise upon you And His glory will appear upon you. (3) Nations will come to your light, And kings to the brightness of your rising. ... (19) No longer will you have the sun for light by day, Nor for brightness will the moon give you light; But you will have the LORD for an everlasting light, And your God for your glory. (20) Your sun will no longer set, Nor will your moon wane; For you will have the LORD for an everlasting light, And the days of your mourning will be over." These prophetic words will not be fulfilled in the ultimate sense until God's people are glorified and fully dwelling in the *light* of His presence through full salvation in Christ Jesus.

Jeremiah 4:23. "I looked to the earth, and behold, *it was* formless and void; And to the heavens, and they had no light." We discussed this important cross-reference for Gen. 1:2 under that verse. This verse in Jeremiah undoubtedly builds on Gen. 1:2. In this context Jeremiah was prophesying regarding what it would be like in Judah after God had judged them through the Babylonians. The darkness (absence of light) resulting from God's judgment in this verse has a strong symbolic/spiritual component. I'll quote Jer. 4:24-28, "I looked on the mountains, and behold, they were quaking, And all the hills moved to and fro. [The words of this verse go with the intense *shaking* of God's judgments.] (25) I looked and behold there was no man, And all the birds of the heavens had fled [These words, along with the words of the next two verses, go with the earth being "formless (or chaotic) and void (or empty)"]. (26) I looked, and behold the fruitful land was a wilderness, And all its cities were pulled down Before the LORD, before His fierce anger. (27) For thus says the LORD, 'The whole land will be a desolation, Yet I will not execute a complete destruction. (28) For this the earth shall mourn And the heavens above be dark [speaking of darkness in a figurative/symbolic/spiritual sense], Because I have spoken, I have purposed, And I will not change My mind, nor will I turn from it.' "

Lamentations 3:1, 2, 6. "I am the man who has seen affliction Because of the rod of His wrath. (2) He has driven me and made me walk in darkness and not in light. (6) In dark places He has made me dwell, Like those who have long been dead." The darkness here speaks in a figurative sense of the results of God's judgments.

John 1:4-9. "In Him was life [very much including spiritual life], and the life was the Light of men. (5) The Light shines in the darkness [Significantly for this study, "the darkness" among men started with the rebellion of Adam and Eve (which was continued by their

offspring), who listened to the devil and turned from God and His light and life to the darkness and death of Satan's kingdom and received God's promised judgment. The Light includes all that man needs, including a right, life-flowing relationship with God in His truth, righteousness, holiness, and blessing. Even after man fell, the Son of God continued to make light available (through His shining) to fallen man, "The light shines in the darkness" (John 1:5).] and the darkness did not comprehend it. [In the margin the NASB has, "or, overpower (it)." I understand the Greek verb used here (*katalambano*) in the sense, "did not take hold of [the light]." Although the light was available, man (speaking of man in general) did not receive the light.] (6) There was a man sent from God, whose name was John [John the Baptist]. (7) He came as a witness, to testify about the Light, so that all might believe through him. (8) He was not the Light, but *he came* to testify about the Light. (9) There was the true Light, which coming into the world, enlightens every man." I can't live with the translation of the NASB for John 1:9. I believe the NIV is much better, "The true light [speaking of the Logos, the Son of God] that gives light to [shines on] every man [John 1:4, 5 show what is meant by His giving light to/shining on every man: The shining of the Light made light available to every man.] was coming into the world." He came into the world through the virgin birth and became a man, but He was much more than just a man; He never ceased being deity with the Father and the Spirit. John 1:10-14 help confirm that this is what His "coming into the world" means.

John 3:19-21. "This is the judgment [condemnation], that the Light has come into the world [The Light, the Son of God, has come into the world. He came to save men from sin and darkness, but the majority (including the majority of the Jews) rejected Him and stuck with the darkness they loved.] and men loved the darkness rather than the Light, for their deeds were evil. [Their evil deeds showed where their hearts were. But the Bible also shows that some people (Jews and Gentiles) whose deeds were evil could and did repent.] (20) For everyone who does evil hates the Light, and does not come to the Light for fear that his deeds will be exposed. (21) But he who practices the truth comes to the Light, so that his deeds may be manifested as having been wrought in God." Those Jews who had a heart for God came running to the ministry of John the Baptist and then to the Lord Jesus Christ. They came to repent and receive salvation. These three verses are very important to help us understand sin and salvation from sin. The gospel is good news only for those who are willing to see and admit their sin and to submit to God's only plan to save man from sin and spiritual death.

John 8:12. "Then Jesus spoke to them, saying, 'I am the Light of the world; he who follows Me will not walk in darkness, but will have the Light of life.' " To walk in the darkness includes walking in the untruth (instead of the truth) and in sin and spiritual death. To walk in the "Light of life" through following Christ by faith includes living in the life (spiritual life), truth, righteousness, salvation, divine order, and blessings of God.

John 12:35, 36. "So Jesus said to them, 'For a little while longer the Light is among you, Walk while you have the Light, so that the darkness will not overtake you; he who walks in the darkness does not know where he goes. (36) While you have the Light, believe in the Light, so that you may become sons of Light [which includes becoming sons of truth and righteousness through salvation in Christ Jesus].' "



John 12:46. "I have come *as* Light into the world, so that everyone who believes in Me will not remain in darkness."

Acts 26:18. "to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the dominion of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins<sup>43</sup> and an inheritance among those who have been sanctified by faith in Me." The light here includes the truth, which is opposed to the lies and deception associated with the darkness and Satan. This verse is one of several that tie the darkness to Satan and his kingdom.

Acts 26:23 NIV. "that the Christ would suffer and, as the first to rise from the dead, would proclaim light to his own people and to the Gentiles."

Romans 2:19. "and are confident that you yourself are a guide to the blind, a light to those who are in darkness."

Romans 13:12. "The night is almost gone [This in one of quite a few verses that use the word "night" in a symbolic way. The "darkness" and the "night" go together.] and the day is near. [The "day" here speaks of the eternal glory that believers will inherit when Christ returns.] Therefore let us lay aside the deeds of darkness [The "deeds (works) of darkness" speak of sinful works.] and put on the armor of light [which includes living in the truth, righteousness, and holiness of God]." Christians are protected as they live in God's truth, righteousness, and holiness by His grace through faith. In Eph. 6:14 the apostle Paul shows that the "breastplate of righteousness" is part of the full armor that we must put on, and keep on, to be victorious over sin and the forces of the evil one.

2 Corinthians 6:14, 15. "Do not be bound together with unbelievers; for what partnership have righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship has light with darkness? (15) Or what harmony has Christ with Belial, or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever?" Righteousness, light, Christ, and believers go together; they are opposite lawlessness, darkness, Belial (ultimately Satan), and unbelievers. This verse, along with many others, demonstrates that *righteousness* in the Bible typically means much more than a legal, positional righteousness; it is contrasted here with lawlessness; righteousness includes living according to God's laws (through His enabling grace, by faith).

Ephesians 5:8, 9. "for you were formerly darkness [which included the fact that they were living in the kingdom of sin, spiritual death, untruth, and the god of this world], but now you are Light in the Lord; walk as children of Light. (9) (for the fruit of the light *consists* in all goodness and righteousness and truth)."

Colossians 1:12, 13. "giving thanks to the Father, who has qualified us [made us sufficient; enabled us] to share in the inheritance of the saints in ["the"; the definite article is included with the Greek noun for *light* here and with the noun for *darkness* in the next verse] Light. (13) For He rescued us from the domain [authority] of [the] darkness, and transferred us to the kingdom of His beloved Son [the Son of His love]." Colossians 1:9-14 are discussed on pages 146-151 of my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*.

---

<sup>43</sup> This significant verse is discussed on pages 153-155 of my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*. One of the primary points I make there is that the translation "forgiveness of sins" isn't adequate for this verse.

1 Thessalonians 5:2-9. "For you yourselves know full well that the day of the Lord will come just like a thief in the night. [The next three verses show that the day of the Lord, which will begin when Christ returns (in the middle of Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> week) to save His own and to judge the world, will not come like a thief in the night for those who are ready for His coming.] (3) While they [the ones who have *not* submitted in faith to the gospel of salvation] are saying, 'Peace and Safety!' then destruction will come upon them suddenly like labor pains upon a woman and they will not escape. (4) But you, brethren, are not in darkness, that the day would overtake you like a thief; (5) for you are all sons of light and sons of day. We are not of night nor of darkness. [Here in verse 5, the words "day" and "night" are used, along with the words "light" and "darkness," in a symbolic sense. To say we are "sons of day" is to say we are living in the light, which includes living in God's truth, life, righteousness, and holiness. "Day" is also used in a symbolic sense in verse 8.] (6) so then let us not sleep as others do, but let us be alert and sober [as we must be if we don't want judgment to come upon us as a thief in the night]. (7) For those who sleep do their sleeping at night, and those who get drunk get drunk at night. (8) But since we are of the day, let us be sober, having put on the breastplate of faith and love, and as a helmet, the hope of salvation. (9) For God has not destined us for wrath, but for obtaining salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ...."

1 Peter 2:9. "But you are A CHOSEN RACE, A royal PRIESTHOOD, A HOLY NATION, A PEOPLE FOR God's OWN POSSESSION, so that you may proclaim the excellencies of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

1 John 1:5-7. "This is the message we have heard from Him and announce to you, that God is Light [In this context, God's Light includes His truth, righteousness, and holiness.], and in Him there is no darkness at all. (6) If we say that we have fellowship with Him and *yet* walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; (7) But if we walk in the Light [This includes walking in the truth, righteousness, and holiness of God (by His grace).], we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin."<sup>44</sup>

1 John 2:8-11. "On the other hand I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the true Light is already shining. (9) The one who says he is in the Light and *yet* hates his brother is in the darkness until now. (10) The one who loves his brother abides in the Light and there is no cause for stumbling in him. (11) But the one who hates his brother is in the darkness and walks in the darkness, and does not know where he is going because the darkness has blinded his eyes."

Revelation 21:23-27. "And the city [New Jerusalem] has no need of the sun or of the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God has illumined it, and its lamp is the Lamb. (24) The nations will walk by its light.... (25) In the daytime (for there will be no night there) [The word "night" is used in a symbolic sense here (everything associated with darkness in a symbolic/spiritual sense will be excluded from the new heaven and new earth), but the literal meaning of night is apparently also included (that is, literal darkness will apparently be excluded from the new heaven and new earth). The Greek noun translated

---

<sup>44</sup> 1 John 1:5-2:6 are discussed on pages 200-208 of my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*. A major point I make there is that the *cleansing* spoken of in 1:7 is a *sanctifying* type of cleansing—it makes us holy; it enables us to dwell in the light.

“in the daytime” could be translated “in the day” or “by day.” The Greek noun used here (*hemera*) is typically translated day(s).<sup>45</sup> The word “daytime/day” is used in a symbolic sense here in Rev. 21:25, but the idea that literal darkness will be excluded from new Jerusalem is apparently also included.] its gates will never be closed [The city gates were closed for protection at night in the ancient world]. ... (27) and nothing unclean, and no one who practices abomination and lying, shall ever come into it, but only those whose names are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”

Revelation 22:5. “And there will no longer be *any* night [The word “night” is used in a symbolic sense, as it was in Rev. 21:25.]; and they [These super-glorious words speak of the people of true Israel.] will not have need of the light of a lamp nor the light of the sun, because the Lord God will illumine them; and they will reign forever and ever.” Actually, the word *light* is not used in this verse in a symbolic sense, but this was a convenient place to include this verse.

Some Other Verses that Use the Word *Light* in a Symbolic Sense: Job 12:22, 25; 17:12; 18:5, 6, 18; 22:28; 24:16; 28:11; 29:3, 24; 33:28, 30; 38:15; Psalms 49:19; 139:11; Prov. 6:23; 13:9; 16:15; Isa. 51:4; Jer. 13:16; Amos 5:18, 20; Mic. 7:8, 9; Zech. 14:6, 7; Matt. 4:16 (twice); 5:14, 16; 6:23; Luke 2:32; 11:35; 16:8; John 5:35; 9:5; 12:35; Acts 13:47; Rom. 2:19; 2 Cor. 4:6; 11:14; and 1 Tim. 6:16.

### The Symbolic Use of the Word *Darkness*

I’ll limit this study to the Hebrew noun *choshek*, the noun that was translated “darkness” in Gen. 1:2, 4, 5, and 18, and to two Greek nouns that were translated *darkness*. This Hebrew noun was used 80 times in the Old Testament; it was translated “darkness” 73 times and “dark” 5 times by the NASB.<sup>46</sup> Disregarding the 4 uses found in Genesis chapter 1, of the 69 other uses where this Hebrew noun was translated *darkness*, some 47 of the uses are symbolic/spiritual, which is almost 70 percent of the uses.

The Greek noun *skotos* was used 30 times in the New Testament; it was translated *darkness* 30 times by the NASB. The Greek noun *skotia* was derived from *skotos*. It was used 17 times in the New Testament; it was translated *darkness* 14 times and *dark* 3 times by the NASB. Of the 47 places that these two Greek nouns were translated *darkness* in the New Testament, some 37 uses are symbolic, which is almost 80 percent of the uses.

2 Samuel 22:29. “For you are my lamp, O LORD; And the LORD illumines my darkness.”

Psalms 18:28. “For you light my lamp; The LORD my God illumines my darkness.” The words of 2 Sam. 22:29 and the words of this psalm were spoken by David. God met David’s need for truth, wisdom, strength, life, blessing, etc. by His light.

<sup>45</sup> This Greek noun is translated “day” 207 times and “days” 148 times by the NASB; it is translated “daytime” twice.

<sup>46</sup> This noun was also translated “obscurity” two times in the Old Testament.

Psalm 107:10-14. "There were those who dwelt in darkness and in the shadow of death, Prisoners in misery and chains, (11) because they had rebelled against the words of God And spurned the counsel of the Most High. (12) Therefore He humbled their hearts with labor; They stumbled and there was none to help. (13) Then they cried out to the LORD in their trouble; He saved them out of their distress. (14) He brought them out of darkness and the shadow of death And broke their bands apart." The words of this psalm were not at all limited to the people of Israel. The context shows that the "darkness" spoken of in verses 10 and 14 came as a consequence of rebelling against God.

Psalm 112:4. "Light [which includes all the blessings of God] arises in the darkness for the upright; *He is* gracious and compassionate and righteous."

Proverbs 2:13. "[To deliver you] From those who leave the paths of uprightness to walk in the ways of darkness [in the ways of unrighteousness]."

Isaiah 5:20 (twice), 30; 9:2; 42:7; 45:7; 59:9b; 60:2; Lamentations 3:2. Quoted, or quoted and discussed, above under light.

Isaiah 47:5. "Sit silently, and go into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans...." In context these words speak of the Babylonians going into the darkness of God's judgment.

Isaiah 58:10. "And if you give yourself to the hungry And satisfy the desire of the afflicted, Then your light will rise in darkness And your gloom *will become* like midday." Their "darkness" and "gloom" had come as a consequence of their sinfulness. If they will repent, the light of God's blessings will again shine upon the people of Israel.

Joel 2:1, 2. "...For the day of the LORD is coming; Surely it is near, (2) A day of darkness and gloom, A day of clouds and thick darkness...." There will be literal darkness when the day of the Lord comes, but the symbolic/spiritual component of the darkness is the most important component by far.

Amos 5:18-20. "Alas, for you who are longing for the day of the LORD [The people of Israel (speaking for the majority) should not have been longing for the day of the LORD—the day when God will come to judge the world and make things right—because they were far from being ready to stand before Him themselves.] For what purpose *will* the day of the LORD *be to* you? It will be darkness and not light [a curse and not a blessing]; (19) As when a man flees from a lion And a bear meets him, Or goes home, leans his hand against the wall And a snake bites him. (20) *Will* not the day of the LORD *be* darkness instead of light, Even gloom with no brightness in it."

Micah 7:8. "Do not rejoice over me, O my enemy, Though I fall I will rise; Though I dwell in darkness, the LORD is a light for me." The next verse (Mic. 5:8) shows that this "darkness" had come to Israel as a penalty for sin, "I will bear the indignation of the LORD [but not forever] Because I have sinned against Him...."

Zephaniah 1:14-18. "Near is the great day of the LORD.... (15) A day of wrath is that day, A day of trouble and distress, A day of destruction and desolation, A day of darkness and gloom, A

day of clouds and thick darkness.... (17) I will bring distress on men So that they will walk like the blind, Because they have sinned against the LORD....”

Matthew 4:14-17. “*This was to fulfill what was spoken through Isaiah the prophet... (16) THE PEOPLE WHO WERE SITTING IN DARKNESS SAW A GREAT LIGHT, AND THOSE WHO WERE SITTING IN THE LAND AND SHADOW OF DEATH, UPON THEM THE LIGHT DAWNED. (17) From that time Jesus began to preach and say, ‘Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’*”

Matthew 8:11, 12. “I say to you that many will come from east and west, and recline *at the table* with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; (12) but the sons of the kingdom will be cast into the outer darkness.” That is, whereas many Gentiles will have a place in heaven through the Lord Jesus Christ, many of the Israelites will be excluded from the kingdom. The “outer darkness” is the equivalent of the eternal lake of fire. Two other verses that speak of sinners being cast into the outer *darkness* are Matt. 22:13 and 25:30. Jude 1:13 (cf. 2 Pet. 2:17) speaks of sinful men “for whom the black darkness has been reserved forever.”

Luke 1:79. “TO SHINE UPON THOSE WHO SIT IN DARKNESS AND THE SHADOW OF DEATH, to guide our feet into the way of peace.” This verse is part of the prophecy of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, which spoke of the glorious salvation that was to come in and through the Lord Jesus Christ. “Darkness” and “death” go together.

Luke 22:53. “While I was with you daily in the temple, you did not lay hands on Me; but this hour [in accordance with the purpose and plan of God] and the power of darkness [The “power of darkness” goes with Satan and his sinful kingdom, with whom some of the Jewish leaders were aligned.] are yours.”

John 1:5; 3:19; 8:12; 12:46; Acts 26:18; Rom. 2:19; 13:12; 2 Cor. 6:14; Eph. 5:8; Col. 1:13; 1 Thess. 5:4, 5; 1 Pet. 2:9; 1 John 1:5, 6; 2:8, 9, 11 (three times). Quoted, or quoted and discussed, above under light.

Ephesians 5:11. “Do not participate in the unfruitful deeds [works] of darkness....” In other words, “Don’t do sinful works.”

Ephesians 6:12 (with 6:10-17). “For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the powers, against the world forces of this darkness, against the spiritual *forces* of wickedness in the heavenly *places*.” Our primary warfare is not against men but against the kingdom of darkness, which is headed up by Satan.

Some Other Verses that Use the Word Darkness in a Symbolic Sense (Literal darkness is included in some of these verses too): Ex. 10:21, 22; 1 Sam. 2:9; Job 5:14; 10:21; 15:22, 23, 30; 17:12, 13; 18:18; 19:8; 20:26; 22:11; 37:19; Psalm 88:12; Prov. 20:12; Eccl. 5:17; 11:8; Isa. 29:18; 49:9; Ezek. 32:8; Nah. 1:8; Matt. 6:23; Luke 11:35; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 4:6; and Jude 1:6.

### The Symbolic Use of the Word *Night*

I'll limit this study to the Hebrew noun *layelah*, which was translated *night* 200 times by the NASB, and to the Greek noun *nux*, which was translated *night* 55 times by the NASB.<sup>47</sup> I didn't expect the word *night* to be used in a symbolic way nearly as often as the word *darkness*, and that expectation was confirmed by this study.

Job 17:12. "They make night into day, *saying*, 'the light is near,' in the presence of darkness." All four words, *night*, *day*, *light*, and *darkness* are used in a symbolic way here.

Psalms 30:5. "For His anger is but for a moment, His favor is for a lifetime; Weeping may last for the night, But a shout of joy *comes* in the morning." The "night" here corresponds with the time of God's anger, the time of His judgments. The "morning" corresponds with the time of blessing that comes after the night of judgment. The Hebrew noun translated "night" in this verse is different, *ereb*.

Isaiah 21:11, 12. "The oracle concerning Edom. One keeps calling to me from Seir, 'Watchman, how far gone is the night [corresponding with the time of judgment]? Watchman, how far gone is the night?' (12) The watchman says, 'Morning comes but also night. [The morning of the day of God's salvation and blessings will come, but before it comes there will be further judgment.] If you would inquire, inquire; Come back again.' "<sup>48</sup>

Isaiah 26:9. "At night [In the night] my soul longs for You, Indeed my spirit within me seeks You diligently; For when the earth experiences Your judgments The inhabitants of the world learn righteousness." The "night" here corresponds with the times of judgment and refining through which God's people must pass.

Micah 3:6. "Therefore *it will be* night for you – without vision, And darkness for you – without divination. The sun will go down on the prophets, And the day will become dark over them."

John 9:4. "We must work the works of Him who sent Me as long as it is day; night is coming when no one can work."

John 11:7-10. "Then after this He said to the disciples, 'Let us go to Judea again.' (8) The disciples said to Him, 'Rabbi, the Jews were just now seeking to stone You, and are You going there again?' (9) Jesus answered, 'Are there not twelve hours in the day? If anyone walks in the day, he does not stumble, because he sees the light of this world. (10) But if anyone walks in the night, he stumbles, because the light is not in him.' " The context requires us to see beyond the literal meaning of the word "day" in verse 9 and the words "night" and "light" in verse 10. The point is that we must walk in the center of God's will, which is likened to walking in the day, the place where God's light is—we will never stumble as we live like this. To walk in the night is to walk in the darkness, separated from the light of God.

---

<sup>47</sup> This Hebrew noun was also translated the following ways in the Old Testament by the NASB: midnight (6); nights (14); nocturnal (1); overnight (2); tonight (10). This Greek noun was also translated the following ways by the NASB: evening (1); midnight (2); nights (3).

<sup>48</sup> These verses and the verse listed next (Isa. 26:9) are discussed in my paper on Selected Prophecies from the Book of Isaiah, dated August 2000.

Romans 13:12; 1 Thessalonians 5:5; Revelation 21:25; and 22:5. Quoted and discussed above, under *light*.

Other verses to consider for a symbolic use of the word *night*: Psalm 77:2, 6.

### The Symbolic Use of the Word *Day*

The Hebrew noun *yom* is typically translated *day* in the Old Testament. It is translated *day* 1,118 times and *days* 641 times.<sup>49</sup> Because of the large number of uses of this word and the fact that this word isn't used in a symbolic way very often, I didn't do a thorough study for this word. The Greek noun *hemera* was translated *day* 208 times, *days* 148 times, and *daytime* 2 times in the New Testament by the NASB.

Job 17:12. Quoted and briefly discussed above, under *night*.

Proverbs 4:18. "But the path of the righteous is like the light of dawn, That shines brighter and brighter until the full day." The "full day" is the day of completed salvation for God's people, the time of their glorification.

John 9:4; 11:9. These verses are quoted, or quoted and discussed, above under *night*.

Romans 13:12. Quoted and discussed above, under *light*.

1 Thessalonians 5:5, 8. Quoted and discussed above, under *light*.

2 Peter 1:19. "So we have the prophetic word *made* more sure, to which you do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day [of eternal glory] dawns and the morning star arises in your hearts."

---

<sup>49</sup> This Hebrew noun was translated other ways too. For example, the NASB translated it as *time* 44 times and *today* 172 times.

## EXTENDED NOTE E

### A Study of the Hebrew Verb *Badal*, To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart

Since this Hebrew verb is so important for the interpretation of Genesis chapter 1 (the verb is used in Gen. 1:4, 6, 7, 14, and 18), it is important for us to get familiar with this word. The most important way to learn the meaning of Hebrew words in the Old Testament is to study all the uses of that word in the Old Testament in their contexts. (The same thing is true for the meaning of Greek words used in the New Testament.) One way to obtain a complete listing of all the uses of a particular Hebrew (or Greek) word that is used in the Bible is to use an Exhaustive Concordance. Exhaustive Concordances are available for the NASB, NIV, KJV, and NKJV, and for some other versions. You don't have to know Hebrew (or Greek) to do such a study, but it certainly helps.

I typically use the NASB (now the 1995 edition); I'll use the concordance for that Bible in this study. If you didn't know the Hebrew verb that was used here, you would start by looking up the verb "separated" that is used in Gen. 1:4. The first verse listed (and partially quoted) under "separated" there is Gen. 1:4. The number listed beside Gen. 1:4 in the concordance is 914. If you look up 914 in the back of the concordance, in the "Hebrew—Aramaic Dictionary," you will find that the Hebrew verb used in Gen. 1:4 is *badal*. (I highly recommend purchasing a concordance that contains the Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries.)

Listed there are all the different ways the NASB translated this verb, and the number of times it was translated each way. This listing gives you a lot of quick information about the use of this verb in the Old Testament. I'll quote the listing for *badal* given there: came over (1), dismissed (1), divide (1), excluded (2), made a separation (1), made...distinction (1), make a distinction (3), partition (1), selected (1), separate (6), separated (10), serve (1), set you apart (1), set apart (6), set aside (2), sever (2), single (1), surely separate (1). These numbers add up to 41,<sup>50</sup> which shows that this Hebrew verb was used 41 times in the Old Testament.

To look up all the uses of this Hebrew verb in the Old Testament, you would look up each of these listings, starting with "came over" and find the verse(s) listed there that has the number 914 beside it. Sometimes the few words quoted there for that verse will suffice to give you an adequate understanding of the way *badal* is used in that verse; other times (quite often) you will need to read the entire verse in the Bible, or that verse and the surrounding verses.

For this study I'll list and quote all 36<sup>51</sup> uses of the Hebrew verb *badal*, excluding only the 5 uses found in Genesis chapter 1 (1:4, 6, 7, 14, and 18); sometimes I'll quote an extra verse or two to establish the context. The first set of verses listed is the most

---

<sup>50</sup> Actually these numbers add up to 42, but they made a mistake; the verse behind their listing "partition" is Ex. 26:33, and the listing behind "serve" is the same verse. The verb *badal* was only used once in Ex. 26:33. That verse is quoted and discussed in this study.

<sup>51</sup> Actually the Hebrew verb is used twice in Isa. 56:3, in an unusual form. I'm just counting this as one use, as did the Exhaustive Concordance.



important for this study. These verses use *badal* for separating, dividing, or distinguishing between the holy and the unholy, the clean and the unclean, the good and the bad, the blessings and the curses. Twenty one of the 36 verses we are considering in this Extended Note are listed in this first set of verses. That tells us a lot about the meaning of this verb. And, significantly, it steers us (I believe) in the right direction to understand the intended meaning of this verb in Genesis chapter 1.

Leviticus 10:10 (with 10:8, 9). “The LORD then spoke to Aaron, saying, (9) ‘Do not drink wine or strong drink, neither you nor your sons with you, when you come into the tent of meeting, so that you will not die – it is a perpetual statute throughout your generations – (10) and so as to make a distinction [The NKJV has, “...generations, (10) that you may distinguish between...” It would also be reasonable to translate, “that you may separate between...” The NIV has, “You must distinguish.”] between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the clean, (11) and so as to teach the sons of Israel all the statutes which the LORD has spoken to them through Moses.’ ” The priests must make a distinction between the holy and the profane, which includes their being separate from the profane (they must be holy) if they are going to function as priests before God and instruct the sons of Israel regarding holiness (separation). The Hebrew preposition *bayin*, which is translated “between,” is used four times in verse 10; before “the holy,” “the profane,” “the unclean,” and “the clean.” I’ll note the use of this preposition throughout this study; significantly, this preposition was used in all five of the verses that use *badal* in Genesis chapter 1.

Leviticus 11:47 (with 11:1-46; I’ll quote 11:44-47). “For I am the LORD your God. Consecrate yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy. And you shall not make yourselves unclean with any of the swarming things that swarm on the earth. (45) For I am the LORD who brought you up from the land of Egypt to be your God; thus you shall be holy [“therefore be holy” NIV], for I am holy. (46) This is the law regarding the animal and the bird, and every living thing that moves in the waters and everything that swarms on the earth, (47) to make a distinction between the unclean and the clean, and between the edible creature and the creature which is not to be eaten.” *Bayin* is used before “the unclean,” “the clean,” “the edible creature,” and “the creature which is not to be eaten.”

Leviticus 20:24, 25 (twice), 26 (I’ll quote 20:22-27). “You are therefore to keep all My statutes and all My ordinances and do them, so that the land to which I am bringing you to live will not spew you out. (23) Moreover, you shall not follow the customs of the nation which I will drive out before you, for they did all these things, and therefore I have abhorred them. (24) Hence I have said to you, ‘You are to possess their land, and I Myself will give it to you to possess it, a land flowing with milk and honey.’ I am the LORD your God, who has separated you from the peoples. (25) You are therefore to make a distinction [or, “to separate”] between the clean animal and the unclean, and between the unclean bird and the clean; and you shall not make yourselves detestable by animal or by bird or by anything that creeps on the ground, which I have separated for you as unclean. (26) Thus you are to be holy to Me, for I the LORD am holy; and I have set you apart [or, “I have separated you”] from the peoples to be Mine. (27) Now a man or a woman who is a medium or a spiritist shall surely be put to death. [Being a “spiritist” or a “medium” was a transgression of the law of God, a transgression that called for the death penalty. These things were/are associated with the Satanic kingdom of darkness.] They shall be stoned with stones, their bloodguiltiness is upon them.” *Bayin* is

used before “the clean animal” in Lev. 20:25 and the Hebrew preposition *le* is used before “the unclean.” This is a variation in the Hebrew from using *bayin* twice. We’ll see this use again as we continue, and it is used in Gen. 1:6.

Numbers 16:21 (with 16:20). “Then the LORD spoke to Moses and Aaron, saying, (21) ‘Separate yourselves from among this [rebellious] congregation, that I may consume them instantly.’ ” Moses, Aaron, and those who were not involved in this rebellion were commanded to separate themselves from the tents of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, leaders of the rebellion, so they would not be destroyed in God’s destruction of those rebels.

Deuteronomy 29:21. “Then the LORD will single him out for adversity [literally “for evil,” which is the opposite of good and blessing] from all the tribes of Israel, according to all the curses of the covenant which are written in this book of the law.” The rebellion and stubbornness of heart that led to this intense judgment is spelled out in Deut. 29:14-20. The rebel will be separated off from the tribes of Israel and will experience the curses that come with rebelling against God’s covenant.

1 Kings 8:53. “For You have separated them [the people of Israel] from all the peoples of the earth as Your inheritance, as You spoke through Moses Your servant, when You brought our fathers forth from Egypt, O Lord GOD.”

2 Chronicles 25:10. “Then Amaziah [the king of Judah] dismissed [separated off] them, the troops which came to him from Ephraim, to go home....” Amaziah had “hired...100,000 valiant warriors from Ephraim/Israel [the northern kingdom] for one hundred talents of silver” (2 Chron. 25:6). The reason Amaziah dismissed them (separated them off) is given in 25:7, “But a man of God came to him saying, ‘O king, do not let the army of Israel go with you, for the LORD is not with Israel *nor with* any of the sons of Ephraim [because of their sinful state].”

Ezra 6:21. “The sons of Israel who returned from [the Babylonian] exile and all those who had separated themselves from the impurity of the nations of the land to *join* them [“Those who had separated themselves from the impurity of the nations” is explained by Ezra 9:1, which is quoted next.], to seek the LORD God of Israel, at *the Passover.*”

Ezra 9:1 (with 9:2). “Now when these things had been completed, the princes approached me [Ezra], saying, ‘The people of Israel and the priests and Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands, according to their abominations, *those* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. (2) For they have taken some of their daughters *as wives* for themselves and for their sons, so that the holy race has intermingled with the peoples of the lands; indeed, the hands of the princes and the rulers have been foremost in this unfaithfulness.’ ”

Ezra 10:8 (with 10:7). “They made a proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem to all the exiles, that they should assemble at Jerusalem, (8) and that whoever would not come within three days according to the counsel of the leaders and the elders, all his possessions should be forfeited and he himself excluded [separated] from the assembly of the exiles.”

Ezra 10:11 (with 10:10). “Then Ezra the priest stood up and said to them, ‘You have been unfaithful and have married foreign wives adding to the guilt of Israel. (11) Now therefore,

make confession to the LORD God of your fathers and do His will; and separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from the foreign wives.”

Nehemiah 9:2. “The descendants of Israel separated themselves from all foreigners, and stood and confessed their sins and the iniquities of their fathers.”

Nehemiah 10:28. “Now the rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants and all those who had separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to the Law of God, their wives, their sons and daughters, all those who had knowledge and understanding [“sons and daughters who are able to understand” NIV].”

Nehemiah 13:3. “So when they heard the law [They were reading from “the book of Moses” (Neh. 13:1).], they excluded [separated] all foreigners from Israel.”

Isaiah 56:3. “Let not the foreigner who has joined himself to the LORD say, ‘The LORD will surely separate me from His people.’ ....”

Isaiah 59:2. “But your iniquities have made a separation between you and your God, And your sins have hidden *His* face from you so that He does not hear.” The iniquities/sins of the people of Israel had separated them from God and from His salvation (cf. Isa. 59:1) and blessings. *Bayin* is used before “you” and “your God.”

Ezekiel 22:26. “Her [Israel’s] priests have done violence to My law and have profaned My holy things; they have made no distinction between the holy and the profane, and they have not taught the difference between the unclean and the clean; and they hide their eyes from My sabbaths, and I am profaned among them.” *Bayin* is used before “the holy” and *le* before “the profane.”

Ezekiel 42:20. “He measured it [the temple] on the four sides; it had a wall all around, the length five hundred and the width five hundred, to divide [or, “to separate”] between the holy and the profane.” *Bayin* is used before “the holy” and *le* before “the profane.”

This next set of verses that use *badal* covers much of the same ground as the verses just listed—people, places, things are set apart for God; they are separated from what defiles. The primary difference is that for most of the verses listed here the separating, the dividing, the being set apart for God is mostly from the other sons of Israel. The priests, for example, were set apart from the people of Israel, who had already been set apart by God and for God. The priests had a special calling from God. God required them to be separated to a greater extent than the other sons of Israel—for the high priest to a greater extent yet.

The verses listed in this section are quite significant for our study (though not as significant as the verses listed in the preceding section) regarding the use of the verb *badal* in Genesis chapter 1. The separating taking place in these verses isn’t a mundane separating of indifferent things; it is a separating that brings some people/things closer to God and the fullness of His light.

Exodus 26:33. “You shall hang up the veil under the clasps, and shall bring in the ark of the testimony within the veil; and the veil shall serve for you as a partition [more literally, “will separate” NIV] between the holy place and the holy of holies.” *Bayin* is used before “the

holy place” and “the holy of holies.” There was, of course, a big difference between the holy place and the holy of holies. The only one permitted to enter the holy of holies was the high priest, and that was only once a year, on the day of atonement.

Numbers 8:14 (I'll quote 8:15-22). “Thus you shall separate the Levites from among the sons of Israel, and the Levites shall be Mine. (15) Then after that the Levites may go in to serve the tent of meeting. But you shall cleanse them and present them as a wave offering; (16) for they are wholly given to Me from among the sons of Israel. I have taken them for Myself instead of every first issue of the womb, the firstborn of all the sons of Israel. (17) For every firstborn among the sons of Israel is Mine, among the men and among the animals; on the day that I struck down all the firstborn in the land of Egypt I sanctified them for Myself. (18) But I have taken the Levites instead of every firstborn among the sons of Israel. (19) I have given the Levites as a gift to Aaron and to his sons from among the sons of Israel, to perform the service of the sons of Israel at the tent of meeting and to make atonement on behalf of the sons of Israel, so that there will be no plague among the sons of Israel by their coming near to the sanctuary.’ (20) Thus did Moses and Aaron and all the congregation of the sons of Israel to the Levites; according to all that the LORD had commanded Moses concerning the Levites, so the sons of Israel did to them. (21) The Levites too purified themselves from sin and washed their clothes; and Aaron presented them as a wave offering before the LORD. Aaron also made atonement for them to cleanse them. (22) Then after that the Levites went in to perform their service in the tent of meeting before Aaron and before his sons; just as the LORD had commanded Moses concerning the Levites, so they did to them.”

Numbers 16:9 (I'll quote 16:8-10). “Then Moses said to Korah, ‘Hear now, you sons of Levi, (9) Is it not enough for you that the God of Israel has separated you from the *rest* of the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to Himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the LORD, and to stand before the congregation to minister to them; (10) and that He has brought you near, *Korah*, and all your brothers, sons of Levi, with you? And are you seeking for the priesthood also?’”

Deuteronomy 10:8 (with 10:9). “At that time the LORD set apart the tribe of Levi to carry the ark of the covenant of the LORD, to stand before the LORD to serve Him and to bless in His name until this day. (9) Therefore, Levi does not have a portion or inheritance with his brothers [Unlike the other tribes of Israel, Levi didn't receive an allotment of land.]; the LORD is his inheritance, just as the LORD your God spoke to him.”

1 Chronicles 23:13 (with 23:14) NIV. “The sons of Amram: Aaron and Moses. Aaron was set apart [or, “was separated”], he and his descendants forever, to consecrate the most holy things, to offer sacrifices before the LORD, to minister before him and to pronounce blessings in his name forever. (14) The sons of Moses the man of God were counted as part of the tribe of Levi.”

1 Chronicles 25:1. “Moreover, David and the commanders of the army set apart for the service *some* of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who *were* to prophesy with lyres, harps and cymbals....”

Ezra 8:24. “Then I [Ezra] set apart twelve of the leading priests, Sherebiah, Hashabiah, and with them ten of their brothers.”

Now I'll list and quote a few verses where the separating/setting apart, though still dealing with the things of God, doesn't necessarily involve a separating/setting apart

unto greater holiness. None of the verses deal with a separating of mundane things that are indifferent.

Deuteronomy 19:2; I won't quote Deuteronomy 4:41 and 19:7, which are similar to 19:2. "you shall set aside three cities for yourself [for cities of refuge] in the midst of your land, which the LORD your God gives you to possess."

1 Chronicles 12:8. "From the Gadites [from the tribe of Gad] there came over ["separated"; "defected" NIV] to David in the stronghold in the wilderness, mighty men of valor, men trained for war, who could handle shield and spear, and whose faces were like the faces of lions, and *they were* as swift as gazelles on the mountains."

Ezra 10:16. "... And Ezra the priest selected [or, "set apart"] men *who were* heads of fathers' households for each of their father's households, all of them by name. So they convened on the first day of the tenth month to investigate the matter."

Ezekiel 39:14. "They will set apart men who will constantly pass through the land, burying those who were passing through, even those left on the surface of the ground, in order to cleanse it. At the end of seven months they will make a search."

The only two verses (of the 36 uses of *badal* found in the Old Testament that aren't found in Genesis chapter 1) that I haven't listed are Leviticus 1:17; 5:8, verses that give instructions for the priests to follow in the sacrificing of birds. In both verses *badal* is used of not totally *severing/separating* the birds. The specialized sacrificial uses of *badal* in these two verses are the only uses of this Hebrew verb where the idea of separating from, setting apart from, or distinguishing between is not found.

*A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* by William Holladay (Eerdmans, 1971, page 34) lists Gen. 1:4 under the meaning "separate, distinguish between."

*The Koehler Baumgartner Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Study Edition* (Brill, 2001, page 110) lists Gen. 1:4, 6, 7, 14, and 18 under the meaning "to separate, to divide from."

I'll quote two paragraphs from what Benedikt Otzen says in the article on *badal* in the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*.<sup>52</sup> "The verb *bdl* is used predominantly in the Priestly literature and usually refers to sacral matters. If a writer wishes to describe a separation in a purely secular context, he usually uses the synonym *paradh*. Passages that deal with the separation of warriors for or from battle are no exception (1 Chron. 12:9 [Engl. v. 8]; 2 Chron. 25:10). Even in these late texts there is a reminiscence of the idea that mustering for battle was a sacral act.

*bdl* must be understood in a similar way in the Deuteronomic regulations concerning the setting apart of the cities of refuge (Deut. 4:41; 19:2, 7). Although Deuteronomy strips this institution of its sacral character [I suppose Otzen means that these verses in Deuteronomy don't mention that these cities of refuge were Levite cities (cf. Num. 35:6).], the choice of words would suggest that it originated in a religious context. Finally the verb *bdl* occurs a

---

<sup>52</sup> Vol. 2 (Eerdmans, 1975), pages 1, 2.

couple of times in the Priestly sacrificial regulations with the simple meaning 'to divide asunder' (Lev. 1:17; 5:8)."

Excerpt from *Be Basic-Genesis 1-11* by Warren W. Wiersbe<sup>53</sup>

"*Day one* (Gen. 1:3-5). God commanded the light to shine and then separated the light from the darkness. But how could there be light when the light-bearers aren't mentioned until the fourth day? (vv. 14-19) ...it probably came from God Himself who is light (John 1:5) and wears light as a garment (Ps. 104:2; Hab. 3:3-4). The eternal city will enjoy endless light without the help of the sun or moon (Rev. 22:5), so why couldn't there be light at the beginning of time before the luminaries were made?

Life as we know it could not exist without the light of the sun. Paul saw in this creative act [of God's bringing forth light in Gen. 1:3] the work of God in the new creation, the salvation of the lost. 'For it is God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Cor. 4:6, NKJV). 'In Him [God the Son] was life; and the life was the light of men' (John 1:4).

In Scripture, light is associated with Christ (John 8:12), the Word of God (Ps. 119:105, 130), God's people (Matt. 5:14-16; Eph. 5:8), and God's blessing (Prov. 4:18), while darkness is associated with Satan (Luke 23:53; Eph. 6:12), sin (Matt. 6:22-23; John 3:19-21), death (Job 3:4-6, 9), spiritual ignorance (John 1:5), and divine judgment (Matt. 8:12). This explains why God separated the light from the darkness, for the two have nothing in common [my emphasis]. God's people are to 'walk in the light' (1 John 1:5-10), for what communion has light with darkness?' (2 Cor. 6:14-16; Eph. 5:1-14)."

---

<sup>53</sup> Cook Communication Ministries, 1998, pages 24, 25.

## EXTENDED NOTE F

### The Use of *Day* and the *Seven Days* in the Creation Account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, Using an Artificial Literary Structure

Excerpts from Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*<sup>54</sup>

I'll quote part of what Blocher says under the heading "The Literary Interpretation," in the chapter titled "The Week of Creation." This is the interpretation Blocher agrees with; he discusses it in some detail in this book. "The [literary] interpretation, which has also been called 'historico-artistic,' or the framework theory, is not, as is too often imagined, an innovation of the modern age. ... [Blocher goes on to speak of Augustine's view.] ... Nearer our own day the great Dominican scholar, M. J. Lagrange, writes without hesitation: 'the author's intention is crystal clear...his procedure is one of logic: it is a literary form.' For several decades quite a number of theologians in the evangelical churches have been advocating the same opinion. The pioneer, around 1930, was probably A. Noordtzij...and since World War II the main proponents have been N. H. Ridderbos...B. Ramm...M. G. Kline...D. F. Payne...and J. A. Thompson.... There is no questioning their competence or, generally speaking, their respect for Scripture.

The literary interpretation takes the form of the week attributed to the work of creation to be an artistic arrangement, a modest example of anthropomorphism [the attributing of human characteristics to God] that is not to be taken literally. The author's intention is not to supply us with a chronology of origins. ... [I believe that this creation account came mostly by revelation from God. Moses, under God, either wrote these chapters or put his stamp of approval on them.]

... [This view] recognizes ordinary days but takes them in the context of one large figurative whole...."

Excerpts from Victor P. Hamilton, *Genesis Chapters 1-17*<sup>55</sup>

"[One] approach to 'day' in Gen. 1 is the literary interpretation. ... This is a word from God addressed to a group of people [the people of Israel] who are surrounded by nations whose cosmology is informed by polytheism and the mythology that flows out of that polytheism. Much in Gen. 1 is patently anti-pagan.<sup>56</sup> The contest is not between a religious view (Israel's) and a secular view (non-Israel's). There were no Charles Darwins in the ancient world who operated from nontheistic presuppositions. ... Gen. 1 is written, at least partially, to present an alternative to that [ancient polytheistic] worldview. The writer's concerns, then, were theological and historical – what happened, and why, and so what. ...

A literary reading of Gen. 1 still permits the retention of 'day' as a solar day of 24 hours. But it understands 'day' not as a chronological account of how many hours God invested in his creating project [If the days of Gen. 1:1-2:3 are being used in a literary (figurative, non-literal) sense, you can't calculate "how many hours God invested in his creating

---

<sup>54</sup> Inter-Varsity Press, 1984, pages 49, 50.

<sup>55</sup> Eerdmans, 1990, pages 54-56.

<sup>56</sup> Hamilton has a footnote, "See G. Hasel, 'The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology,' *EvQ* 46 (1974) 78-80."

project” by adding twenty-four hours for each day.], but as an analogy of God’s creative activity.<sup>57</sup> God reveals himself to his people [speaking of the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3] in a medium with which they can identify and which they can comprehend. The Creation account portrays a God who speaks, who evaluates, who deliberates, who forms, who animates, who regulates. The intended audience of Gen. 1 will fully identify with that model. The Creation account also portrays a God who created on six days and rested on the seventh. The audience, accustomed to their own workweek, will identify with that model too.”

### Excerpts from Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis*<sup>58</sup>

I’ll quote part of what Waltke says under the heading “Excursus: The Literary Genre of the Creation Account” (pages 73-78). I’ll start with two quotations Waltke gives on page 73.

“The Spirit of God who spoke through them did not choose to teach about the heavens to men, as it was of no use for salvation.” AUGUSTINE

“The Bible tell us how to go to Heaven, not how the heavens go.” GALILEO GALILEI

“Even in modern history, there is a tension between the historical referent and authorial creativity in the writing of history. The Bible gives great scope to creativity in interpreting and presenting the data. The biblical narrator even feels license to dischronologize the events.<sup>59</sup> [I don’t agree that the biblical narrator/Narrator took license to “dischronologize the events” (to present the events of Genesis chapter 1 out of chronological sequence). I believe that God wanted the sequence of events to be compatible with the scientific viewpoints held at that time (which included the viewpoint that the earth was immovable and that the sun, moon, and stars rotated around the earth).<sup>60</sup>] ... On the first

<sup>57</sup> Hamilton has a footnote, “See C. E. Hummel, ‘Interpreting Genesis One,’ *JASA* 38 (1986) 175-85, esp. pp. 181-183.” I’ll quote from this article by Hummel later in this Extended Note.

<sup>58</sup> Zondervan, 2000.

<sup>59</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “...Other biblical writers rearrange events for theological purposes (e.g., Gen. 10/11; Ex. 4-11/Ps. 105:28-36; the Synoptic Gospels). In each of these examples, the events are recast to emphasize a theological point.”

<sup>60</sup> In my opinion, we will never be able to rightly interpret Gen. 1:1-2:3 if we assume (as many do) that these verses are packed with scientific details (revelation from God) that no one knew in the ancient world. I strongly agree with the point Waltke made in the preceding excerpt (from his pages 61, 62 [that excerpt is not included in this abbreviated internet version]), that the emphasis of these verses is on *theological*, rather than *scientific*, issues. I believe God limited (at least for the most part) the scientific content of these verses to the scientific viewpoints that were widely accepted at that time. If He had not accommodated this creation account to those viewpoints, the extremely important theological truths contained in these verses would undoubtedly have been subordinated to a significant extent (or even altogether lost) in the confusion generated by the controversy regarding far-less-important scientific details. God cares about the details of science, but the Bible was written (for the most part) to enable us to understand things that are far more important than science—things that involve our relationship with Him and eternal salvation or damnation. He can, and I’m sure that He does, reveal scientific details to men at times, but such revelations are typically made to men of science. (I’m not suggesting that everything scientists learn they learn by revelation from God, but I’m sure that many scientists who have looked to Him for revelation of scientific details have been enlightened by Him.)

Many Christians in our day are so obsessed with the scientific details of the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3—scientific details that, in my opinion, God didn’t incorporate in these verses—that they are missing much of the all-important theological content. Furthermore, this issue is causing very serious



day (Gen. 1:5) God creates the evening and morning, but he does not create the luminaries to divide them until the fourth day (1:14).<sup>61</sup> ....<sup>62</sup> .... [I agree that the author/Author wanted to make the theological point that God, the Creator of the luminaries, is not dependent on the luminaries to provide light. Revelation 21:23, for example, says, “And the city (new Jerusalem) has no need of the sun or of the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God has illumined it, and its lamp is the Lamb.” Also see Rev. 22:5. Revelation 21:25 informs us that “there will be no night [no darkness] there.”] ... The narrator’s concern is not scientific ...but theological and indirectly polemical against pagan mythologies. [As I mentioned, I don’t believe the author/Author’s *scientific* concerns here went beyond the scientific viewpoints of the ancient world. As Waltke’s next sentence shows, he agrees (of course) that the author/Author was interested in the *historical* fact that God created our world and all the things in it, even if the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 was (apparently) written using an artificial literary framework of seven days.] The narrator clearly wishes to establish that it is God who has created all and has dominion over all, including the seas, sun, and moon.<sup>63</sup>

---

divisions among Christians. The nature of the scientific content of Genesis chapter 1, which is so extremely important to a proper interpretation of these verses, is discussed under Genesis chapter 1, in Extended Note G (which deals with Galileo and the earth-centered viewpoint that almost everyone held until the last few hundred years), and in Extended Note H, which is titled “The Bible and Science.”

<sup>61</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “There are other difficulties of chronology. Differences seem to exist between the order of events in the first and second accounts (i.e., Gen. 1:1-2:3; 2:4-25). ... It seems clear that the two chapters were not written to be read sequentially and according to strict chronology.”

The problem that Waltke mentioned about the first day (and the second and third day) existing with an evening and a morning before the sun was created on the fourth day wasn’t intended to be a matter of “dischronologization” in my opinion. (See my next footnote and see under Gen. 1:1-5.) It’s true that Gen. 2:4-25, which (because of the content that deals almost entirely with Adam and the garden of Eden) takes a few liberties, mentioning, for example, the creation of the animals after the creation of Adam, but such liberties don’t cause any serious problems. It seems clear enough that there was no intention to deny in Gen. 2:4-25 the sequence given in Gen. 1:1-2:3, where the animals were created before Adam.

<sup>62</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “The suggestion that he caused them [the sun, moon, and stars] only to appear on the fourth day (having already been created on the first day) is unconvincing.” I agree. Genesis chapter 1 speaks of the sun, moon, and stars being created on the fourth day. But I don’t believe God intended that those receiving this revelation would think of the creation of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day to be out of chronological sequence, or that they understood it to be out of sequence.

The fact that the sun wasn’t created until the fourth day strongly supports the idea that the days of Gen. 1:1-2:3 aren’t to be thought of as literal twenty-four hour days (but I don’t believe it caused any dischronologization problems. As I mentioned, the creation of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day fit well with the idea of an earth-centered universe, which was held by almost all people until the last few hundred years.) There was no problem having light (the light of God) before the sun was created. In fact, as I discuss under Genesis chapter 1, having the light of God come on the scene to bring the light of the first morning of the first day in Gen. 1:3-5 (before the sun, moon, and stars are created) helps confirm the important point that the *symbolic/spiritual* component of that light was much more important in this creation account than the *literal, physical* component of that light.

<sup>63</sup> Waltke has a footnote, “J. L. McKenzie writes, ‘The Hebrew author enumerates all the natural forces in which deity was thought to reside [according to the polytheistic pagan viewpoint], and of all of them he says simply that God made them. ...’ (*The Two-Edged Sword* [...Image, 1966], 101.” This information was extremely important for a world where most people worshipped the sun, moon, stars, and the natural forces, and all the more so because God’s people were tempted to worship them too, and all too often they succumbed to that temptation (but not because God hadn’t taught and warned them against such practices).

... ..the similarities of patterns with ancient Near Eastern material, including the use of the widely attested seven-day typology of the ancient world, may suggest that the narrator is using a stereotypical formula to speak of divine activity and rest.<sup>64</sup> ...

... Contemporary scientists [including many Christian scientists] almost unanimously discount the possibility of creation in one week [in six twenty-four hour days], and we cannot summarily discount the evidence of the earth sciences. General revelation in creation, as well as the special revelation of Scripture, is also the voice of God. ... [But scientists can be wrong, and frequently are, and Bible interpreters can be wrong too, and frequently are.] ...

... Following Henri Blocher,<sup>65</sup> we can describe the creation account as an artistic, literary representation of creation... .." (pages 76-78).

### Excerpts from Kenneth A. Matthews, *Genesis 1-11:26*<sup>66</sup>

First I'll include an excerpt to show that Matthews opts for non-literal days. "... (page 149).

"... As a whole 1:1-2:3 shows a proclivity to groups of sevens, which would further suggest that 1:1-2:3 is an inclusive section.<sup>67</sup> The arrangement of the passage consists of an introduction and seven paragraphs. ...." (pages 114, 115).

"... ..the narrative has the repeated use of the number 'seven' and multiples of seven, followed in frequency by the use of 'three's' and 'ten's.'<sup>68</sup> ... This numerical repetition speaks to the

---

<sup>64</sup> Waltke has a footnote, "Within ancient Near Eastern material, the pattern of six as incompleteness and seven as resolution is quite common."

<sup>65</sup> "In the Beginning (Inter-Varsity, 1984), pages 50-59." I quoted from this book earlier in this Extended Note.

<sup>66</sup> Broadman & Holman, 2001.

<sup>67</sup> Matthews has a footnote, "The structure of our section is based on a system of numerical harmony. Not only is the number *seven* fundamental to its main theme, but it also determines many of its details.... [I'll include several sentences from the 1989 reprint of Cassuto's commentary that Matthews skipped and/or didn't have: "Both to the Israelites and to the Gentiles...it was the number of *perfection* and the basis of ordered arrangement; and particular importance attached to it in the symbolism of numbers. The work of the Creator, which is marked by absolute perfection and flawless systematic orderliness, is distributed over seven days: six days of labour and a seventh day set aside for the enjoyment of the completed task. ..." (page 12).] This numerical symmetry is, as it were, the golden thread that binds together all the parts of the section and serves as a convincing proof of its unity' (U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Vol. 1, From Adam to Noah, Genesis I-VI:8*, trans. I. Abrahams [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961], 12 [12, 15])."

<sup>68</sup> "See Cassuto, *Genesis*, [pages] 12-15." I'll include some excerpts from Cassuto, pages 13-15. "In view of the importance ascribed to the number seven generally, and particularly in the story of Creation, this number occurs again and again in the structure of our section. The following details are worthy of note: (a) After the introductory verse (1:1), the section is divided into *seven* paragraphs, each of which appertains to one of the seven days. An obvious indication of this division is to be seen in the recurring sentence, *And there was evening and there was morning, such-and-such a day.* ... (b-d) Each of the three nouns that occur in the first verse and express the basic concepts of the section, *viz God...heavens...earth* ... are repeated in the section a given number of times that is a multiple of *seven*: thus the name of *God* occurs thirty-five times [fives times seven]...*earth* is found twenty-one times [three times seven]...*heavens* (or *firmament*...) appears twenty-one times. (e) ... (f) The terms *light* and *day* are found, in all, *seven* times in the first paragraph, and there are *seven* references to *light* in the fourth paragraph. (g) *Water* is mentioned *seven times* in the course of paragraphs two and three. (h) ... (I) The expression *it was good* appears *seven times* (the seventh time—*very good*). (j) The first verse has *seven words*. (k) The

literary unity of the narrative and emphasizes the idea of perfection and completion in God's finished creation" (pages 120, 121).

### Excerpts from Ronald F. Youngblood, *The Book of Genesis*<sup>69</sup>

"Ancient Near Eastern literature, particularly from Mesopotamia and Canaan, provides numerous examples of the use of seven days as a literary framework to circumscribe the completion of a cataclysmic or cosmic event. The pattern in these works runs uniformly as follows: 'One day, a second day, so and so happens; a third day, a fourth day, such and such occurs; a fifth day, a sixth day, so and so takes place; then, on the seventh day, the story comes to its exciting conclusion.'<sup>70</sup>

Genesis 1:1-2:3 exhibits a subtle and highly sophisticated modification of that literary device. ... Genesis 1:1-2:3 can be sketched as follows: 'On days one, two and three, God gives form to the universe; on days four, five and six, God fills the universe; then, on the seventh day, the Creator of the universe rests from all his work' ... Exodus 20:8-11, after reminding the Israelites that they were to work six days and rest on the seventh because that is what God did, made the connection between the seventh day and the Sabbath day explicit by paraphrasing Genesis 2:3 slightly: 'Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath and made it holy' (Exod. 20:11)" (pages 31, 32).

### Excerpts from Lee Irons with Meredith G. Kline, "The Framework View"<sup>71</sup>

The "framework view" comes in a variety of forms. Irons and Klein maintain that Gen. 1:1 speaks of "the original *ex nihilo* event" (page 298). They say that "the text cannot be used to determine how much time has elapsed since the creation" (page 218), but they also say, "Although many who hold the framework interpretation today are also persuaded by the current evidence for an old earth/universe, such a stance is not a necessary complement of the framework interpretation itself" (page 218).

I'll quote part of what the authors say under the major heading "Definition and Exposition" (pages 219, 220) "...Although the creative fiat-fulfillments (e.g., 'Then God said, "Let there be light" [fiat]; and there was light [fulfillment]') refer to actual historical events that actually occurred, they are narrated in a nonsequential order<sup>72</sup> within the literary structure or framework of a seven-day week. ...

---

second verse contains fourteen [two times seven] words.... (l) In the *seventh* paragraph, which deals with the *seventh* day, there occur the following three consecutive sentences (three for emphasis), each of which consists of *seven* words and contains in the middle the expression *the seventh day*: *And on THE SEVENTH DAY God finished His work which He had done, and He rested on THE SEVENTH DAY from all His work which He had done. So God blessed THE SEVENTH DAY and hallowed it.* (m) The words in the seventh paragraph total thirty-five.... To suppose all this is a mere coincidence is not possible."

<sup>69</sup> Second edition (Baker, 1991).

<sup>70</sup> Youngblood has a footnote, "For examples, see E. A. Speiser, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 94; H. L. Ginsberg, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 134, 144, 150."

<sup>71</sup> *Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, edited by David G. Hagopian (Crux Press, 2001).

<sup>72</sup> As I have mentioned, I don't agree with this "nonsequential" point. These authors believe, for example, that the events of day 1 and day 4 are the same events.

[I'll quote part of what the authors say under the subheading "The Nonliteral Element" (pages 219, 220): A nonliteral approach to the text is not, as many assume, a recent innovation devised to accommodate modern geological and astronomical evidence for an old earth/universe. Augustine held a nonliteral interpretation of the days, and he was followed by Anselm, Peter Lombard, and others. ...no one can deny that nonliteral approaches to the creation days have a venerable place in the history of Christian interpretation.<sup>73</sup>

I'll quote what the authors further say regarding this issue on a later page (291): "... Augustine and Church fathers influenced by him thought that the days had no reference to the actual time frame of creation. ... Louis Berkhof's description of Augustine's view reads more like a figurative interpretation than the literal, 24-hour view:

Some of the early Church Fathers did not regard [the days] as real indications of the time in which the work of creation was completed, but rather as literary forms in which the writer of Genesis cast the narrative of creation, in order to picture the work of creation – which was really completed in a moment of time – in an orderly fashion for human intelligence.<sup>74</sup>]

... We affirm a historical creation, a historical Adam, and a historical Fall. Genesis 1-3 is a historical narrative of events that actually took place in space and time with the angels of God as 'eyewitnesses' of everything but the initial *ex nihilo* creation event."

"... As with all biblical narratives, the Genesis account of creation presents the facts accurately and inerrantly, but in a literary form intended to convey the rich theological significance of the creation history. Biblical historical narratives normally display literary craftsmanship, and the presence of such craftsmanship in no way detracts from the inerrancy of Scripture or undermines its historical credibility" (pages 223, 224).

### **Excerpts from Charles E. Hummel, "Interpreting Genesis One"<sup>75</sup>**

"Once for all we need to get rid of the deep-seated feeling that figurative speech is inferior to literal language, as if it were somewhat less worthy of God. The Hebrew language is rich in figures of speech. Scripture abounds with symbols and metaphors which the Holy Spirit has used to convey powerfully and clearly the message he intended. ... Genesis 1 is 'historical' in the sense of relating events that actually occurred. ..." (page 177).

"In both its overall structure and use of numbers the writer paid as much attention to the form as to the content of the narrative, a fact which suggests mature meditation. [Hummel makes it clear in this article that he believes the Pentateuch came as revelation from God through Moses, not that God dictated every word to Moses.] The *historico-artistic* interpretation of Genesis 1 [Genesis 1 is a *historical* account of creation, but the account is presented in an *artistic* framework.] does justice to its literary craftsmanship, the general biblical perspective

---

<sup>73</sup> They have an endnote, "C. J. Collins, 'How Old Is the Earth? Anthropomorphic Days in Genesis 1:1-2:3,' *Presbyterion*, vol. 20, no. 2 (1994), p. 125; Jack P. Lewis, 'The Days of Creation: An Historical Survey of Interpretation,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, vol. 32, no. 4 (Dec. 1994), pp. 433-55; Robert Letham, ' "In the Space of Six Days": The days of Creation from Origen to the Westminster Assembly,' *Westminster Theological Journal*, vol. 61, no. 2 (Fall 1999), pp. 149-74."

<sup>74</sup> "Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (...Eerdmans, 1941), page 153."

<sup>75</sup> *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, Vol. 38, No. 3, September 1986. This same article is included as chapter 10, "Genesis One: Origin of the Universe," in the book *The Galileo Connection* by Charles E. Hummel (Inter-Varsity Press, 1986).

on natural events and the view of creation expressed by other writers in both Old and New Testaments” (page 179).

“... Once we get past arguments over the length of the days, we can see the intended meaning of these days for Israel. First, their significance lies not in *identity*, a one-to-one correlation with God’s creative activity, but in an *analogy* that provides a model for human work. The pattern of six plus one, work plus rest on the seventh day, highlights the sabbath. ... Made in the image of God, and given rule over the world, man and woman are the crown of creation. They rest from their labor on the sabbath, which is grounded in the creation (Gen. 2:2; Ex. 20:11).

“... God’s people do not need to know the *how* of creation; but they desperately need to know the *Creator*. [They desperately need to understand things like sin and righteousness, like the reality of the devil and his kingdom of darkness and evil, and the reality of eternal salvation and eternal judgment.] Their God, who has brought them into covenant relationship with himself, is no less than the Creator and Controller of the world. ... He is...the only One worthy of their worship and total commitment. ...” (page 183).

### **Excerpts Showing the Views of Philo and Clement of Alexandria Regarding the *Days of Creation*<sup>76</sup>**

“Philo [about 20 BC to AD 45, a Jew from Alexandria] expressed the notion that God created everything instantaneously and that the six days were figurative, a metaphor for order and completeness:

He [Moses] says that in six days the world was created, not that its Maker required a length of time for His work, for we must think of God as doing all things simultaneously, remembering that ‘all’ includes with the commands which He issues the thought behind them. Six days are mentioned because for the things coming into existence there was need of order.<sup>77</sup>

Philo amplified his reasoning in a later work:

It is quite foolish to think that the world was created in six days or in a space of time at all. Why? Because every period of time is a series of days and nights, and these can only be made such by the movement of the sun as it goes over and under the earth; but the sun is a part of heaven, so that time is confessedly more recent than the world. It would therefore be correct to say that the world was not made in time, but that time was formed by means of the world, for it was heaven’s movement [the movement of the sun] that was the index of the nature of time. When, then, Moses says, ‘He finished His work on the sixth day,’ we must understand him to be adducing not a quantity of days, but a perfect number, namely six<sup>78</sup>” (pages 16, 17).

---

<sup>76</sup> I’m taking these quotations and comments from *Creation and Time* by Hugh Ross (NavPress, 1994), pages 16-18.

<sup>77</sup> “Philo, Judaeus of Alexandria, ‘De Opificio Mundi’ (On the Account of Creation Given by Moses), *Philo*, vol. I, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (...Harvard University Press, 1949), page 13.”

<sup>78</sup> “Philo, Judaeus of Alexandria, ‘Legum Allegoria’ (Allegorical Interpretations of Genesis II, III, Book I, section 2), in *Philo*, vol. I, pages 146-149.”

“Clement of Alexandria (about AD 150-254) [a Christian scholar] echoed Philo’s belief that the Genesis creation days were not literal, twenty-four-hour days.<sup>79</sup> He claimed that the creation days communicated the order and priority of created things but not the time. As he understood it, creation could not take place in time since ‘time was born along with things which exist’<sup>80</sup>” (page 18).

### **Excerpt Dealing with the Belief in an Instantaneous Creation by Athanasius and Other Early Christians<sup>81</sup>**

“Athanasius (296-373), like others of his day, believed that the world was created instantaneously and at the same time had extended through six days.<sup>82</sup>

According to White, Hilary of Poitiers (died 367) offered as a solution to the problem of instantaneous creation and creation in six days the following:

For, although according to Moses there is an appearance of regular order in the fixing of the firmament, the laying bare of the dry land, the gathering together of the waters, the formation of the heavenly bodies, and the arising of living things from land and water, yet the creation of the heavens, earth, and other elements is seen to be the work of a single moment.<sup>83</sup>”

### **A Brief Discussion Regarding the Widespread Viewpoint that the Six Days of Creation Followed by a Day of Rest Shows that Man Is To Live and Work on the Earth for Six Thousand Years and then Have a Thousand Year Period of Rest**

This view was held by some Jews of the ancient world; it is found in many of the early Christian writers; and it is held by many Christians in our day. This view is found among premillennialists, but not all premillennialists hold this viewpoint. The premillennial viewpoint, the viewpoint that Christ will return, judge the world, and establish a thousand year kingdom on the earth was the most common viewpoint in the Christian church for the first few centuries, and it is widely held in our day. I believe this is the correct viewpoint. For one thing, Revelation chapter 20 very strongly favors this viewpoint.

I’ll give an excerpt dealing with 2 Enoch 32:3-33:1.<sup>84</sup> “In this apocalypse, ‘written by an Alexandrine Jew during the first fifty years of our era’ (R. H. Pfeiffer), the world exists for a total of seven days of a thousand years each, and the Lord decrees that the seventh constitutes a penultimate sabbath, to be followed by an endless eighth day of eternal bliss. No Messiah is integrated into this millennial picture [in 2 Enoch], but the implicit use of the canonical theme

---

<sup>79</sup> “Clement of Alexandria, ‘The Stromata,’ Book VI, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, by Salvatore R. C. Lilla (...Oxford University Press, 1971), pages 198-199; ‘The Stromata,’ book VI, Chapter XVI, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. II, pages 512-514.”

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, page 513.

<sup>81</sup> This excerpt was taken from Jack P. Lewis, “The Days of Creation: An Historical Survey of Interpretation,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Dec. 1989), page 448.

<sup>82</sup> “Athanasius *Orat.* 2.48-49 (NPNF, 4.374-375) (White, *History*, 1.6).”

<sup>83</sup> “Hilary *de Trin.* 12.40 (White, *History*, 1.7).”

<sup>84</sup> Taken from J. W. Montgomery, “Millenium,” *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3 [Eerdmans, 1986].

that 'a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday' (Ps. 90:4; 2 Pet. 3:8), with the consequent specification of a future era of explicitly millennial dimensions, is noteworthy" (page 357).

I'll quote from "The Epistle of Barnabus" (prior to AD 150), an early Christian writing.<sup>85</sup> "The Sabbath is mentioned at the beginning of the creation [thus]: 'And God made in six days the works of His hands, and made an end on the seventh day, and rested on it, and sanctified it.' Attend, my children, to the meaning of this expression, 'He finished it in six days.' This implieth that the Lord will finish all things in six thousand years. ... Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. 'And He rested on the seventh day.' This meaneth: when His Son, coming [again], shall destroy the time of the wicked man, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars [I assume the writer was speaking of a change that will take place in the sun, moon, and stars for the millennial kingdom.], then shall He truly rest on the seventh day. ...."

I'll quote from Irenaeus (about AD 130-200), an important church Father.<sup>86</sup> "For in as many days as this world was made, in so many thousand years shall it be concluded. And for this reason the Scripture says: 'Thus the heaven and the earth were finished, and all their adornment. And God brought to a conclusion upon the sixth day the works that He had made; and God rested upon the seventh day from all His works.' This is an account of the things formerly created, as also it is a prophecy of what is to come. For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years; and in six days created things were completed: it is evident, therefore, that they will come to an end at the sixth thousand year."

I'll quote from Lactantius (AD 260-330), a Christian writer.<sup>87</sup> "Therefore, since all the works of God were completed in six days, the world must continue in its present state through six ages, that is six thousand years. ... And again, since God, having finished His works, rested the seventh day and blessed it, at the end of the six thousandth year all wickedness must be abolished from the earth, and righteousness reign for a thousand years; and there must be tranquillity and rest from the labours which the world now has long endured."

I'll also quote from Victorinius (who died as a martyr for Christ in 304).<sup>88</sup> "Wherefore to those seven days [referring to the seven days of creation of Gen. 1:1-2:3] the Lord attributed to each a thousand years; for thus went the warning: 'In thine eyes, O Lord, a thousand years are as one day.' Therefore in the eyes of the Lord each thousand of years is ordained.... Wherefore, as I have narrated, that true Sabbath will be in the seventh millenary of years, when Christ and His elect shall reign. ...."

Tentative Conclusion. I won't be at all surprised if it turns out that this ancient view is correct, that the Genesis 1:1-2:3 account of six days of creation followed by a day of rest was intended by the Creator to indicate that the history of man is to last six thousand years, followed by a thousand year period of righteousness and rest on the earth under the reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. (I'm speaking of the *biblical* "history of man" that is based on the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11, which give the time that elapses from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abraham.)

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Eerdmans, 1985 reprint), Vol. 1, Chapter XV, page 146, 147.

<sup>86</sup> *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, "Irenaeus Against Heresies," Book V, Chapter XXVIII, par. 3, page 557.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, "The Divine Institutes," Book VII, Chapter XIV, page 211.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, "On the Creation of the World," page 342.

Assuming that God did intend to teach this viewpoint, He undoubtedly revealed it to some early Christians. (For example, the Lord Jesus Christ may have revealed it to one, or some, or all of the twelve (eleven) apostles after His resurrection.) If God didn't reveal this viewpoint, we wouldn't have an adequate basis in Gen. 1:1-2:3 (or anywhere else in the Bible) to hold this viewpoint with much assurance. If we take the chronological information in the Bible as it stands (especially the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11<sup>89</sup>), the six thousand years from the creation of Adam ends right about now. Things could get very exciting any time now!

Many, even many young-earth creationists,<sup>90</sup> acknowledge that there may be gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11 and that these genealogies may not tell the entire story. In other words, there may have been—and I believe there were—substantially more than 6,000 years from the time Adam was created until now. I assume that there are gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11. See Extended Note I, which is titled, “When was Adam Created?” Nevertheless, God could have given to Moses (by revelation) the early genealogies of man in the book of Genesis in the form we have them on purpose—and I assume that He did (though certainly not with dogmatic assurance)—designed to show that this present world will end and the millennial kingdom will begin around AD 2000 (obviously, since it's AD 2002 now) a little later than 2000.

---

<sup>89</sup> These genealogies yield about 2000 years (more exactly 1946 years) from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abraham. And we know that Abraham was born around 2000 B.C.

<sup>90</sup> Henry M. Morris, for example, a leader among the young-earth creationists, acknowledges the possibility of gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapter 5 and 11; he says, “At the outside, it would seem impossible to insert gaps totaling more than about five thousand years in these chapters without rendering the record irrelevant and absurd. Consequently, the Bible will not support a date for the creation of man earlier than about 10,000 B.C.” (*Genesis Flood* [Baker, 1976], page 45).



## EXTENDED NOTE G

### Galileo's Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture

The condemnation of Galileo (who lived from AD 1564-1642) and his viewpoint (this viewpoint didn't originate with him) that the earth was not the immovable center of the world (about which the sun, moon, and stars rotate) was quite important, and the results are still with us today. For one thing, many cite what happened there as "proof" that the Bible is wrong and that Christians are against science. It's quite significant that the interpretation of Scripture played a major role in the condemning of Galileo. We'll discuss quite a few issues in this Extended Note, but one of my primary concerns as I write this Note is that I'm afraid some Christians are making a bigger mistake than the Roman Catholic Church made when they condemned Galileo and dogmatically declared the sun-centered viewpoint to be heretical.

Many Christians in our day are dogmatically insisting that the universe was created six thousand years ago (or so). Based on what I have heard and read, their primary motivation for this dogmatic stand comes from their interpretation of the Bible, mostly from Genesis chapter 1. I very much appreciate the fact that the young-earth creationists are attempting to be faithful to the Scriptures. I also very much appreciate the fact that they are fighting against the godless theory of evolution (evolution is usually taught in a way that leaves *God* out of the equation and in a way that enhances *godlessness* in our society) that has captured so much of the educational system of our country (from the university level on down) and other key positions of influence in our country, including most of the media.

The primary problem, from my point of view (and a large number of evangelical Christians agree), is that the young-earth creationists are wrong when they say that the universe (including the earth) was created six thousand years ago (or so). See Extended Note J, "When Were the Universe and Earth Created?" It seems clear to me that the Roman Catholic Church in the days of Galileo had a stronger biblical basis to claim that the sun, moon, and stars rotate about a stationary earth than these Christians have to dogmatically insist that the universe and earth are only thousands of years old.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, as we'll briefly discuss, the Roman Catholic Church had most of the scientific and academic community on their side, quite unlike the young-earth creationists of our day.

---

<sup>91</sup> It's one thing to argue that Adam was created about 6,000 years ago; some young-earth creationists are willing to say Adam could have been created as far back as 12,000 years ago (see the last footnote of Extended Note F), and some of them even date Adam's creation many thousands of years before that (see Extended Note I). It's a totally different thing to argue that the universe (including the earth) was created at essentially the same time. From my point of view, there is essentially no possibility that they are right regarding when God began to create the universe.

I have had Christians tell me they believe the scientific evidence is sufficient to show that the young-earth viewpoint is correct. I suppose that viewpoint sounds reasonable if you have only heard arguments for the young-earth perspective, but it seems to me that the scientific evidence for an old universe and earth and against the young-earth viewpoint is overwhelming (see Extended Note J).

I'm not saying, of course, that the Bible is to be charged with error; the problem was/is with the interpretation of the Bible.<sup>92</sup> As I'll document in this Extended Note, quite a few verses speak of the earth's being fixed and stationary with the sun, moon, and stars rotating around the earth. (Genesis chapter 1 even pictures the sun, moon, and stars being created after the earth.) As we discussed under Gen. 1:14-19 in this paper, and as we will discuss further in Extended Note H ("The Bible and Science"), such statements in the Bible are not to be understood as (scientific) revelation from God; they simply reflected (were an accommodation to) the common scientific viewpoint of the ancient world. After all, the sun does go around the earth every day; it rises every morning and sets every evening. Even today, we still use such terminology, even though we now understand that it would be more scientifically accurate to say that the earth rotates on its axis daily and it rotates around the sun yearly. More importantly, the earth *is* the center of activity for man and God's dealings with man, not the sun, moon, or stars.

### Background Information

I'll quote quite a bit from the article on "Galilei, Galileo" by J. J. Langford in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*.<sup>93</sup>

"Through the ages, the geocentric [earth-centered] system of the universe had been almost universally accepted. It had received its doctrinal formulation in the writings of Aristotle (378-322 B.C.) and Ptolemy...[Greek astronomer; 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD]. Both agreed that the earth was the motionless center of the universe.... ..it was not until Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) that a rival system was sufficiently well formulated to challenge the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic position. In his great work *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (1543), Copernicus advocated a sun-centered universe in which the earth was a planet that revolved both on its axis and around the sun. [Galileo was born in 1564.] ... Galileo studied the *De revolutionibus* and, writing to Johann Kepler in 1597, acknowledged that he had discarded the Ptolemaic position several years before and believed in the reality of the Copernican system. ...

The condemnation of the sun-centered viewpoint and the order for Galileo to stop promoting it in 1616. (I'm still quoting from Langford.) "... [In the opinion of the "committee of 11 theologians who were consultants of the Holy Office" who were asked to look into Galileo's proclamation of the sun-centered viewpoint] the proposition that the sun is at the center of the universe and does not move was 'philosophically foolish and absurd and formally heretical, inasmuch as it expressly contradicts the doctrines of Holy Scripture in many places, both according to their literal meaning and according to the common exposition and interpretation of the holy Fathers and learned theologians.' As to the proposition that the earth is not the center of the universe but that it moves with both an annual and daily

<sup>92</sup> The young-earth creationists base their viewpoint mostly on their interpretation of Genesis chapter 1. The genealogies that start with Adam of Genesis chapters 5 and 11 are also quite relevant to their interpretation regarding when the universe was created since they believe that Adam was created at essentially the same time that the universe was created. Even if the days of Gen. 1:1-2:3 were to be literally interpreted as twenty-four hour days, I would still strongly argue that the universe is far older (apparently billions of years old) in that I believe there was a substantial gap (or gaps) between the time God began to create the universe out of nothing and the time He began to create/recreate the earth as pictured in Gen. 1:1-2:3.

<sup>93</sup> Vol. 6 (Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC, 1967) pages 250-255.

motion, the consultors were agreed that this deserved 'the same censure in philosophy [philosophy included science], and, that, from a theological standpoint, it was at least erroneous in the faith.' Galileo was ordered to appear before Cardinal Bellarmine and was told not to hold or defend the Copernican position any longer. ..." (page 253).

The 1633 trial of Galileo in Rome. (I'm still quoting from Langford.) "[Those who wanted to humiliate Galileo completely] prevailed. [Galileo had many friends in high places, including in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.] They succeeded in having the *Dialogue* [a book written by Galileo that was published in 1632] prohibited (the ban was lifted only in 1822) and in having Galileo condemned as 'vehemently suspected of heresy.' Galileo was made to kneel and abjure the Copernican opinion, sentenced to imprisonment, and given a 'salutary penance' to recite. The prison sentence was never imposed, though Galileo remained under house arrest in Florence the rest of his life. ..." (page 254).

The 1633 "Papal Condemnation (Sentence) of Galileo" and "Recantation of Galileo," both dated June 22, 1633. I downloaded these articles from [www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/galileo/recantation](http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/galileo/recantation). "Law.umkc" must be the Law School of the University of Missouri at Kansas City. I'll quote part of the three page "Condemnation," especially those parts that deal with the Scriptures, then I'll quote almost all of the "Recantation."

"Whereas you, Galileo, son of the late Vaincenzo Galilei, Florentine, aged seventy years, were in the year 1615 denounced to this Holy Office for holding as true the false doctrine taught by some that the Sun is the center of the world and immovable and that the Earth moves, and also with a diurnal [daily] motion...and for replying to the objections from the Holy Scriptures, which from time to time were urged against it, by glossing the said Scriptures according to your own meaning: and whereas there was thereupon produced the copy of a document in the form of a letter, purporting to be written by you to one formerly your disciple, and in this divers propositions are set forth, following the position of Copernicus, which are contrary to the true sense and authority of Holy Scripture.

This Holy Tribunal being therefore of intention to proceed against the disorder and mischief thence resulting, which went on increasing to the prejudice of the Holy Faith, by command of His Holiness and of the Most Eminent Lords Cardinals of this supreme and universal Inquisition, the two propositions of the stability of the Sun and the motion of the Earth were by the theological Qualifiers qualified as follows:

The proposition that the Sun is the center of the world and does not move from its place is absurd and false philosophically [scientifically] and formally heretical, because it is expressly contrary to Holy Scripture.

The proposition that the Earth is not the center of the world and immovable but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is equally absurd and false philosophically and theologically considered at least erroneous in faith.

But whereas it was desired at that time to deal leniently with you, it was decreed at the Holy Congregation held before His Holiness on the twenty-fifth of February, 1616, that his Eminence the Lord Cardinal Bellarmine should order you to abandon altogether the said false doctrine....

...

Furthermore, in order to completely eliminate such a pernicious doctrine, and not let it creep any further to the great detriment of Catholic truth, the Holy Congregation of the Index issued a decree which prohibited books which treat of this and declaring the doctrine itself to be false and wholly contrary to the divine and Holy Scripture.

And whereas a book has appeared here lately, printed in Florence last year, whose inscription showed that you were the author, the title being *Dialogue by Galileo Galilei on the two Chief World Systems, Ptolemaic and Copernican*; and whereas the Holy Congregation was informed that with the printing of this book the false opinion of the earth's motion and the sun's stability was being disseminated and taking hold more and more every day, the said book was diligently examined and found to violate explicitly the above-mentioned injunction given to you; for in the same book you have defended the said opinion already condemned and so declared to your face, although in the said book you try by means of various subterfuges to give the impression of leaving it undecided and labeled as probable; this is still a very serious error since there is no way an opinion declared and defined contrary to divine Scripture may be probable. ...

Therefore, having seen and seriously considered the merits of your case, together with the above-mentioned confessions and excuses and with any other reasonable matter worth seeing and considering, we have come to the final sentence against you given below.

Therefore, invoking the most Holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ and His most glorious Mother, ever Virgin Mary; and sitting as a tribunal, with the advice and counsel of the Reverend Masters of Sacred Theology and the Doctors of both laws, our consultants; in this written opinion we pronounce final judgment on the case pending before us between the Magificent Carlo Sinceri, Doctor of both laws, and Prosecuting Attorney of this Holy Office, on one side, and you the above-mentioned Galileo Galilei, the culprit here present, examined, tried, and confessed as above, on the other side:

We say, pronounce, sentence and declare that you, Galileo, by reason of these things which have been detailed in the trial and which you have confessed already, have rendered yourself according to this Holy Office vehemently suspect of heresy, namely of having held and believed a doctrine that is false and contrary to the divine and Holy Scripture: namely that the Sun is the center of the world and does not move from east to west, and that one may hold and defend as probable an opinion after it has been declared and defined contrary to Holy Scripture. Consequently, you have incurred all the censures and penalties enjoined and promulgated by the sacred Canons and all particular and general laws against such delinquents. We are willing to absolve you from them provided that first, with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, in our presence you abjure [give up opinions publicly, recant], curse and detest the said errors and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the Catholic and Apostolic Church in the manner and form we will prescribe to you.

Furthermore, so that this grievous and pernicious error and transgression of yours may not go altogether unpunished, and so that you will be more cautious in [the] future, and an example for others to abstain from delinquencies of this sort, we order that the book *Dialogue of Galileo Galilei* be prohibited by public edict.

We condemn you to formal imprisonment in this Holy Office at our pleasure. As a salutary penance we impose on you to recite the seven penitential psalms once a week for the next three years. And we reserve to ourselves the power of moderating, commuting, or taking off, the whole or part of the said penalties and penances.

This we say, pronounce, sentence, declare, order and reserve by this or any other better manner or form that we reasonably can or shall think of. So we the undersigned Cardinals pronounce: [The names of seven Cardinals follow, then the names of three judges who did not sign the sentence are given.]”

“I Galileo Galilei...aged seventy years, arraigned personally before this tribunal, and kneeling before you, most Eminent and Reverend Lord Cardinals, Inquisitors general against heretical depravity throughout the whole Christian Republic, having before my eyes and touching with my hands, the holy Gospels – swear that I have always believed, do now believe, and by God's help will for the future believe, all that is held, preached, and taught by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. But whereas – after an injunction had been judicially intimated to me by this Holy Office, to the effect that I must altogether abandon the false opinion that the sun is

the center of the world and immovable, and that the earth is not the center of the world, and moves, and that I must [not] hold, defend, or teach in any way whatsoever, verbally or in writing, the said doctrine, and after it had been notified to me that the said doctrine was contrary to Holy Scripture – I wrote and printed a book in which I discuss this doctrine already condemned, and adduce arguments of great cogency in its favor, without presenting any solution of these; and for this cause I have been pronounced by the Holy Office to be vehemently suspected of heresy, that is to say, of having held and believed that the sun is the center of the world and immovable, and that the earth is not the center and moves:

Therefore, desiring to remove from the minds of your Eminences, and of all faithful Christians, this strong suspicion, reasonably conceived against me, with sincere heart and unfeigned faith I abjure, curse, and detest the aforesaid errors and heresies, and generally every other error and sect whatsoever contrary to the said Holy Church; and I swear that in the future I will never again say or assert, verbally or in writing, anything that might furnish occasion for a similar suspicion regarding me; but that should I know any heretic, or person suspected of heresy, I will denounce him to this Holy Office, or to the Inquisitor and ordinary of the place where I may be. Further, I swear and promise to fulfill and observe in their integrity all penances that have been, or that shall be, imposed upon me by this Holy Office. And, in the event of my contravening (which God forbid) any of these my promises, protestations, and oaths, I submit myself to all the pains and penalties imposed and promulgated in the sacred canons and other constitutions, general and particular, against such delinquents. So help me God, and these His holy Gospels, which I touch with my hands. ... [Galileo's Recantation excludes two points included in the original formula for abjuration presented to him by the Cardinals. These two points, objected to by Galileo, would have had him declare that he was not a good Catholic and that he deceived others in publishing his book.]"

It's important to know that Copernicus and Galileo were practicing Roman Catholics, not anti-God, anti-Bible, anti-Christian scientists. It's clear that one of Galileo's prime concerns was that the Catholic Church not be embarrassed, as it eventually was, by being too quick to condemn the sun-centered viewpoint. Kepler was a committed Protestant, "He was...a devout Christian whose unwavering faith in God sustained his life and motivated his research. ... His relentless search for scientific truth reflected the devotion of a committed Christian. On one occasion he reported, 'I believe Divine Providence intervened so that by chance I found what I could never obtain by my own efforts. I believe this all the more because I have constantly prayed to God that I might succeed if what Copernicus said was true.'"<sup>94</sup>

### **Verses that Were Used to "Prove" that Galileo and the Sun-Centered Viewpoint Were Wrong**

Genesis Chapter 1. This chapter supports the (oversimplified) viewpoint (found repeatedly in the Bible) that the motionless earth is the center of the universe—the earth was here first; the sun, moon, and stars, which were created later and rotate around the earth, were made for the benefit of those on the earth. Richard Blackwell documents that Gen. 1:14, 17 were used against the Copernican view and Galileo.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Charles E. Hummel, *The Galileo Connection: Resolving Conflicts Between Science & the Bible* (InterVarsity Press, 1986), pages 58, 63.

<sup>95</sup> From *Galileo, Bellarmine, and the Bible*, by Richard J. Blackwell. Copyright 1991 by the University of Notre Dame Press, Pages 60, 62. "Ingoli's [Francesco Ingoli was an opponent of Galileo] scriptural argument for the location of the earth at the center of the universe is based on Genesis 1:14..." (page 62).

Joshua 10:12-13. (This passage was the one most often cited against the Copernican view and Galileo.) “Then Joshua spoke to the LORD in the day when the LORD delivered up the Amorites before the sons of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, ‘O sun, stand still at Gibeon, And O moon in the valley of Aijalon.’ (13) So the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, Until the nation avenged themselves of their enemies. Is it not written in the book of Jasher? And the sun stopped in the middle of the sky and did not hasten to go *down* for about a whole day.”

1 Chronicles 16:30. “Tremble before Him all the earth; Indeed, the world is firmly established, it will not be moved.”

Psalm 19:4-6. “... In them [the heavens] He has placed a tent for the sun, (5) Which [the sun] is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber; It rejoices as a strong man to run his course. (6) Its rising is from one end of the heavens, And its circuit to the other end of them; And there is nothing hidden from its heat.”

Psalm 93:1. “The LORD reigns, He is clothed in majesty; The LORD has clothed Himself with strength; Indeed, the world is firmly established, it will not be moved.”

Psalm 104:5. “He established the earth upon its foundations, So that it will not totter [or, move out of place] forever and ever.”

Ecclesiastes 1:5. “Also, the sun rises and the sun sets; And hastening to its place it rises there *again*.” Quite a few other verses speak of the rising and setting of the sun.

Isaiah 38:8. “ ‘Behold I will cause the shadow on the stairway, which has gone down with the sun on the stairway of Ahaz, to go back ten steps.’ So the sun’s *shadow* went back ten steps on the stairway on which it had gone down.”

Acts 2:19. “And I will grant wonders in the sky above and signs on the earth below.” They also used other verses that speak of the heavens/sky as being up and the earth down.

One factor that is often mentioned regarding the extremely harsh (and mostly wrong) response of the Roman Catholic Church to Galileo and the Copernican viewpoint is the fact that that Church was still reacting to the Protestant Reformation, which involved in a major way the interpretation of Scripture. The Catholic Church was strongly motivated to react against any interpretation of Scripture that didn’t line up with their traditional viewpoints.<sup>96</sup>

Much of the scientific community initially rejected Copernicus’ sun-centered viewpoint, and continued to do so for a long time. I’ll include an excerpt from Richard J. Blackwell to illustrate this point.<sup>97</sup> It’s significant that at the time of Galileo’s trial, he still couldn’t scientifically prove the sun-centered viewpoint.

---

<sup>96</sup> See chapter 1, “Trent and Beyond,” in *Galileo, Bellarmine, and the Bible*. The Council of Trent (1545-1563) dealt with the Protestant Reformation.

<sup>97</sup> “*Galileo, Bellarmine, and the Bible*, pages 24-27.”

“It was only towards the end of the century [the late 1500s] that the Catholic response begins to emerge [to the view of Copernicus]. A good example is the work of the most prominent Jesuit astronomer of the day, Christopher Clavius... (1537?-1612). ... Clavius’s work in astronomy is contained primarily in his *In sphaeram Ioannis de Sacro Bosco commentarius*, first published in 1570. ... In it he refers to the Copernican worldview rather infrequently (it does not seem to be a major concern yet), and when he does he disagrees with it, primarily on astronomical and physical grounds but also for Scriptural reasons. He summarizes his analysis near the end of the book as follows:

... But many errors and absurdities are contained in the Copernican position, for example, that the earth is not in the center of the universe... that the sun stands in the center of the world and has no motion at all. All of this is contrary to the common teaching of philosophers and astronomers and seems to contradict what is taught in many places in the Sacred Scriptures....<sup>98</sup>

The lack of doubt expressed here is further supported by the claim that ‘also in agreement with this opinion [Ptolemaic geocentrism] are the Sacred Scriptures which state in many places that the earth is immobile, and that the sun and the other stars move.’<sup>99</sup> He then goes on to quote Psalms 19:5-6 and 104:5 and Ecclesiastes 1:4-6 for support, a role these passages would often assume in the near future. ... Although in his last days Clavius began to have his doubts, few others did.”

“It is curious that, despite the evidence, historians of science have seldom blamed the university professors for their part in the decision against Copernicus and Galileo, their opposition to freedom of scientific inquiry. Yet it was they, the leading scientists, who urged the theologians to intervene, confident that the church would be on their side. ....”<sup>100</sup>

If Galileo could have proved the sun-centered viewpoint, he would not have been condemned. I’m not saying this to justify the Roman Catholic Church. There was plenty to blame them for. “[Galileo] spent most of the next 6 years (1624-30) working on what he thought would be final and conclusive proof that the Copernican system was true. ... the resulting book, entitled *Dialogue on the Two Great World Systems*... went to press in 1632. The main argument of the *Dialogue* was based on an erroneous theory of the tides: a theory that he thought would necessitate the motion of the earth. ....”<sup>101</sup>

Galileo was clearly wrong in his view that the tides are caused by the motion of the earth. (For the record, although Copernicus and Galileo were right to say that the earth

<sup>98</sup> “In *Opera mathematica*, III, 301.”

<sup>99</sup> “Ibid., III, 106.”

<sup>100</sup> Hummel, *Galileo Connection*, pages 119, 120.

<sup>101</sup> Langford, *Galileo*. Also see footnote 49 on page 80 of the book by Blackwell.

rotates about the sun, they were wrong to say that the sun is motionless. We now know a lot more about the dynamics of the universe. Also, for the record, although you sometimes hear it said that the Roman Catholic Church was defending [against Galileo] the view that the earth is flat, a flat earth was not in dispute. Galileo's opponents believed that the earth was spherical.) We had to wait a few years for the mathematician and scientist Isaac Newton (1642-1727) to explain the gravitational attraction of the sun and moon (which causes the tides) and to give us the laws of gravitation and of motion.

"Newton completed a three-part work...in 1686. ... The first volume sets forth three laws of motion which extend Galileo's work and break with the ideas of Aristotle and the medieval philosophers. Here is the first clear description of the way multiple forces operate together, the impact of one body on another and the law of universal gravitation. ... The third volume, entitled *System of the World*, is Newton's crowning achievement. In it the principles of the first two books are applied. Newton explains the orbits of Jupiter's satellites discovered by Galileo, shows how Kepler's three planetary laws are a consequence of universal gravitation, discusses the earth's daily rotation and the movement of its axis in space, and explains how the gravitational pull of the sun and moon causes the tides. Finally he calculates the precise motion of the moon."<sup>102</sup>

"[Newton] was deeply committed in his faith in the Creator of the world who also revealed himself in history and Scripture. A member of the Anglican church.... ...during his life Newton spent more time on theology than on science. He wrote about 1,300,000 words on biblical subjects. ...."<sup>103</sup>

#### The last word from the Roman Catholic Church regarding Galileo

"In 1979, Pope John Paul II declared that the Roman Catholic Church may have been mistaken in condemning Galileo. He instructed a church commission to study Galileo's case. In 1983, the commission concluded that Galileo should not have been condemned. In 1984, at the commission's recommendation, the church published all documents related to Galileo's trial. In 1992, Pope John Paul II publicly endorsed the commission's finding that the church had made a mistake in condemning Galileo."<sup>104</sup>

#### The early Protestant reaction to Copernicus' sun-centered viewpoint

I'll include part of a footnote from C. John Collins.<sup>105</sup> "According to P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, VIII, 678ff, Calvin [1509-1564] rejected the heliocentric theory of Copernicus (published 1543 and influential to Galileo [1564-1642]), on the basis of Scripture, as did Luther [1483-1546], Melancthon [1494-1560], and most others. [Note the early dates for Calvin, Luther, and Melancthon compared with Galileo.] 'Even after the triumph of the Copernican system in the scientific world, there were respectable theologians, like John Owen [1616-1683; a Puritan] and John Wesley [1703-1791], who found it inconsistent with their theory of inspiration, and rejected it as a delusive and arbitrary hypothesis tending toward infidelity.'"

---

<sup>102</sup> Hummel, *Galileo Connection*, page 138.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, page 142.

<sup>104</sup> Article on Galileo by A. Mark Smith in *World Book* (World Book, Inc., 2000), page 3.

<sup>105</sup> "How Old Is the Earth?" *Presbyterion*, 20/2, page 115.



## EXTENDED NOTE H

### The Bible and Science

#### Excerpts from *The Proceedings of the Conference on Biblical Inerrancy 1987*<sup>106</sup>

Excerpts from the article, “The Inerrancy of Scripture,” by Robert Preus. In this article Robert Preus, who was the president of Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana (Missouri Synod Lutheran) at the time, argues strongly for the doctrine of inerrancy and against the “historical-critical” (not to be confused with “historical-grammatical”) approach to the Bible, which he calls a “trojan horse.” I agree that we evangelicals should take a strong stand for inerrancy, and all the more so since the Bible is under such attack in our day (much of this attack is coming from “Christians”),<sup>107</sup> but we must also guard against overstating what we mean by the inerrancy of the Bible. I also agree that much that goes under the name “historical-critical” amounts to a serious attack against the Bible.

Preus gives twelve “Adjuncts to the Doctrine of Biblical Inerrancy” to help define and qualify what he means by *inerrancy*. I’ll quote his adjunct #5; it deals with scientific issues.

“In describing the things of nature Scripture does not employ scientifically precise language, but describes and alludes to things phenomally as they appear to our senses: for example, the fixity of stellar constellations and the magnitude of the stars (Isa. 13:10; Judg. 5:20; Job 38:31; Amos 5:8; Job 9:9)...; the earth as motionless in a fixed position (Eccl. 1:4; Ps. 93:1); the sun as going around the fixed earth (Eccl. 1:5; Matt. 13:6; Eph. 4:26)....

Many things in the realm of nature are spoken of in poetic language: the spreading out of the heavens (Isa. 40:22; Job 9:8), the foundations of the earth (Job 38:6), the pillars of the earth (Job 9:6) and of heaven (Job 26:11), the ends of the earth (Ps. 67:7; 72:8). ...

In none of the above instances is inerrancy threatened or vitiated [weakened]. The intention of the passages cited above is not to establish or vouch for a particular world view or scientific explanation of things. Because the language is not scientific does not imply that it is not true descriptively” (pages 52, 53).

Excerpt from the article “Problem Areas Related to Biblical Inerrancy” by J. I. Packer. Although Packer is a key leader in the biblical inerrancy movement, he is quite generous (maybe even too generous) with his qualifications regarding inerrancy where Genesis chapters 1-3 interact with science.

---

<sup>106</sup> Broadman Press, 1987. “This book contains the papers presented at The Conference on Biblical Inerrancy, May 4-7, 1987, at Ridgecrest Baptist Conference Center in Ridgecrest, North Carolina. The conference was sponsored and coordinated by the six seminaries of the Southern Baptist Convention.” Many of the papers presented were not written by Southern Baptists.

<sup>107</sup> The devil has been working diligently for a long time to discredit God’s Word, and the more liberal branches of Christianity have sided in with him to a significant extent. In our day many associated with the evangelical branches of Christianity have begun to acknowledge error in the Bible.

“Again, what can we be sure of with regard to the creation narrative? What we can be sure of is that its prime purpose is to introduce not the creation but the Creator. ... It is certain that Genesis 1-2:4 celebrates the fact of creation and that Genesis 2:4-3:24 teaches about the ruined relationship between God and the man and the woman. What is less certain is whether all the physical details of the narrative are meant to inform us of what we would in fact have seen happen had we been there, or whether God means them to function as significant symbols only. Differences here do not argue abandonment of inerrancy on anyone’s part, and are in any case only matters of each person’s present opinion on an obscure interpretative question. The exception to this rule is the historicity of Adam and Eve, which is evidently assumed and taught since they are linked by genealogy to the rest of us” (pages 212, 213).

### **Excerpts from, and Discussion Regarding, “The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy”<sup>108</sup>**

The Statement has four parts, a Preface (one page), “A Short Statement” (one-half page), “Articles of Affirmation and Denial” (nineteen “articles”; three and one-half pages), and an “Exposition” (five pages). I’ll quote part of #4 under the “Short Statement.” “Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God’s acts in creation...than in its witness to God’s saving grace in individual lives.” And I’ll quote Article XII, “We affirm that Scripture in its entirety is inerrant, being free from all falsehood, fraud, or deceit. We deny that Biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes, exclusive of assertions in the fields of history and science. We further deny that scientific hypotheses about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on creation and the flood.”

In 1980 the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy published a booklet (*Explaining Inerrancy: A Commentary*<sup>109</sup>) that helps qualify and explain the nineteen articles of the “Chicago Statement.” I’ll quote part of what this booklet says regarding Article XII (quoted in the last paragraph). “The denial explicitly rejects the tendency of some to limit infallibility and inerrancy to specific segments of the biblical message, such as spiritual, religious or redemptive themes, excluding assertions from the fields of history or science. ...

---

<sup>108</sup> This Statement is located (for one place) in the Appendix of *Inerrancy*, edited by Norman L. Geisler (Zondervan, 1980). “The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy was prepared at a three-day meeting in October, 1978, of 284 scholars who are committed to biblical inerrancy. The meeting was sponsored by the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, and most of the scholars were Americans. Interestingly, this group also was responding [as were the Southern Baptists] to a controversy which was occurring in American evangelicalism. ... The controversy among evangelicals concerned whether or not institutions such as Fuller Seminary and individuals in the Evangelical Theological Society and other groups, were betraying their evangelical heritage if they failed to affirm the inerrancy of the Bible. The Council was formed to support inerrancy, and the 1978 statement was its first major achievement” (taken from the article “The Baptist Faith and Message and the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy” by Fisher Humphries in *The Proceedings of the Conference on Biblical Inerrancy 1987*, pages 317, 318).

<sup>109</sup> International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, Oakland, CA, 1980, written by R. C. Sproul. In the foreword of this booklet (51 pages), it mentions that “240 (out of a total of 268) actually affixed their signatures to the Nineteen Articles [in October 1978].” In the foreword it mentions that James I. Packer (I quoted from him above) was on the Draft Committee that composed the “Chicago Statement.”

With respect to matters of science, the further denial that scientific hypotheses about earth history may be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on such matters of creation and the flood again rejects the idea that the Bible speaks merely in areas of spiritual value or concerning redemptive themes. The Bible does have something to say about the origin of the earth, about the advent of man, about creation, and about such matters that have scientific import, as the question of the flood. [It certainly does.] It is important to note that the second denial, 'that scientific hypotheses about earth history may not be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on matters such as the creation and the flood,' does not carry with it the implication that scientific hypotheses or scientific research are useless to the student of the Bible or that science never has anything to contribute to an understanding of biblical material. It merely denies that the actual teaching of Scripture can be overturned by teachings from external sources.

... the scientific discoveries [in the days of Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton] made it necessary for the church to re-examine the teaching on Scripture to see whether or not Scripture actually taught geocentricity or if this was an inference read into the Scripture on the basis of an earlier world view. Upon re-examining what Scripture really taught, the church came to the conclusion that there was no real conflict with science on the question of geocentricity because the Bible did not in fact in any place explicitly teach or assert that the earth was the center of either the solar system or the universe. [I don't have a problem with saying that the Bible doesn't "explicitly teach or assert that the earth was the center of the... universe," but I believe we should acknowledge that God accommodated the Scriptures to the ancient scientific viewpoint of a stationary earth with the sun, moon, and stars rotating about the earth.<sup>110</sup> I don't believe we should be afraid of the truth. (See under Genesis chapter 1 and see Extended Note G.)

I realize that the idea of *accommodation* has been greatly overused by some with catastrophic results, but it provides the best explanation I know of for some of the scientific details of Genesis chapter 1. I don't believe the inerrancy of the Bible is threatened by a cautious, extremely limited acknowledgement of such accommodation. I assume that some of those who signed the "Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy" agree, but it's clear that some don't agree.<sup>111</sup>] Here the advances of science helped the church to correct an earlier misinterpretation of Scripture. To say that science cannot overturn the teaching of Scripture is not to say that science cannot aid the church in understanding Scripture, or even correct false inferences drawn from Scripture or actual misinterpretations of the Scripture. On the other hand, this does not give one license arbitrarily to reinterpret Scripture to force it into conformity to secular theories of origins or the like. For example, if the secular community asserts that the origin of humanity is the result of a cosmic accident or the product of blind, impersonal forces, such a view cannot possibly be reconciled with the biblical view of the purposive act of God's creation of mankind without doing radical violence to the Bible itself.

---

<sup>110</sup> It is reasonable to argue that when the Bible pictures a stationary earth, with the sun, moon, and stars rotating around the earth, for example, this was nothing more than speaking of things as they *appear* to the senses, but it's hard to argue that the sun *appears* to have been created after the earth. As we discussed in some detail under Genesis chapter 1, some argue that Genesis 1 doesn't really speak of the sun, moon, and stars being created on the fourth day, but that they only became visible on the fourth day—it seems clear to me that they are wrong. At least some young-earth creationists argue that the sun and stars actually were created after the earth. I appreciate their desire to rightly interpret Genesis chapter 1, but I assume they are wrong on this point. Some who hold a "framework" interpretation of Genesis chapter 1 deny an intended sequence in the events spoken of throughout the six days of creation. I believe a sequence was intended.

<sup>111</sup> See the excerpts from Wayne A. Grudem in the section that follows.

Questions of the extent of the flood or the literary genre of the earlier chapters of Genesis are not answered by this Statement. Questions of biblical interpretation that touch on the field of hermeneutics remain for further investigation and discussion. What the Scriptures actually teach about creation and the flood is not spelled out by this article; but it does spell out that whatever the Bible teaches about creation and the flood cannot be negated by secular theories” (pages 26, 27).

I’ll include a brief excerpt from a booklet posted on the Internet.<sup>112</sup> I’m quoting from a section titled, “According to the Bible, how old is the earth?” “We don’t know. The Bible doesn’t say. ... Because of the different ways people interpret such evidence; it’s not surprising that there are differences of opinion about how to read God’s two books [the Bible and the world that God created] side by side. Dr. James Sawyer of Western Seminary has pointed out that when the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy was formed in 1978, ‘the founding membership held over 30 discrete positions with reference to the interpretation of Genesis 1. Only one of these positions involved a 6-day recent creation.’ Apparently, most of those on the council felt that the book of God’s words did not demand that the days of creation be considered standard 24-hour days—or that no time elapsed between the days.”

**Excerpts from the Section Titled “The Question of ‘Accommodation’  
to Human Error” by Wayne A. Grudem<sup>113</sup>**

“...it will be useful to consider one particular view of the nature of God’s words in Scripture, a view that is quite widely held at the present time. This viewpoint can be called the concept of ‘accommodation’; that is, the view that ‘the God who lovingly willed to communicate revelational truth to men deliberately *accommodated* his language in nonrevelational matters to the way the original readers viewed the world about them, so as to enhance the communication of revelational truth, by which alone men could be saved.’<sup>114</sup> Those who advocate such a concept also argue that this accommodation can include the statement of, and at least the incidental affirmation of, factual details in historical or scientific matters that are untrue (in the sense that they do not correspond to reality) but that they are generally believed by the hearers or readers. [There is a gigantic difference between accommodation to factual details in “historical” matters and an extremely limited, cautious accommodation to certain “scientific” details. I don’t see a reasonable basis for accommodation in “historical” matters.] Although the advocates of this position may deny that such statements are ‘affirmed’ [“affirmed” as being true; as if the Bible is giving its stamp of approval by including such statements] in one sense (because they do not belong to the main purpose of the author), for purposes of discussion it is important to recognize that such statements are ‘affirmed’ in another sense, namely, that they are repeated by the author in such a way that no indication of disbelief in their truthfulness is communicated by the author to the original readers or hearers. In fact, that is the purpose for such ‘accommodation’; if any suggestion of disbelief in these supposed facts were to be communicated, it would hinder communication by causing needless distraction of attention from the author’s main point (according to the advocates of

---

<sup>112</sup> The booklet is titled “Dinosaurs & the Bible: Defusing the Creation Controversy”; it was written by Dean Ohlman, a staff writer of RBC Ministries; Martin R. De Haan II is the president of RBC Ministries.

<sup>113</sup> This section was part of an essay titled “Scripture’s Self-Attestation and the Problem of Formulating a Doctrine of Scripture” in the book *Scripture and Truth* edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Baker in 1992, originally published in 1983).

<sup>114</sup> Grudem has a footnote. “Daniel P. Fuller, ‘Benjamin B. Warfield’s View of Faith and History,’ *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11 (1868): 81. ....”

accommodation). [There is lot more involved with the accommodation of certain scientific details to the ancient viewpoint than avoiding “needless distraction”; essentially all of the people who have read (or heard) Genesis chapter 1 in all the years since it was written up until the last few hundred years would have had an extremely difficult time accepting this super-important chapter if it had been written from a more scientifically accurate sun-centered viewpoint. The sun-centered viewpoint would have tended to close their minds to all of the super-important revelation contained in Genesis chapter 1, information like the God of Abraham, of Moses, and of the people Israel is the Creator of everything; He is the only one to be worshipped, not the “gods” of the nations, which included worshipping the gods associated with the sun, moon, stars, rain, and the forces of nature. God could, of course, have skipped the scientific details, but the creation account would have lost much of its concrete effectiveness.] ...

... [It seems clear to me (as it is discussed in some detail in this paper, mostly under Genesis chapter 1, in Extended Note G, and here in Extended Note H) that God did accommodate some of the scientific content of Genesis chapter 1 (and many other passages of Scripture) to the ancient scientific viewpoints.] (It should be noted that the position that is being analyzed here is formulated in terms of divine, not human, activity in the writing of Scripture. [In other words, we aren’t concerned here with whether the writers of Scripture wrote from their scientific perspective (which was, for example, the earth-centered viewpoint); we are asking the more important question, whether God, the ultimate Author of the Bible, accommodated the scientific content of passages of the Bible to the ancient scientific viewpoints?] ...” (pages 53-57).

Grudem goes on for three pages telling why he thinks we must reject all such accommodation. He believes that such accommodation goes against what the Bible testifies about its truthfulness and makes a liar out of God. Furthermore he doesn’t believe such accommodation was necessary. I respect Grudem, and I agree with him that we should take a stand for an inerrant Bible. (I don’t consider the accommodation that I think I see in Genesis chapter 1 to be “error.”) Furthermore, I agree with him that most uses of accommodation are clearly wrong. To cite an extreme, but not uncommon, example, some “Christians” say that there is no essential reality to the atoning death of the Lord Jesus Christ: What the Bible says on that topic was just an accommodation to a viewpoint that wasn’t true but was widely accepted in the ancient world. That’s pure heresy! Other examples include the denial of the virgin birth; the existence of angels, demons, or hell; the reality of miracles or authentic prophecies; and a denial of the bodily resurrection of Christ Jesus.

**Excerpts Dealing with “The Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics  
[Interpretation]” that was Published by the  
International Council on Biblical Inerrancy in 1982<sup>115</sup>**

---

<sup>115</sup> This Statement and two related documents are contained in the appendix of the book *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, & the Bible*. The book contains the papers from Summit II, which was held in Chicago on November 10-13, 1982. This Statement represents “a consensus of the approximately one hundred participants and observers gathered at this conference” (page 881). The book was edited by Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus (I quoted from Preus at the beginning of this Extended Note).

I'll quote four of the twenty-five articles of this statement and much of the commentary regarding these four articles that is contained in Appendix B ("Explaining Hermeneutics: A Commentary on the Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics" by Norman L. Geisler).

"Article XV. WE AFFIRM the necessity of interpreting the Bible according to its literal, or normal, sense. The literal sense is the grammatical-historical sense, that is, the meaning which the writer expressed. Interpretation according to the literal sense will take account of all figures of speech and literary forms found in the text. WE DENY the legitimacy of any approach to Scripture that attributes to it meaning which the literal sense does not support.

The literal sense of Scripture is strongly affirmed here. To be sure the English word *literal* carries some problematic connotations with it. Hence the words *normal* and *grammatical-historical* are used to explain what is meant. The literal sense is also designated by the more descriptive title *grammatical-historical sense*. This means the correct interpretation is the one which discovers the meaning of the text in its grammatical forms and in the historical, cultural context in which the text is expressed.

The Denial warns against attributing to Scripture any meaning not based in a literal understanding, such as mythological or allegorical interpretations. This should not be understood as eliminating typology or designated allegory or other literary forms which include figures of speech (see Articles X, XIII, and XIV [not included here]).

Article XX. WE AFFIRM that since God is the author of all truth, all truths, biblical and extrabiblical, are consistent and cohere, and that the Bible speaks truth when it touches on matters pertaining to nature, history, or anything else. We further affirm that in some cases extrabiblical data have value for clarifying what Scripture teaches, and for prompting correction of faulty interpretations. WE DENY that extrabiblical views ever disprove the teaching of Scripture [when it is rightly interpreted] or hold priority over it.

... God has revealed Himself in nature and history as well as in Scripture. However, since God is the ultimate Author of all truth, there can be no contradiction between truths of Scripture and the true teachings of science and history.

Although only the Bible is the normative and infallible rule for doctrine and practice, nevertheless what one learns from sources outside Scripture can occasion a reexamination and reinterpretation of Scripture. For example, some have taught the world to be square because the Bible refers to 'the four corners of the earth' (Isa. 11:12). But scientific knowledge of the spherical nature of the globe leads to a correction of this faulty interpretation. ...

However, whatever prompting and clarifying of Scripture that extrabiblical studies may provide, the final authority for what the Bible teaches rests in the text of Scripture itself and not in anything outside it (except in God Himself). The Denial makes clear this priority of the teaching of God's scriptural revelation over anything outside it.

Article XXI. WE AFFIRM the harmony of special with general revelation and therefore of biblical teaching with the facts of nature. WE DENY that any genuine scientific facts are inconsistent with the true meaning of any passage of Scripture.

This article continues the discussion of the previous article by noting the harmony of God's general revelation (outside Scripture) and His special revelation in Scripture. It is acknowledged by all that certain *interpretations* of Scripture and some *opinions* of scientists will

contradict each other. However, it is insisted here that the *truth* of Scripture and the *facts* of science never contradict each other.

'Genuine' science will always be in accord with Scripture. Science, however, based on naturalistic presuppositions will inevitably come in conflict with the supernatural truths of Scripture.

Far from denying a healthy interchange between scientific theory and biblical interpretation, the framers of this statement welcome such. Indeed, it is acknowledged (in article XX) that the exegete can learn from the scientist. What is denied is that we should accept scientific views that contradict Scripture or that they should be given an authority above Scripture.

Article XXII. WE AFFIRM that Genesis 1-11 is factual, as is the rest of the book. WE DENY that the teachings of Genesis 1-11 are mythical and that scientific hypotheses about earth history or the origin of humanity may be invoked to overthrow what Scripture teaches about creation.

Since the historicity and the scientific accuracy of the early chapters of the Bible have come under severe attack it is important to apply the 'literal' hermeneutic espoused (Article XV) to this question. The result was a recognition of the factual nature of the account of the creation of the universe, all living things, the special creation of man, the Fall, and the Flood. These accounts are all factual, that is, they are about space time events which actually happened as reported in the book of Genesis (see Article XIV [not included here]).

The article left open the question of the age of the earth on which there is no unanimity among evangelicals and which was beyond the purview of this conference. There was, however, complete agreement on denying that Genesis is mythological or unhistorical. Likewise, the use of the term 'creation' was meant to exclude the belief in macro-evolution, whether of the atheistic or theistic varieties" (pages 898-903).

I'll also quote a section from Appendix C, "Exposition on Biblical Hermeneutics" by J. I. Packer. The section is titled "Biblical Statements and Natural Science." I quoted from Packer earlier in this Extended Note; Packer is a leader in the inerrancy movement.

"What the Bible says about the facts of nature is as true and trustworthy as anything else it says. However, it speaks of natural phenomena as they are spoken of in ordinary language, not in the explanatory technical terms of modern science; it accounts for natural events in terms of the action of God, not in terms of causal links within the created order; and it often describes natural processes figuratively and poetically, not analytically and prosaically as modern science seeks to do. This being so, differences of opinion as to the correct scientific account to give of natural facts and events which Scripture celebrates can hardly be avoided.

It should be remembered, however, that Scripture was given to reveal God, not to address scientific issues in scientific terms, and that, as it does not use the language of modern science, so it does not require scientific knowledge about the internal processes of God's creation for the understanding of its essential message about God and ourselves. Scripture interprets scientific knowledge by relating it to the revealed purpose and work of God, thus establishing an ultimate context for the study and reform of scientific ideas. It is not for scientific theories to dictate what Scripture may and may not say, although extra-biblical information will sometimes helpfully expose a misinterpretation of Scripture.

In fact, interrogating biblical statements concerning nature in the light of scientific knowledge about their subject-matter may help toward attaining a more precise exegesis of them. For though exegesis must be controlled by the text itself, not shaped by extraneous considerations, the exegetical process is constantly stimulated by questioning the text as to whether it means this or that" (page 912).

**Excerpts from *Inerrant Wisdom: Science and Inerrancy*  
in *Biblical Perspective* by Paul H. Seely<sup>116</sup>**

This book was mentioned earlier in this paper, under Gen. 1:15, 16. After reading what John Walton said about it, I was looking forward to getting the book. I finally got a copy through the InterLibrary loan. I found the book extremely informative regarding the concept that God accommodated certain scientific details to the ancient viewpoint; I'll quote quite a bit from him on this issue. I was quite disappointed, however, to learn from the book that Seely leaves quite a bit of room for error in the Bible.<sup>117</sup> The history

---

<sup>116</sup> Evangelical Reform, Inc., 1989. I'll quote the note about the author from the back of the book. "After graduating from Westminster Theological Seminary [a conservative Calvinistic seminary], Paul H. Seely spent 20 years carefully studying each verse of the Bible in its original language from Genesis 1:1 to the end of Revelation. In the process he read through 60,000 pages of biblical commentary. In order to understand the Bible historically as well as grammatically he also read through the history and major literature of the ancient Near Eastern peoples, the intertestamental Jews, and the Greeks and Romans, including some 250 volumes of the Loeb Classical Library. He has two grown sons and resides with his wife in Portland, Oregon."

<sup>117</sup> I didn't study out in detail what Seely believes beyond the sections of the book where I quote from him, but I read through the entire book (sometimes skimming a little); I'll point out several places where he goes too far for me and acknowledges error in the Bible. In the preface, Seely mentions that he originally believed in an inerrant Bible. He went out of his way at the time to choose a seminary that held that viewpoint (Westminster Theological Seminary), even though it meant traveling across the country. He still considers himself to be an evangelical Christian. Many evangelicals of our day have wandered far from believing in an inerrant Bible. For some it's a minor problem, involving only minor issues; for others it's a very serious problem, involving major issues. In the case of Seely I believe some of the issues are serious, but I assume he is solid on the foundational Christian doctrines like the deity, virgin birth, sinless life, atoning death, and bodily resurrection of the Son of God; on the reality of angels, the devil, demons, and of miracles; on the reality of the second coming of Christ to judge the world and the reality of heaven and hell.

I'll mention several places where I have to rather strongly disagree with Seely if he is saying what I think he is. In the preface he says, "Certainly the Bible is an unerring guide to faith and morals when taken as a whole and interpreted in submission to the Spirit of Christ." That sentence leaves a whole lot of room for error in the Bible regarding historical facts, etc. Based on what Seely says, and on what he doesn't say, regarding the authorship of the Pentateuch and the books of Isaiah and Daniel on page 65, it doesn't seem that he would take a stand for the authorship of Moses, Isaiah, or Daniel. I believe it's quite important to take a stand on such issues. In the past, evangelicals were united on such issues. It's quite important to believe, for example, that the book of Daniel is what it claims to be (a very important book of the Bible written by Daniel that includes very important prophecies from God regarding future events). For a long time now liberal Christianity has been telling us that the book of Daniel is a rather phony document that was written hundreds of years after Daniel was supposed to have lived that really isn't prophecy at all but mostly history written after the fact in the form of prophecy. They are making a serious mistake, a mistake that would invalidate some of the most important prophecies in the Bible. The fact that the all-important prophecies of the book of Revelation build on the prophecies of Daniel makes this erroneous viewpoint regarding the book of Daniel all the more serious.

On pages 65, 66 Seely says, "Some conservatives, however, insist that even though Jesus did not make any assertions about the nature of Old Testament's historicity, His statements such as Luke 11:51 about Abel, Luke 11:29-32 about Jonah, etc., imply the literal factual truths of the accounts cited; and Christians must be bound by His literal interpretation. [I would think so!] This insistent position, however, cannot avoid the possibility that Jesus' words rested upon accommodation [my emphasis] or assumption and hence cannot logically bear any such weight." If there is room to doubt what the Bible says about Abel and Jonah (I don't believe there is room for such doubts), I suppose there is room to doubt what it says about Adam, Eve, Cain, Noah and the flood, etc. On pages 39, 40 Seely seems to rule



of the Christian church over the past two hundred years has proved that when the door is opened to acknowledge error in the Bible there is almost no limit to what “errors” “Christians” can find (with the abundant help of the devil). Before long, instead of Christians dealing with relatively minor issues, like some differences in the accounts presented in the four Gospels, we hear “Christians” questioning issues like the virgin birth, the atoning death, and the literal bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ or the reality of the devil, demons, and hell.

Excerpts from Chapters 1 and 2. Seely speaks of “the fact that in the entire history of biblical revelation, i.e. throughout the Old Testament and the New, one never finds a scientific truth that is in advance of the prophet’s times.<sup>118</sup> ...” (page 8).

“...as we...examine the statements of Scripture as to their natural scientific content, we find that it always matches the science of the times. ...

So He spoke *their language*, knowing that in the process of time we who would come to know better could easily substitute our more accurate concepts and still understand His infallible message. We can do this more easily than they of earlier times could have understood His message if phrased in vague general terms or utterly bewildering future concepts. His message was still true even though it was expressed in the immature scientific concepts of His little children. ...” (pages 12-14).

Excerpts from Chapter 3. “... One must bear in mind that a belief in the literal moving of the sun around a fixed earth is not something endemic to ancient Jews or ignorant Christians. All peoples everywhere for as far back as history gives record have believed in a literal geocentric universe. Believing that the sun literally moves around a fixed earth is the most natural belief in the world. It is only through the fulfillment of the Scientific Mandate<sup>119</sup> and the accompanying deluge of confirmatory evidence that men have slowly come over to believe today that it is the earth that is moving. And even then we cannot resist talking about the ‘sunrise’ and ‘sunset’!

The same thing is true of the size of the stars. Who would have believed that each of them is larger than the earth? Why would they be? Why should they be? It’s unnatural to think they are larger than the earth, or at least significantly larger than what they appear to be. ...

Christ’s words, ‘makes the sun to rise,’ are then within their historical context, most naturally understood as meaning that Jesus, like everyone around Him, unconsciously assumed the literal moving of the sun around the earth. But whether He knew better or not, His hearers would certainly have understood His language that way; and He made no attempt to correct their mistaken impression. From their perspective, in their historical context, His words

---

out a literal interpretation of the flood account of Genesis chapters 6-9 and essentially the rest of Genesis chapters 1-11 also. I agree with Seely that there are questions about the interpretation of the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11.

<sup>118</sup> Seely has a footnote, “Popular books on science and the Bible (usually written by laymen) often allege the finding of modern scientific truths in Scripture; but, a close examination of such passages shows that they were either truths known to the heathen of those times or most often simply cases of eisegetically reading into the words of Scripture ideas which an historical-grammatical interpretation does not support.” I believe that Seely is (for the most part at least) accurate in what he says here. Even if we could find an example or two where God revealed scientific details in the Bible (and it wouldn’t surprise me if we did), Seely’s overall analysis would still stand—such examples would be rare exceptions to the rule.

<sup>119</sup> Seely explained what he meant by the “Scientific Mandate” in chapter 1. For man to learn the scientific details regarding the world is part of his fulfilling God’s command to subdue the earth (Gen. 1:28).

confirmed their belief in the literal rising and moving of the sun around the earth. For to them the *appearance* was the *reality*. ..." (pages 32-36).

I'll quote part of Seely's Conclusion at the end of his chapter 3. "As a divine Teacher Jesus boldly challenged and attempted to correct various inadequate or erroneous theological views of His contemporaries. But, He never attempted to correct any of their inadequate or erroneous scientific views. ... He left the correction of errant scientific views to generic Man working under the Scientific Mandate. ..." (pages 43, 44).

### Excerpts from "The Three-Storied Universe" by Paul H. Seely<sup>120</sup>

I'll quote a sentence from the Introduction. "It seems that in reaction to unbelief [especially referring to attacks on the Bible coming from Christians, or so-called Christians], the current shibboleth [speaking of a test for Christians, especially Christian leaders, to prove that they are orthodox (see Judg. 12:6)] of would-be theological orthodoxy is, 'The Bible is inerrant whenever it touches on matters of science' " (page 18). A major purpose for Seely in this article is to show that this "shibboleth" is a mistake. It's rather easy to get out of balance in one direction, or another; we desperately need the balanced truth.

Seely discusses the "firmament" in some detail. One of his main points is that the firmament was thought to be solid. He points out, for one thing, that the ocean above the firmament spoken of in Gen. 1:6, 7 requires a solid firmament. He also mentions that Ezek. 1:22-26 are an important cross-reference in that the same Hebrew noun used for the firmament in Gen. 1:6, 7 is used of a solid firmament in those verses written by Ezekiel. He also refers to Job 37:18 to confirm this same point.

I'll quote a few sentences from what Seely says under the heading, "Waters Above the Firmament." "The deep ([Hebrew] *tehom*) of Genesis 1:2 is divided in Genesis 1:6, 7 into two bodies of water. The body of water below forms the earthly sea (Genesis 1:9); and the water above, since it is the other half of the '*tehom*', forms a heavenly sea. ... Thus the sky above is blue [assuming, I suppose, that the firmament supporting the water is transparent]; and the opening of the windows of heaven allows a great deal of water to be poured out on the earth. (Genesis 7:11)

Secondly, the water is *above* the firmament. (Genesis 1:7) Catastrophists and other science-Scripture harmonizers are forever putting this water below the firmament. [We should make every legitimate effort to *harmonize* what the Bible says with modern science. But Seely is concerned (and I believe in most instances rightly so) that many Christians are spending a lot of energy and creating a lot of heat trying to force a harmonization between things that cannot be harmonized (for example, some of the ancient scientific viewpoints reflected in Genesis chapter 1 with our more accurate scientific knowledge of the universe).] This water, so far as the Bible is concerned, is on the far side of the sun, not between the sun and the earth" (page 20).

I'll quote part of what Seely says under the heading "Other Evidence." "Although extra-Biblical concepts are not absolute proof of what the Bible idea is, it is significant that the ancient world thought of the sky as a solid dome above the earth or as solid concentric spheres

---

<sup>120</sup> *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, March, 1969.

in which the heavenly bodies were implanted [and in which they rotated around the earth on a daily basis].<sup>121</sup> ...

It has been thought by some that since the 'birds fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven,' (Genesis 1:20), the firmament must be mere airy expanse. However, the Hebrew of Genesis when properly translated reads, 'let the birds fly above the earth before or 'in front of the firmament.' Genesis 1:20 when properly translated proves that the firmament is a solid plate, not a gaseous expanse. ..." (page 20).

### **Excerpts from “The Firmament and the Water Above; Part I: The Meaning of *raqia* (...‘firmament’) in Gen. 1:6-8” by Paul H. Seely<sup>122</sup>**

Seely points out in his first paragraph that many conservative scholars from Calvin to the present time have defined the *raqia* as an atmospheric “expanse” and denied the concept of a solid “firmament.” ... Seely then goes on for some eight pages showing that the ancients thought of a solid firmament and gives several examples from more recent days where it has been found that scientifically naive peoples (like those who have been found on isolated islands, in parts of Africa, among American Indians, etc.) typically believe in a solid firmament.

“When the original readers of Genesis 1 read the word *raqia* they thought of a solid sky. And so did virtually everyone else up to the time of the Renaissance! [The Renaissance started in the 14<sup>th</sup> century AD.] After the time of Christ there were occasional dissenters, but by and large Jews and Christians, Greeks and barbarians all believed the firmament was solid.

Jews speculated as to what material the firmament was made of: clay or copper or iron (3 *Apoc. Bar.* 3:7). They differentiated between the firmament and the empty space or air between it and the earth (*Gen. Rab.* 4:3.a; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 21:4). They tried to figure how thick it was by employing biblical interpretation (*Gen. Rab.* 4.5.2). Most tellingly they even tried to calculate scientifically the thickness of the firmament (*Pesah* 49a).

... Origen [an early Christian scholar] called the firmament ‘without doubt firm and solid’ (*First Homily on Genesis*, FC 71). Ambrose, commenting on Gen. 1:6, said, ‘the specific solidity of this exterior firmament is meant’ (*Hexameron*, FC 42.60). Augustine said the word firmament was used ‘to indicate not that it is motionless but that it is solid and that it constitutes an impassable boundary between the waters above and the waters below’ (*The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, ACW 41.1.61).

Greeks from Anaximenes to Aristotle set forth as scientific fact that the firmament was made of a crystalline substance to which ‘the stars are fixed like nails.’<sup>123</sup> The idea was passed on for centuries via Ptolemy’s *Almagest*. The barbarians meanwhile worried about the sky falling on them if they did not keep their promises!<sup>124</sup> ...” (pages 236, 237).

### **Excerpts from “The Firmament and the Water Above; Part II: The**

<sup>121</sup> Seely has a footnote, “See the articles on ‘firmament’ in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* and in *Dictionary of the Bible*—William Smith, Vol. 1, Part II.”

<sup>122</sup> *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991), pages 227-240.

<sup>123</sup> “P. Wheelright, *The Presocratics* (New York: Odyssey, 1966), 63, 153. Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.8 and 3.1.”

<sup>124</sup> “*Theognis* 869-72. W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Boston, Beacon, 1956) 5-6.”

## Meaning of ‘The Water above the Firmament’ in Gen. 1:6-8” by Paul H. Seely<sup>125</sup>

“... In the ancient world a virtually universal agreement existed among all peoples everywhere that the sky (firmament) was a rock-solid dome over the earth beneath which were the sun, moon, and stars. In the case of the ‘water above the firmament’ that universal agreement did not exist” (page 31). Seely goes on for several pages showing that although this view did exist in ancient Mesopotamia, it was not widely held in other places.

“... ..what then is the historical meaning of the ‘water above the firmament’? The answer is that ‘the water above the firmament’ was conceived in the ancient Near East...as a sea of water...above a dam-like firmament which serves as a ‘ceiling’ to the universe with the sun, moon, and stars beneath it.

This historical definition of the water above the firmament as an ocean above a solid sky (under which are the sun, moon, and stars) is also the historic doctrine of the Jews and the Christian church. Jews and Christians alike distinguished ‘the waters above the firmament’ from terrestrial clouds.

[Seely gave several persuasive examples from ancient Jewish writings. I’ll just include two examples in this internet version of the paper.] ... ..according to 2 *Enoch* 3:3ff, Enoch was taken up from the earth and first placed on a cloud. He was then taken up higher above the first heaven and shown ‘a very great Sea, greater than the earthly Sea.’ ... In the rabbinical commentary *Genesis Rabbah* the rabbis discussed the water above the firmament, clearly indicating that they understood it to be a body of water (4.5.2 E) above a solid firmament (4.5.2 A-D). Clouds, on the other hand, were below the firmament and rose up to it in order to be filled with water from the water above the firmament (*b. Taan* 1.9b). ....

The Christian church carried on this historic understanding of Genesis 1. [Seely speaks of the views of Basil (AD 330-379), Augustine (AD 354-430), and Chrysostom (AD 347-407).] ... By the time of the Renaissance, however, the pressure on the church from the outside to give up its belief in water above the starry firmament had become quite strong. Consequently, the idea began to be entertained that perhaps ‘the water above the firmament’ referred *only* to terrestrial clouds. Luther was tempted to accept this interpretation, but stuck with the Scriptures. He said,

... ..Moses says in plain words that the waters were above and below the firmament. Here, I take my reason captive and subscribe to the Word even though I do not understand it.<sup>126</sup>

[Seely goes on to quote Calvin who rejected what Luther said and says that the waters above are the clouds.... ..] ...” (pages 37-40).

### A Warning from Augustine Dealing with the Interpretation of Scripture that Deals with Science<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> *Westminster Theological Journal* 54 (1992), pages 31-46.

<sup>126</sup> “Luther’s Works, Vol. 1: *Lectures on Genesis, Chapters 1-5* (...Concordia, 1968) 26.”

<sup>127</sup> *St Augustine, The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, Vol. 1, translated and annotated by J. H. Taylor (Paulist Press, 1982). Taken from Book One, Chapter 19, Section 39, pages 42, 43.

“Usually, even a non-Christian knows something about the earth, the heavens, and the other elements of this world, about the motion and orbit of the stars...and this knowledge he holds to as being certain from reason and experience. Now, it is a disgraceful and dangerous thing for an infidel to hear a Christian, presumably giving the meaning of Holy Scripture, talking nonsense on these topics.... The shame is not so much that an ignorant individual is derided, but that people outside the household of the faith think our sacred writers held such opinions, and, to the great loss of those for whose salvation we toil, the writers of our Scripture are criticized and rejected as unlearned men. If they find a Christian mistaken in a field which they know well and hear him maintaining his foolish opinions about our books, how are they going to believe those books in matters concerning the resurrection of the dead, the hope of eternal life, and the kingdom of heaven, when they think their pages are full of falsehoods on facts which they themselves have learnt from experience and the light of reason? Reckless and incompetent expounders of Holy Scripture bring untold trouble and sorrow on their wiser brethren when they are caught in one of their mischievous false opinions and are taken to task by those who are not bound by the authority of our sacred books. For then, to defend their utterly foolish and obviously untrue statements, they will try to call upon Holy Scripture for proof and even recite from memory many passages which they think support their position, although *they understand neither what they say nor the things about which they make assertion.*”

## EXTENDED NOTE I

### When Was Adam Created?

We will also consider the question, “When was Noah’s flood?”

#### Excerpts from *Unger’s Commentary on the Old Testament* by Merrill F. Unger<sup>128</sup>

I’ll quote part of what Merrill Unger says under Gen. 11:10-32. “ ‘...Shem...begot Arphachshad two years after the flood’ [Gen. 11:10]. ... The Hebrew word translated ‘begot’ does not necessarily mean ‘became the father of,’ but in these *drastically abbreviated* lists it means ‘became the ancestor of’ [Unger’s emphasis]. When Shem was one hundred years old, his wife bore a child who was either Arphachshad or an ancestor of Arphachshad [Gen. 11:10]. The Flood certainly occurred before 4000 B.C. [Those who date the creation of the universe and Adam about 6,000 years ago (about 4000 B.C.) must date the flood about 2300 B.C., but (as we’ll discuss in this Extended Note) it is difficult to defend so late a date for the flood.] The long interval between it [the flood] and Abraham’s birth (2161 B.C. [around 2000 B.C.]), probably at least two thousand years, is evidently covered by this brief genealogy. [The genealogy of Genesis chapter 11, if there were no gaps, would yield only 292 years from the flood to the birth of Abraham.] To have listed all the links would have resulted in an impossibly long and cumbersome text, which would have marred the simplicity and appeal of Genesis 1-11, the introduction to the story of redemption.”

#### Excerpts from *Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis* by John J. Davis<sup>129</sup>

I’ll quote part of what Davis says under the heading “Chronological Framework” and the sub-heading “Adam to Abraham,” (pages 28-32). “... ”

The problem of pre-Abrahamic chronology usually revolves around the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11. They have been regarded by many as sufficient to establish an absolute chronology [an absolute chronology that dates the creation of Adam (and of the universe) at about 4000 B.C.]. This assumption, however, has proved to be a tenuous one because the genealogies in the Bible are not designed to provide this type of statistical information. William H. Green correctly observes: ‘It can scarcely be necessary to adduce proof to one who has even a superficial acquaintance with the genealogies of the Bible, that these are frequently abbreviated by the omission of unimportant names. [The unusual form of the

---

<sup>128</sup> Vol. 1 (Moody Press, 1981), page 53.

<sup>129</sup> Sheffield Publishing Company, original copyright by Baker in 1975. John J. Davis (in 1975 anyway) “is President and Professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Grace Theological Seminary. ... Davis has participated frequently in archaeological expeditions to the Holy Land.” Davis fits in the young-earth creationists’ camp, but (based on his tentative dates for Noah’s flood, which I’ll cite as we continue) his date for the creation of Adam would be at least ten thousand years (on up to several tens of thousands of years) earlier than the 6,000 to 12,000 years ago date held by most young-earth creationists (at least the young-earth creationists I know about). I’ll quote two sentences from page 41, “Recent, sober calculations, made in the light of new scientific evidence, find the earth to be relatively recent in origin. This does not commit one to 4004 B.C. or even to 7000 B.C., but it does exclude the possibility of the earth being millions of years old.”

genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11 makes it more difficult to postulate gaps in those genealogies, but I agree that there undoubtedly are gaps, substantial gaps, in those genealogies.] In fact, abridgement is the general rule, induced by the indisposition of the sacred writers to incumber their pages with more names than were necessary for their immediate purpose. [In some genealogies, the genealogy in Matthew chapter 1, for example, which goes from Abraham to Christ, it's clear that the writer left out some names to end up with three groups of fourteen.<sup>130</sup> Matthew 1:17 says, "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; from David to the deportation to Babylon, fourteen generations; and from the deportation to the Messiah, fourteen generations."]

... It should also be observed that if the genealogy of Genesis 11 is complete, only 292 years separate the flood from the birth of Abraham. Shem, the son of Noah, lived for 502 years after the flood and on this calculation would have outlived Abraham [by 35 years; furthermore, Noah would have continued to live until Abraham was 57]. Genesis 11, then, must have gaps of considerable magnitude, and it is equally probable that the genealogy of Genesis 5 [from Adam to the flood] is incomplete. Therefore, it is impossible to establish a firm date for creation or the flood.

... Stratified mounds in Mesopotamia and Palestine show an unbroken sequence of occupation as far back as 7000 B. C. [which supports a date for the flood earlier than 7000 B.C.]. ... The occupational sequences at Jericho go back to prepottery, Neolithic periods and indicate that the flood must be dated before about 6000 B. C. ... Those who insist on dating the flood later than this have the very delicate and difficult problem of how animal and human life became redistributed across the face of the earth [after the flood] in such an extremely short period of time. No solution to this problem does justice to the overwhelmingly abundant archaeological evidence.

Since primitive cultures apparently appeared worldwide approximately 12,000 to 10,000 B. C., the flood might have occurred sometime prior to that. It could have occurred anywhere from 18,000 to 15,000 B. C. although it may have been slightly later, depending on the accuracy of the dates assigned to Mesolithic and Neolithic sites.<sup>131</sup>

The amount of time which elapsed between Adam and Noah is even more difficult to calculate. ..." (pages 28-31).

### **Excerpts from the Article on the "Chronology of the OT" in the Revised *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* by John N. Oswalt<sup>132</sup>**

"The date of creation is fraught with numerous problems. The first date to be widely accepted was 4004 B. C., which Archbishop Ussher advocated...and which was printed in the margins of many editions of the AV. ... [This date for the creation of Adam (and for the universe)

---

<sup>130</sup> Matthew 1:8, for example, says, "...and Joram, the father of Uzziah"; 1 Chron. 3:11, 12 show that three names were skipped between Joram and Uzziah. The Hebrew noun translated "father" can be used for grandfather, great-grandfather, etc.

<sup>131</sup> "Mesolithic" means Middle Stone Age. My Webster's dictionary dates this age from about 10,000 to about 8000 B.C. and says it was "characterized by the earliest exploitation of local and relatively permanent food resources and the use of microliths [any of various tiny flint tools flaked in two directions and set in bone or wood]. "Neolithic" means New Stone Age. Webster's dates this age from about 8,000 to about 3500 B.C. and says this age was "characterized by polished stone tools, pottery [pottery didn't begin until about 6000 B.C.], weaving, stock rearing, agriculture, and sometimes megaliths [huge stones, especially those used in Neolithic monuments or in construction work]."

<sup>132</sup> Vol. 1, Eerdmans, 1979; I'm quoting from under the heading "Adam to Abraham," pages 675, 676.

doesn't allow for gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11.] This position is still held, although with some modification, by significant numbers of Christians. However, there are serious weaknesses in Ussher's argument. ... it is well-nigh impossible for the Flood to have occurred in 2348, as Ussher claimed. [I agree.] This would have been during the Akkadian empire in Mesopotamia and the Old Kingdom in Egypt. No such cataclysm as the Flood is even mentioned. ["A flood of 2519 (or any date after 3500 B.C.)...is difficult to harmonize with the known historical periods of Egypt and Mesopotamia, which develop steadily from 3000 B.C. onward."<sup>133</sup>] This suggests that however the genealogies and their accompanying numbers are to be handled, they are not to be taken as a literal, lineal chain without any breaks. ...."

### **Excerpts from *Systematic Theology* by Wayne Grudem<sup>134</sup>**

I'll quote a few sentences from what Grudem says under the subheading "There are Gaps in the Genealogies of the Bible." After giving some examples of gaps in the Bible he says, "How many gaps there are and how many generations are missing from the Genesis narratives, we do not know. The life of Abraham may be placed at approximately 2000 B.C., because the kings and places listed in the stories of Abraham's life (Gen. 12ff.) can be correlated with archaeological data that can be dated quite reliably, but prior to Abraham the setting of dates is very uncertain. In view of the exceptionally long life spans reported for people prior to the flood, it would not seem unreasonable to think that a few thousand years have been passed over in the narrative. This gives us some flexibility in our thinking about the date that man first appeared on the earth. ..." (pages 290, 291).

I'll also quote part of what Grudem says under the next subheading, "The Age of the Human Race." "Whether Christians hold to a young earth or old earth view, they will agree that man is certainly on the earth by the time of the cave paintings by Cro-Magnon man, paintings which date from about 10,000 B.C. There is some variation in the date of Cro-Magnon man, however, since the dating of a Cro-Magnon burial site in Siberia is approximately 20,000 to 35,000 B.C. according to the geological evidence found there, but the Carbon-14 dating method gives a date of only 9,000 B.C., or 11,000 years ago.<sup>135</sup> Earlier than the paintings by Cro-

<sup>133</sup> J. B. Payne, "Chronology of the Old Testament," *Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Vol. 1 (Zondervan, 1975, 1976), page 831. If the flood had taken place after 3500-3000 B. C., it would have totally wiped out those cultures.

<sup>134</sup> Inter-Varsity Press, 1994. I'm quoting from the chapter titled "Creation" (pages 262-314).

<sup>135</sup> Grudem has a footnote, "Kofahl and Segraves [young-earth creationists], *The Creation Explanation* [Harold Shaw, 1975], p. 207." Based on what I have read, a date around 10,000 B.C. for the cave paintings of Cro-Magnon man is far too late. For one thing, I just downloaded an article from the Internet published by BBC News October 3, 2001 that deals with "carbon isotope analysis" of some of this cave art. This article deals mostly with paintings discovered in 1994 in Chauvet, France. They "found the Chauvet drawings to be between 29,700 and 32,400 years old. This is about 10,000 years older than comparable cave art found in the Lascaux caves that are around 17,000 years old." There seems to be widespread agreement that Cro-Magnon man is human; if so (I don't know enough to have a strong opinion on this topic), he would have descended from Adam and Eve.

I'll quote from a couple of articles on Cro-Magnon man. First I'll include several excerpts from the brief article in *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, sixth edition, 2001. "...lived about 40,000 years ago. Skeletal remains and associated artifacts...were first found in 1868 in Les Eyzies, Dordogne, France. Later discoveries were made in a number of caverns in the Dordogne valley, Solutré, and in Spain, Germany, and Central Europe. Cro-Magnon man was anatomically identical to modern humans, but differed significantly from Neanderthals, who disappear...about 10,000 years after the appearance [of Cro-Magnon man].... Finely crafted stone and bone tools, shell and ivory jewelry, and polychrome



Magnon man, there is disagreement. ... How human were earlier man-like creatures? (Higher forms of animals, such as chimpanzees, can use tools, and burial of one's dead is not necessarily a human trait.) ... So how long ago did man first appear on the earth? Certainly by 10,000 B.C. [apparently more like 30,000 years ago *if* Cro-Magnon man descended from Adam], if Cro-Magnon cave paintings have been dated correctly. But before that it is difficult to say" (page 292).

### Excerpts from *Genesis 1-11:26* by Kenneth A. Matthews<sup>136</sup>

I'll quote a small part of what Matthews says under Gen. 5:1 regarding the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11. "We agree that chap. 5 evidences a selective [incomplete] genealogy by its highly structured conventions of language and its schematic ten-generation depth.<sup>137</sup> We have seen how this parallels the ten-name genealogy of [Gen.] 11:10-26 (when Abram is counted) and David's genealogy in Ruth 4:18-22, which also contains ten names. ... Its ten-name arrangement also places 'Boaz' as the seventh member, highlighting his role, and is similar to Genesis 5's elevation of Enoch in the seventh position. ...

... Also since Genesis does not offer the ages of the patriarchs as a means of dating creation or the flood, we should avoid using the numbers as a means for establishing an absolute chronology. Genesis 5 is best taken as an 'open' genealogy, perhaps spanning several millennia, though we cannot conclusively assert how much time" (pages 303-305).

---

[several colors] paintings found on cave walls all testify to the cultural advancement of Cro-Magnon man."

I'll also include some excerpts from the article in *Webster's World Encyclopedia 2001*. "... Often tall and well-muscled, Cromagnons were specialist hunters (mammoth, reindeer) occupying rock shelters in W Europe and hut campments on the steppe and tundra of C Europe and Russia. They created figurines, fine engravings, and cave art. ... They were taller and leaner than the Neanderthal Man already in Europe....

All we can say is that about 30,000 or 40,000 years ago, something marvelous happened to humans [Hugh Ross would say that the earlier specimens, Neandertals for example, were not human (were not descendants of Adam). He believes that Cro-Magnon was human.]: they started to produce art, and by 31,000 years ago, they were painting the Vallon-Pont-d'arc caves in France, and producing beads, figurines and more. The human remains that we find with this art show us a different people from the Neandertals, but the really astounding thing is the range of the art.

... Perhaps the most important thing about the Cro-Magnon people is that they were innovators, people who followed fashions. Over 100,000 years, the Neanderthal sites of Europe and the Middle East show the same culture right across the area through all that time. The Cro-Magnon sites, on the other hand, can be dated to within 2,000 years, just by a few artifacts that were found there. One reason for this is that the Cro-Magnons traded useful ideas and materials (including 'useless' materials, like art objects) over hundreds of kilometers, spreading new ideas far more rapidly. ...

The Cro-Manon people often lived in 'caves' – that is, they lived under rock overhangs on the sides of valleys, sites that are probably better called rock shelters. Many of these shelters were well above the valley floor, and would have needed some sort of ladder to get people up to them. ...

[We know] that the Cro-Magnon people used the rock shelters, because they left signs of their occupation behind them. They left rubbish, bone scraps, belongings and broken things, wherever they lived. They left carvings, they left bones with engraved sketches on them, and fragments of stone, left over from the making of stone tools. One shelter at Les Eyzies, Abri Pataus, was completely 'dug,' and yielded more than 50,000 worked pieces of flint. ...."

<sup>136</sup> Broadman & Holman, 1996, 1997, 2001.

<sup>137</sup> Matthews has a footnote, "Ancient genealogies commonly showed fluidity of names and telescoped generations by omission (Wilson, *Genealogy and History*, 92, 134, 197)."

I'll quote part of what Matthews says under Gen. 11:11. "Related to the numbers of 11:10-26 are the problems they create for the chronology of the patriarchs, particularly Abraham, and their ancestors. As the numbers stand in the Hebrew text (MT), Abraham was born 292 years after the flood. This would mean that Noah and Abraham were contemporaries as were Shem and Eber with Jacob.<sup>138</sup> Since Shem's life span was 600 years, and his son Arphaxad was born at 100 years [when Shem was 100] and Abraham was born 290 years after Arphaxad (= 390), given that Abraham died at 175 years (=565), Shem's life span would actually exceed the death of Abraham by thirty-five years.

... A period of 292 years from the flood to the birth of Terah's first son [Abraham] would appear too short. [I strongly agree.] ..." (pages 493, 494).

**Excerpts from *The Genesis Question: Scientific Advances and the Accuracy of Genesis* by Hugh Ross<sup>139</sup>**

I'll include some lengthy excerpts from Chapter 14, "Dating the Origin of Humanity—Genesis 5." (I had some six pages of quotations from Ross here in the original paper. As I mentioned, I still have some printed copies of the original paper.) "The first Christian missionaries to China experienced shock and dismay when they encountered Chinese historical accounts placing Chinese national origins earlier than 4004 B.C.<sup>140</sup> ... The same reaction comes today from American Indians, who date their origin to 9500 B.C.; Australian Aborigines, who date back to 25,000 B.C.; and Europeans, who date advanced cave art back to 30,000 B.C. All are firmly established dates. [Some will question how 'firmly established' these dates are.]" (page 108).

"... " (page 109). Ross aligns himself with those who "date Adam's creation somewhere in the tens of thousands of years ago (but less than a hundred thousand years ago)" (page 110).

Now I'll quote what Ross says under the heading "Biochemical Dates for Eve and Noah." (I had over a page and a half here in the original paper.) "... In 1995 a Y-chromosome research project—one which examined a hundred more nucleotide base pairs than any previous study—fixed the date for the most recent common ancestor of all human males [Noah] at somewhere between 35,000 and 47,000 B.C.<sup>141</sup> ... The recent date eliminates the possibility that modern humans evolved from another bipedal primate species (meaning that humans must be specially created). ... Mitochondrial DNA results typically place the most recent common ancestor of all women [Eve] somewhere between a few thousand and a few tens of thousands of years earlier. ..." (pages 110-112)

---

<sup>138</sup> Matthews has a footnote, "Noah was 600 years old at the time of the flood (7:6), and Abraham was born 292 years after the flood, meaning that Abraham was born 892 years after Noah's birth. Since Noah died at 950 years of age (9:29), Abraham would be his young contemporary. According to Jacob's calculations he was born 452 years from the year of the flood, when Shem was 98 years old. Since Shem lived to 600 years of age, he was 550 years old at the birth of Jacob. Eber [Gen. 11:14-17] too, was his contemporary. Jacob was born 385 years after Eber, and Eber lived 464 years."

<sup>139</sup> Excerpted from *The Genesis Question* by Hugh Ross, Copyright © 1998, 2001, 2<sup>nd</sup> expanded edition.

<sup>140</sup> Ross has a footnote, "Paul Johnson, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Atheneum, 1976), page 413."

<sup>141</sup> "Simon J. Whitfield, John E. Sulston, and Peter N. Goodfellow, 'Sequence Variation of the Human Y Chromosome,' *Nature* 378 (1995), pages 379-380."

... This is interesting information, but it isn't enough to *prove* that Adam was created as far back as 35,000 years ago, or more. For one thing, I wonder how accurately scientists can determine the mutation rate of change of DNA throughout the period from Adam and Eve until today; it seems that these rates could have changed substantially between then and now. (Ross mentions that "Genesis 10 indicates that God may have intervened at some point shortly after the flood, imposing some additional genetic diversity (see chapter 20).") Anyway, I don't have a problem with the possibility that Adam was created as far back as 35,000 to 60,000 years ago.

Excerpts Dealing with Neandertals. I'll quote what Ross says regarding recent important information that shows there is no link between Neandertals and Adam. "[I had quoted some two pages from Ross here in the original paper (from his pages 112-115). The primary point that Ross made here is that recent anatomical and DNA studies have shown that we could not have descended from Neandertals.]

I'll quote a few sentences from what Ross says under the heading "The Origin of Races" from his chapter 20, "The Origin of Nations and Races – Genesis 9-11." "... " (pages 181, 182).

I'll also quote part of what Ross says under the last three headings of chapter 20. First I'll quote most of what he says under "Wheat Reveals Agricultural Spread." "... In one recent case...[DNA fingerprinting] was applied to the study of agriculture's origin...

That study compared the genes of wild wheat to those of cultivated wheat.<sup>142</sup> It indicates that the launch of organized, large-scale agriculture began at about 9000 B.C. The location for this launch was...in Southern Turkey where the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers run close together. This site is consistent with the cradle of human civilization, namely the center of Mesopotamia's fertile crescent... The date is consistent with the Bible's claims for the dawning and spread of advanced civilization *after the Flood* [my emphasis].

The same DNA analysis also outlines the spread of organized agriculture throughout Mesopotamia's fertile crescent (9000 to 8000 B.C.), to Persia, the Nile Delta, India, and Greece (8000 to 6000 B.C.), and beyond to south central Europe, the remainder of Egypt, southern Russia, and Arabia (6000 to 5000 B.C.). ...

[Now I'll quote what Ross says under the heading "Spread of Goat Domestication."] Two American anthropologists, Melinda Zeder and Brian Hesse, have pinpointed the initial domestication of goats as taking place 10,000 years ago in the Zagros Mountains located in western Iran and northeastern Iraq.<sup>143</sup> ... The date and location for the origin of goat domestication matches well the date and location for the domestication of wheat. ....

[And I'll quote part of what Ross says under his last heading of this chapter.] ... Noah and his sons likely lived twenty to thirty thousand years ago. The scattering of peoples following the Tower of Babel debacle probably took place between thirty thousand and eleven thousand years ago. ..." (pages 185-187).

---

<sup>142</sup> "Manfred Heun, et al., 'Site of Einkorn Wheat Domestication Identified by DNA fingerprinting,' *Science* 278 (1997), pages 1312-1314; Jared Diamond, 'Location, Location, Location The First Farmers,' *Science* 278 (1997), pages 1243-1244."

<sup>143</sup> "... 'The Initial Domestication of Goats (*Capra hircus*) in the Zagros Mountains 10,000 Years Ago,' *Science* 287 (2000), pages 2254-2257."

## **Tentative Conclusions Regarding the Dates for Noah's Flood and for the Creation of Adam**

Based on what the preceding excerpts say, it is difficult to date these events with accuracy and assurance. It seems to me, however, that if we accept the widespread viewpoints that the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11 are incomplete and that the universe and earth are far older than 6,000 to 10,000 years (Extended Note J deals with the age of the universe and earth), it doesn't make all that much difference whether Adam was created 10,000 years ago, or 20,000, or even 50,000 or 60,000. I'm not saying, of course, that we shouldn't want to know the date as accurately as possible.

I'll list the tentative range of dates presented in the preceding excerpts and make a few comments. These excerpts were all taken (I believe) from evangelical scholars who have a high respect for the Scriptures as the Word of God.

The range of tentative dates for Noah's flood and then (in parentheses the range of tentative dates for the creation of Adam): "[The flood] certainly occurred before 4000 B.C." (Unger doesn't mention a date for the creation of Adam here, but since he speaks of "drastically abbreviated" genealogies, he undoubtedly would date that event well over 2,000 years before the flood); "[The flood was] earlier than 6000 B.C. ... It could have occurred anywhere from 18,000 to 15,000 B.C. although it may have been slightly later." (Davis doesn't offer a date for the creation of Adam here, but he probably would tentatively date that event at least ten thousand years before the flood.); "perhaps 7<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> millennium B.C. [7000 to 5000 B.C.]" for the flood (Oswalt doesn't mention a date for the creation of Adam here, but since he speaks in tentative terms of Noah being about midway between Abraham and Adam, he would probably tentatively date it in the ballpark of 10,000 to 12,000 B.C.); Grudem doesn't mention a date for the flood here (Regarding the date for the creation of Adam, he says that if Cro-Magnon man's cave paintings have been accurately dated at about 10,000 B.C., then man has been on the earth at least that long and that it is difficult to say how long before that. As I mentioned in a footnote under the excerpts from Grudem, it seems that the dates for the cave art of Cro-Magnon man are some 20,000 years earlier than the 10,000 B.C. date mentioned by Grudem); Matthews doesn't mention a date for the flood or for the creation of Adam here, but he speaks of gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11; Ross mentions that "Noah and his sons likely lived twenty to thirty thousand years ago" (He dates the creation of Adam somewhere in the tens of thousands of years ago, but less than a hundred thousand years ago—see the next heading on the following page). I don't have enough solid information to have a good feel for the date of the flood or of the creation of Adam, but I assume that the flood did not take place later than 5000 B.C. and probably not earlier than 30,000 B.C., and I assume that Adam was not created later than 10,000 B.C. or earlier than 60,000 B.C. If Cro-Magnon man descended from Adam (this is a very common viewpoint) and if the dates for Cro-Magnon man's art are accurate at about 30,000 to 35,000 years ago (I assume that these dates are accurate at least within 5,000 years, or so), then Adam was created before 25,000 B.C., or so.

To gain some perspective regarding the magnitude of the (apparent) gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11 (as documented above, there is widespread

agreement that gaps do exist in those genealogies), let's assume for sake of discussion that the flood took place about 5000 B.C. That would mean that instead of there being 292 years between the flood and the birth of Abraham<sup>144</sup> there would be almost 3,000 years, an increase by a factor of about ten. If we increase the numbers yielded by the genealogies of Genesis chapter 5 (which give the years from Adam to the flood as 1,656 years) by a comparable factor of ten, that would give about 17,000 years. Seventeen thousand years before a flood at 5000 B.C. would take you back to 22,000 B.C. for the creation of Adam. (I'm not suggesting, of course, that the multiplying factor for the two genealogies would necessarily be the same.) If instead of a multiplying factor of ten we use twenty, it would locate the flood more like 8000 B.C. and the creation of Adam some 34,000 years before that at 42,000 B.C.

A Few More Excerpts Dealing with This Topic from *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*.<sup>145</sup> First I'll quote from the article by Hugh Ross and Gleason

L. Archer. "... Conservative estimates among biblical scholars for the creation of Adam and Eve range from about 10,000 to 60,000 years ago. [Many young-earth creationists insist that the universe, earth, and Adam and Eve were created 6,000 years ago.]

... We can expect more refinements in this area, but today's best understanding of this DNA research data place the first woman at about 50,000 years ago<sup>146</sup> and the most recent common ancestor of men (which would be Noah...) at 37,000-49,000 years ago. ...

The relatively recent advent of humankind also finds support in the growing body of anthropological, astronomical, and geological research. The most ancient remnant of advanced art has been dated as 32,000 years old.<sup>147</sup> The Vela supernova, which showered the earth with life-shortening radiation, erupted 20,000-30,000 years ago.<sup>148</sup> Land bridges that made possible human migration to Australia and the Americas formed 12,000-30,000 years ago and 11,000-14,500 years ago, respectively.<sup>149</sup> The most ancient artifacts of religious expression, such as idols and altars, have been dated at 8,000-24,000 years ago.<sup>150</sup> ..." (pages 141, 142).

And I'll quote a paragraph (from the same book) from the response to the article by Ross and Archer by Lee Irons and Meredith G. Kline. "...Acknowledging that the incompleteness of the biblical genealogies limits their usefulness for determining precise dates, Ross and Archer correctly hold that a realistic time frame for the antiquity of man would range

---

<sup>144</sup> There would be 292 years from the flood to the birth of Abraham if there were no gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapter 11.

<sup>145</sup> Crux Press, Inc., 2001.

<sup>146</sup> They have a footnote, "Hugh Ross and Sam Conner, 'Eve's Secret to Growing Younger,' *Faith & Faith*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1998), p. 2; Ann Gibbons, 'Calibrating the Mitochondrial Clock,' *Science*, vol. 279 (1998), p. 29."

<sup>147</sup> "Michael D. Lemonick, 'Stone-Age Bombshell,' *Time* (June 19, 1995), p. 49; Tim Appenzeller, 'Art: Evolution or Revolution?' *Science*, vol. 282 (1998), p. 1451."

<sup>148</sup> "B. Aschenback, R. Egger, and J. Trümper, 'Discovery of Explosion Fragments Outside the Vela Supernova Remnant Shock-Wave Boundary,' *Nature*, vol. 373 (1995), p. 588; A. G. Lyne, R. S. Pritchard, F. Graham-Smith, and F. Camilo, 'Very Low Braking Index for the Vela Pulsar,' *Nature*, 381 (1996), pp. 497-8."

<sup>149</sup> "Ross, *The Genesis Question*, pp. 173-6; Scott A. Elias, Susan K. Short, C. Hans Nelson, and Hilary H. Birks, 'Life and Times of the Bering Land Bridge,' *Nature*, vol. 382 (1996), pp. 61-3."

<sup>150</sup> "C. Simon, 'Stone-Age Sanctuary, Oldest Known Shrine, Discovered in Spain,' *Science News*, vol. 120 (1981), p. 357; Bruce Bower, 'When the Human Spirit Soared,' *Science News*, vol. 130 (1986), pp. 378-9."

from 10,000 to 60,000 years. ... Those who honor the authority of Scripture cannot rightly adopt evolutionary scenarios for the origin of man" (page 180).

### **A Discussion Regarding Carbon 14 Radiometric Dating and the Accuracy of this Method**

I'm taking the information for this discussion from the Internet web site called "Radiocarbon WEB-info" (www.c14dating.com). "This resource is designed to provide online information concerning the radiocarbon dating method. We hope it will be of occasional use to radiocarbon users and interested students alike. Copyright © 1999 Tom Higham, Radiocarbon Laboratory, University of Waikato, New Zealand (Email: thomas.higham@archaeology-research.oxford.ac.uk).<sup>151</sup> Last modified 16 May 2002." There's a lot of information at this web site, and Higham is honest regarding the possibility of obtaining inaccurate dates using this method.

First I'll include a few excerpts from the five page section titled "The Method." "The radiocarbon method was developed by a team of scientists led by the late Professor Willard F. Libby of the University of Chicago in immediate postWW2 years. Libby later received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1960 'for his method to use Carbon-14 for age determinations in archaeology, geology, geophysics, and other branches of science.' ... Today, there are over 130 radiocarbon dating laboratories around the world producing radiocarbon assays for the scientific community. The C14 technique has been and continues to be applied and used in many, many different fields including hydrology, atmospheric science, oceanography, geology, palaeoclimatology, archaeology and biomedicine.

There are three principle isotopes of carbon which occur naturally - C12, C13 (both stable) and C14 (unstable or radioactive). These isotopes are present in the following amounts C12 - 98.89%, C13 - 1.11% and C14 - 0.0000000010%. Thus one carbon 14 atom exists in nature for every 1,000,000,000,000 [1 trillion] C12 atoms in living material. The radiocarbon method is based on the rate of decay of the radioactive or unstable carbon isotope 14 (C14), which is formed in the upper atmosphere through the effect of cosmic ray neutrons upon nitrogen 14. ...

The 14C formed is rapidly oxidized to 14CO<sub>2</sub> and enters the earth's plant and animal lifeways through photosynthesis and the food chain. ... C14 also enters the Earth's oceans in an atmospheric exchange and as dissolved carbonate.... Plants and animals which utilize carbon in biological foodchains take up C14 during their lifetimes. ... As soon as a plant or animal dies, they cease the metabolic function of carbon uptake; there is no replenishment of radioactive carbon, only decay. ...

Libby, Anderson, and Arnold (1949) first discovered that this decay occurs at a constant rate. They found that after 5568 years, half the C14 in the original sample will have decayed and after another 5568 years, half of that remaining material will have decayed, and so on. [On a later page, Higham points out that "Later measurements of the Libby half-life indicated the figure was *ca.* 3% too low and a more accurate half-life was 5730±40years. This is known as the Cambridge half-life."] ... After 10 half-lives, there is a very small amount of radioactive carbon present in a sample. At about 50-60,000 years, then, the limit of the technique is reached (beyond this time, other radiometric techniques must be used for dating). ... the 14C decays back to 14N. ... [After one half-life (5730±40 years) half of the C14 atoms will have decayed leaving a ratio of C14 to C12 atoms of about one-half per 1 trillion. After

---

<sup>151</sup> I received permission to quote this material in the original paper in an Email from Tom Higham.

another half-life the ratio will be down to about one-quarter per 1 trillion, then one-eighth per 1 trillion, one-sixteenth per trillion, one thirty-second, one sixty-fourth, and so on.]

Included below is an impressive list of some of the types of carbonaceous samples that have been commonly radiocarbon dated in the years since the inception of the method: charcoal, wood, twigs and seeds; bone; marine, estuarine and riverine shell; leather; peat; coprolites (samples of preserved faeces); lake muds (gyttja) and sediments; soil; ice cores; pollen; hair; pottery; metal casting ores; wall paintings and rock art works; iron and meteorites; avian (bird) eggshell; corals and foraminifera; speleothems [mineral deposit formed in caves by the evaporation of mineral-rich water, as a stalactite, stalagmite, or helictite (thin, stony, curling cave deposit)]; tufa [porous rock]; blood residues; textiles and fabrics; paper and parchment; fish remains; insect remains; resins and glues; antler and horn; and water.

... Libby and his team initially tested the radiocarbon method on samples from prehistoric Egypt. [These sample were not “prehistoric” in that writing had started in Egypt by 3000 B.C.] They chose samples whose age could be independently determined. A sample of acacia wood from the tomb of the pharaoh Zoser (or Djoser; 3<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty, ca. 2700-2600 BC) was obtained and dated. ... Other analyses were conducted on samples of known age wood (dendrochronologically<sup>152</sup> aged). Again, the fit was within the value predicted at  $\pm 10\%$ . ... In 1949, Arnold and Libby...published their paper ‘Age determinations by radiocarbon content: Checks with samples of known age’ in the journal *Science*. In this paper they presented the first results of the C14 method, including the ‘Curve of Knowns’ in which radiocarbon dates were compared with the known age historical dates (see figure 1). [Figure 1 shows known dates and radiocarbon dates for several other ancient pharaohs (besides the one just mentioned) and several other items, including a redwood tree about 2,700 years old, and Bible (Dead Sea Scroll) manuscripts about 2,000 years old. The four oldest historical ages given on figure 1, all for Egyptian pharaohs, run from 4,000 to 5,000 years old. The measured radiometric dates for these four samples all fell within a  $\pm 10\%$  error band.] ...

... In the late 1950s and early 1960s, researchers measuring the radioactivity of known age tree rings found fluctuations in C14 concentration up to a maximum of  $\pm 5\%$  over the last 1500 years. In addition to long term fluctuations, smaller ‘wiggles’ were identified.... This suggested there were temporal fluctuations in C14 concentration which would necessitate the calibration of radiocarbon dates to other historically aged material. Radiocarbon dates of sequential dendrochronologically aged trees primarily of US bristlecone pine and German and Irish oak have been measured over the past 10 years to produce a calendrical/radiocarbon calibration curve which now extends back over 10,000 years [11,800 years].... This enables radiocarbon dates to be calibrated to solar or calendar dates. [In other words, this data enables correcting C14 dates to some extent for errors arising from variations in the C14 level for the past 11,800 years.]” Next I’ll quote part of what Higham says under the section titled “Radiocarbon Calibration.”

“In order to see what a radiocarbon determination means in terms of a true age we need to know how the atmospheric concentration [of C14] has changed with time.

---

<sup>152</sup> “Dendrochronology” is the science of dating past events or climatic changes by a comparative study of growth rings in tree trunks.

How tree rings are used as a radiocarbon record. Many types of tree reliably lay down one tree ring every year. The wood on these rings once laid down remains unchanged during the life of the tree. This is very useful as a record of the radiocarbon concentration in the past. If we have a tree that is 500 years old we can measure the radiocarbon in the 500 rings and see what radiocarbon concentration corresponds to each calendar year.

Using very old trees (such as the Bristlecone Pines in the western U.S.A.), it is possible to make measurements back to a few thousand years ago. To extend this method further we must use the fact that tree ring widths vary from year to year with changing weather patterns. By using these widths, it is possible to compare the tree rings in a dead tree to those in a tree that is still growing in the same region. By using dead trees of different [older] but overlapping ages, you can build up a library of tree rings of different calendar ages. This has now been done for Bristlecone Pines in the U.S.A. and waterlogged Oaks in Ireland and Germany to provide records extending back over the last 11,000 [11,800] years." This tree ring data obviously helps confirm the viability of C14 radiometric dating back to about 12,000 years ago.

Now, I'll quote some important information from the Table titled "Summary: The accuracy of radiocarbon dates (modified from Polach, H. A. 1976 [which means that Higham is updating Polach's 1976 data in this Table; in an Email response, dated November 21, 2002, to a few questions I had asked Higham, he mentioned that he updated this Table about 4 years ago])" in the four page section titled "Corrections." "Variation in past C14 production rates" is listed as a "Source of Error." It says that the "Effect upon Age Determination" is "0-800 years, [and that] beyond *ca* 12 ka [which means "beyond about 12,000 years"] not determined." In the Email response I received from Dr. Higham, he mentioned that the oldest tree ring data goes back to 11,800 years BP (Before Present) and said "the difference between true age (tree rings) and radiocarbon years is about 1000 years." Under "Measures to minimize the error incurred," the Table says, "Tree ring calibration; otherwise interpret results in radiometric timescale." This means that up to about 12,000 years ago the maximum error due to variations in the amounts of C14 is limited (they believe) to about 1000 years and that this potential error can be minimized by calibrating (correcting) the measurement to the tree ring data. And it means that accepted calibration curves to correct radiocarbon dates for fluctuations in the amounts of C14 are not available for dates earlier than 11,800 years ago.

In the Email response I received from Higham, he mentioned that some calibrations are available for earlier dates (earlier than about 12,000 years ago) using dated sediments from lakes or with corals dated using uranium/thorium. He says these calibrations enable them to correct dates younger than 24,000 years ago for fluctuations in the rates of C14, but that beyond that date there is a potential for error "by as much as 5,000 years, perhaps a little more in specific places." (They are working on getting more accurate calibrations all the time.) I had asked Higham for his informed opinion regarding the maximum error possible in the radiocarbon date caused by variation in C14 rates from 12,000 to 40,000 years ago, or so.

I'll also include a few excerpts from Higham's seven page section titled K-12. "The aim [for this section] is to provide clear, understandable information relating to radiocarbon dating for the benefit of K-12 students, as well as lay people who are not requiring detailed information about the method of radiocarbon dating itself."



“... The job of a radiocarbon laboratory is to measure the remaining amounts of radiocarbon [C14] in a carbon sample. [There is, of course, a lot more involved in radiocarbon dating than determining the amount of C14 left in a particular sample. I’m including this particular excerpt mostly because of the following sentence.] This is very difficult and requires a lot of careful work to produce reliable dates.”

I’ll quote most of what Higham says (still in the section titled K-12) under the heading “What are the oldest things that can be radiocarbon dated?” “... Beyond 60,000 years there is hardly any radiocarbon left in a sample that is original. [C14 in a sample 60,000 years old could have come by contamination of the sample, but that C14 wouldn’t be “original.”] Often, in very old material, there is contamination which can significantly affect the accuracy of a date. Dating material from the archaeological or geological record beyond 30,000 years can be very difficult indeed unless the depositional situation of the sample is favorable and scientists can remove any contamination. Even a small amount of C14 from a contaminant can produce an incorrect date in an old sample. [The older the sample, the less the amount of original C14 remaining (that has not decayed back to N14), and therefore the greater the error due to contamination. Contamination can cause the sample to read too old or too recent, depending on the contamination. If the contamination contains a higher level of C14 than the sample, it will cause the sample to measure a date too recent. If the contamination contains a lower level of C14 (or no C14), it will cause the sample to measure an older date.]

In some places, such as Australia, archaeologists have recognized the problems in dating the oldest sites, which may stretch back over 50–60,000 years. Other techniques such as OSL (Optically Stimulated Luminescence dating) which use different methods of determining age, are often used in parallel with radiocarbon to determine the ages of the uppermost parts [undoubtedly meaning the oldest parts] of the site. The ages derived are compared with one another, and usually, there has been good agreement between the methods. At sites in the far north of the continent, the oldest dates have been obtained using OSL, at about 60,000 years. Again, this is really just beyond the C14 limit for sites such as these.”

I’ll quote most of what Higham says under his last heading (still in the K-12 section), “How do you know that radiocarbon really works?” “It is possible to test radiocarbon dates in different ways. One way is to date things you already know the age of. Libby did this when he first developed the method [but only back to about 5,000 years ago], by dating artifacts of Egyptian sites, which were already dated historically. Another way is to use tree rings. ... Scientists can date the age of the tree by counting and measuring the rings. Radiocarbon daters can then date the tree rings and compare the dates with the real age of the tree. This is a very good way of testing radiocarbon, and we now know that there are some differences in radiocarbon dates and real time. [This is because the amount of C14 varies to some extent from year to year.] Most of the time radiocarbon dating is accurate, but sometimes it is different from the real age by a small amount. [As we discussed above, going back to about 12,000 years ago could result in a maximum error of about 1,000 years) if corrections are not made for the C14 levels. We also discussed the serious potential for error due to contamination, and there’s always the possibility of human error or equipment error.] Using a calibration curve, which is based on radiocarbon dates of tree rings over the last 10,000 years [11,800 years], radiocarbon daters can correct for this problem.

We can also test radiocarbon by comparing the results with the dates produced by other dating methods, and there are many of those. These methods are completely different to

radiocarbon dating and use different methods to provide dates. Some of the dating methods include Uranium/Thorium dating (dating coral etc.), Thermoluminescence (pottery, sediments)... Electron Spin Resonance (teeth), Amino Acid Racemisation dating (eggshell, bones), and many others.”

Lastly, I'll give a few brief excerpts from the sixteen page section titled “Pretreatment.” This section deals with recognizing and (to the extent possible) eliminating contamination from the sample to be dated. “... Sample materials deposited in archaeological or geological contexts seldom remain in pristine condition, of course, they are often degraded and altered chemically [contaminated]. ... Since the 1950s, a number of researchers have concentrated on investigation and reducing the effects of this post-depositional contamination. This field of inquiry is known as sample pretreatment and it is concerned with removing post-depositional contaminants by isolating fractions containing carbon which is autochthonous [that is, portions of the sample that have not been contaminated in a way that affects the amount of C14] and therefore accurately dates the event in question.

The key issue in sample pretreatment is that there is no method, or methods, that can be universally applied to all types of material from archaeological or geological contexts. Pretreatments are designed to remove the contaminating substances that have affected the sample during its post-depositional history. If pretreatments were able to be uniformly implemented, there would have to be a uniform and predictable array of post-depositional characteristics between all samples. Clearly, this is not the case. Each sample submitted for dating has its own specific depositional history. The variety of environment and post-depositional features is reflected in the variety and complexity of pretreatment procedures and the variety of different types of dateable material... Nevertheless, there are certain laboratory procedures which are associated with specific sample types and environments, and a number of accepted and often repeated pretreatment methods. These are described in detail below.”

Tentative Conclusions. My primary concern for this brief study on C14 dating was to get a better handle on the accuracy of this method. I wanted to know, for one thing, if there is a high probability that radiocarbon C14 dates for samples that are say 9,000-11,000 years old are typically fairly accurate (assuming, of course, that skilled operators are using the best equipment and the best techniques available). I'm not especially interested in whether they can typically give a radiocarbon date accurate within two hundred years, or so, of the actual date. I'm mostly interested in whether we can have a high assurance that they can often give a date accurate to within something like a thousand years of the actual date. After doing this study, I have more assurance that this dating method can meet this requirement. If this is a fact, then this method by itself demonstrates that God created Adam thousands of years before 6,000 years ago.

I also wanted to get a feel for the accuracy of C14 dating for samples 30,000-40,000 years old. There is no doubting that this is much more difficult and the potential for error is much higher. Contamination of the samples is a serious problem. Also, as I mentioned, Higham informed me that they don't have solid accepted data for the variation in the levels of C14 for samples that old, but that the data they do have would typically limit the potential error for this factor to a maximum of about 5,000 years. I assume we can have a rather high level of confidence that they can often date samples from 30,000-40,000 years ago within 5,000 years, or so. (I'm not suggesting, of course,

that they can never give a C14 date more accurate than 5,000 years, or so, when dating samples 30,000-40,000 years old, or even older.