

# **Genesis 1:1-2:3; God Creates Our World**

**by Karl Kemp; July, 2014**

I am writing this paper after completing the paper on Genesis chapter 3 and the paper on Genesis 2:9 and the tree of life and the tree of death. You might want to read those papers first.

I am borrowing much of the content of this paper on Genesis 1:1-2:4 from my paper on Genesis Chapter 1-3 that is on my internet site ([karlkempteachingministries.com](http://karlkempteachingministries.com)). The lengthy Appendix (almost 200 pages) that was part of the original paper is not included on my internet site, but I have included some excerpts from the Appendix in this paper. (The reason I didn't include the Appendix on my internet site is that I had included many lengthy excerpts from others throughout the Appendix; I had received permission to include those lengthy excerpts in the original paper, but not for the internet version of the paper.) I'll list the contents of the lengthy Appendix as we continue. I still have quite a few copies of the original 273 page paper, which I will make available to you for \$5 plus postage. (You could send me an e-mail from my internet site.)

All quotations from the Bible were taken from the New American Standard Bible, 1995 edition, unless I mention otherwise. I was able to use footnotes, bold, italics, small caps, some Hebrew letters, dashes, etc. in the internet version of the paper, but not for this present version that I am putting on several Christian article sites. I frequently make comments in the middle of quotations using brackets [ ] or [[ ]] to make them more obvious. cf., e.g., means compare, for example

EXTENDED NOTES (in the Appendix of the original 273 page paper):

A. Excerpts Dealing with the Gap View of Creation (8 pages)

B. Excerpts Dealing with a Modification, or Two, of the Gap View of Creation (8 pages) (God's original creation out of nothing took place long before Genesis 1:1; Satan fell through pride and led a rebellion against God; God judged that rebellion, which led to the chaos, darkness, death, and emptiness pictured in Gen. 1:2.)

C. Ezekiel 28:1-19 (7 pages)

D. The Symbolic Use of the Words "Light," "Darkness," "Night," and "Day" in the Bible (12 pages)

E. A Study of the Hebrew Verb "Badal," To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart (7 pages)

F. The Use of "Day" and the "Seven Days" in the Creation Account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, Using an Artificial Literary Structure (14 pages)

G. Galileo's Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture (10 pages)

H. The Bible and Science (19 pages)

I. When Was Adam Created? 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" (20 pages)

J. When Was the Universe Created? 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 (46 pages)

K. Intelligent Design, Not Evolution. This lengthy Extended Note consists almost entirely of excerpts from scholars involved in the Intelligent Design movement (43 pages)

## **INTRODUCTION**

The first three chapters of Genesis are extremely important. They serve as a foundation for the rest of the book of Genesis and the rest of the Bible. These chapters teach us about God's creation of our world, His creation of man (male and female) in His image, the temptation and fall of Eve and then Adam in the garden of Eden with the resultant spiritual death (and the beginning of the process of physical death) and the expulsion from the garden, in which they had enjoyed a life-flowing relationship with God. Because of their fall, all of their offspring were born into spiritual death, outside of the garden (Rom. 5:12-21). However - thanks be to God! - these chapters include the promise of the ultimate salvation of mankind (all believers) through the Lord Jesus Christ, the Seed of the woman (Gen. 3:15), and the ultimate overthrow and removal of Satan and his kingdom of sin, darkness, and death.

Before I started this study, I hadn't spent much time on the details of Genesis 1:1-2:3, but I had nailed down some key items, though not always with complete assurance. I'll list some key issues regarding the interpretation of the first three chapters of the book of Genesis and make several comments.

**THE INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS 1:1.** I had already become pretty well convinced that the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 starts with the earth already

existing. The earth already existed, but it was in the desolate state pictured in Gen. 1:2 when this creation, or you call it a recreation, began. Genesis 1:1 speaks, in summary form, of the creating that takes place throughout the six days of Genesis chapter 1. The first creative act took place in Gen. 1:3, when God said, "Let there be light." Genesis 1:1 can be considered a *title* for the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3. (This viewpoint is discussed under Genesis chapter 1 and in Extended Note B in the Appendix. I am including some excerpts from Extended Note B in this paper.) I believe that God created all things, including matter, out of nothing, but that that creation took place long before Gen. 1:1. Now, after doing this study, I'm solidly convinced that this is the correct interpretation, the interpretation intended by God. This interpretation is fairly common, as I demonstrate in this paper.

THE INTERPETATION OF GENESIS 1:2. I was convinced that the desolate state of the earth pictured in Gen. 1:2 had been caused by God's judgment of a rebellion led by Satan that involved the earth after that high-level angelic being (apparently one of the cherubim; cf. Ezek. 28:13-16 [A verse-by-verse study of Ezekiel chapter 28 is included in Extended Note C in the Appendix]) rebelled and fell from his righteous state and became an enemy of God (he became Satan/the devil). This high-level angelic being apparently had authority on the earth (not that he was limited to the earth) before his rebellion and fall; he would have been created, ministered under God, and rebelled and been judged (judged in a preliminary sense; his final judgment is still future) all before Gen. 1:1.

I originally learned this viewpoint regarding Gen. 1:2 as a recently converted Christian through the so-called "gap view" of Gen. 1:1, 2. For one thing, the church I was attending when I became a born-again Christian introduced me to the Scofield Reference Bible (KJV), which was the Bible I used for several years; it teaches the gap view of creation. (The gap view is discussed in Extended Note A in the Appendix. I am including some excerpts from that Extended Note in this paper.) The gap view teaches that Gen. 1:1 refers to God's initial creation of everything, including matter, out of nothing, and that Satan rebelled and was judged by God during a gap (a large gap) of time that existed between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2. I agree with what the gap view teaches regarding Gen. 1:2, but I believe it is far better to interpret Gen. 1:1 the way I suggested above. For one thing, it fits the connection between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2 much better.

THE MORE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS 1:1, 2 has God creating everything, including matter, out of nothing in Gen. 1:1, with Gen. 1:2 picturing the earth in an intermediate state of creation, before God has finished His work of creating. It is as if God had said when He created the earth, "Let the earth come into being in a chaotic, desolate form, that is filled with darkness and death, and with water covering everything [as the earth is pictured in Gen. 1:2]; then I'll finish the job."

One major problem with this more traditional interpretation of Gen. 1:1, 2 is that it doesn't leave any room (after the creation of Gen. 1:1) for the righteous existence of the high-level angelic being who became Satan, or for the rebellion led by him that involved a third of God's angels, or for God's preliminary judgment of that rebellion that led to the totally chaotic and dead state of the earth pictured in Gen. 1:2. These things are extremely important to the unfolding history of the earth and mankind. Furthermore, you really have to strain to even see the creation of the angelic kingdom in Gen. 1:1.

With the more traditional viewpoint, we are totally unprepared for Satan (an evil, fallen being who hates God and man) to come on the scene in Genesis chapter 3 or for the existence of anything evil (not good) in God's created universe. Genesis chapter 1 informs us six times that everything that God created in Genesis chapter 1 was good, and once that it was very good. We need to see that sin, Satan, and "darkness" (using the word "darkness" in a symbolic/spiritual sense) all existed before God's creative (recreative) work that is spoken of throughout Genesis chapter 1 began; they were not part of His creative (recreative) work that is spoken of in Genesis chapter 1. And, as I mentioned, we need to see that the chaotic, desolate, dead, dark state of the earth, with water covering everything, resulted from God's judgment of the rebellion led by Satan before Gen. 1:1.

SYMBOLIC/SPIRITUAL LANGUAGE IN GENESIS CHAPTERS 1-3. I believe there is quite a bit of symbolic/spiritual language in Genesis chapters 1-3 and that it is extremely important to recognize this fact and to incorporate it in our interpretation of these chapters. I have observed, however, that many Christians fail to recognize the symbolic/spiritual language in these chapters.

I believe the interpretation of Genesis chapters 1-3 that recognizes the symbolic/spiritual language is far more accurate. Furthermore, the resultant interpretation ends up being far more significant, far more satisfying, and far more edifying (at least ten times more significant, more satisfying, and more edifying - in my opinion) than the interpretation that puts the emphasis on the scientific details of creation that God supposedly revealed in these chapters (especially in Genesis chapter 1). We will discuss the scientific content of Genesis chapter 1 later in the Introduction.

As a recently converted Christian (in 1964), before I had done much study of these chapters, I saw a strong symbolic/spiritual component for the "darkness" spoken of in Gen. 1:2. ((I had a footnote: It seems clear that literal, natural darkness was included too, but the symbolic component of the darkness is the most important component by far. At least some of the Christian scholars who hold the gap view agree that there is an important symbolic component of the darkness of Gen. 1:2, as do some of the scholars who believe (as I do) that

Gen. 1:1 speaks of God's creation starting with the earth in the desolate state pictured in Gen. 1:2. I included a lengthy excerpt from Allen P. Ross ("Creation and Blessing") in Extended Note B in the Appendix; what he says on this topic is the best I have seen. (I am including some excerpts from Extended Note B, including some from Allen P. Ross, in this paper.) ) "Darkness" in the Bible symbolizes sin, Satan and his kingdom, and the consequences of sin, including death and every form of chaos.

After further study I see even more clearly this strong symbolic/spiritual component for the darkness mentioned in Genesis chapter 1, especially in Gen. 1:2. Similarly, there is a strong symbolic component for the "light" of Genesis chapter 1, especially for Gen. 1:3, 4, with light symbolizing God, righteousness, truth, divine order, life (especially spiritual life), and blessings (these good things all come from God). The fact that the sun isn't created until the fourth day, according to this creation account, helps confirm that there is a strong symbolic/spiritual component for the "darkness" and "light" of Gen. 1:2-5.

As part of this study, I looked at the symbolic use of the words "light" and "darkness" throughout the Bible. I found that these words are used in a symbolic sense even more often than I expected. Extended Note D in the Appendix is an eleven-page study titled "The Symbolic Use of the Words 'Light,' 'Darkness,' 'Night,' and 'Day' in the Bible." (I am including some excerpts from that Extended Note in this paper.) As I demonstrate there, more often than not the words light and darkness are used in a symbolic sense in both the Old and New Testaments.

I also spent some profitable time studying the Hebrew verb "badal," which is used five times in Genesis chapter 1. The fact that this particular verb was used in Genesis chapter 1 helps confirm that there is a strong symbolic/spiritual component for the "light" and "darkness" of Genesis chapter 1. Extended Note E in the Appendix is a six-page study titled "A Study of the Hebrew Verb 'Badal,' To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart." (I am including some excerpts from that Extended Note in this paper.) The most important use of this Hebrew verb in Genesis chapter 1 is found in Gen. 1:4, "God saw that the light was good [[It is quite significant that this creation account doesn't say that the *darkness* was *good*. If Gen. 1:2, 4 were speaking of light and darkness in a strictly literal/natural sense, it would be reasonable to call the darkness good, along with the light (I have noticed that some commentators make the point that the darkness is good, along with the light; they are thinking in terms of literal/natural darkness and light), but there is no way that the darkness can be called good when understood in a symbolic/spiritual sense.]]; and GOD SEPARATED ["badal"] THE LIGHT FROM THE DARKNESS [or, we could translate, "GOD DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS"]."

It is quite significant, as Extended Note E shows, that "badal" is consistently

used of separating (or distinguishing between) things like the holy from the unholy, and the clean from the unclean throughout the Old Testament. This verb was used thirty-six times in the Old Testament, not including the five uses found in Genesis chapter 1; it is never used of a mundane separating of indifferent things in any of those thirty-six uses.

**OTHER IMPORTANT SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE IN GENESIS CHAPTERS 1-3.** The symbolic/spiritual nature of the two trees in the middle of the garden and of the serpent (who is Satan, not a serpent that Satan spoke through) help confirm the strong symbolic/spiritual component of the light and darkness of Genesis chapter 1 and the fact that Genesis chapters 1-3 have a strong symbolic/spiritual component. God, the light, life (spiritual life and physical/natural life) and the tree of life, and His kingdom of truth, righteousness, peace, order, and blessings all go together; Satan (the serpent), the darkness, death (spiritual death and physical death) and partaking of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL (which can also be called the tree of DEATH), and his kingdom of sin, lies, and (God's) curses all go together.

Even as a recently converted believer, I understood the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in a symbolic/spiritual sense. After doing this study, I'm even more convinced that this is the correct interpretation. Most commentators do not understand the trees in a symbolic sense (but they at least agree that there is something spiritual/supernatural about the trees; some say the trees are sacramental); they do not see a symbolic/spiritual component for the light and the darkness of Genesis chapter 1; and they do not see the serpent as a symbol for Satan (but they at least agree that Satan spoke through the serpent).

**WHAT IT MEANT FOR ADAM AND EVE TO EAT OF THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT OF THE TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL.** For Adam and Eve to eat of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL was for them to forsake God and the GOOD (before their rebellion they knew only GOOD) and to partake of EVIL. They partook of evil by DOING EVIL and by EXPERIENCING THE EVIL CONSEQUENCES that always come with doing evil. (Some of the consequences of sin are immediate; some are future, but they are sure to come to those who don't repent and submit to the Creator, Savior, and Judge of all people.) God had warned that if Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit they would die (Gen. 2:17). Eating of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL resulted in THE EVIL OF DEATH (with the emphasis on spiritual death, but also including physical death [the enemy of physical death will be abolished at the end of this age]). They died spiritually the day they ate of the forbidden fruit, and the physical death process was initiated.

Significantly, this tree can also be called the TREE OF DEATH; this tree is the evil alternative to the TREE OF LIFE. Adam and Eve didn't have a lot of

choices: They would either serve God from the heart in truth (in accordance with His Word) and righteousness (by His grace through faith) or they would forsake Him and His LIFE, with the result being DEATH. Adam and Eve forsook the LIGHT and partook of the DARKNESS (using the words light and darkness in a symbolic/spiritual sense). They forsook God and His life and blessings and partook of death and the other curses that come with sin. They chose the wrong tree! All of us descendants of Adam and Eve must choose whether we are going to choose God or the tree of death.

WHAT IT MEANT/MEANS FOR MAN TO EAT OF THE FRUIT OF THE TREE OF LIFE. (See my paper on Genesis 2:9 for more details.) Let's briefly discuss the tree of life that was located (along with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil) in the middle of the Garden of Eden. God (God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit) is the only source of life (spiritual life and physical/natural life) and of everything else that is good. Spiritual life, which centers in a life-flowing relationship with God (by the Spirit), is obviously much more important than physical/natural life. Those who partake of God's spiritual life, even if they temporarily lose their physical life, will forever partake of God's eternal life and blessings and will ultimately receive glorified bodies, bodies designed for the heavenly dimension. I DON'T BELIEVE THERE EVER EXISTED, OR CAN EXIST, A PHYSICAL TREE THAT CAN PROVIDE THE LIFE OF GOD. THERE IS NO SUCH MAGIC TREE OR FRUIT. It could be said, however, that the cross of Christ opens the door for man to receive the life of God.

Adam and Eve continually partook of the life of God ((to the extent that the life of God was available to them at that time [[I had a footnote: The life that Adam and Eve experienced in the garden before the fall was very far beneath what God's people will experience in the eternal glorified age to come. For one thing, they had bodies made of the dust of the earth, bodies designed for a temporary existence in the earthly, physical/natural dimension, not glorified bodies designed for living in the heavenly, fully-glorified dimension (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45-52).]])) as long as they walked right before Him from their hearts in obedience to His Word; the blessings were rather automatic. The only way they could stop partaking of the good fruit of the TREE OF LIFE (the LIFE of God) was for them to rebel against God and partake of the evil forbidden fruit of the TREE OF DEATH (the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL).

The last two chapters of the Bible (Revelation chapters 21, 22), which speak of the glory of the eternal state, with the new heaven, new earth, and new Jerusalem, also speak of the TREE(S) OF LIFE. I believe the tree(s) of life spoken of in Gen. 2:9; 3:22, 24 and Rev. 22:4, 14 (and Ezek. 47:7, 12; Rev. 2:7) are symbols for the life of God, especially for His spiritual/eternal life. To partake of the fruit of the tree(s) of life is to partake of the spiritual/eternal life of God. THE TRIUNE GOD IS THE ONLY SOURCE OF LIFE IN THE UNIVERSE.

In Revelation 22:1, 2 we see "a river of the WATER OF LIFE" flowing from the throne of God the Father and God the Son. (The *trees* are situated on both banks of the *river*.) It seems clear to me (and this is a widely accepted viewpoint) that this flowing river symbolizes the Spirit of life (the Holy Spirit), who comes to God's people (even now, but in a much fuller sense in the eternal state) from God the Father and God the Son (on the basis of the atoning death of the Son/the Lamb of God). If the "river of the water of life" is symbolic, so are the TREE(S) OF LIFE along the banks of the river that are dependent on the water of the river. It also seems clear to me that the water flowing from the temple of God in Ezek. 47:1-12 that became a river and that had the trees (of life) on both sides of it is to be understood in a symbolic/spiritual sense for the Spirit/life of God. Ezekiel 47:12 says that the trees will bear fruit every month "because their water flows from the sanctuary [the temple where God dwells]."

Throughout the Bible, water is used as a symbol for the Holy Spirit and the life of God. To partake of the fruit of the tree(s) of life, which are alongside the river of the water of life coming from the throne of God the Father and God the Son (in Rev. 22:1, 2), is a symbolic way to speak of partaking of the spiritual/eternal life of God. I believe it means the same thing in Genesis chapters 1-3, but the dimension of the life available to Adam and Eve was small compared with that which will be available to God's people in the eternal, glorified state. To drink of the water that Christ gives believers (John 4:14; 7:39-40, which, as John 7:39, 40 demonstrate, refers to the Holy Spirit) or to partake from the water of the "springs of the water of life" (Rev. 7:17) is comparable in meaning with partaking of the fruit of the tree of life.

((I had a three-paragraph footnote: Since I have learned over the years that many Christians have a hard time seeing the symbolic/spiritual nature of the tree(s) of life (and other such symbols), I'll say a little more. By speaking of the symbolic/spiritual nature of the tree(s) of life, we are not at all denying reality; we are speaking of the highest reality, the reality of the dimension of God and His Spirit.

Let's consider PSALM 46:4, 5a (NIV): "There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God [speaking of the literal city of Jerusalem], the holy place where the Most High dwells. (5) God is within her, she will not fall." It is clear that Psalm 46:4 isn't speaking of a literal river of literal water. For one thing, there was/is no such river in Jerusalem. The river speaks in a symbolic/Spiritual sense of God's presence and life ("God is within her") by His Spirit. If the believers of Israel in Old Testament days (who weren't born-again yet and who had experienced far less of the work of the Spirit and the life of God than we believers experience in New Testament days) could understand that there was a symbolic/Spiritual river flowing to God's people then, we should (it seems to me) be able to understand the symbolic/spiritual (but VERY REAL) river flowing to us now, and the much fuller flowing of that river (that is full of glory) in the eternal state, and the symbolic/Spiritual nature of the tree(s) of life of Genesis

chapters 2 and 3, Revelation chapter 22, and Ezekiel chapter 47. We need literal water, but we need God's Spirit and His life infinitely more. Those who dwell in the presence of God find that He provides everything they need.

I'll give another illustration of symbolic/Spiritual language. In John chapter 6 Christ said He was/is the "bread of life. In 6:51 He said, "I am the living bread that came out of heaven; IF ANYONE EATS OF THIS BREAD, HE WILL LIVE FOREVER [my emphasis] (or, we could say, he will partake of eternal life). To eat of this bread is symbolic for partaking of the full salvation provided in Christ Jesus by faith. In John 6:47, right in the middle of this discourse, Jesus said, "HE WHO BELIEVES [HAS FAITH] HAS ETERNAL LIFE." We will speak quite a bit more about symbolic/Spiritual language throughout this paper, always aiming for the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches. (This is the end of the three-paragraph footnote.) )

THE SERPENT OF GENESIS CHAPTER 3 IS A SYMBOL FOR SATAN. We'll discuss this point in some detail under Genesis chapter 3 (not included in this present paper). Here I'll just point out that Revelation 12:9; 20:2 specifically call Satan "the serpent of old." As I mentioned, most Christian commentators disagree with the idea that the serpent of Genesis chapter 3 is a symbol for Satan; they think that Satan was speaking through a literal serpent.

EVEN THOUGH WE ARE INFORMED THROUGHOUT GENESIS CHAPTER 1 THAT EVERYTHING GOD CREATED WAS GOOD, WE ARE ALSO INFORMED THAT MAN HAD TO SUBDUE/CONQUER THE EARTH. The fact that God informed newly created man that he must "subdue/conquer" the earth (Gen. 1:20) serves as a strong confirmation of the fact that, even though all of God's creative work pictured in Gen. 1:1-2:3 was *good*, there were some things on the earth that were not *good*. Behind the scenes, in the spiritual dimension, there was/is an *evil* kingdom, a kingdom of sin, darkness, and death that is headed up by Satan, a kingdom of rebels that God permits to exist for His purposes for a season before He totally removes that kingdom through judgment. It's important to see that Satan and his kingdom of darkness were not part of God's creative work spoken of in Gen. 1:1-2:3. He was created, fell, and was judged in a preliminary sense before Gen. 1:1.

The primary thing that Adam and Eve needed to subdue/conquer was the all-too-real potential to sin against God and join the devil in his kingdom of rebellion, darkness, and death. ((I had a footnote: Before the fall man hardly needed to subdue/conquer the animal kingdom. Genesis 1:30 (cf. Gen. 2:19, 20; Isa. 11:6-9; 65:25) seems to indicate that the animals, at that time, were no threat to Adam, or even to one another, in that they were vegetarians. And the ground, at that time, did not need to be subdued; it yielded bountiful produce with minimal effort (or less). So too, Adam and Eve had no problems with things like violent weather, droughts, floods, or plagues/sickness before the fall.)) As we know, the encounter of man with Satan in the garden that is reported in

Genesis chapter 3 turned out very bad; instead of subduing, Adam and Eve were subdued by sin, darkness, and death. Anyway, God in His mercy and grace didn't let the story end there. His promise of Gen. 3:15 revealed that eventually man (through the ultimate Seed of the woman, the God-man) will totally subdue/conquer Satan and his kingdom of sin, darkness, and death.

#### THE NATURE OF THE DAYS OF THE SEVEN DAYS OF GENESIS 1:1-2:3.

When I started this study, I hadn't formed a strong opinion regarding the nature of the days of creation, but I didn't think they were literal twenty-four hour days. Now I can say that I agree with those who say the seven days constitute an artificial literary framework *designed by God* to yield, for one thing, an important model for Israel's sabbath at the end of six days of work. Under Gen. 1:5, I list six reasons for not understanding the days to be literal twenty-four hour days. Extended Note F in the Appendix is titled, "The Use of *Day* and the *Seven Days* in the Creation Account of Genesis 1:1-2:3, Using an Artificial Literary Structure." I include some excerpts from that Extended Note under Gen. 1:5.

If it is true that the seven days of Gen. 1:1-2:3 constitute an artificial literary framework, there's no basis to argue that the first six days cover a period of one hundred and forty-four hours. I don't believe God intended to reveal how long He took in His recreation of the earth. *For the record though, this paper wouldn't change hardly at all if the six days of Genesis chapter 1 covered one hundred and forty-four hours.*

#### SOME APPARENT INTENDED PURPOSES FOR GENESIS CHAPTERS 1-3, WITH THE EMPHASIS ON THE CREATION ACCOUNT OF GENESIS 1:1-2:3.

I am taking the liberty here to incorporate some information and confirmation gained from other parts of the Bible; God never intended that we would be able to fully or adequately understand Genesis chapters 1-3 in isolation from the rest of the Bible.

One of the most important purposes for the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 was to teach that God is the Creator of all that exists, including every being; He and He alone is God (which includes His being Judge), and He alone is to be worshipped. One reason this revelation was so important in the ancient world was that all of the peoples that Israel interacted with believed in and worshipped many gods, including the sun, moon, and stars, etc. that were thought to be gods. Genesis 1:1-2:3 showed that the sun, moon, and stars, etc. were created by God; we must worship the Creator, not the beings and things created by Him.

The people of ancient Israel were tempted to worship the gods of the nations, and all too often many of them did. In our day, in our part of the world, most people don't believe in literal gods, but the end result is similar because people (in pride and unbelief) worship the "gods" of our age, for example, false religion and the occult, false science (science that denies God), money, sex, intellect,

fame, sports, and hobbies. Satan and his evil kingdom of darkness (which includes the fallen angels and demons) was/is behind the false "gods" of the nations of the ancient world and of our modern world.

Another important purpose for Gen. 1:1-2:3 was to teach that our world was designed and created (recreated) especially for man and that man, who was created in the image of God, was created to rule on the earth, under God, and in faithfulness to Him. It was of crucial importance for God to reveal to all who had/have ears to hear about His work of creating, about the existence and work of Satan and his evil kingdom of darkness and death, about the fall of Adam and Eve and the consequences of the fall, about salvation and what God requires of man, and some insight regarding His plans to eternally save those who submit to Him in faith and to totally remove Satan and all who continue to follow him in rebellion against God.

I have already spoken of the importance of seeing that the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 started with the earth being in a chaotic, desolate state, a state of darkness and death that had resulted from God's judgment of a rebellion led by Satan that involved the earth. This is important information, very important information! For one thing, it helps us understand Satan and his evil kingdom of sin, darkness, and spiritual death. ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: Bible-believing Christians who reject the idea that Gen. 1: 2 has anything to do with the fall and judgment of Satan must at least agree that Satan exists; that he was an evil, fallen being who hated God and man BEFORE he tempted Eve in Genesis chapter 3; that he was created good, but that he rebelled against God through pride and was judged (judged in a preliminary sense; his final judgment will not take place until the end of this age when God casts him into the lake of fire); and that he heads up an evil kingdom of sin, darkness, and spiritual death on the earth (not that his presence and activities are limited to the earth; he and his angels have access to heavenly places).

The rebellion and judgment of an earlier (before Gen. 1:1) kingdom on the earth offers the best explanation I know of for the existence of the large number of demons on the earth: Apparently they are the disembodied spirits of beings (not human beings) that were involved with Satan in that earlier rebellion and judgment. I will include some excerpts from G. H. Pember from Extended Note C that deal with this topic at the end of this Introduction.)) Genesis chapters 1-3 demonstrate that after the rebellion and fall of Satan and the rebellion and fall of man, God is still God; He is in sovereign control of the universe; He limits what He permits the devil and evil people to do. He permits Satan to tempt His people, but He always provides grace sufficient for them to be victorious over temptation. There was/is no excuse for the sin of Adam and Eve, or for the sin of Christians.

I have also mentioned the importance of seeing the strong symbolic/spiritual component for the "light" and "darkness" in this creation account (Gen. 1:1-2:3)

and for the strong emphasis on the need to separate, and to keep separate, the *light* from the *darkness*. The *darkness* symbolizes Satan and his kingdom of *evil* that exists in the background (cf., e.g., Col. 1:13). The darkness mentioned in Gen. 1:2 already existed when God's creative work spoken of in Gen. 1:1-2:3 began; it was not part of that creative work, which was all pronounced *good*. As I mentioned, God's first act of creation mentioned in Genesis chapter 1 was His calling forth light (Gen. 1:3), and that light was not at all limited to physical light.

I don't believe God purposed in the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 to reveal the time that expired from Gen. 1:3 to the end of the sixth day. (And, much more importantly, He has not revealed to us how long before the recreation of the earth the angelic kingdom was created or the earth was created, or when Satan and his followers fell. The Scriptures don't tell us when the universe or the earth were created, but the most common scientific viewpoint is that the universe started about 14 billion years ago, and the earth about 4.6 billion years ago.) For one thing, as I mentioned, it doesn't seem that God intended the seven days of creation to be understood as literal twenty-four hour days.

Even if Gen. 1:1 did speak of God's initial creation of everything out of nothing and the first six days were twenty-four hour days and you reject the gap view of creation, there still would be an unknown gap of time between the creation of Gen. 1:1 and the time the first day began when God said "Let there be light" in Gen. 1:3. ((I had a three-paragraph footnote: For those who believe that Gen. 1:1 speaks of the absolute beginning of God's creation (I'm quite sure that it doesn't), there still remains a gap of time between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:3, since the morning of the first day of creation begins with the light that came when God said, "Let there be light." The time that expired from Gen. 1:1 to the end of the sixth day would, therefore, be more than six literal twenty-four hour days, even if you took the days as literal twenty-four hour days, which I wouldn't.

I'll give an example of an early Christian writer, Caedmon, who saw a substantial gap between Gen. 1:1, 2 and Gen. 1:3. He was a Christian poet in England in the middle of the seventh century. I learned about him from Arthur C. Custance and Weston W. Fields, who are both quoted in Extended Note A in the Appendix. I obtained the book that contains the relevant writings of Caedmon through the Inter-Library Loan ("Genesis A," translated from the Old English by L. Mason, Vol. XLVIII of the Yale Studies in English series, A. S. Cook, editor, pages 1-3).

In Caedmon's view God had created the heavenly kingdom (Gen. 1:1, 2), which included the angels and the earth, but the earth remained desolate, dark, idle, and useless for a lengthy period, until God had need of it. I'll quote part of what he says regarding the angelic hosts. "These angelic hosts were wont to feel joy and rapture, transcendent bliss, in the presence of their Creator: their beatitude was measureless. Glorious ministers magnified their Lord, spoke his praise with zeal, lauded the Master of their being, and were excellently happy in the

majesty of God. They had no knowledge of working evil or wickedness, but dwelt in innocence forever with their Lord: from the beginning [from the time of their creation] they wrought in heaven nothing but righteousness and truth, until a Prince of angels through pride strayed into sin...(page 1). Caedmon goes on to speak of God's banishing the rebels from heaven and of His preparing the earth for man and creating man (as pictured in Gen. 1:3-2:3) with the purpose of (ultimately) letting man occupy the "noble seats and glory-crowned abodes which the haughty rebels had left vacant, high in heaven" (page 3).)

Here's a very important point: I don't believe God purposed to reveal much scientific information in the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3. ((I had a footnote: He did reveal some "scientific" details, the fact that HE created our universe, for example, and that HE created man (male and female) in His image, but such information is more *theological* than *scientific*. True science cannot ignore the truth. I'm not suggesting, of course, that God doesn't care about getting science right; He is the God of truth; but scientific details are far less important than issues like eternal salvation and eternal damnation.)) As we will discuss in some detail in this paper, it seems that God accommodated the scientific details of this account to the scientific viewpoints of the ancient world. ((I had a footnote: See under Genesis chapter 1 and see Extended Note H, "The Bible and Science." I am including some excerpts from Extended Note H in this paper. Extended Note G is also quite relevant to this topic, "Galileo's Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture."))

It seems that in our day when most Christians (including both young-earth and old-earth creationists) discuss Genesis chapter 1 they spend most of their time and energy arguing (and sometimes arguing on a very intense level; some young earth creationists even question whether you can be a genuine Christian and deny the young-earth viewpoint) about scientific details, details that God supposedly revealed in this chapter, details that must perfectly correlate with our modern scientific viewpoints, at least where the modern scientific viewpoints are (in their opinion) accurate. ((I had a footnote: The old-earth creationists (I'm speaking of Bible-believing Christians) tend to think modern science is right in most of what it says relevant to Genesis chapter 1 (excluding, for one super-important thing, the modern scientific views regarding the origin of life and evolution of man). The young-earth creationists think modern science is mostly wrong in what it says relevant to Genesis chapter 1, very much including the age of the universe and earth.)) This widespread viewpoint regarding the scientific content of Gen. 1:1-2:3 is leading to much confusion and intense strife in the body of Christ. I believe most of this effort amounts to trying to find revelation of scientific details that God didn't include in this creation account.

The prime example of God's accommodating scientific details to the ancient viewpoint is the *earth-centered* viewpoint reflected in Genesis chapter 1 and throughout the Bible. The earth is pictured (spoken of as) being unmovable, with the sun, moon, and stars rotating about it on a daily basis. Genesis chapter

1 also speaks of the sun, moon, and stars being created after the earth. ((I had a footnote: Some argue that Genesis chapter 1 doesn't speak of the sun, moon, and stars being created after the earth, but (as we discuss in this paper) I believe they are wrong. Few scientists would agree that the earth was created before the sun or before most of the other stars. Scientists can be wrong, but I believe they are right when they say that the earth was not here before the sun and (most of the) stars.))

Another apparent example of God's accommodating scientific details to the ancient viewpoint is the solid firmament spoken of several times in Genesis chapter 1, which God created on the second day of creation, above which He placed the large amounts of excess water that He removed from the earth on the second day (see Gen. 1:2, 6, 7). Many don't agree that Genesis chapter 1 speaks of a solid firmament, but (as we discuss in some detail in this paper) I believe they are wrong.

If God's revelation through Moses (or other spokesmen) would have challenged universally held scientific viewpoints (like the earth-centered viewpoint), it would have been terribly confusing to those who read/heard it, and it would have seriously detracted from His purpose(s) for this creation account. From the days of Moses, about thirty-four hundred years ago (and in the days before Moses), until a few hundred years ago, almost all people (Jews, Christians, and the rest of mankind) have held the earth-centered viewpoint, and they would not have been able to identify at all with a sun-centered viewpoint, where the earth not only rotates around the sun on a yearly basis but also rotates daily on its axis. God's purposes for this creation account were far more important (infinitely more important) than for God to correct ancient scientific ideas about our world that were wrong.

Some insist that God did not accommodate these scientific details to the ancient viewpoint and that such accommodation would constitute error in the Bible. I don't believe that this accommodation constitutes error, but I agree that the idea of accommodation can be a slippery slope and that we must make it a top priority to rightly divide God's Word. (These things are discussed in this paper, especially in Extended Note H in the Appendix, "The Bible and Science.")

**WHEN WAS ADAM CREATED?** The genealogies of Genesis chapter 5 (which go from the creation of Adam to the birth of the sons of Noah) and of Genesis chapter 11 (which go from Shem's, a son of Noah, giving birth to Arpachshad two years after the flood to the birth of Abraham and his two brothers) show that (if there were no gaps in these genealogies) there were about two thousand years from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abraham (more exactly 1,946 years). We know that Abraham was born about 2000 BC. These numbers would date the creation of Adam about 4000 BC (about six thousand years ago), and they would date Noah's flood at about 2300 BC, that is *if* there were no gaps in

the genealogies of Genesis 5 and/or 11.

A large number of Christian scholars (including some young-earth creationists) are convinced that these genealogies must be incomplete. There are several compelling reasons for believing that Adam must have been created thousands of years before 4000 BC and that Noah's flood must have taken place thousands of years before 2300 BC. ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: See Extended Note I in the Appendix, "When Was Adam Created? Some young-earth creationists believe there are gaps in the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11. Other young-earth creationists admit the possibility of gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11. Henry Morris, for example, a leader among the young-earth creationists, acknowledges the possibility that gaps in the genealogies could push the date for the creation as far back as 10,000 BC (twelve thousand years ago) at the max ("The Genesis Record" [Baker, 1976], page 45). John J. Davis, who is a young-earth creationist, opts for a date ten thousand to tens of thousands of years before 10,000 BC for the creation of Adam. (I quoted from him in Extended Note I.)

Most of the young-earth creationists that I know about argue for the creation of the universe, earth, and of Adam about 6,000 years ago. They are basing this opinion (typically they are taking a dogmatic stand for this interpretation of the Bible) on three assumptions, all of which are wrong, in my opinion. (It is significant that if they are wrong in even one of these three assumptions their date of 6,000 years is wrong. And, as I said, I believe they are wrong on all three assumptions.) They are assuming that there were no substantial gaps between the time God began to create the universe and the time the first day of Genesis chapter 1 began; they are assuming that the days of Genesis 1:1-2:3 are literal twenty-four hour days; and they are assuming that there are no gaps in the genealogies of Genesis chapter 5 or 11. The first two assumptions have nothing to do with dating the creation of Adam, but they have everything to do with dating when God began to create the universe.) I don't have all the answers, but I believe the creation of Adam was at least ten thousand years ago, and it could have been twenty or thirty thousand years ago, or even forty to sixty thousand years ago.

WHEN WERE THE UNIVERSE AND EARTH CREATED? (See the footnote in the last two paragraphs for a start.) Strong controversy erupts here. Many (or most) young-earth creationists insist that God initiated His creation of the universe five twenty-four hour days before He created Adam on the sixth day. ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: Henry Morris, for example ("Genesis Record," page 45) says, "As far as the creation of the universe is concerned, this took place five days earlier than the creation of man. That these were literal days, not ages of indefinite duration corresponding to the supposed geological ages, will be shown in the next chapter. That there is no gap in time of any significance before the six days of creation will be shown in the next section of this chapter." Morris deals with, and rejects, the "gap theory" in his following

section.

Some young-earth creationists acknowledge that a very small amount of time could have passed between the time God began His work of creation and the time the first day of Genesis chapter 1 began. As I have mentioned, I believe God began His work of creating long before Gen. 1:1.) They are basing this viewpoint on Genesis chapter 1. I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT YOUNG-EARTH CREATIONISTS ARE TRYING TO BE FAITHFUL TO GOD AND THE BIBLE AND THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE TAKEN A VERY STRONG STAND AGAINST THE GODLESS EVOLUTION THAT REIGNS IN SO MUCH OF THE WORLD OF OUR DAY; for one place, it reigns in our schools (grades 1-12 and the universities).

Based on what I have read and heard, I have to agree with those who say the young-earth creationists are unintentionally proving to be a major ally of those who want to see evolution (to the exclusion of creationism) taught in our schools. By insisting that we must believe that God created the universe and earth six thousand years ago (or close to that), they tend to close the ears of many who desperately need to hear the important things they are saying (centering in the fact that God, the God of the Bible, is the Creator of our world and of man - we didn't get here by evolution - and He is the only Savior and Judge, before whom all people will ultimately stand). I am not suggesting that if the young-earth creationists stopped insisting that the earth is young all ears would pop open to the truth, but I believe it would be an important step in the right direction and that some ears would pop open.

If the young-earth creationists were right about the universe and earth's being created six thousand years ago, or so (if that is what God really intended to teach in Genesis chapters 1, 5, and 11), then Christians would have to hold that viewpoint, even if it is considered clearly wrong (many say it's ridiculous) by most scientists (including many Christian scientists) and many Christian scholars (including many evangelicals). The major problem with their position, from my point of view, is that there is very little chance (essentially no chance) that they are right about the age of the universe and the earth. It seems to me that the scientific evidence against their viewpoint is overwhelming already (I discussed this topic to some extent in Extended Note J in the original 273 page paper on Genesis chapters 1-3), and I assume it will continue to get stronger as the evidence keeps coming in through scientific research.

The Roman Catholic Church had a much stronger scriptural basis to deny the sun-centered viewpoint of Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo and to condemn Galileo for teaching views contrary to what the Bible teaches than the young-earth creationists have for insisting that the universe and earth were created six thousand years ago, or so. See Extended Note G in the Appendix, "Galileo's Condemnation and the Interpretation of Scripture." As the scientific evidence for the sun-centered viewpoint continued to build it eventually became obvious that

the Roman Catholic Church was wrong in the interpretation of the Bible they were so sure of when they condemned Galileo. It is also significant that the Roman Catholic Church was defending the viewpoint that the scientific, secular/pagan, and Christian world had always believed. Most of the scientists of that day agreed with the Roman Catholic Church, against Galileo, and some of them stirred up opposition in the Roman Catholic Church against him. By contrast, most of the scientists of our day (including many Christians) strongly disagree with the young-earth creationists on the age of our universe and earth.

It is true, of course, that if the young-earth creationists could prove that the earth is only six thousand years old (or close to that), that fact, in itself, would destroy the false theory of godless evolution (which they desperately and rightly want to destroy), but if the earth is older (I assume that it is billions of years old) that fact doesn't begin to validate godless evolution, not at all! Man would not have evolved on the earth even if the earth had existed hundreds of billions of years, or more. The more scientists learn, for example, about living cells and how complicated those cells and the molecules that make up those cells are (including DNA), with all of the complicated things that have to interact in just the right way for the cell to function (cells are complicated like a city; they even have factories to produce the required proteins – think about that!), the more it seems obvious that such cells would not have evolved in multiplied hundreds of billions of years, much less monkeys, or people (who are on a totally different level than monkeys in that we have been created in the image of God). See Extended Note K in the Appendix, "Intelligent Design, Not Evolution." That lengthy Extended Note, forty-three pages, consists mostly of excerpts from leaders of the Intelligent Design movement. That movement is having some success refuting godless evolution on a scientific basis, and it looks like they will have a lot more success in the near future. Refuting godless evolution is a far different thing though than helping men see their need to submit to God and His Word.

A LISTING OF THE EXCERPTS INCLUDED IN EXTENDED NOTE K, "INTELLIGENT DESIGN, NOT EVOLUTION" (43 pages) AND SOME EXCERPTS TAKEN FROM THOSE EXTENSIVE EXCERPTS FOR THIS PAPER ((My paper with the Appendix that includes Extended Note K was published in 2003. Quite a few books that deal with this topic have been published since then, but most of the information included in Extended Note K is quite relevant for today. You could, of course, skip this section, which is about fifteen pages, and go on with the other information included in the Introduction of this paper, but this information is quite relevant to Gen. 1:1-3, which deals with God's creation of our world. If evolution is true (the way it is being taught in our world today, very much including the schools), God did not create our world or the things in it; the Bible isn't true, and the God of the Bible doesn't exist. However, evolution (the way it is being taught in our world today, very much including the schools) isn't true! The Bible is true! God is the Creator!))

EXCERPTS FROM "DARWIN'S BLACK BOX: THE BIOCHEMICAL CHALLENGE TO EVOLUTION," BY MICHAEL J. BEHE (Simon and Schuster, 1996). ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: I believe all of the scholars involved in the Intelligent Design movement are Christians; some are evangelical Christians, but not all of them. By design the Intelligent Design movement doesn't argue from the Bible. Their primary reason for this is that they want to be heard and taken seriously by the academic community, the media, the public schools, etc. I'm not sure that God fully endorses that method. Perhaps He does lead some Christians that way, but we must be careful with that method.

If everyone in the world were won over to the Intelligent Design viewpoint and acknowledged that there must be some kind of Designer behind our world, we wouldn't have accomplished much *if* they don't submit in faith to God and His Word (the Bible). And that's a big *if* that can't just be taken for granted. Throughout the history of man, large numbers of peoples have believed in the existence of God, but they have not really submitted to Him and His Word. I'm much more comfortable with the Bible, gospel-centered approach of Hugh Ross than with the Intelligent Design approach, but that doesn't mean that much that is happening in the Intelligent Design movement is not of God; I believe much, or most, of it is.))

I have heard quite a bit about the Intelligent Design movement the past few years (written in 2003); this book is often mentioned. This book is the first one I purchased to study this topic for this paper. About all I knew of the Intelligent Design movement was that it was having some success showing that the evolutionary viewpoint, that traces back to Darwin, that all life on the earth, including monkeys and men, evolved; it was not created by God. From a Christian point of view, this viewpoint constitutes godless heresy!

I knew that the Intelligent Design movement was arguing that the more recent scientific data regarding living cells effectively demonstrates that life is so complex and shows so many characteristics of being carefully designed by a very competent Designer that the evolutionists cannot reasonably continue to dogmatically insist that life evolved without a designer. Extended Note K deals with some other powerful examples too (along with the cell), very much including the extreme complexity, and the fine-tuning of the creation of the universe, that were/are required for us to have life on the earth.

The author "is professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University. He lives in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania." He informs us that he is a Roman Catholic (page 239) and that he has "no reason to doubt that the universe is the billions of years old that physicists say it is" (page 5). With his next sentence on that page, he shows that he still leaves much room for evolutionary ideas (if I understand what he is saying, he leaves a lot more room than I could accept), "Further, I

find the idea of common descent (that all organisms share a common ancestor) fairly convincing, and have no particular reason to doubt it." He doesn't deal with "the idea of common descent" in this book.

This book is packed with detailed scientific information to demonstrate and back up the author's points; I typically found that information to be persuasive and interesting.... (I quoted 5 pages from this book in Extended Note K.)

Excerpts from the Preface, Under the Heading "A Molecular Phenomenon."

"... Shortly after 1950 science advanced to the point where it could determine the shapes and properties of a few of the molecules that make up living organisms. Slowly, painstakingly, the structures of more and more biological molecules were elucidated, and the way they work inferred from countless experiments. The cumulative results show with piercing clarity that life is based on *machines* - machines made up of molecules! Molecular machines haul cargo from one place in the cell to another along 'highways' made of other molecules, while still others act as cables, ropes, and pulleys to hold the cell in shape. Machines turn cellular switches on and off, sometimes killing the cell or causing it to grow. Solar-powered machines capture the energy of photons and store it in chemicals. Electrical machines allow current to flow through nerves. Manufacturing machines build other molecular machines, as well as themselves. Cells swim using machines, copy themselves with machinery, ingest food with machinery. In short, highly sophisticated molecular machines control every cellular process. Thus the details of life are finely calibrated, and the machinery of life enormously complex. ... [[I'll give a little information from the Wikipedia article titled "10 Micrometers" to give the approximate size of human cells. (A micrometer is one millionth of a meter; it equals .0000397 inches.) The article gives the "typical length of a human liver cell, an average sized body cell" as 50 micrometers (.0019 inches) and 10 micrometers as the "mean longest dimension of a human red blood cell" (.000397 inches). For comparison, the minimum width of a strand of human hair is 17 micrometers (.00067 inches). Another article on the internet mentions that an "average size bacterium" is about 2 micrometers long (.000079 inches) and .5 micrometers in diameter (.0000198 inches). It's amazing all the living complexity that God put in such a small space.]]

... It was once expected that the basis of life would be exceedingly simple. That expectation has been smashed. Vision, motion, and other biological functions have proven to be no less sophisticated than television cameras and automobiles. ...".

Excerpts from Pages 15-22 of Chapter 1. "... It is the astonishing complexity of subcellular organic structures that has forced the question, How could all this have evolved? (page 15) [Behe then goes on for several pages discussing the molecular details of vision, things which Darwin knew nothing about.] ... Each of the anatomical steps and structures that Darwin thought were so simple actually

involves staggeringly complicated biochemical processes that cannot be papered over with rhetoric. ... Now the black box of the cell has been opened, and the infinitesimal world that stands revealed must be explained" (page 22).

Excerpts from Chapter 2, Under the Heading "Irreducible Complexity and the Nature of Mutation."

Excerpts Toward the End of Chapter 7.

Excerpts from Chapter 9, "Intelligent Design," Under the Heading "Detection of Design."

Excerpts from Chapter 11, "Science, Philosophy, Religion," under the Heading "The Dilemma." "... The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell - to investigate life at the molecular level - is a loud, clear, piercing cry of '*design!*' The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science. ...

Why does the scientific community not greedily embrace its startling discovery? ... The dilemma is that while one side of the elephant is labeled intelligent design, the other side might be labeled God" (pages 232, 233).

Behe goes on for quite a few pages discussing some of the main reasons why so many don't want to leave room for God and His creation.

EXCERPTS FROM "DARWIN ON TRIAL" BY PHILLIP E. JOHNSON (Inter-Varsity Press, 2nd edition 1993). I purchased this book at the same time I purchased "Darwin's Black Box." I have heard quite a bit about Phillip Johnson over the past years, and I have heard a few brief interviews with him, but I hadn't read any of his books until this one. I knew that he was a professor of law who was being quite effective in pointing out very serious problems with the theory of evolution. I believe this book is quite effective. I quoted six pages from this book in Extended Note K.

I'll start by quoting what is written on the back cover of the book. "The controversial book that rocked the scientific establishment! Why? It shows that the theory of evolution is based not on fact but on faith - faith in philosophical naturalism. Phillip Johnson argues courageously that there simply is no vast body of empirical data supporting the theory. ...

With the intrigue of a mystery and the gripping detail of a court trial, Johnson takes readers through the evidence with the lawyer's skill he learned as a Berkeley professor of law specializing in the logic of arguments.

'Unquestionably the best critique of Darwinism I have ever read.' (Michael

Denton, author of 'Evolution: A Theory in Crisis') - 'Shows just how Darwinian evolution has become an idol.' (Alvin Plantinga, University of Notre Dame) - 'Calm, comprehensive, and compellingly persuasive.' (Richard John Neuhaus, editor, 'First Things')

Phillip E. Johnson is a graduate of Harvard and the University of Chicago. He was a law clerk for Chief Justice Earl Warren and has taught law for over twenty years at the University of California at Berkeley."

Johnson tells us something about where he is coming from and his purpose for this book on page 14, "I am a philosophical theist and a Christian. ... My purpose is to examine the scientific evidence on its own terms, being careful to distinguish the evidence itself from any religious or philosophical bias that might distort our interpretation of that evidence. ... The question I want to investigate is whether Darwinism is based upon a fair assessment of the scientific evidence...."

"... When the doctrines of science are taught as fact, then whatever those doctrines exclude cannot be true. By the use of labels, objection to naturalistic evolution can be dismissed without a fair hearing.

... Creation-science is not science, said the Academy [National Academy of Sciences] in its argument to the Supreme Court, because 'it fails to display the most basic characteristic of science: reliance upon naturalistic explanations. ...

The Academy...defined 'science' in such a way that advocates of supernatural creation may neither argue for their own position nor dispute the claims of the scientific establishment. ...

... ..the very persons who insist upon keeping religion and science separate are eager to use their science as a basis for pronouncements about religion. The literature of Darwinism is full of anti-theistic conclusions, such as that the universe was not designed and has no purpose, and that we humans are the product of blind natural processes that care nothing about us. What is more, these statements are not presented as personal opinions but as the logical implications of evolutionary science. ..." (pages 7-9).

Excerpts from Chapter 4, "The Fossil Problem" (pages 45-62). Johnson demonstrates that the fossil record doesn't back up what the evolutionists are saying, and gives a few quotations from some of them to prove the point.

Excerpts from Chapter 9, "The Rules of Science" (pages 113-124). "... Naturalism assumes the entire realm of nature to be a closed system of material causes and effects, which cannot be influenced by anything from 'outside.' ...science, which studies only the natural, is our only reliable path to knowledge. ...

...the positive evidence that Darwinian evolution either can produce or has produced important biological innovations is nonexistent. ..." (pages 116-120).

Excerpts from Chapter 10, "Darwinist Religion" (pages 125-134).

Excerpts from Chapter 12, "Science and Pseudoscience" (pages 147-156).

Excerpts from the Epilogue, "The Book ["Darwin on Trial"] and Its Critics."

EXCERPTS FROM "REASON IN THE BALANCE: THE CASE AGAINST NATURALISM, IN SCIENCE, LAW AND EDUCATION" BY PHILLIP E. JOHNSON (Inter-Varsity Press, 1995; I quoted two pages from this book in Extended Note K):

Excerpts from the Introduction. "... The most influential intellectuals in America and around the world are mostly *naturalists*, who assume that God exists only as an idea in the minds of religious believers. In our greatest universities, naturalism - the doctrine that nature is 'all there is' - is the virtually unquestioned assumption that underlies not only natural science but intellectual work of all kinds. ... ..rationality requires that we recognize the Creator as the imaginary being he always has been, and that we rely only on things that are real, such as ourselves and the material world of nature. Reliance on the guidance of an imaginary supernatural being is called superstition.

Naturalism in the Academy. The domination of naturalism over intellectual life is not affected by the fact that some religious believers and active churchgoers hold prestigious academic appointments. With very few exceptions, these believers maintain their respectability by tacitly accepting the naturalistic rules that define rationality in the universities. They explicitly or implicitly concede that their theism is a matter of 'faith' and agree to leave the realm of 'reason' to the agnostics. This is true in every field of study, but especially so in natural science, the discipline that has the authority to describe physical reality for all the others. A biologist may believe in God on Sundays, but he or she had better not bring that belief to the laboratory on Monday with the idea that it has any bearing on the nature and origin of living organisms. For professional purposes, atheistic and theistic biologists alike must assume that nature is all there is.

Natural science is thus based on naturalism. What a science based on naturalism tells us, not surprisingly, is that naturalism is true. Because of the authority of science, the assumption that naturalism is true dominates all the disciplines of the university. As the famous Harvard paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson straightforwardly put it, the 'meaning of evolution' - that is to say, the guiding premise of the branch of natural science that studies the history of life - is that 'man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did

not have him in mind.' ...

These are not idiosyncratic statements of personal opinion, but reflections of the orthodox understanding of evolution that is unchallenged within mainstream science. ...".

#### Naturalism in Popular Culture.

Excerpts from Chapter 3, "The Grand Metaphysical Story of Science" (pages 51-70). "... Modernism rests on the grand metaphysical story of science, and the degree to which the story has been successfully told rests largely on the Darwinian theory of evolution. For scientific naturalists the story and the theory are virtually sacrosanct..." (page 70).

#### Excerpts from Chapter 8, "Education" (pages 155-171).

EXCERPTS FROM "INTELLIGENT DESIGN: THE BRIDGE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY" BY WILLIAM A. DEMSKI (Inter-Varsity Press, 1999; I quoted six pages from this book in Extended Note K):

I had never heard of the author when I started this paper on Genesis chapters 1-3. "William A. Dembski holds a Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of Chicago and a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Illinois at Chicago. He also has earned degrees in theology and psychology. He is the recipient of two fellowships from the National Science Foundation and currently is a senior fellow of the Discovery Institute for the Renewal of Science and Culture. He has done postdoctoral work at the University of Chicago, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University and Northwestern University. Dembski has written numerous scholarly articles and is the author of the critically acclaimed 'The Design Inference' (Cambridge) as well as the editor of 'Mere Creation' (Inter-Varsity Press)."

I'll include several quotations that I took from the internet that speak of the author and/or the book. "William Dembski is perhaps the very brightest of a new generation of scholars willing to challenge the most sacred twentieth-century intellectual idol - the unproven notion that all of life can be explained in terms of natural selection and mutations." (Henry F. Schaeffer III, Graham Perdue Professor and Director, Center for Computational Quantum Chemistry, University of Georgia) - "William Dembski is the Isaac Newton of information theory, and since this is the Age of Information, that makes Dembski one of the most important thinkers of our time. His 'law of the conservation of information' represents a revolutionary breakthrough. ((I had a footnote: I'll quote a sentence from the Preface of "Intelligent Design" that deals with "the law of the conservation of information." "From this law it follows that information is not reducible to natural causes and that the origin of information is best sought in

intelligent causes" (page 18). Dembski deals with this law extensively in chapter 6, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to get into those details. I'll quote two sentences from that chapter, "Since natural causes are precisely those characterized by chance, law or a combination of the two, the broad conclusion of the last section may be restated as follows: NATURAL CAUSES ARE INCAPABLE OF GENERATING CSI [complex specified information]. I call this result the law of conservation of information, or LCI for short" (page 170). And I'll quote a sentence from the first paragraph of chapter 6, "The great myth of modern evolutionary biology is that information can be gotten on the cheap without recourse to intelligence" (page 153).) ... He convincingly diagnoses our present confusions about the relationship between science and theology and offers a promising alternative." (Rob Koons, Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of Texas) - "William Dembski is one of the main leaders of the intelligent design movement. He made it his first priority to state his thesis in the most rigorous possible form for a readership of academic philosophers and mathematicians. Having done that successfully, he now provides a popular treatment of the same issues. This is a must read for those who want to understand how we know that living organisms really are designed by a Creator." (Phillip E. Johnson, author of "Darwin on Trial") - "True science is never dogmatic. It follows the evidence of eyes and ears wherever it may lead. William Dembski argues, convincingly, that the evidence at hand, particularly in biology and biochemistry, leads inexorably to the conclusion that life could not exist without an intelligent designer. If Dembski is right - and I believe he is - then it is unscientific to deny the existence of God. ..." (Thomas G. West, professor of politics at the University of Dallas, senior fellow with the Claremont Institute, author of "Vindicating the Founders; Sex, Class, and Justice in the Origins of America").

Excerpts from the Preface. "Intelligent design is three things: a scientific research program that investigates the effects of intelligent causes; an intellectual movement that challenges Darwinism and its naturalistic legacy; and a way of understanding divine action. Intelligent design therefore intersects science and theology. ..." (page 13).

"... It was Darwin's expulsion of design from biology that made possible the triumph of naturalism in Western culture. So, too, it will be intelligent design's reinstatement of design within biology that will be the undoing of naturalism in Western culture.

*The Goal: Showing How Design Unseats Naturalism.* The guiding question throughout this book is, If naturalism is false, how could we know it? The key to overturning naturalism is design, and not just the design of the universe taken as a whole but design within the universe, and especially within biology. ... The aim of this book then is to show how detecting design within the universe, and especially against the backdrop of biology and biochemistry, unseats naturalism. ..." (page 14).

"... How is design empirically detectable? [Chapter 5] answers that question. In order to detect design two features must be present, complexity and specification. Complexity guarantees that the object in question is not so simple that it can readily be attributed to chance. Specification guarantees that the object exhibits the right sort of pattern associated with intelligent causes. A single letter of the alphabet is specified without being complex. A long sequence of random letters is complex without being specified. ... *Specified complexity* is how we detect design empirically. [Chapter 5] explains specified complexity and shows how it applies to Michael Behe's irreducibly complex biochemical systems. ..." (page 17).

Excerpts from Chapter 4, "Naturalism & Its Cure" (pages 97-121).

Excerpts from Chapter 5, "Reinstating Design Within Science" (pages 122-152). "... It's [the] worry of falsely attributing something to design...only to have it overturned later that has prevented design from entering science proper.

This worry, though perhaps justified in the past, is no longer tenable. There does in fact exist a rigorous criterion for distinguishing intelligently caused objects from unintelligently caused ones. ... The great breakthrough of the intelligent design movement has been to isolate and make precise this criterion. ..." (page 127).

Excerpts from Chapter 8, "The Act of Creation" (pages 211-236).

EXCERPTS FROM "SCIENCE AND EVIDENCE FOR DESIGN IN THE UNIVERSE BY MICHAEL J. BEHE, WILLIAM A. DEMBSKI, AND STEPHEN C. MEYER (Ignatius Press, 2nd printing 2002; I quoted three and one-half pages from this book in Extended Note K):

I quoted from the first two authors above, and much of what they say in this book is a repetition of what they said in the other books. Here I'll just quote from the Foreword and from Stephen C. Meyer, who "received his Ph.D. in the History of Philosophy and Science from the University of Cambridge for a dissertation on origin-of-life biology and the methodology of the historical sciences. He is currently Associate Professor of Philosophy at Whitworth College and the director of Discovery Institute's Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture. He has contributed to a number of books and is currently writing a book developing a scientific theory of biological design."

Excerpts from the Foreword. " ... In chapter two, philosopher of science Stephen Meyer uses Dembski's method to examine evidence from the natural world. He first examines the so-called 'fine-tuning' of the laws of physics. ... ..he argues that intelligent design best explains the origin of the fine-tuning

evidence. He then makes a similar argument about the origin of the information necessary to build a living cell. He notes that studies of the genetic molecule DNA reveal that it functions much in the same way as a computer code or written text. ... He concludes that the information content of DNA - like the information in a computer program or an ancient scroll - had an intelligent source. ..." (pages 11-13).

Excerpts from "Evidence for Design in Physics and Biology: From the Origin of the Universe to the Origin of Life" by Stephen C. Meyer (pages 53-111).

"... Beginning in the 1960s, physicists unveiled a universe apparently fine-tuned for the possibility of human life. They discovered that the existence of life in the universe depends upon a highly improbable but precise balance of physical factors. ("K. Giberson, 'The Anthropic Principle,' 'Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies' 9 (1997): 63-90, and response by Steven Yates, pp. 91-104." I have found Hugh Ross's writings on this topic to be interesting and informative; those writings include the following: "Anthropic Principle," "Facts for Faith," Q1, 2002, pages 24-31; "The Fingerprint of God," 1991, pages 119-138; and chapters 13-17 in "The Creator and the Cosmos," 1993, 1995, 2001, pages 137-212; "Why the Universe is the Way It Is," 2008.) ... Even very slight alterations in the values of many factors, such as the expansion rate of the universe, the strength of gravitational or electromagnetic attraction, or the value of Planck's constant, would render life impossible. [And there are many more such factors.] Physicists now refer to these factors as 'anthropic coincidences' [from the Greek "anthropos," which means "man"] (because they make life possible for man) and to the fortunate convergence of all these coincidences as the 'fine tuning of the universe.' [As Meyer points out, we are speaking of fine tuning of numbers like one part in 1 followed by 60 zeros for the expansion rate of the universe; or 1 followed by forty zeros for the force of gravity, for example. That is FINE TUNING!] Given the improbability of the precise ensemble of values represented by these constants, and their specificity relative to the requirements of a life-sustaining universe, many physicists have noted that the fine tuning strongly suggests design by a preexistent intelligence. As well-known British physicist Paul Davies has put it, 'the impression of design is overwhelming.'

... Is it possible that suddenly, without intending to, we have stumbled upon scientific proof for the existence of a Supreme Being? Was it God who stepped in and so providentially crafted the cosmos for our benefit?' ... Indeed, it is precisely the combination of the improbability (or complexity) of the settings and their specificity relative to the conditions required for a life-sustaining universe that seems to trigger the 'commonsense' recognition of design. ..." (pages 56-61).

[[I'll rather briefly supplement this discussion on the fine tuning required to have life.

First I'll include a few excerpts from "The Creator and the Cosmos" by Hugh Ross that deals extensively with this topic (NavPress, 1993, 1995, 2001).

I'll quote a little from chapter 14, "A 'Just Right' Universe." "If it [the strong nuclear force] were just 2% weaker or 0.3% stronger than it actually is, life would be impossible at any time and any place within the universe [I'll skip their footnote]" (page 147). "Unless the number of electrons is equivalent to the number of protons to an accuracy of one part in [1 with 37 zeros] or better, electromagnetic forces in the universe would have so overcome gravitational forces that galaxies, stars, and planets never would have formed" (page 150).

"As described in chapter 5...for the universe to produce all the stars and planets necessary to explain the possibility of Earth sustaining physical life, the value of the cosmic mass density must be fine-tuned to better than one part in [1 with 60 zeros] and the value of the space energy density to better than one part in [1 with 120 zeros]. ..." (page 151).

"If the electromagnetic force relative to gravity were increased by just one part in [1 with 40 zeros] only large stars would form. And if it were decreased by [that amount] only small stars would form. But for life to be possible in the universe, both large and small stars must exist. ... [Ross goes on to say that at that time "thirty-five characteristics" that must be fine-tuned "for life of any kind to possibly exist" and he lists them. He mentioned that this list continues to grow, which I'll demonstrate as we continue]." (pages 153-157)

Chapter 16 is titled, "Earth: The Place for Life." Under the heading "Many Fine-Tuned Characteristics," Ross says "...Earth is prepared for physical life through a variety of finely-tuned characteristics of our galaxy group, galaxy, star, planet, collider [He is speaking of the collider (about the size of Mars) that apparently struck the earth, which resulted in the moon, in a greatly improved (thinner) atmosphere on the earth, and which brought important elements to the earth, etc.], and moon. He goes on to mention that this list that is always increasing was up to a hundred different characteristics at that time (which would have been about AD 2000) and he listed 66 of them. Ross puts the listing of 66 characteristics (on pages 188-193) under the heading, "Evidence for the Fine-Tuning of the Galaxy-Sun-Earth-Moon System for Life Support."

Chapter 8 of "Why the Universe is the Way it Is" by Hugh Ross (Baker Books, 2008) is titled "Why This Particular Planet, Star, Galaxy, and Universe?" I'll quote part of what Ross says under "The Case for Fine-Tuning Grows" (pages 121-124). "...table 8.1...illustrates how...evidence has accumulated from research into the laws of physics and the gross features of the universe. [Table 8-1 is essentially the same, if not exactly the same, as the list of thirty-five characteristics referred to in the preceding paragraphs. Table 8-1 shows that the "cosmic features that must be fine-tuned for any physical life to exist" went

from 15 in 1988 to 140 in 2006.] ...table 8.2...offers the same kind of illustration based on research into the features of the Virgo supercluster, the Local Group, the Milky Way Galaxy [The Virgo supercluster contains the Local Group, which includes the Milky Way Galaxy, our galaxy.], the solar system, and Earth. [Table 8.2 is titled, "Galactic and Terrestrial Features That Must Be Fine-Tuned to Support Permanent Simple Life." In 1995 there were 41 "Fine-Tuned Features Observed, which gives the "Probability of Finding Within the Observable Universe a Life-Supportable Body with These Features" of .000(with 30 total zeros)1. By 2006 the numbers jumped to 676 (from 41) and .000(with 555 total zeros).] From 1995 to 2006, scientific evidence of the fine-tuning required for life's benefit became roughly a trillion trillion trillion trillion times stronger with each succeeding year's research. Such mounting evidence for fine-tuning shouts loudly that life must be more than a cosmic accident. The universe and its substructures must have been engineered to make physical life possible. ...

...table 8.4 augments the 2006 fine-tuning data (presented in table 8.2) by showing how the fine-tuning numbers decrease or increase depending on the complexity of the life-forms considered. Specifically, it shows the number of fine-tuned characteristics required for the support of each of three categories of life: ephemeral simple life ["briefly existing bacteria"], permanent simple life ["permanent bacteria"], and intelligent physical life capable of launching and sustaining a global high-technology civilization. [Table 8.4, "Detailed Breakdown of Evidence for Fine-Tuning (as of 2006)," shows that for "briefly existing bacteria" the "Fine-tuned Features Observed" is 501 and the "Probability of Finding a Life-Supportable Body" is .000(with 310 total zeros)1. For "Permanent bacteria" the numbers are 676 and .000(with 555 total zeros)1. And for "High-tech humans" the numbers jump to 824 and .000(with 1049 total zeros)1.]

According to the research data, an astronomical body capable of supporting human beings and equipping them to launch and sustain a global high-technology civilization demands at least 1 with 700 zeros times more fine-tuning than is necessary for support of ephemeral simple life. To put this number (1 with 700 zeros) into perspective, the total number of protons and neutrons in the observable universe amounts to 1 with 79 zeros.

Such a dramatic difference compels the conclusion that the entire universe and all it contains exists and has been exquisitely designed for the purpose of making possible a global high-tech human civilization. Such a conclusion implies enormous significance and high purposes for the human species and their civilization. The next few chapters are devoted to deciphering at least some of them."

**FURTHER EXCERPTS THAT HELP EXPLAIN DNA:** In the brief excerpts contained in this paper, I wasn't able to include any excerpts dealing with the details of DNA. I don't know about you, but I find this information to be very interesting. We are seeing the handiwork of God in His creation of the universe,

including His creation of DNA and the complex proteins and the very-much-more-complex cells that make life possible. I'll supplement what was said above regarding DNA and the proteins that are generated according to the genetic information contained in the DNA. Don't turn your mind off; you *can* understand the basics of the DNA molecule. And when you understand DNA, you are ready to understand (on a basic level) RNA, genes, and chromosomes. We'll briefly discuss each of these things as we continue. I'll skip that information from Extended Note K for this paper. I had two and one-half pages here in Extended Note K.

EXCERPTS FROM "SIGNS OF INTELLIGENCE: UNDERSTANDING INTELLIGENT DESIGN" (Edited by William A. Dembski & James M. Kushiner [Baker Book House Company, 2001]. There are fifteen essays by different authors included in this book, counting the Introduction. I'll include excerpts from three of the essays. I had five and one-half pages here in Extended Note K.):

Excerpts from Chapter 1, "The Intelligent Design Movement: Challenging the Modernist Monopoly on Science" by Phillip E. Johnson (pages 25-41).

I quoted from this author above. The bio here mentions that Phillip Johnson is "an elder in the Presbyterian Church (USA)."

I quoted one and one-half pages from what Johnson said in Extended Note K, but I won't be able to quote any of that information here. For one thing, he shows how those who are pushing evolution, which "is taught in public education and promoted in the national media" are desperate to stamp out creationism (which they [think they] know is wrong), even to use dishonest means like teaching half truths (when they try to give the impression that microevolution proves macroevolution, for example) or when they don't teach students facts that would undermine their dogma. Johnson is convinced that the truth will eventually prevail.

Excerpts from Chapter 4, "The Regeneration of Science and Culture: The Cultural Implications of Scientific Materialism Versus Intelligent Design" by John G. West Jr. (pages 60-69).

"John G. West Jr., Ph.D. (government, The Claremont Graduate School), is assistant professor of political science at Seattle Pacific University, senior fellow of the Discovery Institute, and associate director of the Discovery Institute's Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture. ...."

"To appreciate fully the cultural implications of intelligent design, one first must understand the cultural damage inflicted by scientific materialism, the paradigm it seeks to replace.

... ..materialism became enshrined as the reigning philosophy of Western culture largely due to the work of Charles Darwin. ...

Scientific materialism...had far-reaching consequences for Western society. By claiming that all human thoughts and actions are dictated by either biology or environment, scientific materialists undermined traditional theories of human freedom and responsibility. By asserting that our moral beliefs were merely the products of heredity and environment, scientific materialists laid the groundwork for moral relativism. ...

... Indeed, the extent of the impact of scientific materialism on modern culture is hard to overstate.

... Although such purebred socialism never had a wide following in America, the economic determinism underlying it helped create the modern welfare state. ...

In the criminal justice system, scientific materialism likewise undermined theories of personal responsibility. ... In the new view, accountability and punishment were replaced with a model that regarded criminals as the helpless victims of environment and heredity. ..." (pages 60-63).

West goes on to briefly discuss how scientific materialism has a powerful negative impact in medicine (e.g., abortion, "infanticide for children with disabilities, and the growing practice of assisted suicide"), "traditional beliefs about family life and marriage," "the field of education," and a few other areas. "Thus have the ideas of scientific materialism influenced virtually every area of modern culture. Ideas have consequences, and in the modern era scientific ideas have had particularly momentous consequences for society. ..." (page 65).

Excerpts from Chapter 11, "The Cambrian Explosion: The Fossil Record and Intelligent Design" by Robert F. DeHaan and John L. Wiester (pages 145-156).

"Robert F. DeHaan, Ph.D. (human development, University of Chicago), is retired; he taught developmental psychology at the University of Chicago and Hope College."

"John L. Wiester (B.A., geology, Stanford University) is chairman of the Science Education Commission of the American Scientific Affiliation, an association of Christians in the sciences, and has taught geology at Biola University for the past five years. He is author of 'The Genesis Connection' [1983] and coauthor of 'Teaching Science in a Climate of Controversy' [1989], as well as 'What's Darwin Got to Do with It?' [2000]."

I quoted more than two pages from this article in Extended Note K. I won't be

able to quote any of that information here, but the authors show that the testimony of the fossil record from the Cambrian explosion demonstrates intelligent design. I'll include some excerpts later that explain the Cambrian explosion, which is quite important.

EXCERPTS FROM AN INTERVIEW WITH PAUL CHIEN THAT DEALS WITH THE CAMBRIAN EXPLOSION (Interview of Paul Chien by Fazale Rana & Hugh Ross in an article titled "Exploding With Life!" in "Facts for Faith," 2nd quarter, 2000. "Dr. Paul Chien, chairman and professor of biology at the University of San Francisco, is not only a renowned zoologist with published papers in more than 50 journals and several international lecture tours to his credit; he is also a devout Christian bursting with spiritual vitality and with first-hand observations of the big news on biology's 'big bang,' the Cambrian Explosion. A senior fellow of the Discovery Institute...." I quoted a little less than one page from this interview in Extended Note K.

It was in 1984 that "complex animals were first found among the Cambrian creatures" by paleontologists.

I'll quote what Chien says in answer to the question "How does this discovery impact those using the evolutionary paradigm?" "It presents them quite a problem. When we look at these early Cambrian fossils, we can conclude that roughly all the living phyla we see today were represented then.

In fact, there were a dozen more phyla on earth then than there are now. They seem to have gone extinct just after the beginning. So if you look at the origin of animals, in terms of phyla, or in terms of different body plans, they were all there very near the beginning, all together. We see no evidence of a slow, gradual kind of evolution.

This is a significant point about the Cambrian explosion that isn't often talked about: We see these different body plans, or different animal phyla, coming out first, before a diversity of species comes out. In other words, the development happens from the top down instead of from the bottom up.

[Then, in answer to the follow up question, "So, are you saying that the Cambrian explosion shows evolution 'going the wrong way?' " Chien responded:] "Yes. ... CREATION IS GOING ON [my emphasis]."

I'll quote part of Chien's answer to the question "How rapidly did this Cambrian burst of life occur?" "The western literature states the duration of the explosion as 5 to 10 million years - but the latest figure given by Chinese scientists...is 2 to 3 million." And later in the article he points out that "When people talk about how fast the explosion went, prominent figures in the field say, 'A few million years is many generations.' But in terms of the kinds of changes we see, a few

million years is nothing."

Lastly, I'll quote part of what Chien says in answer to the question "How can Christians use the Cambrian explosion to defend their faith - even to share the gospel?" "I've found that explaining how the Cambrian explosion supports the biblical doctrine of creation is quite effective, especially among Chinese scholars - the very Chinese who were educated in Taoism and atheism.

The two major evidences they had for their views were the steady state theory of the universe and the Darwinian theory, and now both supports are broken. When you explain that to them it really makes them think."

EXCERPTS FROM "THE CAMBRIAN EXPLOSION: BIOLOGY'S BIG BANG" BY STEPHEN C. MEYER, P. A. NELSON, AND PAUL CHIEN (I downloaded this article from the Internet; I found it under "Cambrian Explosion." The article was posted by the Discovery Institute, with headquarters in Seattle, Washington, [www.discovery.org/article Files/PDFs/Cambrian.pdf](http://www.discovery.org/article%20Files/PDFs/Cambrian.pdf). The article is fifty pages long and contains many points and details that I won't be able to get into here. Also, because of the technical nature of this paper, I won't include most of the footnotes. I quoted eight pages from this article in Extended Note K. There is no way that I can begin to cover all of the important information contained on these eight pages in these brief excerpts.):

I'll quote part of "I. Introduction: Design Without a Designer?" (pages 1, 2). "In this paper we test the claims of neo-Darwinism, and another fully naturalistic version of evolutionary theory known as 'punctuated equilibrium.' ((I had a footnote: I'll include a few sentences from the brief article under "Gould, Stephen Jay" from the CD of the 2002 Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. He was a "U.S. paleontologist and evolutionary biologist," who "joined the faculty of Harvard University in 1967." "With Niles Eldredge (born 1943), he developed the controversial theory of punctuated equilibrium (1972), a revision of Darwinism that proposed that the evolutionary creation of new species occurs in rapid bursts over periods as short as thousands of years, which are followed by long periods of stability.")) We will do so by comparing the empirical expectations of these two theories about the history of life against the data of 'the Cambrian explosion'.... We shall show that the Cambrian fossil record contradicts the empirical expectations of both these theories in several significant respects. ... [They go on to say that the evidence fits design]."

I'll quote part of "II. The Cambrian Explosion" (pages 2-6). "The term Cambrian Explosion describes the geologically sudden appearance of multi-cellular animals in the fossil record during the Cambrian period of geologic time. By the close of this event, as many as forty-one separate phyla first made their appearance on earth. Phyla constitute the highest biological categories or taxa in the animal kingdom, with each phylum exhibiting a unique architecture,

blueprint or structural body plan. ...

... Geologically speaking, 5 million years represents an extremely small fraction of the Earth's history. ... Yet almost all the major innovations in the basic architecture of living forms occurred abruptly within just such a small fraction of the earth's history during the Cambrian. ...

... ..in almost all cases, the body plans and structures present in Cambrian period animals have no clear morphological antecedents in earlier strata. ...

... Cambrian rocks display at least two-thirds of the basic body plans or architectural designs of the animal kingdom. ..." (pages 2, 3).

"... The major body plans that arise in the Cambrian period exhibit considerable morphological isolation from one another (or 'disparity') and then subsequent 'stasis.' ...

...the sudden emergence of the various animals of the Cambrian explosion represents a dramatic discontinuous or 'quantum' increase in the information content (or specified complexity) of the biological world. ... ..beginning about 570 million years ago, the first multi-cellular animals arrived on the scene.... Forty million years later, the Cambrian explosion occurred. [Where did all that quantum increase in information content come from? By the way, I don't know enough to accept or reject these dates (scientists, including Christian scientists, can be wrong) but I am sure that the earth is not 6,000 or 10,000 years old.] ..." (pages 4, 5).

I'll quote a small part of what the authors say under "III. Testing the Neo-Darwinian and Punctualist Mechanisms" (pages 6-15). "...the data of the Cambrian explosion actually contradict the empirical expectations of neo-Darwinism at nearly every point. ...

III.D. Summary Assessment (pages 14-15) ...

These problems underscore a more significant theoretical difficulty for evolutionary theory generally, namely, the insufficiency of attempts to extrapolate micro-evolutionary mechanisms to explain macro-evolutionary development. ...

[In the next section of this paper the authors deal with objections to their position (pages 15-24). I won't quote any of that material.]

V. Evidence of Design? (pages 24-43)

V.A. The 'Quantum' Increase in Specified Biological Information. (pages 25-38)

V.B. The Persistence of Morphological Isolation or Disparity (Stasis). (pages 39-40)

V. C. An Inverted Cone of Diversity: Disparity Preceding Diversity. (pages 40-42)

V. D. Sudden Appearance and Absence of Ancestral Precursors. (pages 42-43)

This is the end of the excerpts from Extended Note K in the original 273 page paper on Genesis chapters 1-3. (We are still in the Introduction of this paper on Genesis 1:1-2:3.)

My primary goal for this paper was/is to present an accurate, relevant, verse-by-verse explanation of Genesis chapters 1-3. I also wanted to address in as constructive a way as possible the young-earth controversy that has become so divisive in segments of the body of Christ; many are saying (even insisting) that Christians are unfaithful to God and the Bible if they don't agree with the young-earth date for the universe and the earth. We desperately need the truth, the balanced truth in every area, including the interpretation of Genesis chapters 1-3. WE HAVE NO NEED TO FEAR THE TRUTH! IT WILL STAND! All real truth, including scientific truth, is God's truth!

I'll close this Introduction with the following excerpts from G. H. Pember:

EXCERPTS FROM G. H. PEMBER IN EXTENDED NOTE C THAT DEAL WITH EZEKIEL CHAPTER 28 AND WHERE DEMONS COME FROM ("Earth's Earliest Ages" [1975 Kregel reprint, originally published in 1876]; Pember taught the gap view of creation):

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 for the ruin of the new creation. Hence the Eden of this passage [Ezek. 28:13] must have been of a far earlier date. ... (page 50).

" ... 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 [before he became Satan/the devil], as the great governing head and the viceroy of the Almighty [at least Satan had a high-level position under God], assisted by glorious beings of his own nature [angels], 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 [I had a footnote: Revelation 12:4 with 12:7-9 indicates that a third of God's angels followed Satan in his rebellion.], and so descended to those who were in the flesh [who became the demons]. [[I had a footnote: 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).]] ...

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. [At least we know that a third of God's angels followed the devil in his rebellion against God.] ... 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). ...

... ..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 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).

May God's will be fully accomplished through this paper and His people be edified! In Jesus' name! (This is the end of the Introduction for this paper on Gen. 1:1-2:3.)

## GENESIS CHAPTER 1

**"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.** [[I'll quote a few verses from the New Testament that deal with God's work of creating in the beginning and make a few comments. JOHN 1:1-3: "In the beginning [before any creating had taken place] was the Word [the "Logos" (Greek); the Son of God; He is an uncreated Being; if He had been created, He wouldn't be deity (God) with the Father and the Spirit], and the Word was with God [The "Logos" "was with" God the Father], and the Word was God [These last words of John 1:1 confirm, along with many other verses in the Bible, that God the Son is deity with God the Father]. (2) He was in the beginning with God. (3) All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being." The "all things [that] came into being through Him" clearly includes all the other beings in the universe, whether cherubim, seraphim, archangels, angels, men, demons, etc. COLOSSIANS 1:16 confirms this last point, "For by Him [God the Son] all things were created, *both* in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities - all things have been created by Him and for Him." Included with the "all things [that] were created [by Him]" is physical matter. God created all things *out of nothing*: HEBREWS 11:3 says, "By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible." We can understand these things "by faith" because God has revealed them to us in His Word.

The most common interpretation for these words of Gen. 1:1 among Christians has always been that they speak of God's original creation of all things, including matter, out of nothing in the absolute beginning of His work of creating.

Excerpts from Bruce K. Waltke, from the Chapter Titled "Prologue (1:1-2:3)" ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001]. Waltke wrote the book "with Cathi J. Fredricks.")

Commenting on the words "In the beginning" (Gen. 1:1), Waltke (who, for one thing, is a Hebrew scholar) says, "'Beginning' refers to the entire created event, the six days of creation, not something before the six days (In a footnote Waltke says, "This is a relative beginning. As verse 2 seems to indicate, there is a pre-Genesis time and space.") 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" (page 58). (In a footnote Waltke mentions that those who hold that view believe 1:2 shows the earth in a state before God has completed his work of creation, and he mentions that Martin Luther and John Calvin taught that view.)

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" (page 58). (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."

((I had a three-paragraph footnote: The Hebrew verb behind "created" here in Gen. 1:1 (and in Gen. 1:21, 27; 2:3, 4; 5:1, 2; Ezek. 28:12, 15; and often) is "bara." This verb doesn't require us to think of creation out of nothing (as you often hear it said). It is frequently used for the creation of man (e.g., Gen. 1:27; 5:1, 2; Deut. 4:32; and Psalm 89:47), and Gen. 2:7 shows that God formed man (referring to his physical body) "of dust from the ground" that already existed. The verb is used in Psalm 51:10, where David asked God to "create" in him a clean heart. The verb is used in Isa. 45:7 of God's creating "calamity," speaking of His work of judging. Furthermore, there is nothing about the word "beginning" in Gen. 1:1 that requires us to think of the *absolute* beginning. The *beginning* in view must be discerned from the context (cf., e.g., Isa. 41:26; Jer. 17:12).

I'll quote part of what David Atkinson says regarding God's creative work and "bara" ("Message of Genesis 1-11" [Inter-Varsity Press, 1990], pages 21, 22). "It is important to see that what God creates is something distinct from himself. This chapter has no place for *pantheism* - the idea that 'God' is another name for 'everything.' It is true that God indwells the world, and the world has its being 'in God,' but God remains God, and in transcendent distinction from what he has made.

It is important also to notice that elsewhere in the Bible, the word *bara* is used in the context of salvation. The unique word for God's creative activity is much more commonly used of his liberating and saving actions in history. [In a footnote he says, "cf. Isa. 43:1ff." The Hebrew verb *bara* is used in Isa. 43:1, 7, and 15; it is used in those verses of His *creative* work of redeeming, saving, and ultimately glorifying His people, the people of true Israel.] The God who makes things is the God who also makes things new. [Atkinson has a footnote, "Isa. 43:19."] The God who we see in Genesis 1 is the Creator of all, we learn from a broader biblical picture is also the redeemer, sustainer, re-creator, and the one who brings all things to completion. God's creative activity in history is not only the preservation of what he has made; it is a continuous, creative engagement with his world, leading it forward to its future glory. [He has a footnote, "Cf., e.g., Rom. 8:18-22; Eph. 1:10; Rev. 21:4; Matt. 19:28."] Atkinson believes, by the way, that Gen. 1:1 speaks of God's creating everything out of nothing. (This is the end of the footnote.) ) Many commentators of our day disagree with this interpretation (that Gen. 1:1 speaks of God creating all things out of nothing), but I suppose it still is the most common view among Christians. This is the viewpoint of those who hold the "gap view" of Gen. 1:1, 2. (I very briefly discussed the "gap view" in the Introduction of this paper. The gap view is discussed in some detail in Extended Note A of the Appendix of the original 273 page paper on Genesis chapters 1-3.)

I'LL INCLUDE SOME EXCERPTS FROM "EXTENDED NOTE A," "EXCERPTS DEALING WITH THE GAP VIEW OF CREATION" (The Gap View is quite important):

EXCERPTS FROM JAMES MONTGOMERY BOICE'S EXPOSITIONAL COMMENTARY ON GENESIS ("Genesis," Vol. 1 (Baker, 1998; originally published in 1982 by Zondervan):

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 quoted from Arthur Custance in Extended Note A, but I won't include any excerpts from him in this paper. As I mentioned, you can get a copy of my original paper.] ... It was in Scotland [at the 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.

Chalmers wrote in the early 1800s, but his views thrived around the turn of the century as they were picked up by the various writers of early fundamentalism. ... [Boice mentioned and quoted from G. H. Pember, "Earth's Earliest Ages" (1976); Arthur W. Pink, "...Gleanings in Genesis" (1922); and Harry Rimmer, "Modern Science and the Genesis Record" (1941).] ...

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..." (pages 57, 58).

EXCERPTS FROM DONALD GREY BARNHOUSE (Boice mentioned Barnhouse too), "The Invisible War" (Zondervan, 1965):

"Probably one of the commonest errors in Biblical interpretation is the thought that the first verse of Genesis and the second verse are closely connected in time. ... (pages 9, 10).

"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. [Barnhouse went on to speak of the fact that the chaos, etc. (of Gen. 1:2) resulted from God's judgment of Satan's rebellion.] ...

[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...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 is 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"). (This is the end of the excerpts from Extended Note A.)

I have always agreed with what the gap view teaches regarding verse 2, but I never was fully satisfied with that view's interpretation of verse 1, especially the transition from verse 1 to verse 2. When I was first confronted (some ten to fifteen years ago; now some twenty to twenty-five years ago) with the viewpoint that Gen. 1:1 does not refer to God's original creation of all things out of nothing in the *absolute* beginning of creation, but to His creation of our present world (you could call it a recreation), starting with the earth in the desolate state pictured in verse 2, it sounded quite plausible - now I'm quite convinced that is the correct viewpoint. For some excerpts and discussion dealing with this viewpoint, see Extended Note B in the Appendix of this paper, "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." That Extended Note deals for the most part with the interpretation of Gen. 1:1, 2.

I'LL INCLUDE SEVERAL EXCERPTS FROM "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" - I believe this is the correct viewpoint):

EXCERPTS FROM WHAT ALLEN P. ROSS SAYS REGARDING GENESIS 1:1, 2 in the "Bible Knowledge Commentary - Old Testament" (Victor Books, 1985):

"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 that God created 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. [Ross refers to "Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament," which I'll quote from next.] 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).

EXCERPTS FROM WHAT MERRILL UNGER (Just Mentioned by Ross) SAYS UNDER GENESIS 1:1, 2 ("Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament," Vol. 1 [Moody Bible Institute, 1981]):

"...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 a little 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 re-creation, days of the divine "revelation" of re-creation to man, or days of extended geologic ages. I believe the second view is the correct view: God chose to give us this account of His re-creation of the earth using a twenty-four hour day format that would be familiar to us, including a day of rest, etc. after six days of work. Ross mentions these three but favors the first view. Many of the Christian scholars who hold the "title view" of Gen. 1:1 do not believe that God created the world in six literal twenty-four hour days. (The "title view" holds that Gen. 1:1 functions as a "title" for the creation account of Genesis chapter 1.)

#### EXCERPTS FROM "CREATION AND BLESSING: A GUIDE TO THE STUDY AND EXPOSITION OF GENESIS" BY ALLEN P. ROSS (Baker Books, 1996, 1998):

"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' ([Hebrew "tohu wabohu," where "wa" means "and"), 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.] ...

...according to the second circumstantial clause [of Gen. 1:2], 'darkness' ([Hebrew] '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. [Light goes with divine order and the blessings of God; darkness goes with sin and God's judgment of sin.] ...

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]. ..."

Since darkness yet remained, God divided it from the light. From the beginning God's people would thus learn that God makes divisions ([Hebrew] "badal"). In Israel's law the Lord would make divisions between the holy and the profane (Lev. 10:10; 11:47).... The division of light from darkness in creation thus displays the will of God as a foretaste of the law' (page 108).

EXCERPTS FROM KENNETH A. MATTHEWS ("Genesis 1-11:26" [Broadman & Holman, 2001], pages 140-143):

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. ((Matthews had a footnote: "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.)) ...

... [In other words, Gen. 1:1 speaks in summary form of God's work of creation spelled out in Gen. 1:3-2:3.] Verse 2 describes the earth in a negative state, a chaos of elements, which is opposed to creation (cf. Isa. 34:11; Jer. 4:23 [verses that speak of the conditions after God judges, and it is significant that both verses use "tohu" and "bohu," as does Gen. 1:2]).... ... Also, '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.] ...."

EXCERPTS FROM JOHN H. WALTON ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001]):

Walton lists two evidences that support the viewpoint that Gen. 1:1 introduces and summarizes the activity of the seven days: "(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 "toledoth" [[In Gen. 2:4 this plural Hebrew noun was translated "the generations" by the KJV; "the history" by the NKJV, and in the margin it says, "literally genealogy"; and "the account" by the NASB and NIV]] statement introduces a section.... (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).

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" (page 70).

(Now we are ready to go on to Gen. 1:2.)] **(2) The earth was formless and void** [[(This double bracket goes on for two long paragraphs.) The Hebrew noun behind "formless" is "tohu," and behind "void" is "bohu." From my point of view, rightly discerning the intended meaning (God's intended meaning) for these two Hebrew nouns is crucial for the correct interpretation of this verse and the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3. I believe that verse 2 pictures the desolate state of the earth after God judged a rebellion led by Satan. The judgment took place before Gen. 1:1. The margin of the NASB has, "or, a waste and emptiness." The NIV has, "without form and empty"; the *Amplified Bible* has, "without form and an empty waste." The BDB Hebrew Lexicon gives "formlessness, confusion, unreality, emptiness" as the meaning of "tohu." BDB translates "tohu" as "chaos" for Isa. 24:10: "*city of chaos* (of ruined city)"; quite a few translations have "city of chaos." (I had a footnote: Isaiah chapter 24 prophesies regarding God's end-time judgment of the world. Apparently "chaos" is what is left of the city after God's judgment. Isaiah chapter 24 is discussed in a verse-by-verse manner in my paper on selected passages from the book of Isaiah on my internet site.)

"Bohu" is only used two other places in the Old Testament; in both verses it is combined with "tohu," as it is here in Gen. 1:2: Isa. 34:11 ((I had a footnote: Isaiah chapter 34 prophesies regarding God's end-time judgment of "Edom," with Edom being a symbol for the world. God's end-time judgment of the world is a very common theme in the book of Isaiah (see my paper on selected eschatological passages from the book of Isaiah on my internet site). I'll quote Isa. 34:11, "But pelican and hedgehog will possess it ["It" refers to Edom after being judged by God], And owl and raven will dwell in it; And He

will stretch over it the line of desolation [The Hebrew behind "desolation is "tohu." The NIV translates "chaos" here.] And the plumb line of emptiness [The Hebrew behind "emptiness" is "bohu." The NIV translates "desolation" here.)) and Jer. 4:23. ((I had a footnote: Jeremiah 4:23 is in a context dealing with God's intense judgment of Judah through the Babylonians. It prophesied of the devastation that would result from this judgment in very intense terms, "I looked on the earth, and behold, *it was formless and void* [The Hebrew behind "formless" and "void" is "tohu" and "bohu." In the margin the NASB has a cross-reference to Gen. 1:2, and it offers another translation, "a waste and emptiness." The last words of Gen. 1:2 could be translated, "and behold, chaos and emptiness.]; And to the heavens, and they had no light [Compare the *darkness* mentioned in Gen. 1:2.]. It seems clear that Jer. 4:23 builds on Gen. 1:2.)) Both of these verses (Isa. 34:11; Jer. 4:23) use this combination of Hebrew nouns to speak of the chaos and emptiness that result from God's judgments, which confirms that this is a reasonable way to understand the meaning here in Gen. 1:2. And there are quite a few other substantial reasons to favor this interpretation for "tohu" and "bohu" here in Gen. 1:2, as discussed throughout this study of Genesis chapter 1 (including the Extended Notes), very much including the discussion of the rest of this verse and of verse 3 regarding the meaning of "darkness" and "light" and the discussion regarding the "separation" of the "light" (which was pronounced "good" in Gen. 1:4) from the "darkness.["], **and darkness** [[The "darkness" here is strongly contrasted with the "light" spoken of in verses 3-5; for one thing, darkness is the absence of light. We are undoubtedly supposed to think of literal physical darkness and light in these verses, but I believe the emphasis here (as it very often is for these words throughout the Bible) is on light and darkness as symbols (or we could say light and darkness in a spiritual sense). I suggest you read the 12 page study on the meaning of these words in Extended Note D in the Appendix of the original 273 page paper, "The Symbolic Use of the Words 'Light,' 'Darkness,' 'Night,' and 'Day' in the Bible."]]

I'LL SUMMARIZE THE RESULTS OF EXTENDED NOTE D AND QUOTE QUITE A FEW OF THE MANY VERSES I QUOTED THERE, WITH SOME COMMENTS. (It is quite important to understand the symbolic/spiritual use of these words, especially the words LIGHT and DARKNESS.):

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'll start with the word LIGHT, but some of the verses I'll quote under LIGHT also include the word DARKNESS, and a few of them include the words NIGHT and DAY in a symbolic/spiritual sense. 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.

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.

Psalms 27:1. "The LORD is my LIGHT and my salvation...."

Psalms 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."

Psalms 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, especially spiritual life (cf., e.g., John 1:4, "In Him was life, and the life was the LIGHT of men").

Psalms 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."

Psalms 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 sin and the absence of the truth.

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 [Hebrew verb] when it rises And the moon will not shed its LIGHT." This verse (with 13:6-13) 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 symbolic/spiritual component.

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 that results from the judgment of God). I had a footnote: 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 when He judges), and His people are continuously exhorted to choose that which is right and good. It is true, of course, that God's judgments work for *good* if they help motivate people to repent.

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 [Hebrew "tohu" and "bohu," as in Gen. 1:2]; And to the heavens, and they had no LIGHT." 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 [with a strong symbolic/spiritual component], Because I have spoken, I have purposed, And I will not change My mind, nor will I turn from it.' "

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 here, "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. The LIGHT of God and the LIFE of God go together.

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 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. (I had a footnote: 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. A translation like "release from sins with the guilt and the penalties [including the major penalties of spiritual death and bondage to sin]" would be better.)

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 moral laws (through His enabling grace, by faith).

Colossians 1:12, 13. "giving thanks to the Father, who has qualified us [enabled us, made us fit] 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." They are also discussed in my recently published e-book, "Righteousness, Holiness, and Victory Over Sin." (Both books are available at amazon.com.)

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." (I had a footnote: 1 John 1:5-2:6 are discussed on pages 200-208 of my book "Holiness and Victory Over Sin" and in my recently published e-book, "Righteousness, 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 (as it frequently is) - it makes us holy; it enables us to dwell in the light.

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 [IN THE DAY] (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 IN THE DAYTIME could be translated IN THE DAY or BY DAY. The Greek noun used here ("hemera") is typically translated day(s). (I had a footnote: This Greek noun is translated "day" 207 times and "days" 148 times by the NASB; it is translated "daytime" twice.) The word "daytime/day" is used in a symbolic sense here in Rev. 21:25, but, as I mentioned, 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 [there will be no darkness there], 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 a symbolic sense in this verse, but this was a convenient place to include this verse.

#### 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. 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.

Psalms 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.

Psalms 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 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.

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.

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."

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 people but against the kingdom of DARKNESS, which is headed up by Satan.

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. 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 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.' " (I had a footnote: These verses and the verse listed next (Isa. 26:9) are discussed in my paper on selected eschatological passages from the book of Isaiah on my internet site.)

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, without the LIGHT of God.

#### 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. 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. I included a few uses of a symbolic use of the word DAY above (under the words LIGHT and 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.

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."

This completes the excerpts from Extended Note D that deal with the very important symbolic/spiritual use of the words LIGHT, DARKNESS, NIGHT, AND DAY. Now we will continue the discussion under Gen. 1:2, under the word "darkness":

Seeing the strong symbolic/spiritual component of the light and darkness of Gen. 1:2-5 (cf. Gen. 1:14, 18) is very important to the proper interpretation of Gen. 1:1-2:3. God is light and the ultimate source of light (spiritual light and physical light). Taking light in the full biblical sense, it includes life (very much including spiritual life), truth, righteousness, holiness, divine order, and the blessings that accompany dwelling in the light, including peace and health. Darkness is associated with sin, death (spiritual death and physical death), Satan and his kingdom, chaos, and the judgments and curses that come from God because of sin. Here in Gen. 1:2, "darkness" apparently includes the symbolic/spiritual ideas of the absence of God's life, of His divine order, and of His blessings that had resulted from a very intense judgment against sin, along with the lack of physical (natural) light. Physical (natural) light ultimately comes from God too. ((I had a four-paragraph footnote: With the typical worldview of our day, we (even many/most Christians) tend to think of the sun rising, sending its rays upon the earth, and setting according to natural, scientific law, and that God has little or nothing to do with it. But the worldview of the ancient world was different. Ancient Israel didn't take the rays from the sun for granted. (Neither did the other peoples who lived in the ancient world.) For them, physical, natural light (and the rain, etc.) came from God, as did the much-more-important spiritual light: God created the sun; He keeps it shining and giving off light and energy; He keeps it rotating around the earth on a daily basis; etc.

I'll quote part of what John H. Walton says under the subheading "The entire creation - nature - history continuum is totally dependent on God" ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001]). "There was nothing that Israelites would have referred to as natural laws. ...nothing in the earthly realm happened independently of the heavenly realm.

Our modern 'dilemma' of trying to discern what happens naturally and what is a result of God's intervention would seem to ancient Israelites, at best, ludicrous and, at worst, heretical. ...

... In most of the ancient world [the pagan world] the admixture of what we call natural and supernatural was achieved by infusing nature with the divine. Consequently, the gods were seen to be inherent in nature, manifested in the elements and, at least in the early periods, of one and the same essence with them. ..." (pages 50, 51). Walton went on to say that the God who revealed Himself in the Bible (very much including in Genesis 1:1-2:3) was separate from (He was not part of) what He had created (including matter and the forces of nature). (This is the end of the four-paragraph footnote.) )

The fact that the sun hasn't been created yet in the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 helps confirm that the LIGHT and DARKNESS of Gen. 1:2-5 have a strong symbolic component. God Himself probably is the source of the light of Gen. 1:3, even as He is the source of the light of new Jerusalem (Rev. 21:23; 22:5).

Genesis 1:3 says, "Then God said, 'Let there be light'; and there was light." (We are still in the discussion under the word "darkness" of Gen. 1:2) Genesis 1:4 goes on to say that "God separated the light from the darkness [or, distinguished between the light and the darkness]." Physical "light" and "darkness" are undoubtedly included in the light and darkness mentioned in 1:4 (cf. Gen. 1:14, 18), but the symbolic/spiritual component of that light and darkness is far more important than the physical component. Another confirmation of this fact is that Gen. 1:4 says, "God saw that the light was good," whereas this creation account doesn't say that the darkness is good. I don't believe there would have been any problem saying that physical darkness is good, but since there is some emphasis on symbolic/spiritual darkness here, there was no way it could be said that the darkness is good.

There is some emphasis in Gen. 1:2-19 on God's creative work of SEPARATING (and DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN) things that must be separated, and kept separate, as we'll see. The fact that LIGHT must be separated, and kept separate, from DARKNESS for God's people is a dominant message of the Bible, as demonstrated in Extended Note E, "A Study of the Hebrew Verb 'Badal,' To Separate, To Divide, To Distinguish Between, To Set Apart." I'll give some excerpts from Extended Note E as we continue.

Other uses in the Old Testament for the Hebrew verb "badal," the verb that was translated "separated" in 1:4 (and is also used in Gen. 1:6, 7, 14, and 18), confirm that this SEPARATION is a very important issue. Separating (distinguishing between) the

light from the darkness includes keeping the things of God (very much including His people) holy and separate from sin and all the things associated with sin and Satan and his kingdom of darkness.

For man to fail to keep separate from the darkness, was for man to fail to keep separate from evil. God warned man that he must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL. Before Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit of that tree, through the devil's deceiving temptations and in rebellion against God and His Word, they knew only GOOD. After they ate of the forbidden fruit, they began to know evil too. They came to know evil by doing evil (sinning) and by experiencing the evil consequences/penalties that come with sin. The first major penalty for sin was death (Gen. 2:17). Spiritual death came immediately; the physical death process was set in motion. To say the same thing with different words, Adam and Eve failed to keep separate from the darkness, and they began to know/experience the darkness.

The Hebrew verb "badal" was used 41 times in the Old Testament. In Extended Note E, I list and quote essentially every one of the other 36 uses of this verb that are not found in Genesis chapter 1. Extended Note E is very important for this study, and that study is interesting and important in its own right. For one thing, SEPARATION is closely associated with the biblical concept of HOLINESS (being set apart/separated from everything depraved, corrupt, unclean, and sinful for God and the things of God), and holiness is certainly one of the most important concepts in the Bible.

It is quite significant that the most common use of "badal" in those verses (some 21 of the 36 uses) is of the separating, dividing, distinguishing between that which is righteous, holy, and/or clean and that which is sinful, defiled, and/or unclean. Furthermore, in essentially every one of the other uses of "badal" in the Old Testament (beyond the 21 uses just mentioned), this verb is used of setting apart people (especially the priests and Levites) or places for God. "Badal" was apparently never used in the Old Testament - and that includes the 5 uses in Genesis chapter 1 - for the separating of things that are indifferent.

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 in Extended Note E 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, distinguishing between, or setting apart is not found.

SOME EXCERPTS FROM EXTENDED NOTE E (of the original 273 page paper), "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, NKJV, and for some other versions. You don't have to know Hebrew (or Greek) to do such a study, but it 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, which shows that this Hebrew verb was used 41 times in the Old Testament. (I had a footnote: 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.)

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 (but not in these excerpts) I'll quote 34 of the 36 uses of the Hebrew verb "badal," excluding 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. (I had a footnote: 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. As I mentioned above, I won't quote Lev. 1:17; 5:8 which don't fit the typical pattern for badal.)

The first set of verses that are quoted (21 verses) is the most 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. This shows 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, "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 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.

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."

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."

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 "Ie" 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. 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."

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."

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."

"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."

I'll quote two paragraphs from what Benedikt Otzen says in the article on "badal" in the "Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament" (Vol. 2 [Eerdmans, 1975], pages 1, 2). "The verb *bdl* [badal] 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 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 (Cook Communication Ministries, 1998, pages 24, 25.)

"*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. GOD'S PEOPLE ARE TO 'WALK IN THE LIGHT' (1 John 1:5-10), FOR WHAT COMMUNION HAS LIGHT WITH DARKNESS?' [my emphasis] (2 Cor. 6:14-16; Eph. 5:1-14)."

This completes the excerpts from Extended Note E, "A Study of the Hebrew Verb 'Badal,' to Separate, to Divide, to Distinguish Between, to Set Apart."

#### A DISCUSSION REGARDING SYMBOLIC/SPIRITUAL LANGUAGE IN THE BIBLE:

If we want to understand the Scriptures, it is extremely important for us to rightly discern symbolic/spiritual language, and it isn't always easy, as the divisions in the body of Christ regarding the interpretation of many passages of Scripture (including Genesis chapters 1-3 and the book of Revelation) demonstrate. Some miss the balance by not recognizing language that is symbolic. Some have the idea that if it is possible to take a passage literally, then it should be understood that way. I don't believe that rule is adequate. Our goal must be to interpret each passage the way intended by the author/Author. (I had a footnote: One reason that I added the word "Author," referring to God, is that there are many passages in the Bible that contain revelation, sometimes

total revelation, where the human "author" was just passing on what God gave him to pass on. In such cases the author had no input as to whether to use symbolic language, or not.)

I'll quote a few sentences from C. John Collins that deal with this issue ("How Old Is the Earth?" "Presbyterion" 20/2 [1994], page 112). "The first principle of Bible interpretation is, 'take the text on its own terms': that is, we adjust ourselves to the author's perspective, and try to discern what questions they were answering, and what understanding and conventions they shared with their addressees. We may not assume that they are necessarily answering our questions or following our conventions." In a footnote Collins says, "Surely stating the principle this way is far superior to the misleading 'take it literally unless context requires otherwise,' which seems to be the popular way of describing the grammatical-historical hermeneutic. We may not pre-judge what literary types and forms God 'must' use in order to communicate with us; and even in straight prose we make room for idioms, hyperbole, round numbers, anthropomorphisms, statement of a general principle without stopping to discuss nuances and exceptions, and other rhetorical devices. 'The first qualification for judging any piece of workmanship from a corkscrew to a cathedral is to know *what* it is - what it was intended to do and how it is meant to be used' (C. S. Lewis, 'Preface to Paradise Lost,' 1); as for judging, so also for interpreting."

Some miss the all-important balanced truth in the other direction; they find symbolic language where it was not intended by the author/Author. A prime example (from my point of view), a very important example, is the interpretation of Revelation chapter 20. Instead of seeing a literal millennium on the earth at the end of this age, they take the language as symbolic. I don't believe they have an adequate basis for taking that chapter as symbolic; their interpretations are very strained. Such interpreters typically find very few literal prophecies in the Bible dealing with what will come to pass at the end of this age; they mostly find only what they are looking for: general truths and principles that apply to this entire age.

I acknowledge that at first reading the fact that the darkness and light spoken of in Gen. 1:2-5 have a strong symbolic component may not necessarily jump out at you. ((You could at least make sense of the passage thinking only of physical darkness and light. [I had a footnote: It's very easy for most interpreters to think only of literal darkness and light because they (wrongly) approach Genesis chapter 1 expecting and looking for God's revelation of physical/natural scientific details regarding His creation of the universe. Throughout this paper I try to show that that approach is defective. For one thing, I don't believe God chose to reveal hardly any scientific details in Genesis chapter 1. For a start see what I said on this topic in the Introduction of this paper.])) The more you get into the details of Gen. 1:1-2:3, however, and the more you incorporate what you learn as you continue with Genesis and the rest of the Bible, the more the strong symbolic component of the darkness and light spoken of in Gen. 1:2-5 begins to assert itself. Many passages in the Bible were written in a way that they could not be understood, or fully understood, without the light contained in other parts of the Bible. Sometimes God's people had to wait for subsequent revelation to understand, or fully

understand, what was written. Furthermore, we are very dependent on the ministry of the Holy Spirit to understand God's Word.

As we continue with Genesis chapters 1-3, we find (I believe) some heavy-duty symbolic language. The three prime examples are the two very special trees in the middle of the garden (the "tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL," which can also be called "the tree of death," and the "tree of life") and the "serpent" (a symbol for Satan, not a literal serpent that the devil spoke through). Many have pointed out that the first three chapters of the Bible have much in common with the last two chapters of the Bible, Revelation chapters 21, 22.

[[I had a four paragraph footnote: In some ways Revelation 21, 22 picture a return to the garden of Eden before the fall (cf., e.g., the "tree(s) of life" [Rev. 22:2]), but Revelation chapters 21, 22 go very far beyond the state/glory pictured in Genesis chapters 1-3. For example, Adam, even before the fall, had a body created of the elements of this world and designed for life in this world; in the eternal state our bodies will be glorified (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 15:45-53). The glory of the garden of Eden can hardly be compared with the exceeding glory of the eternal state pictured in Revelation chapters 21, 22.

I'll quote a large part of what J. Sidlow Baxter says in a subsection titled "Genesis and the Apocalypse [the book of Revelation]" when discussing the book of Genesis ("Explore the Book" [Zondervan, 1966], pages 25-27). "It is important to recognize the relationship between Genesis and the last book of Scripture. There is a correspondence between them which at once suggests itself as being both a *proof* and a *product* of the fact that the Bible is a *completed* revelation. There is no adequate understanding of either of them [Genesis or the book of Revelation] without the other; but taken together they are mutually complete. ... In broad outline and majestic language Genesis answers the question: 'How did all begin?' ... Revelation answers the question: 'How will all issue [end]?' All that lies between them is development from the one to the other. ...

Mark the *contrasts* between the one book and the other. In Genesis we see the first paradise *closed* (3:23); in Revelation we see the new paradise *opened* (21:25). In Genesis we see *dispossession* through human sin (3:24); in Revelation we see *repossession* through Divine grace (21:24). In Genesis we see the 'curse' imposed (3:17); in Revelation we see the 'curse' removed (22:3). In Genesis we see access to the tree of life disinherited, in Adam (3:24); in Revelation we see access to the tree of life *reinhaerited*, in Christ (22:14). In Genesis we see the beginning of sorrow and death (3:16-19) [We see the beginning of sorrow and death *for man*, not the ultimate beginning of sorrow and death. Baxter, who holds the gap view of Genesis chapter 1, would agree with this detail.] ... In Genesis we see the evil triumph of the Serpent (3:13); in Revelation we see the ultimate triumph of the Lamb (20:10; 22:3). ...

... In Genesis we have the *sentence* passed on Satan; in the Apocalypse we have the sentence *executed*. In Genesis we are given the *first promise* of a coming Saviour and salvation; in the Apocalypse we see that promise in its final and glorious *fulfilment*. Genesis causes *anticipation*; the Apocalypse effects *realization*. Genesis is the

*foundation* stone of the Bible; the Apocalypse is the *capstone*. (This is the end of the four-paragraph footnote.))]] Those chapters from the book of Revelation, which are discussed in a verse-by-verse manner in some detail in my paper on Revelation chapter 20-22 on my internet site, are full of symbolic language, including (but not at all limited to) the symbolic numbers for the dimensions of new Jerusalem and the wall of that city; the "river of the water of life, clear as crystal" flowing from the throne of God the Father and God the Son (the "river of the water of life" surely serves as a symbol for the Spirit of life); and the "tree[s] of life" along the banks of this "river," which is the equivalent of the "tree of life" spoken of in Gen. 2:9; 3:22, 24 and in other verses; to partake of the fruit of that tree is to partake of spiritual/eternal life.

It is very important for the reader to understand that when I say Genesis chapters 1-3 and Revelation chapters 21, 22 contain quite a bit of symbolic/spiritual language I am not at all saying that these passages speak of things that are not real. (Actually, the entire book of Revelation is packed with symbolic language, but probably not to the extent of the last two chapters of that book.)

[[I had a two-paragraph footnote: One passage that especially impresses me in the book of Revelation is Revelation chapter 12, but I am extremely impressed with the entire book of Revelation. (Revelation chapter 12 is discussed in some detail in my book, "The Mid-Week Rapture" and my recently published e-book, "Introduction to the Mid-Week Rapture." Both books are available at amazon.com. The entire book of Revelation is discussed verse-by-verse in those books, or in papers that are available on my internet site.) Once we understand the symbolic language of those verses (other passages in the Bible explain and confirm what many/most of the symbols mean), we can see that those verses say more about salvation, sin, the devil and his angels, the history of the people of God, the timing (mid-week) of the resurrection, rapture, and glorification of the people of God, and the conversion of the end-time remnant of Israel (with a three and one-half year period of trials for this remnant, accompanied with great blessings) than could possibly be communicated as effectively with the same number of words without using symbolic language. Symbolic/spiritual language can communicate in effective, powerful ways, as it does, for example, throughout Revelation chapter 12. For one thing, as they say, a picture can sometimes communicate more than a thousand words.

I'll give a very obvious example of symbolic language from the book of Revelation. "And I saw...a Lamb standing, as if slain [The Lamb is, of course, the Lord Jesus Christ who was slain to overthrow sin and Satan and to save us. When John sees Him, He is no longer dead; He has been raised from the dead victorious over all the enemies of God; He is in heaven on the throne of God, with God the Father.] having seven horns [The number seven symbolizes perfection. John's seeing the Lamb with seven horns symbolizes that the Lamb has perfect/complete dominion and power to reign and subdue every enemy.] and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent out into all the earth [The seven eyes symbolize the Lamb's ability to see what is happening everywhere in the universe in every dimension by the Holy Spirit, who is referred to in a symbolic way here as "the seven Spirits of God" (cf., e.g., Rev. 1:4; 3:1; 4:5)]. There's

no way we can understand the seven horns and seven eyes in a literal sense (or the fact that the Son of God became the *Lamb* of God.) (This is the end of the two-paragraph footnote.))]] Genesis chapters 1-3 and Revelation chapters 21, 22 certainly deal with things that are real. The creation was real; the life of God (which was symbolized by the river of the water of life and the tree(s) of life), and the absence of God's life (spiritual death) are real; sin and Satan are real; Adam and Eve were real; the garden of Eden was real; God's plan of salvation (cf. Gen. 3:15) was/is real; etc.; and the new heaven and new earth with its new Jerusalem will be real. By using symbolic language these chapters are able to say more, in more powerful ways, and with fewer words than if no symbolic language had been used. When it comes to describing the new heaven and new earth of Revelation chapters 21, 22, symbolic language is especially helpful. The new earth with its new Jerusalem will be in a different dimension than the one we live in now; it will be in the heavenly, glorified dimension, a dimension that, for one thing, is beyond the physical elements of the present, temporary, physical world.

One last comment here, I certainly am not attacking Christians who don't see a symbolic component for the words *darkness* and *light* in Gen. 1:2-5. I must say, however, that I don't believe we can adequately understand the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 if we don't see this strong symbolic component. I'll be saying a lot more as we continue that will help substantiate what I have already said regarding the interpretation of Gen. 1:1-2:3. (Now I'll quote the rest of Gen. 1:2, the part that comes after the word "darkness," which we have been discussing, along with the word "light," in some detail.))]] **was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving** [I prefer "hovering" (cf. Deut. 32:11).] **over the surface of the waters.** [[The "deep" here speaks of the "waters" that were covering the earth when God began His work of creation (recreation) spoken of in Gen. 1:1-2:3. At that time, according to this account, the "deep" was extra deep, covering everything on the earth (cf., e.g., Gen. 1:9), as it would again at the time of Noah's flood. A major aspect of God's work for the second day of creation (Gen. 1:6-8) was to remove the large amounts of excess water from the earth. Genesis 1:7 says, "God made the expanse [firmament], and separated the waters which were below the expanse [firmament] from the waters which were above the expanse [firmament]." First He made the firmament; then He removed the large amounts of excess water from the earth and put them "above the firmament." He couldn't remove the large amounts of excess water and put them above the firmament until He had made the firmament.

The account of Noah's flood (Genesis chapters 6-8) yields important information that helps us understand the picture here in Gen. 1:2-8. Before Noah's flood, large amounts of water were stored above the firmament. At the time of the flood, "the floodgates of the sky [or, "the windows of the heavens"] were opened" (Gen. 7:11). It began to rain, and the water rose on the earth until it was fifteen cubits (some twenty-two and one-half feet) above the tops of the mountains (Gen. 7:20). Finally "the floodgates of the sky were closed" (Gen. 8:2). Genesis 7:11 informs us that the same day the floodgates of the sky were opened, "all the fountains of the great deep burst open"; Gen. 8:2 mentions the closing of the fountains of the deep along with closing the floodgates of the sky.

It seems significant that the same Hebrew verb ("badal") that we discussed above (including the excerpts from Extended Note E), the verb that was used for God's SEPARATING the LIGHT from the DARKNESS (or, DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN the LIGHT and the DARKNESS) in Gen. 1:4, is also used for His SEPARATING the WATERS from the WATERS: "Then God said, 'Let there be an expanse [firmament] in the midst of the waters, and LET IT SEPARATE the waters from the waters.' (7) God made the expanse [firmament], and SEPARATED the waters which were below the expanse [firmament] from the waters which were above the expanse [firmament]." The separating off of these large amounts of excess water was a *good* and necessary step in preparing (recreating) the earth for man. This wasn't a mere *separating* of mundane things that were indifferent. Apparently we are supposed to understand that the excess water on the earth pictured in Gen. 1:2 had come as part of God's judgment of the earlier Satanic rebellion that we spoke of above. (I don't mean to suggest that Gen. 1:2, by itself, indicated where the chaotic, dead, dark, empty state pictured in that verse came from.)

The "Spirit of God was moving ["hovering"] over the surface of the waters." The Spirit of God was on the scene ready and waiting for God's creative Word to be spoken. With His infinite wisdom, energy, and power, the Spirit of God will bring to pass what is spoken. "In the Old Testament the Spirit is a term for God's outgoing energy, creative and sustaining (cf. Job 33:4; Psalm 104:30)" (Derek Kidner, "Genesis" (Inter-Varsity Press, 1967), page 45).

#### BRIEF DISCUSSION REGARDING THE MORE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THESE VERSES:

I'll quote a few sentences from Gordon J. Wenham ("Genesis 1-15" (1987 by Word, Inc., now published by Thomas Nelson) to introduce this discussion. Wenham favors the more traditional view. On page 11 he lists four possible ways to understand Gen. 1:1 with 1:2, 3. The first two ways both start the translation of 1:1 with the words, "In the beginning WHEN God created...." Regarding the third way, which I believe is the correct way, Wenham says, "Verse 1 is a main clause, summarizing all the events described in vv 2-31. It is a title to the chapter as a whole...." And regarding the fourth way, he says, "Verse 1 is a main clause describing the first act of creation [[In other words, God began to create, at the absolute beginning of creation. Bruce Waltke (see the excerpt from from him near the beginning of the discussion of Gen. 1:1 in this paper) commented that the verb for create doesn't fit the idea of begin to create. I believe he is right.]]. ... Theologically these [four] different translations [based on the four ways to understand Gen. 1:1-3] are of great consequence, for apart from #4, the translations all presuppose the existence of chaotic preexistent matter before the work of creation [or, recreation] began." Wenham then goes on for two pages discussing these four viewpoints. I'll just quote half a sentence from what he says, "The traditional interpretation supposes that God first created chaos and then ordered it..." (page 13).

Before making a few comments, I'll quote a few sentences from what Wenham says under Gen. 1:2 a few pages later. First I'll give his translation for the first part of Gen. 1:2, "Now the earth was total chaos, and darkness covered the deep. ... This **FRIGHTENING** [my emphasis] disorganization is the antithesis to the order that characterized the work of creation when it was complete. Here and in Isa 34:11 and Jer 4:23 'tohu' is coupled with 'bohu' 'void' where, as the context shows, the **DREADFULNESS OF THE SITUATION** [my emphasis] before the divine word brought order out of **CHAOS** [my emphasis] is underlined. [Significantly, as I have pointed out, Isa. 34:11 and Jer. 4:23 both use "tohu" and "bohu" to speak of the chaos and emptiness that come as a result of God's judgments.]

The same point is made in another powerful image in the next clause, 'darkness covered the deep.' 'Choshek' [a Hebrew noun] 'darkness' is another evocative word in Hebrew. **IF LIGHT SYMBOLIZES GOD, DARKNESS EVOKES EVERYTHING THAT IS ANTI-GOD: THE WICKED (Prov 2:13), JUDGMENT (Exod 10:21), DEATH (Ps 88:13). SALVATION IS DESCRIBED AS BRINGING LIGHT TO THOSE IN DARKNESS** [my emphasis] (Isa 9:1, etc.). ... " (pages 15, 16).

My comments in this paragraph are not aimed at Wenham, but at what seems to me to be a rather overwhelming problem for those holding the more traditional view of Gen. 1:1-3 (Wenham's view #4, which he embraces). Is it really all that obvious and reasonable to think that God, in His first step/phase of creation, would create such a frightening, dreadful, chaotic mess. I'm trying to ask a serious question, not to insult anyone. Are we really supposed to think that God initially said something like, "Let matter be created in a totally chaotic form, with total darkness (which, as Wenham says, symbolizes "everything that is anti-God."), and let there be far-too-much water, a destructive amount of water, on the earth, with literally everything on the earth being covered by it."

I believe the view that Gen. 1:2 describes the state of the earth after God judged an earlier rebellion is far more reasonable and far more satisfying than the more traditional view, and significantly, the more traditional view regarding God's creation of Gen. 1:1-2:3 fails to account for the fall of Satan and the judgment that fell on him and his followers. (The more traditional view assumes that the cherubim, angels, etc. were created in Gen. 1:1; you have to strain to see their creation in that verse.) I believe, in agreement with many, that they were created, fell, and were judged *before* Gen. 1:1. The fall and judgment of Satan and his followers are extremely important for the book of Genesis (very much including chapters 1-3) and for the unfolding story of the Bible. God's angelic court is mentioned in Genesis chapter 1 (verse 26), and Satan plays a major role in Genesis chapter 3 as a subtle, determined, already fallen enemy of God and of man. ((I had a footnote: Many details about Satan and his highly organized worldwide kingdom that extends into the heavenly places are not revealed until we get to the New Testament, but we learn quite a bit about this enemy of God and of man in the Old Testament. In Genesis chapter 6, we read of the extremely sinful exploits of some of the angels; undoubtedly they were part of the angels that followed Satan in his initial rebellion against God (cf. Rev. 12:4, 7-9; 2 Pet. 2:4; and JUDE 1:6, 7). (It is clear

that the fall of Satan took place before he tempted Eve in Genesis chapter 3. As I mentioned, I believe he fell and that he and his followers were judged before Gen. 1:1 and that that judgment left the earth in the desolate, chaotic state pictured in Gen. 1:2.) Satan is mentioned, using the name "Satan," in 1 Chron. 21:1; quite a few times in Job chapters 1, 2; and in Zech. 3:1, 2. In Dan. 10:13, 20 we learn of the powerful princes of Persia and Greece who are arrayed against God and His people. Undoubtedly they were evil angels under Satan. In Lev. 17:7; Deut. 32:17; and Psalm 106:37, we read of *demons*. In 1 Sam. 16:15, 16, 23; and 18:10, we read of *evil spirits*. In Leviticus chapter 16, which deals with the all-important sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, we learn of "Azazel," who represents Satan, or an evil angel under him. (On "Azazel" see pages 17, 18 of my book, "Holiness and Victory Over Sin.") )

The fact that Gen. 1:28 speaks of the need for man to subdue/conquer the earth serves as a strong confirmation of the reality of the existence of Satan and his kingdom of darkness that must be subdued by man. ((I had a footnote: I'm not suggesting that Adam and Eve knew all about Satan and his kingdom of evil before their fall, or that they knew that God would use man to subdue and overthrow that kingdom. God's revelation is progressive, but they certainly knew enough to avoid rebelling against God and being subdued by sin and Satan through eating of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge of good AND EVIL (the tree of death).)) Satan and his kingdom of darkness were not part of the creation of Gen. 1:1-2:3, which was all good, and they had no authority over man, not until man joined the devil in his rebellion against God, but their existence was/is very real and they must be subdued by man; eventually they will be totally subdued and removed by God's judgment through the Lord Jesus Christ and His people (Gen. 3:15).

If we interpret Gen. 1:2 as I believe we should, God is revealing some very important information, the kind of information that we must have to understand our world, sin, and salvation. It is typical for the Bible that God is very much more interested in teaching us about things that pertain to sin and salvation from sin (things that we couldn't know apart from His revelation) than in teaching us about far-less-important things like scientific details.

We learn a quite a bit about God's angels, and we learn a lot about Satan and his highly organized kingdom of fallen angels and demons in the Bible (especially in the New Testament), but Gen. 1:2 (with some confirmation from Ezek. 28:12-15) is unique in giving us insight into the fact that Satan apparently had a kingdom on the earth that was destroyed by God in judgment after the rebellion led by Satan. This viewpoint is the only one I know of that offers a good explanation for where the demons (who definitely exist on the earth in extremely large numbers) came from. We have discussed these things already in this paper (See the excerpts from G. H. Pember that deal with Ezekiel chapter 28 and where demons come from at the end of the Introduction for this paper), and I'll say quite a bit more as we continue with Gen. 1:1-2:3 that will help confirm what I have said already. Now we are ready to go on to Gen. 1:3.] **(3) Then God said, 'Let there be light'; and there was light.** [[This is the first creative act of God mentioned in Genesis chapter 1. Many commentators make this point. As we discussed above,

physical light was included, but the emphasis seems to fall on the symbolic/spiritual component of light here. In verse 4 we are informed that the light was good, but this is not said of the darkness, and we are informed that the light must be kept separate from the darkness (we must distinguish between the light and the darkness). These facts serve as a strong confirmation of the symbolic/spiritual use of the words light and darkness in these verses.

Furthermore, the fact that, in this creation account, the light comes forth before the sun is created serves as a strong confirmation that the light has a strong symbolic/spiritual component. The light of Gen. 1:3-5 doesn't come from the sun (since it hasn't been created yet). I assume that God Himself is the source of this light. ((We have discussed this point already. Commenting on the word "light" of Gen. 1:3, Bruce K. Waltke ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001]) says, "Light symbolizes life and blessings of various sorts (cf. Ps. 19:1-6; 27:1; 49:20 [19]; 97:11). Since the sun is only later introduced...the text emphasizes that God is the *ultimate* source of light ..." (page 61).)) God certainly isn't dependent on the sun for light; the last two chapters of the Bible show that the light of the new heavens and new earth with its new Jerusalem will emanate from God the Father and the Lamb of God: "And the city has no need of the sun or of the moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God has illumined it, and its lamp is the Lamb" (Rev. 21:23). "And there will no longer be *any* night; and they 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 [true Israel, which includes all true Christians] will reign forever and ever" (Rev. 22:5). These two verses from the book of Revelation (along with the other verses that are discussed in Extended Note D; I included extensive excerpts from Extended Note D earlier in this paper) help confirm the symbolic/spiritual component of the words "light" and "darkness" (and the words "day" and "night") here in Genesis chapter 1. (Now Gen. 1:4.)) **(4) God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness.** [[See under Gen. 1:2, 3. As Extended Note E shows (I included quite a few excerpts from Extended Note E earlier in this paper), these last words could also be translated, "and God MADE A DISTINCTION between the light and the darkness." The Hebrew preposition "bayin" that means "between" is used before the Hebrew words translated "the light" and "the darkness." ((I had a footnote: The other verses in the Old Testament that use "bayin" with "badal" are significant cross-references for understanding the use of these words here in Genesis chapter 1 ("badal" and "bayin" are also used in Gen. 1:6, 7, 14, and 18). Those other verses, which are quoted and briefly discussed in Extended Note E, are Lev. 10:10; 11:47; 20:25; Isa. 59:2; Ezek. 22:26; and 42:20.)) The twenty-one uses of the Hebrew verb "badal" (which means to separate, divide, distinguish between, set apart) that are quoted in the first section of Extended Note E are especially relevant to the use of the Hebrew verb here in Gen. 1:4 (and in Gen. 1:6, 7, 14, and 18). The verses quoted in that first section demonstrate that the most common use for this Hebrew verb is to separate things that must be separated and kept separate (the holy from the unholy, the clean from the unclean).

Essentially every other use of this Hebrew verb in the Old Testament (it was used thirty-six times apart from the five uses found here in Genesis chapter 1, for a total of forty-one) fits into a similar category where people or places are set apart in some special

way for God; many of those remaining verses deal with the setting apart of the priests and Levites. "Badal" is not used of a mundane separating of indifferent things in any of the other thirty-six uses of this verb in the Old Testament. The usage and meaning of *badal* in the Old Testament serves as a strong confirmation of the strong symbolic/spiritual component of the words *light* and *darkness* here in Genesis chapter 1, and all the more so since all five of the uses of the verb here in Genesis chapter 1 are accompanied by the preposition *bayin*.] **(5) God called the light day, and the darkness He called night.** [[Based on what I said above (and in Extended Notes A-E), I believe there is a strong symbolic/spiritual component for the words "light," "day," "darkness," and "night" here, along with the literal component for these words.] **And there was evening and there was morning, one day.** [[Let's discuss the meaning of the word "day" for the seven days of the creation week of Genesis 1:1-2:3. (God didn't create on the seventh day.) In agreement with many (but probably not the majority), I don't believe these are literal twenty-four hour days, but this point isn't a big deal to me (it doesn't affect what I say in this paper hardly at all). ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: I don't have much insight as to how much time passed from the time God began His recreation of the earth (starting with His "Let there be light" on the first day of creation; the first day begins with the light that God called forth in Gen. 1:3) to the time He finished this recreation (at the end of the sixth day). If it was a very short time it would be easier to understand Gen. 1:29, 30. Anyway, I'm not at all sure that it was a short time. As I discuss in some detail in this paper, I don't believe God has chosen to reveal hardly any scientific details in Genesis chapter 1, including the amount of time that God used here.

Many commentators who believe that the days of creation week were literal twenty-four hour days do *not* believe that the universe and earth are young. There are several ways to see long periods of time before God said "Let there be light" on the first day of creation. As we have discussed, I believe there was a gap before Gen. 1:1. Also, as we have discussed, there are many who agree with the young-earth creationists that creation began at Gen. 1:1 and that the days were twenty-four hours, but they see a gap between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2 (see the Introduction of this paper.)) I agree with the commentators (and there are many) who understand the seven days to be an artificial literary framework used by the author/Author. See 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." For one thing, the number seven frequently serves as a symbol for perfection and completeness in the Bible, and significantly, the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 provided the scriptural foundation for Israel's seven-day week, with six days of work followed by a day of rest.

The seven-day format of Gen. 1:1-2:3 was apparently designed so that Moses' readers could identify with and imitate God's pattern. ((I had a footnote: I assume the format came from God. If it didn't, He at least put His stamp of approval on Moses' use of the format. The account of the six days of creation followed by a day of rest and the fact that Israel had a seven-day week with the seventh day set aside for rest and worship both originated with God. Under Gen. 2:3 I'll include some excerpts which show that the seventh day sabbath was unknown in the ancient world and that there is a good

possibility that the seven-day week originated with Israel (by God's revelation) too.)) Significantly, Gen. 2:3 informs us that "God blessed the seventh day AND SANCTIFIED IT [He "made it holy" (NIV)], because in it He rested from all His work which [He] created and made."

#### SOME KEY REASONS FOR NOT SEEING LITERAL TWENTY-FOUR HOUR DAYS IN THIS PASSAGE:

1. It is very significant that the sun (and the moon and stars) were not created, according to this account of creation, until the fourth day. ((I had a two-paragraph footnote: I realize that some commentators argue that the sun, moon, and stars were actually created before the fourth day and that all this passage says is that they first *became visible* on the earth on the fourth day. I don't believe there's any chance that this is what was intended by the author/Author. It seems clear to me that in the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 the Hebrew verb "asah," which is used of the creation of the sun and moon (and stars) in Gen. 1:16, is often used interchangeably with the verb "bara" (the verb used for creation in 1:1, 21, 27; and 2:3).

The interchangeability of the two verbs in this creation account is demonstrated by the usage of these two verbs throughout this account: Gen. 1:16 says, "God made ["asah"] the two great lights" (He created them) after saying in 1:14, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens." Gen. 1:17 goes on to say, "God placed them in the expanse [firmament] of the heavens." The "expanse [firmament]" was created/made (*asah*) on the second day (1:7). The verb *asah* is used for creation in Gen. 1:7, 16, 25, 26 (Gen. 1:26 says, "Let us make [*asah*] man"; Gen. 1:27 continues, "God created ["bara"] man"), 31 ("God saw all that He had made [*asah*]"); 2:2 ("By the seventh day God completed His work which He had done [*asah*], and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done [*asah*]"), 2:3 ("Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created [*bara*] and made [*asah*])." Also, compare the use of *bara* in Gen. 1:1 with the use of *asah* in Ex. 20:11 ("For in six days the LORD MADE the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and made it holy."); and in Neh. 9:6.)) Our twenty-four hour day-and-night cycle depends on the sun. Genesis 1:14 even says of the sun, moon, and stars, "Let them be for signs and for seasons and FOR DAYS, and years. I certainly don't believe we are supposed to think of God's having provided an alternative before He created the sun (as I mentioned, I assume that God Himself was the source of this light) to cause a twenty-four hour light and darkness cycle for the first three days of creation.

2. Based on what I said under number 1 regarding the non-literal (non twenty-four hour) nature of the first three days of the creation week, it doesn't seem reasonable to expect that the fourth through the seventh day would be literal twenty-four-hour days. As I mentioned, I agree with those who understand the seven days to be an artificial literary structure designed by the Author/author.

3. The fact that there is a strong symbolic component for the words "darkness" and "light" and that the symbolic component is much more important than the physical component of these words in Gen. 1:2-5 lends rather strong support to the concept that the seven days of the creation week are to be understood in non-literal fashion.

4. It is very significant, as many have pointed out, that the seventh day in which God rested (Gen. 2:1-3) still continues - the seventh day wasn't, therefore, a twenty-four hour day. ((I had a footnote: Genesis 1:1-2:3 show that God finished His work of creation before the seventh day began. To say that His day of rest (which started when His work of creating was finished) will last forever must be qualified: At the end of this age, He will CREATE the "new heaven and new earth" (Rev. 21:1). Furthermore, His CREATIVE work of saving and judging continues throughout this age.)) Genesis 2:1-3 don't mention that the seventh day ended, and the formula "And there was evening and there was morning, the seventh day" which was there for the other six days, was not included for the seventh day. Hebrews 4:1-10 (especially 4:3, 10) confirm that God entered His rest (not that He is resting/inactive in every sense; far from it). I'll quote Heb. 4:3, "For we who have believed [The writer of Hebrews is speaking of born-again Christians] enter that rest [[In agreement with many, I believe we should translate "ARE ENTERING that rest," or the equivalent. The writer of Hebrews isn't speaking here of Christians entering God's rest by casting our cares upon Him and walking in His grace by faith, as important as that type of rest is. He is speaking of our entering the eternal, heavenly rest of God AFTER we have faithfully finished our work, at the end of our race. We will then enter God's rest (which is spoken of throughout Heb. 4:1-11), the rest that God entered when He finished His work.]], just as He said, 'AS I SWORE IN MY WRATH, THEY SHALL NOT ENTER MY REST' [The writer of Hebrews quoted Psalm 95:11 to demonstrate that, although some fail through unbelief and rebellion to enter God's rest, that rest *is* available for those who will enter on God's terms.], although His works were finished from the foundation of the world [and He entered His rest at that time]."

5. As many have pointed out, when we read all that took place on the sixth day in Genesis chapters 1 and 2, it provides another strong reason for understanding the days in a non-literal sense.

I'll quote a long paragraph from Wayne Grudem that rather effectively deals with this point ("Systematic Theology" [Zondervan, 1994], page 294). Grudem, by the way, doesn't come to a final conclusion regarding the length of the days of Genesis chapter 1. "An additional argument for a long period of time in these 'days' is the fact that the sixth day includes so many events that it must have been longer than twenty-four hours. The sixth day of creation (Gen. 1:24-31) includes the creation of animals and the creation of man and woman both ('male and female he created them,' Gen. 1:27). It was also on the sixth day that God blessed Adam and Eve and said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth' (Gen. 1:28). But that means that the sixth day included God's creation of Adam, God's putting Adam in the Garden of Eden to till it and keep it, and giving Adam directions regarding the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:15-17), his bringing all the animals to

man for them to be named (Gen. 2:18-20), finding no helper fit for Adam (Gen. 2:20), and then causing a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and creating Eve from his rib (Gen. 2:21-25). The finite nature of man and the incredibly large number of animals created by God would by itself seem to require that a much longer period of time than part of one day would be needed to include so many events - at least that would be an 'ordinary' understanding of the passage for an original reader, a consideration that is not unimportant in a debate that often emphasizes what an ordinary reading of the text by the original readers would lead them to conclude. [[Those who insist that God created everything in six twenty-four hour days are the ones who often speak of what an 'ordinary' reading of the text by the original readers would conclude. Grudem has a footnote. "Advocates of a twenty-four-hour day can give scenarios whereby Adam only named representative types of animals or named them rapidly without any observation of their activities or abilities, but both suggestions are much less likely interpretations in view of the importance attached to naming in the Old Testament.]] If the sixth day is shown by contextual considerations to be considerably longer than an ordinary twenty-four-hour day, then does not the context itself favor the sense of 'day' as simply a 'period of time' of unspecified length?" (Now we'll continue with reason 5.)

To see all that took place on the sixth day, read Gen. 1:24-31; 2:7-25. God could, of course, have accomplished everything mentioned there in twenty-four literal hours (or in less time if He chose to), even though Adam was directly involved with much of the activity mentioned in Gen. 2:7-25. I don't get the impression, however, that God was in a hurry or felt a need to do something miraculous to squeeze all that is mentioned as happening on the sixth day into a twenty-four hour period. Anyway, based on what has already been said under numbers 1-4, I wouldn't be expecting a literal twenty-four hour day for any of the days, very much including the sixth day.

6. And, lastly, as many have pointed out, the fact that the word "day" is used in Gen. 2:4 to cover all the creation that took place throughout the six *days* of Genesis chapter 1 lends rather strong support for the idea that the word *day* isn't being used in a literal twenty-four hour sense in the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3.

(We are still under Gen. 1:5.) Let's discuss the meaning of the words, "And there was evening, and there was morning, one day." (As I mentioned, the words "And there was evening, and there was morning" are used at the end of each of the first six days, but not for the seventh.) I'll quote what Bruce K. Waltke says here ("Genesis," pages 61, 62). "One might translate this, 'Evening came, and then morning....' The idea, as expressed by the Hebrew, is that the first day ends when the darkness of the evening is expelled by the morning light." With the morning light, the second day begins, just as the first day began when God created light with His words, "Let there be light."

Many think the first day ends when the light of the first day ends. One reason for that view is the idea that for Israel the day ends and a new day begins when the sun goes down. (I'll deal with that issue in the next paragraph.) Another reason many opt for that view is the widespread (but I believe mistaken) idea that the six days of creation include

what happens in Gen. 1:1, 2. The first day could then be said to begin with the darkness mentioned in Gen. 1:2; I'm confident, however, that the six days of creation begin when God says, "Let there be light." As we discussed, Gen. 1:1 serves as a title or summary for God's week of creation; furthermore, as we have discussed, the darkness pictured in Gen. 1:2 wasn't part of God's work of creation (that chaotic, dead, darkness was the reason a new creation/recreation was needed); the darkness (with some emphasis on the symbolic/spiritual component of the darkness) was already there when He began His work of creation (recreation) spelled out in Genesis chapter 1.

I'll quote a part of what Ronald B. Allen says in the article on "ereb," the Hebrew noun translated "evening," in the "Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament," Vol. 2 (Moody Bible Institute, 1980, page 694.) "The phrase 'there was an evening and there was a morning' occurs six times in the creation narrative (Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31), delimiting the six days of divine creative activity. This phrase would indicate that in ancient Israel a day began with sunrise. Some have felt this at variance with the Jewish practice of regarding sunset as the beginning of the next day. Cassuto [a highly respected Jewish scholar], after dealing with the biblical data and the Jewish custom, concludes that there was 'only one system of COMPUTING time: the day is considered to begin in the morning; but in regard to the festivals and appointed times, the Torah ordains that they shall be observed also on the night of the PRECEDING DAY' (U. Cassuto, "Genesis," Vol. I, p. 29 [Cassuto's emphasis]). ...."

#### EXCERPTS FROM 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" (Inter-Varsity Press, 1984, pages 49, 50):

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 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...." Blocher mentions that Augustine, M. J. Lagrange, A. Noordtjij, N. H. Ridderbos, B. Ramm, M. G. Kline, and J. A. Thompson hold to a literary interpretation.

Excerpts from Victor P. Hamilton, "Genesis Chapters 1-17" (Eerdmans, 1990, pages 54-56):

"[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. (Hamilton has a footnote: "See G. Hasel, 'The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology,' 'EvQ' 46, 1974, 78-80.") ...

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 project" by adding twenty-four hours for each day.]... ((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 as we continue.)) 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 Kenneth A. Matthews, "Genesis 1-11:26" (Broadman & Holman, 2001):

Matthews opts for non-literal days. For one thing, it is difficult to think of twenty-four hour days before the sun is created, and the seventh day is different in that its ending is not mentioned (see his page 149).

"... As a whole [Gen.] 1:1-2:3 shows a proclivity to groups of sevens, which would further suggest that 1:1-2:3 is an inclusive section. ((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])).

The arrangement of the passage consists of an introduction and seven paragraphs. [Matthews goes on to mention the introduction (verses 1, 2); six days of creation

(verses 3-31) and the seventh day (2:1-3).] The presentation of each creation day follows a predictable order: (1) 'God said,' (2) command given, (3) the fact of creation, (4) God's evaluation, (5) the boundaries of the created element, and (6) the naming. This pattern is not slavish; there is variation, but this does not distract from the impression of the general pattern, namely, that the creation is shaped by a supreme Overseer" (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.' (Matthews has a footnote: "See Cassuto, 'Genesis,' [pages] 12-15.") [[I'll include an interesting excerpt 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 [five 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 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.... (m) The words in the seventh paragraph total thirty-five.... To suppose all this is a mere coincidence is not possible." (This completes the excerpt from Cassuto, now back to Matthews.)] ... This numerical repetition speaks to 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" (Second edition, Baker, 1991):

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

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" ("Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation," edited by David G. Hagopian [Crux Press, 2001]):

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 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. ((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."))

...the framework interpretation [The authors are speaking for themselves, not for every person who holds some form of the framework interpretation.] maintains the historicity of Genesis, which contains the presuppositional foundations for the subsequent unfolding of progressive revelation. Because of our firm commitment to the historicity of Genesis, the framework interpretation militantly resists all attempts to relegate the creation to the status of myth or saga or any category other than that of a history of events that actually transpired in space and time. In other words, by interpreting the days of creation in a nonliteral manner, we do not in any way, deny their historicity. 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" (210-220).

"Clearly, this structuring of the creation narrative according to a seven-day scheme is an intentional literary device" (page 227).

Excerpts from Charles E. Hummel, "Interpreting Genesis One" ("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].):

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

"Preoccupation with *how long* it took God to create the world, in days or epochs, deflects attention from the main point of Genesis 1. Such 'scientific' concerns run interpretation onto a siding, away from the main track of God's revelation. 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). If your God is the One who created everything that exists, He is the One true God,

and He is well able to overpower all opposition and to bring His people to full and final salvation, in accordance with His covenant promises. Of course His people must do the things required of them (from the heart by God's enabling grace), as they are spelled out in His covenant(s).

Excerpts Showing the Views of Philo and Clement of Alexandria Regarding the "Days" of Creation (I'm taking these quotations and comments from "Creation and Time" by Hugh Ross [NavPress, 1994], pages 16-18):

"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.' ("Philo, Judaeus of Alexandria, 'De Opificio Mundi' (On the Account of Creation Given by Moses), [in] 'Philo,' vol. I, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (...Harvard University Press, 1949), page 13.")

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' ("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 AD150-254) [a Christian scholar] echoed Philo's belief that the Genesis creation days were not literal, twenty-four-hour days ("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.")). 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' ("Clement of Alexandria, page 513")." (Now that we have completed the six pages of excerpts from 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," we are ready to go on to Gen. 1:6.))] **(6) Then God said, 'Let there be an expanse [firmament] in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.'** [[The Hebrew could be translated, "Let it separate ["badal"] between ["bayin"] the waters and ["le"] the waters." ((I had a footnote: Sometimes the Hebrew uses the preposition "bayin" followed by the preposition "le" instead of using "bayin" twice. For examples of this usage, see Lev. 20:25; Ezek. 22:26; and 42:20 in Extended Note E.)) The fact that the Hebrew verb *badal*, which was used in verse 4 (for separating, or distinguishing between, the light from the darkness), was used here, and in the following verse, and even more so since "bayin" and "le" were used too (*bayin* and *bayin* are used with *badal* in the following verse), strongly suggests that we should expect an important reason for separating these two waters, and for keeping them separate. Above (under Gen. 1:2, under the words "was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving [hovering] over the surface of the waters"), I discussed the need to separate these two waters from one another. This wasn't a mundane separating of waters from waters. This was the separating off of the large quantity of excess waters, with which God had (apparently) flooded the earth in an earlier judgment, as part of His creative work that would prepare the earth for man.

The separating off of the waters of judgment was a good and necessary thing. If these waters had not been separated off, man could not have lived on the earth. At the time of Noah's flood, God apparently used those same waters to destroy mankind from the earth (with the exception of Noah and his family, who were preserved through the ark), because of the rebellion of man as they aligned themselves closely with the devil in his rebellion and darkness.

2 PETER 3:5-7 are an important cross-reference; these verses explain why God created our world (Gen. 1:1-2:3) with a large quantity of excess waters above the firmament. I'll include a brief discussion of 2 Pet. 3:5-7 here. (These verses are discussed in some detail in my verse-by-verse study of 2 Peter on my internet site.) In context Peter was refuting mockers who were saying, "all continues just as it was from the beginning," while denying the coming of judgment day at the end of this age (2 Pet. 2:16-21; 3:3-18).

I'll quote 2 Pet. 3:5-7 and make some comments in brackets, "For when they maintain this, it escapes their notice that [The NIV seems better, "But they deliberately forget that"] by the word of God [cf. Gen. 1:1-10] *the* heavens existed long ago and *the* earth was formed out of water and by water [[I would translate something like, "and the earth existing out of water [referring to the dry land that existed after the waters left on the earth were gathered together in Gen. 1:9, 10] and between water [between the water stored above the firmament and the water stored in the fountains of the great deep, with which the world was flooded in Noah's day.]"], through which [The Greek word behind "which" is plural. I believe it refers to the waters above and the waters below that God used to flood the earth in Noah's day.] the world at that time was destroyed, being flooded with water. [Noah's flood demonstrated, for one thing, that what the mockers were saying wasn't true: Things hadn't always continued the same since creation. And

they were wrong in denying that the Lord is coming to judge the world at the end of this age. The flood of Noah's day took place, and it foreshadowed God's end-time judgment of the world (cf. 1 Pet. 3:20, 21; 2 Pet. 2:5.) (7) But [or, And] by His word the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, kept for the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men. [On the "fire," cf. 2 Pet. 3:10. I prefer a translation like, "are stored up with fire." Just as the ancient world was stored up with waters that were to be used in judgment (by God's creative design), the present heavens and earth are stored up with fire that is to be used in His end-time judgments (by His creative design).

The primary point I want to make here is that 2 Pet. 3:5-7 help confirm that the excess waters existed above the firmament, by God's creative design, in preparation for the flood of Noah's day. God, through His foreknowledge, knew of the intense rebellion that would take place on the earth in the days before Noah's flood. He knew it was coming, and He was prepared for it (as He always is prepared for everything). I'm not denying, of course, that beneficial rains fall on the earth from above; I have just been dealing with the large quantity of excess waters.]] **(7) God made the expanse** ["firmament"; the KJV and NKJV have "firmament" here and in the verses that follow throughout this chapter; the NASB has, "or, firmament" in the margin; see under Gen. 1:8 on the meaning], **and separated the waters which were below the expanse** [firmament] **from the waters which were above the expanse** ["firmament"; compare Psalms 104:3 ((I had a footnote: I'll give Mitchell Dahood's translation for the first line of Psalm 104:3, "Who stored with water his upper chambers ("Psalms III 101-150" [Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970], page 31). I'll also quote a small part of what he says regarding this translation when discussing this verse on page 32, "From this proposed translation naturally follows the sequel in vs. 13 [Psalm 104:13], 'Who waters the mountains from his upper chambers....' " I'll quote part of what A. F. Kirkpatrick says under Psalm 104:3 ("Book of Psalms" [1982 Baker reprint of the 1902 edition], page 606). Kirkpatrick speaks of "the mysterious reservoir of waters, which was imagined by the ancient Hebrews to exist above the 'firmament' (Gen. 1:7; Ps. 29:3; 148:4).... The line is an echo of Amos 9:6, 'he that buildeth his upper chambers in the heavens.' ")); 148:4. The Hebrew here in Gen. 1:7 could be translated, "He separated ["badal"] between ["bayin"] the waters which were below the firmament and ["bayin"] the waters which were above the firmament." It is clear that God couldn't separate off the waters which were to be above the firmament until He had made/created the firmament.]]; **and it was so. (8) God called the expanse** [firmament] **heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day.** [[Genesis chapter 1 has quite a bit to say about the "firmament" (Hebrew "raqia"). It was used to separate the waters below from the waters above (Gen. 1:6, 7). In Gen. 1:8 "God called the expanse [firmament] heaven." (The Hebrew word for heaven is plural; the NIV translates "called the expanse sky.")) In Gen. 1:14, 15, and 17 we read that God created the lights (sun, moon, and stars) and placed them "in the expanse [firmament] of the heavens." In Gen. 1:20 we read of the birds flying above the earth "in the open expanse [firmament] of the heavens." I strongly prefer the more literal translation of the NKJV, "across the face of the firmament of the heavens"; the birds could not fly "in the firmament."

For the word "expanse" the NASB has the alternative translation "firmament" for each of these verses in Genesis chapter 1 (1:6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, and 20). Many agree with the viewpoint presented in the BDB Hebrew Lexicon for the meaning of "raqia" in these verses, "the vault of heaven, or 'firmament,' regarded by the Hebrews as solid, and supporting 'waters' above it..." (I believe this is the meaning intended by the author/Author.) Regarding the meaning of this noun, BDB also says, "extended surface, (solid) expanse (as if *beaten out*; cf. Job 37:18 ["Can you, with Him, spread out the skies (or, heavens), strong as a molten mirror?"])." The verb this Hebrew noun (*raqia*) was derived from was sometimes used for beating out metal plates. Isaiah 40:22b says, "Who stretches out the heavens like a curtain ["canopy" NIV] And spreads them out like a tent to dwell in." Revelation 6:14, speaking of God's end-time judgment of the world, says, "The sky [or, heavens] was split apart like a scroll when it is rolled up." It is not difficult to picture a relatively thin, solid firmament (which was viewed as a foundational part of the heavens) being rolled up as a scroll.

I'll quote what Edward J. Young, a well-respected evangelical scholar, says regarding the meaning of "raqia" here ("Studies in Genesis One" [P&R, about 1964], page 90, footnote 94). "*i.e.*, that which is hammered, beaten out. Cf. Isa. 42:5; Ps. 136:6 and the Phoenician... 'plating' (Cooke: "North Semitic Inscriptions," Oxford, 1903, p. 75). Note also the LXX [Septuagint] "stereoma" and Vulgate [in Latin] "firmamentum," which are satisfactory renderings. I am unable to accept the opinion that the waters above the expanse refer to the clouds, for this position does not do justice to the language of the text which states that these waters are *above* the expanse [firmament]."

Paul H. Seely persuasively argues for this view of the firmament; see Extended Note H, "The Bible and Science." I'LL INCLUDE SOME EXTENSIVE EXCERPTS FROM WHAT PAUL SEELY SAID ON THIS TOPIC FROM EXTENDED NOTE H (in the Appendix of the original 373 page paper; I believe this is very important, and interesting):

Excerpts from "The Three-Storied Universe" by Paul H. Seely ("Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation," March, 1969):

The relationship of science to Scripture is this: "The Bible gives redemptive truth through the scientific thoughts of the times without ever intending that those scientific thoughts should be believed as inerrant" (page 18). I agree that God accommodated some scientific details to the ancient viewpoint (including the idea that the earth is stationary and the sun rotates around the earth; the idea that the stars are smaller than the moon and the earth; and the idea of a solid firmament that we are discussing), but His word teaches us many things related to science that we desperately need to know, that He is the Creator of everything that exists in both the spiritual and the physical dimensions, for example, and that He created Adam and Eve as the first humans. The truth about God's creating everything that exists out of nothing (and that most of what so-called science in our day teaches about the evolution of life, or humans, or animals is gigantic error) is theological truth too.

"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 is rather easy for sincere, intelligent Christians to get out of balance in one direction, or another; we desperately need the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches.

Seely discusses the "firmament" in some detail in this article. One of his main points is that the viewpoint of the Bible is that the firmament is 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. ... ..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 in which the heavenly bodies were implanted [and in which they rotated around the earth on a daily basis; it wasn't until the days of Isaac Newton (1642-1747) and his discovery of the laws of gravity and motion, that we could understand how one body could orbit around another body without being supported.]. (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.") ...

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).

And I'll quote part of what Seely says under Conclusions. "The aim of the Bible is to give redemptive truth. It never intended to teach science, nor does it ever claim to be 'inerrant whenever it touches on science.' It does not correct the errant science of the times in which it was written, but rather incorporates that pre-scientific science into its redemptive message. It is left to man, to whom God gave the cultural mandate (Genesis 1:28), and the common grace to fulfill it, to discover the truth about science. ...."

Excerpts from "The Firmament and the Water Above; Part I: The Meaning of 'raqia' (...'firmament') in Gen. 1:6-8" by Paul H. Seely ("Westminster Theological Journal" 53, 1991, pages 227-240.):

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." In his second paragraph Seely says, "The historical evidence, however, which we will set forth in concrete detail, shows that the *raqia* was originally conceived of as being solid and not a merely atmospheric expanse. ... The basic historical fact that defines the meaning of *raqia* in Genesis 1 is simply this: *all* peoples in the ancient world thought of the sky as solid. ..." (pages 227, 228). 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 14th 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. ...

Astonishing as it may seem to the modern mind, with very rare exceptions the idea that the sky is not solid is a distinctly modern one. Historical evidence shows that virtually everyone in the ancient world believed in a solid firmament. Accordingly it is highly probable that the historical meaning of *raqia* in Genesis 1 is a solid firmament. Certainly anyone denying the solidity of the *raqia* in Genesis 1 bears a heavy burden of proof. ...

... The fact that it was named 'heaven(s)' in Gen. 1:8 and birds fly in the heaven(s) (Deut. 4:17) seems to imply the *raqia* was not solid. But the word 'shamayim' (heaven[s]) is broader in meaning than *raqia*. It encompasses not only the *raqia* (Gen. 1:8; Psalm 19:6; 148:4) but the space above the *raqia* (Psalm 2:4; 11:4; 139:8) as well as the space below (Psalm 8:8; 79:2). Hence birds fly in the heavens [above the earth and below the *raqia*], but never in the *raqia*. Rather, birds fly 'upon the face' or 'in front of' the *raqia* (Gen. 1:20). ..." (pages 236, 237).

Excerpts from "The Firmament and the Water Above; Part II: The Meaning of 'The Water above the Firmament' in Gen. 1:6-8" by Paul H. Seely ("Westminster Theological Journal" 54, 1992, pages 31-46):

"... 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.

"... In the light of 'Enuma Elish' [[This "so called Babylonia Creation Epic" has much in common with the creation account of Genesis chapter 1; there are gigantic differences too; for one thing this pagan document speaks of the pagan gods (including Marduk) but knows nothing of God.]] (and Egyptian literature), 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 not as terrestrial clouds, nor as a canopy of water between the sun and the earth, nor even as galactic vapor, but 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. ...

... By the time of the Renaissance...the pressure on the [Christian] 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. ..." (pages 37-40).

"The divine intent of this picture was not to communicate natural science, but to teach the fact that the God of Scripture is Creator and absolute Sovereign over the supposedly independent forces of the natural world. This is an important revelation which men still need today. ...

...God has sometimes allowed his inspired penmen to advert to the scientific concepts of their own day. This fact in no way effaces the point and purpose of Genesis 1 to reveal the sovereign power and glory of the one true Creator. The divinely intended message of Genesis 1 does not err, but stands out in glorious contrast to the dark mythological polytheism of its own time, and by its divinely inspired excellence endures yet today as a bright revelation for all time" (pages 45, 46). (Now we are ready for Gen. 1:9.)) **(9) Then God said, 'Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear'; and it was so.** [[Compare Job 38:8-11; Psalm 104:1-9 (There is widespread agreement that these verses deal with the Genesis 1 creation, not Noah's flood.); and Jer. 5:22. As we have discussed, the large amounts of excess water had already been separated from the earth and placed "above the expanse [firmament]." In order for the dry land to appear it still was necessary to drain the waters from what was to become "dry land." Draining the waters probably included

cutting channels/ivers that would facilitate the waters flowing into the seas. It is also possible that some (or all) of the land that was to become "dry land" had to rise in elevation, but I doubt that idea was intended in this verse.]] **(10) God called the dry land earth** ["called the dry ground 'land' " NIV], **and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good. (11) Then God said, 'Let the earth sprout vegetation: plants yielding seed, and fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit after their kind with seed in them'; and it was so. (12) The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit with seed in them, after their kind; and God saw that it was good. (13) There was evening and there was morning, a third day. (14) Then God said, 'Let there be lights in the expanse [firmament] of the heavens to separate the day from the night** [See under Gen. 1:18.], **and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years** [[Ancient Israel's calendar, with its days, (lunar) months, seasons, and years was based on the daily rotation of the sun, moon, and stars about the earth (actually the earth was rotating daily on its axis and the earth was rotating annually around the sun, but they didn't know that then) and the monthly phases of the moon (caused by the moon's rotation about the earth every month, starting with the new moon; to be precise, a lunar month is 29.530588 days).

I'll quote part of what H. C. Leupold says regarding the meaning of "for signs" here ("Exposition of Genesis", Vol. 1 [Wartburg Press, 1942], page 73). "Now signs...is here used in the broadest possible sense. Indeed, the luminaries are signs from various points of view. They are 'signs' to devout faith, declaring the glory of their Creator (cf. Ps. 8 and 19). They are 'signs' by which men get their bearings, or the point of the compass by day or by night. They may convey 'signs' in reference to future events (Matt. 2:2; Luke 21:25). They furnish quite reliable 'signs' for determining in advance the weather to be expected (Matt. 16:2, 3). They may be 'signs' of divine judgments (Joel 2:30; Matt. 24:29). That they may well serve in all these capacities is clear both from Scripture and from experience. ...."]; **(15) and let them be for lights in the expanse [firmament] of the heavens to give light on the earth'; and it was so. (16) God made the two great lights, the greater light to govern the day, and the lesser light to govern the night; He made the stars also.** [[As I mentioned, I believe the creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 clearly speaks of the sun, moon, and stars being created on the fourth day (not before the fourth day). That causes a problem with modern science, BUT IT FITS PERFECTLY WITH THE EARTH-CENTERED VIEWPOINT OF THE SCRIPTURES. (I'm speaking of the earth being the center with respect to the sun, moon, and stars, not with respect to God or heaven). I list quite a few verses to demonstrate the earth-centered viewpoint, with the earth being stationary, of the Scriptures in Extended Note G ("Galileo's Trial and the Interpretation of Scripture").

I'll list some verses that were used to "prove" that Copernicus and Galileo were very wrong to say that the earth moves around the sun: Josh. 10:12, 13; 1 Chron. 16:30; Psalm 19:4-6; 93:1; 104:5; Eccl. 1:5; Isa. 38:8; and Acts 2:19. The Roman Catholic Church had a much stronger scriptural basis to argue for a stationary earth than the Christians of our day who argue for a six-thousand year old earth and universe (or close

to six-thousand years) have for their viewpoint. Furthermore, most of the scientists of Galileo's day agreed with the earth-centered viewpoint, against Galileo.

You could argue, based on the genealogies of Genesis chapters 5 and 11, that Adam was created some six-thousand years ago (we'll discuss this topic later in this paper), but (from my point of view) that is very different than arguing that the earth (universe) was created some six-thousand years ago. God didn't have the Bible written to correct the scientific views of the ancient world. If He would have had His spokesmen correct the scientific viewpoints of their day, it would have thrown up gigantic barriers against accepting the really important things that He wanted to say through His spokesmen.

For one thing, as many have pointed out, the writers of Scripture (in a manner typical for man) often speak of things as they appear to the senses, as they *seem* to be.

((I had a nine-paragraph footnote: "Thus Genesis' description of the 'expanse [firmament]' is phenomenological [as things appear to an observer on the earth]... (Kenneth A. Matthews, "Genesis 1-11:26" [Broadman, 1996, 1997, 2001], page 150). Matthews has a footnote, "As B. Ramm explains, the Bible's 'language about astronomy, botany, zoology, and geology is restricted to the vocabulary of popular observation. What can be seen through microscope or telescope is not commented on. Phenomenal language is true because all it claims is to be descriptive' ('Protestant Biblical Interpretation,' 3rd ed. [...Baker, 1970], 210)."

I'll quote part of what John Calvin said on this topic under Gen. 1:16 ("Genesis" [Crossway Books, 2001], pages 22, 23). "...Moses described in popular style what all ordinary men without training and education perceive with their ordinary senses. Astronomers, on the other hand, investigate with great labor whatever the keenness of man's intellect is able to discover. Such study is certainly not to be disapproved, nor science condemned with the insolence of some fanatics who habitually reject whatever is unknown to them. The study of astronomy not only gives pleasure but is also extremely useful. And no one can deny that it admirably reveals the wisdom of God. Therefore, clever men who expend their labor upon it are to be praised, and those who have ability and leisure ought not to neglect work of that kind.

Moses did not wish to keep us from such study when he omitted the scientific details. But since he had been appointed a guide of unlearned men rather than of the learned, he could not fulfill his duty except by coming down to their level. If he had spoken of matters unknown to the crowd, the unlearned could say that his teaching was over their heads. In fact, when the Spirit of God opens a common school for all, it is not strange that he chooses to teach especially what can be understood by all.

When the astronomer seeks the true size of stars and finds the moon smaller than Saturn, he gives us specialized knowledge. But the eye sees things differently, and Moses adapts himself to the ordinary view.

God has stretched out his hand to us to give us the splendor of the sun and moon to enjoy. Great would be our ingratitude if we shut our eyes to this experience of beauty! There is no reason why clever men should jeer at Moses' ignorance. He is not explaining the heavens to us but is describing what is before our eyes. [Also, Moses and the other writers of Scripture were limited to how much God chose to reveal to them.] ...."

I'll quote a few sentences from what John H. Walton says on this topic ("Genesis" [Zondervan, 2001], pages 87-90). "There is not a single example of God revealing scientifically transcendent information to the Israelites. [[Walton has a footnote here, "An intriguing and detailed discussion of this can be found in P. Seely, "Inerrant Wisdom" (...Evangelical Reform, 1989), 1-21. .... I quote extensively from Paul Seely in Extended Note H. I have included some informative excerpts from Seely that deal with the firmament under Gen. 1:8.]] In fact, the evidence is to the contrary. Consider the following four examples: [I'll just quote his third example:] The movements of the celestial bodies and the understanding of weather all are described in terms similar to that in the rest of the ancient Near East. ..." (pages 87, 88). "Are we so presumptuous as to think that inspired text, to be 'true,' must somehow incorporate our view of science into its discussions of origins?" (page 90).

I'll also include an excerpt from Charles E. Hummel ("Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation," Vol. 38, No. 3, September 1986). After mentioning several attempts by some Christians to square the creation account with the details of modern science, Hummel says, "...they attempt to find answers to questions the text does not address.... ...any extent to which Genesis teaches modern scientific concepts would have made its message unintelligible to its first readers, and to most of the people who have lived during the last three thousand years. ..." (page 185).

I continue with this important theme in Extended Note H, "The Bible and Science." (For one thing, as I mentioned, I quote extensively from Paul Seely there, who was mentioned by Walton earlier in this footnote.) In that Note we also discuss inerrancy and the Bible. I suggest you read Extended Notes G and H. They are available in the original 273 page paper. As I mentioned at the beginning of this paper, I still have some copies of that paper. This is the end of the nine-paragraph footnote.) )) The earth *seemed* to be the stable, unmovable center of the visible universe, with the sun, moon, and stars rotating around the earth. Also, it was very clear to God's people, based on what God had revealed to them (special revelation), that the earth had been created (recreated) especially for man, and that it was the earth, not the sun, moon, or stars, that was God's chosen center of activity for man.

God could, of course, have included many verses in the Bible that would satisfy modern science. He could have revealed, for example, that the earth rotates on its axis and it rotates around the sun. That would have provided an effective apologetic tool for the generations that lived after science discovered that the sun-centered viewpoint is correct after all, but He clearly didn't choose to reveal that information in the Bible. For one thing, incorporating such details would have been terribly confusing and distracting

for the large number of earlier generations; it would certainly have seriously detracted from God's primary purpose for the Bible. Anyway, for those who have a heart open to God, He has more than adequately demonstrated to each generation (very much including our own) that the Bible is His book, a unique book. Those who begin to open their hearts to the God who is there and to examine the Bible always find that it reveals the things men need to know, including the fact that He (and He alone) can save from sin, spiritual death, darkness, Satan, and eternal judgment.

The fact that the Bible is filled with prophecies, many of which have already been fulfilled, is sufficient to demonstrate that this *is* God's book - there is no book like it. ((I had a footnote: For a discussion regarding the fact that prophecies in the Bible confirm that God is God and the Bible is His book, and for a listing of some of those prophecies, see pages 8, 9 of my paper on selected passages from the book of Isaiah on my internet site. As discussed there, God frequently makes the claim that He, and He alone, is able to give such prophecies and then bring to pass the things prophesied.)) Those who open their hearts to God and His Word will find more than sufficient confirmation that He is real, that the Bible is true, and that He will meet the deepest needs of their hearts and lives.

God calls people to submit to Him in repentance and faith. Faith in Christ isn't a leap into the dark (it is a leap into the arms of the God of the Bible, a leap in accordance with His Word), but repentance and faith involve the heart and require going beyond logical evidence that will satisfy the intellect. God wants/demands our hearts - and He won't settle for less.]] **(17) God placed them [the sun, moon, and stars] in the expanse [firmament] of the heavens to give light on the earth, (18) and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good.** [[Genesis 1:14-19 build on Gen. 1:2-8, and the interpretation of Gen. 1:14-19 given here builds on the interpretation of Gen. 1:2-8 given above. Having a more literal translation for the key words in the center of verses 14 and 18 will be helpful: "to separate [or, distinguish (Hebrew verb "badal")] between [Hebrew preposition "bayin"] the day and ["bayin"] the night" (Gen. 1:14); "to separate [or, distinguish ("badal")] between ["bayin"] the light and ["bayin"] the darkness" (Gen. 1:18). ((I had a footnote: As discussed above, and with the confirming evidence given in Extended Note E (I quoted much of this confirming evidence above, under the word "darkness" of Gen. 1:2), the dominant use of the Hebrew verb "badal" throughout the Old Testament (and all-the-more-so since the Hebrew preposition "bayin" was used here in Gen. 1:14, 18, as it was in Gen. 1:4, 6, 7 and other verses of the Old Testament) rather strongly favors seeing a separation of things that must be separated, and kept separated, like the holy from the unholy, and the good from the evil.)) Although it isn't as obvious here in 1:14-18 as in 1:2-5, I believe there is a symbolic component for the words "light," "darkness," "day," and "night" here in 1:14 and 18 too.

((I had a five-paragraph footnote: As we discussed above, physical light and darkness were undoubtedly included along with the strong symbolic/spiritual component of the light and darkness of Gen. 1:2-5. Here in Gen. 1:14-18 there is some obvious emphasis on physical light in that the "lights/luminaries" that God created on the fourth day were

created, for one thing, "to give [physical] light" on the earth. Nevertheless, it seems that the far-more-important symbolic/spiritual component of light and darkness are included here too (building on Gen. 1:2-5).

Apparently we can say that at least one reason God chose to create our world with a daytime, nighttime cycle (speaking of physical light, darkness, daytime, and nighttime) was to provide His people with a constant reminder of the all-important reality that apart from God's kingdom of light, there is the all-too-real kingdom of sin, Satan, darkness, and death. (These evil things haven't been abolished yet, but Jesus Christ will abolish them from God's kingdom soon. They have already been defeated through His atoning death.) It seems that God went out of His way in the Mosaic Law, which was the foundation for the old covenant (which in turn provided the foundation and framework for the new covenant), to provide His people (all who had ears to hear) with constant reminders of the reality of sin, Satan, darkness, and death. (The creation account of Gen. 1:1-2:3 was part of the Mosaic Law, and part of the Old Testament. It was not written for people who were limited to the information contained in these verses.)

Not only was physical death a constant reminder of sin and its penalties and consequences under the old covenant, but God clearly showed in the Mosaic Law that physical death was an enemy, something that was not good, something that was unclean and defiling. (Death is still called an enemy in the New Testament [1 Cor. 15:26; 2 Tim. 1:10; Rev. 20:14; 21:4].) It was not part of God's good creation. If the sons of Israel came in contact with death, they became defiled, unclean; they were to be excluded from the camp of the people of God for seven days until they had been cleansed through the ashes of a sacrificed red heifer. (See Numbers chapter 19.) For those Israelites who had been set apart by God in a special sense, like the priests (see Lev. 21:1-4), and much more so for the high priests (Lev. 21:10, 11), or for those with a Nazarite vow (see Num. 6:6-12), to come in contact with death was a more serious matter and must be avoided (as far as it was possible). Such reminders of sin and its penalties and consequences were designed by God to help humble His people and to help motivate them to put Him and His Word first place in their hearts and lives and to fear sinning against Him.

Another constant reminder of the awesome reality of sin, darkness, etc. that God gave His people in the Mosaic Law dealt with sexual relations and the bearing of children. Although it was understood that sexual relations in marriage and the bearing of children were a blessing from God, it was also understood that everything associated with the process, including the menstrual cycle, had been affected by the fall (ever since the fall of Adam and Eve, children have been born outside the garden of Eden into a fallen world that is permeated with darkness and death) and now involved uncleanness and pain along with blessing. See, for example, Gen. 3:16; Lev. 12:1-8; and 15:16-33.

Other constant reminders were sickness and disease (see chapter D of my book "Holiness and Victory Over Sin") and all the things that worked against the production of food (cf. Gen. 3:17-19). (This is the end of the five-paragraph footnote.) ) There wasn't much of a need, if any need at all, to separate (or to distinguish) between physical light

and physical darkness, but the separating (or distinguishing) between light and darkness when understood in a symbolic/spiritual sense is a dominant message of the Bible, as discussed above under Gen. 1:2-5. It is necessary and "good" to distinguish between and to separate between the light and the darkness because of the strong symbolic/spiritual component of these words.]] **(19) There was evening and there was morning, a fourth day. (20) Then God said, 'Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse [firmament] of the heavens** [For a more accurate translation of the last words of this verse, and for a discussion regarding the meaning of the firmament, see above, under Gen. 1:8.].'**(21) God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. (22) God blessed them, saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.'****(23) There was evening and there was morning, a fifth day. (24) Then God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind'; and it was so.** [The sixth day is discussed to some extent on page 71 of this paper, under #5, under the heading "Some Key Reasons for Not Seeing Literal Twenty-Four Hour Days in This Passage (Gen. 1:2-2:3).] **(25) God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good.** [[God created the plants, trees, fish, birds, animals, etc, after their kind. They didn't evolve from another kind. (See Extended Note K in the Appendix of the original 273 page paper. I included excerpts from Extended Note K in the Introduction of this paper.) By God's design there is some room for micro-evolution within a kind, as animals, for example, adapt to their environment, or with the breeding of animals for different purposes, but God is the Creator of each kind, and He determined the degrees of adaptation that are attainable. There is some room for changes caused by mutations, but almost all mutations are harmful (see Extended Note K), and such changes can never create an eye or a heart, or change a cow into a dog (or a dog into a cow).]] **(26) Then God said, 'Let Us** [[(This double bracket goes on for four paragraphs.) Also see Gen. 3:22; 11:7. I agree with the large number of commentators who understand God to be speaking to the heavenly beings surrounding Him here, the cherubim, seraphim, archangel(s), etc. Job 38:4-7 show that the heavenly (angelic) beings (they are called "sons of God" in Job 38:7, as in Job chapters 1 and 2) were there when God "laid the foundation of the earth." (Many only see the Trinity here, with "Us" referring to the three Persons of the Trinity.) I'll quote part of what Bruce K. Waltke says here ("Genesis," [Zondervan, 2001], pages 64, 65). "The explanation that better satisfies all such uses of the pronoun [The other such uses of the pronoun "us" are Gen. 3:22; 11:7; and Isa. 6:8.] is that God is addressing the angels or heavenly court ((cf. 1 Kings 22:19-22 [In these verses God interacts with "all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right and on His left.]; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Ps. 29:1-3; 89:5-6 [I'll quote Psalm 89:5-7, "The heavens will praise Your wonders, O LORD; Your faithfulness also IN THE ASSEMBLY OF THE HOLY ONES [my emphasis]. (6) For who in the skies is comparable to the LORD? Who among THE SONS OF THE MIGHTY [my emphasis] is like the LORD, (7) A God greatly feared IN THE COUNCIL OF THE HOLY ONES [my emphasis], And awesome above ALL THOSE WHO ARE AROUND HIM (my emphasis)?"; Isa. 6:8 ["Then I heard the

voice of the Lord, saying, 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us?' Then I (Isaiah) said, 'Here am I, send me!' " In the preceding verses of Isaiah chapter 6, the seraphim play a major role (see Isa. 6:2, 6, 7); I assume God was speaking to them here (or to them and the rest of the heavenly council).[...]). ... It is not surprising that God would address the heavenly court, since angels play a prominent role in Scripture...." ((Waltke has a footnote, "...God's address of the heavenly court does not mean that they participate in the act of creation. ....")) Also see Isa. 24:24; Rev. 4:4-11. ((In Rev. 4:4-11 we see the twenty-four elders [high-level angelic beings] crowned and sitting on thrones around the throne of God, and we see the four living creatures around the throne. The four living creatures interact with God and play important roles in the outworking of His plans as shown by Rev. 6:1, 3, 5, 7; 7:13, 14; 8:2; 14:18; 15:1, 5-7; 16:1-17; 17:1; and 21:9, 10. (The four living creatures are similar to, but not identical with, the cherubim of the Old Testament.) So do the twenty-four elders: Rev. 5:6, 8, 14; 7:13-17; 11:16-18 14:3; 19:4.))

The angels are called "sons of God" (Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). We Christians become sons of God in Christ ((Matt. 5:9, 45; Luke 6:35; 20:35, 36 ("but those who are considered worthy to attain to the age and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; for they cannot even die anymore, because they are like angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection"); Rom. 8:14, 15, 19, 23; Gal. 3:26; 4:5, 6; Eph. 1:5; Heb. 2:10; and 12:5, 7, 8)).

I'm sure that God could have done without His heavenly council and ignored them (He didn't have to create them in the first place), but God isn't like that. He chooses to delegate authority to, and to use, those He has created (He created them for a purpose; that purpose includes using them, but even more importantly, it includes establishing a love relationship with them) - this includes us too, and especially after we are glorified.

I'll include a brief excerpt from what Gordon J. Wenham says here ("Genesis 1-15," pages 27, 28). "... 'Let us create man' should...be regarded as a divine announcement to the heavenly court, drawing the angelic host's attention to the master stroke of creation, man. [Wenham went on to mention Job 38:4, 7 ('When I laid the foundation of the earth...all the sons of God shouted for joy')]...." (This is the end of the four paragraph footnote.)

I believe in the Trinity, but I don't believe the Trinity is in view here. We don't clearly see the Trinity until we get to the New Testament. I have four articles/paper on the Trinity on my internet site: "Who Do We Worship?"; Who Do We Pray To"; More on the Trinity; and "The Name Yahweh and God the Father and God the Son." (Now we'll continue with Gen. 1:26.)) **make** [Hebrew verb "asah"] **man in Our image, according to Our likeness** [[Compare Gen. 5:1, 3 ("...Adam...became the father of a *son* in his own likeness, according to his image, and he named him Seth."); Gen. 9:6; and James 3:9. For us to be created in the image and likeness of God includes the fact that we are moral beings, created to be righteous in submission to God; that God can delegate authority to us and we can work (see the rest of the verse and the following verse); that

we have a will, we think, and we have emotions. Also, significantly, because we have been created in His image, we can communicate with Him, and worship Him.

Even though the image and likeness of God in man was defaced through the fall, something of His image and likeness remains (cf., e.g., Gen. 5:1; 9:6; and James 3:9). The image and likeness of God in man is restored and even taken to a higher level through salvation and union with Christ Jesus (the God-man); in the glorified state we will have the image and likeness of God in a much fuller sense than Adam had before the fall (cf., e. g., Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:4; Eph. 4:24; Col. 1:15; 3:10; and 1 John 3:2).]; **and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.'** **(27) God created** [The Hebrew verb "bara" is used three times in this verse.] **man** [Hebrew "adam" (also in 1:26); "man" speaks of mankind, "male and female." The noun for "Adam" and "man" is exactly the same in Hebrew.] **in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.** [Genesis 2:18-25 provide some details regarding God's creation of Eve, and regarding her role.] **(28) God blessed them; and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it** [[Compare Gen. 9:1, 7. The NASB, KJV, NKJV, and NIV all translate "subdue" here; the *Jerusalem Bible* has "conquer." The primary thing Adam and Eve needed to subdue/conquer at that time was the potential to rebel against God through eating of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good AND EVIL, thereby joining the devil in his rebellion and darkness. Man was created a free moral agent with the potential for sin. It doesn't seem that Adam and Eve needed to subdue/conquer the animals, birds, etc.; Genesis chapters 1, 2 give the strong impression that, before the fall, the animals, etc. were docile (see Gen. 1:30; 2:19, 20). After the fall there was a need to subdue some animals, etc, and to rule over them. Also, there was nothing in the environment in the garden of Eden that they needed to subdue before the fall.

The devil and darkness didn't have any authority over Adam and Eve before they sinned, but the devil and the darkness were very much on the scene, as we discussed above in some detail. Adam and Eve were obligated to use their God given authority to resist the lies and temptations of the evil one and to stay within the boundaries God had ordained for them, living (from the heart) in obedience to Him, in the center of His will.

God had a plan before the foundation of the world to subdue the devil and darkness through man, but man under, and in union with, the man (the God-man) Christ Jesus (see Gen. 3:14, 15; Rom. 16:20 ["The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet."]). This plan required the Son of God to condescend to become a man (but not just a man; He never ceased being deity). Through His sinless life and His atoning death on the cross (cf., e.g., Heb. 2:14), the Lord Jesus Christ has totally defeated Satan, death, and darkness (which will be fully manifested at the right time), and He earned the right to save all of mankind who submit (in repentance and faith) to God and His plan of salvation.

The Hebrew verb ("kabash") behind "subdue/conquer" is a strong verb. I'll quote part of what John N. Oswalt says regarding the meaning of this verb in the article on this verb in the "Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament," Vol. 1 (Moody Press, 1980, page 430). " 'Kabash' assumes that the party being subdued is hostile to the subduer, necessitating some sort of coercion if the subduing is to take place. [The verb is used]...of the conquest of the Caananites in Num. 32:22, 29; Josh. 18:1; 1 Chron. 22:18. In 2 Chron. 28:10; Neh. 5:5; Jer. 34:11, 16 it refers to forced servitude. Therefore 'subdue' in Gen. 1:28 implies that creation will not do man's bidding gladly or easily and that man must now bring creation into submission by main strength. It is not to rule man. ...." God's creation of Genesis chapter 1 was good and didn't need to be subdued, but Satan's kingdom of darkness needed to be subdued. Satan fell, and a third of the angels fell with him, before the creation (recreation) of Gen. 1:1-2:3. Satan was very much on the scene in Genesis chapter 3.

Psalm 8 is an important cross-reference for Gen. 1:26-28. I'll quote Psalm 8:5-7, "Yet You have made him [man] a little lower than God [or, the angels], And You crown him with glory and majesty! (6) You make him rule over the works of Your hands; You have put all things beneath his feet, (7) All sheep and oxen, And also the beasts of the field, (8) The birds of the heavens and the fish of the sea, Whatever passes through the paths of the seas." The thing that makes this psalm so significant and exciting is the exalted sense in which it is interpreted in Heb. 2:5-13. For one thing, the "all things" of Psalm 8:6 is interpreted to include the enemies of God and His people (not just the animals, birds, fish, etc.).

The Lord Jesus Christ subdues all the enemies of God and puts them beneath His feet. Much of this subduing is still future, starting with the second coming of Christ (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 15:23-28), but it is as good as done in the plan of God. The future subduing of Satan and his kingdom of darkness is based on the atoning death, resurrection and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ that has already been accomplished. Hebrews 2:5-13 show that Christ's brethren (believers) will reign with Him. We will reign with Him from the time of the mid-week glorification and rapture. This reigning will include subduing, judging, and removing all who persist in rebellion. We will rule with a rod of iron (see Rev. 2:26, 27; 12:5; and 19:15). In this present life we have authority as Christians to subdue and remove the darkness (which includes sin and demons) from our hearts and lives and to spread the kingdom as far as God enables. Psalm 8; Heb. 2:5-11; and other relevant verses are discussed on pages 76-80 of my book "The Mid-Week Rapture." Psalm 8, with Heb. 2:5-14, are discussed verse-by-verse in my paper that deals with selected eschatological Psalms on my internet site (Google to Karl Kemp Teaching).

I'll quote part of what Allen P. Ross says here ("Creation and Blessing" [Baker, 1998], page 113). "...humans are to have dominion over the world. The terms used suggest putting down opposition and were perhaps used in anticipation of the conflict with evil. As the Scriptures unfold, however, one realizes how humans have failed at this task [starting with the initial rebellion when Adam and Eve accepted the darkness and sided with the devil against God]. The New Testament states that 'we do not yet see all things under his dominion,' but Jesus Christ, the express image of the Father, will ultimately re-

establish such dominion (Heb. 2:8-9)."]; **and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth.'** (29) **Then God said, 'Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you; (30) and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to every thing that moves on the earth which has life** [[In the margin the NASB has, "Literally, *in which is a living soul.*" Plants don't have souls. Furthermore, the souls of animals are quite different than the souls of man in that animals were not created in the image of God.]], **I have given every green plant for food'; and it was so.** [[These verses give the strong impression that before the fall the beasts and birds did not eat meat, and this impression is strengthened by Isa. 11:6-9; 65:25 (verses that speak of wolves, lions, leopards, and bears eating vegetation and not being a danger to the lambs, calves, etc. in the coming kingdom). Romans 8:20-22 fit that idea too. "The narrative [Sarna is speaking of Gen. 1:29, 30] presupposes a pristine state of vegetarianism. Isaiah's vision of the ideal future in 11:7 and 65:25 sees the carnivorous animals becoming herbivorous" (Nahum M. Sarna, "Genesis" [Jewish Publication Society, 1989], pages 13, 14). "...humankind survives on a vegetarian diet. What is strange, and probably unexplainable (from a scientific position), is the fact that the animals too are not carnivores but also vegetarians" (Victor P. Hamilton, "Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17" [Eerdmans, 1990], page 140).

I'll quote part of what Gordon J. Wenham says here ("Genesis 1-15" [Word, Incorporated, 1987], pages 33, 34). "Westermann (1:163-164) cites other texts to show that there was a widespread belief in antiquity that man and animals were once vegetarian. ... Genesis 1...does not forbid the consumption of meat, and it may be that meat eating is envisaged from the time of the fall. ... Abel kept and sacrificed sheep (4:2-4), and Noah distinguished clean and unclean animals (7:2). [The Israelites were permitted to sacrifice and to eat "clean" animals, but not the "unclean."] Gispén may therefore be correct in suggesting that 9:3 is ratifying the post-fall practice of meat-eating rather than inaugurating it."

I'll quote part of what Franz Delitzsch says here ("Genesis" [Klock and Klock reprint, 1978; originally published by T. & T. Clark in 1888], pages 102, 103). "...at the beginning peace prevailed between man and the beasts, and among the beasts towards each other. ... Outside of Israel too the tradition is widely spread, that men and animals were originally satisfied with vegetable food. ... The objection, that the teeth and intestines of men, as well as of many beasts, are adapted for both animal and vegetable diet, does not perplex us, - the whole of the six days' creation is, so to speak, supralapsarian [which means, "before the fall"], *i.e.* is constituted that the consequences of the foreseen fall of man were taken into account, and that there should be no need of remodeling of creation. That man can live and thrive without animal food is a fact confirmed by experience.... Nor does the reference to the animals of the *primaeva* world, among whom devouring each other was already customary, seem to us any counter-proof. For such animals belong to the time prior to the world of man, while the peace, which restriction to vegetable diet would secure, refers only to the animal world contemporary with man, and appointed to live along with him. ...."

It's easy for me to think of animals and other beings killing one another on the earth after Satan's rebellion took place, but before Gen. 1:1. (There were no *human* beings, descendants of Adam, in that world.) But Gen. 1:29, 30 indicate that the animals were vegetarians before the fall of Adam and Eve. That would at least apply to the animals "contemporary with man, and appointed to live along with him" (quoting Delitzsch from the last paragraph). Delitzsch taught the gap view of creation (gap between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2).

I'll also quote part of what Henry M. Morris [a young-earth creationist] says here ("The Genesis Record" [Baker, 1976], page 78). "As far as carnivorous animals are concerned, their desire for meat must also have been a later development, either at the time of the Curse or after the Flood. [I don't believe it would have been as late as after the flood.] Even today, of course, such animals can and will (if they have to) live on a vegetarian diet. Whether such structures as fangs and claws were part of their original equipment, or were recessive features which only became dominant due to selection processes later, or were mutational features following the Curse, or exactly what, must await further research. ...."] **(31) God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good.** [[All that God made in His creation (recreation) that is spelled out in Gen. 1:1-30 was very good. Behind the scenes, however, there was an evil kingdom of rebellion and darkness headed up by the devil that existed before God began His creative work spelled out in Gen. 1:1-30.]] **And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.** [[The exceptional definite article here and with the seventh day points to the special character of these days within the scheme of Creation" (Sarna, "Genesis," page 14). The definite article ("the" in English) was not used in the Hebrew for the first five days.]]

## GENESIS CHAPTER 2

**"Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts.**

[Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3 speak of the sun, moon, and stars being the "host(s)" of heaven.] **(2) By the seventh day God completed His work which He had done** [Hebrew verb "asah"], **and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done** [*asah*]. [God had finished His work of creation before the seventh day began; see #4 under Gen. 1:5.] **(3) Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested** [[The Hebrew verb is "shabath," which means to cease, to desist, to rest. The Hebrew noun ("shabbath") that is translated "sabbath(s)" 107 times in the Old Testament (NASB) was derived from this verb.]] **from all His work which God had created** [Hebrew verb "bara"] **and made** [Hebrew verb "asah"]. [[As I mentioned when discussing Genesis chapter 1, I believe, in agreement with many, that the seven days of Gen. 1:1-2:3 was an artificial literary framework designed by God, for one reason, to provide the basis for Israel's seven-day week, with six days of work and a day of rest. (See 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." I included some excerpts from that Note under Gen. 1:5 in this paper.) The dominant idea here in

Gen. 2:3 was to sanctify (set apart) the seventh day (the sabbath) as a day for rest and worship.

I'll quote part of what Nahum M. Sarna says regarding the seventh day of Gen. 2:1-3 ("Genesis" [Jewish Publication Society, 1989], page 14). "...there cannot be any doubt that the text [Gen. 2:1-3] provides the unspoken foundation for the future institution of the Sabbath. Not only is the vocabulary of the present passage interwoven with the other Pentateuchal references to the Sabbath (Sarna has an endnote, "Exod. 15:5, 22, 26; 23:12; 31:13-17; 34:21; 35:2; Lev. 23:3 all bear traces of the vocabulary of our passage."), but the connection with Creation is made explicit in the first version of the Ten Commandments, given in Exodus 20:8-11. 'Remember the sabbath day and keep it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a sabbath of the LORD your God.... For in six days the LORD made [Hebrew verb "asah"] heaven and earth and sea, and all that is in them, and He rested on the seventh day...and hallowed it.' The biblical institution of the weekly Sabbath is unparalleled in the ancient world. In fact, the concept of a seven-day week is unique to Israel, as is also, so far, the seven-day cosmogonic [creation] tradition. Both these phenomena are extraordinary in light of the widespread use of a seven-day unit of time, both as a literary convention and as an aspect of cultic observance in the ancient Near East. ...".

I'll quote a paragraph from Glenn Wyper regarding the origin of the seven-day week (Article on "week" in "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia - Fully Revised," Vol. 4 [Eerdmans, 1988], page 1045). "The origin of the seven-day week is disputed. Despite many theories, there is thus far no conclusive evidence that it originated prior to the existence of Israel. It is clear, however, that the seven-day week, culminating in the Sabbath, was an important calendrical unit in Israel from its earliest days. During the period of the Roman empire the use of the seven-day week became widespread, probably through the influence of Jews and Christians."

I'll quote part of what Gordon J. Wenham says here ("Genesis 1-15" [Word, Incorporated, 1987], page 36). "...God 'blessed' it [the seventh day] and 'hallowed' it [made it holy]. These are striking terms to apply to a day. ... apart from the Sabbath, only in Neh. 8:9, 11 is a festival day called holy. God is holy.... Anything...that is described as holy in the OT derives its holiness from being chosen by God and given to him in the correct prescribed manner (see G. J. Wenham, "Leviticus," 18-27). ...Genesis emphasizes the sacredness of the Sabbath. ...."]]

May the will of God be fully accomplished through this paper and His people be edified!

© Copyright by Karl Kemp