

COMPROMISES OF GENESIS

by

Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

Copyright © Apologetics Press

All rights reserved. This document may be printed or stored on computer media, on the condition that it will not be republished in print, on-line (including reposting on any personal Web sites, corporate Web sites, organizational Web sites, electronic bulletin boards, etc.), or on computer media, and will not be used for any commercial purposes. Further, it must be copied with source statements (publisher, author, title, bibliographic references, etc.), and must include this paragraph granting limited rights for copying and reproduction, along with the name and address of the publisher and owner of these rights, as listed below. Except for those exclusions mentioned above, and brief quotations in articles or critical reviews, or distribution for educational purposes (including students in classes), no part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher.

Apologetics Press, Inc.
230 Landmark Drive
Montgomery, AL 36117 U.S.A.
334/272-8558
800/234-8558



www.ApologeticsPress.org

COMPROMISES OF GENESIS

by

Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

It can be stated with confidence that Genesis is the single most ridiculed book in the Bible. While men of all ages have mocked and attacked the Bible as a whole, no single book has taken the brunt of such attacks more often than the book of Genesis. Men who are bent on denigrating the Word of God expend great effort to show that Genesis is foolish and anti-scientific. To use the words of one writer, it should be viewed as “a fairytale written by an old, senile Hebrew storyteller who could do no better, for a bunch of ignorant Jews who deserved no better.”

The reason for the vehemence and frequency of such attacks upon the inspired book should be obvious: biblical faith and man’s world view both find their own genesis, their own “reason to be,” upon its pages. But with Genesis neatly dismissed, the rest of Scripture sits upon a conveniently mobile foundation, and as such, is like a rotting shack teetering upon a fault line—with collapse imminent.

Think of the significance of this book. The book of Genesis not only gives the only inspired cosmogony (world view) available to man, but in doing so introduces for the first time on written record the Bible’s primary theme—redemption of man through reconciliation to the God from Whom he separated himself.

Genesis tells man how to interpret the physical world in which he lives. It gives the divine answers to timeless questions concerning the meaning and result of sin. It tells man of the proper relationship between the sexes. It informs man how variations arose among humankind, and even instructs him as to the origin of his various languages.

In fewer words than an average sportswriter would use to describe a Friday night high school football game, Moses (through inspiration) detailed in Genesis 3 the breaking of the covenant between man and God, the entrance of sin into the world, and the need for a coming Redeemer—the theme that will occupy the rest of Scripture. Were it not for the book of Genesis, and the material that it contains, man

forever would be forced to ask, yet never be competent to answer, such questions as “Whence have I come?,” “Why am I here?,” and “Where am I going?” Only in Genesis can the information be found to formulate answers to these questions that linger in the heart of every human.

In his arrogance, man has set out to manufacture his own answers. He thus has rejected—often at tremendous cost—the instructions of God, and thereby pretends to be his own God. He has devised world views that are diametrically opposed to, and mutually exclusive of, the Genesis record. And then he dares to boast that in light of his discoveries, Genesis should be viewed as little more than an allegory, myth, or fable. Such thinking brings to mind statements made by the character Tell Sackett in one of Louis L’Amour’s novels when he said:

All that was speculation, and a man can get carried away by reasonable theory. Often a man finds a theory that explains things and he builds atop that theory, finding all the right answers...only the basic theory is wrong. But that’s the last thing he will want to admit (1980, pp. 22-23).

Any theory that contradicts, rejects, or belittles Genesis is wrong—no matter how many right answers it might appear to give. Alas, as Tell Sackett wisely said, “But that’s the last thing he will want to admit.” The Bible writer put it this way in Isaiah 29:14: “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning will I bring to naught.” Paul asked many years later, “Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?” (1 Corinthians 1:20b).

Yet the last thing many want to admit is that Genesis is right, while they are wrong. Thus, the attack upon the inspired book and its contents continues. And each year it seems to grow more vehement in nature.

Intimidation often is the name of the game. It is a tragic but nonetheless true fact that numerous views are propagated in the world today simply on the basis of intimidation. Those in the greatest number, or those who are the most vocal, frequently intimidate the relatively muted minority into accepting their views. Or, at least to some extent, the “few” are coerced into subdued compromise. That is precisely what has happened in the case of many professed friends of the Bible. For instance, many—intimidated by the scholastic, well-polished, and highly publicized theories of scientists—have abandoned altogether any confidence in what God’s supernatural revelation has to say regarding man’s origin, in deference to

the pseudo-scientific evolutionary speculations that have become so common in this day and age. Others, not willing to forsake the totality of their faith, have sought an amalgamation, an illegitimate alliance, between biblical and evolutionary views.

THE DOUBLE-REVELATION THEORY

For example, certain faint-minded Bible believers (Hebrews 12:3) now are propounding what is known as the “Double-Revelation Theory”—a concept whose almost overnight rise to popularity is nothing short of staggering. Briefly stated, proponents of this theory maintain that God has given man two distinct and ultimate revelations of truth: (1) a revelation of Himself **in nature** [natural revelation]; and (2) a revelation of Himself **in Scripture** [special revelation]. However, proponents of this theory believe that each of these two revelations is fully authoritative in its own realm, and suggest that although these two revelations differ greatly in their character and scope, they cannot appear to intelligent men to contradict each other since they are given by the same self-consistent God of Truth. Therefore, we are told, the **theologian** is the God-appointed interpreter of Scripture while the **scientist** is the God-appointed interpreter of nature—each having, as it were, specialized “lenses” for reading the true message of his particular “book of revelation.”

In other words, whenever there is an apparent conflict between the conclusions of the theologian and the scientist—especially with regard to such questions as the origin of the Universe, the solar system, the Moon, the Earth, plant life, animal life, and man—it is the theologian who must rethink his interpretation of Scripture so as to bring the Bible into harmony with current scientific consensus, since (so we are told) “the Bible is not a textbook on science” and these problems overlap the territory in which science alone must give us the detailed and authoritative answers. It is held that this is necessarily the case, because if a grammatical/historical interpretation of any biblical account should lead the Bible student to adopt conclusions that are contrary to the prevailing views of trained scientists concerning the origin and nature of the material Universe, then such a student would be guilty of making God a deceiver of mankind in these vitally important matters. But a God of Truth cannot lie (Titus 1:2). Therefore, so the argument goes, the Bible account must be “interpreted” in such a way as to bring it into full agreement with the generally

accepted views of contemporary scientists. There are, of course, a variety of ways by which advocates of the Double-Revelation Theory hope to accomplish this unusual dichotomy. If one is speaking of Genesis 1-11, for example, these chapters no longer are viewed as literal and historical, but rather as mythical, allegorical, or poetical. The Bible, we are told, provides answers to such “spiritual” questions as “Who?” or “Why?” Scientists, however, must answer the important questions of “When?” and “How?” The conclusion we are being asked to reach, then, is that whenever God’s natural revelation (as interpreted by the scientist) is at odds with His special revelation (as interpreted by the theologian), the theologian must be wrong and special revelation must yield. Peter Berkout put it this way:

Both the Bible of nature and the Holy Bible are infallible, each in its own way, because both are written by the almighty hand of God; otherwise, speaking with all reverence, God could not be trusted. Evolution is not just about all hypothesis. We are compelled to believe that at least much of it is true. And we may not be silent about that.... It is the result of reading the Bible of nature directly (1965, p. 22).

An example or two will suffice to show the end results of the acceptance of the Double-Revelation Theory. On June 13, 1986, Henry Morris (creationist) debated Lewis Mammel (theist, but anti-creationist of AT&T Bell Research Laboratories) on the topic of the age of the Earth. During the closing moments of the debate, in response to a question from the audience, Dr. Mammel stated (in speaking about Christians and creationists): “I think they would be able to adjust their interpretation to agree with what we see in the natural world. **I think it’s a mistake to elevate doctrine above our reason and the evidence of our senses**” (transcribed directly from the debate tapes; emp. added). Rarely will one find such a bold, emphatic statement so firmly in support of the Double-Revelation Theory. Dr. Mammel made it clear: Bible believers must not allow doctrine to be elevated above scientific evidence.

Another example of the widespread acceptance of this kind of erroneous thinking can be found in the June 1978 issue of the publication, *Does God Exist?*, by John Clayton of South Bend, Indiana. In that issue, Mr. Clayton authored an article titled “The Question of Methusaleh.” In answering the question, “Did the patriarchs of old **really** live to be as old as the Bible says?,” Clayton suggested that they did not. He went to great lengths (even providing mathematical equations) to suggest that time was not counted as we count time today and that the patriarchs’ ages might simply be divided by 12 (1978, 5[6]:11-13).

In April 1987, Mr. Clayton reiterated his stand regarding the ages of the patriarchs. In a letter to the Church of Christ in Laramie, Wyoming (which had written him to question him on this very topic), he wrote: “It is a fact that there is no scientific evidence that people lived to be hundreds of years old. It may just be that we haven’t found the right bones, but most bones of ancient man turn out to be twenty or thirty years of age and none have been found, to my knowledge, older than eighty-eight years old. For this reason, I have tried to point out that there are many possible ways in which the extreme age of Methusaleh might be explained....”

Mr. Clayton’s point is abundantly clear: since science has not proved it, we can’t accept it the way the Bible writers wrote it. One cannot help but wonder how those who think like Mr. Clayton would accept a floating axe head, the Sun standing still, or the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. Science has proven none of these either, yet the Bible states that each **did** occur!

The Double-Revelation Theory must be rejected unequivocally by Bible-believing Christians. As noted scholar Edward J. Young put it:

What strikes one immediately upon reading such a statement is the low estimate of the Bible which it entails. Whenever “science” and the Bible are in conflict, it is always the Bible that, in one manner or another, must give way. We are not told that “science” should correct its answers in the light of Scripture. Always it is the other way around. Yet this is really surprising, for the answers which scientists have provided have frequently changed with the passing of time. The “authoritative” answers of pre-Copernican scientists are no longer acceptable; nor, for that matter, are many of the views of twenty-five years ago (1964, p. 53).

Indeed, why is it that God’s **unchanging** revelation of a true Bible should be “reinterpreted” to fit the **changing** revelation of nature as interpreted by scientists? This is a true case of the “cart before the horse” if there ever was one.

Further, the writers of the Bible deal abundantly with matters of fact in both science and history (unlike the sacred writings of Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, etc., which deal almost exclusively with faith/conduct matters). To take the position that the Bible is unreliable when it deals with verifiable data of science and history almost inevitably will cause thinking inquirers to reject its teachings on theological matters and correct behavior. As Jesus said: “If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?” (John 3:12). If Jesus and His writers have told us

about “earthly” things (and they most certainly have), and if we are not predisposed to believe such, how can we be expected to believe statements from these same men with regard to spiritual matters such as redemption, sanctification, and justification?

The Bible must be accepted as absolutely inerrant and authoritative on all matters with which it deals. Otherwise, it is not really the Word of God. If any man, or group of men, is empowered to tell us **authoritatively** what God’s Word means, then we may as well entrust him (or them) with a commission to rewrite the Bible altogether. Man seeks to become God when he (whether he is a theologian, scientist, or anyone else) insists that **his** word must be accepted over and above what God’s Word says.

In addition, the Double-Revelation Theory, though popular, fails to come to grips with major theological and scientific realities. Proponents of the concept fail to give due recognition to the inherent limitations of the scientific method. For example, science cannot deal with once-for-all, completely unique events (like origins). Science also is impotent when it comes to dealing with moral and/or spiritual (thus empirically elusive) realities that give significance to human endeavor. Science fails most conspicuously, however, when any attempt is made to employ it in analyzing the supernatural and miraculous acts of God. These events undeniably form the foundation of the Judeo-Christian world view. The scientist or theologian who accepts the Double-Revelation Theory would have us believe that even in such matters as these, science takes precedence. How so?

Acceptance of the Double-Revelation Theory also fails to take into consideration the noetic effects of sin. While it is true that the heavens declare the glory of God, it also is true that the eyes of man’s understanding, blinded by sin, do not always read the heavens aright. The noetic effects of sin lead to anti-theistic presuppositions and inclinations. We must remember that much is presented as established scientific fact that is hostile to the conclusions presented in the Bible. As Whitcomb and DeYoung noted:

Those who exclusively employ the scientific method in historical sciences (e.g., paleontology) uncritically apply this method in a uniformitarian manner by extrapolating present natural processes forever into the past. Furthermore, they ignore the possible anti-theistic bias of the scientist himself as he handles the facts of nature in arriving at a **cosmology** (i.e., a theory concerning the basic structure and character of the universe) and a **cosmogony** (i.e., a theory concerning the origin of the universe and its parts). To the extent that such theorists fail to give careful and honest recognition to these essential limitations of the scientific method and of the investigator himself, they fail to give a true and undistorted picture of reality as

a whole, and they fail also to point men to the only true source for understanding its mysteries (1978, p. 56, emp. in orig).

It most certainly is true that God cannot deny Himself (2 Timothy 2:13). God's Word always will agree with God's world, for the Author of the one is the Creator of the other. God's revelation in nature often can amplify and illustrate His Word, but His written revelation always must inform and constrain our interpretation of nature. Yes, God has spoken to us through nature. Numerous passages attest to that fact (Job 12:7-8; 26:13-14; Psalm 19:1-2; 97:6; Acts 14:17; 17:24-28; Romans 1:20-21). The proper use of science and technology not only helps man to implement the Edenic commission to "subdue and have dominion over the earth" (Genesis 1:28), but also teaches men more and more about the person and work of the Creator. God's revelation in nature, therefore, always must **supplement** and **confirm** His revelation in Scripture. It cannot be used to correct or interpret it. **If there is an apparent conflict—one that cannot be resolved by a more careful study of the relevant data of both science and Scripture—then the written Word must take priority!** Therein lies the greatest single fault of the so-called Double-Revelation Theory. It places scientists' supposed "interpretation" of nature above what God said. No amount of theological wrangling, or scientific mumbo-jumbo, ever will make that right.

Since Genesis deals with beginnings, and since what Genesis has to say is contradictory to modern humanistic thought, Genesis not only has endured its fair share of attacks but has been the object of much compromise as well. Especially hard hit have been those sections of Scripture that deal with **time**. Those who would have us believe that science takes precedence over Scripture, and those who have as their ultimate goal the adoption and defense of geologic time, evolutionary timetables, etc., obviously must find a way of dealing with the Scriptures' statements on the subject of time.

THE AGE OF THE EARTH

In attempting to answer the question, "How old is the Earth?" with a response that says the Earth is extremely ancient, and that the Bible allows for (or demands!) such a concept, proponents of such a view are left with but three options that can be used to defend their system of thought. And each of the three easily is shown to be false.

We must press those who would compromise the plain statements and inferences of Scripture with the following question: If the Universe is ancient, as modern science would have us believe, **where** in the biblical text is this time to be inserted?

The correct answer, of course, is that there is **no place** in the biblical text where such time can be inserted. Those who affirm that the Universe is ancient, however, know that they must find a way to inject this time into the biblical text. And they know that there are only three options open to them: (a) the eons of time needed to make the creation ancient might be placed **before** the creation; (b) the time might be placed **during** the creation week; or (c) the time might be placed **after** the creation week.

The Attempt to Place the Time Needed for an Ancient Earth Before the Creation Week: The Gap Theory

In Genesis 1:1-2, the following statements are made: (1) “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. (2) And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” For over 100 years, Bible believers who were determined to insert the time necessary to have an ancient Earth studied Genesis 1 with the intent of doing just that. They came to the conclusion that it might be possible to insert the alleged time **before** the creation week—between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. This came to be known as the Gap Theory (synonyms: Ruin and Reconstruction Theory, Ruination/Re-creation Theory, Pre-Adamic Cataclysm Theory, Restitution Theory, etc.), which was popularized by G.H. Pember in his book, *Earth’s Earliest Ages*, and by Harry Rimmer in his book, *Modern Science and the Genesis Record*. The *Scofield Reference Bible* advocated the theory in its footnotes on Genesis 1. Arthur C. Custance wrote what many consider to be the most avid defense of the theory in his work, *Without Form and Void*. Joining him in defense of the Gap Theory, or modifications of it, have been such men as John Clayton (1976, pp. 137-138), Robert Milligan (1972 reprint, pp. 23ff.), George Klingman (1929, p. 128), and others. This theory states that a vast “gap” of time existed between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, which may be accommodated to the standard geologic time scale. During this proposed gap, there lived successive generations of plants, animals, and even pre-Adamic men. According to this view, God destroyed the original creation because of a Satanic rebellion. Genesis

1:2, therefore, should be translated to suggest that the Earth “became waste and void.” The creation week then is said to be a “recreation” that took six literal days. It is sad indeed when men who supposedly are Bible believers must stoop to such exegetical “hocus-pocus” to pervert the plain teachings of the Bible in order to accommodate evolutionary presuppositions. The Gap Theory (and modifications of it) are false.

(1) Exodus 20:11 plainly states: “For in **six days** Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day” (cf. Exodus 31:17, emp. added). Notice all that this statement includes. If **everything** was made in **six days**, then **nothing** was created prior to those six days! The Bible always is its own best interpreter. This one verse demolishes the Gap Theory, and all modifications of it. [NOTE: More will be said below concerning the supposed difference between the Hebrew words *asah* and *bara* as suggested by Gap theorists.]

(2) Adam is called the “**first man**” (1 Corinthians 15:45). That excludes any pre-Adamic race of men; Adam was the first.

(3) At the conclusion of the sixth day, God saw **everything** that He had made, and behold it was “**very good**” (Genesis 1:31; emp. added.). If God’s original creation had become contaminated through Satan’s rebellion and subsequently was destroyed—and the new creation rested on a veritable graveyard of destruction—it is difficult indeed to see how God could have surveyed the situation and then used the expression “very good” to describe it.

(4) Gap theorists suggest that the Hebrew word for “was” (*hayetha*) should be translated “became” or “had become,” indicating a change of state from the original perfect creation to a chaotic condition (v. 2). Yet none of the scholarly translations of the Bible translates the verse in such a fashion. A few years ago, 20 leading Hebrew scholars were polled to see if there was exegetical evidence of a “gap” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. They unanimously responded: “NO!” (Henkel, 1950, p. 49, n. 30). Hebrew scholar J.W. Watts stated: “In Genesis 1:2a the verb is perfect. It indicates a fixed and completed state. In other words, original matter was in a state of chaos when created; it came into being that way” (1947, 1:16). Harold Stigers, in his commentary on Genesis, observed:

The cataclysmic theory (also called the restitution theory) respecting v. 2 can have no place in a proper

translation. The construction of “became void,” etc., is not justified by Hebrew syntax. When the verb “to be” (*hayah*) is to be constructed as “became,” the addition of the prepositional lamedh is required with the following word to provide this meaning, and this preposition is absent here (1976, p. 49).

(5) We know the Gap Theory to be false because it infers death and destruction in the world prior to Adam. This is in direct contradiction to New Testament teaching (1 Corinthians 15:21; Romans 8:20-22; 5:12) which states that sin and death entered the world through the human race because of Adam’s sin. If the Gap Theory is true, Paul is made to be a liar.

(6) Gap theorists assert that the phrase, “without form and void” of Genesis 1:2 (Hebrew, *tohu wabohu*), can refer only to something once in a state of repair but now ruined. To that Whitcomb has replied:

Many Bible students, however, are puzzled with the statement in Genesis 1:2 that the Earth was without form and void. Does God create things that have no form and are void? The answer, of course, depends on what those words mean. “Without form and void” translate the Hebrew expression *tohu wabohu*, which literally means “empty and formless.” In other words, the Earth was not chaotic, not under a curse of judgment. It was simply empty of living things and without the features that it later possessed, such as oceans and continents, hills and valleys—features that would be essential for man’s well-being. In other words, it was not an appropriate home for man... (1973b, 2:69-70).

(7) Gap theorists assert that in order for their theory to be true, the two Hebrew words *asah* and *bara* used in the creation account (meaning to “create” or “make”) **must** refer to **different** things and never can be used interchangeably. For example, *bara* supposedly means “to create,” whereas *asah* means “to make, remake, or make over again.” The conclusion we are supposed to draw, of course, is that the “original creation” was “created” while the creation of the six days was “made” (viz., “made over”). This, however, is patently false. The two words, on occasion, are used interchangeably. Henry Morris called our attention to this when he wrote:

The Hebrew words for “create” (*bara*) and for “make” (*asah*) are very often used quite interchangeably in Scripture, at least when God is the one referred to as creating or making. Therefore the fact that *bara* is used only three times in Genesis 1 (vv. 1, 21 and 27) certainly does not imply that the other creative acts, in which “made” or some similar expression is used, were really only acts of restoration. For example, in Genesis 1:21, God “created” the fishes and birds; in 1:25 He “made” the animals and creeping things. In verse 26, God speaks of “making” man in His own image. No scientific or exegetical ground exists for distinction between the two processes, except perhaps a matter of grammatical emphasis....

The natural reading of the whole account surely conveys the understanding of real creation throughout, with no intimation that the actual story is one of reconstruction of a devastated world. Finally, the summary verse (Genesis 2:3) clearly says that **all** of God’s works, both of “creating” and “making” were completed within the six days after which God “rested” (1966, p. 32, emp. in orig.).

If anyone is impressed by the fact that “made” (Hebrew *asah*) is used in Exodus 20:11 instead of “created” (Hebrew *bara*), the phrase “all that in them is” should make it plain that the whole earth structure—not just the earth’s surface—is included in the entities that were “made” in the six days (1974, pp. 236-237).

Noted scholar C.F. Keil declared that when *bara* is in the *Qal* (Kal) stem in Hebrew, as in Genesis 1:1:

It always means **to create**, and is only applied to a divine creation, the production of that which had no existence before. It is never joined with an accusative of material, although it does not exclude a pre-existent material unconditionally, but is used for the creation of man (v. 27, ch. v. 1,2), and of everything new that God creates, whether in the kingdom of nature (Numbers 16:30) or of that of grace (Exodus 34:10; Psalms 51:10, etc.). In this verse, however, the existence of any primeval material is precluded by the object created: “the heavens and the earth” (1971, 1:47).

Moses also employed the term *asa* (“made”) in Genesis 1:7,16,25, et al. This word is a synonym for *bara*, and its usage affords not a shred of evidence for an alleged gap of billions of years, along with a subsequent “remaking” of the Earth (Genesis 1:1-1:2) as advanced by some to accommodate an evolutionary view of Earth history. Professor W.W. Fields noted that “*asa* and *bara* must be regarded as interchangeable, particularly when describing the general creative action of God” (1976, p. 74; cf. Genesis 2:4, Exodus 20:11, and Nehemiah 9:6).

The Attempt to Place the Time needed for an Ancient Earth During the Creation Week: The Day-Age Theory

Since the time required for an ancient Earth cannot be placed **before** the creation week, some have asserted that it might be placed **during** the creation week. The “days” of Genesis 1, we are told, aren’t “days” at all, but rather extended periods (eons) of time. Several renowned religionists have advocated this theory [e.g.: Wilbur M. Smith in his book, *Therefore Stand!* (1974 reprint), Davis A. Young, in his book, *Creation and the Flood* (1977), and Edward J. Carnell in his work, *The Case for Orthodox Theology* (1959)]. Jack Wood Sears, formerly of Harding University, is on record as advocating this particular viewpoint. [In December 1977, Dr. Sears and I shared the platform at a week-long lecture series in Zimbabwe (then Rhodesia). During those lectures in the capital city of Salisbury, I responded to a question from the audience, stating that the days of creation in Genesis 1 were literal, 24-hour periods. In his lecture the next day, Dr. Sears took issue with my statements. In my debate with Dr. Sears at Denton, Texas in November 1983, Dr. Sears once again made clear his position when he stated that the “days” of Gene-

sis were long periods of time.] The Day-Age Theory, however, easily is shown to be false. Consider the following.

(1) We know the days of Genesis 1 are literal 24-hour days because the Hebrew word *yom* translated “day” is both used and defined in Genesis 1:5.

As added proof, the word is clearly defined the first time it is used. God defines His terms! “And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day” (Genesis 1:5). *Yom* is defined here at the light period in the regular succession of light and darkness, which, as the earth rotates on its axis, has continued ever since. This definition obviously precludes any possible interpretation as a geologic age (Morris, 1974, p. 224).

God plainly said that “the evening and the morning were the first day,” which should settle the matter. Amazingly enough, however, we have a built-in scheme for interpreting the length of each of these days. Genesis 1:14 states that God created the lights to divide the day from the night, and that they were to be for signs, for seasons, for days and for years. If the “days” are “ages,” then pray tell, what are the **years**? If a “day” is an “age,” what is a night? Marcus Dods, writing in the *Expositor’s Bible*, remarked: “If the word ‘day’ in this chapter does not mean a period of 24 hours the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless” (1948, 1:4-5).

(2) The Day-Age Theory is false because whenever the Hebrew word *yom* is preceded by a numeral in a non-prophetical passage, it **always** carries the meaning of a 24-hour day. *Yom* occurs over 100 times in the Old Testament in this manner, and always the meaning of a 24-hour day is conveyed. Arthur Williams, writing in the *Creation Research Annual*, commented: “We have failed to find a single example of the use of the word ‘day’ in the entire Scripture where it means other than a period of twenty-four hours when modified by the use of the numerical adjective” (1965, p. 10).

(3) In addition, whenever the Hebrew word *yom* occurs in the plural (*yamim*) in a non-prophetical passage, it **always** refers to a literal, 24-hour day.

When the word “days” appears in the plural (Hebrew *yamim*) as it does over 700 times in the Old Testament, it **always** refers to literal days. Thus, in Exodus 20:11, when the Scripture says that “in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,” there can be no doubt whatever that six literal days are meant (Morris, 1970, p. 59, emp. in orig.).

(4) The Hebrew phrase translated “evening and morning” is used over 100 times in the Old Testament with the word *yom*. Each time it is used in a non-prophetical passage, it refers to a literal, 24-hour

day. “The Hebrew words for ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ occur over 100 times each in the Old Testament, and **always** in the literal sense” (Morris, 1970, p. 58, emp. in orig.).

(5) Had Moses wanted us to understand that these “days” actually were long, geological periods of time, he could have used words that specified exactly that. Yet he did not. He could have used the Hebrew word *olam*, or the word *dor*, both of which can indicate indefinite periods of time. He could have modified the Hebrew word *yom* by the adjective *rab* (*yom rab*—a “long” day), but again, he did not. As one author correctly pointed out, if God said that He created everything in six days, but really used six eons, wouldn’t that make God a deceptive, tricky, sneaky, deceitful God? (Chouinard, 1975, 11[4]:14-15).

(6) If the “days” of Genesis were not days at all, but long geological periods of time, then a problem of no little significance arises in the field of botany. Guy N. Woods mentioned this problem:

Botany, the field of plant-life, came into existence on the third day. Those who allege that the days of Genesis 1 may have been long geological ages, must accept the absurd hypothesis that plant-life survived in periods of total darkness through half of each geologic age, running into millions of years (1976, p. 17).

Indeed, if there were periods of “evening and morning” after each of the creation days—as the text so states—then how did the plant life survive in extended periods of total darkness, and extended periods of nothing but light.

(7) The days of Genesis 1 plainly are 24-hour days because of God’s explicit command to the Israelites to observe the Sabbath. God plainly told them not only **what** to do, but **why** to do it. The Sabbath command in Exodus 20:8-11 can be understood only when the days of Genesis are considered to be 24-hour days. John Whitcomb wrote:

Genesis chapter one is explained by Exodus 20:8-11 when God spoke to Israel and said, “Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.... For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.” Obviously God was speaking in terms of literal days. No Jew in his right mind would think that God meant “six indefinite periods shalt thou labor and rest a seventh indefinite period.” God, of course, could have created the universe in one moment, but as a matter of fact, He stretched it out over six whole days in order to serve as a pattern for man’s cycle of work and rest (1973a, 2:63-64).

There are other arguments that are equally as damaging to the Day-Age Theory, but space precludes an examination of each of them. It should be obvious, even to the most casual reader, that the time needed

for an ancient Earth cannot be placed **during** the creation week. There simply are too many safeguards to allow it.

The Attempt to Place the Time Needed for an Ancient Earth after the Creation Week

Failing in attempts to place the time needed for an ancient Earth either before or during the creation week, some have attempted to place the time **after** that week. But these attempts have been few and far between because it is at this point that one major obstacle to all attempts to interject evolutionary time into the Bible comes clearly into view. That obstacle has to do with the biblical genealogies. Rarely will people try to place time after the creation week because: (a) One of the main reasons for putting the time in is to allow for geologic ages to be possible; but if the creation already has taken place, what good is time “after the fact”? (b) The genealogies provide such tremendous protection for the text that there simply is no way around the message they tell. That message is this: Man has been on the Earth since the beginning, and that beginning was not very long ago! There have been those who have suggested that biblical genealogies cannot, and do not, provide reliable information that can be used to help establish relative dated for man’s existence upon the Earth, etc. [Clayton, 1977, p. 3; Sears, 1969, p. 97]. But perhaps those who suggest such have not considered the following information.

(1) Concerning Adam and Eve, Jesus declared: “But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made he them” (Mark 10:6: cf. Matthew 19:4). Christ dated the first human couple from the creation week. “Beginning” (*arché*) here is used of “absolute, denoting the beginning of the world and of its history, the beginning of creation,” and “creation” (*ktiseos*) denotes “the sum-total of what God has created.” (Cremer, 1962, pp. 113-114,381). Unquestionably, Jesus placed the first humans at the very dawn of creation. To reject this clear truth, one must contend either that: (a) Christ knew the Universe was in existence billions of years prior to man, but, accommodating Himself to the ignorances of that age, deliberately misrepresented the situation; or (b) the Lord—living in pre-scientific times—was uninformed about the matter (despite the fact that He was there as Creator—Colossians 1:16). Either of these allegations is blasphemous!

(2) We are told time and again that the genealogies cannot be used for anything relating to chronology because there are huge “gaps” in them. But certain important points conveniently are overlooked by those who suggest such. Custance admitted:

We are told again and again that some of these genealogies contain gaps: but what is never pointed out by those who lay the emphasis on gaps, is that they only know of the existence of these gaps because the Bible elsewhere fills them in. How otherwise could one know of them? But if they are filled in, they are not gaps at all! Thus in the final analysis the argument is completely without foundation. (1967, p. 3).

Furthermore, **even if there were gaps in the genealogies, there would not necessarily be gaps in the chronologies therein recorded. The question of chronology is not the same as that of genealogy!**

James Jordan, writing in the *Creation Social Sciences and Humanities Quarterly*, stated:

Gaps in the genealogies, however, do not prove gaps in chronologies. The known gaps all occur in non-chronological genealogies. Moreover, even if there were gaps in the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, this would not affect the chronological information therein recorded, for even if Enosh were the great-grandson of Seth, it would still be the case that Seth was 105 years old when Enosh was born, according to a simple reading of the text. Thus genealogy and chronology are distinct problems with distinct characteristics. They ought not to be confused (1979, 2[2]:12).

Notice also that the “gaps” occur in derivative genealogies, not original ones. Matthew is at liberty to arrange his genealogy of Christ in three groups of 14, making some omissions, because his genealogy was derived from the complete lists found in the Old Testament and elsewhere. In the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, remember also that the inclusion of the father’s age at the time of his son’s birth is wholly without meaning or use unless chronology is intended. Else why would the Holy Spirit give us such irrelevant information?

(3) Man, according to the Lord, has been here “since the beginning of the creation.” But some, wishing to defend an ancient Earth, are faced with a serious problem. It can be demonstrated archaeologically that the genealogy of Jesus from Mary back to Abraham spans, at most, about 2,000 years (Kitchen and Mitchell, 1974, p. 213). No one would doubt, of course, that from the present back to Jesus it has been roughly 2,000 years as well. That means that from Abraham to the present it has been somewhat less than 4,000 years. The only time frame in doubt then, is the span from Abraham back to Adam. How many generations does that cover? In Luke’s record, twenty generations are listed from Abraham back to Adam. Are there significant gaps in that record? Apparently not, since Jude, writing by inspiration, corroborated

the first seven when he that wrote Enoch was the seventh from Adam (Jude 14). That leaves only 13 generations into which all those eons of time can be placed. Yet man, according to the Lord, has been here on the Earth since the beginning. How could multiplied millions or billions of years be “squeezed” into just thirteen generations! It is impossible (see Jackson, 1978).

(4) Paul wrote in Romans 1:20: “For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse.” The term “perceived” is from the Greek *noeo*, a word used for rational intelligence, while the phrase “clearly seen” (*kathoratai*) is an intensified form of *horao*, a term which “gives prominence to the discerning mind.” (Thayer, 1958, p. 452). Paul’s point was perfectly clear: the power and divinity of God, as revealed in the things that He made, have been observable to **human intelligence** since the creation of the world. Man thus has existed from the beginning. The Earth is not billions of years older than mankind.

(5) Though the Genesis account does not declare exactly how long Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Eden prior to their fall, we know that it could not have been very long. This is revealed by the fact that Christ, referring to the curse of death upon the human family, said that the devil was a murderer “**from the beginning**” (John 8:44). Once again, human existence is placed near “the beginning.”

(6) In Luke 11:45-52, the Lord rebuked the rebellious Jews of that day and foretold the horrible destruction that would come upon them. He charged them with following in the footsteps of their ancestors and hence announced that upon them would come “the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world.” Then, with parallelism characteristic of Hebrew expression, Christ rephrased the thought when He said: “from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zechariah.” Here is the important point: Jesus placed the murder of Abel back near the **foundation of the world**. Granted, Abel’s death occurred some years after the initial creation, but it was close enough to that creation for Jesus to state that it was associated with “the beginning of the world.” If the world came into existence several billion years before the first family, how could the shedding of human blood be declared to extend back to the foundation of the world?

(7) Chronology is the backbone of history. And Christianity is the religion of the true God—a religion steeped in history. This being the case, should we not then expect chronology from the Bible writers? And that is, in fact, exactly what we get:

Chronology is of concern to the writers of the Bible. From this perspective we should be **surprised** if the Bible did **not** include chronological data regarding the period from Creation to Abraham, especially since such data can now be obtained from no other source. That chronology is of concern to the Bible (and to its Author) can also be seen from the often difficult and confusing chronology of the Kings of Israel. Thus, we find that it is the **intention** of the Bible to provide us with chronology from Abraham to the Exile. Some of that chronology is given in summary statements...but some is also given interspersed in the histories of the Kings. Is it therefore surprising or unreasonable that some should be given along with genealogies as well? (Jordan, 1980, 2[12]:21, emp. in orig.)

It is easy enough to say, “Oh, but the genealogies have ‘gaps’ in them that render them useless for chronological purposes.” But upon deeper examination, the alleged gaps disappear. Furthermore, the fact that gaps **might** exist still does not destroy the **chronology** of the statements.

The “Appearance of Age” Concept

“But the Earth is measured scientifically to be **so old**,” comes the objection. Again, this is not a treatise on the scientific methods used to establish the age of the Earth. However, one item that needs to be considered is the biblical doctrine of apparent age. How old was Adam two seconds after God created him? Well, of course, he was two seconds old. That was his **literal** age. What was his **apparent** age? That is, how old did Adam **appear** to be? He was old enough to reproduce, for that is the command God gave him (Genesis 1:28). Similarly, how old did Eve appear to be two seconds after her creation? She was **literally** two seconds old, yet she must have **appeared** much older (she, too, was able to reproduce). The same may be applied to the plants and animals. In fact, the same principle would apply to the entire initial creation. Think about this: if God created plants, animals, and man with the appearance of age, does it make sense that He would act any differently in regard to the Earth that was to be their home? Of course not. God is a God of order, not confusion (1 Corinthians 14:33). Consider this also: how could God create **anything** without it having the appearance of some age? If God had created an atom, how would He make it look like it had not been there already? If He had wanted to create a sapling, how would He have made it so it did not appear to have some “age” attached to it? The point is this: the doctrine of apparent age is intrinsically linked to the creation account. And it does not lay God open to the charge, as some

have suggested, of being deceptive or tricky or deceitful. After all, God **told us** exactly what he did. Thus, He hardly be charged with deception or deceit.

How old is the Earth? One thing we know from the Bible: it is **five days older than man!** And relatively speaking it is very young—with an age measured in a few thousand years, not billions. The Bible is factual in its clear statements and its implied deductions regarding the history of man. Let us not be stampeded into accepting anything less than God’s Word on the subject. And above all, let us not be destroyed “for lack of knowledge” (Hosea 4:6).

THEISTIC EVOLUTION

Amidst the discussion over evolution and creation, a group has arisen which believes that **both** evolution and creation are true. These people hold to “theistic evolution” (also called “religious evolution” or “mitigated evolution”), all the while claiming that it sustains them in their religious beliefs while allowing them to “mix and mingle” with rank and file evolutionists. Their name is Legion and their tribe is increasing.

Theistic Evolution Defined

The word “theistic” comes from the Greek word *theos*, meaning God. Therefore, when one claims to be a “theistic” evolutionist, he is claiming to believe in both God and evolution at the same time. A brief review of the literature reveals the following good definitions of theistic evolution:

1. “ ‘ Theistic evolution’ states that God did create and develop the universe and its components, but that He did it by evolutionary processes’ ” (Jennings, n.d., p. 3).
2. “There are many in the religious world, and a few in the New Testament church who think that Genesis can and must be harmonized with evolution. They are theistic evolutionists who maintain that evolution was God’s method of creation” (Bales, 1974, p. 52).
3. “Theistic evolution is the teaching that plants, animals, and man gradually evolved from lower forms, but that God supervised the process. The theistic evolutionist is a nominal Christian who says, ‘I believe that evolution is a fact, but that God did it’ ” (Culp, 1975, p. 148).
4. “Those who hold the view called ‘theistic evolution’ are those who claim to believe in God (Theistic instead of Atheistic) but very **definitely** believe in evolution. They believe God is responsible for life, but that He used evolution to bring it into existence” (Tarbet, n.d., pp. 8-9, emp. in orig.).
5. “Basically, theistic evolution contends that abiogenesis (the spontaneous formation of life from chemicals) and evolution amoeba to man through eons) have occurred, but a creator was instrumental in forming the initial matter and laws, and more or less guided the whole process” (Wysong, 1976, p. 63).

The point is clear. The theistic evolutionist believes evolution simply was “the way God did it” as He brought the Universe and its contents into existence.

Is Theistic Evolution Popular?

Is theistic evolution popular? Indeed it is. Many people today use it as “a way out” of having to make a decision in favor of either evolution or creation. It has become the “middle of the road” position that so many Christians already have taken on a myriad of other issues (e.g.: verbal, plenary inspiration, the virgin birth, miracles, etc.). As Wysong pointed out:

Theistic evolution has been advocated in the past by men like Augustine and Aquinas. Today it is vogue. It is downright hard to find anyone who does not believe in evolution in one form or another, and it is also difficult to find anyone who does not believe in a creator in one form or another. This hybrid belief has given reprieve to those not wishing to make a total commitment to either side (1976, p. 63).

People have accepted theistic evolution for any number of reasons. One often given is that they believe it not only is **not contradictory** to the Bible, but, in fact, is completely compatible with the Divine Record. Neal Buffaloe, for example stated: “The concept of evolution is neither degrading to man, detrimental to human dignity, nor in conflict with the Bible” (1969, pp. 17,20-21). Albertus Pieters, in his book, *Notes On Genesis*, when speaking of theistic evolution said: “In such a conception there is nothing contrary to the Bible” (as quoted in Ramm, 1955, p. 201). Many people believe in theistic evolution because they are convinced the evidence for evolution simply is too strong. Nobel laureate George W. Beadle put it this way: “One must accept all of evolution or none. And the evidence for organic evolution is overwhelmingly convincing...belief in evolution, including the spontaneous origin of life from non-living antecedents, need in no way conflict with religion” (as quoted in Buffaloe, 1969). John Clayton, author of *The Source*, wrote: “If we look carefully at the issues about which we are talking, however, we can find that evolution and the Bible show amazing agreement on almost all issues and that one is not mutually exclusive of the other” (1976, p. 130). Still others believe in theistic evolution because they feel it simply doesn’t matter all that much. Neal Buffaloe stated: “What do we care that man the animal is a product of evolution as long as man the spirit is begotten of God?” (1969, pp. 17,20-21). No doubt there are many other reasons that could be given as well if space permitted.

What Is Wrong With Theistic Evolution?

Is theistic evolution biblical, and therefore acceptable? No, it is not. It is one of the most dangerous compromises ever to befall the Bible believer. To compromise on the matter of origins is certain to lead, at some point or another, to compromise in yet another area, and then another, and then another, *ad infinitum*. If the first chapter of the Bible is untrustworthy (and therefore subject to compromise), why should the other chapters be any different? Theistic evolution is a God-denying, Jesus-denying, Holy Spirit-denying falsehood. Christians who value their souls will shun it, and urge others to do likewise. Here are just a few of the things wrong with theistic evolution.

There is no theistic statement that shows theistic evolution to be true. God never said He used evolution to create man. In fact, He said just the opposite.

God could have accomplished the origin of life in any way He chose, by evolution or by creation, but an admission that there is a God and that He made such an accomplishment in any way, means that we are totally dependent upon His revelation to determine which way. His revelation declares creation, not evolution (Camp, 1972, pp. 205-206).

The texts throughout the Bible (Genesis 1-2; Exodus 20:11; 31:17; Nehemiah 9:6, et al.) plainly teach fiat creation and do not even hint of any kind of evolutionary process. God said He used creation; that settles it.

Theistic evolution is wrong because evolution implies atheism. Charles Smith, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, said simply: “Evolution is atheism” (as quoted in Klingman, 1929, p. 115). Evolution, by definition, is “a” (without) “theism” (God)—i.e., it is atheistic. Woolsey Teller acknowledged: “The God idea cannot be reconciled with our knowledge of evolution” (as quoted in West, 1974, p. 4). J.R. Straton put it this way: “Those who try to reconcile these theories (of evolution) with the Christian system of truth assert that such is not the case...yet the definitions given...prove that God **is of necessity ruled out, and that in favor of chance**” (1956, 2:1048-1049, emp. added). As much as theistic evolutionists do not like to admit it, evolution is founded on atheism (no God). The two systems (theism/atheism) cannot be combined without becoming contradictory.

Theistic evolution is wrong because it cannot explain where man acquired his soul.

To be consistent evolutionists, theistic evolutionists must maintain that the image of God, in man, was evolved. If they call on God and a miracle to get the image of God in man, why so hesitant to call on God and a miracle for the giving of the life of the body to a physical body formed of the dust of the earth? Their non-theistic evolutionistic colleagues will not find the creation of the image of God in man any more acceptable than the creation of the body of man. What do theistic evolutionists affirm of the origin of the image of God? (Bales, 1974, p. 52).

This problem, of course, has bothered theistic evolutionists for centuries. Because of it, the fallacious doctrines of “progressive creationism” and “threshold evolution” were invented—yet without success. The Bible plainly states that God created man in the image of God and instilled in him a soul. Did that soul evolve along with all the other parts of man? How will the theistic evolutionist get a soul into man?

Theistic evolution is wrong because the Bible states that Adam was the first man. Paul (and Moses, Genesis 1-2) made it perfectly clear that Adam was the **first** man! Not so, says evolution. Evolution theory says that *Homo erectus* or *Homo habilis* or *Australopithecus afarensis* or...was the first man. Which will the theistic evolutionist accept?

Theistic evolution is wrong because the Bible states the heavens, the Earth, the sea, and all that in them is were created in six days. Evolution theory, of course, says that evolution took place over billions of years. Exodus 20:11, Exodus 31:17, and Nehemiah 9:6 state just the opposite. Genesis 1 even tells us that each day of creation consisted of an “evening and a morning” so that there could be no doubt of the length of these creation days.

Theistic evolution is wrong because the Bible states that God created a fully grown, fully developed man and woman in a single day. Genesis 1:27ff. describes the creation of man and woman—in one literal day. They were fully grown and ready to go about doing the things God had commanded them to do. Yet evolution says, first, that there was no Adam and Eve, and second, that the first human pair on the Earth had to evolve slowly over long periods of geological time. There is nothing similar in the two accounts. Which will the theistic evolutionist accept?

Theistic evolution is wrong because it makes a liar out of Jesus the Savior. Jesus stated in Mark 10:6 (cf. Matthew 19:4): “But from the beginning of the creation male and female made He them.” Jesus affirmed that Adam and Eve had been on the Earth “from the beginning of the creation.” Paul affirmed in

Romans 1:20-21 that the things God had made were being “perceived” even “since the creation of the world.” Who was there to “perceive” these things “since the creation of the world?” Moses told us. Paul told us. Adam and Eve were their names. Jesus affirmed their status here on the Earth “from the beginning of the creation.” Now if the evolutionists are correct and man has been on the Earth some 4 million years or so, it is not difficult to figure out that 4 million years out of an alleged Earth history of 4.5 billion years is not, by any stretch of the imagination, “from the beginning.” Rather, it is “from the end.” The choice is this: either Jesus lied and evolutionists are correct, or Jesus told the truth and evolution is wrong. To accept any part of evolution makes Jesus Christ a liar (not to mention Paul and Moses).

Theistic evolution is wrong because it cannot explain Eve. This problem has haunted theistic evolutionists since the very inception of the theory. The Bible makes it abundantly clear that God put Adam to sleep and took from his side material from which He made woman (Genesis 2:21-23). Eve is even named by Paul in 1 Timothy 2:13 as being a real, historical character. Yet evolution says that the sexes evolved, simultaneously, in the same geographical region, with one being male and one being female. There is nothing similar in the two incidents. How will the theistic evolutionist explain Eve? Most theistic evolutionists, when faced with this problem, simply attempt to do away with Eve by making the first eleven chapters of Genesis mythological or allegorical—anything but, literal history.

GENESIS 1-11: LITERAL/HISTORICAL OR MYTHOLOGICAL/ALLEGORICAL?

Is Genesis 1-11 mythological? Or is it literally true—trustworthy history? Many today would have us believe that Genesis is merely a myth. The renowned *Interpreter’s Bible Commentary* put it like this:

Obviously, the book [Genesis—BT] begins in that misty region of tradition and transmitted myth in which imagination precedes knowledge. Few will suppose that Adam and Eve and the Garden of Eden belong to factual history. Cain and Abel and Lamech and Nimrod and Methusaleh and Noah—these also come down to us as legends rather than as persons identifiable in the literal history of a particular time (1952, 1:460,463).

Others have rushed to join in this kind of thinking. For example, in 1981, Neal Buffaloe, professor of biology at the University of Central Arkansas co-authored (with N. Patrick Murray, an Episcopal “priest”) a booklet titled *Creationism and Evolution*. This small booklet was a frontal attack upon the credibility of

the Genesis record. In fact, concerning the events of Genesis 1-11, Dr. Buffaloe and his co-author even went so far as to state:

...the mainstream of Biblical scholarship rejects the literal historicity of the Genesis stories prior to Chapter 12, and finds the literature of parable and symbol in the early chapters of Genesis.... One of our main purposes here, in fact, is to show that the vast mainstream of Theistic interpretation has long ago assimilated the concept of evolution into its faith-perspective, along with modern astronomy, the atomic theory, and other scientific findings.... If God chose to use the process of evolution over a span of billions of years, isn't that his prerogative as sovereign Creator? Far from undermining the canons of Theistic faith, the long eons of evolutionary meandering can be viewed as a kind of expression of the creative "playfulness" of God (1981, pp. 5,11-12).

Buffaloe and Murray went on to say that Genesis 1 "is closely related to an earlier Babylonian creation account, known as *Enuma Elish*" and that it was their feeling that "the Hebrew writer adapted the well-known Middle Eastern story for his purposes." Then, with one fell swoop of the literary pen, they labeled the early chapters of Genesis as "creation **epics** or **poems**.... They were imaginative creations, in poetic language." Continuing, the authors stated:

In other words, the Genesis poems are significant not because they tell us how things **were**, or the way things happened long ago. Rather, they are talking about man's situation **now**—the eternal importance of man's relationship to God, and the primordial disruption of that fellowship that lies at the root of human nature and history. When we read the ancient Hebrew accounts of the creation—Adam and Eve, the Garden of Eden, man's "fall" by listening to the seductive words of a serpent, and God's Sabbath rest—we must understand...that "these things never were, but always are.... The stories are told and retold recorded and read and reread not for their **wasness** but for their **isness**. (1981, p. 8, emp. in orig.)

Buffaloe and Murray are not alone in such an assessment. John N. Clayton, in the 1976 edition of his book, *The Source*, commented: "If we look carefully at the issues about which we are talking, however, we can find that evolution and the Bible show amazing agreement on almost all issues and that one is not mutually exclusive of the other" (1976, p. 130). During a May 1981 seminar in Endwell, New York, Mr. Clayton went on record as stating: "Evolution is a fact of biology; I believe in evolution. It is not the purpose of Genesis to give us a historical record for the existence of everything" (as quoted in Francella, 1981). Clayton's reference to Genesis not being a "historical record" was not his first. In a letter to the editor in the March 1979 issue of the *Rocky Mountain Christian*, Clayton wrote: "I have been accused of not believing Exodus 20:11. What I have pointed out is that Exodus 20:11 is a quote from Genesis 2, and **Genesis 2 is not a historical account**" (1979, 7[4]:3, emp. added). It is not surprising, then, to find Clayton eventually stating: "I do not contend that it can be conclusively proven to 20th Century Americans that

the Bible is inspired, because the Bible writings have been written over a period of 4,000 years, in at least three languages and several cultures. This variability of background leads to cultural and linguistic difficulties that allow differences of opinion to creep in. There are countless examples of such difficulties.”

A more telling or erroneous statement would be difficult to find. First, the Bible was not written over a period of 4,000 years, but 1,600. Second, the charge that “differences of opinion” have crept into the inspired text is blasphemous. Faithful translation does not destroy inspiration! The Lord Himself quoted from the Septuagint and even called it “scripture” (John 19:36). Elsewhere our Lord noted that “the scripture cannot be broken” (John 10:35). The Bible’s claim of inspiration (2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:20-21; 1 Corinthians 2:12-13) is supported by the weightiest of evidences, while the so-called “countless examples” of Clayton’s “differences of opinion” have yet to come to light.

It would be hard to imagine statements any more fallacious or any more detrimental to both the Old and New Testament documents and the story of redemption contained therein. It is high time that Christians take a firm stand on the literal and historical nature of God’s Word as presented specifically in Genesis 1-11, and refute with appropriate evidences the attempts being made on every turn to undermine the authority of the Bible. As Whitcomb remarked:

Surely the words of rebuke given by our Lord to the two on the road to Emmaus must be applicable to many Christians today: “O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken” (Luke 24:25). Our basic problem today in the question of origins is not so much that we are ignorant of the theories and speculations of men. Our problem too often is that we neither know the Scriptures nor the power of God, and therefore deeply err in communicating God’s message to modern man (1972, p. 111).

Genesis 1-11 is an historical, literal account and not one to the status of be relegated to the status of myth, allegory, or “poem.” Consider the following:

(1) The style of these early chapters of Genesis does not suggest a mythical, allegorical, or poetical approach. Noted scholar Edward J. Young declared:

Genesis one is not poetry or saga or myth, but straightforward history, and, inasmuch as it is a divine revelation, accurately records those matters of which it speaks. That Genesis one is historical may be seen from these considerations: (1) It sustains an intimate relationship with the remainder of the book. The remainder of the book (i.e., the Generations) presupposes the Creation Account, and the Creation Account prepares for what follows. The two portions of Genesis are integral parts of the book and complement one another. (2) The characteristics of Hebrew poetry are lacking. There are poetic accounts of the creation and these form a striking contrast to Genesis one (1975, p. 105).

The cautious reader will be completely unable to detect differences in style and syntax between Genesis 1-11 and Genesis 12-50. There is no striking difference between the type of literature or style of writing between these two sections of the book. The same type of narrative as a prosaic account is to be found in Genesis 1-11 as in Genesis 12-50. As Thomas H. Horne well stated in his classical book, *Critical Introduction*, "The style of these chapters, as indeed, of the whole book of Genesis, is strictly historical, and betrays no vestige whatever of allegorical or figurative description; this is so evident to anyone that reads with attention, as to need no proof" (1970, 2:205).

(2) The Genesis narrative is to be accepted as literal history because this is the view entertained by the Lord. Henry M. Morris wrote:

Especially significant is the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself frequently quoted from Genesis. In one instance He used a quotation from both Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 (Matthew 19:4-6), thus stamping these chapters as both historically accurate and divinely inspired. Thus, one cannot legitimately question the historicity of the creation record without questioning the judgment and veracity of the Apostles and of Christ Himself. And this, of course, is an option which is not open to any consistent Christian (1967, p. 57).

Whitcomb observed:

...It is the privilege of these men to dispense with an historical Adam if they so desire. But they do not at the same time have the privilege of claiming that Jesus Christ spoke the truth. Adam and Jesus Christ stand or fall together, for Jesus said: "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:46-47). Our Lord also insisted that "till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law (and this includes Genesis) till all things be accomplished" (Matthew 5:18). If Genesis is not historically dependable, then Jesus is not a dependable guide to all truth, and we are without a Savior (1972, p. 111).

Jesus referred back to the literal and historical events of Genesis 1-11 on more than one occasion. For example, Jesus spoke of the flood of Noah as a real, historical event (Matthew 24:37ff.). He referred to Abel as a real, historical character (Matthew 23:35). He spoke the truth on marriage and divorce in Matthew 19 (cf. Mark 10), referring to God's statement to Adam and Eve in Genesis 2:24 as a real, historical event. Jesus called Satan the "father of lies" (John 8:44), referring back to the historical account of Genesis 3:4. Other examples could be given, but these should be sufficient to prove Jesus' support of the historical nature of Genesis. As Dr. Morris said: "Denying the historical validity of the Creation account also undermines the authority of the New Testament and of Christ Himself" (1966, p. 92).

(3) The Genesis narrative is to be accepted as literal and historical because the inspired writers of the New Testament not only referred to the narrative, but made doctrinal arguments that depended upon the historical validity of the Genesis record. Every New Testament writer made allusions to, or quoted from, the book of Genesis. In fact, all books of the New Testament except Philemon, 2 John, and 3 John contain allusions to Genesis. Of the fifty chapters in Genesis, only seven (20,24,34,36, 40,43,44) are not quoted or cited in the New Testament. [NOTE: All 11 chapters of Genesis 1-11 are quoted or cited; none is omitted] There are 200 specific references to Genesis used by the New Testament writers. More than half of the 200 allusions to Genesis are found in the first 11 chapters. Sixty-three of the allusions are to the first three chapters of Genesis, while fourteen are from the flood story (6-8) and fifty-eight are related to Abraham (11).

Paul contended that woman is of (*ek*—a Greek preposition meaning “out of”) man (1 Corinthians 11:8,12). He called Adam and Eve by name (1 Timothy 2:13), and considered Adam as historical as Moses (Romans 5:14) and Christ (1 Corinthians 15:45-47). He labeled Adam as the first man (1 Corinthians 15:45), and clearly stated that “the serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness” (2 Corinthians 11:3). Peter used the Flood to make an analogy to our salvation (1 Peter 3), and referred to the creation of the Earth as something that actually had taken place (2 Peter 3:5b). Other examples are far too numerous to give here. As Morris remarked:

Many people have tried to explain away the record of this chapter by calling it an allegory, or hymn, or myth. But this is impossible without simultaneously undermining the integrity of all the rest of Bible. This first chapter of Genesis fits perfectly into the historical record of the rest of the book of Genesis, which in turn is foundational to the entire Bible (1967, pp. 56-57).

(4) Consider the damage done to Christ Himself when Adam is made to be nothing but a myth.

Adam	Christ
1. Is called “the son of God” (Luke 3: 38)	1. Is called “the Son of God” (John 3:16)
2. Was uniquely (miraculously) brought forth by God (Genesis 2:7)	2. Was uniquely (miraculously) brought forth by God (Matthew 1:21)
3. Was the head of the physical race (1 Corinthians 15:45)	3. Is the head of the spiritual race (Ephesians 1:22; 4:15)
4. Was named by God (Genesis 5:2)	4. Was named by God (Matthew 1:21)
5. Was caused to sleep an unnatural sleep (Genesis 2:21)	5. Was caused to sleep an unnatural sleep (Acts 2:27)
6. In his sleep, his side was opened (Genesis 2:21)	6. In His sleep, His side was opened (John 19:34)
7. From his side was taken the rib—the price for his bride (Genesis 2:21-22)	7. From His side was taken His blood—the purchase price for His bride (Acts 20:28)
8. Adam loved his bride (Genesis 2:23)	8. Christ loves the church (Ephesians 4:15)
9. Adam was “head” over Eve (1 Timothy 2:12-13)	9. Christ is “head” of the Church (Ephesians 4:15)
10. Through Adam sin came into the world (Romans 5:12)	10. Through Christ salvation came into the world (Matthew 1:21)
11. Because of Adam, death reigned (Romans 5:14)	11. Because of Christ, righteousness and eternal life reign (John 5:24)

AGES OF THE PATRIARCHS

The early chapters of Genesis record great life spans for the patriarchs, topped by Methusaleh at 969 years. This may seem incomprehensible to us today, but obviously was quite possible under the conditions prevailing in the antediluvian world. Donald Patten and his son Phillip have suggested that possibly a much higher carbon dioxide content in the atmosphere would have slowed down maturation rates and induced longer life (no date). Slowing maturation also would produce, in some instances, giantism. Geological and biblical evidences certainly indicate that plants, animals, and even humans of the past have been larger than those we observe today (grape clusters carried back from the land of Canaan by the twelve spies, dinosaurs, Goliath—just to name a few.). As one writer has stated:

The Flood completely altered the climatic balance. The ozone layer was disturbed thereby letting a greater quantity of harmful ultra-violet radiation penetrate to the ground. The carbon dioxide balance was altered giving much reduced percentages. Thus life spans were dramatically shortened.... The curve of declining longevity is perfectly consistent with a gradual reduction of carbon dioxide. The average age of antediluvians, Enoch excepted, was 912, but this reduced in a mathematical curve after the Flood thereby suggesting a physical cause (Fisher, 1982, p. 54).

Some, however, are not content to accept the biblical record in regard to the ages of the patriarchs, and have suggested that these ages should not be viewed as literal. For example, John Clayton authored

an article in the June 1978 issue of his paper, *Does God Exist?*, in which he attempted to answer the question: “Did the patriarchs of old really live to be to the ages ascribed to them in the Bible?” He stated: “The Bible indicates ages of 969, 950, etc., years for early man. From a scientific standpoint we cannot verify this figure” (1978, 5[6]:11). As late as 1987 (in a letter to the Church of Christ in Laramie, Wyoming), Mr. Clayton made the same points when he wrote: “It is a fact that there is no scientific evidence that people lived to be hundreds of years old. It may just be that we haven’t found the right bones, but most bones of ancient man turn out to be twenty or thirty years of age and none have been found, to my knowledge, older than eighty-eight years old. For this reason, I have tried to point out that there are many possible ways in which the extreme age of Methusaleh might be explained....”

One of the “many ways” by which Clayton suggests that the ages of the patriarchs might be “explained” is to do what some ancient cultures did and divide the ages of a factor of 12 (since some cultures ascribed ages by calling their “years” by our months). In fact, in the article in his June 1978 publication, he even gave an example of how this can be done, and concluded that Methusaleh therefore would have been around 80, not 969.

Error is always its own worst enemy, however. Frederick Filby demonstrated just how wrong this concept is when he noted: “This we reject completely, as not only can it be shown to be absolutely wrong, but it makes more difficulties than it solves. Enoch we are told, had a son Methusaleh when he was sixty-five. If we divide by twelve, he had a son when he was 5.4 years old!” (1970, p. 101). As the old adage suggests, that which proves too much proves nothing at all.

THE FLOOD—GLOBAL OR LOCAL?

Considering all the compromise that has taken place in regard to parts of Genesis such as the creation account, the ages of the patriarchs, and the genealogies, it hardly is surprising that the account of the Great Flood likewise should come under attack. And indeed it has.

Among religionists of the past, such men as Robert Jamieson, prominent nineteenth-century Bible scholar, come to mind. In the *Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary* (1945) he presented a lengthy defense of the local flood theory. John Pye Smith, in his work, *The Relation Between the Holy Scriptures*

and Some Parts of Geological Science (1854), strongly advocated a limited, local flood. Edward Hitchcock, in his work, *The Religion of Geology and Its Connected Sciences* (1854), and Hugh Miller in his work, *The Testimony of the Rocks* (1875), also defended the local flood theory, asserting that the biblical account of a global flood was simply not acceptable.

In more recent times, Arthur C. Custance, the late religionist/anthropologist, defended the local, limited flood viewpoint in his works, *The Extent of the Flood: Doorway Papers No. 41* (1958), and *The Flood: Local or Global?* (1979). John Warwick Montgomery, in his book, *The Quest for Noah's Ark* (1972), joined Dr. Custance in defending the local flood theory. However, probably one of the most fervent, advocates of the local flood theory in our day is Bernard Ramm, who attempted to refute the idea of a global, universal flood in his controversial volume, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (1955). Ramm has urged that those of us who accept the biblical account of a universal Flood abandon our “hyperorthodox” attitude toward uniformitarianism and surrender the notion that the Flood was global.

Apparently, Ramm is getting his wish—at least in some quarters. For example, John Clayton has gone on record as stating:

There is no way geologically of supporting the idea that there was a worldwide flood.... On the North American continent, for example, there is no place, no real conclusive evidence that there has ever been a flood over this continent.... You cannot go to geology and find evidence to support the idea of the worldwide flood.... **The Bible does not maintain positively that this was a worldwide flood.... It seems to me plausible that possibly the flood was confined to the known earth at that time** (n.d., emp. added).

John Willis, in the commentary on Genesis that he authored, stated in regard to the global nature of the flood: “There is simply not enough concrete information to allow a dogmatic judgment in this matter.” He then listed the various arguments set forth for a local flood and ended with this assessment: “Geologists have discovered ample evidence of flooding all over the globe but no conclusive evidence of one universal flood. Rather, available remains can as easily point to local floods that occurred at different historical periods” (1979, p. 174).

Clyde Woods, in his *Living Way Commentary on the Old Testament: Genesis-Exodus*, wrote: “The extent of the flood has been disputed; some scholars insist that only a worldwide flood can satisfy the demands of the record, whereas others believe that the flood was limited to the area of man’s habitation.

A local flood seems favored by the extra-biblical evidence, but it does appear that the more natural meaning of the text favors a universal flood.” Woods then listed the various arguments for a local flood and drew this conclusion: “Thus, the local flood hypothesis seems to be a valid alternative” (1972, p. 20, emp. added).

The careful reader will have noticed by now one conspicuous and common trait of each of these statements. “You cannot go to geology....” “Geologists have discovered...no conclusive evidence.” “A local flood seems favored by the extra-biblical evidence.” Notice carefully how the conclusion preferring the local flood over the global flood is based in its entirety on the so-called “geological/scientific” evidence, **without any regard whatsoever for what the Bible has to say!** What are we discussing here? I was under the impression we were discussing the **biblical** Flood. Does it not make sense, then, that we should go first and foremost to the Bible to see what it has to say? As Byron Nelson correctly said: “It is a disregard for God and the sacred record of his acts, and nothing else, which has caused the discard of the Flood theory to take place” (1931, p. 137). It appears that there are indeed some who “preserve an outward reverence for the Bible,” yet “speak of Genesis patronizingly.” Theodore Epp remarked concerning the local flood view: “This concept seems to have gotten its greatest support from Christians attempting to harmonize the Bible with science. For the most part, the result has been a compromise between the Bible and historical geology, which is based on evolutionary thinking” (1972, p. 138). How very sad. And yet this syndrome apparently is becoming all the more common.

Since it is the biblical Flood about which we are speaking, and since it is from the Bible itself that we shall learn more about the Noahic Flood than from any other source, it is now to the Bible that we turn for information on whether the Flood was indeed a global, universal, worldwide event or some minor, local catastrophe. As we begin, however, let me make it clear that God’s Word speaks plainly of the fact that the Great Flood of Genesis 6-9 was indeed universal. The evidence to that effect from both Scripture and science is overwhelming. This brief review will list several, but will not be exhaustive due to space limitations. Enough information is available, however, to prove without a doubt that the Genesis Flood was a global event.

The Need for an Ark

According to the account recorded in Genesis 6-8, 120 years before the Flood God chose to reveal to Noah His intent to destroy the Earth by water, and therefore instructed him to make the necessary preparations for this coming judgment by building an ark that would be the instrument for saving not only his own family, but also the seed of all air-breathing creatures in the world. Rehwinkle noted: “The word ‘ark’ seems to be derived from the Egyptian language and signifies ‘chest’ or something to float. The word occurs only twice in the Bible, here for the ark of Noah and again in Exodus 2:3-5 for the ark of bulrushes in which the infant Moses was saved from the cruel decree of Pharaoh” (1951, p. 58). Before we examine the construction and size of the ark of Noah, a more basic question to mind: If the Flood was local, as some Bible critics maintain, **why would Noah have needed to build such an ark in the first place?** Whitcomb has remarked:

...there would have been no need for an Ark at all if the flood was local in extent. The whole procedure of constructing such a vessel, involving over 100 years of planning and toiling, simply to escape a local flood can hardly be described as anything but utterly foolish and unnecessary! How much more sensible it would have been for God simply to have warned Noah of the coming destruction in plenty of time for him to move to an area that would not have been affected by the Flood, even as Lot was taken out of Sodom before the fire fell from heaven. Not only man, but also the great numbers of animals of all kinds, and certainly the birds, could easily have moved out of the danger zone also, without having to be stored in a barge for an entire year! The biblical record simply cannot be harmonized with the concept of a Flood that was confined to the Near East (1972, p. 47, emp. in orig.).

This is a point that almost all advocates of the local flood theory either miss, or purposely fail to discuss. In fact, Morris and Whitcomb have pointed out: “The writers have had a difficult time finding local-Flood advocates that are willing to face the implications of this particular argument” (1961, p. 11). One certainly can understand why!

In an effort to support the concept of a local flood, Custance suggested that the entire ark-building episode was merely an “object lesson” to the antediluvians.

It would require real energy and faith to follow Noah’s example and build other Arks, but it would have required neither of these to pack up a few things and migrate. There is nothing Noah could have done to stop them except disappearing very secretly. Such a departure could hardly act as the kind of warning that the deliberate construction of the Ark could have done. And the inspiration for this undertaking was given to Noah by leaving him in ignorance of the exact limits of the Flood. He was assured that all mankind would be destroyed, and probably supposed that the Flood would therefore be universal. This supposition may have been quite essential for him (1958, p. 18).

In responding to this suggestion by Custance, Whitcomb and Morris asked:

But how can one read the Flood account of Genesis 6-9 with close attention and then arrive at the conclusion that the Ark was built merely to warn the ungodly, and not **mainly** to save the occupants of the Ark from death by drowning? And how can we exonerate God Himself from the charge of deception, if we say that He led Noah to believe that the Flood would be universal, in order to encourage him to work on the Ark, when He knew all the time that it would **not** be universal? (1961, p. 12, emp. in orig.).

One final point needs to be mentioned in this vein. Some today are fervent in their insistence that the ark has been found on top of the 17,000-foot-high Mt. Ararat in Turkey. Among that number is John Warwick Montgomery (1972). Dr. Montgomery, however, is a strong advocate of the local flood theory. How, in the name of common sense, can a man claim to accept biblical and/or scientific evidence that he feels points to the remains of Noah's ark being on the top of Mt. Ararat in Turkey, and then turn right around and **deny the biblical testimony to the global Flood that supposedly put it there?! Does Dr. Montgomery understand what he is asking us to believe? To claim that the remains of the ark are on top of the 17,000-foot-high Mt. Ararat, while at the same time insisting that it was put there by a local flood, is to suggest the impossible. [NOTE: I do not accept Montgomery's claim that the ark can be proven to be on Ararat, but that is beyond the scope of this discussion.]**

The Construction and Size of the Ark

God told Noah (Genesis 6:15) to make "the length of the ark three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits." If we are to understand the size of the ark, we first must understand the length of the cubit. "The Babylonians had a 'royal' cubit of about 19.8 inches, the Egyptians had a longer and a shorter cubit of about 20.65 and 17.6 inches respectively, while the Hebrews apparently had a long cubit of 20.4 inches (Ezekiel 40:5) and a common cubit of about 17.5 inches" (Whitcomb and Morris, 1961, p. 10). In fact, as Filby has pointed out, as late as 1858 "the largest vessel of her type in the world was the P & O liner *Himalaya*, 240 feet by 35 feet." It was in that year that Isambard K. Brunel produced

the *Great Eastern*, 692 feet by 83 feet by 30 feet of approximately 19,000 tons...five times the tonnage of any ship then afloat... Still more interesting are the figures for the *Great Britain*, designed by I.K. Brunel in 1844. Her dimensions were 322 feet by 51 feet by 32½ feet, so that the ratios are almost exactly those of the Ark. Brunel had the accumulated knowledge of generations of shipbuilders to draw upon. The Ark was the first of its kind! (Filby, 1970, p. 93).

Whitcomb and Morris, using the conservative estimate for a cubit of 17 ½ inches, have shown that the ark would have been 437.5 feet long, 72.92 feet wide, and 43.75 feet high. On its three decks (Genesis 6:16) it had a total area of approximately 95,700 square feet—the equivalent to slightly more than twenty standard basketball courts. Its total volume would have been 1,396,000 cubic feet. The gross tonnage (measurement of cubic space rather than weight, one ton being equivalent to 100 cubic feet of usable storage space) was about 13,960 tons (1961, p. 10).

Critics of the flood story often have stated that the ark simply was not large enough to handle all the cargo it was designed to carry. Those critics, however, generally have not considered just how large the ark really was, or the cargo it had to carry. As Whitcomb noted:

For the sake of realism, imagine waiting at a railroad crossing while ten freight trains, each pulling 52 boxcars, move slowly by, one after another. That is how much space was available in the Ark, for its capacity was equivalent to 520 modern railroad stock cars. A barge of such gigantic size, with its thousands of built-in compartments (Genesis 6:14) would have been sufficiently large to carry two of every **species** of air-breathing animal in the world today (and doubtless the tendency toward taxonomic splitting has produced more “species” than can be justified in terms of Genesis “kinds”) on only half of its available deck space. The remaining space would have been occupied by Noah’s family, five additional representatives of each of the comparatively few kinds of animals acceptable for sacrifice, two each of the kinds that have become extinct since the Flood, and food for them all (Genesis 6:21) [1972, p. 23, emp. in orig.].

In *The Genesis Flood*, Whitcomb and Morris investigated the numbers of animals that would have been on the ark (using highest possible estimates, and taxonomic figures provided by evolutionists), and showed that the biblical account can fit the known scientific facts regarding these matters (1961, pp. 65-69). Some have stated that an examination of such facts amounts to nothing more than “mental gymnastics” (Clayton, 1980, 7[7]:8). It is not “mental gymnastics,” however, to compare the physical structure and size of the ark (as given by the Bible itself) to known scientific facts regarding the animal kingdom. In fact, rather than being “mental gymnastics,” it serves to show the fallacious nature of the arguments set forth by those who would criticize the inspired account.

Some, like Custance, have stated (or implied) that the building of such a large boat as the ark, in such remote times of antiquity and by so few men, simply would not have been possible. Regarding such a suggestion, I would like to offer the following comments. First, as Whitcomb and Morris have noted:

The Scriptures, however, do not suggest that Noah and his three sons had to construct the Ark without the

help of hired men. Nevertheless, we agree that the sheer massiveness of the Ark staggers the imagination. In fact, this is the very point of our argument: for Noah to have built a vessel of such magnitude simply for the purpose of escaping a local flood is inconceivable. The very size of the Ark should effectively eliminate the local-Flood view from serious consideration among those who take the Book of Genesis at face value (1961, p. 11).

Second, note what Filby has said in this regard:

Yet even granting all this some may feel that the Ark was too large for early man to have attempted. A survey of the ancient world shows in fact the very reverse. One is constantly amazed at the enormous tasks which our ancestors attempted. The Great Pyramid was not the work of the later Pharaohs; it was the work of the 4th Dynasty—long before Abraham! This pyramid contained over two million blocks of stone each weighing about 2½ tons. Its vast sides, 756 feet long, are set to the points of the compass to an accuracy of a small fraction of one degree! The so-called Colossi of Memnon again are not of recent times—they belong to the 18th Dynasty of Egypt. Cut from blocks of sandstone they weigh 400 tons each and were brought 600 miles to their present position.... As our thoughts go back to the Colossus of Rhodes, the Pharos Lighthouse, the Hanging Gardens, the Ziggurats, the Step Pyramid—or even in our own land, to Stonehenge—we have no reason to suppose that early man was afraid to tackle great tasks (1970, p. 92).

Custance's argument thus is shown to be completely at odds with historical data. Merely because the ark was large does not mean the task was impossible. And we must not forget, Noah had over 100 years in which to build it (Genesis 6:3).

The Rainbow Covenant and Its Implications

A point that often is overlooked by local flood advocates is the rainbow covenant (Genesis 9:11-15) God made with Noah. Three times (Genesis 8:21; 9:11,15) God promised never again to wipe out “everything living” and “all flesh” by a flood. He set His bow (rainbow) in the heavens as a sign of that promise. If the Flood of Genesis 6-9 was merely a local flood, then it is obvious that God has broken His promise numerous times, since there have been countless local floods upon the face of the Earth in which multiplied thousands of people have perished.

If the Genesis Flood was local, but God promised never to send another (local) flood again, then why have local floods continued? The advocates of the local flood theory have God breaking His promise, in spite of plain statements of Scripture like Titus 1:2 which state that God “cannot lie.” S.J. Schultz remarked:

Had any part of the human race survived the flood outside of Noah and his family they would not have been included in the covenant God made here. The implication seems to be that all mankind descended from Noah so that the covenant with its bow in the cloud as a reminder would be for all mankind (1955, 7:52).

The arguments are incontrovertible to those who respect the inspiration of Scripture that the Flood was a global, universal, worldwide event.

REFERENCES

- Bales, J.D. (1974), "Theistic Evolution and Genesis," *Gospel Advocate*, 116[4]:52-54, January 24.
- Berkout, Peter (1965), *The Banner*, March 5.
- Buffaloe, Neal (1969), "God or Evolution?," *Mission*, April.
- Buffaloe, Neal and N. Patrick Murray (1981), *Creationism and Evolution* (Little Rock, AR: The Bookmark).
- Camp, Robert (1972), *A Critical Look at Evolution* (Atlanta, GA: Religion, Science and Communication Research and Development Corporation).
- Carnell, Edward J. (1959), *The Case for Orthodox Theology* (Philadelphia, MA: Westminster Press).
- Chouinard, Larry (1975), "A Review of the 'Does God Exist?' Series," *Christian Courier*, 11[4]:14-15, August.
- Clayton, John N. (no date), *Questions and Answers: Number 1* (South Bend, IN: Privately published by author), taped lecture.
- Clayton, John (1976), *The Source* (South Bend, IN: Privately published by author).
- Clayton, John (1977), *Does God Exist?* Correspondence Course (South Bend, IN: Privately published by author), Lesson 4.
- Clayton, John (1978), "The Question of Methusaleh," *Does God Exist?*, 5[6]:11-13, June.
- Clayton, John (1979), "Letter to the Editor," *Rocky Mountain Christian*, 7[4]:3, March.
- Clayton, John N. (1980), "The Flood—Fact, Theory, and Fiction," *Does God Exist?*, 7[7]:2-9, July.
- Cremer, H. (1962), *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek* (London: T.&T. Clark).
- Culp, G.R. (1975), *Remember Thy Creator* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Custance, Arthur C. (1958), *The Extent of the Flood*, Doorway Papers #41 (Ottawa, Canada: Doorway Papers). This material by Custance later was included in his 1979 book, *The Flood: Local or Global?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan).
- Custance (1967), *The Genealogies of the Bible*, Doorway Papers #24 (Ottawa, Canada: Doorway Papers).
- Custance, Arthur C. (1979), *The Flood: Local or Global?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan).
- Dods, Marcus (1948), "Genesis," *The Expositor's Bible*, ed. W.R. Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Epp, Theodore (1972), *The God of Creation* (Lincoln, NE: Back to the Bible).
- Fields, W.W. (1976), *Unformed and Unfilled* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Filby, Frederick A. (1970), *The Flood Reconsidered* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan).
- Fisher, G.A. (1982), *Speak Through the Earthquake, Wind & Fire* (England: Countywise, Ltd. Birkenhead, Wirral, Merseyside).
- Francella, Kevin (1981), "Former Atheist Says Bible and Evolution Are Compatible," *The Sunday Press* (Birmingham, New York), May 17.
- Hitchcock, Edward (1854), *The Religion of Geology and Its Connected Sciences* (Boston, MA: Phillips, Sampson, and Company).
- Henkle, M. (1950), "Fundamental Christianity & Evolution," *Modern Science and the Christian Faith* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press).
- Horne, Thomas H. (1970 reprint), *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*

- (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- The Interpreter's Bible* (1952), [New York: Abingdon].
- Jackson, Wayne (1978), "The Antiquity of Human History," *Words of Truth*, 14[18]:1, April 14.
- Jamieson, Robert, et al. (1945), *Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Jennings, Mark (no date), *Theistic Evolution* (Fort Worth, TX: Star), a tract.
- Jordan, James (1979), "The Biblical Chronology Question: An Analysis," *Creation Social Sciences & Humanities Quarterly*, 2[2]:9-15.
- Jordan, James (1980), "The Biblical Chronology Question: An Analysis," *Creation Social Sciences & Humanities Quarterly*, 2[3]:17-26.
- Keil, C.F. and F. Delitzsch (1971), *The Pentateuch* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Kitchen, K.A., and J.D. Douglas, eds. (1982), *The New Bible Dictionary* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale), second edition.
- Klingman, George (1929), *God Is* (Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate).
- L'Amour, Louis (1980), *Treasure Mountain* (New York: Bantam).
- Miller, Hugh (1875), *The Testimony of the Rocks* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers).
- Milligan, Robert (1972 reprint), *The Scheme of Redemption* (Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate).
- Montgomery, John Warwick (1972), *The Quest for Noah's Ark* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship).
- Morris, Henry M. (1966), *Studies in the Bible and Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Morris, Henry M. (1967), *Evolution and the Modern Christian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Morris, Henry M. (1970), *Biblical Cosmology and Modern Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Morris, Henry M. (1974), *Scientific Creationism* (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers).
- Nelson, Byron (1931), *The Deluge Story in Stone* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg).
- Patten, Donald and Phillip Patten (no date), "The Longevity Accounts in Genesis, Job, Josephus and Augustine," unpublished manuscript.
- Pieters, Albertus (1947), *Notes On Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Ramm, B. (1955), *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Rehwinkle, Alfred M. (1951), *The Flood* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia).
- Schultz, S.J. (1955), "The Unity of the Race: Genesis 1-11," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, September.
- Sears, Jack Wood (1969), *Conflict and Harmony in Science and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Smith, John Pye (1854), *The Relation Between the Holy Scriptures and Some Parts of Geological Science* (London: Henry G. Bohn), fifth edition.
- Smith, Wilbur M. (1974 reprint), *Therefore Stand!* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Stigers, Harold (1976), *A Commentary on Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan).
- Straton, J.R. (1956), "Evolution," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans),.
- Tarbet, Don (no date) *The Bible Versus Evolution* (Fort Worth, TX: Star), a tract.
- Thayer, J.H. (1958), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark).
- Watts, J.W. (1947), *A Survey of Old Testament Preaching* (Nashville, TN: Broadman).
- West, Bob (1974), *Evolution Versus Science and the Bible* (Sapphire, NC: Bob West Publications), Lesson 12.
- Whitcomb, John C. and Henry M. Morris (1961), *The Genesis Flood* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).

- Whitcomb, John C. (1972), *The Early Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Whitcomb, John C. (1973a), "The Days of Creation," *And God Created*, ed. Kelly L. Segraves (San Diego, CA: Creation Science Research Center).
- Whitcomb, John C. (1973b), "The Gap Theory," *And God Created*, ed. Kelly L. Segraves (San Diego, CA: Creation Science Research Center).
- Whitcomb, John C. (1978), *The Moon: Its Creation, Form and Significance* (Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books).
- Williams, Arthur (1965), *Creation Research Annual* (Ann Arbor, MI: Creation Research Society).
- Willis, John (1979), *Genesis* (Austin, TX: Sweet Publishing Co.).
- Woods, Clyde (1972), *The Living Way Commentary on the Old Testament: Genesis-Exodus* (Shreveport, LA: Lambert).
- Woods, Guy N. (1976), *Questions And Answers: Open Forum* (Henderson, TN: Freed-Hardeman College).
- Wysong, R.L. (1976), *The Creation/Evolution Controversy* (East Lansing, MI: Inquiry Press).
- Young, Davis A. (1977), *Creation And The Flood* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Young, Edward J. (1964), *Studies in Genesis One* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed).
- Young, Edward J. (1975), *Studies in Genesis One* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).