

Unshaken Foundations: Reclaiming Earth's History Through Scripture, Science, and the Coherence of Faith—

Theological Foundations of Young-Earth Creationism

Jonathan K. Corrado*

Key Words: Biblical Genealogies, Creation Days, Doctrinal Integrity, Scriptural Authority, Young-Earth Chronology

* Jonathan K. Corrado, PhD, ThM, PE,
Corresponding author, Cincinnati, OH,
jccorrad2@liberty.edu
Accepted for publication July 18, 2025

Abstract

This first paper in a series exploring young-Earth creationism (YEC) examines its theological foundations and Biblical rationale, laying the groundwork for a broader, interdisciplinary analysis. Grounded in a literal interpretation of Genesis, it focuses on key scriptural evidence, including genealogies and Earth's chronology, that support an Earth age of approximately 6,000 years. This work also addresses theological challenges posed by old-Earth interpretations and highlights their implications for fundamental doctrines, such as the coherence of Christ's redemptive work. By reaffirming the authority of Scripture, this study establishes the Biblical cornerstone for subsequent explorations into scientific and philosophical dimensions of YEC.

Simple Summary

This article, the first in a series exploring Young-Earth Creationism (YEC), outlines the theological reasons for believing the Earth is only about 6,000 years old, arguing that this view is supported by a literal interpretation of the Bible's authority. The approximate 6,000-year age is calculated by carefully analyzing the specific chronological details and genealogies found in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11, which track human lineage from Adam. A key focus is on the meaning of the Hebrew word *yôm* (day) in Genesis 1, which YEC proponents argue should be understood as a literal, ordinary 24-hour period because it is consistently paired with the phrases "evening and morning" and ordinal numbers. Furthermore, the paper maintains that Genesis 1 is written as a historical narrative, not poetry or allegory, reinforcing the need for a plain reading of the text. The study challenges old-Earth interpretations, like the Day-Age Theory, stating that these models raise theological difficulties by suggesting that death and suffering existed for millions of years before Adam's sin, thus undermining foundational Christian doctrines about the Fall and Christ's redemptive work. Ultimately, this work reaffirms Scripture as the ultimate guide for interpreting Earth's history, serving as the necessary Biblical foundation for future papers that will examine the scientific and philosophical aspects of YEC.

Setting the Stage

The question of the Earth's age and the nature of creation has long stood at the intersection of theology, science, and

Biblical scholarship. While salvation remains the cornerstone of Christian faith, the debate over Earth's timeline carries profound implications for Bib-

lical interpretation, doctrinal integrity, and the dialogue between faith-based perspectives and secular paradigms. Central to this discourse is a critical

question: Should Scripture conform to prevailing human theories, or must Scripture itself guide our understanding of the natural world?

Young-Earth Creationism (YEC), rooted in the traditional and conservative exegesis of Scripture, asserts an Earth age of approximately 6,000 years, derived from genealogies and Biblical chronology. This perspective stands in tension with the scientific consensus favoring Earth's ancient origins. Yet, YEC does not rely solely on theology; it draws from a growing body of evidence to present itself as a scientifically viable framework that harmonizes with Biblical timelines. Far from being a simplistic or pseudoscientific position, YEC offers a coherent worldview supported by a literal interpretation of Genesis and a commitment to scriptural authority.

As the esteemed preacher Charles Spurgeon once remarked, "We are told that the world has existed for millions of years; we care very little for the guesses of science, but we do care for the teaching of Christ" (Spurgeon, 1886). Spurgeon's adherence to the primacy of Scripture reflects the enduring perspective of YEC: that Biblical truth must remain the lens through which we interpret competing theories of Earth's history. For many believers, YEC offers theological coherence while providing a scientifically informed view that aligns with their faith.

This paper serves as the Biblical cornerstone for a series dedicated to exploring YEC. By establishing the Biblical and theological foundations of YEC through a literal interpretation of Genesis, this work aims to reaffirm the authority of Scripture as the ultimate framework for understanding Earth's history. This foundational study prepares the stage for subsequent papers that will address scientific and philosophical dimensions, creating an integrated defense of YEC within the dialogue of faith and reason.

YEC continues to face robust challenges from scientific disciplines that endorse a much older Earth and universe. However, its proponents actively engage with these critiques, drawing upon rigorous methodologies to reconcile their views with contemporary findings. YEC emphasizes that when scientific evidence is interpreted through a Biblical lens, it reveals compelling support for a young Earth. This approach challenges the notion that faith and science are inherently incompatible, instead demonstrating their coexistence within a scripturally rooted worldview.

This paper reaffirms the authority of Scripture by advocating for a young-Earth perspective, firmly grounded in a literal reading of Genesis. Through an examination of Biblical genealogies, the creation account, and the narrative of the global Flood, it addresses the theological and logical difficulties inherent in old-Earth interpretations. By exploring how such perspectives influence foundational Christian doctrines—including the origin of sin, the nature of death, and Christ's redemptive work—this study underscores the centrality of Scripture in shaping a coherent Christian worldview.

Ultimately, this paper (as well as the papers in this series) consolidates key YEC arguments into an interconnected discussion. While evidence supporting a young-Earth perspective is often scattered across various texts, papers, and studies, this synthesis seeks to unify these threads into a single, accessible resource. In doing so, it aims to strengthen the coherence of YEC while resisting the secular paradigms that frequently challenge the authority of Scripture.

Biblical Genealogies and Earth's Chronology

Throughout history, humankind has sought to understand its origins—

where we came from, how we got here, and how long this journey has unfolded. For Christians, the Bible offers not just spiritual guidance but also a historical framework that answers some of these profound questions. Among these is the age of the Earth, which can be explored through a careful analysis of Scripture.

One of the most influential figures in these calculations was Archbishop James Ussher, a 17th-century Irish theologian, who meticulously analyzed the genealogies in Genesis and integrated historical records, such as the reigns of ancient monarchs, to determine a precise timeline for the Earth's history. Ussher's chronology famously placed the creation of the Earth on the evening before October 23, 4004 BC. His work, published in *Annals of the World*, became a cornerstone for those seeking to align Biblical accounts with historical chronology (Ussher, 1658). Ussher's approach was not arbitrary; it reflected a comprehensive and systematic methodology, one that set a precedent for future scholars who sought to harmonize Scripture with historical records (Barrick, 2008).

The age of the Earth, from a Biblical perspective, can be determined through a detailed analysis of scriptural evidence, particularly the genealogies presented in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11. These genealogies trace the lineage of humanity from Adam through key figures such as Noah and Abraham (Barrick, 2008). Genesis 5:3 specifies that Adam was 130 years old when he fathered Seth, and this level of specificity is consistent throughout these chapters, which detail not only the ages of the patriarchs at the birth of their offspring but also their total lifespans (Barrick, 2008). By summing these ages, theologians calculate that approximately 2,000 years passed between Adam and Abraham. Further analysis of Biblical texts and historical context indicates that an additional

2,000 years elapsed between Abraham and Jesus. With roughly 2,000 years having passed since Jesus' time on Earth, the Biblical chronology situates the Earth's age at approximately 6,000 years (Whitcomb and Morris, 1961).

The detailed genealogies in Genesis reinforce this estimation and provide a compelling framework for understanding Earth's chronology. For example, in Genesis 5, the Scripture explicitly states, "Adam lived 130 years and begot a son in his own likeness, after his image, and named him Seth" (Genesis 5:3). Similar records continue with figures such as Methuselah, who, according to Genesis 5:27, lived to be 969 years old—the longest recorded lifespan in the Bible. These genealogical accounts were not written as vague allegories, but as precise historical records intended to be taken seriously by their readers (Barrick, 2008).

The specificity of these genealogical records—detailing the exact ages at which individuals fathered children and their total lifespans—sets them apart from symbolic or allegorical writings (Snelling, 2014). Unlike allegories, which typically rely on abstract or figurative language to convey moral or philosophical truths, these passages present numerical details with meticulous precision, indicating their purpose as historical documentation. Phrases such as "Adam lived 130 years" or "Seth lived 105 years and begot Enosh" (Genesis 5:6) clearly reflect an intent to provide a chronological framework.

Moreover, the genealogies are central to the Bible's broader historical narrative, particularly in the genealogy of Jesus Christ presented in the New Testament (Matthew 1:1–17, Luke 3:23–38). These genealogical records directly build upon the Old Testament lineages, linking the patriarchs to the fulfillment of messianic prophecy (Barrick, 2008). Were the genealogies to be understood merely as allegories, the continuity of Scripture and the fulfill-

ment of God's promises through Christ would be undermined, weakening key Christian doctrines (Whitcomb and Morris, 1961).

Throughout history, Christian scholars have relied on these genealogies to explore and affirm the Bible's historical narrative. Julius Africanus, a third-century Christian historian, used the Septuagint—a Greek translation of the Old Testament—to calculate the age of the Earth. Although the figures in the Septuagint differ slightly from those in the Masoretic Text (the Hebrew version of the Old Testament), their overall conclusions remain consistent, placing the creation of the Earth approximately 4,000 to 5,500 years BC (Africanus, 221; Barrick, 2008). These figures have also been corroborated by other early Christian historians, such as Eusebius, who further emphasized the importance of integrating genealogical records with historical events to form a cohesive Biblical timeline.

Additionally, the genealogies in Genesis serve a practical and theological purpose that further justifies their interpretation as historical accounts (Ham, 1987). They provide an ancestral record that traces the continuity of God's covenant with His people, forming a direct line from Adam to Noah and onward to Abraham, whose descendants were chosen to carry forward God's promises (Snelling, 2014). This unbroken lineage not only connects humanity's origins to its ultimate redemption through Jesus Christ but also affirms the authority of Scripture as a reliable historical document.

While modern scientific claims often challenge the idea of a young Earth, these Biblical genealogies offer an internally consistent framework for understanding human history and Earth's timeline. Despite differences in interpretation between Christian traditions—such as variations between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint—the overarching conclusion remains:

the Biblical narrative supports an Earth that is thousands, not millions or billions, of years old (Jones, 2005). These genealogical records, far from being relics of an ancient worldview, remain central to the Christian understanding of history, theology, and faith.

Septuagint and Its Provenance

The Septuagint (LXX)—a Greek translation of Hebrew scripture completed in the third century BC—offers valuable insight into textual transmission and Biblical interpretation. While often debated regarding its alignment with the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint holds a unique position in the history of Biblical scholarship. For YEC advocates, the Septuagint is a vital resource, as its genealogical data offers evidence consistent with the young-Earth framework. However, as highlighted in Michael Lamb's 2019 research, the Septuagint's textual reliability is challenged by its instances of extensive messianic prophecy corruptions and Flood-related chronology errors. Lamb argues that such issues disqualify the Septuagint as a reliable source for creationist research, emphasizing that its genealogical variations cannot be fully reconciled with the Biblical framework (Lamb, 2019).

Despite these concerns, the Septuagint remains an important text for understanding the theological and historical development of Biblical chronology. One of the key points of divergence between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text lies in their genealogical ages, particularly in the early chapters of Genesis. The Septuagint often lists higher-age figures for the patriarchs at the time they fathered children, resulting in a longer chronological timeline between Adam and Abraham compared to the Masoretic Text. For instance, the age discrepancies between these texts yield a dif-

ference of approximately 1,400 years. This raises critical questions about the precise chronology of Biblical events. While these variations still affirm an Earth that is thousands of years old, Lamb's findings suggest that reliance on the Septuagint's data might obscure rather than clarify the young-Earth framework, particularly in light of its textual inconsistencies (Barrick, 2008; Lamb, 2019).

The Septuagint's provenance and purpose further enhance its relevance to YEC. Dr. Pieter Lalleman highlights its widespread use among early Christians, including the New Testament authors, who frequently quoted from it. This affirms the Septuagint's theological authority in shaping early Christian thought and its compatibility with the core tenets of Biblical doctrine. Early Christian historians such as Julius Africanus relied heavily on the Septuagint for their genealogical calculations, using it to argue for a coherent Biblical chronology (Africanus, 221; Lalleman, 2015). Likewise, Eusebius of Caesarea adopted the Septuagint's genealogical data in his seminal *Chronicon*, reinforcing its historical significance in establishing a timeline that aligns with YEC perspectives (Eusebius, 325).

Timothy Michael Law underscores the Septuagint's role in bridging the Hebrew scriptures with the Greek-speaking world, thus preserving the integrity of God's word across linguistic and cultural boundaries. This cross-cultural translation effort ensured that the theological truths of Scripture, including the creation account and genealogical records, remained accessible to the growing Christian community (Law, 2013). While some may view the variations between the Septuagint and Masoretic Text as problematic, they also demonstrate the meticulous nature of Biblical transmission and the divine providence guiding its preservation. Despite textual challenges, the Septuagint's use by early Christians

and its role in Biblical scholarship affirm its theological significance.

Furthermore, the theological implications of the Septuagint's translation process affirm the coherence of a young-Earth chronology within the broader framework of Scripture. By using genealogical records, the Septuagint upholds the integrity of key doctrinal concepts, such as the historical reality of Adam as the first man and the centrality of humanity's origin in God's creative work. Early Christian theologians, including Clement of Alexandria, cited the Septuagint's chronology to argue for a unified Biblical timeline, emphasizing its consistency with the Genesis narrative and its role in affirming the young-Earth view (Clement of Alexandria, 190; Africanus, 221).

While critics often point to differences between the Septuagint and Masoretic Text as evidence of textual inconsistency, YEC proponents highlight that both texts ultimately point to a shared timeline that supports a young Earth. The genealogical data in the Septuagint provides additional layers of clarity for calculating the age of the Earth while preserving the theological significance of the Genesis account. The LXX thus serves not only as a historical artifact but also as a critical piece of evidence in reaffirming the authority and reliability of Scripture.

The Septuagint's genealogies, when viewed through the lens of a young-Earth framework, further underscore the consistency of Biblical chronology. Its role in shaping early Christian thought and its compatibility with foundational doctrines make it a cornerstone in defending the theological coherence of YEC. By preserving the integrity of Genesis and its timeline, the Septuagint contributes to a holistic understanding of Earth's history, centered on the authority of God's word.

The paper *A Quantitative Analysis of the Life Spans of the Genesis Patriarchs*

(Archer, 2012) provides insights into the life spans recorded in Genesis, emphasizing the theological coherence of the Septuagint's genealogical data. Archer argues that these records align with a timeline consistent with YEC, addressing discrepancies between the Septuagint and Masoretic Text while underscoring the reliability of both texts.

Challenges Posed by Old-Earth Interpretations

While the genealogies provide a robust framework for understanding Earth's age, they also highlight significant theological and doctrinal tensions posed by old-Earth interpretations. These alternative views attempt to reconcile Scripture with secular theories, yet they raise profound challenges that extend beyond science, impacting foundational Christian doctrines such as the Fall and redemption.

As humankind has grappled with questions about the origin and age of the Earth, perspectives have shifted significantly (Ham, 1987). For centuries, the Biblical account provided the primary framework for understanding the natural world and humanity's place within it (Mortenson, 2004). This view held sway not only within religious circles but also in broader intellectual discourse, with scholars relying on Scripture as a foundational source for knowledge about creation. However, during the late 18th and early 19th centuries, a paradigm shift began to take hold. Advances in geology, paleontology, and astronomy led to the emergence of scientific theories proposing that the Earth's age extended to millions or even billions of years—an interpretation fundamentally at odds with the traditional Biblical timeline (Mortenson, 2004; Snelling, 2014).

Key figures such as James Hutton, often referred to as the "father of modern geology" (Hutton, 1788), and

Charles Lyell introduced revolutionary concepts like uniformitarianism. This principle posited that geological processes observed today—such as sedimentation and erosion—had operated uniformly over vast periods of time, challenging the longstanding notion of a young Earth shaped primarily by catastrophic events like the Biblical Flood. These ideas, popularized through works like Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (Lyell, 1830–1833), gained significant traction and laid the foundation for a scientific consensus around deep time (Mortenson, 2004).

Simultaneously, discoveries in paleontology, such as the fossilized remains of extinct species, further reinforced the notion of an ancient Earth. Fossil stratigraphy suggested a sequential order of life-forms appearing and disappearing over time, leading to the belief in a progressive development of life across epochs (Whitcomb and Morris, 1961). These findings introduced a direct challenge to the Biblical narrative of creation and the timeline derived from genealogies in Genesis. Additionally, emerging theories in astronomy, such as Immanuel Kant's and Pierre-Simon Laplace's nebular hypothesis, proposed that the Solar System formed over millions of years through natural processes, further shifting perceptions of the universe's age (Mortenson, 2004).

In response to the paradigm shift introduced by radiometric dating and uniformitarianism, YEC proponents have sought to critically examine the assumptions underlying these methods. The CRSQ paper titled "Extensive Messianic Prophecy Corruptions and Flood-Related Chronology Errors Disqualify the Septuagint (LXX) as a Reliable Source for Creationist Research" (Lamb, 2019) highlights inconsistencies in the assumptions underlying radiometric dating methods, suggesting that accelerated nuclear decay during the global Flood could

account for observed isotopic ratios. These findings not only challenge the validity of secular dating methods but also underscore the compatibility of geological evidence with the Biblical account, reinforcing the theological coherence of a young-Earth view.

In response to these developments, Christian theologians and scientists were faced with the task of reconciling their faith with these scientific claims. Various interpretative approaches arose, each seeking to harmonize the Biblical account of creation with an old-Earth framework. One prominent model, the Gap Theory, suggests a temporal gap between Genesis 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and Genesis 1:2, "The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters." This gap purportedly allows for the passage of millions or billions of years, accommodating scientific evidence for an ancient Earth while maintaining the integrity of the six-day creation narrative beginning in Genesis 1:3. Advocates of this theory, such as Thomas Chalmers in the early 19th century, argued that the gap could also explain geological phenomena like fossils and sedimentary layers without contradicting Scripture (Chalmers, 1814; Mortenson, 2004).

Another influential interpretation, the Day-Age Theory, emerged as a means to align the Genesis creation account with scientific timelines. Proponents argue that the Hebrew word *yôm* (day) in Genesis 1, while often used to denote a 24-hour period, can also signify an indefinite span of time (Ross, 2017). This interpretation suggests that each creation "day" represents a long epoch, potentially spanning millions of years. Supporters often cite passages such as Psalm 90:4 (NIV) ("A thousand years in your sight are like a day that has just gone by") and 2 Peter 3:8, "But, beloved, do not forget this one thing,

that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," which echo this sentiment, as evidence that *yôm* need not always denote a literal day. However, critics emphasize that Genesis 1 consistently pairs *yôm* with the phrases "evening and morning," reinforcing its interpretation as a literal 24-hour period within the creation narrative (McGee, 2019).

More radical departures from traditional interpretations have gone further, rejecting Genesis 1–11 as a historical narrative altogether. These views, influenced by evolutionary theory, propose that these chapters are mythological or allegorical in nature, intended to convey theological truths rather than historical events (Walton, 2009). Under such frameworks, the Bible's historical timeline begins with Genesis 12 and the story of Abraham. This approach introduces theological challenges, particularly with regard to the origins of sin, the reality of death, and the necessity of Christ's redemptive work. If Genesis 1–11 is viewed merely as allegory, key elements of Christian doctrine—such as the introduction of sin through Adam—risk being undermined (Collins, 2011).

Furthermore, the reinterpretation of the Genesis Flood narrative also plays a significant role in this discussion. The concept of an ancient Earth requires reconsideration of the global Flood described in Genesis 6–9. A literal interpretation of the Flood implies a catastrophic event that would have dramatically altered the Earth's geological landscape, erasing sedimentary layers and fossils accumulated over billions of years. Old-Earth frameworks often recast the Flood as a localized event rather than a global one, creating tension with the Biblical text, which describes the waters covering "all the high mountains under the entire heavens" (Genesis 7:19, NIV) (Ham, 1987).

In the midst of these interpretative debates, Jesus' words in Mark 10:6

offer significant insight: “But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female.” This statement aligns with the traditional Biblical timeline, in which humanity was created at the beginning of Creation Week, rather than appearing millions or billions of years later, as proposed by evolutionary theory. Jesus’ reference to creation underscores the importance of viewing Genesis not merely as symbolic but as an account with historical and theological weight (Collins, 2011).

Efforts to reconcile Scripture with scientific claims, though often well-intentioned, highlight the complexities of this debate. While approaches like the Gap Theory and Day-Age Theory attempt to bridge the gap between Scripture and science, they frequently raise additional theological and hermeneutical challenges. Galatians 6:1 (“Brethren, if a man is overtaken in any trespass, you who are spiritual restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness, considering yourself lest you also be tempted”) reminds Christians to engage with such differing perspectives in a spirit of gentleness and humility, fostering dialogue while upholding the authority of Scripture.

The question of how to interpret the creation days described in Genesis lies at the heart of this debate. Central to this discussion is the Hebrew term *yôm*, which holds pivotal significance for understanding the timeline of creation and addressing the challenges posed by old-Earth interpretations.

The Nature of Creation Days: *Yôm* in Context

This section examines the grammatical and contextual interpretation of *yôm* in Genesis 1, emphasizing repeated phrases like “evening and morning” and the pairing with ordinal numbers as definitive markers of ordinary, 24-hour days. It highlights the application of the literal-grammatical-historical

hermeneutical method, which demonstrates how the historical narrative of Genesis 1 affirms a literal interpretation of the creation days. Additionally, it addresses objections to this view, such as poetic readings, scientific re-interpretations, and alternative models like the “Day-Age Theory,” focusing on the theological implications of maintaining a literal understanding.

At the core of the debate over Earth’s age is the meaning of the Hebrew term *yôm* in Genesis 1. Whether *yôm* refers to literal 24-hour days or extended epochs is pivotal to the theological coherence of YEC and its defense against competing interpretations. For centuries, this term has been central to discussions of the Genesis creation account—whether it describes six ordinary days or represents longer ages (Ham, 1987; Barrick, 2008). As scientific models favoring an ancient Earth gained prominence, challenges to the traditional understanding of *yôm* became widespread, sparking diverse interpretations among Christian scholars and theologians (Walton, 2009).

The interpretation of the Hebrew term *yôm* as a literal 24-hour period remains a central debate in understanding Genesis. Norman Geisler, in his *Systematic Theology*, acknowledges that *yôm* most often refers to a standard day. However, he argues that this does not necessarily apply to Genesis 1, offering several reasons to suggest the creation days might not correspond to literal 24-hour periods (Geisler, 2002). Despite this, the text consistently states, “So the evening and the morning were the first day,” (the Hebrew text in Genesis 1:5 literally says, “Day One,”) and so forth, which strongly supports the interpretation of standard, 24-hour days (Ham, 1987).

This focus on the repeated phrases “evening and morning” forms the foundation of YECs interpretative approach. YECs employ a literal-grammatical-historical hermeneutic to interpret

Scripture, particularly Genesis 1 (Barrick, 2008). This approach seeks to understand the text in its plain and straightforward meaning as it would have been understood by its original audience. As described in Article XV of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics (International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1982), this method emphasizes the importance of interpreting Scripture in its historical and cultural context, while recognizing the grammatical structure and literary genre of the text. It affirms that the meaning expressed in each Biblical passage is single, definite, and fixed, rejecting interpretations that obscure or distort the clarity of Scripture.

In the context of Genesis 1, the literal-grammatical-historical approach highlights the repeated pairing of “evening and morning” with each *yôm* as a clear marker of ordinary, 24-hour days. This interpretation aligns with the passage’s presentation as historical narrative rather than poetry or allegory. Reinterpreting the text to incorporate external theories—such as millions of years—compromises its natural reading and obscures its clarity (Mortenson, 2004). By adhering to this hermeneutic, YEC proponents uphold the authority of Scripture, ensuring that its meaning is derived from the text itself rather than imposed by external assumptions.

The contextual use of *yôm* throughout scripture underscores the importance of deriving meaning directly from the text. As with any term, the meaning of *yôm* is determined by its surrounding context. This principle is especially significant given that *yôm* appears over 2,300 times in the Old Testament, and its meaning is rarely debated outside of Genesis 1 (Sarfati, 2015). For instance, no one questions whether the Israelites marched around Jericho for seven literal days or whether Jonah spent three actual days in the belly of the great fish (Walton, 2009).

However, in Genesis 1, the meaning of *yôm* is frequently reexamined to align with alternative interpretations. These reinterpretations often rely on external influences, such as geological or cosmological claims, rather than deriving their conclusions solely from the text itself.

Some argue that *yôm* in Genesis can signify more than a literal day. For example, Genesis 2:4, "This is the history of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," refers to the entire six days of creation as "the day when all things were created." This usage is similar to colloquial expressions like "back in the day," which refer to an extended period. However, Genesis 1 consistently pairs *yôm* with the phrases "evening and morning," clearly defining it as a normal 24-hour day (Snelling, 2014). This literal understanding is supported by the grammatical structure of the text, where *yôm* is paired with the cardinal number "one," a combination that uniformly denotes a standard day elsewhere in Scripture (Geisler, 2002).

Further reinforcement of this interpretation comes from Exodus 20:9–10, where God, during the giving of the Ten Commandments, commands the Israelites: "Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God." This instruction directly parallels God's own Creation Week. The explicit comparison between the Israelites' six-day workweek and God's six-day creation period underscores the ordinary nature of these days. Exodus 20:11 further clarifies, stating, "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day." The Creator equates the human work cycle with His own creative actions. No one would interpret a human workweek as spanning billions of years; similarly, there is no reason to understand God's

Creation Week as anything other than normal, literal days. For the Israelites, who first received this command, the creation days would have been unmistakably understood as ordinary days. The symmetry between God's Creation Week and the Israelites' weekly cycle provides strong evidence for the literal interpretation of the creation days (Sarfati, 2015). Introducing the concept of long ages or millions of years conflicts with this plain reading of the text, creating unnecessary theological tension (Walton, 2009).

Psalm 90:4, which states, "A day is like a thousand years," and 2 Peter 3:8, which echoes this idea ("with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day"), are sometimes cited to challenge the literal interpretation (Geisler, 2002). Yet these passages speak to God's timelessness and are unrelated to the duration of the creation days. Even if one were to accept the hypothesis that each creation day represents 1,000 years, this would place the Earth's age at only 12,000 years—still far from the millions or billions proposed by old Earth theories. Furthermore, Psalm 90:4 also asserts, "A thousand years are like a day," emphasizing that the verse reflects God's transcendence over time rather than providing a mathematical formula (Barrick, 2008).

In Genesis 1:14, the term "day" is contrasted with "seasons" and "years," providing a clear distinction in the cycles of time ordained by God. This verse states, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years" (Genesis 1:14, ESV). The verse's juxtaposition of day, season, and year serves as an anchor for understanding the temporal framework within the creation narrative. These terms correspond to observable cycles—daylight and darkness, seasonal changes, and annual rotations—which are univer-

sally understood and practical for human experience.

To interpret a "day" in Genesis as spanning billions of years introduces substantial challenges to the coherence of "seasons" and "years" in this verse. If a day were extended to one billion years, the duration of a season (approximately three months) would be disproportionate at 90 billion years, and a year would span an unfathomable 360 billion years. Such interpretations not only strain the practical application of these terms but also conflict with the straightforward reading of the text. By understanding "day" as a literal 24-hour period, the integrity and clarity of Genesis 1:14 remain intact, aligning with the historical and cultural context of its audience and preserving the logical consistency of the temporal framework established by Scripture.

Similarly, the *New Compact Bible Dictionary* claims that Scripture provides no specific details about the exact timing of the creation of matter or the precise moments when the first day began and the sixth day ended. However, such uncertainties are addressed in the opening words of the Bible: "In the beginning" (Genesis 1:1). Contrary to the notion that the Bible lacks sufficient information, Genesis offers clear and direct answers, framed in terms that its original audience would have comprehended (Beall, 2015).

Wayne Grudem, in his widely referenced *Systematic Theology*, also addresses the length of the days in Genesis 1. He suggests that God may have chosen not to provide enough information to reach a definitive conclusion. While Grudem emphasizes the importance of treating differing views with charity, it is equally important to recognize that Scripture consistently presents the creation days as ordinary, 24-hour periods (Grudem, 1994). Grudem's acknowledgment highlights the importance of the literal-grammatical-

historical approach to Scripture, which prioritizes the text's intended meaning over external reinterpretations (Beall, 2015).

Finally, the broader Biblical narrative supports this interpretation. Jesus Himself references the Genesis creation account in Mark 10:6, stating, "But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female." This statement aligns with the literal timeline of Genesis, which places humanity at the beginning of creation rather than at the end of a long evolutionary process. Such consistency reinforces the coherence of a straightforward reading of the text, where the creation days are understood as ordinary days (Snelling, 2014).

By employing a literal-grammatical-historical hermeneutic, the young-Earth creationist perspective upholds the authority and clarity of Scripture. Genesis 1's repeated references to "evening and morning," its connection to the Sabbath commandment, and the broader consistency of Biblical doctrine all point to a plain reading of *yôm* as a 24-hour day. This approach resists external pressures to reinterpret the text in light of secular theories, maintaining Scripture's integrity and historical reliability (Barrick, 2008).

Concordance Study of the Hebrew Noun *Yôm*

This section expands beyond Genesis 1 to explore the broader lexical usage of *yôm* across Scripture through concordance studies. It highlights the varied meanings of *yôm*—literal and extended—within different contexts, such as Jonah's time in the fish and the Israelites' march around Jericho. This study underscores the theological coherence of interpreting *yôm* as literal days in Genesis 1, linking this interpretation to foundational doctrines like the Fall, redemption, and Christ's work. While brief consideration is giv-

en to instances like Genesis 2:4, where *yôm* is used more flexibly, this does not detract from its literal meaning in the creation narrative. The section also counters reinterpretations of *yôm* that introduce inconsistencies into the temporal framework of Genesis (e.g., with terms such as "seasons" and "years").

The Hebrew noun *yôm* holds pivotal significance for understanding the Genesis creation account and its timeline. Its interpretation in Genesis 1 shapes critical theological concepts, including the age of the Earth and the coherence of Biblical chronology. Across Scripture, *yôm* is used to signify both literal days (24 hours) and extended periods, but context remains the ultimate guide to its interpretation. In Genesis 1, the consistent pairing of *yôm* with ordinal numbers and the recurring phrase "evening and morning" reinforces its meaning as ordinary 24-hour days (Ham, 1987; Barrick, 2008).

Lexical Studies and Contextual Consistency

A concordance study of *yôm* across the Old Testament reveals that its literal meaning prevails overwhelmingly in narrative contexts. For instance, passages such as Jonah's three days in the belly of the fish (Jonah 1:17) and the Israelites' seven-day march around Jericho (Joshua 6:4) are understood universally as literal 24-hour periods. (Sarfati, 2015).

The repeated pairing of *yôm* with "evening and morning" strengthens this interpretation. Scholars such as Mark Koehne emphasize that this phrase functions as a boundary marker, delineating the end of one day and the beginning of another, leaving little room for non-literal interpretations (Koehne, 2018). This structure contrasts sharply with poetic or allegorical language found in Psalms and Proverbs, which employs symbolic imagery rather than precise chronological markers.

Theological Implications

Understanding *yôm* as literal, ordinary days upholds the coherence of foundational doctrines such as the Fall and redemption. As Jonathan Sarfati argues, interpreting *yôm* as extended epochs introduces theological tensions, particularly regarding the origin of sin and the necessity of Christ's redemptive work. If death existed for millions of years before Adam's sin, it undermines the Gospel's message that death is the result of sin (Sarfati, 2015). Thus, a literal reading of *yôm* preserves the theological integrity of Scripture.

Moreover, Exodus 20:9–11 reinforces the ordinary nature of *yôm*. This passage directly links the six creation days to the Israelites' workweek: "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day." The symmetry between God's Creation Week and the human workweek affirms the literal interpretation, as no one interprets the Sabbath commandment as spanning millions of years (Ham, 1987).

Lexical Flexibility and Genesis 2:4

While *yôm* occasionally signifies extended periods, as seen in Genesis 2:4 ("in the day the Lord God made the earth and the heavens"), this usage aligns with colloquial expressions like "back in the day." Such extended meanings are context-specific and do not affect the interpretation of *yôm* in Genesis 1, where "evening and morning" clarify its ordinary sense. Wayne Grudem further highlights that context is key to understanding *yôm* across Scripture, and the Genesis creation account provides unmistakable markers of literal days (Grudem, 1994).

Defending the Literal Interpretation

Attempts to reinterpret *yôm* in Genesis 1 often stem from external pressures

to harmonize Scripture with secular scientific theories. However, these reinterpretations introduce inconsistencies within the Biblical narrative. For instance, extending the creation days into epochs disrupts the logical framework of Genesis 1:14, which juxtaposes “days,” “seasons,” and “years” as distinct cycles. If a “day” spans billions of years, the temporal coherence of “seasons” and “years” collapses, creating theological and practical difficulties (Barrick, 2008).

Furthermore, Psalm 90:4 (“A day is like a thousand years”) and 2 Peter 3:8 (“with the Lord one day is as a thousand years”) are often cited to challenge the literal interpretation. Yet these verses speak to God’s timelessness rather than the duration of creation days. Even if applied mathematically, they place the Earth’s age far below the billions proposed by secular models, reinforcing the young-Earth framework.

Genesis 1: Poetry or Historical Narrative?

As we consider the nature of the creation days, it is equally important to evaluate the literary structure of Genesis 1. Some scholars propose that the chapter employs poetic or symbolic language, yet a closer examination reveals its alignment with historical narrative—a critical aspect in affirming its literal interpretation and theological reliability.

The debate over the historical versus poetic nature of Genesis 1 builds upon broader discussions regarding the interpretation of *yôm* and the timeline of creation. As scholars and theologians continue to wrestle with these questions, some interpretations propose that Genesis 1 should be viewed as poetic or semi-poetic, introducing yet another layer to the discourse.

For example, Rob Bell refers to Genesis 1 as the “Creation Poem,” while

Meredith Kline describes it as semi-poetic, emphasizing its structural symmetry and artistic composition (Kline, 1996; Bell, 2011). Hugh Ross, a proponent of old-Earth creationism, offers a variation of the Day-Age Theory called “progressive creation,” which interprets the days of Genesis 1 as extended periods lasting millions of years. Ross often applies a literal reading to poetic passages, such as those found in the Psalms, and then uses these interpretations to reframe narrative passages like Genesis 1 (Ross, 1994). Similarly, John Walton, in his *Lost World of Genesis One*, advocates for viewing Genesis 1 as an ancient cosmological text rather than a literal historical record. Walton argues that Genesis 1 reflects the functional ordering of the universe rather than material origins, proposing that its primary purpose is theological rather than scientific (Walton, 2009).

Additional proponents of poetic or symbolic interpretations include Tremper Longman III and Bruce Waltke, who suggest that Genesis 1 employs figurative language to convey profound truths about God’s creative power and sovereignty (Longman and Waltke, 1993). Some scholars have pointed to the parallels between Genesis 1 and other ancient Near Eastern creation myths, such as the *Enuma Elish*, to argue that Genesis 1 shares characteristics of epic poetry or symbolic narratives common to its cultural context (Walton, 2009). These views, while varied, generally aim to reconcile the Genesis creation account with modern scientific theories about the universe’s age and development.

Despite these perspectives, the literary structure of Genesis 1 provides compelling evidence that the text is not poetic but a historical narrative (Barrick, 2008). The style of Genesis 1 aligns with the rest of Genesis, excluding specific poetic segments such as Jacob’s blessings in Genesis 49. Unlike poetic passages that employ symbolic

language to evoke emotions or abstract themes, Genesis 1 meticulously chronicles the steps of creation in a structured and sequential manner. This detailed presentation underscores its purpose as a record of actual events rather than an artistic expression of ideas.

A key feature distinguishing historical narrative from poetry in Hebrew literature is the use of the *vav-consecutive imperfect*, a grammatical construction that conveys a clear sequence of events: “this happened, then this, then this.” This form is extensively employed in Genesis 1, emphasizing the chronological nature of the creation account (Snelling, 2014). By contrast, Hebrew poetry relies on parallelism, the repetition of ideas in a balanced structure, and often incorporates figurative or symbolic language to explore deeper spiritual truths. The absence of such poetic hallmarks in Genesis 1 further solidifies its classification as a historical narrative.

The Hebrew grammar of Genesis 1:2 provides key insights into the relationship between verses 1 and 2, particularly in the use of the *vav* disjunctive at the beginning of verse 2. This grammatical construction contrasts with the *vav* consecutive that begins in verse 3 and onward, highlighting a break in the narrative flow to provide additional descriptive or explanatory information (Barrick, 2008).

The *vav* disjunctive in verse 2 links it directly to verse 1, offering further context for the initial act of creation described in the opening statement, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Beall, 2015). Rather than supporting a temporal gap between verses 1 and 2, the *vav* disjunctive underscores that Genesis 1:2 serves as a continuation of verse 1, elaborating on the initial state of creation as “formless and void.” This foundational Hebrew grammatical indicator affirms the continuity of the text, leaving no room to insert millions

of years between these verses (Snelling, 2014). Instead, the passage describes a cohesive sequence: God created the heavens and the earth in an unformed and unfilled state, which He then shaped and completed over six literal days (Ham, 1987).

By grounding the interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2 in the text's grammatical structure, the clarity and coherence of the creation account are reinforced as a single, unified narrative (Barrick, 2008; Snelling, 2014). This interpretation aligns with a plain reading of the text while countering alternative models, such as the Gap Theory, which attempt to accommodate long ages within the Biblical framework (Mortenson, 2004). This distinction between poetic and historical prose is evident throughout the Bible. For example, the account of the Israelites crossing the Red Sea is presented in two contrasting styles. In Exodus 14, the event is narrated as prose: "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night." This detailed and step-by-step description gives readers a clear and factual record of the miraculous event. However, in Exodus 15, the same event is recounted poetically: "Pharaoh's chariots and his army He has cast into the sea...they sank to the bottom like a stone." While the poetic version captures the emotional and symbolic resonance of the event, the prose provides the precise sequence of what occurred. This distinction is critical when evaluating Genesis 1, as its prose style mirrors that of historical accounts, further affirming its literal nature (Barrick, 2008).

Additionally, Genesis 1's repeated use of phrases such as "and God said," "and it was so," and "there was evening and there was morning" reinforces its literal and historical tone. These recurring refrains serve not as artistic embellishments but as markers of the orderly progression of creation over

six days. Each declaration of "evening and morning" denotes a 24-hour cycle, leaving little room for interpretations that extend these periods into epochs of millions of years (Ham, 1987).

Moreover, Genesis 1 lacks the symbolic imagery often found in Hebrew poetry. For instance, Psalm 19 poetically declares, "The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of His hands." While this passage uses vivid imagery to convey theological truths about God's majesty, Genesis 1 adopts a straightforward and direct approach. The absence of such metaphorical language in Genesis 1 strengthens the argument for its historical nature, as the chapter prioritizes clarity over artistic expression (Snelling, 2014).

By presenting creation in a structured, sequential, and factual manner, Genesis 1 sets itself apart as a historical narrative. Its style reflects an intention to provide a reliable account of how the universe came into being, one meant to be understood plainly and literally by its audience. This reinforces its role as a foundational text for understanding the origins of the world according to the Bible.

Critics of young-Earth creationism, such as Ronald Numbers in *The Creationists*, contend that no prominent Christian theologians supported this view prior to the 20th century (Numbers, 2006). However, evidence suggests otherwise, as numerous historical figures within Christianity upheld a literal interpretation of the Genesis creation account. Both the Apostle Paul and Jesus treated Genesis as literal history, affirming its accuracy and reliability. For example, in 1 Corinthians 15:45, Paul refers to Adam as "the first man," underscoring the historicity of Adam and the events recorded in Genesis. Jesus also validated the Genesis account in Mark 10:6, where He declared, "But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and

female," confirming the placement of humanity at the start of creation rather than as a later development in an evolutionary framework.

In addition to Biblical figures, influential theologians across Church history have consistently upheld a six-day creation. Martin Luther, a central figure of the Reformation, resolutely affirmed the literal reading of Genesis. He declared, "When Moses writes that God created heaven and Earth in six days, let this period continue to have been six days." Luther further emphasized the importance of trusting Scripture's plain meaning over human speculation, urging readers to accept the Holy Spirit's account of creation even when the intricacies of the process transcended human understanding. His stance reflects the broader theological tradition of taking Scripture at face value, especially in matters where divine revelation supersedes human reasoning (Batten, 2015).

John Calvin, another prominent Reformer, also advocated for a straightforward reading of the Genesis creation account. In his *Commentary on Genesis*, Calvin emphasized that Moses wrote in a style accessible to all, ensuring that even the unlearned could grasp the truths of creation. He rejected allegorical interpretations of Genesis, affirming that the text was meant to describe real events rather than abstract ideas (Calvin, 1847). Calvin's insistence on the clarity and literal nature of scripture further challenges the notion that young-Earth creationism lacked historical support.

Moreover, early Church fathers such as Basil of Caesarea and Augustine of Hippo also engaged with the Genesis creation narrative. While Augustine's views on the nature of the creation days were nuanced, and while differing on the mechanism and timing of creation, he nevertheless affirmed the direct involvement of God in creating the world and rejected the idea

that it arose through natural processes over vast ages (Augustine, 401). Basil, in his *Hexaemeron* (a series of sermons on the six days of creation), strongly defended the literal interpretation of the creation days, describing them as “ordinary days” marked by morning and evening (Basil, 370).

The claim that young-Earth creationism is a relatively modern development fails to account for these numerous historical endorsements of a literal Genesis. Such perspectives were not formulated in response to contemporary scientific theories but were instead rooted in a long-standing tradition of fidelity to Scripture. By treating Genesis as literal history, these theologians upheld the integrity of Biblical revelation and reinforced its foundational role in understanding God’s creative work (Batten, 2015).

Hebrew Poetry in Genesis: Structure, Style, and Implications

Genesis 1 has long been a cornerstone of theological discourse, yet the debate surrounding its literary style persists. While the passage exhibits elevated language and a rhythmic structure, its classification as historical prose rather than poetry is crucial to understanding its purpose and reliability. A comprehensive examination of the text reveals that, while Genesis 1 contains stylistic elements reminiscent of poetry, such as repetition and parallelism, its core characteristics align with Hebrew historical narrative.

Distinguishing Poetry from Historical Prose

Hebrew poetry, as prominently found in Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, relies on hallmark features such as parallelism, metaphor, and symbolic imagery to convey theological and emotional truths. For instance, Psalm 19:1 poetically declares, “The heavens declare

the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of His hands.” This verse employs vivid imagery to inspire awe and wonder. By contrast, Genesis 1:1 begins with the straightforward assertion: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” This direct language focuses on factual events rather than metaphorical or abstract reflections (Jackson, 2007).

Dr. Steven Boyd’s statistical analysis of Hebrew verb forms further supports the narrative nature of Genesis 1. By comparing the use of finite verbs in Genesis 1 with those found in historical accounts versus poetic texts, Boyd concludes that the verb patterns in Genesis 1 correspond overwhelmingly to historical prose. Specifically, the frequent use of the *vav-consecutive* (a grammatical structure denoting sequence) throughout the chapter reinforces its orderly, chronological presentation of events (Boyd, 2005; Snelling, 2014). This grammatical feature starkly contrasts with the parallel structures and lack of temporal markers found in Hebrew poetry.

The CRSQ has published research further substantiating the classification of Genesis 1 as historical narrative rather than poetry. For instance, B.T. Mann’s paper, “A Critical Evaluation of the Tablet Model: Considerations on the Origin of the Book of Genesis” (Mann, 2017), delves into the literary and grammatical structure of Genesis 1. Mann critiques theories suggesting that Genesis derives from poetic or symbolic sources, instead emphasizing the pivotal role of the *vav-consecutive*—a grammatical construction indicative of sequential events in Hebrew historical prose. This feature, central to the text’s structure, strongly supports the narrative flow of Genesis 1, directly contrasting with the parallelism and metaphor characteristic of Hebrew poetry. Mann’s analysis, published in *CRSQ*, thus reinforces the argument that Genesis 1 was written

as a straightforward account of real events, intended to be interpreted as historical prose.

Purposeful Repetition and Theological Rhythm

The repetition of key phrases in Genesis 1, such as “And God said,” “And it was so,” and “There was evening, and there was morning,” creates a rhythmic structure that some interpret as poetic. However, this repetition serves a theological and structural purpose rather than a poetic one. By punctuating each act of creation with these refrains, the text emphasizes God’s sovereign authority and the orderly progression of creation. Unlike the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, which often explores themes from multiple angles, the repetition in Genesis 1 underscores the sequential nature of the narrative, aligning it with historical recounting (Barrick, 2008).

This rhythm also reflects the liturgical purpose of the text. Scholars such as John Currid note that Genesis 1 was likely written to be recited or memorized, which may account for its rhythmic qualities. Currid argues that such qualities do not detract from the text’s historical nature but instead highlight its pedagogical intent—to affirm the centrality of God’s creative work in the lives of the covenant community (Currid, 2003).

Comparison with Other Ancient Near Eastern Texts

Some have drawn parallels between Genesis 1 and ancient Near Eastern creation myths, such as the Babylonian *Enuma Elish*. While these comparisons acknowledge the shared cultural context of the Biblical text, they also underscore its unique nature. Unlike the symbolic and polytheistic narratives of its contemporaries, Genesis 1 presents a monotheistic, orderly account of creation. It focuses on the direct actions of a single sovereign God, eschewing

the allegorical and dramatic elements often found in ancient mythologies (Snelling, 2014).

The structured progression of Genesis 1 also contrasts with the chaotic, often cyclical cosmologies of ancient myths. For example, the *Enuma Elish* depicts creation as the outcome of conflict among gods, whereas Genesis 1 portrays creation as a deliberate and harmonious act of divine will. This distinction reinforces the historical tone of Genesis 1 while highlighting its theological depth (Mortenson, 2004).

Implications for Young-Earth Creationism

Understanding Genesis 1 as historical prose rather than poetry has profound implications for interpreting the creation account. The historical framework of the text supports the literal six-day creation timeline central to YEC. A poetic or allegorical reading would introduce ambiguity into the text, weakening its theological claims and its coherence with other scriptural passages, such as Exodus 20:11, which explicitly links the creation days to the human workweek (Barrick, 2008; Ham, 1987).

Moreover, viewing Genesis 1 as historical narrative ensures the continuity of its theological message with the rest of Scripture. For instance, Jesus' reference to the creation account in Mark 10:6 ("But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female") presupposes the historical reality of the events described in Genesis. Similarly, the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 trace humanity's lineage directly back to Adam, underscoring the necessity of a literal understanding of the creation account (Snelling, 2014).

Reaffirming the Foundations

Through an exploration of genealogies, creation days, and the historical

framework of Genesis 1, this paper establishes the theological foundation for YEC. By reaffirming the authority of Scripture, it confronts the challenges posed by alternative views and emphasizes the coherence of YEC within a Biblically grounded worldview.

This paper reaffirms the theological foundations of YEC by emphasizing the authority of Scripture as the ultimate guide to understanding Earth's history and origins. A careful examination of Biblical genealogies provides a clear and consistent timeline, situating the Earth's age at approximately 6,000 years. This analysis, rooted in a literal interpretation of Genesis, reveals the coherence of Scripture and its integral role in shaping a Christian worldview. Further, the examination of the creation days and the historical narrative of Genesis 1 highlights the clarity and reliability of the Biblical text, affirming its intended message for the original audience and subsequent generations.

By addressing old-Earth interpretations, this paper confronts theological challenges such as death before sin and their implications for foundational doctrines, including the Fall, original sin, and Christ's redemptive work. These interpretations often undermine the central message of the Gospel, which is inextricably tied to the historical events described in Genesis. The necessity of maintaining a Scripture-centered approach is underscored by the observation of Augustine: "If you believe what you like in the Gospel, and reject what you don't like, it is not the Gospel you believe, but yourself." This statement challenges readers to adhere to the plain and clear teaching of Scripture, rather than conforming to external theories that dilute its authority.

Moreover, the plausibility of old-Earth interpretations is called into question by the inconsistencies they introduce into the Biblical narrative. For instance, the reinterpretation of

creation days as indefinite periods departs from the straightforward reading of Genesis and creates tensions with the timeline derived from genealogies. Such models also grapple with reconciling the concept of death before the Fall, which directly contradicts the foundational Christian doctrines of sin and redemption. These issues highlight the theological and logical challenges of old-Earth perspectives, urging readers to reconsider whether such views truly align with the transformative truth of Scripture.

As the theological foundation for a broader exploration of YEC, this paper reaffirms the authority of Scripture as the definitive guide to understanding Earth's history. By examining Biblical genealogies and the creation narrative, it situates the Earth's age within a coherent theological framework, while challenging old-Earth interpretations that conflict with foundational Christian doctrines. The analysis presented here sets the stage for subsequent papers that will integrate scientific and philosophical perspectives, forming a holistic defense of YEC. This series ultimately seeks to demonstrate the coherence of faith, Scripture, and reason in reclaiming Earth's history through a Biblically grounded lens.

References

- Africanus, J. 221. *Chronography*. Quoted in Eusebius, *Chronicle*.
- Archer, G.S. 2012. A quantitative analysis of the life spans of the Genesis patriarchs. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 48(3): 155–170.
- Augustine, A. 401. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Translated by J.H. Taylor. Ancient Christian Writers Series. Paulist Press, Mahwah, NJ.
- Barrick, W.D. 2008. Biblical chronology: Genesis 5 and 11. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 19(2): 127–143.
- Basil, B.C. 370. *Hexaemeron*. Translated by B. Jackson. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene*

- Fathers, Second Series*, Vol. 8. Edited by P. Schaff and H. Wace. 1895. T&T Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Batten, D. 2015. *Six Days...Really? Why Taking Genesis 1 Literally Matters*. Creation Ministries International, Brisbane, Australia.
- Beall, T.S. 2015. *House of Cards: A Biblical Approach to Genesis and the Age of the Earth*. Ambassador International, Greenville, SC.
- Bell, R. 2011. *Love Wins: A Book About Heaven, Hell, and the Fate of Every Person Who Ever Lived*. HarperOne, New York, NY.
- Boyd, S.W. 2005. Statistical determination of genre in Biblical Hebrew: Evidence for an historical reading of Genesis 1:1–2:3. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 18(1): 77–91.
- Calvin, J. 1847. *Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. King. Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Chalmers, T. 1814. *On the Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God as Manifested in the Adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man. Bridgewater Treatises*. The Royal Society of London, London, England.
- Clement of Alexandria. 190. *Stromata*. Translated by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2. T&T Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Collins, C.J. 2011. *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist? Who They Were and Why You Should Care*. Crossway, Wheaton, IL.
- Currid, J.D. 2003. *Genesis: Volume 1, Chapters 1–11*. Evangelical Press, Welwyn Garden City, UK.
- Eusebius. 325. *Chronicon*. Cited from Africanus' *Chronography*.
- Geisler, N. 2002. *Systematic Theology*, Volume 2. Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, MN.
- Grudem, W. 1994. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Ham, K. 1987. *The Lie: Evolution*. Master Books, Green Forest, AR.
- International Council on Biblical Inerrancy. 1982. *Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics*.
- Jackson, W. 2007. Is the Genesis creation account poetry? *Christian Courier*; <https://christiancourier.com/articles/is-the-genesis-creation-account-poetry>.
- Jones, F.N. 2005. *Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Basics*. Master Books, Green Forest, AR.
- Kline, M.G. 1996. *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview*. Two Age Press, Overland Park, KS.
- Koehne, M. 2018. *Yôm* in the Genesis creation account: A defense of its literal meaning. *Kolbe Center Journal* 14(3): 24–39.
- Lalleman, P.J. 2015. The Septuagint and its role in Biblical chronology. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23(2): 35–49.
- Lamb, M.J. 2019. Extensive messianic prophecy corruptions and Flood-related chronology errors disqualify the Septuagint (LXX) as a reliable source for creationist research. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 56(1): 45–60.
- Law, T.M. 2013. *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Longman, III, T., and Waltke, B. 1993. *An Introduction to the Old Testament: A Canonical Approach*. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Lyell, C. 1830–1833. *Principles of Geology: Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference to Causes Now in Operation*. John Murray, London, England.
- Mann, B.T. 2017. A critical evaluation of the Tablet Model: Considerations on the origin of the Book of Genesis. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 54(4): 121–135.
- McGee, D.A. 2019. Critical analysis of Hugh Ross' progressive day-age creationism through the framework of young-Earth creationism. *Answers Research Journal* 12: 53–71.
- Mortenson, Terry. 2004. *The Great Turning Point: The Church's Catastrophic Mistake on Geology—Before Darwin*. Master Books, Green Forest, AR.
- Numbers, R.L. 2006. *The Creationists: From Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design*, Expanded edition. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Ross, H. 1994. *Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective on the Creation-Date Controversy*. NavPress, Colorado Springs, CO.
- Ross, M.R. 2017. Fossil record (young-Earth creation view). In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, pp. 290–294. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Sarfati, J.D. 2015. *The Genesis Account: A Theological, Historical, and Scientific Commentary on Genesis 1–11*. Creation Book Publishers, Powder Springs, GA.
- Snelling, A.A. 2014. *Earth's Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation, and the Flood*. Master Books, Green Forest, AR.
- Spurgeon, C.H. 1886. *The Problem of the Age. Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*. Available at The Spurgeon Library.
- Ussher, J. 1658. *Annals of the World*. London, England. (Republished in 2003 by Master Books, Green Forest, AR.)
- Walton, J.H. 2009. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. IVP Academic, Downers Grove, IL.
- Whitcomb, J.C., and Morris, H.M. 1961. *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, Phillipsburg, NJ.