

THE GENESIS ACCOUNT OF CREATION

By ARTHUR F. WILLIAMS, D.D.

Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio

Current theories—far-reaching in their effects—call for fresh consideration of this subject

There are certain areas of Biblical interpretation in which Christians find themselves in serious disagreement. One of these is the Genesis account of creation. Some interpret the record *literally*, believing each of the six days to have been cycles of 24 hours, on the sixth of which God created man in His own image by divine fiat from the dust of the earth. They believe that God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and he became a living soul. They, likewise, believe that this occurred at a time not longer than a few thousand years ago. Others interpret the entire record of creation "parabolically," and insist that the six days represent a vast period of time, extending into millions or billions of years. The evidence for these opposing views will be examined together with the theological implications involved.

DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE?

Some regard the issue as peripheral and of such trivial importance as to be unworthy of debate. Others regard the day-age theory as merely an attempt to accommodate the Word of God to the prevailing scientific philosophy. They believe that it opens the door to further compromises with the world in its antagonism to the credibility of Scripture. This article presents evidence in support of the literal interpretation of the Genesis account of creation which requires us to believe each of the six days was comparable to our own. The day-age theory, though espoused by some men who are sincere Christians, is fraught with dangerous consequences to the Christian faith. This question is not merely academic, as some assert, but it directly affects Biblical theology.

For instance, if there is textual justification for interpreting each of the six days of Genesis parabolically or figuratively, what defense can be offered for not doing the same with the language descriptive of God's creation of man in Genesis 2:7? Are we to understand that there was a literal garden in which God planted "the tree of life" and the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," or is this to be understood figuratively? And what about the record of God's creation of woman? Did God literally cause a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and did He literally take one of his ribs from which He made woman, or is this too, to be regarded as figurative? Are we to understand that a literal serpent was the diabolical instrument in the temptation of Eve, or should this also be interpreted parabolically? And further, what are we to understand from the language concerning the curse which God is said to have pronounced upon

the serpent? Was this literal, and did it affect the posture of the serpent, or are we to take this figuratively, too? Such questions demand an answer. Where does the figurative or parabolic end and sober history begin? Or are we at liberty to treat the entire record as "mythological" as neo-orthodoxy does? In the light of the confusion which presently prevails in Christendom concerning origins, it is not surprising that some young people who were students at a certain Christian college asked their pastor, "Don't you think we could just forget the first eleven chapters of Genesis and still be Christians?" The issue is not so peripheral as some would lead us to believe. The first chapters of Genesis must be regarded as the seed plot of the entire Bible, and if we err here, there is reason to believe that those who come under false interpretations of the Genesis account of creation will sooner or later become involved in error in other areas of divine revelation. It is our conviction that once the interpretation of the six days of creation which makes them extended periods of perhaps millions of years in duration is accepted, the door is opened for the entire evolutionary philosophy. In saying this, we do not mean to imply that all who hold to the day-age theory are evolutionists. We do insist, however, that such a view can only be maintained by an acceptance of the mental construct known as the geologic column, which is based upon the assumption of evolution.

WHY SUCH DIVERGENT CONCLUSIONS?

How is it that men who claim to believe the Bible to be the very Word of God can arrive at such contradictory conclusions? Why is it that some believe in a relatively recent creation fully accomplished in six solar days while others believe the earth with life upon it is billions of years old, and that each of the six days was of undetermined duration? The answer is to be found in the method of Bible interpretation employed. There is no more important discipline for the Bible exegete than a painstaking study of sound principles of Biblical hermeneutics.

BY WHAT METHOD IS SCRIPTURE TO BE INTERPRETED?

One of the first and most important steps in any exegesis of Scripture is to determine the purpose of the writer and the literary nature of the book. Some books of the Bible are historical; some are poetic; others are prophetic in character. Figures of speech abound in poetic literature, but they are recognized as such and the reader is mentally prepared to adjust his thinking to the real concept so beautifully expressed in figurative terms. Our Lord made much use of the parable as a means of conveying truth

more understandingly to the minds of those whose hearts were open to receive divine instruction. When He did use this method of communication, however, He always made it clear that it was parabolic and not to be understood literally.

The exegete must decide if the text of Genesis is poetic, prophetic, or historical. It is my contention as a professional student of hermeneutics that the five books of Moses must be classified as historical. The first three chapters of Genesis are just as truly historical as the remainder of the book. Therefore, we are not prepared to find parables in such a record of sober history.

One of the recognized dangers of Bible interpretation is that of "eisegesis," or reading into the texts of Scripture meanings which they did not originally possess. There are certain important rules of hermeneutics which must be faithfully observed if one is to be preserved from error. Consideration must be given to the cultural context in which the Word of God was communicated. We endeavor to discover what the words which the Holy Spirit prompted the writer to employ meant, both to the writer and also to the people to whom this revelation was to be given. With this rule in mind let us consider the record of creation as given through Moses to the nation Israel.

What did the word *yom* (day) mean to Moses and to Israel in the day in which the books of Moses were written? I am sure that all will agree that neither Moses nor the people of his day had any knowledge of the science of geology or of the theories which have been advanced to account for geological phenomena. Therefore, we are not justified in attributing to Moses a meaning of the word "day" which later use may have given to the word in an entirely different context.

The word "day" in our English Bibles occurs a total of 396 times in the five books of Moses. They are distributed as follows: 72 times in Genesis; 76 in Exodus; 64 in Leviticus; 81 in Numbers, and 103 in Deuteronomy. In every instance, with the exception of Genesis 32:24, the word "day" is a translation of the Hebrew word *yore*. Since this is true, it becomes necessary to find out what the word *yom* meant to Moses and to the people of Israel, to whom this revelation was given. Let us not be guilty of reading into the word a meaning which later use may have given to it in an entirely different context.

In the Genesis account of creation the word "day" occurs 14 times, always a translation of the Hebrew word *yore*. Those who hold to the day-age theory ask us to give to the word "day" a meaning which it has nowhere else in the five books of Moses. Such a meaning (that of an indefinite period of time), we are told, has for its justification the cultural significance of the word *yom* in the thinking of Moses and that of the children of Israel. One might very properly inquire why the cultural meaning of the word *yom* should be so very different in the Genesis ac-

count of creation from that which it obviously had in all of the other writings of Moses.

As if the consistent significance of the word *yom* throughout the writings of Moses were not enough to establish the meaning of the English word "day," God added statements which are difficult to interpret otherwise. ". . . God divided the *light* from the *darkness*. And God called the light *Day*, and the darkness he called *Night*. And the *evening* and the *morning* were the first day." In the light of cultural considerations of hermeneutics, can anyone honestly believe that these terms as used in the Genesis account of creation had a meaning almost infinitely removed from the meaning which they had elsewhere in the writings of Moses? The word "day," would have had no meaning to Moses or to his contemporaries other than that which was limited by reference to the sun. It would be impossible to prove from Scripture that the Israelites in the days of Moses had any concept of a "day" in terms of millions or billions of years. The evidence arising from serious consideration of the cultural meaning of the word *yom* as used by Moses and understood by the Israelites is wholly on the side of a 24-hour day in the Genesis account of creation. Such a view is consistent with its meaning as used by Moses throughout his writings.

In the twentieth chapter of Exodus we read, beginning at verse 8, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." An examination of this passage and also another similar passage in Exodus 31:17 must be considered in any interpretation of the Genesis account of creation. Did Moses enjoin upon Israel the observance of the seventh day, attaching to it the concept of from sunset to sunset, while-at the same time; wishing to convey the idea that the six days in which God created were periods of one million years or more? Did Moses mean that the six days are to correspond with the geological column of the evolutionary paleontologist? Such an interpretation would require a rendering such as the following: "Six days shalt thou labour and do thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God . . . For in six million years the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is . . ."

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "DAY"

The root meaning of the Hebrew word *yore*, translated "day" throughout the writings of Moses, according to Strong, is " 'to be hot,' a day (as the warm hours) whether literally from sunrise to sunset, or from one sunset to the next." That the word is also used figuratively is readily acknowledged, but when so used Strong says, "It is defined by an associated term." An illustration of this would be "the

day of the Lord." Those who insist that the six days of Genesis I should be interpreted parabolically claim "proof" for this method of interpretation on the basis of its use in Genesis 2:4, which reads, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in *the day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens . . ." Since the word "day" is used in Genesis 2:4 with obvious reference to all time involved in creation we are told, "Thus *incontestably* the usage of 'day' in Genesis 2:4 is parabolic."

Now every student of Scripture recognizes the fact that the word "day" is used to designate a period of time of varying lengths. When Zephaniah speaks of "the day of the Lord" (1:7) we have no reason to think of his use of the word "day" as a period limited to 24 hours. Nor when Peter speaks of the same period are we justified in concluding that "the day of the Lord" is to be limited to 24 hours. But we are not justified in assuming that because Peter tells us "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" that the word "day" has no time signification. The duration of time indicated by the use of the word "day" must be determined by the context in which it is found.

Now those who hold to the day-age theory of creation insist that the use of the word "day" in Genesis 2:4 proves that the use of the same word in Genesis I must refer to a period of undetermined length. That such "proof" is open to question we shall endeavor to demonstrate. Not all Hebrew scholars agree with this conclusion. Regarding the day-age interpretation, Dr. Bernard Ramm says, "The problem of the meaning of *yom* is not fully decided as to whether it can mean period or not. The word is one which has many uses as we have already indicated. We are not presently persuaded that it can be stretched so as to mean *period* or *epoch* or *age* as such terms are used in geology. Though not closing the door on the age-day interpretation of the word *yore*, we do not feel that lexicography of the Hebrew language will as yet permit it."

Leupold, a recognized Hebrew scholar, says:

"In the interest of accuracy it should be noted that within the confines of this one verse, Genesis 1:5, the word "day" is used in two different senses. "Day" (*yore*) over against "night" (*layelah*) must refer to the light part of the day, roughly, a twelve hour period. When the verse concludes with the statement that the first "day" (*yore*) is concluded, the term must mean a twenty-four hour period . . . to make this statement refer to two parts of a long geologic period; the first part of a kind of evening; the second a kind of morning; both together a kind of long period, runs afoul of three things: first, that "evening" nowhere in the Scripture bears this meaning; secondly, neither does "morning"; thirdly, "day" never means "period" . . . There ought to be no need of refuting the idea that *yom* means period. Reputable dictionaries like Buhl, B D B or K W

know nothing of this notion. Hebrew dictionaries are our primary source of reliable information concerning Hebrew words. Commentaries with critical leanings utter statements that are very decided in this instance. Says Skinner: "The interpretation of *yom* as aeon, a favorite resource of harmonists of science and revelation, is opposed to the plain sense of the passage and has no warrant in Hebrew usage." Dillman remarks: "The reasons advanced by ancient and modern writers for construing these days to be longer periods of time are inadequate." If it is claimed that some works can with difficulty be compressed within twenty-four hours, like those of the third day or the sixth, that claim may well be described as a purely subjective opinion. He that desires to reason it out as possible can assemble fully as many arguments as he who holds the opposite opinion. Or if it be claimed that "the duration of the seventh day determines the rest" let it be noted that nothing is stated about the duration of the seventh. This happens to be an argument from silence, and therefore it is exceptionally weak. Or again, if it be claimed that "the argument of the fourth (our third) commandment confirms this probability" we find in this commandment even stronger confirmation of our contention. Six twenty-four hour days followed by one such day of rest alone can furnish a proper analogy for our laboring six days and resting on the seventh day; *periods* furnish a poor analogy for *days*. Finally, it is contended that our conception contradicts one school of thought in the field of geology. But this is a school of thought which we are convinced is hopelessly entangled in misconceptions which grow out of attempts to co-ordinate the actual findings of geology with an evolutionistic conception of what geology should be, and so is for the present thrown into a complete misreading of the available evidence, even as history, anthropology, Old Testament studies and many other sciences have been derailed and mired by the same attempt."

It is interesting to note that even Dr. Edward John Carnell admits that the "Genesis account implies an act of immediate creation, but the same account implies that God made the world in *six literal days*." But having this admission he then proceeds to state what he cannot prove: "And since orthodoxy has given up the literal-day theory out of respect for geology, it would certainly forfeit no principle if it gave up the immediate-creation theory out of respect for paleontology. The two seem to be quite parallel." This statement in its entirety is most significant. First, it tells us that Dr. Carnell and others like him who still want to be regarded as orthodox *have given up the literal-day theory out of respect for geology*, not out of respect for the text of God's Word. Secondly, it tells us what logically follows from an abandonment of sound Biblical exegesis, namely, *the giving up of the immediate-creation theory out of respect for paleontology*. Nor have we any reason to conclude that this is the end of "giving up" out of

respect for the intellectual world of our day. Consistency makes certain demands of us, either for the truth or against it. What Dr. Carnell has failed to prove is that "orthodoxy has given up the literal-day theory." He does not, and cannot speak for "orthodoxy." He is a representative of that school of thought which Dr. Harold John Ockenga of Park Street Congregational Church in Boston designates as "neo-evangelicalism." These men have surrendered the plain teachings of God's Word "out of respect for geology and paleontology." One cannot help wondering what the final outcome of such a surrender may be. There is not a miracle in the entire Bible which can be substantiated by the empirical methods of modern science. Will such men, or their children, find it necessary to surrender the doctrine of the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection of Christ out of respect for biology and physics? That evangelical scholars are increasingly surrendering to the theory of evolution should become evident from a quotation in an article in the *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* entitled, "The Evolution of Evangelical Thinking on Evolution," by J. Frank Cassel, a recent president of the ASA (Dec. 1959, p. 27) :

"Thus, in 15 years we have seen develop in the A. S. A. a spectrum of belief in evolution that would have shocked all of us at the inception of this organization. Many still reserve judgment, but few, I believe, are able to meet Dr. Mixer's challenge of, 'Show me a better explanation.' "

When once an attempt is made to harmonize the Word of God with "the consensus of modern scholarship" it is difficult to terminate the compromise of Scripture which such accommodation requires.

It is our conviction that we have a parallel; use of the word "day" in the seventh chapter of Numbers to that in Genesis 1 and 2. In Numbers 7:1, 2 we read, "And it came to pass on the day that Moses had fully set up the tabernacle, and had anointed it, and sanctified it . . . That the princes of Israel . . . offered." In verse 10 we read, "And the princes offered for dedication of the altar in *the day* that it was anointed, even the princes offered their offering before the altar." In the verses which follow we read what Nahshon offered on "the first day" (v. 12) ; what Nethaneel offered "on the second day" (v. 18) ; and what Eliab offered on "the third day" (v. 24) . Each of the twelve princes offered, one on each of twelve days. Then in verse 84 we read, "This was the dedication of the altar, *in the day* when it was anointed, by the princes of Israel." There appears to be no more justification for the idea that the word in Genesis 2:4 is used parabolically than in Numbers 7:84. In both instances we have first a record of details which occurred in "days" of 24 hours' duration, and then we have the same word used *comprehensively* of what has been previously set forth in detail. Such a use of the word "day" is not peculiar to the Hebrews; we use the word similarly today

without confusion. A biographer of Lincoln may state the day of his birth and the day of his marriage, the day of his inauguration and the day of his death, etc., and then when summing up the details of his life may say, "Now in Lincoln's *day* there were no automobiles, radios, or television." No one would think such a biographer was using the word "parabolically." Rather, he would be using it *comprehensively*. And this is exactly what we find in Genesis 2:4. After the writer has informed us as to what transpired on each of six days, he sums up God's creative acts by saying, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, *in the day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."

To insist that the word "day" is used parabolically in Genesis 1 and 2 is implicit with danger in the exegesis of Scripture. Parabolic interpretation is not justified by the language and it opens the door for parabolic interpretation of other details in the early chapters of Genesis. This would rob Genesis of all historical significance and leave the reader uncertain as to where the parabolic ends and sober history begins. When we read such expressions as "light" and "darkness," "night" and "day," "evening" and "morning" in connection with the six days of Genesis 1, we would very naturally conclude that such days were similar to our own. We have failed to find a single example of the use of the word "day" in the entire Scriptures where it means other than a period of 24 hours when modified by the use of a numerical adjective. Doctors Morris and Whitcomb state, "Therefore, we must approach a study of the work of the six days of creation strictly from the perspective of scriptural revelation, and not at all from that of a projection of present natural processes into the past. It is precisely this sort of illegitimate projection which has led to the theory of evolution and to the various theological devices that have been conceived for harmonizing it with the Biblical revelation. Since God's revealed Word describes this creation as taking place in six 'days' and since there apparently is no contextual basis for understanding these days in any symbolic sense, it is an act of both faith and reason to accept them, literally, as real days."

THE APPEAL TO SCIENCE

Those who argue for the day-age theory of creation appeal to the science of geology for confirmation. We are told that sedimentary rocks have been laid down in certain areas to depths of seven miles or more. Of necessity, this would require millions of years for their formation. I do not profess to be an authority on geology, but I do favor a literal interpretation of the Biblical record over that of current scientific opinion to the contrary. Is there any place on God's footstool where sedimentary rocks can be found for a depth of seven miles? Is it not true that this claim is based upon a method of *correlation which assumes evolution as the starting point?*

We are told that "in 1815 William Smith observed that each layer had a characteristic *assemblage of fossils, and by comparing the fossils in various strata* in England he could establish the relative sequence of these strata. The subsequent refinement of this technique has become one of the most powerful tools for dating which the modern geologist has." There is no doubt but that this last statement is true. Now if this method of dating the rocks is "one of the most powerful tools for dating which the modern geologist has," it will not be necessary to examine his weaker ones. It is strange that anyone who repudiates the theory of evolution should place any confidence in such a method of dating. It is based in its entirety upon the assumption of evolution. Modern geology is based upon the assumption that sedimentary rocks in which the prevailing fossils are primitive must have been deposited earlier than rocks with fossil remains of higher forms of life. Rocks are examined in various parts of the world and classified as to their age, not on the basis of their relation to layers above and beneath, but on the basis of their predominant fossil enclosures. "The refinement" of a method of dating which is basically false does not enhance its validity!

No one should form conclusions as to the age of the earth or life by quoting from the pen of fallible men. It is interesting to note, however, that not all "scholarship" is on the side of the day-age theory or "progressive creation."

Dr. Walter E. Lammerts, for example, received his Ph.D. from the University of California, taught at UCLA and is now Director of Research at the Germain Seed Company, Livermore, Calif. Along with more than 200 other scientists, many listed in American Men of Science, he is a member of the Creation Research Society. Some months ago the editor of "The Progress Summary" became interested in the evasion of some neo-evangelical scholars as to the age of man. He stated that the maximum age of man, Biblically, is not more than 10,000 years and asked Dr. Lammerts for his opinion from the standpoint of his scientific research. His answer, as quoted below, is the most responsible and fascinating statement we have ever read on this subject for it goes far beyond the mere question of the age of man.

"Regarding the question you asked in your second paragraph, I am in complete accord with Dr. Henry Morris, particularly as regards not only the age of man, but the earth, our stellar system, and in fact, the universe. As a matter of fact, were it not for my belief in the truth and literal interpretation of the Genesis account, I would have great difficulty in believing that the earth was even 6,000 years old! However, there seems to be no doubt but that people would live for vastly longer periods of time, i.e., almost a thousand years in the days before the Flood. Accordingly, I am willing to grant this extreme age for the earth and universe. Actually from the strictly scientific point of view, most of the surface features

of the earth give the appearance of being far younger. The reason for this, I presume, is that as the number of years from the time of the Flood increase, the amount of erosion and other geological actions decrease. Accordingly, most of our rivers, mountains, and other features of the earth give the impression of being quite young, geologically speaking."

The prevailing uniformitarian concept in scientific circles is that the processes now operative in the world are the same as have been active from time immemorial. I believe this to be purely an assumption. There is abundant evidence of great cataclysms in past ages, which cannot possibly be accounted for in the theory of uniformity. It is incredible on the theory of uniformity that fossil forms of tropical plant and animal life could have been formed in such a state of preservation and on such a scale as those which have been found in northern Siberia. What convulsions of nature account for such phenomena we may not yet fully know, but that such have occurred cannot be honestly denied. The theory that the earth must be billions of years old is based in part upon the method of determining the age of rocks by the evidence supplied in the decay of Uranium 238 to form lead. Since this rate of decay is so measurably slow, it is assumed that the formation of lead has required billions of years. But is it not pure assumption to insist that this is the only way lead has come into existence? Is it not possible, and even probable, that God created quantities of lead at the same time that He created Uranium 238? It has also been argued that since some distant stars are millions of light years removed from the earth, it has required an almost incredible period of time for their light to become visible. But this, too, is an assumption. God Who created the stars could cause their light to become visible on earth at the instant of their creation. It is my conviction that the creative acts of God were instantaneous, and created organisms were mature. God did not create Adam as an infant, but as a mature man. I am not willing, on the basis of the currently accepted geological column or on the basis of radioactive dating, to accept the conclusions that the earth is billions of years old and that life upon it has existed for a vast period of time.

DO THE ROCKS PROVE "PROGRESSIVE EVOLUTION" ?

The fact remains that sedimentary rocks do not exhibit such an orderly sequence as the evolutionary geologist would have us believe. There are vast areas of the earth's crust in which the fossil record is embarrassing to the evolutionist. Rocks with relatively primitive fossil forms are found on top of rocks with fossil remains of higher forms of life. In the face of such evidence the evolutionist resorts to a marvelous explanation. He tells us that the rocks on top (with fossil forms of primitive life) are really older than those beneath them, and their present location is due to immense lateral thrusts! Great areas of rock of earlier deposition allegedly were upraised and then.

moved laterally over more recent sedimentary deposits. Such areas have been examined which cover thousands of square miles! Now the credulous are asked to believe the above explanation since the rocks *must exhibit* evolutionary development from the simple to the more complex. The entire theory upon which evolutionary geology is built rests upon the assumption that the age of the rocks must be determined on the basis of the state of life development as exhibited by their fossil remains. Thus the geologic column which originated with William Smith and was refined by evolutionary scholars has become "one of the most powerful tools for dating which the modern geologist has."

EVOLUTION THEORISTS AND THE GENESIS FLOOD

All evolutionists insist that the earth and the universe came into being millions, if not billions of years ago. The geological column is predicated upon the theory of uniformitarianism. It makes no provisions for cataclysms, which might produce in a relatively short period of time what the evolutionary geologist can only account for on the basis of millions of years. Evolutionary geologists repudiate the literal interpretation of the Genesis account of creation and rather than accepting the plain statements of Scripture, some writers attempt to disprove the universality of the flood by appealing to evolutionary geology. Everyone who believes that the Bible is the very Word of God must decide for himself whether he will interpret the phenomena of nature by the simple statements of Scripture, or interpret Holy Scripture by the theories of modern scientists.

UNACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVES

Now if one is to accept this method of dating, there are only two possible conclusions which can be drawn. One must accept the evolutionary concept of creation, either naturalistic or theistic, or what some scholars call "progressive creation." Unlike evolution, progressive creation credits God with creating by divine fiat something new on each of the six "days" --some new forms of life unrelated biologically to preceding forms of life. Now if "progressive creation" is to be accepted it would seem that more than six days would be required. The evolutionary geological column is divided into major eras designated by such terms as Archeozoic, Proterozoic, mesozoic, and cenozoic, each of which is subdivided into vast periods of time. If we were to accept the day-age theory of creation it could seem that the Genesis record has ceased to have any historic sig-

nificance. Genesis covers not more than a few hours of the billions of years which the theory seeks to establish.

THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY

An interpretation is not necessarily substantiated just because it is approved by a long list of eminent scholars. With all due respect to such scholarship it still is our very basic statement of faith that the Bible is our sole authority in all matters of faith and practice. The careful student will not allow himself to be persuaded by a long list of illustrious names. The Bible repeatedly refers to the record of creation, and invariably speaks of it as the work of God accomplished in "six days." Agnostic scientists work on the *a priori* assumption that all phenomena of nature are to be explained, in terms of present day observable physico-chemical laws. Either consciously or subconsciously, they are prejudiced in favor of this viewpoint.

In contrast we work on the *a priori* assumption that all the phenomena of nature are to be explained in terms of God's creative power and design. The so-called "laws" of nature are God at work providentially maintaining His original creation.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE GENESIS FLOOD

The language of Scripture represents the flood of Noah as both anthropologically and geologically universal. Yet, even within the ranks of professing Christians are many who appear to be more disposed to accept the conclusions of evolutionary scientists than they are to believe the plain statement of God's Word. I believe that many of the geological phenomena observable in the world today have had their origin in the Genesis flood. Some argue, however, that the flood was only local or at best only "anthropologically" universal. It is my contention that if the Genesis flood was only local, several deductions are logically inevitable. First, we must conclude that the language of Scripture is susceptible to meanings which are not obvious to average intelligence. Secondly, God's bow in the cloud has ceased to have the significance which He attached to it when He said, "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth." By this covenant God promised never again to destroy the earth with a flood. It cannot be denied that local floods have devastated vast areas of the earth from the days of Noah until today, but there has been no universal flood since Noah's day. Thirdly, the warning which God has given to the world through the Apostle Peter has ceased to have any significant meaning if the flood was local in character. Peter refers to it as of such universal destructiveness as to foreshadow the universal judgment of

God upon an unrepentant world in the day of the Lord's wrath.

THE INTELLECTUAL TREND OF OUR DAY

It is not within our province to judge the motives of men, but it appears to us that in our day there are those who disdain to be called "fundamentalists" and who brand all who are willing to be identified by such a designation as *naive*, *unscientific*, and *reactionary*. There are some who insist that one's views with reference to the "days" of creation should not be made a test of *spirituality*, but they do not seem to object to its being made a test of *mentality*. Regardless of how he may be evaluated by the so-called "intellectual world" of our day, one must rest upon the statement of Holy Scriptures, interpreting them *literally*, unless the context requires otherwise. So-called "conclusions of scholarship" should not be regarded as infallible. The statements of God's Holy Word should be accepted with a reverence not grant-

ed to the writings of any man, however learned he may be. In the future, the discrepancies between "science" and the Bible will be completely resolved. Those who have placed implicit confidence in the theories of scientists will regret that they have tried to make the Bible "acceptable" to unregenerate intellectuals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cooper, David L., *The God of Israel*.
 Carnell, Edward J., *The Case for Orthodox Theology*. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959).
 Leupold, H. C., *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1942).
 Morris, Henry M. and Whitcomb, John C., *The Genesis Flood* (Nutley, N. J.: The Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1961).
 Strong, James, *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1890). See page 48, No. 3117, under "Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary."

"If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the Devil are at the moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christ. Where the battle rages, there the loyalty of the soldier is proved, and to be steady on all the battlefield besides is merely flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point."

-MARTIN LUTHER