

# Simple Proof of 144 Hour Creation

## Why Long Days Wear No Clothes

by Tom Sullivan

**“See to it that no one takes you captive by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental spirits of the world, and not according to Christ”**  
(Colossians 2:8)

Copyright 2020 by Tom Sullivan. The author grants to all the right to freely copy and distribute this work in any form, provided that this and the below copyright notices are included, and that no part of the content of this work is modified or omitted. (Normal layout changes, for example to fit various electronic media, are permitted.) Modifying or omitting any part of the content of this work automatically revokes this permission. The *Open Manhole* tract that is reproduced in Appendix B is governed by its own copyright:

Copyright 1998, 2015 General permission to duplicate and distribute granted, providing that the text of this tract is unaltered, Scripture passages are in larger type than other text, and this copyright notice is included. All Scripture text from the New King James Bible.

Scripture quotations are from the ESV<sup>®</sup> Bible (The Holy Bible, English Standard Version<sup>®</sup>), copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved. [You] may not copy or download more than 500 consecutive verses of the ESV Bible or more than one half of any book of the ESV Bible. The version quoted is the ESV 2011 edition.

In the *Open Manhole* tract reproduced in *Appendix B*:  
Scripture taken from the New King James Version<sup>®</sup>. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

### ***Revision History***

August 20, 2020: First edition.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Why It Matters.....	7
Trust in God’s Word.....	7
Trust in God’s Witness in His Creation.....	8
We Glorify God When We Acknowledge His Creation.....	8
There Is a War Against the Supernatural.....	9
The Witness of God’s Creation Is a Safety Net.....	9
God’s Creation Is a Witness to Unbelievers.....	10
Approaching Scripture Scripturally.....	11
God Gave the Bible to All of Us.....	11
The Devil Wants to Take the Bible Away from Us in Whole or Part, and Is Sneaky about It.....	11
Let Us Dive into Genesis 1 and 2.....	15
Three Initial Questions.....	15
God Alone Created the Universe.....	20
The Scriptural Lesson from the Structure of the Six Days.....	21
God’s Work of Creation.....	23
A Day of Rest.....	27
Transitioning from Global to Local.....	29
The Garden in Eden and Adam and Eve.....	35
Our Lord Jesus Christ Instructs Us about How God Created the Universe.....	37
The Core Issue: Sight or Faith.....	39
An Awful Lot of Science Is Not Wearing Any Clothes.....	40
Scientists Are Human and Sinners Like All of Us.....	40
The Persecution of Galileo Has Made Christians Overly Cautious.....	43
We Do Not Have to Believe in Big Bang or Evolution Theories.....	44
Some Practical Applications.....	56
Conclusion.....	59
Appendix A: The Emperor’s New Clothes.....	62
Appendix B: The Open Manhole.....	65
Appendix C: Places Where <i>bawraw</i> Appears in Scripture:	71
Places Where a Basic Form of the Verb Is Used.....	71
Appendix D: Two Technical Whodunits.....	75
Appendix E: Creation in Six Days and the Sabbath.....	78
Acknowledgments.....	79
Scripture Index.....	80
General Index.....	83
Colophon.....	86

## Introduction

This book's title refers to the fable, *The Emperor's New Clothes*, written by Hans Christian Andersen in 1837. That fable provides an underlying theme for this book. The whole fable is in Appendix A, but here is a short summary: A foppish emperor was taken in by two swindlers, who claimed they could manufacture a magnificent set of clothes for the emperor. The con men claimed nobody would be able to see or feel the clothes if they were unfit for their office, a fool, or stupid. Of course, nobody saw anything because there was nothing to see, but nobody wanted to admit it for fear of being thought a fool by everybody else. The pretense continued all the way to the occasion of a grand parade, when a little child exclaimed the truth: "But he hasn't got anything on." After which, the whole town realized the truth and repeated the child's words, but the emperor, though suspecting the truth, paraded on. (One must wonder about an emperor who, believing in the scam, was willing to be seen stark naked by all the fools, stupid people, and incompetents who might be around.)

God, in Genesis chapters 1 and 2, gives us a simple, factual narrative account of the creation work that He did in six twenty-four-hour days. Set against this truth is the *Framework Hypothesis*, a false teaching that the first two chapters of Genesis are not really a simple narrative, but a kind of "secret code" that only experts can decipher. Once deciphered, this code supposedly teaches that the days of creation are actually periods of millions or billions of years, a teaching often called *long-day creationism*. Obviously, this idea supports the modern heresies of Darwinism and the Big-Bang. The child in the fable did not need to be an expert to see the plain truth and decisively refute the so-called experts. That child illustrates a purpose of this book: to equip people from all walks of life to be able to see the plain truth and confidently refute the highly credentialed "experts" peddling those false teachings. Since long days are not wearing clothes, it is easy to see their falsehood.

**“My son, beware of anything beyond these. Of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh”** (Ecclesiastes 12:12). There are already many good books and videos available that defend the scriptural teaching that God created the universe in six twenty-four-hour days. So why this one?

1. This book tells you why you should care and why the issue is important, something often overlooked.
2. It does not try to teach you science; many books are geared to those interested in science and leave many readers in the dark. (But those interested in science should profit from this book also.) There will be some science, but everything will be explained using simple, everyday things in your life. God did not write His precious Word for rocket scientists only, but for all of us.
3. This book leaves the deep theology and complex arguments to more qualified expositors, and will help you see for yourself why six-day creationism is what God teaches in His Word.
4. It explains the heresy of various *Framework Hypotheses*,<sup>1</sup> which kowtow<sup>2</sup> to Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony,<sup>3</sup> and infect the evangelical church deeply and broadly. This book shows why they are false and will guide you through the first two chapters of Genesis so you can see

---

<sup>1</sup> hypotheses: plural of hypothesis

<sup>2</sup> kowtow: to get down on hands and knees and knock the forehead on the ground three times. This act of worship was demanded by ancient Chinese emperors and, especially for Westerners, deemed offensive and humiliating.

<sup>3</sup> cosmogony: the study of the origins of the universe, stars, the sun, the earth, and so on

this for yourself using sanctified common sense. Of course, Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony get hammered thoroughly as well, an easier and quicker job than you might think.

Some of the arguments presented in this book do depend on simple science for their proof. Such paragraphs are marked with **Optional Science**. If you like, you may just skip such marked paragraphs as the following paragraph will state the conclusion drawn from the optional paragraph. You will thus miss out on very little.

I am writing to my fellow believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, as one layman to another. But is Jesus Christ the center of your life? Do you live to glorify God? Are you trusting in the Lord Jesus *alone* for forgiveness of your sins? If so, kindly read on. If not, you have worse problems than what this book addresses. For an introduction to true, biblical Christianity, please see Appendix B—you are in mortal danger of spending eternity in hideous torment of body and soul in the fire of Hell.

There are those who wish to snow us under, flatly contradicting God’s Word, with sophisticated and plausible-sounding reasons why God did not create the universe or why God created the universe over billions of years, sometimes even twisting the Holy Scriptures to support their false teachings. The whole purpose of this book is to show you that, like the child in the fable, you can use the brains God gave you and confidently see the lies for what they are. You can have trust and faith in God and His simple and plain first-person account in the first two chapters of Genesis. You do not need to be intimidated by false teachers, however smart they may be or by their PhDs. Let me give you an analogy: suppose an astrologer claims he has spent most of his life studying astrology and has four PhDs in astrology and then asks for your zodiac sign so he can tell your fortune. You have the Holy Bible: **“There shall not be found among you anyone who burns his son or his daughter as an offering, anyone who practices divination or tells fortunes or interprets omens, or a sorcerer”** (Deuteronomy 18:10). Do you somehow need an equivalent education in astrology to know his astrology is worthless? Likewise, you will not need to know or learn any science or theology to profit from this book. If you understand and believe the Gospel of John, you are good to go.

Set against God’s revealed truth are the false teachings of Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony. Virtually everyone has some familiarity with these to one degree or another. But there is a subtler and more dangerous demonic lie that pervades Christendom, and even much of evangelicalism: the *Framework Hypothesis*, of which there are many variants.

*Answers in Genesis* (<https://answersingenesis.org>) is a great organization with many helpful resources, including the famous Creation Museum and (Noah’s) Ark Encounter. Their website has a paper that includes the following brief statement about the Framework Hypothesis:

The Framework Hypothesis<sup>4</sup> is essentially an attempt to reclassify the genre<sup>5</sup> of Genesis 1 as being something other than historical narrative. Proponents have attempted to identify figurative language or semi-poetic devices in the text. Thinking they have successfully shown that the Bible’s first chapter is not to be taken in its plain sense, they make the claim that Genesis 1

---

<sup>4</sup> This description is the meaning of *Framework Hypothesis* adopted by this book. There are various ways, some theologically useful for various purposes, of finding structures and relationships in Genesis 1 and 2, and also connections to other parts of the Bible. So long as these do not dilute the teaching of six twenty-four-hour day creation, we do not consider them to be Framework Hypotheses in this book.

<sup>5</sup> genre: class of literature such as prose, poetry, narrative (story), satire, and so on

simply reveals that God created everything and that He made man in His own image, but it gives us no information about how or when He did this.

The leading promoter of the Framework Hypothesis pulled no punches when explaining his goal in promoting it. “To rebut the literalist interpretation of the Genesis creation week propounded by the young-earth theorists is a central concern of this article. . . . The conclusion is that as far as the time frame is concerned, with respect to both the duration and sequence of events, the scientist is left free of biblical constraints in hypothesizing about cosmic origins.”<sup>6</sup>

This is just a fancy way of saying that God was not telling a straight story in the first two chapters of Genesis. But if you know the secret codes, you will supposedly see that Genesis chapters 1 and 2 are not about how God created the universe in six twenty-four-hour days, but supposedly have some other meaning. The same article<sup>7</sup> states that Hebrew scholar Steven Boyd concluded that Genesis 1 is narrative; the chance of it not being narrative is virtually zero.<sup>8</sup>

But you do not have to take an expert’s word for it. God made human brains with special “circuitry” to process language so people of all cultures have the ability to use and understand such things as irony, sarcasm, poetry, fables, imagery, and factual narratives. Thus, your sanctified common sense will tell you that the first two chapters of Genesis are a simple and straightforward narrative. You may not completely understand all the events, but you will have no trouble knowing what the events were.

In almost all cases, the reason some people adopt some variant of the Framework Hypothesis (lumped together as *Framework Hypotheses* from here on) is to try to make the Bible match up with modern science.<sup>9</sup> All Framework Hypotheses are false but are believed by a large number of highly intelligent people who are using their brains alone when they should also be using faith in God. Many of those who believe in some Framework Hypothesis are good, godly, sincere, Bible-believing Christians, but they have been misled by bad science; bad science that permeates our time and culture like thick smog. I extend particularly charitable forbearance to those educated fifty or more years ago; much in both theology and science has changed since then. At this time, let us just note that our argument is not against honest science, per se, nor against scientific data and observations. Our argument is against various false interpretations of data and observations. Because Bible-believing Christians are the main target audience of this book, Framework Hypotheses are a main target of this book’s arguments.

An obvious question is, “Should I care?” Some questions, such as “How can God be three Persons in One Trinity?,” are mysteries known only to God. Other questions, such as “When did God create the angels?,” do not seem worth much time or ink. But, “Are the first two chapters of Genesis reliable and readable information that our God wants us to know?” Emphatically yes—that question is

---

<sup>6</sup> *What’s Wrong with the Framework Hypothesis?*, Dr. Robert V. McCabe and Tim Chaffey, <https://answersingenesis.org/creationism/old-earth/whats-wrong-with-the-framework-hypothesis/> (accessed April 20, 2020).

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Boyd spoke in mathematical language: “Genesis one can be classified as narrative with a probability of virtually one.” This means that the chances of Genesis 1 not being narrative are practically zero.

<sup>9</sup> This statement is rather general, so unsurprisingly there are exceptions. To attempt to review all of the variations of Framework Hypotheses and long-day views, views that deviate from six twenty-four-hour creation *ex nihilo*, would convert this short book into a large tome.

important. So first, we will explore why it is important, then show that you can, without the help of too-clever experts, read and understand God's message to you in the first two chapters of Genesis with confidence, profit, and to the glory of God. The beginning of Genesis is a plain, straightforward, and simple, yet majestic narrative; beginning Hebrew students often do their first real reading in the Hebrew of Genesis.

## Why It Matters

### Trust in God's Word

Some years ago<sup>10</sup> I was in a store where they were putting on a kind of trade show for major home improvement supplies such as windows, flooring, and so on. I needed windows, so I stopped at the booth of a seller of windows. The salesman bragged that his windows used unbreakable tempered glass—the same kind of glass used for car side windows. He handed me a glass sample and challenged me to break it. It was attached at a corner by a chain to a whole bundle of samples. Keeping the samples on the chain was mistake number one; it invited people to hit the opposite corner. Mistake number two: he did not know to whom he had just handed a challenge. That piece of glass was doomed even if the aftermath was a crater in the concrete floor. I slammed the corner opposite the chain on the concrete floor, and the glass exploded into the little “balls” typical of broken tempered glass and they were everywhere. Flabbergasted, he put a whole window on the floor and said, “Watch this.” Famous last words and mistake number three: he stepped on it. CRUNCH! It was ordinary fragile window glass. I gave him some sizes to bid on, but for some odd reason, I never heard from him again.

Unlike regular glass, tempered glass cannot be cut or drilled. It will always be in the shape in which it was manufactured until it is broken. Sometimes people who are in a car wreck find their doors jammed shut, so they try to break a window to escape. But usually the tempered glass is too strong for them. However, tempered glass has a weakness. If you put a lot of force on a small area, such as the corner of that hapless salesman's sample, it takes far less force to break it, and when it breaks, the whole thing shatters into small pieces. It is truly a case of all or nothing. It is for this reason rescue responders sometimes carry an *automatic center punch* with which to break tempered glass windows. This is a tool normally used for making small dents in steel or other metal. It puts a lot of force on a small area, so it can break tempered glass. Any Framework Hypothesis is an automatic center punch against the Holy Bible.

To speak more exactly, the Word of God is eternal, invincible, and unyielding against all the forces of Hell, nuclear weapons, and exploding stars. But in a real sense our relationship with the Holy Bible is all or nothing, just like tempered glass. It is super strong and can keep us safe on one side while Hell is on the other side of the window. But if we allow any lies to replace faith in Christ's Word at any point, that protective window can shatter. It is like this: if we cannot trust God to tell a straight and true story in the simple narrative of Genesis chapters 1 and 2, how do we know which other parts of the Holy Bible we can trust? How do we know whether we can trust Him when He says, **“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life”** (John 3:16), or **“For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God, not a result of works, so that no one may boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them”** (Ephesians 2:8–10)? In other words, if God is either in error or is lying in one thing, how do we trust Him in other things? But, of course, God cannot lie and knows all things perfectly. **“God is not man, that he should lie, or a son of man, that he should change his mind. Has he said, and will he not do it? Or has he spoken, and will he not fulfill it?”** (Numbers 23:19). **“And no creature is hidden from his sight, but all are naked and exposed to the eyes of him to**

---

<sup>10</sup> My stories are true in the main, but are from senior memory, and in some cases I had to guess to fill in forgotten details or change details to protect confidentiality and so on.

whom we must give account” (Hebrews 4:13). **“Oh, the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?”** (Romans 11:33–34). If we refuse to trust Him in any one thing, we now have to pick and choose from the Bible using our own feeble wisdom and deceitful hearts. **“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately sick; who can understand it?”** (Jeremiah 17:9). We can no longer forcefully say, “God said it. That settles it.” The effects may not be immediately felt or visible, but the rot, corrosion, and gangrene silently begin. If you have been convicted by your conscience, remember that God is full of grace and mercy: **“Just so, I tell you, there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance”** (Luke 15:7). We must be careful to realize that, while it is quite acceptable to form doctrinal statements or paradigms based upon our study of the Scriptures, we must not take a simple narrative and twist it out of shape from what God intended to say in order to either suit our fancy or put a Band-aid over our lack of faith in God’s Word.

A subtler problem is that, once a believer is tricked into disbelieving one part of the Bible by means of some sort of clever argument, his or her relationship to God’s Word is corroded and corrupted. The believer comes to lack confidence in his or her ability to read and comprehend Scripture accurately, and it thus becomes easier to rationalize away or ignore certain teachings. In the first case above, it is trust in Scripture that Satan attacks; in this second case, it is the believer’s confidence in his or her own ability to accurately read and interpret the Scriptures that the devil is attacking.<sup>11</sup>

### ***Trust in God’s Witness in His Creation***

Another reason why trust in the first two chapters of Genesis is important is it reinforces to us what the inspired Apostle Paul teaches: **“For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse”** (Romans 1:20). But if we disbelieve the plain teaching of Genesis 1 and 2, the witness from creation is muffled and obscured in our minds. We have two choices: We can believe that all the complex universe in which we live came about by accident, and a very improbable accident at that. Or, we can trust God and His Word and see His glory, power, wisdom, and godhead every time we look around us, and thus give thanks and glory to Him.

### ***We Glorify God When We Acknowledge His Creation***

If we understand that all the universe with all its great and marvelous complexities and fine details of mathematics, physics, chemistry, life, and humanity are God’s handiwork, and we thank and praise Him for His wonderful works, we bring glory to God. As a secondary, but important effect, the Holy Spirit will use that praise and thanksgiving to sanctify us. You probably thank God for food at meals. Have you ever thanked and praised God for air to breathe? That food tastes good, in addition to sustaining life? And so on.

But nearly all versions of Framework Hypotheses basically teach that God used time and chance and millions and billions of years of random events, to create the universe.<sup>12</sup> Now please ask

---

<sup>11</sup> It is worth noting that there are many other issues in our day where the devil and his henchmen are seeking to hand believers an automatic center punch and get them to use it against the precious resource of God’s Word as applied to our lives.



yourself: Is that an image of a skilled, intelligent workman? Does a skilled craftsman always just try things at random and see what might work? What a hideous, blasphemous insult to God!

Moreover, as will be seen below, God made a special point of emphasizing the fact that He created the universe in six twenty-four-hour days. If God thought it important, so should we. Disbelieving God is no way to glorify Him.

### ***There Is a War Against the Supernatural***

Unbelievers hate the supernatural unless it be demonic in origin; to acknowledge the supernatural is to begin to acknowledge God. Thus, some will flat-out deny there is a Creator God. But others will seek to minimize the supernatural in biblical accounts and attempt to maximize the “natural.” One way to do this is to mingle some form of creationism with false theories of origin. This is more destructive than is immediately apparent because the trend then becomes to eliminate the supernatural altogether. In this sense, long-day creationism is the camel’s nose in the tent.

### ***The Witness of God’s Creation Is a Safety Net***

To put it bluntly: Peter could not make good on his boast to follow Christ. Are you better than Peter? Peter’s faith failed him. Do you think you will never have doubts? Do you think you will never have a *crisis of faith*, a prolonged period of doubting and distrusting God, even questioning His very existence? I have “been there, done that.” It is no fun and dishonoring to God. I can also testify that there are still occasional attacks of doubt in my life. But being now a convinced six-day creationist, when I look out on God’s handiwork, I can ask myself the question, preaching to myself, “Then just who made all this? It cannot possibly have come about by chance.” I see God’s handiwork. I see His power, wisdom, skill, and glory. I am not alone in this experience.

Some might object that believers ought not need the safety net of the witness of creation. But God is gracious to us and gives us many helps against temptation because He knows our weaknesses and is kind to us. The matter is similar to the threat of Hell as a means of grace. It is our Lord Jesus Himself who spoke most about Hell. It is a real threat and a safety net against backsliding. The witness of creation is a similar means of grace. **“Therefore he had to be made like his brothers in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For because he himself has suffered when tempted, he is able to help those who are being tempted”** (Hebrews 2:17–18). **“No temptation has overtaken you that is not common to man. God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your ability, but with the temptation he will also provide the way of escape, that you may be able to endure it”** (1 Corinthians 10:13).

Now please consider what can happen if someone is taught that the Bible says God somehow created the universe via time and chance. The same evidence would appear to support either the existence of God or Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony. Something valuable is lost. This is not a matter of strict logic, but it tends toward serious mental confusion. Additionally, the creation will no longer clearly show God’s wisdom and power to them. They might blasphemously think that perhaps

---

<sup>12</sup> Recall that we are using the description of the Framework Hypothesis in *What’s Wrong with the Framework Hypothesis?* by Dr. Robert V. McCabe and Tim Chaffey. It is difficult to conceive of a motive for “long-day creationism” or a Framework Hypothesis apart from seeking agreement with Darwinism or the Big-Bang.

God lucked out —perish the thought!—so that all of those chance evolutionary events worked out to make a creation.<sup>13</sup>

### ***God's Creation Is a Witness to Unbelievers***

“Creation” by time and chance is not a viable hypothesis. And, indeed, now more than ever, more and more scientists are becoming convinced we live in a designed universe—there must be an intelligent designer. But alas, most do not take the next step and seek the Designer of the Bible; but some do. It is the Holy Scriptures that reveal God to us in vivid, clear, and commanding detail. The Holy Scriptures reveal to us that God is that Intelligent Designer, and not just Designer, but Creator, and this not just in Genesis, but all throughout Scripture.

But if the Bible supposedly teaches, as Framework Hypotheses teach, God used time and chance to create the universe, where is the seeker supposed to go to find the Intelligent Designer? If the Bible (supposedly) teaches what he no longer believes to be true, why should such a seeker even open a Bible? What a hideous thing!

We have seen some of the bad effects Framework Hypotheses can have, especially on people's relationship with the Holy Bible. But also, the false ways that Framework Hypotheses proponents approach Scripture have infected Christianity from ancient times. We need to be aware of those tricks both to avoid being tricked and so we do not inadvertently use them ourselves.

---

<sup>13</sup> “Theistic Evolution” proponents might argue that God supposedly used or oversaw random events to make sure things worked out to a particular end. But there is absolutely no evidence for such a scheme in Scripture, and there is no rational reason why a super-rational and almighty Being would want to use randomness to achieve a designed result instead of just doing it directly. This is the kind of vain and unprovable speculation that by its very nature is not provably refutable apart from the Holy Bible. Theistic Evolution proponents merely accept Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinism as given, then arbitrarily, with no biblical evidence, assume that God did things accordingly.

## ***Approaching Scripture Scripturally***

Because the issue of six-day creation is important, and because six-day creation is under such strong attack, we want to look at the first two chapters of Genesis with care. To prepare ourselves to accurately approach Genesis 1 and 2 with confidence and profit, it may be helpful to consider a few preliminary matters.

### ***God Gave the Bible to All of Us***

God gave the Bible to all of us, not just experts. One of the great principles of the Protestant Reformation is that the Holy Bible belongs to all believers and that it speaks to all believers, even children. **“And how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work”** (2 Timothy 3:15–17). **“Your word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path”** (Psalm 119:105). **“The unfolding of your words gives light; it imparts understanding to the simple”** (Psalm 119:130). Therefore we need to be wary of cleverly concocted schemes that purport to interpret Scripture, and the more complex, the more wary. We also need to be wary of ourselves for the same reasons, and as we study, pursue plainness and simplicity to the extent the text allows. We want to know the truth so we will be free from the wolves. **“And you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free”** (John 8:32).

### ***The Devil Wants to Take the Bible Away from Us in Whole or Part, and Is Sneaky about It***

Unfortunately, the devil has many tricks to separate people from the holy Word of God. Sometimes he just flat out contradicts God as he did against Eve. **“Now the serpent was more crafty than any other beast of the field that the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, ‘Did God actually say, “You shall not eat of any tree in the garden?”’”** (Genesis 3:1).

At other times the old deceiver puts “experts” between a person and God. A few examples from history will suffice to illustrate the problem. **“About the middle of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and began teaching. The Jews therefore marveled, saying, ‘How is it that this man has learning, when he has never studied?’”** (John 7:14–15). The Jews’ statement is absurd; the Jews of Christ’s time were a very literate people and children would receive formal schooling starting at a young age.<sup>14</sup> What they really meant was that our Lord Jesus had not been taught the lies of the Pharisees in their properly accredited schools. This is quite similar to how today, believers are often denigrated as “ignorant,” “superstitious,” and “unscientific” because they believe the Holy Bible instead of Darwin. Our Lord Jesus did not twist the Scriptures as did Scribes and Pharisees. **“For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, ‘Whoever reviles father or mother must surely die.’ But you say, ‘If a man tells his father or his mother, “Whatever you would have gained from me is Corban”’ (that is, given to God)—then you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or mother”** (Mark 7:10–12). There are also other examples in the Gospels of the false teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their false teaching *appeared* to come from

---

<sup>14</sup> Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (Hendrickson Publishers, July 1995), ISBN:0-943575-83-4, 160-1.

Scripture, but it was only what came out of the sausage grinder<sup>15</sup> after being mixed with human imagination and demonic lies. Jesus rightly denounces it: **“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you travel across sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves”** (Matthew 23:15). Their spiritual and intellectual pride is evident in their reply to the man born blind who gave them a simple common-sense observation: **“If this man were not from God, he could do nothing.’ They answered him, ‘You were born in utter sin, and would you teach us?’ And they cast him out”** (John 9:33–34).

Another example of how the devil puts “experts” between the Holy Bible and people is the Roman Catholic “church.”<sup>16</sup> They officially teach that the Pope and the hierarchy have sole authority to definitively interpret the Holy Bible and say what it “really” means. This teaching would be comical were it not so productive of spiritual poison. Two examples are sufficient to illustrate this. Scripture says, **“And Jesus answered him, ‘It is written, “You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve””** (Luke 4:8). While the Lord Jesus spoke these words to the devil, He also affirmed the sacred precept that only God is to be worshiped. But Catholics worship, serve, and pray to Mary and a whole host of “saints.”<sup>17</sup> The Lord Jesus said: **“And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life”** (Matthew 25:46), leaving just two destinations after death. But Roman Catholicism teaches a doctrine of *purgatory*, a third after-death destination, one of hellish torment, supposedly to punish most believers for their sins prior to their admission to Heaven. “Purgatory” does not appear in the Bible, and the doctrine of purgatory implies that Christ’s work on the Cross is somehow defective.<sup>18</sup> As exemplified above, a simple, plain reading of Scripture is sufficient to refute these errors and heresies. We have seen examples of how the devil put both the ancient Jewish hierarchy and the more recent Roman Catholic hierarchy between the Bible and people. We will end this section with an example of how the devil can put Bible commentators between the Holy Bible and people.

Some of you may be aware of the *Scotfield Reference Bible*. It contains the text of the King James Version, but also has voluminous notes and commentary that supposedly explain the text, but that make many false assertions and prophecies. The *Scotfield Reference Bible* promotes *Scotfieldism*,<sup>19</sup> a form of premillennial dispensationalism,<sup>20</sup> that is now discredited by its failed prophecies and teachings. Note carefully that while all Scotfieldists are dispensationalists, by no means are all

---

<sup>15</sup> A sausage grinder mixes everything up and hides and obscures the original ingredients; it is thus possible for the unscrupulous to include inedible or unsavory fillers in the final product.

<sup>16</sup> The Roman Catholic “church” officially and formally *rejects* the precious doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, by the alone instrument of faith, by God’s grace alone. In spite of this, there are true believers in that denomination, but they are so by rejecting many of the teachings of it.

<sup>17</sup> Scripturally, a *saint* is a believer in Christ. But in Roman Catholicism, *saints* are those officially so designated by the Pope. Rome does make a theoretical distinction between the worship of God and the worship of Mary and the saints, much the same as a thief will make a distinction between stealing and “borrowing.”

<sup>18</sup> Where the doctrine of purgatory is not defective is that it continues to bring in much revenue to Rome by sales of special masses and indulgences. These are purchased because they supposedly lessen the time a loved one spends in purgatory. Not surprisingly, there is no price list giving years off per dollar.

<sup>19</sup> Do you really want to read a long and complicated footnote? Suffice it to say that, due to the failed prophecies, Scotfield’s system is dying the slow death that is typical of discredited theories whose long-habituated adherents die off one by one. A detailed examination of it is outside the scope of this book.

<sup>20</sup> Premillennial dispensationalism is a system of biblical interpretation. Although this author strongly disagrees with it, the matter is outside of the scope of this book. The interested reader may wish to consult John Gerstner’s *Wrongly Dividing the World of Truth*.

dispensationalists Scofieldists. **“When a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD, if the word does not come to pass or come true, that is a word that the LORD has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptuously. You need not be afraid of him”** (Deuteronomy 18:22). More than one person has struggled to explain some teaching from the Scofield Bible using an ordinary Bible and found that the teaching was not really in the Holy Bible after all. (Although Scofieldism contains very many errors, it is not outside of the bounds of Christianity, and does teach the basic Gospel.)

The techniques exemplified above are also used by pushers of Framework Hypotheses.<sup>21</sup> Further, since these techniques pretend to honor God’s Word, they are more insidious than outright rejection of Scripture. Those are the reasons I have expended so many words on the problem of Satan’s experts inserting themselves between believers and the Scriptures. One reason these wolves are often successful is that we have all benefited from the many good, godly, and expert commentators, Bible teachers, pastors, and elders. A sheepdog and a wolf are both canines and are outwardly similar. So how do we tell the Good Shepherd’s sheepdogs from the wolves? If you have read many commentaries on the same passage, you already know that there is a wide spectrum of opinion on relatively minor details, such as who wrote the book of Hebrews or who wrote a particular Psalm. There are also differences of emphasis, personal applications, how one passage illustrates another, and so on. But, for what they may be worth, here are some general suggestions:

<b>Good, Godly, Knowledgeable Commentators</b>	<b>False and Mistaken Commentators</b>
The lights come on, and your understanding of Scripture is improved.	You find it difficult to follow and wonder how he got that from the actual text of the Bible.
Later on, when you read a passage upon which the commentator had expounded, the explanation still rings true as you read it and the explanation helps you.	Later on, when you read a passage upon which the commentator had expounded, you wonder how the explanation applies to the passage.
Other Scripture supports the commentator’s interpretations. He uses a lot of Scripture.	The commentator uses a lot of human logic and relatively little Scripture.
The commentator is humble, respects other theologians, and is willing to be silent or express uncertainty when the Scriptures are unclear or ambiguous.	The commentator disdains the views of others. He does not express uncertainty when he should. He may even try to jam his views down the reader’s throat.
Sanctified common sense tells you it is true.	The commentary does not seem to make sense.
You hear the Shepherd’s voice as the sheepdog speaks for Christ because you are one of Christ’s sheep.	You get a whiff of wolf. The anointing that you received from the Holy Spirit tells you that something is amiss (1 John 2:26–27). <sup>22</sup>
The commentator’s conclusions are supported by other Scriptures.	The commentator’s conclusions contradict other Scriptures.

<sup>21</sup> Somewhat similar to the situation with recreational drugs, we should charitably distinguish between the pushers and those whom they have misled and victimized.

<sup>22</sup> **“I write these things to you about those who are trying to deceive you. But the anointing that you received from him abides in you, and you have no need that anyone should teach you. But as his anointing teaches you about everything, and is true, and is no lie—just as it has taught you, abide in him”** (1 John 2:26–27).

The commentator is willing to respect the hidden things of God.	The commentator speculates overly much.
Other books and articles by the same commentator are holy, true, and accurate to God's Word.	Other books and articles by the same commentator leave you wondering about his orthodoxy.

In the introduction, we defined the controversy and the purpose of this book. Then we saw why it is important to defend six twenty-four-hour-day creationism. Above all, it is important that we trust the Word of God. In the preceding chapter we saw that God wrote the Bible for all of us and He intends that we profit from it. But the devil puts forth great effort to take the Bible away from us and, failing that, obscure its meaning by trickery. For all these reasons, it is important for us to be able to confidently read the first two chapters of Genesis with understanding in spite of its mysteries and the current controversies. Above all, we need to know what God wants us to know.

## Let Us Dive into Genesis 1 and 2

We now come to the text of Genesis 1 and 2 itself. Because we live in the midst of a thick smog of false teachings and assumptions about the book of Genesis, we will often have to stop and deal with these falsehoods lest they wrongly influence our understanding of the Scriptures. Also, Genesis deals with God's stupendous work of creation in just two short chapters, leaving us with mysteries, unanswered questions, and problems of interpretation. We will therefore find it helpful to stop and examine some of these as well. Our goal is that, by the end of this chapter, you will be equipped to read and interpret Genesis 1 and 2 as God intended. Doing so also buttresses our understanding against false alternatives and heresies.

Scripture quotations are from the English Standard Version (ESV) with references to the original Hebrew text. There are quite a few transliteration<sup>23</sup> methods out there, but right or wrong, we will use the pronunciation (not the transliteration) of the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*<sup>24</sup> to refer to Hebrew words.

### Three Initial Questions

**“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth”** (Genesis 1:1). Right away we have three questions to resolve, and they are fundamental. They are all the more worth our attention because false answers to these questions have spawned many heresies, including Framework Hypotheses:

1. Is this first verse a title, summary, or some kind of isolated statement? Or is it simply the beginning of the story?
2. What is meant by “the beginning”?
3. Does this teach, as traditionally taught, that God created the heavens and the earth from nothing (*ex nihilo*), that is, without using any preexisting matter, energy, space-time, or other starting *stuff* (for want of a better word)?
- 4.

#### **The First Sentence: Title, Summary, or Part of the Narrative?**

You can answer the first question yourself just by looking at other passages of Scripture and seeing how the Scripture itself uses titles and by looking at the flow of the narrative. Here are the first three verses of Genesis:

**“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. And God said, ‘Let there be light,’ and there was light”** (Genesis 1:1–3).

---

<sup>23</sup> A transliteration converts the alphabet of another language to the reader's language. I chose to use the Strong's pronunciation instead of the transliteration because transliterations are mostly useful for people who are already at least somewhat familiar with the original language, and because most Hebrew transliterations do not actually tell you how to pronounce the word.

<sup>24</sup> This work is published widely in both paper and electronic form. This book uses the version supplied by the *Crosswire Project*. (<http://www2.crosswire.org/sword/modules/ModDisp.jsp?modType=Dictionaries>). For software with which to access it and to obtain the latest versions, start with <https://www.crosswire.org/applications>.

Notice how the narrative just jumps in and starts telling us the story. There is no literary device that breaks off verse 1 from the rest. Let us look at the beginnings of some other narratives:

**“Now Moses was keeping the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro, the priest of Midian, and he led his flock to the west side of the wilderness and came to Horeb, the mountain of God. And the angel of the LORD appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush. He looked, and behold, the bush was burning, yet it was not consumed. And Moses said, ‘I will turn aside to see this great sight, why the bush is not burned’”** (Exodus 3:1–3).

**“As they were coming home, when David returned from striking down the Philistine, the women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul, with tambourines, with songs of joy, and with musical instruments. And the women sang to one another as they celebrated, ‘Saul has struck down his thousands, and David his ten thousands.’ And Saul was very angry, and this saying displeased him. He said, ‘They have ascribed to David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed thousands, and what more can he have but the kingdom?’”** (1 Samuel 18:6–8).

**“Abner the son of Ner, and the servants of Ish-bosheth the son of Saul, went out from Mahanaim to Gibeon. And Joab the son of Zeruiah and the servants of David went out and met them at the pool of Gibeon. And they sat down, the one on the one side of the pool, and the other on the other side of the pool”** (2 Samuel 2:12–13).

Observe how it is common in Scripture for a narrative to just start up and go.<sup>25</sup> But Scripture does make use of titles or similar introductory statements (underlined below):

**“This is the book of the generations of Adam. When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them Man when they were created. When Adam had lived 130 years, he fathered a son in his own likeness, after his image, and named him Seth”** (Genesis 5:1–3).

**“These are the generations of Jacob.<sup>26</sup> Joseph, being seventeen years old, was pasturing the flock with his brothers. He was a boy with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, his father’s wives. And Joseph brought a bad report of them to their father. Now Israel loved Joseph more than any other of his sons, because he was the son of his old age. And he made him a robe of many colors. But when his brothers saw that their father loved him more than all his brothers, they hated him and could not speak peacefully to him”** (Genesis 37:2–4)

**“To the choirmaster: with stringed instruments. A Psalm of David. Answer me when I call, O God of my righteousness! You have given me relief when I was in distress. Be gracious to me and hear my prayer! O men, how long shall my honor be turned into shame? How long will you love vain words and seek after lies? Selah But know that the LORD has set apart the godly for himself; the LORD hears when I call to him”** (Psalm 4:1–3).

---

<sup>25</sup> Some translations will start a passage with *And* or *Now*. Hebrew often puts a conjunction where we would not do so in English. To omit the conjunction during translation is not necessarily wrong, depending on the context.

<sup>26</sup> Many other versions translate *generations* as *history* or something similar since that is roughly the meaning of the Hebrew idiom. (It does often refer to a literal genealogy.)



The titles in the passages above are underlined. As you can see, it is generally pretty easy to tell when a passage starts out with a title or introduction as opposed to when the passage jumps right into the narrative. The conclusion we draw is that Genesis 1:1 is part of the story about what God did on the first day. It flows right into the rest of that story. It is not a title and not a summary of the rest of the narrative. There is no indication of any break in the flow of the story that would justify the fantasy of the *gap theory*.<sup>27</sup> That answers the first question: verse 1 is part of the narrative; in particular, part of the narrative of the first day.

### ***What is Meant by Beginning?***

In his book *Genesis Unbound*, a book that teaches a form of Framework Hypothesis, John Sailhammer wants us to believe the first Hebrew word in the Holy Bible, *raysheeth*<sup>28</sup> refers to an indefinite period of time longer than a day. He claims Genesis 1:1 tells of a *beginning* that was eons of time during which God created the heavens and the earth. Sailhammer then claims Genesis 1:2 and following tell of how God planted the Garden in Eden in six twenty-four-hour days.<sup>29</sup> But as we have seen above, Genesis 1:1 is part of the narrative of the first day. Now let us use some sanctified common sense: How many pages are in the beginning of a 100-page book? Ten? Thirty? Ninety? Two hundred? So the beginning certainly cannot be longer than the first day, however long that day may have been. That answers question two: the *beginning* is the first part of the first day.

### ***Did God Create the Universe Out of Nothing? Or Something?***

The third question is whether God:

- Created the universe out of something (such as matter or energy)
- *OR*
- Created everything in the universe (*ex nihilo*) either:
  - Out of nothing, or
  - From raw materials, in whole or part, that He had already created out of nothing by however many successive processing steps, as when God made Adam out of dust that He had previously created.

It has been the universal understanding of orthodox Christianity that God created the universe from nothing, or *ex nihilo*, to use the classic Latin term. But this doctrine has been a focal point of much vicious attack. So let us examine the evidence for ourselves so as to better internalize it and have confidence in it. Showing that God created the universe from nothing also definitively forces a correct translation of verse 1 as was done above. That is because it is somewhat possible to translate the beginning of Genesis as “When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was formless and void.” This incorrect translation implies that God started His work with some preexisting matter, but such a translation is not possible if it is shown that God did not start with any preexisting matter.

Let us first examine some other Scriptures before returning to Genesis. **“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with**

---

<sup>27</sup> The *gap theory* fiction was popularized by the Scofield Reference Bible. It has no textual support whatsoever. This false theory purports to teach that there was some undefined period of years between verses 1 and 2.

<sup>28</sup> This is actually the main word only; in the text, it is preceded by an attached Hebrew letter, *beth*, meaning *in the*.

<sup>29</sup> John Sailhammer, *Genesis Unbound* (Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books, 1996), ISBN: 0-88070-868-9, 38-44.

**God. All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made”** (John 1:1–3). Here we see that Jesus was and is God. Also, nothing was made except through Jesus Christ, who was in the beginning. Putting this together, we see it is through our Lord Jesus Christ that *everything* was made. Genesis 1:2 teaches us that the Holy Spirit was also working in creation. It would be absurd to exclude our Heavenly Father, so we can simply say that God made everything. Now, if God made everything, then before God first made something, there was nothing. Therefore, there can be no previously existing material (that God did not make) out of which God made the heavens and the earth. Nothing existed until God created it out of nothing. John’s Gospel is not the only place that teaches all things were made through our Lord Jesus. **“But in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world”** (Hebrews 1:2).

**“By faith we understand that the universe was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things that are visible”** (Hebrews 11:3). Today, to our scientifically informed minds, we can think of many things that are real, but not visible. But although philosophers speculated about invisible things, they were not part of everyday experience to the ancients. This verse is difficult to unambiguously interpret and commentators are divided. But if the Greek, properly understood, does teach God did not create the universe from anything now visible, then it is evidence for creation from nothing.

Now let us return to *bawraw*, the Hebrew word that is translated *created*. We can, with profit, see how *bawraw* is used elsewhere in Scripture. Here are some statistics. For the full list see Appendix C.

- A. 12 verses refer to God’s original creation or of the New Heavens and New Earth.
- B. 14 verses refer to God’s creation of humans.
- C. 10 verses refer to God creating a miracle or specific event.
- D. 2 verses refer to God working spiritually in a believer.
- E. 2 verses refer to routine events of God’s providence.

Let us consider now whether or not *bawraw* indicates that God is creating something from nothing. Remember that we are not discussing the English word *create*, which does not quite mean the same thing. For now, we skip A above, since that is the one in question. First, observe that everything in the list above is something only God can do. For each category, an example from Appendix C is quoted.

Category E: **“I form light and create darkness, I make well-being and create calamity, I am the LORD, who does all these things”** (Isaiah 45:7). There is a sense in which God’s creation and providence are the same kind of work of God; only the time of the event is different. The three uses of *bawraw* in the two verses in this category do not shed light on the present question of the meaning of *bawraw*. In light of this, we chose to treat category E like category A: the meaning of *bawraw* in these verses is yet to be determined.

Category B: **“Everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made”** (Isaiah 43:7). This verse above speaks of creation of a human, then of God forming the embryo, then growing it into a newborn baby, made in God’s image at all stages. Scripture as a whole speaks of people as individual and particular creations of God. Of the fourteen verses in this

category, six of them speak of God creating particular people or groups of people in the present or future tenses; these thus refer to God creating them *after* the original creation of Genesis 1 and 2. Also, **“Thus says God, the LORD, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and what comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it”** (Isaiah 42:5). **“Let this be recorded for a generation to come, so that a people yet to be created may praise the LORD”** (Psalm 102:18). Here we see that, in the past, God created the heavens and the earth, but *presently* gives spirit<sup>30</sup> to people, and that there are people yet to be created. A human soul, once created, is eternal and will vastly outlive this universe. The soul is something mysteriously spiritual and made for God, to yearn for God, and to interact with God, not made out of any raw material from this universe, or even available within this universe. This author finds it difficult to conceive how an eternal soul that is able to dwell in Heaven can come from a finite and physical universe. By contrast, humans will receive their bodies, reconstituted glorious in Heaven, or reconstituted able to endure eternal torment in Hell without perishing. But Scripture says nothing similar regarding souls; they go directly to their eternal home. Hence, a human soul can only be created by God *ex nihilo*, from nothing, because there is no “something” in this universe available for the job. Passages in Category B thus use *bawraw* to mean to create from nothing.

Category C: **“Then the LORD will create over the whole site of Mount Zion and over her assemblies a cloud by day, and smoke and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory there will be a canopy”** (Isaiah 4:5). Many times, when God speaks of His miraculous works, He speaks of creating some new thing or creating the miracle itself. In the passage above, similar to what He did during the Exodus sojourn, God provided a fire that burned in midair with no fuel source. Since God is, at least partly, using resources not available in the universe itself, God creates these miracles from nothing (*ex nihilo*). For example, there are rocks and there is water, but not significant water inside desert rocks. **“Behold, I will stand before you there on the rock at Horeb, and you shall strike the rock, and water shall come out of it, and the people will drink.’ And Moses did so, in the sight of the elders of Israel”** (Exodus 17:6). God created the water from nothing.<sup>31</sup> Passages in Category C thus use *bawraw* to mean to create from nothing.

Category D: **“Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me”** (Psalm 51:10). Finally, we come to cases when God the Holy Spirit works directly on a human soul. Just as God creates souls from nothing in this universe, so any improvements to human souls must also be from nothing (*ex nihilo*). The truth of this depends on the reasoning given for Category B and the fact that, if the soul is not originally created from anything available within this universe, then any improvements to the soul itself cannot be made using anything available within this universe. Passages in Category D thus use *bawraw* to mean to create from nothing. Of course, this does not prevent the Holy Spirit from using physical things as means of grace—for example, in the sacraments.

Thus we see that the Bible uses *bawraw* elsewhere to mean creation from nothing. Depending on the word under study, this type of word study can be a powerful tool, and it works well in the case of *bawraw*; there are many examples, the doer of the verb is always God, and the contexts are similar:

---

<sup>30</sup> While the exact relationship between the human spirit and human soul is unclear, Scripture does make it clear that they are inseparably connected, unlike body and soul, which are separable. Scripture often uses *spirit* and *soul* interchangeably, but never defines their relationship. Just as *head count* refers to whole people with whole bodies, so a reference to *spirit* must also refer to the soul, or an inseparable part or aspect of the soul.

<sup>31</sup> Those who reject the supernatural will carp that the water must have come out of a previously unknown underground stream or something. But the Holy Bible says that the water came out of the rock, not a hole in the rock.

supernatural works of God.<sup>32</sup> Other passages of Scripture also support the fact that God created the universe from nothing. Thus, when *bawraw* is used in Genesis, chapters 1 and 2, it must mean creation from nothing.

Further, there is good evidence from the natural world to show that passages in categories A and E use *bawraw* to mean to create from nothing. **“For I the LORD do not change; therefore you, O children of Jacob, are not consumed”** (Malachi 3:6). Because God does not change, and things in the universe do change, it is clear that God is *transcendent*, that is, entirely separate from His creation. No part of creation is part of God and no part of God is part of His creation. So, if the universe did not come from God’s substance (for lack of a better word), from what did it come? Did the universe come from itself?

**Optional Science:** Albert Einstein’s famous  $E = mc^2$  teaches that energy and mass are convertible. But, as long as energy remains energy, energy is *conserved*; it can be changed from one form to another, but not created or destroyed. Mass (matter) is also conserved. For example, you can take a match or splinter of wood, put it in a sealed container on a sensitive scale, and ignite the wood, perhaps with an electric igniter. The scale will not move. The smoke, ash, carbon dioxide and water vapor will weigh just as much as the original wood and oxygen. This is an example of conservation of mass. A machinist, while hardening steel, can plunge a piece of orange-hot steel into a bucket of water. The steel will cool drastically, the water will warm a noticeable amount, and the temperature of the room will go up a tiny bit. But the total heat energy of the steel, water, and room will stay the same. This is an example of conservation of energy.

Apart from a work of God, the old saying is true: “You can’t get something for nothing.” A universe cannot come into existence by itself, but only by some power from outside the universe itself. Consequently, there was no preexisting “something” God could have used; God had to create the universe from nothing (*ex nihilo*). Humans can dig clay, make and fire bricks, and build with the bricks. But only God can create that clay out of nothing.

From all the observations above, we see that *bawraw* carries with it the meaning of creation from nothing (*ex nihilo*). We have seen for ourselves the truth of the historic teaching of orthodox Christianity: God created all things from nothing (*ex nihilo*), either directly or out of something God previously created from nothing.

## **God Alone Created the Universe**

**“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth”** (Genesis 1:1). In the Hebrew, *in the beginning* is the first word,<sup>33</sup> *created* is the second word, and *God* is the third word. This third word tells us why the issue of creation from nothing is important. **“I am the LORD; that is my name; my glory I give to no other, nor my praise to carved idols”** (Isaiah 42:8). God created and formed everything that exists. He had no help and needed no help. To attribute any of His creation to some

<sup>32</sup> Our word study makes a good strong case that *bawraw* means to create from nothing. But, as with any word study, to fully cinch the case that *bawraw* means to create *ex nihilo* requires a fair amount of additional advanced scholarly work beyond the scope of this book. Orthodox scholars who have done this work have come to the same conclusion.

<sup>33</sup> In common with many other languages, Hebrew often uses one word where more than one word is needed in English. It does this by adding various letters and groups of letters to a root word, resulting in a complex single word. English does this to a limited extent; for example, we add *-ed* to a word to make it past tense.

supposedly preexisting material, to time and chance, or to “natural” causes is to idolatrously set something else on the same level as God.

Starting with just the first three Hebrew words in the Holy Bible we have established four foundational truths that deeply affect our understanding not only of Genesis 1 and 2, but much of Scripture:

1. The creation account is a simple unified narrative. Genesis 1:1 is an integral part of that narrative.
2. God created the heavens and the earth in unfinished form in the beginning of the first day of creation.
3. God created everything *ex nihilo*, out of nothing. He also made other things out of materials that He had created from nothing.
4. God alone is the sole Creator of this universe. He had no help from any outside “natural law” or anything else.

### ***The Scriptural Lesson from the Structure of the Six Days***

First let us note that the Hebrew *yome*, usually translated *day*, has two basic but different meanings. The first meaning is of a full twenty-four-hour calendar day or the daylight time of a calendar day. The second meaning is of some defined event or interval of time that is not a calendar day. Here is an example where *yome* refers to a calendar day: **“But when dawn came up the next day, God appointed a worm that attacked the plant, so that it withered”** (Jonah 4:7). Here are four examples in two verses where *yome* refers to some interval of time or event: **“For the day is near, the day of the LORD is near; it will be a day of clouds, a time of doom for the nations”** (Ezekiel 30:3). **“‘In that day,’ declares the LORD, ‘I will assemble the lame and gather those who have been driven away and those whom I have afflicted’”** (Micah 4:6). To correctly understand the first two chapters of Genesis, we will need to carefully distinguish between these uses of *yome*.

The text below is the first chapter of Genesis, with much of its text omitted, and some seemingly irreverent replacements:

In the beginning,

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the first day.

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the second day.

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the third day.

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the fourth day.

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the fifth day.

God did something.

And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.

When any author uses repetition or some other literary structure in a passage, we must take notice. The whole point of reading, after all, is to accurately receive what the author is transmitting. This becomes especially important when the Author is God Himself. Obviously God thought it important that we know what He did on which day, and that these days were calendar days; only

calendar days have evenings and mornings. The days were not indefinite periods of time or groups of events. To illustrate this point, God could have simply given us the events themselves:

In the beginning,  
God did something.  
God did something.  
God did something.  
God did something.  
God did something.  
God did something.

In this hypothetical case, we would still know what God did and in what sequence. It is thus clear that God wanted us to know on what day He did things. But if this were all, God could have merely separated the days with something like this:

In the beginning,  
God did something.  
The next day,  
God did something.  
The next day,  
God did something.  
The next day,  
God did something.  
The next day,  
God did something.  
The next day,  
God did something.

But God did not use any of these shorter versions. Instead, as seen in the full version above, He followed His description of each day's events with the same statement: *And there was evening and there was morning, the Xth day*. Furthermore, this uniform and repetitive use of *And there was evening and there was morning, the Xth day* tells us that these days were themselves uniform. In other words, they measured out the same amount of time. We are left with the task of calibrating that unit of time—that is, we must determine how long these days were. And that is an easy task: **“And God said, ‘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). This was part of God's work on the fourth day, so, at the very least, the fifth day onward was defined by solar day and solar night. Since Scripture makes a point that the days were uniform in length, all of the days were twenty-four-hour<sup>34</sup> days. There is not really any alternative calibration for the day length that would make any sense. It is perhaps worth noting in passing that, had God created the universe over billions of years or something, being a God of truth, He surely would have given us different time references.

---

<sup>34</sup> **Optional Science:** The twenty-four hours of Genesis could have been slightly different from our current twenty-four hours. We know, using highly precise atomic clocks, that the earth does not always rotate at exactly the same speed. Further, major geologic events, such as, most particularly, the flood of Noah, may alter the mass distribution of the earth, thus changing its rotation speed. You may experience this for yourself. Sit in an office chair that revolves freely and set yourself to spinning. Now stick out your legs. Your rotation speed will slow. Pull them in again. Your rotation speed will increase. Now you get to explain what you are doing to the boss.

We thus conclude that the references to days that had evenings and mornings in Genesis chapter 1 refer to ordinary twenty-four-hour calendar days. This is plain and unambiguous; there is no poetry or literary imagery present that might suggest otherwise. Let us thus state the matter frankly and boldly: God, a firsthand witness, teaches us in His infallible Word about the events of the creation—about work He Himself performed—that He did the creation work in six twenty-four-hour days.

We have now accomplished the most important goal of this book: we have proven that God, by Himself, created this universe in six twenty-four-hour days *ex nihilo*. Our next goal is to be able to read the simple, straightforward narrative of Genesis 1 and 2 with understanding. By seeing the truth for ourselves, we will not be troubled by false Framework Hypotheses. Let us be in awe of Him who did so much great and vast work in less than a week.

## **God's Work of Creation**

### **Day One**

**“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. And God said, ‘Let there be light,’ and there was light. And God saw that the light was good. And God separated the light from the darkness. God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, the first day”** (Genesis 1:1–5).

On this day, we see three of four “techniques” (for want of a better word) that God used in creation. First, the technique of creating the heavens and the earth is unspecified. God spoke a command, the second technique, to create light. When God called the light *Day*, He used the third technique, naming by fiat. As with all days but the second, God pronounces His work on that day to be good.

There exists some confusion over the meaning of *without form and void*. There are ancient teachings that the world began as chaos and this idea from heathen philosophers has persisted to this day. It is quite overstating the case. The Hebrew *toho* means a desert, a desolation, without form, an empty place, and similar; here it is translated *without form*. Nothing has been made from the earth yet; it is as a lump of potter’s clay. Nothing has been built on the earth; it is yet as a desert place. The other Hebrew word is *bohoo*, meaning void, that is, empty; here it is translated *void*. The earth is, in a manner of speaking, a container. One must shape the formless clay and make a pot first, then you have a container into which you can put something. But this formless state was not chaos; it had a useful, specific composition; the potter’s clay was not mixed with mud and gravel. Or for another analogy, accurately mixed dough awaits being cut into cookie shapes, baking, and the addition of toppings.

Taking the text in order, it would seem our next topic is, What was the Spirit of God doing while hovering over the face of the waters? But there are reasons why we will not attempt to answer that question, and they deserve some extended explanation.

## A Question about Our Questions

Doubtless, you have questions. So do we all; some of the more obvious questions are: What is meant by *the heavens and the earth*? Does this mean the universe? Probably. But this universe, like the earth, was obviously empty since the sun, moon, and stars (including planets, known then as *wandering stars*) were created later. So is this referring to the underlying structure of the universe? Maybe. Maybe not. It would make sense according to current scientific theories. We now believe the universe is a structure in higher dimensions than the three spatial dimensions and one time dimension we normally experience as humans. In other words, empty space and time did not “naturally” exist; God had to create space-time so there would be a universe into which to put the solar system and other stars.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, what is meant by *light*? Does this mean light as we see it with our eyes, or, given that there were yet no *sources* of light, such as the sun, some kind of primal energy from which God made all kinds of light and energy later?

These are interesting questions, but Scripture does not answer them. And if we make guesses about them, we will never know for certain if we are right or wrong because there is no way to go back and look or otherwise test our thinking. Thus, since there are many other works on Genesis that attempt to answer these kinds of scientific questions, let us consider them outside of the scope of this book and focus on our main themes. Let us exercise our God-given faith and trust that God did everything correctly. We are here on a finished Earth, are we not? **“The secret things belong to the LORD our God, but the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law”** (Deuteronomy 29:29).

Scientific questions are not the only questions. For example, the Holy Spirit is the first Person of the Trinity explicitly mentioned in the Bible. What exactly was His role in creation? What does this teach us about the work of the Holy Spirit today? Although Genesis 1–2 is a simple narrative, what it teaches profoundly affects our understanding of all of Scripture. Thus, many volumes have been written on Genesis, and for good reason: a basic understanding of Genesis is important for understanding Scripture as a whole, and there are many links to other parts of Scripture, both from and to Genesis. There is therefore no reason for this small book to try to duplicate what others have already done better, and thus such theological topics also fall outside the narrow scope of this writing. As a result, we are going to deliberately pass over many questions about *how* and *why* God did some things and focus on *what* God did, and on what day; as such, there will be limited need for commentary.

## Day Two

**“And God said, ‘Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.’ And God made the expanse and separated the waters that were under the expanse from the waters that were above the expanse. And it was so. And God called the expanse Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, the second day”** (Genesis 1:6–8).

<sup>35</sup> General Relativity obviously would not have occurred to Moses’ readers. Still, since the stars were created later, the idea of an initially empty container, that is, empty space, would not necessarily been foreign to them. It is also entirely possible that God made further changes to the basic structure of the universe after the first day, for example, when He created the stars. Although General Relativity has stood up to much experimental verification, it need not be true in order for the point to be valid that before God began His creation, there were not only no stars, planets, Earth, and so on, but also there was no universe in which to put them. **“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made”** (John 1:1–3), and that includes universes, empty or otherwise.



Here we see a fourth technique: manufacturing something out of raw material that He had previously created. Whether God manufactured (“made”) by spoken command in addition to creating by spoken command is not immediately clear from this text. Another possibility is that God spoke the expanse into being from nothing, then further shaped or processed it to put it into its final form. All of these different techniques show us that God is in no way limited in His abilities. All in all, we should not try to be too exact in our interpretations of the processes used since they are far beyond human comprehension.

The expanse, (Hebrew: *rawkeeah*) is what we now call the sky. In verses 14 and 15 (day four), we see that God put the sun and moon in the *rawkeeah*, and in verse 20 (day five), we see that this expanse (*rawkeeah*) is the atmosphere in which birds fly. God also called the expanse Heaven. So Scripture uses *heaven* in three ways: It can mean the atmosphere. *Heavens* (plural) usually refers to what we now call outer space. And, of course, there is God’s Heaven to where His elect go when they leave this earth. The ancient Hebrews, like other ancient peoples, had their speculations concerning the nature and structure of the *rawkeeah*, but Scripture does not give this information. Also, there is no indication that the *waters* are not liquid water. This is significant since there is not yet a sun to warm the earth. This is completely contrary to any creation-by-chance theory, but perfectly consistent with a manufacturing operation.

This is the only day in which the text does not state that God saw that His work was good. Perhaps that is due to the relative incompleteness of the work of this day; there seem to have been no “final products” of this day.

### **Day Three**

**“And God said, ‘Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear.’ And it was so. God called the dry land Earth, and the waters that were gathered together he called Seas. And God saw that it was good. And God said, ‘Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, on the earth.’ And it was so. The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed according to their own kinds, and trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the third day” (Genesis 1:9–13).**

There is not yet a sun to illuminate and warm the earth or drive photosynthesis. This situation is utterly contrary to all modern scientific theories. But it is not at all contrary to common manufacturing practices, even in your own kitchen. You may well make the pie filling long before you make the dough that will be the bottom crust. Automobile engines are made before the whole automobile, even though the automobile frame supports the engine. Electronic circuit boards are always built before being installed in the device in which they are used. More than that, they are often first powered up, programmed, and tested in special fixtures that supply power to the circuit board during testing. The board is then later installed in the final product, which product will have its own power supply, such as batteries. Other examples abound.

## **Day Four**

**“And God said, ‘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, and let them be lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth.’ And it was so. And God made the two great lights—the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night—and the stars. And God set them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the fourth day”** (Genesis 1:14–19).

Notice the phrase *and the stars*. Almost as an aside, God tells us about the other very roughly trillion trillions ( $10^{24}$ ) of stars that are not in our solar system. Clearly God’s emphasis in this Genesis narrative is not to give us detailed science, but to tell mankind about his God-given home. *Seasons* refers not only to climatological seasons and calendars, but the Hebrew *moade* has a basic meaning of an *appointment*. Thus it may not only refer to the proper time to plant various crops, but also to the periodic feasts of the Mosaic Law, and to the Sabbath. Also, some translations will more accurately use *luminary* or something similar, instead of the ESV’s *light*, to translate the Hebrew *mawore*, which may also mean *light*, but not in the present context. As any electrician will tell you, that bulb you screw into a socket is a *lamp* that converts electricity into *light*.<sup>36</sup>

## **Day Five**

**“And God said, ‘Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the expanse of the heavens.’ So God created the great sea creatures and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.’ And there was evening and there was morning, the fifth day”** (Genesis 1:20–23).

Contrary to modern taxonomy, the Hebrew literally says that God said: “Let the waters swarm with swarms of living lives, and let fliers fly”; so the former category includes all water dwellers and the latter, all flying creatures, including birds, bats, and some flying insects. Land insects (“creeping things”) came the next day. Where butterflies and moths fit due to their caterpillar larval stage and flying adult stage is perhaps a question for Moses when believers in Christ are in glory. The same question applies to amphibians. These are merely examples of details so minor they would otherwise clutter up the simple narrative of creation, so God is silent about them.

## **Day Six**

**“And God said, ‘Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds—livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.’ And it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds and the livestock according to their kinds, and everything that creeps on the ground according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God**

---

<sup>36</sup> So just how many nitpicking Bible expositors does it take to... never mind...

**blessed them. And God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’ And God said, ‘Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food. And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food.’ And it was so. And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day”** (Genesis 1:24–31).

God pronounced everything He had made to be *very* good. Although a full exposition is well outside of the scope of this book, we will do well to briefly note a few things. This passage is one of the most crucial in Scripture:

1. God made mankind in His image. Remember that when you interact with others.
2. God made us either male or female; there are not any other options.
3. God put the earth into human hands as stewards (or managers) of His creation; the earth is not some sacred entity on which humankind is a contaminant. **“For thus says the LORD, who created the heavens (he is God!), who formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it empty, he formed it to be inhabited!): ‘I am the LORD, and there is no other’”** (Isaiah 45:18). As further evidence of this, observe that God created both wild animals and livestock, and provided food for both people and animals.

**“And God blessed them. And God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’ And God said, ‘Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food’”** (Genesis 1:28–29). Here God was speaking not to Adam<sup>37</sup> only as an individual, but in Adam’s capacity as the representative of the whole human race. These commands are universally recognized in orthodox Christianity as the *Dominion Mandate* to all Adam’s descendants in recognition of Adam’s representative status. Adam’s representative status is also why, when he sinned, all mankind fell with him. **“Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned”** (Romans 5:12).

Evolution teaches that modern humans evolved from earlier primates. But we see here that God explicitly, directly, and personally created Adam, the first human. By contrast, God’s creation of animals was far less intimate: **“Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds...”** The end of Luke’s genealogy of the Lord Jesus also confirms for us that Adam was the first human: **“the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God”** (Luke 3:38). Further, God did not take an ape and from the ape make a man; He made Adam from dust and personally breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.

## ***A Day of Rest***

This is one of those places where it is glaringly obvious that, when the Bible was divided into chapters in AD 1227, some of the chapter divisions could have been done better. In the present case, the narrative that began in Genesis 1:1 continues uninterrupted through Genesis 2:3.

---

<sup>37</sup> Eve, if present, was present only for herself, not in the same representative capacity as Adam.

**“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work that he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it God rested from all his work that he had done in creation”** (Genesis 2:1–3).

It is necessary to break the pattern of limited commentary in this matter. If the days of creation were not of uniform length; we might think we may choose to work however much time we wish between Sabbaths, if we observe the Sabbath at all. Thus, here is another reason for the importance of six-day creationism: the Fourth Commandment is otherwise weakened. Further, this is an inexcusable, destructive, and pervasive area of disobedience among Christians.

It is obvious that, if God could make a trillion trillions of stars in one day, He could have completed all of creation in one day. Doubtless God had multiple reasons for using six days, and it has been observed by many<sup>38</sup> that one reason God worked six days and rested on the seventh was to firmly establish and sanctify the weekly Sabbath and to enjoin a usual pattern of six days of labor each week for mankind. Although the seventh day<sup>39</sup> seems to be primarily in view, *seventh day* obviously is meaningless without six other days. The Fourth Commandment strongly suggests this is so in its last sentence: **“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates. For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy”** (Exodus 20:8–11). Although the direction of cause and effect in the Commandment is stated to be from creation to commandment, God does everything with definite purpose, so God, anticipating His Commandment, also designed His creation process accordingly. Because the Fourth Commandment was so important that God designed His creation process to support it, He also said: **“If you turn back your foot from the Sabbath, from doing your pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight and the holy day of the LORD honorable; if you honor it, not going your own ways, or seeking your own pleasure, or talking idly; then you shall take delight in the LORD, and I will make you ride on the heights of the earth; I will feed you with the heritage of Jacob your father, for the mouth of the LORD has spoken”** (Isaiah 58:13–14). In light of these clear commands from God, it must be asked: why do so many Christians live as though there were only nine (or fewer!) Commandments?

So far, the creation narrative has been very simple in its literary form, especially considering the stupendously majestic creation it relates. We saw that God created our entire universe in just six twenty-four-hour days *ex nihilo*, then rested on the seventh day. There are still some things God wants us to know and the continued narrative is also simple and straightforward, but there is a transition we have to make. It will be like taking two pleasant highways to a destination, but between the two highways there is a slightly tricky interchange that must be attentively navigated. We desire to be able to read Genesis 2 also with understanding. By seeing the truth for ourselves, we will not be troubled by false Framework Hypotheses.

<sup>38</sup> See Appendix E for a few examples.

<sup>39</sup> Note that God commands six days of work followed by a seventh day of rest. In honor of Christ’s resurrection, He changed the day of rest to the first day. But He did not give us a calendar; the time of the start of a week is a human convention dependent on longitude and other considerations.

## ***Transitioning from Global to Local***

If you are familiar with the book of Genesis in general outline, you will be aware that, in the main, the geographic focus of Genesis becomes increasingly narrow, especially after the flood. We have seen some of that already. The last reference to the universe as a whole was in day four, when God made the stars. After that, the narrative is concerned with the earth alone. Now as we will see, we will transition from the earth as a whole to the Garden in Eden. This second chapter has been a source of much completely needless confusion. Because of this, chapter 2 has also been rather productive of heresies and has provided much fodder for creative but false interpretations in support of various Framework Hypotheses. Common to all of these Framework Hypotheses are detailed and intricate “explanations” that are far more complex than the simple narrative before us. One such false scheme is to treat Genesis 2:4–25 as a repetition or further explanation of Genesis 1:1 to Genesis 2:3 or vice versa. Sadly, all of these herculean endeavors are merely false guesses that contradict other clear teachings of Scripture. So let us proceed carefully and cautiously. Albert Einstein is credited with saying that everything should be as simple as possible, but no simpler. Because God gave the Scriptures to all of us, not merely the Einsteins, we should also seek clarity and simplicity.

**“These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created”** (v. 4a). You may recall that chapter 1 left us hanging a little bit. It spoke of the creation of mankind, but the details were scanty; there was no mention of Eve, for example. Chapter 2 contains many more details about God’s dealings with mankind, specifically with Adam and Eve. Further, the geography shrinks drastically, from the whole earth to the Garden in Eden. As any experienced writer will tell you, this calls for a smooth literary transition from one to the other. This is a title and part of the transition, as will become clear below.

In Hebrew, “these are the generations” is an idiom for “this is the history.” Sometimes, of course, the idiom is quite literal, as only a genealogy follows. But neither the English *history* nor *genealogy* quite capture all the nuances. We should look at other *toledaw*,<sup>40</sup> as they are sometimes called, in Genesis. These are recognizable by their form: *These are the generations of X...* or something very similar. To make an accurate evaluation of all eleven that appear in Genesis, one must examine rather large amounts of text, so that text will not be quoted here, except for the beginning of one as an example for discussion: **“These are the generations of Shem. When Shem was 100 years old, he fathered Arpachshad two years after the flood. And Shem lived after he fathered Arpachshad 500 years and had other sons and daughters. When Arpachshad had lived 35 years, he fathered Shelah. And Arpachshad lived after he fathered Shelah 403 years and had other sons and daughters. When Shelah had lived 30 years, he fathered Eber”** (Genesis 11:10–14). And this *toledaw* then continues for another eighteen verses about Shem’s descendants. Notice that the text is *not* mostly about Shem, but about his descendants. That is, the *toledaw* largely describes events that *followed* as a result of Shem. *Followed as a result* seems a strange way of describing the offspring of a parent, but it does accommodate the more general nature of a *toledaw*. The amount of following information about X itself can vary. Here is a short summary:

---

<sup>40</sup> This is actually a plural Hebrew word, so, for convenience, *toledaw* will appear here for both singular and plural uses, similar to the English *deer*.

Passage	X	Proportion of Information About X Itself
Genesis 2:4	Creation	(To Be Decided)
Genesis 5:1	Adam	Relatively little about Adam
Genesis 6:9	Noah	Noah figures prominently, but not quite as much as the flood
Genesis 10:1	Sons of Noah	Relatively little about the sons of Noah
Genesis 11:10	Shem	Relatively little about Shem
Genesis 11:27	Terah	Relatively little about Terah
Genesis 25:12	Ishmael	Relatively little about Ishmael
Genesis 25:19	Isaac	Isaac appears frequently, but relatively little about Isaac
Genesis 36:1	Esau	Partly about Esau
Genesis 36:9	Esau	Relatively little about Esau
Genesis 37:2	Jacob	Relatively little about Jacob, but he often pops into prominence

As you can see, *usually* a *toledaw* is largely, but not entirely, about what follows from X, not so much about X. To continue, here is the X of the *toledaw* now under consideration: “**in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens**” (v. 4b). So, in the case of Genesis 2:4a, the X is the creation described in chapter 1. The word *made* is not *bawraw*, but another Hebrew word, *awsaw*, which means to make, do, accomplish, and similar ideas; it is a broad word. (In fact, all occurrences of *make*, *made*, or *done* found in Genesis in the ESV so far are translated from *awsaw*.) Therefore, this use of *yome* would be best taken as referring to the entire six-day creation event, as is evident from the context. A reference back to Genesis 1:1 (alone) would have used *created*, not *made*. Thus, we conclude that Genesis 2:4 is a transition that prepares the reader for what *follows* the creation of the heavens and the earth (not necessarily all of the events of Genesis 1). We therefore also conclude that Genesis 2 is not some kind of restatement of Genesis 1. Finally, since this is a literary transition, we may expect references back to the events of chapter 1.

“**That which has been is far off, and deep, very deep; who can find it out?**” (Ecclesiastes 7:24). We have seen from the table above that a *toledaw* is usually a transition, not a sharp or well-defined break from previous events. We therefore seem to be left with the task of establishing the chronological relationship of the events of Genesis 2 to the events of Genesis 1. Scripture does not explicitly give us this information, and, depending on different interpretations of the text, one may come to different conclusions. In the narrative in Genesis 2, Adam is a principal character. Therefore, the events are taking place within the time frame of a human lifetime, not over the millions and billions of years required for Big-Bang cosmogony or evolution. For this reason, and because the chronology does not affect *what* happened, only *when*, the chronology question falls outside of the scope of the main purposes of this book and we will not attempt to definitively resolve it here. Nevertheless, considering that Genesis 2:7 refers to Adam’s creation, and so does Genesis 1:27, a reasonable option is to treat the events of Genesis 2:7–25 as occurring between Genesis 1:27 and the end of the sixth day, Genesis 1:30. This is consistent with the *toledaw* of Genesis 2:4 since the creation of the heavens and the earth and their contents is finished except for mankind and the Garden in Eden. This chronology will be examined in a bit more detail later.

Before going on with the literary transition, we must pause and consider the different meanings of *ehrets*, the fourth most commonly used Hebrew noun in the Old Testament; it is used more than

2,400 times. As you might guess, a word used that often will have multiple meanings. In the following passages, [*ehrets*] follows the English word that is translated from *ehrets*.

**“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth [*ehrets*]”** (Genesis 1:1).

**“God called the dry land Earth [*ehrets*], and the waters that were gathered together he called Seas. And God saw that it was good”** (Genesis 1:10).

**“Now the LORD said to Abram, ‘Go from your country and your kindred and your father’s house to the land [*ehrets*] that I will show you’”** (Genesis 12:1).

**“My lord, listen to me: a piece of land [*ehrets*] worth four hundred shekels of silver, what is that between you and me? Bury your dead”** (Genesis 23:15).

**“And Abner said again to Asahel, ‘Turn aside from following me. Why should I strike you to the ground [*ehrets*]? How then could I lift up my face to your brother Joab?’”** (2 Samuel 2:22).

*Earth* and *land* are the two most common uses of *ehrets*. The first two chapters of Genesis contain many instances of *ehrets*, and translators must choose wisely between *land* and *earth*. Those who use other versions than the ESV 2011 may well find different translations of *ehrets* and may find it helpful to note these in their Bible for future reference. Also, there is a different Hebrew word that refers to dry ground, and another, *adawmaw*, that is usually used when referring to the soil.

The literary transition continues and also contains additional information:

**“When no bush of the field was yet in the land [*ehrets*] and no small plant of the field [*sawdeh*: field or farm, or flat land such as a plain] had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land [*ehrets*], and there was no man to work the ground [*adawmaw*]”—(v. 5 ESV)—“and a mist was going up from the land [*ehrets*] and was watering the whole face of the ground [*adawmaw*]”—(v. 6 ESV).**

**“When no bush of the field was yet in the land [*ehrets*] and no small plant of the field [*sawdeh*: field or farm, or flat land such as a plain] had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land [*ehrets*], and there was no man to work the ground [*adawmaw*]”—(v. 5 ESV)—“and a mist was going up from the earth [*ehrets*] and was watering the whole face of the ground [*adawmaw*]”—(v. 6, *earth* underlined is the author’s suggestion of an alternate translation).**

These two verses are also part of the literary transition; they set the stage for the present point in the narrative by describing the situation as it then existed—it is the result of what God did or did not do during day three. The choice in verse 5 of *land* for *ehrets* in two places tells us that the scene (location) is now the site of the future Garden in Eden. The ESV has done well in beginning this verse with *When*; combined with the *yet*, it indicates an indefinite amount of time that follows day three. *Bush* is well translated, but it may equally be translated *shrub* or *plant*, but *small plant* refers principally to grass or *herbs*, plants without woody stems. Some have suggested that the reference is to cultivated plants, but the text neither clearly supports nor clearly refutes that idea. This passage has some ambiguities in it

and raises some questions. Before attempting answers, it is important to recall that God's entire creation work is a set of miracles, so reasoning from natural laws must be done with caution.

In the account of day three in Genesis 1:11–12, God created lush vegetation on the earth, including fruit trees. Genesis 1:11 and 1:12 both use the same three distinctive Hebrew words that refer to plants. One means *trees* in that context, and the other two have a range of meanings. Of these, *dehsheh* may mean *grass*, *sprout*, *greenery*, *vegetation*, or *herb*. And the second word, *ehseb*, may mean *herb*, *grass*, or *vegetation*. This latter word is the one translated *small plant* here in verse 5, and these small plants, present on the earth from day three, are now missing from this site. Also missing are bushes/shrubs/plants, that is, larger tree-like plants. Given the range of somewhat overlapping meanings of these botanical words, we can hardly be precise, but clearly this site was relatively bare of vegetation compared with the earth in general. God gives two reasons for this: first, there had yet been no rain on the site, and second, there was no man to work the ground.

We should understand this site to be the site of the future Garden in Eden for at least three reasons. First, if the above description referred to the entire earth, it would contradict Genesis 1:11–12. Second, the site appears to be dependent on the work of man; one man could hardly work the entire earth. Third, verse 8, just two verses later, speaks directly about the Garden in Eden. It is for these reasons I have retained the translation of *ehrets* to *land* (instead of *earth*) in verse 5 above.

The word *ade*, here translated *mist*, only appears in one other place in Scripture, and its meaning is uncertain, other than the fact that it is water, since it waters, literally *gives a drink to*, plants. Now, there are actually places on earth, including the Middle East, where mist and dew are very significant agriculturally. So *mist* is not ruled out. But the context would also allow *spring*, water that originates in the earth and comes up to the surface. Beyond that, there could well have been some other natural mechanism, of which we have no concept, that did not survive the fall and flood. Also, in Genesis 2:10, we see that a river, possibly originating from the *ade*, flowed out of Eden to water the Garden in Eden, but it is unclear if this was the case prior to when God planted the Garden.

Some questions remain, and, as before, we must be willing to let God have His mysteries. Yet, if we can find at least plausible answers, it helps us understand and internalize the narrative's teachings. Another important reason is that it lends credibility to our understanding of the narrative in contrast to the false teachings of Framework Hypotheses. Please notice that the issue is the credibility of our *understanding*, not of God's narrative.

First, were plants being watered by this mist or spring (instead of rain) only at the future site of the Garden in Eden or was this a worldwide phenomenon? The text itself does not entirely unambiguously answer this question, but it does give us some significant evidence. First, verse 6 tells us this mist/spring system watered the *whole* face of the ground [*adawmaw*]. In the context of the Garden site alone, the *whole* seems superfluous, so we may understand the *whole* to refer to the ground over the entire earth. Second, rainbows were new at the time Noah got off the ark. **"I have set my bow<sup>41</sup> in the cloud, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and the earth"** (Genesis 9:13).<sup>42</sup> Also, there is no further mention in Scripture of rain until the flood of Noah, though this is

---

<sup>41</sup> Proponents of sodomism are guilty of serious trademark violation. (I favor *sodomism* because it puts the spotlight on the sin and its approval, not who is tempted by what.)

<sup>42</sup> An alternate explanation for the appearance of rainbows could be changes in the atmosphere itself, though this seems unlikely.



weak evidence due to the limited detail seen in narratives in the early part of Genesis. Finally, if rain were a normal phenomenon at the time, there would be no reason for Scripture to make a point of telling us there existed the alternate system of the *ade*.

Some further evidence for a lack of rain on the earth is connected with the fact that there was no man to work the ground. Recall that the site is not described as being flat-out desert; there was some vegetation, and the variety of vegetation is normally limited in areas of low water availability. Since the site was yet undeveloped, perhaps there was not a fully developed “irrigation system,” for want of a better term, that would have watered a more diverse plant population, especially a system suited for the better trees yet to be planted, and there was no man to install or maintain such a system. This would not have been a problem had there been rain since rain normally covers wide areas. Therefore, we favor the translation of *ehrets*, not as *land*, but as *earth*, in verse six.

Now obviously, God did not make a mistake and overlook the site of the future Garden. So why did He leave it somewhat barren, and unlike the rest of the earth, with only a limited water supply? God is infinitely wise, and His creation processes will reflect that. Unlike a human manufacturing operation, there was no duplicated work, scrap, rework, or the like. So let us consider a homeowner who buys a newly built house and the contractor had replaced and leveled the topsoil, leaving the rest of the landscaping to the homeowner. Of course, there may be some trees left standing also. The homeowner wants to put a garden in this spot, a tool shed in that spot, and a flower bed in a third spot. Now, does a wise homeowner put sod everywhere on the now-bare topsoil, only to use a rototiller on the sod where the garden will be, put the shed on top of the sod there, and hoe up more sod for the flower bed? Or does he skip the sod where something else is to go? **“And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom he had formed”** (Genesis 2:8). So what do you think? During the first six days, could God have left the place of the future Garden in Eden relatively bare of other vegetation? This author’s educated guess is that God, knowing His future plans, left the site of the future Garden somewhat bare on day three, when He created vegetation generally. God would have purposefully kept some of the plants from day three that He wanted to end up in the finished Garden. For example, perhaps God kept out fruit trees from day three because He would later plant better fruit trees (verse 9), but may have left (for example) lumber trees from day three.

It is important to make a distinction here: the guess pertaining to *why* God left a more or less bare spot is very uncertain; to pretend to definitely know God’s mind would be presumptuous and arrogant. That part of the guess is only to show the reasonableness of the interpretation of verse 5 teaching that God planted the Garden in Eden on land that was relatively bare compared to the lush vegetation described in Genesis 1:11–12 (day three), and that Genesis 2:5–6 is not just a recapitulation of events from day three, as suggested by some Framework Hypothesis proponents.

It may be helpful to review the literary transition to this point. Genesis 2:4 is a *toledaw* that functions both as a title and a time marker showing that the narrative is transitioning from the creation of the heavens and the earth to something new. Verses 5 and 6 are a transition in space from the whole universe and earth to the site of the future Garden in Eden. So now we come to verse 7, the final verse of the transition; it picks up the action in the narrative at the time of Adam’s creation in Genesis 1:27. **“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created *him*; male and female he created *them*”** (Genesis 1:27, italics added). The distinction in the number of the italicized pronouns (singular or plural) properly reflects the Hebrew. To be painfully precise then, the action of the narrative in Genesis 2:8 picks up at the semicolon in Genesis 1:27, at the creation of Adam. As above,

since Scripture does not explicitly give us the timing between these two portions of the narrative, I leave this as an educated guess.

**“then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature”** (Genesis 2:7 ESV).

**“And the LORD God had formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature”** (Genesis 2:7 [author’s changes from the ESV underlined]).

Instead of *creature*, the Hebrew *nehfesh* could have been translated *life* or *soul*. In this context, all three meanings likely apply together.

The original ESV translation is not actually all that bad. But for the final part of this literary transition, the author’s changes seem smoother. Hebrew does not have the sophisticated system of tenses English has. A single verb form in Hebrew may cover many English past tenses, such as *he did* or *he had done*.<sup>43</sup> If the simple English past tense is retained, then Genesis 2:7 could be incorrectly read as a continuation of the events of day three in chapter 1 or even earlier. It could also imply that Genesis 2:7 refers to action that continues from “action” in Genesis 2:5–6. But use of the English past perfect (*had formed*) in Genesis 2:7 as part of the literary transition creates a clear reference back to Genesis 1:27 in time and restarts the action in the narrative from that point. It is also consistent with the view that Genesis 2:5–6 sets the stage in location. The Hebrew *waw* that is translated *then* in the ESV is most often translated *and*. In both of the translations above, the choice of the meaning of the *waw* fits the context created by the verb tense. This issue of English tenses will come up again, and for the same reason.

There is yet one more transition worthy of note. Assuming the timing discussed above, God’s instructions to Adam and Eve in Genesis 1:28–30 most likely occurred after Genesis 2:25. It may well be that the reason these instructions are related in Genesis 1 instead of Genesis 2 is that the instructions in Genesis 1 have a worldwide scope. By contrast, the instructions in Genesis 2:16–17 pertain to the local Garden in Eden. However, in Genesis 2:23–24, Adam spoke as a prophet, and that prophecy has worldwide scope.

Now, I do not claim to have definitively resolved the questions raised by the transition from Genesis 1 to Genesis 2. I am a mere sinful human working with a small amount of information given by an eternal and almighty God. When by God’s grace in Christ we enter glory, all of us who expound on God’s Holy Word will recall, to one degree or another, what God said to Job: **“Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?”** (Job 38:2). May the Holy Spirit guide you in your study of God’s Word, here and everywhere. You are more than welcome to form your own opinions. But given we have a simple narrative before us, it seems fitting that any alternate opinions should also be simple and straightforward and of a nature that would have made sense to the original audience. Alternatively, you can simply leave any of the uncertain details to God as one of His unrevealed

---

<sup>43</sup> The verb *yawtsar*, *formed* is in the *prefixed imperfect sequential* form, common in narratives and used frequently in these first two chapters. This form is used to connect verbs to add a sense of connectedness and sequence to them, either in time or thought. Based on the overall context, this author chooses to treat the verb as being in thought sequence, in which case, the use of the English past perfect tense fits nicely. But if one assumes that the sequence is in time, then the verse makes little sense in the overall flow of the narrative.

mysteries, trusting in Him. Recall also that these discussions of timing do not affect *what happened*, but only *when*.

To summarize the small changes to the ESV translation I have made, here is the whole passage:

**“These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens. When no bush of the field was yet in the land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground, and a mist was going up from the earth and was watering the whole face of the ground—and the LORD God had formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature”** (Genesis 2:4–7, author’s changes from the ESV underlined).

And, thus ends the literary transition. The stage has been set and the action in the narrative now resumes.

### ***The Garden in Eden and Adam and Eve***

**“And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground [*adawmaw*] the LORD God made to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil”** (Genesis 2:8–9).

We are forcefully reminded of how much things have changed due to Adam’s fall; trees of life and of knowledge of any kind are not only now absent, but we have no concept of how they might have operated. This example should teach us to be extremely cautious about attempting to apply presently existing “natural laws” to the events of creation, or indeed to any other event where God was miraculously at work such as the fall of Adam and its consequent curse or to the flood of Noah.

**“A river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and there it divided and became four rivers. The name of the first is the Pishon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold. And the gold of that land is good; bdellium and onyx stone are there. The name of the second river is the Gihon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Cush. And the name of the third river is the Tigris, which flows east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates”** (Genesis 2:10–14)

From this description, we see that there were abundant natural resources, including gold, in lands at some distance, far or near, from Eden.<sup>44</sup> Now, that gold and other resources were not there by accident; God deliberately put them there to be used. It would seem that Adam had not gotten around to learning goldsmithing before his fall, but the gold does indicate that God did not originally intend people to live a primitive, almost animal-like existence as some imagine. Also, the meaning of the geographical descriptions are a matter of continuing debate as the given configuration of the rivers does not exist today.

---

<sup>44</sup>The locations of Eden and Havilah have not been determined definitively.

**“The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to work it and keep it. And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, ‘You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die.’ Then the LORD God said, ‘It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him”** (Genesis 2:15–18).

There is much theology in this passage, but it is not only outside the scope and purpose of this book, but many other, much more able, commentators have thoroughly analyzed it. The use of *yome* in *for in the day that you eat of it*, could refer to Adam’s spiritual death in one calendar day or to the time period of Adam’s remaining and suddenly mortal life, or both.

**“Now out of the ground the LORD God had formed every beast of the field and every bird of the heavens and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. And whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name”** (Genesis 2:19 ESV, underlining added).

This verse has a trap in it for the unwary since we are way beyond the literary transition. As mentioned above, Hebrew does not have the sophisticated system of tenses English has, and a single verb form in Hebrew may cover many English past tenses, such as *he did* or *he had done*. Genesis 1:25 describes God’s creation of land animals. The next verse, Genesis 1:26, begins with *Then God said*, and goes on to tell of God’s creation of mankind. Thus, the sequence in the narrative of the previous chapter is that God created animals, then mankind. Coming back to our present verse, Genesis 2:19, the ESV correctly uses the English past perfect tense *had formed* (first dotted underline added above) to indicate that the formation of the land animals had already occurred before God *brought* (second dotted underline added above) them to Adam. *Brought* is in the English simple past tense, indicating that the action of the verb occurred *after* the verb in the past perfect tense (*had formed*). Unfortunately, few versions make this distinction in order to translate so as to be consistent with Genesis 1:25–26. Failure of most versions in this regard does not change *what* happened, but it can lead to confusion because it could appear that Genesis 2:19a has a time frame back to the creation of the land animals. It also obscures the fact that God had already fully made the land animals and Adam earlier. God was now interacting with these creatures (Adam and animals)<sup>45</sup> that were fully made and able to interact with one another and God.<sup>46</sup>

If I may be permitted a conjecture: Could the Garden in Eden not only have been not only a plant garden, but a plant and *animal* garden? That is, just as God populated the garden with desirable plants, might He have populated it with desirable animals also? Pets are popular today, and many children seem to be naturally attracted to animals. But the present situation is different: sin has entered the world. And perhaps that is the reason pets are so popular: whatever they may do to the furniture or carpet, they are just being animals, but they are not sinning against us as do humans.

---

<sup>45</sup> Colloquial English tends to limit *creature* to animals, often with no thought of God. But biblically, anything that God has made is a creature.

<sup>46</sup> Both of the verbs in question and the *said* at the beginning of verse 18 use the *prefixed imperfect sequential* form, common in narratives and used frequently in these first two chapters. This form is used to connect verbs to add a sense of connectedness and sequence to them, either in time or thought. Based on Genesis 1:25–26, this author (and presumably the ESV translators) chose to treat the verbs as being in thought sequence, in which case, the use of the English past perfect tense fits nicely. But if one ignores Genesis 1:25–30 and assumes that the sequence is in time, then we have the implication that Adam named animals as God created them, which makes little sense in the overall flow of the narrative and is difficult to reconcile with Genesis 1:25–30.

**“The man gave names to all livestock and to the birds of the heavens and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper fit for him. So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh. And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said, ‘This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.’ Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. And the man and his wife were both naked and were not ashamed” (Genesis 2:20–25).**

God clearly tells us that He made Eve out of one of Adam’s ribs. There is no natural process whereby the small mass of one rib, biologically incapable of reproduction or the production of other organs, can be increased to the mass and complexity of a full-grown adult woman.<sup>47</sup> Let those who believe in long-day creation or evolution reconcile their ideas with this plain statement by the God who did it Himself.

Again, there is much rich and valuable theology here, but it also is beyond the scope of this book. To properly expound on all the theology of these first two chapters would convert this small book into a large tome. At the same time, it is my hope and prayer that this limited exposition has more fully opened these first two chapters of Genesis to your understanding. My hope and prayer also is that your strengthened understanding will be used by the Holy Spirit to “inoculate” you against the diseases of Framework Hypotheses. More than that, it is my hope and prayer that you will give God the glory due His Name and recognize in your mind and heart the great power, wisdom, and goodness God displayed during His work of creation. Please do not rob God of His glory by ascribing any of His work to “natural” causes.

Our study in Genesis is finished, but Genesis does not stand alone; there are other places in Scripture that instruct us concerning creation. A very significant example is one of the miracles our Lord Jesus performed, a miracle that superficially seems more minor than some of His other miracles.

### ***Our Lord Jesus Christ Instructs Us about How God Created the Universe***

The Scriptures say of Christ: **“He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature, and he upholds the universe by the word of his power. After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Hebrews 1:3). “All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made” (John 1:3).** In light of these two verses, we can learn something about how God created the universe by recalling the miracle of the Lord Jesus changing water into wine: **“When the wine ran out, the mother of Jesus said to him, ‘They have no wine.’ And Jesus said to her, ‘Woman, what does this have to do with me? My hour has not yet come.’ His mother said to the servants, ‘Do whatever he tells you.’ Now there were six stone water jars there for the Jewish rites of purification, each holding twenty or thirty gallons. Jesus said to the servants, ‘Fill the jars with water.’ And they filled them up to the brim. And he said to them, ‘Now draw some out and take it to the master of the feast.’ So they**

---

<sup>47</sup> It is clear that God’s designed natural method of mammalian reproduction is by specialized reproductive organs and a period of maternal care. Eve’s creation from a man is thus indisputably part of the miraculous process of creation. The existence of modern artificial biological manipulations does not change this fact. Rather, the technically demanding nature of such manipulations vividly demonstrates God’s wisdom, skill, and manufacturing prowess and shows the foolishness of ideas of creation by time and chance.

**took it. When the master of the feast tasted the water now become wine, and did not know where it came from (though the servants who had drawn the water knew), the master of the feast called the bridegroom and said to him, ‘Everyone serves the good wine first, and when people have drunk freely, then the poor wine. But you have kept the good wine until now’”** (John 2:3–10). First, the wine was good, just as God pronounced the work of His creation good. Second, Christ used no props, gestures, or commands to the water; He did not even comment about the water or wine. After the jars were filled, Christ just told the servants to take some out. The execution of this miracle was, from a human standpoint, about as low-key as you can get. And this confirms our earlier observations about how effortlessly God created the universe; God does not need any natural processes to do His work. He does not need any tools, automated machinery, automated “natural laws,” or any other kind of help. God speaks and something then exists. God does not even *need* to speak, just as our Lord Jesus had no need to speak to the water. When God made the stars, He named them all after He made them, but the text does not say, “Let there be stars.”

One conclusion from this is that Framework Hypotheses proponents who insist on using present-day natural law to limit or confine God’s creative activity are just plain wrong. They disbelieve parts of the creation narrative on the basis of present-day physical or natural impossibility or a supposed need for billions of years for something to happen. Knowingly or not, they blasphemously call God a liar.

It is somewhat interesting to notice that wine contains carbon atoms, which water does not. That means that to turn water into wine by ordinary physical processes requires nuclear reactions. Depending on assumptions, these nuclear reactions could have yielded a few megatons of energy. That wedding party would have been one loud party indeed, had the Lord Jesus not have been our Creator and God.

## ***The Core Issue: Sight or Faith***

Decades ago, as a new believer, I read Josh McDowell's *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. That book was a good book; please do not get me wrong. But anything good can be misused by fools; I tried to use it as a substitute for faith. It seemed to me that, for nearly every assertion the book made, I thought, "Yes, but." Used to the rigors of mathematical formulas and computer algorithms, I failed to find rigorous, iron-clad proof for Christianity. Later, I learned that mathematics itself proves you always have to take *something* on faith, that is, some unproven and unprovable assumptions must be made.<sup>48</sup> God created a universe that gives abundant evidence about Himself, but He still requires of us faith, that is, trust and total commitment to Him without reservation in all areas of life. Please learn from my mistake. The material that follows is not a substitute for faith. Scripture infallibly tells us what to believe and how to live. What follows is designed to expose Satan's lies and remove some of the temptations and stumbling blocks those lies cause. I have tried to learn from my betters, and like Josh McDowell, I present evidence, not proof. The Holy Bible is our proof. In keeping with a theme of this book: **"Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it"** (Mark 10:15).

We have seen why a belief in six twenty-four hour day creation is important. We have seen that Genesis 1 and 2 do teach that God made the universe in six twenty-four hour days. When read as the simple narrative that it is, the main points are clear and unambiguous, even if our curiosity is not satisfied concerning every detail. God said it. That settles it. By faith in Him, we receive it. But in our weakness, we are often tempted to unbelief. **"No temptation has overtaken you that is not common to man. God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your ability, but with the temptation he will also provide the way of escape, that you may be able to endure it"** (1 Corinthians 10:13). May God use the following chapters to provide us ways of escape.

---

<sup>48</sup> I refer primarily to Kurt Gödel's Incompleteness theorems.

## ***An Awful Lot of Science Is Not Wearing Any Clothes***

In a better world, we would now be done. But the very atmosphere as it were is polluted by Satan's lies. Thus, to complete this book, we need to give some attention to the lies and refute them. Unlike many other books on six-day creation, we will not trouble to debate with the scientists,<sup>49</sup> but simply and easily show that the splendid clothing of their theories of origin is only imaginary. This is much easier than it might seem at first. There are two reasons for this, as will become clearer later. First, there will be no pretended neutrality as though humans are in a position to judge God. The discussion will continue in the light of Scripture and what every person knows deep down: the creation bears witness to God's eternal power and divine nature and we must all give account to that Creator. More than that, this book primarily addresses six-day versus long-day creation; it thus speaks mainly to believers in Jesus Christ and His Word, and with that Sword of the Spirit, **"We destroy arguments and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God, and take every thought captive to obey Christ"** (3 Corinthians 10:5).

Second, the larger and more majestic the house of cards, the easier it is to flatten it with a bit of sanctified common sense. This is saying nothing more than the bigger the target is, the easier it is to hit and the more weak points it has. The bigger and more complex the lie, the easier it is to find simple ways to destroy the lie with truth. For example, in Psalm 35:19–21 and 41:5–10, David complains of slanders against him. These could have been when King Saul was persecuting David and it is likely Saul's courtiers slandered David on multiple occasions. So far as we know, David did not debate with the accusers. He did demolish those slanders when he twice preserved Saul's life in spite of having opportunity to kill him.

## ***Scientists Are Human and Sinners Like All of Us***

A medical research firm for which I worked was moving to a new location and contractors were still working on our new facility as we were trying to settle in. One of the contractors asked what we did, and in response to someone's answer of "medical research," the contractor replied that he had always wondered what kind of people did medical research. The reply to him was something to the effect that we were nothing special. This little conversation, in a way, shows how science is something mysterious to many people and this aura of mystery can extend to scientists themselves.

It is an objective fact that science has generated a huge store of knowledge that has vastly improved the condition of people around the world. The combined efforts of scientists, engineers, technicians, and many others have brought to us wealth and comforts that were the stuff of fairy tales a bare couple of centuries ago. But like everything else in this fallen world, nothing is as good as we would like. Every human activity, not just science, has a cost and unwanted side effects. Thus, we are always making mistakes and suffering from unforeseen and unintended consequences. We fix those and the cycle repeats. But on the whole, science has been a great God-given blessing to the world.

---

<sup>49</sup> There is no implication intended here to the effect that all scientists believe or think alike. It would just become a bit tedious to qualify the term each time with "who believe in long-day creationism, a Framework Hypothesis, Darwinism, evolution, Big-Bang cosmogony, and so on." The author himself has a science degree and has worked in science.



But sin is always a problem for every single human being: **“As it is written: ‘None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands; no one seeks for God. All have turned aside; together they have become worthless; no one does good, not even one. Their throat is an open grave; they use their tongues to deceive. The venom of asps is under their lips. Their mouth is full of curses and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood; in their paths are ruin and misery, and the way of peace they have not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes’”** (Romans 3:10–18). In every trade and profession, there are both people of at least outward<sup>50</sup> integrity and there are dishonest people, cheats, and criminals. Every profession and every social group has its special set of temptations. Science is no exception, and scientists, like all human beings, have the problem described in Romans 3:10–18 above.

Thus, we need to have care and be fair; but we do well to expose deeds of darkness. **“Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them”** (Ephesians 5:11). Biblical Christianity is unpopular in today’s culture, and even more so in academia generally. The “received truth” in science includes belief in Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinism. Darwinian evolution is considered a central unifying and organizing principle in biology. The Big Bang theory of the origin of the universe and its implications not only dominate astrophysics, but greatly influence geology and many other areas of science. To go against the prevailing culture in any business or institution can be detrimental to one’s career, and this can be especially true in academia. Scientists working in private industry have more freedom but are still under much peer pressure to conform. Since textbooks and other science educational materials embrace Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony, students are saturated with these false teachings. Science publications targeting general readers also peddle these false ideas. The commitment of both scientists and providers of grant money to evolution and Big Bang theories is perhaps reflected in the large amount of time and energy spent on research into the origins of the universe, life, and humanity. It is therefore worthwhile to explore the origin and nature of these false theories of Big-Bang cosmogony and evolution further.

First, much outward sin is simply a matter of the sinner having the ability and opportunity to pull it off. **“And Achan answered Joshua, ‘Truly I have sinned against the LORD God of Israel, and this is what I did: when I saw among the spoil a beautiful cloak from Shinar, and 200 shekels of silver, and a bar of gold weighing 50 shekels, then I coveted them and took them. And see, they are hidden in the earth inside my tent, with the silver underneath’”** (Joshua 7:20–21). Had Achan taken a different route through the city or never found himself alone in order to do his deed in secret or been too ill to participate in the raid, his heart would have been no cleaner in God’s sight, but he perhaps would not have entered the select list of biblical bad boys.

One day when I was a child, I took a shortcut on my bicycle through a muddy field, bringing home some of that field on myself and bicycle. My mother demanded an explanation. I did not know that telling the truth would have brought any punishment, but why take a chance? I said that a car had come over the hill on the wrong side of the road, so I sought the muddy ditch for safety. Problem solved. Now notice that I did not mention leprechauns or flying saucers. Also, the supposed threat was an automobile, not a jet fighter plane on full afterburner. Nor was it an elderly pedestrian. The relative speeds of the supposed threat and a boy’s reaction time more or less fit together. My explanation fit the world we actually observe and live in. Also, notice nobody could prove me wrong; there were no

---

<sup>50</sup> By *outward* integrity is meant a generally moral life motivated by self-respect, public image, a desire for a clean conscience, and so on. But if this is all someone has, without a regenerated heart that inwardly trusts in and is dedicated unconditionally to Christ, that someone is bound for Hell. Please see Appendix B if this applies to you.

witnesses, and nobody had a “time machine” with which to view the past. This story, with limitations, illustrates much of the reason why Darwinism, Big-Bang cosmogony, various Framework Hypotheses, and “long-day creationism” have come into being.

Scientists who are able to get their advanced degrees have the smarts and proper training to concoct theories of origins that are based on good science; the theories thus fit the observed world in which we live. Like Achan, they have an opportunity not all of us have. Although their false theories fit our observed universe in many particulars, they willfully reject the clear evidence of God’s designed and built creation. **“Claiming to be wise, they became fools”** (Romans 1:22). **“The fool says in his heart, ‘There is no God.’ They are corrupt, doing abominable iniquity; there is none who does good”** (Psalm 53:1). Like all of us, scientists live according to the religion they truly believe in their hearts, and their words and deeds reflect their hearts. The false theories of origin are merely highly sophisticated versions of the lie I told my mother about the mud. In both cases, the idea is to hide the truth by giving an alternate plausible explanation that is consistent with known science and the observable world. Theologians who develop any version of a Framework Hypothesis are guilty of the same thing.

To be fair: every human knows there is a Creator God in his or her deepest heart. But the level at which people are routinely conscious of their suppression of the knowledge of God is quite variable. Some people have driven this knowledge deep down into their subconscious, and, on the other hand, there are people who are fully conscious of God’s existence but hate Him. For this reason, while all who deny the God of the Bible are lying, the magnitude and culpability of the sin of lying is quite variable. Thus also, not everyone who deceives himself or herself into believing the lie should be branded a liar in human society the same way we brand burglars as criminals.

Second, not only scientists, but people in general understand the devil’s logic: “I like to sin. I do not want to obey God. Therefore, I will find ‘proof’ that a Holy God is not needed to explain life and the universe.” (Of course, there are many other excuses also.) So, like a small child at night hiding from imaginary monsters under a thin bedsheet, people use Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinism to try to shield themselves from God. Or so they think. On Judgment Day, these flimsy false theories will make the child’s thin bedsheet look like battleship armor.<sup>51</sup> **“And no creature is hidden from his sight, but all are naked and exposed to the eyes of him to whom we must give account”** (Hebrews 4:13). Long days of creation, Darwinism, and Big-Bang cosmogony are only imaginary clothing that the naked users of it pretend to be wearing; it will no more shield them from the wrath of God than a bedsheet will stop a sixteen-inch armor-piercing shell.

Because most people would rather sin and pretend to be their own bosses than obey and submit to God, they are happy some scientists do the dirty work for them. **“But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction”** (2 Peter. 2:1). **“For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own passions”** (2 Timothy 4:3).

An important point must be made here. As stated above, to go against the prevailing culture in any business or institution can be detrimental to one’s career, and this can be especially true in

---

<sup>51</sup> Armor on the *USS Missouri* was hardened steel up to 14.5 inches (37 cm) thick.

academia. That is just one example of an excuse to sin. The use of such excuses changes absolutely nothing; God must be fully obeyed. The Lord Jesus said, **“So everyone who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven, but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my Father who is in heaven”** (Matthew 10:32–33).

We have seen that science is not some kind of infallible truth-generating system. Science, as an institution, is composed of humans who have all of the problems common to mankind, including sin, refusal to submit to God, and valuing self above God. Thus, because they have the ability, they concoct theories that deny God and His work, and many who do not have that ability are glad of it. The next sections will show why their theories cannot disprove the Genesis account of God’s creation. But first, we should consider a little history.

### ***The Persecution of Galileo Has Made Christians Overly Cautious***

There are a few things worthy of note here. First, **“Dead flies make the perfumer’s ointment give off a stench; so a little folly outweighs wisdom and honor”** (Ecclesiastes 10:1). Unbelievers like to use the persecution of Galileo as a way to frighten Christians away from using the Bible to contradict evolution or Big Bang theories, and they have gotten a lot of mileage out of this one incident. But who among humans is infallible? What human is never wrong on anything? Our first response should be, OK, the clergy were wrong; do you never make a mistake?

Second, Galileo was persecuted by the Inquisition; that same notorious Inquisition that persecuted anybody who disagreed with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Galileo was just one victim of many. Against Galileo, Roman Catholic scholars used passages such as: **“Tremble before him, all the earth; yes, the world is established; it shall never be moved”** (1 Chronicles 16:30). Now suppose you are having a flat front tire fixed. The mechanic, while torquing (precisely tightening) the lug nuts, assures you, “It is good and tight. It is not going anywhere.” Is this a literal statement? As you steer, the wheel moves left or right and the wheel and hub go around and around. We give human authors poetic license; do we presume to revoke God’s poetic license? God speaks to us in His Word so as to be understood by all, not just astronomers with PhDs, who, like the rest of us, speak of pretty sunsets. God frequently mentions or describes things as they appear to us so that everyone will recognize the thing or phenomenon immediately. This is an example even to us today—it is important to be aware of the genre of the passage we are reading. Galileo was a victim of people taking poetic passages as literal statements. Framework Hypotheses take straightforward narrative passages as though they are poetic, and many secular scientists believe the whole of Scripture is fiction.

Third, Galileo faced opposition from secular sources as well. Some people refused to look through his telescope, and not for the reason you might think. Stage magicians and charlatans were well known to use lenses and mirrors for their tricks. Further, most people of the day believed in geocentrism,<sup>52</sup> including astronomers and, in the face of still apparently contradictory evidence, were reluctant to change to a new and unproven theory.

---

<sup>52</sup> geocentrism: the theory that the sun and planets revolve around the Earth.

## ***We Do Not Have to Believe in Big Bang or Evolution Theories***

Before we proceed further, it is important to understand what kind of evidence will be presented below. There are two important points in this regard. First, the Holy Bible, God's Word, proves these theories wrong. This also applies to all manner of Framework Hypotheses and long-day creation theories. God said it. That settles it. And also, rightly evaluated, the observable creation shows God's power and divinity. **"For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse"** (Romans 1:19–20). To state the truth again: the Holy Bible infallibly proves that evolution, the Big Bang theory, all Framework Hypotheses, long-day creation, and similar ideas are lies and foolishness. Case closed. Period.

Most people are in rebellion against God and the Lord Jesus Christ as He is revealed to us in the Gospels. If you are in this category, please be advised that you are merely one heartbeat, one breath away from the eternal torments of Hell. You should stop reading here and go to Appendix B; the rest of this book will do you no good unless you come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ, repent, and believe in Jesus Christ as your own Lord and Savior.

There is indeed a large body of literature that addresses the bad science and presents evidence for why the universe is the designed, manufactured product of a personal God. You may want to start with <https://answersingenesis.org/>. There is no reason for this small book to attempt to duplicate the many fine efforts of others, so only a bare summary follows, so as to make this book complete.

There are a number of people, many of whom are true believers in Jesus Christ, who have been taken in by the claims of bad scientific theories of origins and various Framework Hypotheses. Such brethren are not necessarily weak Christians, but some are truly holy and godly disciples of our Lord Jesus who have been victims of bad teaching. The evidence presented below is largely directed to that audience.

Adolf Hitler was a talented and skilled propagandist who used the technique of the *big lie* and is probably most responsible for popularizing that phrase. This technique is frequently summed up (possibly by Joseph Goebbels) as, "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it."<sup>53</sup> The lies of Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinism are massive and pervasive Big Lies that have duped many. They are presented as settled facts and settled laws of nature on the same level as the law of gravity, Newton's laws of motion, the fact that white light from the sun is a spectrum of all the colors of a rainbow, or the fact that a liquid will assume the shape of its container. Since this is the situation, charity demands we recognize that not all people who have been duped by this massive satanic lie are themselves liars; they may more or less innocently propagate what they genuinely believe. But belief in this Big Lie can cause great mental confusion for those who otherwise take the Holy Scriptures seriously, seeking to accurately determine authorial intent according

---

<sup>53</sup> According to [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big\\_lie#Hitler's\\_use\\_of\\_the\\_expression](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_lie#Hitler's_use_of_the_expression) (Accessed March 26, 2020), Hitler did address this propaganda method in his *Mein Kampf*. According to <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/hitler-on-the-big-lie> (accessed March 26, 2020), apparently Joseph Goebbels or someone associated with Hitler said: "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State."

to the genre of the passage. If you are in this category, the rest of this book is definitely for you. May God bless you and grant you clarity of mind by the working of the Holy Spirit.

The material presented below is not as an alibi that proves the impossibility of an accusation. Rather it is as the kind of evidence a defense attorney might use to induce reasonable and significant doubt in jurors about the prosecution's case. By this means, the jurors are then free to believe in evidence in favor of the innocence of the accused. The Holy Bible is definitely not guilty of teaching scientific falsehood! This book does not attempt to use detailed scientific arguments because, "**Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest you be like him yourself**" (Proverbs 26:4). At the same time there is value in showing that the claims of science with respect to Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony are not true. We will thus "**Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes**" (Proverbs 26:5), and for the comfort of the brethren in Christ.

### ***It is Not Possible to Use the Laws of Nature to Extrapolate Back to Creation***

First, we need to define *natural law*, or *laws of nature*, from a biblical standpoint. "**I form light and create darkness, I make well-being and create calamity, I am the LORD, who does all these things**" (Isaiah 45:7). Let us take this seriously. Everything that happens, happens because God does it. God is so powerful that He has no need to make use of anything automatic. Natural laws are not automatic mechanisms by which God saves Himself labor. Things that happen repetitively are things God does the same way every time, both to demonstrate His faithfulness and to make it possible for humans to live in a reasonably predictable world. In light of this, a miracle is nothing special to God; He just does something different than usual, that is all. God is free to change his usual working, working that presents to us the appearance of natural law, as He pleases. As the mechanism in an automobile engine repeats the same motions over and over hundreds of times a minute, or as the electrons in a computer chip do the same thing over and over billions of times a second, it is not due to the power of some created natural law; rather God is demonstrating His faithfulness and goodness to us. For the sake of simplicity, with this understanding, we will continue to use *natural law* as a convenient term for God's usual manner of working in His created universe.

Most significantly, during God's creation work, natural laws must have changed rapidly at times. Not only did the natural laws change, but the material on which those laws operated changed rapidly as well. In other words, as the inputs to natural laws changed, the outputs would also have changed, even if the operative laws were stable, which was not necessarily the case. "**Thus says God, the LORD, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and what comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it**" (Isaiah 42:5). "**The oracle of the word of the LORD concerning Israel: Thus declares the LORD, who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth and formed the spirit of man within him**" (Zechariah 12:1). The very fact that God stretched out the heavens, changing the very shape and size of the universe, fatally destroys any confidence in historical astronomical predictions back to creation. The same kind of thing must be said for historical geology since God also formed and reshaped the earth.

Suppose you see your neighbor far down the street, walking. You can time him as he walks a known distance, then estimate his departure time from his house next door. But what if, unknown to you, another neighbor gave him a ride most of the way? Your time estimate would be way off. Just as the second neighbor destroyed your time estimate, God destroyed historical astronomy and cosmogony

when He stretched out the heavens. Calculations relating the speed of light to astronomical distance are useless because the universe rapidly changed shape as God stretched it out. This analogy does not answer all questions, but many other factors also would have come into play during the process of creation.

Now consider a fantasy of two scientists taking a time machine back to day seven, when God was resting after His creation. The Genesis account strongly implies God created adult animals, the more so since He created mature fruit trees able to produce edible fruit. So one scientist examines an adult mouse and concludes that the mouse is around two months old. The other examines an adult elephant and concludes that the elephant is about twelve years old. Then they meet Adam and suppose he is around twenty years old. Adam tells the scientists both animals are only about a day old. The scientists reply, "That is crazy. Do you think we were born yesterday?" Adam replies, "Well, I was born yesterday and it seems to have done me no harm."

Creating adult animals and humans ready to reproduce themselves was simply God's choice. There was no reason He could not have created babies and nursed and reared them up to adulthood. Likewise, although it is useless to speculate why, it appears God created an "adult" (for lack of a better term) universe for good reasons known to Himself. Thus, astronomers are able to currently observe the formation of new stars and the deaths of old stars. The difference between the supposed ages of the mouse and elephant illustrate additional difficulties in applying current observations to the age of the universe besides discontinuities and changes introduced by the process of creation.

There were at least two other events in biblical history that throw doubt on historical extrapolation from current natural laws and conditions. The first was the fall of Adam and the consequent curse. Judging by failed Mars missions,<sup>54</sup> the curse extends at least throughout the solar system, and probably the universe. Work is now toilsome, childbirth greatly painful, agriculture difficult, and marriage takes much work to make a go of it. Trees no longer impart knowledge, and snakes no longer have legs. How did God make these changes? Did He change natural laws, the material on which those laws operate, or both? We have no idea, but in any event, there must be unknown discontinuities affecting historical extrapolations.

The flood of Noah ran the earth through the washing machine, then the clothes dryer. From that tangled mess of laundry, so to speak, God raised up brand-new ecologies throughout the world, surely a great and major work in many ways similar to the original creation. Formerly, there were no rainbows; now there are. Formerly people lived for centuries; now to reach the century mark in age is rare. God put the fear of man in animals,<sup>55</sup> and gave animals to other animals and humans as food. This may imply that some kinds of food plants became extinct during the flood, possibly resulting in some animal extinctions also. Throughout the flood and dry-out events, how much did God change natural laws? And how much did God change the material of nature on which natural laws operate? We do not

---

<sup>54</sup> **"By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return"** (Genesis 3:19). Experience tells us that getting things accomplished is universally painful to one degree or another, no matter where you go. Neil Armstrong barely had enough fuel to avoid landing *Eagle* on rocks that could have tipped it over. Vehicles get stuck on Earth and vehicles get stuck on Mars. Mechanics drop tools on Earth and spacewalkers "drop" tools into a different orbit than theirs. Examples abound.

<sup>55</sup> According to one wildlife refuge worker, large predators will attack humans out of fear; they want to eliminate the threat. Except for polar bears, most predators will hunt humans for food only due to inability to obtain other game.

know, but there were certainly changes and these changes also introduced unknown changes that make historical extrapolations very problematic.

Let us let God summarize this section for us: **“That which has been is far off, and deep, very deep; who can find it out?”** (Ecclesiastes 7:24)

The fundamental condition of the universe and Earth as we observe them today is not the same as it was when God created it. It is impossible to analyze miracles using natural laws. Thus, starting with faith in God and His Word, we have used the Holy Bible and sanctified common sense to show that scientific theories of origins not only do not, but cannot disprove the Genesis account of creation. And, by using the power of God’s Word and wisdom instead of human wisdom, we did it with very little scientific knowledge. We next examine the problems caused by unverifiable assumptions and coincidences.

### ***Occam’s Razor Cuts the Throats of Evolution and the Big Bang***

Occam’s razor says that, when there are multiple competing hypotheses for the same outcome, one should select the solution with the fewest assumptions.<sup>56</sup> Six-day creationists need make only one assumption: the narrative of Genesis 1 and 2 is a factual, literal narrative. By contrast, the number of assumptions that must be made in order to develop unbiblical theories of origin is huge. Even common sense ought to tell us which to choose. The problem with assumptions will be our next topic.

Henry Ford is credited (discredited?) with saying, “History is bunk.” Now, that statement is, of course, not true. In fact, if one were to hand a Bible to a librarian who had no previous knowledge of its existence, after thumbing through it and reading random passages, he or she might put it in the history section; all events and teachings of the Bible are set in some historical context. But while the discipline of history is not bunk, there is certainly a lot of “history” that is bunk. Much of the problem comes from false assumptions, some from scholarly dishonesty or carelessness, and some from primary sources that are themselves false. Controversies among historians are rampant; it is just plain hard to determine exactly what happened during such and such historical event, even with plenty of preserved source documents. Often many assumptions must be made to try to fill in a complete picture of some historical event. And this is during our present “historic” age. The situation among archaeologists is even worse; many assumptions and suppositions are made from an inscription, pottery fragment, corroded bronze tool or weapon, or other artifact. Paleobiologists,<sup>57</sup> who must deal with the prehistoric, fare worse yet; they build theories on a fragment of bone, some DNA resemblance, a stone spearhead and the like, and with many assumptions try to construct what the organisms or people looked like and how they thought and lived. To sum up the situation for evolutionists, it is one assumption after another. Cosmogonists have a similar problem. No probe, much less an astronaut, has ever reached another star. Humans have observed the heavens with sophisticated instruments for barely a century, and astronomers assume that things were the same for billions of years in the past.

---

<sup>56</sup> Occam’s Razor is not natural law. Probability theory supports its validity but also shows that it must be sometimes wrong. It is a very handy rule of thumb that has proven to be useful, even if sometimes it does not yield the correct result.

<sup>57</sup> paleobiologist: one who studies the origin, evolution, and biology of plants and animals from prior geologic eras

To make things even worse, all of the problems of discontinuities introduced by the creation process itself, the fall, and the flood are piled on top of the problems just discussed. The result is that Occam's razor not only cuts the throats of false theories of origin, but beheads them.

To sum up, when assumptions multiply, the possibility of error multiplies even faster. This is a poor contrast to the infallible and inerrant Word of God. A couple of stories about electrical troubleshooting will illustrate the problem humans have with assumptions at a practical level. Because these two stories will not be equally interesting or understandable to all, there are three reading paths from which you may choose:

1. You understand something about electricity and know what an ohm is. You also like those troubleshooting stories that appear in trade magazines and might enjoy a couple of small technical whodunits. Perhaps you want to see if you can figure it out before I did. Then please see Appendix D now as the spoilers will come fast in this main text. Then jump to the *In Summary* paragraph below the *Optional Science* paragraphs for each narrative.
2. Others should go ahead and read the *Optional Science* stories below; they are not technically demanding. But if you get lost...
3. Just jump to the next paragraph; it summarizes what happened and makes the point clear.

**Optional Science:** Burglar alarm systems often use sensors to detect when a door is opened. If the door is closed, the alarm control panel sees a normal voltage; otherwise, an alarm is raised. One place had an outdoor concrete structure with a sensor on the door. The alarm was armed after hours, but sometimes people had to get in that door after hours, so there was a switch that was wired in parallel with the sensor. If someone needed to get in that door after hours, the security operator could just flip the switch and a red light would also come on. The rest of the area remained protected, except that one remote door. One day, the alarm computer reported a funny voltage on that circuit. The voltage was not off enough to make an alarm, so the computer just gave a warning that maybe something was starting to come loose. The security operator, wondering, flipped the switch on and the voltage returned to normal. He flipped the switch back to off, and the voltage stayed normal, so he forgot about it. But you do not ignore problems with alarm systems. So, after about the third time, the owner got involved and figured the switch must be bad.

So I arrived one fine day, new switch in hand. But, after I had studied the computer logs and looked at the wiring, it did not appear likely that the switch was the problem. The logs showed the voltage slowly creeping up over a few days. I pulled the sensor out of its hole in the concrete and it was wet as a fish and the terminals were all corroded. That explained a lot, but not why flipping the switch "fixed" the problem. Quite curious, after disconnecting and removing the sensor, I measured the sensor, or tried to. The reading was crazy. My meter was telling me the sensor should have been making the alarm go off. Wondering if my meter was bad, I measured the voltage across the sensor, expecting it to be zero. It was not; it was the same voltage the computer logs had indicated. That sensor, resting disconnected on the table, should not have been a source of voltage. On a hunch, I briefly shorted the sensor leads and measured the voltage again. It was zero. I repeated my original measurement, and the sensor was dead shorted. So, not only were the contacts corroded shut, but the corrosion, the water, and dissimilar metals had created, over time, a battery.<sup>58</sup> When I shorted the sensor leads, or the security

---

<sup>58</sup> That "battery" is more properly known as an electrochemical cell. If you have a modern digital voltmeter you can make something like this yourself. Take a bright penny and a nickel. Put the nickel on the table, wet a piece of paper towel with salt water and put it on the nickel, leaving an edge exposed. Put the penny on the towel so it does not touch the nickel. Now measure the voltage across the penny and nickel. You should get about 0.3 volts.



operator flipped the switch, the short drained the battery so the now-dead battery did not create strange voltages anymore.

**In summary**, a burglar alarm system was behaving oddly. Because a switch affected the behavior, it was assumed that there was an electrical problem, probably in the switch itself. Investigation revealed that the problem did not make sense from an electrical standpoint. But it turned out that water and corrosion had caused a chemical reaction that created an unwanted voltage. What had seemed like a simple electrical switch problem was actually a chemistry problem. The switch was fine. That is the kind of thing that can make troubleshooting malfunctioning systems interesting, to say the least. Here was a simple thing nobody had thought of that changed everybody's entire understanding. The original assumption of a bad switch was dead wrong. The owner could not think of any other explanation. I never expected a chemistry problem. This illustrates the problem with assumptions; the many assumptions used in Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony make their conclusions highly doubtful.

**Optional Science:** In this next one, I did not exactly come out of it with an enhanced reputation. There was a piece of equipment that consumed some fair amount of power. It had to be available at all times, so there was no off switch; to work on it, you removed the fuse. The equipment had come over on the Mayflower and was showing its age. I had designed, built, and programmed a new controller for the equipment that used a then-modern *microcontroller*, a small, entire computer on one chip such as are used in programmable thermostats, microwave ovens, and the like. It had worked just fine for a good while, but then one day it just sat there and sort of stuttered. So something had gone wrong.

I went up to the equipment, pulled the fuse and, finding nothing obvious, put it back in for further testing. It immediately started working fine. Now, most of us have experienced computer crashes or malfunctions. They do that. I used to say that, if cars were like computers, a minor adjustment to your carburetor could make your muffler fall off. So I put a reset switch on the controller. After all, the standard advice before calling computer tech support is to first reboot. That actually does fix very many problems. So, the reset switch seemed to be a reasonable idea. Then, sometime later, it stuttered again, but the reset switch did not work. So I pulled the fuse, then put it back in, and, like before, it immediately started working fine just as previously. Thus, I decided that, if killing the power for half a minute solved the problem, the best thing would be to build a circuit that would detect the failure and cycle the power on the microcontroller, similar to pulling the fuse for a minute. The owner grudgingly bore the cost and I built and installed it, and things were fine for a good long while.

Then, all of a sudden the equipment quit completely. I traced voltages back through the chain of power supplies from the microcontroller all the way back to the fuse. The fuse measured open. I pulled the fuse, and it looked perfectly good; the fuse element was a big high-amperage thing that was easy to see. Wondering if I had made a mistake, I measured the fuse again and it was not all the way open, but bad. I measured it again, and the reading had changed. Pushing and pulling on it changed the reading some more. So all this time, the fuse was not blown, but had an intermittent bad connection inside of it. So much trouble was caused by a defective, but not blown, fuse.

**In summary**, some equipment would suddenly start malfunctioning in a manner that suggested that its little computer was causing the problem. Each time I went to work on it, I had to remove the fuse and put it back in. This restarted the computer and the equipment started working again, so I kept

blaming the computer. But all along, the problem was that the fuse, while not blown, had an intermittent bad connection inside of it. Every time I had pulled the fuse out and put it back in, the movement fixed the loose connection for a time. Small mistakes or small things overlooked can greatly mislead a person! Again, this problem of false assumptions makes Darwinian evolution and Big-Bang cosmogony very doubtful.

The two stories above show how hard it can sometimes be to find the truth behind some phenomenon without being misled by incorrect assumptions or bad data. Now consider how many assumptions scientists must make when trying to figure out what happened thousands (and they think billions) of years ago, and in the case of astronomy, across vast unexplored distances. Any one false assumption or error can make a whole grand scheme wrong. Mistakes and false assumptions are to be expected in any human activity. But there are no mistakes or false assumptions in God's Word, and the Holy Bible infallibly teaches us that false theories of origins are definitely making many wrong assumptions.

It is not just bad assumptions that can get you into trouble. One day I was in my lab working on some high-voltage, high-power equipment that had some really expensive precision parts in it. I had helped design and build it, so now it was my job to debug the new design. To try to find the cause of some odd behavior, I had to probe a very sensitive point in the circuit. One slip of the test probe could create a huge power surge that would blow things up seriously. I could not help recalling the day years before when my test probe slipped and I blew a minicomputer processor board that was worth more than a month's pay. I braced my body and arms and carefully touched the probe to the circuit and instantly everything went dead, including the overhead lights. I could do nothing but sigh deeply, then get up and go reset the circuit breaker. I toggled the breaker, but my lab was still dead. In fact, the whole suite was dead. As I went outside, heading for the main distribution breakers, I saw that all the other business signs and windows were also dark. Some drunk driver had knocked out a major utility pole and darkened a good part of the city—at just the instant my probe touched.

Coincidences, mistakes, glitches in the apparatus, and all manner of possible interfering events are why scientists repeat their experiments. Unfortunately, it would seem rather difficult to repeat the Big Bang so as to make sure there are no mere coincidences in the data.

Everything presented so far has more than adequately refuted all Framework Hypotheses. The more recent subchapters have shown why Christians need not accept or fear Big-Bang cosmogony or Darwinism. These false teachings are supported by numerous unverifiable assumptions, making trust in them optional, to say the least. The eternal wisdom of the Word of God and a small bit of sanctified common sense have done this without actually delving into scientific arguments. The fact remains, however, that there are some very powerful and simple scientific arguments against "creation by chance." **Optional Science:** A few readers may wish to just jump to the *A Warning to the Stubborn* subchapter below. But it should be more profitable to just go ahead and not be concerned if there is something you do not understand. Have fun watching good science chew up bad science.

## ***A Quick Dumpster Dive***

**This whole subchapter is Optional Science:** It is summarized in the next subchapter.

Although most people are familiar with the broad outlines of Darwinism and Big-Bang cosmogony—and that enough for our purposes—a quick simple review of this trash may be helpful. According to the Big Bang theory, a massive, highly concentrated burst of energy exploded into existence. From where is a matter of ongoing debate. Eventually, this energy condensed into matter, the matter into atoms, and the atoms into stars. The stars, by nuclear fusion, created heavier elements, and over time and by chance, the earth came into being as gravity pulled clouds of gaseous elements and dust into a planet around a suitable star. The chances of this were infinitesimally small. But the theory's proponents assume that, however improbable, it must have happened because here we are. It makes about as much sense as expecting a complete and functional jetliner (such as a Boeing Dreamliner) to condense out of the mushroom cloud of plasma and vapor generated by an atmospheric nuclear bomb test. The Bible's creation account is simply ruled out by fiat.

Darwinian evolution also supposedly happened by time and chance as well. Supposedly random mutations occasionally create “better” organisms more fit to survive than the “previous model.” By this time-plus-chance process, chance arrangements of atoms made molecules, some of these molecules eventually, again by chance, joined together to make primitive life forms that mutated to single-celled organisms, to multicelled organisms, to higher and higher organisms, and then to human beings.

Before going further, let us make something clear. Mutations<sup>59</sup> do happen. And, when the environment changes in a way that is detrimental to the organism, those individuals that have mutations suited to the new environment are fitter, do survive, and reproduce their kind with the mutation. This is how populations of bacteria become resistant to antibiotics, populations of bedbugs become resistant to DDT, and so on. It is God's designed system to preserve species. In higher organisms that use sexual reproduction, their DNA generally contains enough information to produce enough diversity in the offspring to create a preservative effect. This is also a mechanism that God designed so as to preserve species. Put another way, God made organisms and ecologies fault-tolerant.

But these mechanisms that God made to produce fault tolerance do not have the horsepower, so to speak, to make highly advanced organisms out of lower organisms; chance is not some kind of creative force. This is why most mutations in the DNA of organisms are detrimental and very seldom improve the organism. Creating resistance to an antibiotic by a single gene change in fast-multiplying bacteria is one thing; creating human beings from primeval slime is quite another. The same idea applies to gas clouds condensing into habitable planets suitable for advanced life. Therefore, the life we now see on planet Earth can only be a product of God's design and manufacture.

## ***Chance Changes Rarely Make Things Better***

Before proceeding, here is a summary of the previous chapter: Both Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinism depend on the idea that an accumulation of improbable chance changes over a long period of time just happened to create the universe, the earth, life, and humankind.

---

<sup>59</sup> In this simplification, *mutations* may mean either genetic or epigenetic changes.

It is worth taking a bit of time to explore just how improbable it is that time plus random changes created the earth in which we live or any living organisms. Have you ever had your cat walk across your keyboard while your head was turned? Did the new input to your document pass the spell checker, much less the grammar checker? How many of your typos actually improve your document (unless perhaps your subconscious is at work)? How often does a driving error just happen to avoid a wreck instead of causing one? If you are building something and make a substantial mistake while measuring, how often does the cut piece fit better? If you dump out a bag of child's blocks (with letters on all six faces) onto the floor, what does common sense tell you about the chances that the blocks will all, by chance, stack one on another and make a coherent sentence?

### ***Big-Bang Cosmogony and Darwinism Are Losing Favor***

It is universally acknowledged that, according to Big Bang and evolution theories, the existence of humans is an extremely improbable event. For decades, some workers in the hard sciences, such as mathematicians and mathematical physicists, have argued that Darwinism is not merely improbable, but mathematically impossible.

When Charles Darwin wrote his infamous *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, biochemistry as a distinct, named scientific discipline did not yet exist. In the intervening years, in large part due to the increasing availability of sophisticated automated instruments, our knowledge of biology has exploded. Even in the last decade or so, new discoveries have revealed that life is far more complex than previously recognized. What formerly seemed improbable now seems impossible within the purported age of the earth.

It has also become increasingly recognized that life has many complex systems that could only have evolved if many multiple helpful chance changes occurred together, because any missing part would have prevented that critical system from working. This is the problem of *irreducible complexity*, a reference to systems that are as simple as possible; one missing or malfunctioning part would destroy the system. A common, traditional, snap-type mousetrap is a good example of irreducible complexity. Take a good look at a mousetrap and see if you can figure out how the thing could possibly work if any of the parts were missing. If you look at it, you will likely count, including the base, about nine parts. Rates of change in organisms are highly variable and most chance changes are detrimental or neutral, not beneficial. But let us pick a number—say, one chance in a million per generation per part that there will be a mutation. So, what are the chances that some wood and metal contraption would “evolve” into a mousetrap? Remember, we need all nine parts; if only one is missing, it would not “live and reproduce.”<sup>60</sup> The chance would be 1 in  $10^{54}$ , the number 1 followed by 54 zeros—that is, one chance in a million trillions of trillions of trillions of trillions. The human eye has over two million parts. Now what do you think the chances of a human eye evolving by chance might be? These small chances are why it is mostly rapidly multiplying microorganisms and pests that develop resistance to drugs or poisons. First, to get this resistance, they only need to change just one or two genes. Second, their fast multiplication gives them many tries to come up with resistant genetics. For example, if you want to toss coins until you get ten heads, you can get those ten heads much faster by dumping a couple of

---

<sup>60</sup> This is admittedly a simplistic illustrative model, but it would apply to multiple cases. In the case of the evolution of a new feature in an organism, until the feature is completely evolved and thus beneficial to the organism, it would not make it more fit but, due to non-beneficial energy and nutrient load, less fit. Thus, the variety of the organism with the developing new feature would go extinct in favor of varieties not burdened with it. Also, as illustrated, mutations would tend to degrade the feature over time, as well preventing its completion to beneficial state.

whole rolls of coins on the floor at once. The problem of irreducible complexity is fatal to Darwinism. The same must be said for the chances of habitable planets condensing from gas and dust around suitable stars by chance. However many habitable planets exist in the universe, they were all created by God's precision manufacturing.<sup>61</sup>

If you like, you can experience the problem of irreducible complexity for yourself. You will want to build a simple something with nine parts, such as a stack of nine coins or child's blocks. Take a pair of dice and throw them. If you get snake eyes (two), you have a beneficial change; add a part to your something. If it is any other number, you have a detrimental change; take one part away from your something if there are any parts there. Keep throwing dice and adding or removing parts until you are convinced or the sun gets cold.

In recognition of the problem of irreducible complexity, and of the high complexity of biology, especially mammalian, some scientists have put forth theories of *intelligent design*. They recognize that life is designed, and that there must be a designer. For the most part, proponents of intelligent design are shunned by mainstream science. Would that those who come to this realization find a saving relationship with the Designer! Alas, most do not. And how horrible it would be if their first real encounter with Scripture is via a book that twists Scripture to match what they have rejected!

The Big Bang theory also has many problems. There is currently no good generally accepted explanation for the source of the emergence of the Big Bang. There are many other problem areas as well.<sup>62</sup> Whenever (if?) any of these areas are resolved, the Big Bang theory itself will need to be changed. Many scientists simply reject the Big Bang theory as being unproven.

Scientific knowledge is always a work in progress. Currently "received" theories of origin are in flux, like all of science. It would be not only strange, but tragic if some Christians retain these theories in support of their Framework Hypotheses at the expense of a simple and clear faith in God's Word. There is danger that, as the theories are changed and updated, many Framework Hypotheses will be left in the dust, along with the Holy Bible's subjective credibility.

### ***A Warning to the Stubborn***

Dear reader, it is possible you have been led to a new understanding of the truth of six twenty-four-hour-day creation. You know in your heart that it is true. This warning does not now speak of those who are genuinely uncertain, still need to think things through, or feel a need for further study. No, this warning is to those whose consciences have convinced or convicted them, but for one reason or another, perhaps fear of rejection by colleagues or damage to career, refuse to bow to God's truth. **"But whoever has doubts is condemned if he eats, because the eating is not from faith. For whatever does not proceed from faith is sin"** (Romans 14:23). **"For what will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and forfeits his soul? Or what shall a man give in return for his soul?"** (Matthew 16:26). **"And that servant who knew his master's will but did not get ready or act according to his will, will receive a severe beating"** (Luke 12:47). Your stubborn rejection of the truth is sin, an offense against God and His holiness, and punishable by eternity in Hell.

---

<sup>61</sup> It was formerly thought that *exoplanets*, planets of stars other than the sun, were rare. Now we know they are fairly common, though we know little about them as yet.

<sup>62</sup> There is no point in trying to discuss highly esoteric matters of General Relativity and quantum mechanics pertaining to a false theory in this book.

Sin, any sin, unrepentantly cherished in the heart is extraordinarily dangerous. The one who cherishes any known sin or knowingly refuses to repent of and fight against all known sin can have no assurance of salvation. This is the common teaching of nearly all good Bible commentators, though most do not expound on the matter at length. But Puritan preacher Richard Alleine did expound on this at length throughout his book, *The Vindication of Piety*, and he is more emphatic than most:

A Christian not only accepts the promises of the Gospel as good and comfortable words, but can heartily write “Good is the Word of the Lord” on every precept. He likes his duties as well as his privileges, his work as well as his reward. This heart-acceptance is set forth in expressions regarding a willing mind, a ready mind, and an eager mind. And as his heart is toward his work, so it is for any work to which the Lord calls it. He has respect for all the commandments. He would not wish to be without one leaf, no, not one line of the whole Word of God. He is ready for every good work. He would not wish one duty lifted from him of all that God requires. He would not have one sin allowed to him of all that God forbids. He who says concerning any one word in the whole will of God, “This I must have struck out or be dispensed with before I can be a Christian,” is one whose heart is not upright. He who wishes to have any one sin to be no sin, any one duty to be no duty, any one sin to be allowed to him, or any duty to be lifted from him is no Christian.<sup>63</sup>

**“Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church”** (Ephesians 5:31–32). In light of this, the analogy of marriage appears frequently in Scripture and Bible commentaries with respect to Christ and His universal Church. Commentators also use marriage as an analogy for a believer’s mystical union with Christ **“For the LORD your God is a consuming fire, a jealous God”** (Deuteronomy 4:24). So, with respect to an unrepentantly cherished sin, consider what would happen in a marriage if the husband brought home a prostitute with whom to spend the night, right past his wife, even just once a year?

There was one of Jesus’s disciples who cherished a hidden sin. This hidden sin showed the condition of his heart; a horrible condition that was openly displayed near the end of his life: **“But Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples (he who was about to betray him), said, ‘Why was this ointment not sold for three hundred denarii and given to the poor?’ He said this, not because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief, and having charge of the moneybag he used to help himself to what was put into it”** (John 12:4–6).

---

<sup>63</sup> From a translation into contemporary English at <https://beforgiven.info/TranslatedWorks/vin/vindicationpiety.pdf>, p. 83, (accessed March, 7, 2020). These appear to be overly strong and severe statements, but there is an excellent reason why they are true: God is innately and essentially perfect and holy in His being. His law is not an arbitrary choice, but is a reflection of His holy character and very being. If He were less than perfect and holy, He would be something other than God, or in the context of the present discussion, an idol of one’s imagination. A believer may indeed struggle with interpretations and applications of God’s Word, and he will often find putting off sins and accepting duties to be difficult. But the believer is a bondsman (δούλος [*doulos*]) of Christ, and, perhaps after a struggle with his own sinful desires, will thus willingly submit his will to the Lord of Lords and King of Kings. Such struggles need not rise to the level of wishing God would change His mind about His Word. Still, Alleine perhaps might have better said something like, “He who *unrepentantly* wishes to have any one sin...” Also, it should be noted that some new believers may not live long enough to reach this level of sanctification, such as the thief on the cross.

It is important to realize that, while a particular cherished sin may not, in itself, be as heinous as some other sins, both what that cherished sin reveals about the heart that cherishes it and its corrosive effect on the heart make it far more dangerous than may outwardly appear.

## Some Practical Applications

Evolution and Big Bang theories are not mere ivory tower abstractions. Their poison infects not only theoretical science, but medicine, politics, human relationships, lifestyle choices, and more. The purpose of this chapter is to briefly mention in quick succession some things that may help encourage you to think biblically; in this case, to help you deeply realize that we live in a *designed, manufactured, and God-built* universe. And, everything around us, and all that happens to us, happens because God *chose* to make it happen that way.

- After the flood, God raised up new *designed* and *built* ecologies around the world to replace what He had destroyed due to human sin. It is still true that God made the earth to be mankind's home: **“For thus says the LORD, who created the heavens (he is God!), who formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it empty, he formed it to be inhabited!): ‘I am the LORD, and there is no other’”** (Isaiah 45:18). Humans are not contaminants on a “sacred” earth.
- Speaking of ecosystems, what would you think of a home builder who incorrectly installed the furnace, and when you started to use it, your house would burn down? Or what would you think of a manufacturer who included batteries with the product, but the batteries were the wrong voltage, so they destroyed the product the first time you turned it on? There are people who live in fear that minor changes to our environment could cause a “world-ending” style of disaster. These fears are reasonable under the belief that we accidentally evolved on an earth that accidentally condensed out of a gas cloud billions of years ago. Under that belief, what if we accidentally knocked down that accidentally-set-up house of cards? But God said, **“And when the LORD smelled the pleasing aroma, the LORD said in his heart, ‘I will never again curse the ground because of man, for the intention of man’s heart is evil from his youth. Neither will I ever again strike down every living creature as I have done. While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease’”** (Genesis 8:21–22).
- There are those who, for various reasons, think eating meat is somehow wrong or undesirable. But God said, **“Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. And as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything”** (Genesis 9:3). Also, various experts are continually giving us ever-changing dietary advice. Now the pendulum seems to have somewhat swung back to recommending whole milk, animal fats such as lard, and other natural products. But we should consider that the same God who made us also made our food. Need we tamper with it so much? Is there something wrong with God's design of our food? This does not excuse gluttony or a significantly unbalanced diet, nor does it mean that poisonous plants and animals do not exist.
- Why is there coal, petroleum, and natural gas in the ground? Did not God put it there, designedly and for the gracious purpose of meeting our needs? Then is it reasonable to expect that there is something wrong with using it? We live in a God-designed and God-built world with God-given resources for our use. After all, if a furnace manufacturer designed a furnace to use natural gas, we would expect the furnace to handle that natural gas safely and heat our house, and not melt the furnace. So likewise, why do we not expect that the same God who designed the earth and put fuels in the ground would not also have designed the earth to safely handle those fuels and not “melt”?



- In fact, if you think about it, is it not clear that God graciously put many abundant natural resources in and on the earth to provide for humankind? If there is iron ore in the ground, it is there because God deliberately put it there for us. He also gave us those marvelous things we call trees. From mostly air and water, and a bare handful of earth, God grows up trees for fruit, shade, beauty, and that astonishingly useful and versatile building material, wood. All natural resources are God’s expressions of His kindness, goodness, care, power, and divinity. We ought to be thankful for them and use them to meet human needs, lift people out of poverty, and bring glory to God.
- **“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them”** (Genesis 1:27). Humans have two sexes. That is the way God made us. Likewise, a man will cling to his wife—a woman, not another man—and a woman to a man.
- **“Remember also your Creator in the days of your youth, before the evil days come and the years draw near of which you will say, ‘I have no pleasure in them’”** (Ecclesiastes 12:1). Since we are God’s creatures, He owns us and has every right to use us as He pleases, and every right to demand our full obedience in all circumstances. He created all things; He thus has the right to grant or withhold things from us as He pleases in His infinite wisdom. We must prepare spiritually for old age, and the possibility of even severe afflictions. We must not fall into grumbling or discontent when infirmities, afflictions, or other losses come.
- **“Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless to one another, profaning the covenant of our fathers?”** (Malachi 2:10). **“And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their dwelling place”** (Acts 17:26). It appears that, in some special way, God creates each person, individually, in His image. And, whatever differences may appear between one person and another, we are all offspring of Adam and Noah. **“So whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets”** (Matthew 7:12).
- Evolutionary assumptions have led to medical malpractice. For example, in living memory, the tonsils and the appendix were thought to be useless. They both are now understood to have useful functions. Due to these false assumptions, many people have been needlessly deprived of these useful organs. (However, removal is still sometimes needed, especially the appendix; non-surgical treatments for appendicitis are not yet well developed.)

These are just a few examples of how we must consciously, in opposition to the prevailing culture, remember that we live in a *designed, created, and manufactured* universe in which nothing is left to “chance.” That everything is not at as we would like is due to our own sin and Adam’s sin. **“The LORD is a jealous and avenging God; the LORD is avenging and wrathful; the LORD takes vengeance on his adversaries and keeps wrath for his enemies”** (Nahum 1:2). **“And to Adam he said, ‘Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, ‘You shall not eat of it,’ cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life’”** (Genesis 3:17). The reverse is also true: we are often sinfully discontented with God’s perfectly wise and holy providence. **“It was also about these that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, ‘Behold, the Lord comes with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all and to convict all the ungodly of all their deeds of ungodliness that they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things that ungodly**

**sinner**s have spoken against him.’ These are grumblers, malcontents, following their own sinful desires; they are loud-mouthed boasters, showing favoritism to gain advantage” (Jude 14–16).

## Conclusion

Let us summarize the main points of this book, not necessarily in the order presented:

- The creation story in Genesis 1 and 2 is a straightforward and simply written narrative that has no difficult poetry or prophecies. God wants us to take it as it is written, and it is easy to understand.
- While the creation account is easy to understand, it takes faith and trust in God and His Word to accept it as written, especially in light of false teachings and the relentless propaganda of Darwinian evolution and Big-Bang cosmogony.
  - As a result of unbelief, some people have developed *Framework Hypotheses* of various kinds to try to “reconcile” Scripture with these false theories of origin. The results are both illogical and dishonoring to God.
  - Framework Hypotheses treat the twenty-four-hour days of creation as though they actually refer to long ages of time, or to something other than what the text plainly says, and otherwise twist the Scriptures.
- If we reject the simple teaching of the first two chapters of Genesis, we seriously injure our relationship to God’s Word, for we destroy our confidence in the rest of Scripture.
- This rejection has other ill effects:
  - We call God a liar.
  - We take glory from God and assign the glory to time and chance.
  - We diminish our witness to the world of God’s power, wisdom, glory, and saving grace in Christ.
  - We deny the great truth that God graciously gave His Word to all people, diminishing people’s confidence in their ability to read and understand the Bible. It also opens the door to trust in false teachers more generally.
- The first sentence in Genesis 1 is not a title or summary, but is an integral part of the narrative of what God did on the first day.
- In Genesis 1:1, the word *beginning* refers to the beginning of the first day.
- God created everything from nothing (*ex nihilo*), that is, not out of anything preexisting and not out of His own substance. God also formed, made, fashioned, or otherwise manufactured some things out of raw materials that He had previously created or manufactured. But ultimately, all that exists in the universe has its source only from God’s creation from nothing.
- A good part of the text of Genesis chapter 1 is given to emphasizing the fact that God created the universe in six days.
- Some of those six days were after the creation of the sun, moon, and stars, thus calibrating the days as twenty-four-hour days.
- On the seventh day, God rested, thereby instituting the day of rest known as the Sabbath or the Lord’s Day.
- After God finished the heavens and the earth, He turned His attention to planting the Garden in Eden and getting Adam, and later Eve, situated and settled in it.

- Proper attention to some details will make the transition from the story of the earth’s creation to the story of the Garden in Eden easy to understand:
  - The narrative starts with a literary transition to bring the reader from a global perspective to a local perspective.
  - The *toledaw* tells us to expect further narrative about what follows after the creation of the heavens and the earth, although it does not give us the exact time of the following narrative.
  - Care is needed to correctly translate the Hebrew *ehrets* as *earth* or *land* as the context demands.
  - During the creation of the earth as a whole, God left a more or less bare spot for the future Garden in Eden.
  - It makes sense that God left this spot of land bare, knowing His future use of that spot. This hypothesis is not essential since it concerns why God did something, but does not alter what He did. It may help smooth the reader’s way through the narrative.
  - In Genesis 2:7, use of the English past perfect tense as underlined clarifies the meaning of the text: **“And the LORD God had formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature”** (Genesis 2:7 ESV, author’s changes underlined), and makes the narrative flow smoother.
  - In Genesis 2:19, use by the ESV of the English past perfect tense as underlined resolves much potential confusion: **“Now out of the ground the LORD God had formed every beast of the field and every bird of the heavens and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. And whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name”** (Genesis 2:19 ESV, dotted underline added). The English past perfect tense makes the verse consistent with the events of the sixth day as given in Genesis 1:25–27, which use of the English simple past tense by many other versions does not.
- Our Lord Jesus Christ turned water into wine with an absolute minimum of props or show. The ease with which He did this shows His power in creation, and how He needs no help from anything He created, such as time and chance.
- The core issue for believers is whether we will trust God or not, in spite of apparent contradictory scientific or other evidence.
- Scientists are human and sinners like all of us.
  - They have the smarts and expertise to concoct theories of origin that are true to known laws of nature and true to their own religious convictions.
  - Scientists and people generally embrace these false teachings because they do not want to obey God. Often this ultimate heart-level motive is deeply buried in the subconscious.
- Both Big-Bang cosmogony and Darwinian evolution have serious problems that even many scientists are acknowledging.
  - Chance is not a creative force.
  - Random mutations or errors rarely improve anything.
  - The probability of a sufficient number of beneficial mutations happening together to produce a new “feature” in an organism is vanishingly small.
  - Modern understandings of the complexities of life have led many to recognize that there must have been an intelligent designer.

- Anyone who is convinced in his or her own mind that six-day creation is true, but knowingly and unrepentantly refuses to submit to God's Word in the matter, is in danger of Hell.
- There are many practical applications that flow out of a personal recognition that we live in a created, designed, and manufactured universe, a universe given to us by a gracious, loving and perfect Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

## **Appendix A: The Emperor's New Clothes**

Written by Hans Christian Andersen in 1837.<sup>64</sup>

Many years ago there was an Emperor so exceedingly fond of new clothes that he spent all his money on being well dressed. He cared nothing about reviewing his soldiers, going to the theater, or going for a ride in his carriage, except to show off his new clothes. He had a coat for every hour of the day, and instead of saying, as one might, about any other ruler, "The King's in council," here they always said. "The Emperor's in his dressing room."

In the great city where he lived, life was always gay.<sup>65</sup> Every day many strangers came to town, and among them one day came two swindlers. They let it be known they were weavers, and they said they could weave the most magnificent fabrics imaginable. Not only were their colors and patterns uncommonly fine, but clothes made of this cloth had a wonderful way of becoming invisible to anyone who was unfit for his office, or who was unusually stupid.

"Those would be just the clothes for me," thought the Emperor. "If I wore them I would be able to discover which men in my empire are unfit for their posts. And I could tell the wise men from the fools. Yes, I certainly must get some of the stuff woven for me right away." He paid the two swindlers a large sum of money to start work at once.

They set up two looms and pretended to weave, though there was nothing on the looms. All the finest silk and the purest gold thread which they demanded went into their traveling bags, while they worked the empty looms far into the night.

"I'd like to know how those weavers are getting on with the cloth," the Emperor thought, but he felt slightly uncomfortable when he remembered that those who were unfit for their position would not be able to see the fabric. It couldn't have been that he doubted himself, yet he thought he'd rather send someone else to see how things were going. The whole town knew about the cloth's peculiar power, and all were impatient to find out how stupid their neighbors were.

"I'll send my honest old minister to the weavers," the Emperor decided. "He'll be the best one to tell me how the material looks, for he's a sensible man and no one does his duty better."

So the honest old minister went to the room where the two swindlers sat working away at their empty looms.

"Heaven help me," he thought as his eyes flew wide open, "I can't see anything at all." But he did not say so.

Both the swindlers begged him to be so kind as to come near to approve the excellent pattern, the beautiful colors. They pointed to the empty looms, and the poor old minister stared as hard as he dared. He couldn't see anything, because there was nothing to see. "Heaven have mercy," he thought.

"Can it be that I'm a fool? I'd have never guessed it, and not a soul must know. Am I unfit to be the minister? It would never do to let on that I can't see the cloth."

<sup>64</sup> [https://andersen.sdu.dk/vaerk/hersholt/TheEmperorsNewClothes\\_e.html](https://andersen.sdu.dk/vaerk/hersholt/TheEmperorsNewClothes_e.html) (Accessed March 20, 2020).

<sup>65</sup> gay: in the present context, full of happiness

“Don’t hesitate to tell us what you think of it,” said one of the weavers.

“Oh, it’s beautiful—it’s enchanting.” The old minister peered through his spectacles. “Such a pattern, what colors! I’ll be sure to tell the Emperor how delighted I am with it.”

“We’re pleased to hear that,” the swindlers said. They proceeded to name all the colors and to explain the intricate pattern. The old minister paid the closest attention, so that he could tell it all to the Emperor. And so he did.

The swindlers at once asked for more money, more silk and gold thread, to get on with the weaving. But it all went into their pockets. Not a thread went into the looms, though they worked at their weaving as hard as ever.

The Emperor presently sent another trustworthy official to see how the work progressed and how soon it would be ready. The same thing happened to him that had happened to the minister. He looked and he looked, but as there was nothing to see in the looms he couldn’t see anything.

“Isn’t it a beautiful piece of goods?” the swindlers asked him, as they displayed and described their imaginary pattern.

“I know I’m not stupid,” the man thought, “so it must be that I’m unworthy of my good office. That’s strange. I mustn’t let anyone find it out, though.” So he praised the material he did not see. He declared he was delighted with the beautiful colors and the exquisite pattern. To the Emperor he said, “It held me spellbound.”

All the town was talking of this splendid cloth, and the Emperor wanted to see it for himself while it was still in the looms. Attended by a band of chosen men, among whom were his two old trusted officials—the ones who had been to the weavers—he set out to see the two swindlers. He found them weaving with might and main, but without a thread in their looms.

“Magnificent,” said the two officials already duped. “Just look, Your Majesty, what colors! What a design!” They pointed to the empty looms, each supposing that the others could see the stuff.

“What’s this?” thought the Emperor. “I can’t see anything. This is terrible!”

“Am I a fool? Am I unfit to be the Emperor? What a thing to happen to me of all people!—Oh! It’s very pretty,” he said. “It has my highest approval.” And he nodded approbation at the empty loom. Nothing could make him say that he couldn’t see anything.

His whole retinue stared and stared. One saw no more than another, but they all joined the Emperor in exclaiming, “Oh! It’s very pretty,” and they advised him to wear clothes made of this wonderful cloth especially for the great procession he was soon to lead. “Magnificent! Excellent! Unsurpassed!” were bandied from mouth to mouth, and everyone did his best to seem well pleased. The Emperor gave each of the swindlers a cross to wear in his buttonhole, and the title of “Sir Weaver.”

Before the procession the swindlers sat up all night and burned more than six candles, to show how busy they were finishing the Emperor’s new clothes. They pretended to take the cloth off the

loom. They made cuts in the air with huge scissors. And at last they said, “Now the Emperor’s new clothes are ready for him.”

Then the Emperor himself came with his noblest noblemen, and the swindlers each raised an arm as if they were holding something. They said, “These are the trousers, here’s the coat, and this is the mantle,” naming each garment. “All of them are as light as a spider web. One would almost think he had nothing on, but that’s what makes them so fine.”

“Exactly,” all the noblemen agreed, though they could see nothing, for there was nothing to see.

“If Your Imperial Majesty will condescend to take your clothes off,” said the swindlers, “we will help you on with your new ones here in front of the long mirror.”

The Emperor undressed, and the swindlers pretended to put his new clothes on him, one garment after another. They took him around the waist and seemed to be fastening something—that was his train—as the Emperor turned round and round before the looking glass.

“How well Your Majesty’s new clothes look. Aren’t they becoming!” He heard on all sides, “That pattern, so perfect! Those colors, so suitable! It is a magnificent outfit.”

Then the minister of public processions announced: “Your Majesty’s canopy is waiting outside.”

“Well, I’m supposed to be ready,” the Emperor said, and turned again for one last look in the mirror. “It is a remarkable fit, isn’t it?” He seemed to regard his costume with the greatest interest.

The noblemen who were to carry his train stooped low and reached for the floor as if they were picking up his mantle. Then they pretended to lift and hold it high. They didn’t dare admit they had nothing to hold.

So off went the Emperor in procession under his splendid canopy. Everyone in the streets and the windows said, “Oh, how fine are the Emperor’s new clothes! Don’t they fit him to perfection? And see his long train!” Nobody would confess that he couldn’t see anything, for that would prove him either unfit for his position, or a fool. No costume the Emperor had worn before was ever such a complete success.

“But he hasn’t got anything on,” a little child said.

“Did you ever hear such innocent prattle?” said its father. And one person whispered to another what the child had said, “He hasn’t anything on. A child says he hasn’t anything on.”

“But he hasn’t got anything on!” the whole town cried out at last.

The Emperor shivered, for he suspected they were right. But he thought, “This procession has got to go on.” So he walked more proudly than ever, as his noblemen held high the train that wasn’t there at all.



## ***Appendix B: The Open Manhole***

### *INTRODUCTION*

Suppose you saw someone crossing the street, not particularly noticing where he was going. Now suppose that he is about to step into an open manhole. How would you respond? Some people, not the kind we would want to know, might remain silent, hoping to enjoy the spectacle of someone falling in and breaking his leg at the bottom of the city sewer. Others might wish to help, but are too timid, afraid that they may be wrong, or that they will offend the careless pedestrian. After all, nobody likes to be told that they are making a mistake.

Yet, I hope that you would be the kind of person who would recognize the danger and think enough of a fellow citizen's welfare that you would shout out a warning and point out the danger. If he stubbornly refused to listen and fell in anyway, at least you could sleep that night. It is in this spirit of kindly warning that I have written this pamphlet. I hope that you will take just a minute or two to read on with an open mind.

### *THE NIGHTMARE*

There is an all-too-common condition that has eluded the best efforts of medical science to find a cure. Billions of tax dollars have been spent by university and medical researchers in vain. Those suffering from the advanced stages of this condition are condemned to suffer the most excruciating pain day after day for many years. Past a certain point, there is no treatment, no cure, and not even any way to alleviate the incredible torment. This condition kills more victims than AIDS, cancer, heart disease, stroke, and auto accidents combined.

The truly sad thing is that this condition is treatable if detected early and the patient is willing to make some lifestyle changes. Even sadder is that the lifestyle changes will usually make a person's life happier—not always, but usually. More tragic yet is the fact that the method of preventing this condition is well documented and proven. The prevention methods have been published many times over the years. Why then do so many people allow themselves to be trapped by such horror?

One reason may be that many people are so consumed by their present lifestyle that they refuse to consider any lifestyle alternative with an open mind. What about you? Another reason may be personal pride, an unwillingness to admit that they have been wrong all along. But consider—what pride is there in the sickbed or grave? Yet another reason may be that those who publish the prevention techniques are generally outside of the medical and other “establishments,” and thus not “respectable.” This last problem is hardly new; those who first developed the germ theory of disease were mocked, ridiculed, and even persecuted. Will you consider your situation with an open mind? Or are you content to live for the present, choosing to blindly ignore the great danger that you may face? Please read on with an open mind. You have only a couple of minutes to lose and much to gain.

What is this terrible condition? It is called GUILT. Not guilt feelings, mind you, but an actual legal guilt that deserves the punishment of eternal hellfire. OK, go ahead and laugh. This has just turned out to be another tract by some Bible-thumping fundamentalist, right? But, are you sure that you are right and that I am wrong? If you are right, you have only wasted a couple of minutes reading this. But if you are wrong, the consequences are unspeakably awful. Have you ever burned yourself? Think of that pain all over your entire body day after day, year after year, for all eternity. This is not the pain

of *having burned* yourself and then quickly yanking your finger away. This is the pain of being trapped in a raging fire. There is NO ESCAPE. If you are wrong, the consequences of being wrong are so horrible that you owe it to yourself to carefully consider this tract with an open mind.

### *THE CURE EXPLAINED*

The problem is basically simple. God made the entire universe, creating it from nothing. He also made you. This gives Him the right to specify how you will live and to punish you if you do not obey. God is perfectly holy, and no sin (violation of God's commands) can come into His presence or remain unpunished. This may sound harsh to modern ears, but the holiness of God is no small matter. God is perfectly holy, and it is God's own glory that is His standard for holiness in people. Anything less is sin.

Romans 3:23 – For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.

Have you sinned? Measure yourself against God's standard in Exodus 20:3–17. God commanded you:

1. You shall have no other gods before Me.
2. You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them nor serve them. For I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generations of those who hate Me, but showing mercy to thousands, to those who love Me and keep My commandments.
3. You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain, for the LORD will not hold him guiltless who takes His name in vain.
4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD your God. In it you shall do no work: you, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your male servant, nor your female servant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger who is within your gates. 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. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.
5. Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long upon the land which the LORD your God is giving you.
6. You shall not murder.
7. You shall not commit adultery.
8. You shall not steal.
9. You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.
10. You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his male servant, nor his female servant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that is your neighbor's.

How do you measure up? Have you ever disobeyed God? God also said:

Isaiah 59:2 – But your iniquities have separated you from your God; And your sins have hidden His face from you, So that He will not hear.

God is holy. God is also perfectly just. Now, no judge can be just who lets criminals go unpunished. Many criminals think that they do not deserve to be punished. This is part of human nature—we think we are not as bad as we really are. The fact of the matter is, however, that we are truly guilty before God and richly deserve the fires of Hell.

Romans 6:23 – For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Revelation 21:8 – But the cowardly, unbelieving, abominable, murderers, sexually immoral, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

Now someone will say that “God is love” and thus He would not throw anyone into Hell. Another will say that for God to torment a person in Hell on account of “just a little sin” would be cruel. But, God is also holy and just. If you think that you do not deserve hellfire, then you either do not understand the holiness and perfection of God, do not realize the seriousness of your sin, or more probably, both. Indeed, it is His holiness and justice that show the magnitude of His love for us. Would you give your life for that of a cockroach? Or would you send your only son to die so that a cockroach might live? Cockroaches, being part of God’s natural creation, are neither unholy nor sinners. Sinners are infinitely more disgusting and revolting to God than cockroaches are to us.

Romans 5:8 – But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us.

What makes the difference between the “us” for whom Christ died and the “them” for whom Christ did not die? The answer is God’s grace, wherein Christ takes upon Himself the punishment due for sins and turns away the just and holy wrath of God by giving perfect satisfaction to God’s holy justice. The Bible speaks clearly regarding those who have been saved from the fires of Hell into eternal life. God said,

Ephesians 2:8–10 – For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them.

Notice that good works (going to church, helping the poor, or whatever) do not save anyone, but are the *result* of God’s free gift of salvation. This matter deserves some discussion on two points. First, people realize instinctively that they cannot serve God and go on sinning willfully. “Getting religion” involves a change of lifestyle. In short, there is a cost involved in following Jesus Christ. It is tragic that all too many people love their sin or their present lifestyle so much that they willfully turn a blind eye

to the dangers of Hell and the glories of being with God in Heaven. In order to be saved, you *must* repent of (turn away from) your sins. You cannot pretend. God who sees and hears all will not be fooled.

Mark 12: 30–31 – “And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength.” This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” There is no other commandment greater than these.

The second point is that many people think that their good deeds will outweigh their bad deeds and so they will go to Heaven and escape Hell. Not only is this not true, but it would not work even if it were true because God’s standard of holiness is His own glory, absolute perfection, which is beyond human reach. Be honest with yourself. Do you truly love the Lord with *all* your heart, soul, mind, and strength? Do you *really* love others as yourself? An analogy might help. No doubt any basketball player can jump a lot higher than I can and shoot far better—but it would make no difference if the hoop were on the moon. Against such a high standard (the moon), the basketball player is no better than I am. Only Jesus Christ ever lived a perfect life. Jesus Christ is the only person in history to ever earn the right to go to Heaven by living a perfect life—a right He earned for those who repent and believe in Him.

Isaiah 61:10 – I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, My soul shall be joyful in my God; For He has clothed me with the garments of salvation, He has covered me with the robe of righteousness, As a bridegroom decks himself with ornaments, And as a bride adorns herself with her jewels.

Romans 4:5–7 – But to him who does not work but believes on Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is accounted for righteousness, just as David also describes the blessedness of the person to whom God imputes righteousness apart from works: “Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, And whose sins are covered.”

Only the righteousness of Christ will get anyone into Heaven. Only the righteousness of Christ will deliver anyone from the fires of Hell. Christ’s righteousness covers the sins of anyone who receives His righteousness through faith.

John 3:16 – For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

Psalms 34:22 – The LORD redeems the soul of His servants, And none of those who trust in Him shall be condemned.

Isaiah 12:2 – Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid; For the LORD GOD is my strength and song, And He has become my salvation.

In the modern world, there is the prevalent error that faith (or belief) is a matter of intellectual conviction or emotional assurance. Nothing could be further from the truth. Faith is not confidence in yourself, but in Christ's forgiveness and righteousness.

James 2:19 – You believe that there is one God. You do well. Even the demons believe; and tremble!

Faith, or belief in God, is an *act of the will*, a choice that you must make. True faith expresses itself in acts of obedience to God. True intellectual conviction and emotional assurance come from a personal relationship with the Living God.

John 14:21 – He who has My commandments and keeps them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him.

One final point. You have no doubt heard many “experts” say things such as:  
The Bible is fiction.  
The Bible is a matter of human interpretation.  
God is love and would never send anyone to Hell.  
All religions lead to God.  
Truth is relative.  
The important thing is to be sincere.  
Science “proves” people evolved from slime and Genesis is mere fable.

These “experts” are only rationalizing away the truth. For God said,

Romans 1: 20 – For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools ...

*WILL YOU TAKE THE CURE AND INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE?*

Now then, friend, what will you do? I urge you to carefully consider where you will spend eternity. The issue is very simple:

1. God made you.
1. God told you how you must live and put this knowledge in your conscience.
2. You have rebelled and sinned against God instead of obeying Him.
3. You deserve to be punished for your rebellion against God and you deserve to go to Hell.
4. Yet, in His awesome lovingkindness, God gave His Son, Jesus Christ, so that whoever repents and trusts in Jesus *will* be forgiven and *will* inherit eternal life.

You may say, “It can't be that simple.” It *is* that simple. It is simple enough for children.

Luke 18: 16 – But Jesus called them to Him and said, “Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God. Assuredly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will by no means enter it.”

Jesus has not restricted His grace to philosophers and engineers, but to those who trust in His mercy with a simple childlike trust. He *commands* you to repent and trust Christ for your salvation from your sins. Will you obey God or not? This is a simple yes or no question.

You may still have doubts. You may still have questions. You can definitely trust your questions and doubts to God. My friend, this is more than the difference between life and death; it is the difference between eternal death and eternal life. Will you repent and believe in Jesus Christ?

If your answer is no, be assured that you can always change your mind—until you die. If your answer is yes, then consider the following prayer. Such prayers are neither mechanical nor magical. They can neither save you nor magically compel God to save you. But if the prayer reflects the desire of your heart, it is a way to acknowledge to Jesus your new faith in Him and your repentance from sin.

Oh, most merciful and gracious Heavenly Father, I acknowledge that You have created me. I know that I have, of my own fault, sinned against You. I know that I deserve to be punished. I repent and turn away from my sins. I believe that You have sent Your only Begotten Son, Jesus Christ, that whoever believes in Him will have eternal life. Have mercy on me and forgive my sins, not because I deserve Your mercy and lovingkindness, but because *You* are merciful and gracious. I know that You have sent Jesus Christ to pay for my sins and appease Your just anger against me. Thank You for Your great mercy and for Your wonderful gift of forgiveness and eternal life in Jesus Christ. Oh, Lord Jesus Christ, I thank You for coming into my life. Have mercy on me and teach me how to live as one of Your disciples ought to live. By Your grace and help, I promise to seek You, learn from You, obey You, and glorify You, in this life and forever.

If this prayer reflects what is on your heart, then welcome to the Eternal Kingdom of Jesus Christ! There are two things you will need to do right away. The first is get a Bible. You would do well to start reading the Gospel of John. The second thing you need to do is find a good church whose members and pastor believe that the Bible is the Word of God and that the Bible is the only inerrant and infallible rule for faith and life. Make sure they believe that Jesus Christ is *both* God and Man and the *only* way to eternal life. If they don't believe these things, run for your life. Ask God to help you find the right church. A good church will right away help you get started in the basics of how to walk with God and arrange for you to be baptized. Praise the Lord!

Tract by: Tom Sullivan  
Reformed Presbyterian Church of Lafayette  
1723 S. 9th Street  
Lafayette, IN 47905  
Voice: 765-474-3307  
E-mail: [info@reformedlafayette.com](mailto:info@reformedlafayette.com)  
<https://www.reformedlafayette.com>

Copyright 1998, 2015 General permission to duplicate and distribute granted, providing that the text of this tract is unaltered, Scripture passages are in larger type than other text, and this copyright notice is included. All Scripture text from the New King James Bible.

Note: This tract and 6-up camera-ready copy for reproduction are available at <https://BeForgiven.INFO>.

## ***Appendix C: Places Where bawraw Appears in Scripture:***

### ***Places Where a Basic Form of the Verb Is Used***

#### ***References to Creation in General***

“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1).

“So God created the great sea creatures and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good” (Genesis 1:21).

“So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy, because on it God rested from all his work that he had done in creation” (Genesis 2:3).

“These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens” (Genesis 2:4).

“The north and the south, you have created them; Tabor and Hermon joyously praise your name” (Psalm 89:12).

“Let them praise the name of the LORD! For he commanded and they were created” (Psalm 148:5).

“Lift up your eyes on high and see: who created these? He who brings out their host by number, calling them all by name, by the greatness of his might, and because he is strong in power not one is missing” (Isaiah 40:26).

“Have you not known? Have you not heard? The LORD is the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth. He does not faint or grow weary; his understanding is unsearchable” (Isaiah 40:28).

“Thus says God, the LORD, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and what comes from it, who gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it” (Isaiah 42:5).

“For thus says the LORD, who created the heavens (he is God!), who formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it empty, he formed it to be inhabited!): ‘I am the LORD, and there is no other’” (Isaiah 45:18).

“For behold, he who forms the mountains and creates the wind, and declares to man what is his thought, who makes the morning darkness, and treads on the heights of the earth—the LORD, the God of hosts, is his name!” (Amos 4:13).

#### ***Reference to Creation of New Heavens and New Earth***

“For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former things shall not be remembered or come into mind. But be glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for behold, I create Jerusalem to be a joy, and her people to be a gladness” (Isaiah 65:17–18).

## ***References to Creation of Humans, Either Generally or Individually***

“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them” (Genesis 1:27).

“This is the book of the generations of Adam. When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God” (Genesis 5:1).

“Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them Man when they were created” (Genesis 5:2).

“So the LORD said, ‘I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens, for I am sorry that I have made them’” (Genesis 6:7).

“For ask now of the days that are past, which were before you, since the day that God created man on the earth, and ask from one end of heaven to the other, whether such a great thing as this has ever happened or was ever heard of” (Deuteronomy 4:32).

“Remember how short my time is! For what vanity you have created all the children of man!” (Psalm 89:47).

“Let this be recorded for a generation to come, so that a people yet to be created may praise the LORD” (Psalm 102:18).

“Remember also your Creator in the days of your youth, before the evil days come and the years draw near of which you will say, ‘I have no pleasure in them’” (Ecclesiastes 12:1).

“But now thus says the LORD, he who created you, O Jacob, he who formed you, O Israel: ‘Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by name, you are mine’” (Isaiah 43:1).

“Everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made” (Isaiah 43:7).

“I am the LORD, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King” (Isaiah 43:15).

“I made the earth and created man on it; it was my hands that stretched out the heavens, and I commanded all their host” (Isaiah 45:12).

“Behold, I have created the smith who blows the fire of coals and produces a weapon for its purpose. I have also created the ravager to destroy” (Isaiah 54:16).

“Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless to one another, profaning the covenant of our fathers?” (Malachi 2:10).



### ***References to Creation of Miracles, Actual or Figurative, Present or Prophesied***

“And he said, ‘Behold, I am making a covenant. Before all your people I will do marvels, such as have not been created in all the earth or in any nation. And all the people among whom you are shall see the work of the LORD, for it is an awesome thing that I will do with you’” (Exodus 34:10).

“But if the LORD creates something new, and the ground opens its mouth and swallows them up with all that belongs to them, and they go down alive into Sheol, then you shall know that these men have despised the LORD” (Numbers 16:30).

“Then the LORD will create over the whole site of Mount Zion and over her assemblies a cloud by day, and smoke and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory there will be a canopy” (Isaiah 4:5).

“That they may see and know, may consider and understand together, that the hand of the LORD has done this, the Holy One of Israel has created it” (Isaiah 41:20).

“Shower, O heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain down righteousness; let the earth open, that salvation and righteousness may bear fruit; let the earth cause them both to sprout; I the LORD have created it” (Isaiah 45:8).

“They are created now, not long ago; before today you have never heard of them, lest you should say, ‘Behold, I knew them’” (Isaiah 48:7).

“How long will you waver, O faithless daughter? For the LORD has created a new thing on the earth: a woman encircles a man” (Jeremiah 31:22).

“Return it to its sheath. In the place where you were created, in the land of your origin, I will judge you” (Ezekiel 21:30).

“You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, sardius, topaz, and diamond, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, emerald, and carbuncle; and crafted in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared” (Ezekiel 28:13).

“You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created, till unrighteousness was found in you” (Ezekiel 28:15).

### ***References to Spiritual Activities That Only God Can Do***

“Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me” (Psalm 51:10).

“‘I have seen his ways, but I will heal him; I will lead him and restore comfort to him and his mourners, creating the fruit [praise] of the lips. Peace, peace, to the far and to the near,’ says the LORD, ‘and I will heal him’” (Isaiah 57:18–19).

## **References to Providence**

“I form light and create darkness, I make well-being and create calamity, I am the LORD, who does all these things” (Isaiah 45:7).

“When you send forth your Spirit, they are created, and you renew the face of the ground” (Psalm 104:30).

## **Places Where Other than *Kal* or *Niphal*<sup>66</sup> Forms of the Verb Are Used**

The words that are translated from *bawraw* are underlined. As may be seen, the meanings are not the same as the usual meaning of *bawraw* as *create*, so these instances are not included in the statistics.

“And Joshua said to them, ‘If you are a numerous people, go up by yourselves to the forest, and there clear ground for yourselves in the land of the Perizzites and the Rephaim, since the hill country of Ephraim is too narrow for you’” (Joshua 17:15).

“But the hill country shall be yours, for though it is a forest, you shall clear it and possess it to its farthest borders. For you shall drive out the Canaanites, though they have chariots of iron, and though they are strong” (Joshua 17:18).

“Why then do you scorn my sacrifices and my offerings that I commanded for my dwelling, and honor your sons above me by fattening yourselves on the choicest parts of every offering of my people Israel?” (1 Samuel 2:29)

“As for you, son of man, mark two ways for the sword of the king of Babylon to come. Both of them shall come from the same land. And make a signpost; make it at the head of the way to a city” (Ezekiel 21:19).

“And the host shall stone them and cut them down with their swords. They shall kill their sons and their daughters, and burn up their houses” (Ezekiel 23:47).

---

<sup>66</sup> Hebrew has seven verb patterns or conjugations. The *Kal* is the simple active form, the *Niphal* the simple passive form.

## **Appendix D: Two Technical Whodunits**

Burglar alarm systems often use magnetically operated sensors to detect when a door or window is opened; in this case, the sensor was a simple pair of contacts that close when a magnet is near the sensor. If the magnet is near the sensor, the alarm control sees a normal voltage about midway between power and ground. If the magnet leaves the proximity of the sensor, as when a door is opened, the alarm control sees power supply voltage. Or if the wires to the sensor are shorted, the alarm control sees ground. Businesses can have quite sophisticated systems. Now, one place had an outdoor concrete structure with a magnetic sensor on the door. The zone was armed after hours, but sometimes someone had to get into that structure after hours, so there was a switch that was wired in parallel with the magnetic sensor contacts. If someone needed to get in, the security operator could just flip the double-pole switch and a red LED would come on, the LED being controlled by the other pair of double-pole switch contacts. The rest of the zone remained armed, while the zone would ignore that one outside structure door.

One day, the alarm computer reported a funny voltage on that zone. The voltage was not off enough to make an alarm, so the computer just gave a warning that maybe something was starting to come loose. The security operator, wondering, flipped the switch on and the voltage returned to normal. He flipped the switch back to off, and the voltage stayed normal, so he forgot about it. But you do not ignore problems with security systems. So, after about the third time, the owner got involved and figured the switch was bad. I arrived one fine day, new switch in hand, but after I studied the alarm system computer logs and looked at the wiring, it did not appear likely that the switch was the problem. After all, unless the switch was on (shorting the sensor circuit), it was not really even in the circuit, so its contact resistance would have no effect if the switch was off. The switch was sealed, so leakage across the poles seemed unlikely also.

So I left the switch alone and, key in hand, went out to that door thinking that either the underground cable or the magnetic sensor was bad. I opened the door and went back to the security panel, and behold, the voltage had not changed; it was still just off a bit. So now was it the underground cable or the magnetic sensor? I disconnected the magnetic sensor and now the controller showed that the door was opened. I put a jumper wire in place of the magnetic sensor and now the zone showed a normal voltage. I put the sensor back in the circuit with jumpers and the voltage was off a bit again. I again replaced the sensor with a jumper and checked the bypass switch with the door open. The red light went on and the zone voltage was good.

So I pulled the sensor out of its hole and it was wet as a fish and the terminals were all corroded. That explained a lot, but not why flipping the switch “fixed” the problem. Quite curious, I measured the switch resistance. The reading was about 1 k $\Omega$ , about half the 2 k $\Omega$  end-of-line resistor that formed one half of the resistor voltage divider that produced a normal zone voltage. My meter was telling me that the sensor should have been making the alarm go off, not just giving a slightly odd voltage. Wondering if my meter was bad, I measured the voltage across the sensor, expecting it to be zero. It was not; it was the same voltage as the computer log had indicated, about 0.3V. That sensor should not have been a source of voltage; that voltage was what fooled the resistance measurement function. On a hunch, I shorted the sensor leads together and measured the voltage again. It was zero. I repeated my original resistance measurement, and the sensor was dead shorted, even with no magnet. So not only were the contacts corroded shut, but the corrosion, water, and dissimilar metals somewhere

in the switch had created, over time, an electrochemical cell.<sup>67</sup> When I shorted the sensor leads, or the security operator had flipped the switch, the short drained the cell so that the now-dead cell did not create any strange voltages. In sum, what had seemed like a simple electrical problem was actually a chemistry problem.

Here was a simple thing nobody had thought of, which changed everybody's entire understanding of something. The original assumption of a bad switch was dead wrong. The owner could not think of any other explanation. I never expected a chemistry problem. Only God knows all the mistakes and wrong assumptions that long-day creationists, Framework Hypothesis proponents, and proponents of Big Bang and evolution theories are making.

In this next one, I did not exactly come out of it with an enhanced reputation. There was a piece of equipment that consumed some fair amount of power that had to be available at all times, so there was no off switch. To work on it, you removed the fuse. The equipment had come over on the Mayflower and was showing its age. I had designed, built, and programmed a new controller that used a then-modern microcontroller chip. It worked just fine for a good while, but then one day it just sat there and sort of stuttered. I went up to the equipment, pulled the fuse and, not immediately finding any problem, put it back in to test it further. It immediately started working fine.

Now, most of us have experienced computer crashes or malfunctions. They do that. I used to say that, if cars were like computers, a minor adjustment to your carburetor could make your muffler fall off. But people don't like equipment downtime, and trying to find the cause of a once-in-several-months glitch was about as appealing to me as getting life without parole, so I put a reset switch for the microcontroller on the front panel. It was a quick fix. After all, the standard advice before calling computer tech support is to first reboot. So the reset switch seemed to be a reasonable idea.

Sometime later, it started stuttering again, but the reset switch did not work. I pulled the fuse and found no obvious problem, put the fuse back in and it immediately started working fine, just as before. Now, this kind of thing does occasionally happen; microcontrollers can be quite complex little beasts and I had seen my share of odd behavior from time to time that turned out to be due to a bug in the microcontroller chip itself. That the microcontroller's own internal watchdog "obviously" slept instead of barking seemed to confirm this. But the equipment was critical, so I decided that, if killing the power solved the problem, the best thing would be to change the microcontroller program to emit a periodic toggling signal and build a hardware watchdog that would cycle the power to the microcontroller if the toggling signal quit. The owner grudgingly bore the cost and I built and installed it. Things were fine for a good long while. Then all of a sudden the equipment quit completely. I went in and, sure enough, it was totally dead. I traced back through the chain of power supplies from the microcontroller all the way back to the fuse. There was voltage on the line side of the fuse, but not the load side. I pulled the fuse, and it looked perfectly good; the element was a big, easy-to-see, high-amperage thing. Wondering if I had made a mistake, I measured the fuse resistance and it was not all the way open, but had high resistance. I measured it again, and the resistance had changed. Pushing and pulling on it changed the resistance change some more.

---

<sup>67</sup> If you have a modern digital voltmeter you can make something like this yourself. Take a bright penny and a nickel. Put the nickel on the table, wet a piece of paper towel with salt water and put it on the nickel, leaving an edge exposed. Put the penny on the towel so it does not touch the nickel. Now measure the voltage across the penny and nickel. You should get about 0.3 volts.

So, all this time, the fuse was not blown but had an intermittent bad connection somewhere in it. The equipment stuttered because the fuse let in just enough current to charge up the microcontroller supply, then the microcontroller started up and began to operate the equipment. But the equipment load shorted the high resistance fuse connection out and the microcontroller lost its power also and the cycle repeated. So much trouble was caused by a defectively manufactured, but not blown, fuse. When I pulled it and put it back in, I suppose something was just loose enough to wipe the “contacts” and fix the open circuit. I have seen many intermittents, but that occasion was the first intermittent fuse I had seen. Looking for a complex problem, I had overlooked a simple possibility. Of course, another problem with troubleshooting intermittents is that you can look at it cross-eyed and “fix” it.

Small mistakes or small things overlooked can greatly mislead one! Unlike this case, where I got feedback on my work, proponents of creation by chance will never get feedback directly from the unobservable past. Alas, one day God will give them feedback much to their shame and eternal horror and torment in Hell.

## **Appendix E: Creation in Six Days and the Sabbath**

**“He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, how will he not also with him graciously give us all things?”** (Romans 8:32). **“And we know that for those who love God all things work together for good, for those who are called according to his purpose”** (Romans 8:28). At least one reason why God specifically took six days to create the heavens and the earth and then rested on the seventh day was to support His intention that we also work six days and commit the seventh day to His worship, spiritual work, and works of necessity and mercy. This idea is neither new with this author, nor to this century as will be seen below.

Reformer John Calvin, in his *Commentary on Genesis 2:3*, said, “Whence it also appears, that God always had respect to the welfare of men, I have said above, that six days were employed in the formation of the world; not that God, to whom one moment is as a thousand years, had need of this succession of time, but that he might engage us in the consideration of his works. He had the same end in view in the appointment of his own rest, for he set apart a day selected out of the remainder for this special use. Wherefore, that benediction [Genesis 2:3] is nothing else than a solemn consecration, by which God claims for himself the meditations and employments of men on the seventh day.”<sup>68</sup>

Puritan preacher Bartholomew Ashwood, in his *Heavenly Trade*, quoted another author, Mayer: “In the original, the command to work six days is given in the same commanding terms as the command to not work on the Sabbath. The same reason is given for both; the one is taken from God’s resting on the seventh day, and the other from His working six days” [language updated by the author].<sup>69</sup>

Commentator Matthew Poole wrote, “He rested, not for his own need and refreshment, for he is never weary, Isaiah 40:28; but for our example and instruction, that we might keep that day as a day of religious rest.”<sup>70</sup> Obviously, similar logic will apply to the six working days.

Contemporary author Rowland S. Ward wrote, “The simple affirmation that the Sabbath originates at creation does not explain its character. To that question more than one answer has been given. Yet even if one does not understand the creation days to be of the same length as our solar days, it is agreed by all that the narrative of God’s creation week aims to provide a pattern for human activity. It is to have a rhythm of work and rest based on a seven-day cycle, the day of rest also providing opportunity for worship of the Creator.”<sup>71</sup> Now obviously, if the narrative aims to do something, then the work that the narrative describes must have the same aim; God’s purposes are all unified and there can be no disunity of intent between His actions and His revelation of those actions.

---

<sup>68</sup>John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis*, Rev. John King, translator (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984, ISBN: 0-8010-2440-4), Vol. 1, 105.

<sup>69</sup>Bartholomew Ashwood, *The Heavenly Trade Or The Best Commerce The Only Way to Live Well in Impoverishing Times* (London, Printed for William Marshall at the Bible in Newgate Street, 1688), 256.

<sup>70</sup> Rev. Steven Dilday, translator, *The Works of the Reverend Matthew Poole, The Exegetical Labors of the Reverend Matthew Poole* (Culpeper, VA: Master Poole Publishing, 2007), Vol. 1, 121.

<sup>71</sup> Anthony T. Selvaggio, editor, *The Faith Once Delivered* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Puritan and Reformed Publishing, 2007, ISBN: 978-1-59638-020-2), 194.

## ***Acknowledgments***

This author thanks God for the people who have reviewed beta versions of this book, contributed much helpful advice and counsel, and saved him from some blunders. Some put in an extra large amount of effort and, judging by times on emails, even burnt midnight oil. Thanks to DA, RB, DC, DF, JF, and MH, who chose to remain anonymous, and to Professor Keith A. Evans of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, PA who was especially helpful.

## Scripture Index

For the benefit of users of electronic versions, the page numbers given are hyperlinks. An *n* after a page number indicates that the reference occurs in a footnote.

Genesis 1:1	<a href="#">15</a>	Genesis 2:15–18	<a href="#">36</a>
Genesis 1:1–3	<a href="#">15</a>	Genesis 2:16–17	<a href="#">34</a>
Genesis 1:1	<a href="#">17</a> , <a href="#">17</a> , <a href="#">17</a> , <a href="#">20</a> , <a href="#">21</a>	Genesis 2:19	<a href="#">36</a> , <a href="#">36</a> , <a href="#">36</a> , <a href="#">60</a> , <a href="#">60</a>
Genesis 1:1–5	<a href="#">23</a>	Genesis 2:20–25	<a href="#">37</a>
Genesis 1:1	<a href="#">27</a> , <a href="#">29</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">31</a> , <a href="#">59</a> , <a href="#">71</a>	Genesis 2:23–24	<a href="#">34</a>
Genesis 1:2	<a href="#">17</a> , <a href="#">18</a>	Genesis 2:25	<a href="#">34</a>
Genesis 1:6–8	<a href="#">24</a>	Genesis 3:1	<a href="#">11</a>
Genesis 1:9–13	<a href="#">25</a>	Genesis 3:17	<a href="#">57</a>
Genesis 1:10	<a href="#">31</a>	Genesis 3:19	<a href="#">46n</a>
Genesis 1:11–12	<a href="#">32</a>	Genesis 5:1–3	<a href="#">16</a>
Genesis 1:11	<a href="#">32</a>	Genesis 5:1	<a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">72</a>
Genesis 1:11–12	<a href="#">32</a> , <a href="#">33</a>	Genesis 5:2	<a href="#">72</a>
Genesis 1:14	<a href="#">22</a>	Genesis 6:7	<a href="#">72</a>
Genesis 1:14–19	<a href="#">26</a>	Genesis 8:21–22	<a href="#">56</a>
Genesis 1:20–23	<a href="#">26</a>	Genesis 9:3	<a href="#">56</a>
Genesis 1:21	<a href="#">71</a>	Genesis 9:13	<a href="#">32</a>
Genesis 1:24–31	<a href="#">27</a>	Genesis 11:10–14	<a href="#">29</a>
Genesis 1:25	<a href="#">36</a>	Genesis 12:1	<a href="#">31</a>
Genesis 1:25–26	<a href="#">36</a> , <a href="#">36n</a>	Genesis 23:15	<a href="#">31</a>
Genesis 1:25–30	<a href="#">36n</a> , <a href="#">36n</a>	Genesis 37:2–4	<a href="#">16</a>
Genesis 1:25–27	<a href="#">60</a>	Genesis 1	<a href="#">4n</a> , <a href="#">4</a> , <a href="#">4</a> , <a href="#">5</a> , <a href="#">5n</a> , <a href="#">8</a> , <a href="#">11</a> , <a href="#">15</a> , <a href="#">15</a> , <a href="#">19</a> , <a href="#">21</a> , <a href="#">23</a>
Genesis 1:26	<a href="#">36</a>	Genesis 1–2	<a href="#">24</a>
Genesis 1:27	<a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">33</a> , <a href="#">33</a> , <a href="#">33</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">57</a> , <a href="#">72</a>	Genesis 1	<a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">39</a> , <a href="#">47</a> , <a href="#">59</a> , <a href="#">59</a>
Genesis 1:28–29	<a href="#">27</a>	Genesis 2	<a href="#">28</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a>
Genesis 1:28–30	<a href="#">34</a>	Exodus 3:1–3	<a href="#">16</a>
Genesis 1:30	<a href="#">30</a>	Exodus 17:6	<a href="#">19</a>
Genesis 2:1–3	<a href="#">28</a>	Exodus 20:3–17	<a href="#">66</a>
Genesis 2:3	<a href="#">27</a> , <a href="#">29</a> , <a href="#">71</a> , <a href="#">78</a> , <a href="#">78</a>	Exodus 20:8–11	<a href="#">28</a>
Genesis 2:4–25	<a href="#">29</a>	Exodus 34:10	<a href="#">73</a>
Genesis 2:4	<a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">30</a> , <a href="#">33</a>	Numbers 16:30	<a href="#">73</a>
Genesis 2:4–7	<a href="#">35</a>	Numbers 23:19	<a href="#">7</a>
Genesis 2:4	<a href="#">71</a>	Deuteronomy 4:24	<a href="#">54</a>
Genesis 2:5–6	<a href="#">33</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a>	Deuteronomy 4:32	<a href="#">72</a>
Genesis 2:7	<a href="#">30</a>	Deuteronomy 18:10	<a href="#">4</a>
Genesis 2:7–25	<a href="#">30</a>	Deuteronomy 18:22	<a href="#">13</a>
Genesis 2:7	<a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">60</a> , <a href="#">60</a>	Deuteronomy 29:29	<a href="#">24</a>
Genesis 2:8	<a href="#">33</a> , <a href="#">33</a>	Joshua 7:20–21	<a href="#">41</a>
Genesis 2:8–9	<a href="#">35</a>	Joshua 17:15	<a href="#">74</a>
Genesis 2:10	<a href="#">32</a>	Joshua 17:18	<a href="#">74</a>
Genesis 2:10–14	<a href="#">35</a>		



1 Samuel 2:29	<a href="#">74</a>	Ezekiel 21:19	<a href="#">74</a>
1 Samuel 18:6–8	<a href="#">16</a>	Ezekiel 21:30	<a href="#">73</a>
2 Samuel 2:12–13	<a href="#">16</a>	Ezekiel 23:47	<a href="#">74</a>
2 Samuel 2:22	<a href="#">31</a>	Ezekiel 28:13	<a href="#">73</a>
1 Chronicles 16:30	<a href="#">43</a>	Ezekiel 28:15	<a href="#">73</a>
Job 38:2	<a href="#">34</a>	Ezekiel 30:3	<a href="#">21</a>
Psalms 4:1–3	<a href="#">16</a>	Amos 4:13	<a href="#">71</a>
Psalms 34:22	<a href="#">68</a>	Jonah 4:7	<a href="#">21</a>
Psalms 35:19–21	<a href="#">40</a>	Micah 4:6	<a href="#">21</a>
Psalms 51:10	<a href="#">19, 73</a>	Nahum 1:2	<a href="#">57</a>
Psalms 53:1	<a href="#">42</a>	Zechariah 12:1	<a href="#">45</a>
Psalms 89:12	<a href="#">71</a>	Malachi 2:10	<a href="#">57, 72</a>
Psalms 89:47	<a href="#">72</a>	Malachi 3:6	<a href="#">20</a>
Psalms 102:18	<a href="#">19, 72</a>	Matthew 7:12	<a href="#">57</a>
Psalms 104:30	<a href="#">74</a>	Matthew 10:32–33	<a href="#">43</a>
Psalms 119:105	<a href="#">11</a>	Matthew 16:26	<a href="#">53</a>
Psalms 119:130	<a href="#">11</a>	Matthew 23:15	<a href="#">12</a>
Psalms 148:5	<a href="#">71</a>	Matthew 25:46	<a href="#">12</a>
Proverbs 26:4	<a href="#">45</a>	Mark 7:10–12	<a href="#">11</a>
Proverbs 26:5	<a href="#">45</a>	Mark 10:15	<a href="#">39</a>
Ecclesiastes 7:24	<a href="#">30, 47</a>	Mark 12:30–31	<a href="#">68</a>
Ecclesiastes 10:1	<a href="#">43</a>	Luke 3:38	<a href="#">27</a>
Ecclesiastes 12:1	<a href="#">57, 72</a>	Luke 4:8	<a href="#">12</a>
Ecclesiastes 12:12	<a href="#">3</a>	Luke 12:47	<a href="#">53</a>
Isaiah 4:5	<a href="#">19, 73</a>	Luke 15:7	<a href="#">8</a>
Isaiah 12:2	<a href="#">68</a>	Luke 18:16	<a href="#">70</a>
Isaiah 40:26	<a href="#">71</a>	John 1:1–3	<a href="#">18, 24n</a>
Isaiah 40:28	<a href="#">71, 78</a>	John 1:3	<a href="#">37</a>
Isaiah 41:20	<a href="#">73</a>	John 2:3–10	<a href="#">38</a>
Isaiah 42:5	<a href="#">19, 45, 71</a>	John 3:16	<a href="#">7, 68</a>
Isaiah 42:8	<a href="#">20</a>	John 7:14–15	<a href="#">11</a>
Isaiah 43:1	<a href="#">72</a>	John 8:32	<a href="#">11</a>
Isaiah 43:7	<a href="#">18, 72</a>	John 9:33–34	<a href="#">12</a>
Isaiah 43:15	<a href="#">72</a>	John 12:4–6	<a href="#">54</a>
Isaiah 45:7	<a href="#">18, 45, 74</a>	John 14:21	<a href="#">69</a>
Isaiah 45:8	<a href="#">73</a>	John 15:5	<a href="#">80</a>
Isaiah 45:12	<a href="#">72</a>	Acts 17:26	<a href="#">57</a>
Isaiah 45:18	<a href="#">27, 56, 71</a>	Acts 17:28	<a href="#">80</a>
Isaiah 48:7	<a href="#">73</a>	Romans 1:19–20	<a href="#">44</a>
Isaiah 54:16	<a href="#">72</a>	Romans 1:20	<a href="#">8, 69</a>
Isaiah 57:18–19	<a href="#">73</a>	Romans 1:22	<a href="#">42</a>
Isaiah 58:13–14	<a href="#">28</a>	Romans 3:10–18	<a href="#">41, 41</a>
Isaiah 59:2	<a href="#">67</a>	Romans 3:23	<a href="#">66</a>
Isaiah 61:10	<a href="#">68</a>	Romans 4:5–7	<a href="#">68</a>
Isaiah 65:17–18	<a href="#">71</a>	Romans 5:8	<a href="#">67</a>
Jeremiah 17:9	<a href="#">8</a>	Romans 5:12	<a href="#">27</a>
Jeremiah 31:22	<a href="#">73</a>	Romans 6:23	<a href="#">67</a>

Romans 8:28	<a href="#">78</a>
Romans 8:32	<a href="#">78</a>
Romans 11:33–34	<a href="#">8</a>
Romans 14:23	<a href="#">53</a>
1 Corinthians 10:13	<a href="#">9</a> , <a href="#">39</a>
Ephesians 2:8–10	<a href="#">7</a> , <a href="#">67</a>
Ephesians 5:11	<a href="#">41</a>
Ephesians 5:31–32	<a href="#">54</a>
Colossians 2:8	<a href="#">1</a>
2 Timothy 3:15–17	<a href="#">11</a>
2 Timothy 4:3	<a href="#">42</a>
Hebrews 1:2	<a href="#">18</a>
Hebrews 1:3	<a href="#">37</a>
Hebrews 2:17–18	<a href="#">9</a>
Hebrews 4:13	<a href="#">8</a> , <a href="#">42</a>
Hebrews 11:3	<a href="#">18</a>
James 2:19	<a href="#">69</a>
2 Peter 2:1	<a href="#">42</a>
1 John 2:26–27	<a href="#">13</a> , <a href="#">13n</a>
Jude 1–1	<a href="#">58</a>
Revelation 21:8	<a href="#">67</a>

## General Index

ability.....	<a href="#">41</a>
academia.....	<a href="#">41</a>
accidentally evolved.....	<a href="#">56</a>
afflictions.....	<a href="#">57</a>
animal garden.....	<a href="#">36</a>
appendix.....	<a href="#">57</a>
archaeology.....	<a href="#">47</a>
assumptions.....	<a href="#">47</a> , <a href="#">48</a> , <a href="#">49</a> , <a href="#">50</a>
astrologer.....	<a href="#">4</a>
astrophysics.....	<a href="#">41</a>
automatic center punch.....	<a href="#">7</a>
bare.....	<a href="#">33</a>
bawraw.....	<a href="#">20</a>
beginning.....	<a href="#">17</a>
Big-Bang.....	<a href="#">3</a>
Big-Bang cosmogony.....	<a href="#">3</a> , <a href="#">41</a> , <a href="#">51</a>
biology.....	<a href="#">41</a>
calibrating.....	<a href="#">22</a>
calibration.....	<a href="#">22</a>
cherished sin.....	<a href="#">54</a>
coal.....	<a href="#">56</a>
coincidences.....	<a href="#">50</a>
crisis of faith.....	<a href="#">9</a>
Darwinism.....	<a href="#">3</a> , <a href="#">41</a> , <a href="#">51</a>
day.....	<a href="#">21</a>
day length.....	<a href="#">22</a>
death.....	<a href="#">67</a>
dispensationalism.....	<a href="#">12</a>
divine nature.....	<a href="#">40</a>
dominion.....	<a href="#">27</a>
Dominion Mandate.....	<a href="#">27</a>
educational materials.....	<a href="#">41</a>
ehrets.....	<a href="#">30</a>
energy.....	<a href="#">20</a>
eternal life.....	<a href="#">69</a>
eternal power.....	<a href="#">40</a>
evening.....	<a href="#">22</a>
excuses.....	<a href="#">42</a>
expanse.....	<a href="#">25</a>
experts.....	<a href="#">69</a>
fable.....	<a href="#">3</a>
faith.....	<a href="#">39</a> , <a href="#">67</a> , <a href="#">70</a>
fault tolerance.....	<a href="#">51</a>
female.....	<a href="#">27</a>
fiat.....	<a href="#">51</a>

flying creatures.....	<a href="#">26</a>
food.....	<a href="#">56</a>
Framework Hypothesis.....	<a href="#">4</a>
Galileo.....	<a href="#">43</a>
gap theory.....	<a href="#">17</a>
Garden in Eden.....	<a href="#">32</a>
geocentrism.....	<a href="#">43</a>
glory of God.....	<a href="#">66</a>
gold.....	<a href="#">35</a>
good works.....	<a href="#">67</a>
guilt.....	<a href="#">65</a>
heart.....	<a href="#">42</a>
hellfire.....	<a href="#">65</a>
hidden sin.....	<a href="#">54</a>
history.....	<a href="#">47</a>
Holy Bible.....	<a href="#">11</a>
image.....	<a href="#">26</a>
Inquisition.....	<a href="#">43</a>
intelligent design.....	<a href="#">10, 53</a>
irreducible complexity.....	<a href="#">52</a>
kinds.....	<a href="#">26</a>
legal guilt.....	<a href="#">65</a>
literary transition.....	<a href="#">29</a>
livestock.....	<a href="#">26</a>
long-day creationism.....	<a href="#">3</a>
love.....	<a href="#">67</a>
male.....	<a href="#">27</a>
mankind's home.....	<a href="#">56</a>
mass.....	<a href="#">20</a>
meat.....	<a href="#">56</a>
medical malpractice.....	<a href="#">57</a>
megatons.....	<a href="#">38</a>
mist.....	<a href="#">32</a>
morning.....	<a href="#">22</a>
mousetrap.....	<a href="#">52</a>
mutations.....	<a href="#">51</a>
natural gas.....	<a href="#">56</a>
natural resources.....	<a href="#">57</a>
Occam's razor.....	<a href="#">47</a>
Open Manhole.....	<a href="#">65</a>
opportunity.....	<a href="#">41, 42</a>
organizing principle.....	<a href="#">41</a>
paleobiology.....	<a href="#">47</a>
people.....	<a href="#">42</a>
petroleum.....	<a href="#">56</a>
pets.....	<a href="#">36</a>
poetic license.....	<a href="#">43</a>

prayer.....	<a href="#">70</a>
profession.....	<a href="#">41</a>
Protestant Reformation.....	<a href="#">11</a>
purgatory.....	<a href="#">12</a>
rain.....	<a href="#">32</a>
rainbows.....	<a href="#">32</a>
religion.....	<a href="#">42</a>
rib.....	<a href="#">37</a>
Sabbath.....	<a href="#">28</a>
science.....	<a href="#">40</a>
science publications.....	<a href="#">41</a>
scientists.....	<a href="#">40</a> , <a href="#">41</a> , <a href="#">42</a>
Scotfield Reference Bible.....	<a href="#">12</a>
Scotfieldism.....	<a href="#">12</a>
seasons.....	<a href="#">26</a>
simple.....	<a href="#">69</a>
sin.....	<a href="#">41</a> , <a href="#">54</a> , <a href="#">67</a>
social group.....	<a href="#">41</a>
speed of light.....	<a href="#">46</a>
spring.....	<a href="#">32</a>
stars.....	<a href="#">26</a>
stubborn.....	<a href="#">53</a>
students.....	<a href="#">41</a>
techniques.....	<a href="#">23</a>
tempered glass.....	<a href="#">7</a>
tenses.....	<a href="#">34</a> , <a href="#">36</a>
toledaw.....	<a href="#">29</a>
tonsils.....	<a href="#">57</a>
transcendent.....	<a href="#">20</a>
transition.....	<a href="#">29</a>
two sexes.....	<a href="#">57</a>
universe.....	<a href="#">24</a> , <a href="#">46</a>
water dwellers.....	<a href="#">26</a>
water into wine.....	<a href="#">37</a>
yome.....	<a href="#">21</a>

## **Colophon**

May God use this book to bless you. If you have found any good in it, give God the glory, **“for ‘In him we live and move and have our being’; as even some of your own poets have said, ‘For we are indeed his offspring’”** (Acts 17:28). **“I am the vine; you are the branches. Whoever abides in me and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing”** (John 15:5). The defects are entirely mine. This is not merely a formal show of piety; my gracious Lord and Savior Jesus Christ answered many prayers concerning this book for wisdom and help. And, we know that only the Holy Spirit gives understanding of the Holy Bible.