

Letter from Pastor Daniel..... 2

Week 1 Study..... 4

Week 2 Study..... 11

Week 3 Study..... 16

Week 4 Study..... 21

Week 5 Study..... 27

Week 6 Study..... 32

Week 7 Study..... 38

Appendix I (Week 1) 44

Appendix II (Week 4) 55

Appendix III (Week 4) 69

This Study Guide utilizes many videos from RightNow Media. This service is free and available to anyone associated with Easthaven. Contact the church office at (406) 752-7021 for more information.

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Church Family,

For several generations, our world has had a “theory” presented to us as if it was a fact. We have been told over and over that questioning the theory was a position of ignorance of proven scientific evidence. According to Encarta Dictionary, a theory is defined as “an idea of or belief about something arrived at through speculation or conjecture.” In some places today, this theory has actually been relabeled as a science, indicating it has been proven by observable evidence; however, the truth testifies to a dramatically different picture. For the course of this series of studies, we are going to examine what the Bible actually says about how God created the heavens and the earth and all that is in them. The series is entitled *Origins - Created for purpose*. As followers of Jesus who discovered the fulfilled promise of a Savior from the loving heart of our Heavenly Father who sent His only Son to pay the ransom for our sins by sacrificing Himself on a cross some 2000 years ago and proving His power over death in His own resurrection, we have believed a truth based on the textual integrity of the Bible. This series attempts to reestablish our confidence in this integrity and answer a series of key questions about how God created all things.

Questions like:

- Have we lost the conversation about how things began?
- Is the earth really millions or billions of years old?
- Is there good reason why the days of creation are in the order they are recorded?
- Is there significance to being created in God’s image?

- Is there any value to having the principle of the Sabbath?
- Do we understand the lingering impact of the fall into sin?

In this series, we will attempt to gain a fuller understanding of what the Bible actually teaches and add a significant level of confidence to our answers. For our church family, the format of this devotional guide to the series will be somewhat different from previous small group guides. Instead of five days of personal devotions, you will be given one lesson to be completed prior to hearing the sermon over the weekend. You may choose to sit down and work through the entire lesson in one sitting, or you may choose to spread it out over the week. Each lesson will direct you to watch some video teachings online to establish some foundation thoughts about the subject matter for that week. I would love for you to have worked through the entire lesson prior to coming to a worship service for the purpose of stirring your thinking about this subject. If you are not currently involved in a small group, this is a great time to get connected at that level. These lessons will provide opportunity for some great conversations about things you rarely get a chance to discuss. Please make a commitment to your own spiritual growth and take advantage of this exciting study.

I am looking forward to learning and growing with you through these studies.

Honored and humbled to serve and grow with you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daniel Lambert". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the text "Honored and humbled to serve and grow with you,".

Pastor Daniel <><

Week One



SMALL GROUP
ministry

The Real Origin of the Species

This week is a study of the way that Christians have seemed to have lost the battle of ideas about how the world was formed. How do you think that the argument was lost?

Please read this article about the history of the Battle. (It's a little long, if time does not allow for the whole article, please read through section 2 which is provided in Appendix I in the back of this Guide).

<https://answersingenesis.org/age-of-the-earth/are-philosophical-naturalism-and-age-of-the-earth-related/>

Does this article change how you thought the argument was lost?

Describe philosophical naturalism in your own words.

How was the 'Galileo affair' used to attack people who tried to apply the Bible to the study of geology?

What does it say about your concept of who God is if He takes millions or billions of years to create the earth? Was He struggling over long ages to slowly figure out how to build it and create life on it? Is your concept of God that He is *big and all powerful* or *small and weak*?

During this onslaught, the church was in conflict - many inside the church accepted the new ideas even though these ideas undercut the entire foundation of the Bible. There were many theories proposed to try to align the scientific ideas with the Bible: day = age, Gap Theory, and Framework Theory. Unfortunately, these theories are trying to re-interpret the Bible based on science. Science is placed in mastery over the Bible. There were many scientists who argued against the long age interpretations - Granville Penn, George Bugg, Andrew Ure, George Fairholme, and John Murray were some. One thing that they never did was to join into a formal organization to fight together for their ideas. That step wouldn't happen until the Institute for Creation Research was formed in 1970 by Dr. Henry Morris.

Why are the formal organizations so important to the support of an idea in the culture?

Watch this video on YouTube:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8CylfWoHkT0>

Why did so many pastors accept evolution?

Would you have been confident enough in the Bible to stand against popular culture?

Watch Cameron's story "Creation vs Evolution" on RightNow Media:

<https://www.rightnowmedia.org/Content/illustration/114522>

Have you ever felt like Cameron?

Have you ever been the student who didn't stand up?

Read John 1:1-5, Romans 1:20, and Colossians 1:15-17.

Does the New Testament treat Genesis as an analogy?

Read Matthew 19:3-6.

Look at this verse again, “That He who created them in the beginning made them male and female,” (HCSB). What is Jesus referring to when He says this?

For more in-depth study, read *The Great Turning Point* by Terry Mortenson.

Week Two



SMALL GROUP
ministry ¹¹

A Case For A Young Earth

Read Exodus 20:11 and 31:17.

Do these verses support a natural reading of Genesis 1?

Could these verses be referring to millions of days?

Read Genesis 5.

Does the text support an expansion of time to millions of years?

Read Matthew 1.

Why is the genealogy of Jesus treated so highly in Matthew's Gospel?

Read Luke 3:23-38.

Why is it important to know the genealogy of Jesus?

Soft tissue and red blood cells have been found in dinosaur fossils. Watch this video to see some of the soft tissue:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9pHTi-4ef5E>.

What do you think the implications of this is?

This clip shows a section of the Colorado River with pictures from 150 years ago and from today: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=auEK17ysb3Y>. The standard theory of earth formation would propose that the river channel was cut by just time and slow erosion. Does that really seem to match the data?

This clip shows some of the rock layers from around the Grand Canyon:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iOzkG3kP3OI>.

Does this data fit with the uniformitarian view of earth formation? (Uniformitarian views are that the earth was formed over a long period of time through only the slow processes that are viewable today.)

Finding fossils in the rocks was a detail used during the initial formulation of the study of Geology and has long been a major portion of the argument for long ages. However, Ken Ham from Answers in Genesis has stated, "If there was a global Flood, as described in Genesis, what would we expect to see? Well, billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water all over the earth. And you know what we do find? Well, billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water all over the earth!" Is there a flaw in this argument?

Does this data change your views?

Week Three



SMALL GROUP
ministry

God Creates a Framework - Light and Dark

Watch this quiz clip “Which Came First?” on
RightNow Media:

<https://www.rightnowmedia.org/Content/illustration/98199>

Now read Genesis 1:1-13.

During this study, please carefully read the actual text of the Bible - there are many details that we have read over for years but never noticed. What was a new thing that you noticed today?

How did you do on the quiz? Does creating light mean that God created the sun? What other explanations could there be?

On the second day, it says that God separated the waters of the heavens from the waters of the earth. What do you think this means? Is there enough information to build a strong theory?

What was created on Day 3?

What is meant by the phrase “according to their kinds” (HCSB)?

Which came first, the plant or the seed?

Find 3 phrases that are repeated for each day (or most of the days) and explain the significance of each.

Week Four



SMALL GROUP
ministry

God Fills Up His Universe

Read Genesis 1:14-25.

Watch this video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a2wOujRZfNE>

What did God make on Day 4?

What are the purposes of the “lights in the expanse of the sky”?

Does it seem odd that God didn’t create the sun and the moon until Day 4? Why do you think that is?

Does this text suggest or require that the Earth is the center of the universe?

Watch this video: <https://youtu.be/7ki6HUOhjj8>

What did God make on Day 5?

What are we told about fish and bird reproduction?

How does the evolutionary theory explain sexual reproduction?

How does creation explain sexual reproduction?

What did God make on Day 6?

What is a kind?

Would it align with species or families as scientists would define today?

Would it be defined by what can reproduce?

Human Population: If Humans have been around for ~50,000 years as the evolutionists suggest, where have the remains all gone?

Watch David Rives on Youtube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=io3A9bE_Y3Y

Watch Is Genesis History:

<https://isgenesishistory.com/tale-two-dichotomies/> (Full article in Appendix II)

<https://isgenesishistory.com/should-genesis-1-2-be-taken-literally/> (Full article in Appendix III)

Week Five



SMALL GROUP
ministry

Created in the Image of God

Read Genesis 1:26-31.

Find and explain expressions from Genesis 1:26 that show people are special in God's creation.

What special responsibilities were given to people in Genesis 1:28?

Explain what it means to subdue the earth and have dominion over animals. (Think: What kinds of activities would this authorize?)

What were people and animals told to eat? Extra Credit: When does this change?

Read Genesis 2:21-25.

Does this account conflict with Genesis 1? Is this a different creation event or just an expanded telling of the same event?

Why is it not good to be alone?

How do verses 21 and 22 describe a woman being made?

List some New Testament passages that refer to Adam or Eve or the first man or woman.

What lessons can we learn about marriage from Genesis 2:24?

Read Mark 10:6-9.

How does Jesus affirm marriage?

At what point in time does Jesus say 'male and female' are created? Does it leave room for a lot of time between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:25?

Read 1 Corinthians 6:15-20.

How does this affirm the proper place in our lives for sex?

Week Six



SMALL GROUP
ministry

The Principle of Sabbath for Humanity

SUMMARY

Believers are not obligated to observe the Sabbath. The Sabbath was the sign of the Mosaic covenant. The Mosaic covenant and the Sabbath as the covenant sign are no longer applicable now that the new covenant of Jesus Christ has come. Believers are called upon to honor and respect those who think the Sabbath is still mandatory for believers. But if one argues that the Sabbath is required for salvation, such a teaching is contrary to the gospel and should be resisted forcefully. In any case, Paul makes it clear in both Romans 14:5 and Colossians 2:16-17 that the Sabbath has passed away now that Christ has come. It is wise naturally for believers to rest, and hence one principle that could be derived from the Sabbath is that believers should regularly rest. But the New Testament does not specify when that rest should take place, nor does it set forth a period of time when that rest should occur. We must remember that the early Christians were required to work on Sundays. They worshiped the Lord on the Lord's Day, the day of Jesus' resurrection, but the early Christians did not believe the Lord's Day fulfilled or replaced the Sabbath. The Sabbath pointed toward eschatological rest in Christ, which believers enjoy in part now and will enjoy fully on the Last Day.

Read Genesis 2:1-3.

What does it mean that God declared the seventh day holy?

What do you think it means when it says God worked?

Read Exodus 20:8-11.

Do the 10 commandments affirm the 6 day creation?

What is the purpose of the Sabbath?

Read Matthew 12:1-8 and Mark 2:23-28.

Do the words of Jesus change your understanding of the purpose of the Sabbath?

Read Romans 14:5.

Is there any longer a special requirement for keeping the Sabbath?

Continued...

Watch “Prepared for Influence” on RightNow Media.
<https://www.rightnowmedia.org/Training/Post/View/194563>
Focus on times 6:35 to 7:30.

In our busy lives today, do you overlook the value of Sabbath and of rest?

Watch “The Dangers of Working Full Throttle” on RightNow Media.
<https://www.rightnowmedia.org/Training/Post/View/66804>

In what ways do you create a Sabbath rest in your life?

List some ways you could improve the way you rest from work.

Week Seven



The Fall And Its Implications

Read Genesis 3.

What animal was used to tempt Eve, and how is that animal described?

What question did this animal ask Eve, and how did Eve respond? (Think: Could Eve's sin be excused on the basis of ignorance?)

What did the serpent say would and would not happen if Eve ate the fruit? (Think: Why would this appeal to a human?)

In what three ways did the fruit appeal to Eve?

What did Adam and Eve realize when they had eaten the fruit?

What did they do?

What does the Bible teach about nakedness and inadequate clothing? Use other Bible references in your answer. (Think: What can we learn from the fact that the people were still “naked” when wearing the fig leaf coverings?)

What did Adam say when God asked him about his sin, and what did the woman say when God asked her? (Think: What lessons can we learn from this about blame shifting?)

What punishment did God bring on the serpent? Explain.

Describe the punishments the woman received as a result of her sin.

Have you ever been there when your cat, dog, horse, or cow gave birth? Do they seem to experience the same level of pain as women do during their labor?

Describe the punishments the man would receive. What else was cursed besides the man, the woman, and the serpent?

How did God clothe the man and woman? What does this teach about God's attitude toward adequate clothing - reference verse 7? What does this tell us about the use of animals?

Read Romans 5:12-14, 18-21.

Does the Apostle Paul treat Adam as a real physical person?

What happens to the Gospel message if we try to treat the Genesis story as an allegory?

How can you have eternal life?

Appendix I

Philosophical Naturalism and the Age of the Earth: Are They Related?

by Dr. Terry Mortenson on March 2, 2005

Originally published in *The Master's Seminary Journal* 15, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 71–92.

Many Christians do not understand the stranglehold that philosophical naturalism has on geology and astronomy. Contemporary concern over the negative impact of theories of biological evolution is justified, but many Christians do not understand the stranglehold that philosophical naturalism has on geology and astronomy. The historical roots of philosophical naturalism reach back into the sixteenth century in the works of Galileo Galilei and Francis Bacon. Evolutionary and naturalistic theories of the earth's creation based on uniformitarian assumptions and advocating old-earth theories emerged in the late eighteenth century. In the early nineteenth century, many Christians sought to harmonize biblical teaching with old-earth geological theories such as the gap theory and a tranquil or local Noachian flood. However, many evangelicals and High Churchmen still held to the literal view of *Genesis 1–11*. Two Enlightenment-generated philosophical movements in the eighteenth century, deism and atheism, elevated human reason to a place of supreme authority and took an anti-supernaturalistic view of the Bible, holding it to be just another human book. The two movements with

their advocacy of an old-earth and their effect on astronomy and geology preceded Darwin and supplied him with millions of years needed for his naturalistic theory of the origin of living things. From this lineage it is clear that geology is not an unbiased, objective science and that old-earth theories, naturalism, and uniformitarianism are inseparable. Intelligent-design arguments usually used to combat evolution fail to account for the curse imposed by God in *Genesis 3* and are therefore only partially effective. Intelligent-design advocates should recognize that the naturalism represented in evolutionary theories began much earlier than Darwin. A return to the Scriptures and their teaching of a young earth is the great need of the day.

Many are concerned about the negative impact of evolution on today's world. Some see the consequences in terms of moral and spiritual chaos in society and the church. Others see the damage that the brainwashing of evolution is causing in academic and intellectual arenas. They correctly argue that neo-Darwinism (or any related theory of biological evolution, such as 'punctuated equilibrium theory') is not pure science, but largely philosophical naturalism] masquerading as scientific fact. Many such critics of evolution are part of what is called the 'Intelligent Design' (hereafter ID) movement. But many are also within the 'young-earth creationist' (hereafter YEC) movement.

I strongly agree with and appreciate a great deal of what leaders in the ID movement are writing, not only about the scientific problems with all theories of biological evolution, but especially about the

stranglehold that philosophical naturalism (hereafter simply 'naturalism') has on science.

However, from my reading of ID books and articles and listening to lectures by some of those leaders, I do not think that they see clearly enough the extent to which science is dominated by naturalism. The reason for this observation is that many ID leaders have made oral or written statements something like this: 'We are not going to deal with the question of the age of the earth because it is a divisive side issue. Instead we want to address the main issue, which is the control of science by naturalism.'² The implication of such statements is that the age of the earth is unrelated to naturalism. Many Christians have not even considered the arguments for young-earth creationism because they think that the ID movement has the right view and is dealing with evolution correctly. But this disjunction of naturalism and the age of the earth is incorrect, as I hope to show.

As I read their writings, the ID people do not seem to understand the historical roots of the philosophical control of science. Or, perhaps, they do not appear to have gone back far enough in their historical investigations. A closer look at history, especially the history of the idea of an old earth, provides abundant evidence that the originators of the idea of an old earth and old universe interpreted the physical evidence by using essentially naturalistic assumptions. Similarly, a closer look at the way modern old-earth geologists and old-universe cosmologists reason shows that both geology and astronomy are controlled by the same naturalism

that dominates the biological sciences, and indeed nearly all of academia.

I submit, therefore, that the age of the earth strikes at the very heart of naturalism's control of science and that fighting naturalism only in the biological sciences amounts to fighting only one-third of the battle. Worse still, many of the people involved at the highest levels in the ID movement (e.g., Hugh Ross, Robert Newman, Walter Bradley) are not neutral regarding the age of the earth (as the recognized leader of the ID movement, Phillip Johnson, attempts to be), but are actively and strongly opposed to the young-earth view. Although the ID movement is fighting naturalism in biology, it is actually tolerating or even promoting naturalism in geology and astronomy—which is not a consistent strategy—thus undermining its potential effectiveness.

I. Historical roots

The idea of an old earth really began to take hold in science in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, before Darwin's controversial theory appeared on the scene. Prior to this, in Europe and North America (where science was born and developed under the influence of Christianity and assumptions about physical reality were rooted firmly in the Bible), the dominant, majority view was that God created the world in six literal days about 6,000 years earlier and judged it with a global, catastrophic flood. How, then, did the old-earth idea arise?

Two important people in the sixteenth century greatly influenced the development of old-earth thinking at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Those two were Galileo Galilei and Sir Francis Bacon. As is well known, Galileo (1564–1642) was a proponent of Copernicus’s theory that the earth revolves around the sun, not vice versa. Initially the Roman Catholic Church leadership had no problem with this idea, but for various academic, political, and ecclesiastical reasons, in 1633 the pope changed his mind and forced Galileo to recant his belief in heliocentricity on threat of excommunication. But eventually heliocentricity became generally accepted and with that many Christians absorbed two lessons from the so-called ‘Galileo affair.’ One was from a statement of Galileo himself. He wrote, ‘The intention of the Holy Ghost is to teach us how to go to heaven, not how heaven goes.’³ In other words, the Bible teaches theology and morality, but not astronomy or science. The other closely related lesson was that the church will make big mistakes if it tries to tell scientists what to believe about the world.⁴

Galileo’s contemporary in England, Francis Bacon (1561–1626), was a politician and philosopher who significantly influenced the development of modern science. He emphasized observation and experimentation as the best method for gaining true knowledge about the world. He also insisted that theory should be built only on the foundation of a wealth of carefully collected data. But although Bacon wrote explicitly of his belief in a recent, literal 6-day creation,⁵ he like Galileo insisted on not mixing

the study of what he called the two books of God: creation and the Scriptures. He stated,

But some of the moderns, however, have indulged in this folly, with such consummate carelessness, as to have endeavoured to found a natural philosophy on the first chapter of Genesis, the book of Job, and other passages of holy Scripture—‘seeking the dead among the living.’ And this folly is the more to be prevented and restrained, because, from the unsound admixture of things divine and human, there arises not merely a fantastic philosophy, but also a heretical religion.6

As a result of the powerful influence of Galileo and Bacon, a strong bifurcation developed between the interpretation of creation (which became the task of scientists) and the interpretation of Scripture (which is the work of theologians and pastors). With the advent of the nineteenth century, the old-earth geologists, whether Christian or not, often referred to Bacon and Galileo’s dictums to silence the objections of the ‘Scriptural geologists,’ a group of Christian clergy and scientists writing from about 1820 to 1850 who raised biblical, geological, and philosophical arguments against old-earth theories and for the literal truth of Genesis—a literal six-day creation about 6,000 years ago and a global catastrophic flood at the time of Noah, which they believed was responsible for most of the geological record.7 The warning of the old-earth proponents was powerful in its effect on the minds of the public. The message was that defenders of a literal interpretation of Genesis regarding Creation, Noah’s flood, and the age of the earth were repeating the

same mistake the Roman Catholic Church made three centuries earlier in relation to the nature of the solar system. And just look at how that retarded the progress of science and exposed the church to ridicule, said the old-earth advocates.

II. New theories about the history of creation

In contrast to the long-standing young-earth creationist view, different histories of the earth began to be developed in the late eighteenth century, which were evolutionary and naturalistic in character. Three prominent French scientists were very influential in this regard. In 1778 Georges-Louis Comte de Buffon (1708–1788) postulated that the earth was the result of a collision between a comet and the sun and had gradually cooled from a molten lava state over at least 75,000 years (a figure based on his study of cooling metals).⁸ Buffon was probably a deist or possibly a secret atheist.⁹ Pierre Laplace (1749–1827), an open atheist, published his nebular hypothesis in 1796.¹⁰ He imagined that the solar system had naturally and gradually condensed from a gas cloud during a very long period of time. In his *Zoological Philosophy* of 1809, Jean Lamarck (1744–1829), who straddled the fence between deism and atheism,¹¹ proposed a theory of biological evolution over long ages, with a mechanism known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

New theories in geology were also being advocated at the turn of the nineteenth century as geology began to develop into a disciplined field of scientific

study. Abraham Werner (1749–1817) was a German mineralogist and probably a deist.¹² Although he published very little, his impact on geology was enormous, because many of the nineteenth century's greatest geologists had been his students. He theorized that the strata of the earth had been precipitated chemically and mechanically from a slowly receding universal ocean. According to Werner's unpublished writings, the earth was at least one million years old.¹³ His elegantly simple, oceanic theory was quickly rejected (because it just did not fit the facts), but the idea of an old earth remained with his students.

The Scotsman, James Hutton (1726–1797), was trained in medicine but turned to farming for many years before eventually devoting his time to geology. In his *Theory of the Earth*, published in 1795, he proposed that the continents were gradually and continually being eroded into the ocean basins. These sediments were then gradually hardened and raised by the internal heat of the earth to form new continents, which would be eroded into the ocean again. With this slow cyclical process in mind, Hutton could see no evidence of a beginning to the earth, a view that precipitated the charge of atheism by many of his contemporaries, though he too was most likely a deist.¹⁴

Neither Werner nor Hutton paid attention to the fossils in rocks. But another key person in the development of old-earth geological theories, who did, was the Englishman, William Smith (1769–1839). He was a drainage engineer and surveyor and helped build canals all over England and Wales, which gave

him much exposure to the strata and fossils. He is called the 'Father of English Stratigraphy' because he produced the first geological maps of England and Wales and developed the method of using fossils to assign relative dates to the strata.¹⁵ As a vague sort of theist¹⁶ he believed in many supernatural creation events and supernaturally induced floods over the course of much more time than indicated in the Bible.¹⁷

The Frenchman, Georges Cuvier (1768–1832), was a famous comparative anatomist and paleontologist. Although he was a nominal Lutheran, recent research has shown that he was an irreverent deist.¹⁸ Because of his scientific stature, he was most influential in popularizing the catastrophist theory of earth history. By studying fossils found largely in the Paris Basin he believed that over the course of untold ages there had been at least four regional or nearly global catastrophic floods, the last of which probably was about 5,000 years ago.¹⁹ This obviously coincided with the date of Noah's flood, and some who endorsed Cuvier's theory made this connection. However, in his published theory, Cuvier himself never explicitly equated his last catastrophe with Noah's flood.²⁰

Finally, Charles Lyell (1797–1875), a trained lawyer turned geologist and probably a deist (or Unitarian, which is essentially the same),²¹ began publishing his three-volume *Principles of Geology* in 1830. Building on Hutton's uniformitarian ideas, Lyell insisted that the geological features of the earth can, and indeed must, be explained by slow gradual processes of erosion, sedimentation, earthquakes, volcanism, etc.,

operating at essentially the same average rate and power as observed today. By the 1840s his view became the ruling paradigm in geology. So, at the time of the Scriptural geologists (ca. 1820–50), there were three views of earth history.

It should be noted that two very influential geologists in England (and in the world) at this time were William Buckland (1784–1856) and Adam Sedgwick (1785–1873). Buckland became the head professor of geology at Oxford University in 1813 and Sedgwick gained the same position at Cambridge in 1818. Both were ordained Anglican clergy and both initially promoted old-earth catastrophism. But under the influence of Lyell they both converted to uniformitarianism with public recantations of their catastrophist views in the early 1830s. Buckland is often viewed as a defender of Noah's flood because of his 1823 book, *Reliquiae Diluvianae*. But this apparent defense of the flood was actually a subtle attack on it, as Scriptural geologists accurately perceived. Because of their powerful positions in academia and in the church, Sedgwick and Buckland led many Christians in the 1820s to accept the new geological theories about the history of the earth and to abandon their faith in the literal interpretation of Genesis and in the unique and geologically significant Noachian flood.

One more fact about geology at this time deserves mention. The world's first scientific society devoted exclusively to geology was the London Geological Society (LGS), founded in 1807. From its inception, which was at a time when very little was known about the geological formations of the earth and the

fossils in them, the LGS was controlled by the assumption that earth history is much older than and different from that presented in Genesis. And a few of its most powerful members were Anglican clergy. Not only was very little known about the geological features of the earth, but at that time there were no university degrees in geology and no professional geologists. Neither was seen until the 1830s and 1840s, which was long after the naturalistic idea of an old earth was firmly entrenched in the minds of those who controlled the geological societies, journals, and university geology departments.

Full article at <https://answersingenesis.org/age-of-the-earth/are-philosophical-naturalism-and-age-of-the-earth-related/>

Appendix II

THE FALSE DICHOTOMY

By: Thomas Purifoy, Jr. - Writer, Director

First, a bit of history.

On February 23, 2017 at 2:01am, my friend Paul Nelson published a blog post dissenting from his role in our film *Is Genesis History?*

Just 17 hours later, the film was shown in over 700 theaters around the United States. It ended up being the highest grossing film in the country that night. Over 143,000 people spent two hours watching a documentary that makes the argument there are two competing views concerning the history of the earth.

The word “two” in the argument was one of the things Paul dissented from. He claimed we were creating a false dichotomy by not presenting all possible views in the origins debate.

Although in the film and in his full interview he employs this one-to-one comparison, his later reflection led him to re-evaluate what he said. He and I spoke about it and he asked if I would change the film.

I said it was too late at that point (the theaters already had the prints), but that I thought his statement was accurate: there really are just two

primary views of earth history *when one evaluates them as history.*

As a philosopher, Paul seemed to be shifting back to viewing things from a philosophical perspective. The film, however, was not about comparing two different philosophies, but two different *histories.*

What is the difference between philosophy and history?

Philosophy is concerned with knowledge, ideas, causality, and logic; history is concerned with time, duration, people, and events. Over and over again, the film emphasizes it is comparing two views of history.

What are those two views?

People are exposed to the first view when they open a science textbook, watch a series like *Cosmos*, or see a film like *X-Men*: over billions of years, strictly physical processes operating without intelligent design formed everything around us. This is the conventional view that is pervasively taught throughout the world today.

The other view is found in the pages of the Bible. From the 15th-century BC to the present, people have been reading the account in Genesis and taking it to be literal history: God created the earth and universe in a period of 6 days; over a thousand years later, there was a global flood that transformed the earth. This is the historical Genesis view that has

been accepted by the majority of Judeo-Christian societies for the last 3500 years.

WHAT ABOUT OLD EARTH CREATIONISTS?

There is, however, a group that adopts the conventional timeline of earth history yet also says it can detect signs of intelligent design in that history. In other words, the people in this group are making a *philosophical* distinction as to how they interpret the causality of the events in the conventional timeline.

Paul lists out a number of them in his article. Two from the 19th-century are Charles Lyell, a deist, and Alfred Russel Wallace, a theistic evolutionist; both rejected the possibility of divine revelation in history. Their view of design therefore had little to do with the actions of God as recorded in the Bible.

Paul then provides a more recent list that includes some Christians who have accepted the conventional timeline. They are often referred to as “old earth creationists.” Many are intellectually-gifted, godly men who have made important contributions to the origins debate.

Almost all of them accept the Bible as history. Yet when they come to Genesis 1, they say it is not an *actual or literal* history of the universe being created in six normal days; when they come to Genesis 6-8, they say it is not describing a *global* flood. Instead, they say the conventional timeline (13,820,000,000 years) provides the duration and sequence of events for the history of the universe.

I would observe that the exceptions these men are making have enormous historical consequences.

After all, old earth creationists say the traditional interpretation of Genesis concerning *time, duration, people, and events* is completely different from what actually happened. They argue for the reality of “deep time” with an entirely different duration and series of events.

What are the implications of deep time? Almost everyone recognizes how difficult it is to conceptually compare these two views. If years became size, it would be like replacing a small hill in your backyard with the entire Himalayan mountain range. If years became feet, it would be like walking a mile versus walking to the moon. These are gargantuan differences in terms of time and events.

This is why the following questions come up at the beginning of the film: Was the world created in six literal days, or billions of years? Was there a global flood, or a local flood? These are *historical questions*.

To put them in perspective, it would be like asking: did World War II last for 6 years, or 106 years? Was it a global war, or was it limited to Europe? Furthermore, if WWII did last for 106 years, then countless additional events had to have happened during that time. This is very important: one cannot significantly alter the *duration* of time without altering the *events* that go with it.

This is what you notice when you start digging into what old earth creationists actually think happened

in the history of the world. It looks a lot like the conventional view of history, but with philosophical ideas about design and cause added in.

This is the reason their view was not included in the film. It is a mixture of the two histories that borrows from both, but is consistent with neither. It is not unique, but is a combination of the two.

WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES?

The consequences of an old earth creationist view of history are a cascading series of re-interpretations that start at Genesis and ripple throughout the entire Bible.

Here are just a few theological and historical problems that result from this attempted marriage:

- The Bible never separates the creation of heaven and earth over a long duration, but lists them together as they are in Genesis 1:1. As Isaiah tells us, “God, the Lord, who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and what comes from it...” The conventional view, however, says there was no earth anywhere in the universe for the first 9,000,000,000 years of its history. This is a radical change in the doctrine of Creation.
- Isaiah 45:18 tells us “The Lord, who created the heavens (he is God!),...formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it empty, he formed it to be inhabited!)” Yet the conventional

view says the earth formed slowly over millions of years and was unlivable for billions of years due to volcanism and lack of oxygen. In other words, the earth was created empty and was uninhabited by people for over 4,500,000,000 years. This alters ones view of the purpose of Creation.

- The conventional view says there were no humans in the universe for 99.9999% of its history, but Paul tells us in Romans 1:20 that God's "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." If man is the only creature in God's image who can do this perceiving – the creature for whom He made the universe – why would he be nowhere to be found for practically its entire history?
- In the conventional view, there are approximately 13,820,000,000 years of corruption and decay, as well as 541,000,000 years of animal suffering and death, all before Adam. Although Christian theology and statements of Paul in Romans 5 ("just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin..."), Romans 8 ("For the creation was subjected to futility..."), and 1 Corinthians ("For as by a man came death...") talk about Adam bringing death and corruption into the universe, the doctrine of a universal Fall must be changed because death and decay had been around for billions of years.
- According to the conventional view, the sedimentary rock layers covering the earth were laid down slowly over 541,000,000 years due to the gradual rise and fall of epicontinental seas. Those layers therefore cannot be the result of a

global flood and judgment of God. This requires old earth creationists to reinterpret multiple statements in Genesis such as God bringing “a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh in which is the breath of life under heaven...” as well as statements by Jesus and Peter to mean something different than their literal reading (which is the way the church has always interpreted them). Instead of the massive layers of rock being a picture of Judgment, they become merely a picture of deep time.

- If the sedimentary rock layers were laid down over hundreds of millions of years, then one must explain the origin of all the billions of land and sea creatures fossilized in them. To fit these creatures in the conventional timeline of 541,000,000 years and yet appeal to a Creator, some old earth creationists introduced the idea of “progressive creation” events that happened every 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 years. According to them, God performed approximately 30 of these major creation events (sometimes followed by major extinction events) during the history of the earth before Adam. Not agreeing with that solution, other old earth creationists have employed “theistic evolution” with random mutations, natural selection, and death as the way God formed all the creatures on earth from a common ancestor. Needless to say, neither of these views can appeal to the Bible for positive support, and both are obviously inconsistent with the duration and type of events recorded throughout the Bible.
- This view leads those who accept the conventional timeline to the curious situation of God having been completely silent for 99.99% of

the history of the universe. For a God that defines His relationship to us through Revelation of His actions in history – as Amos tells us “the Lord God does nothing without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets” – this is completely uncharacteristic, especially since the first chapter of the Bible appears to be just what He would naturally provide for us: a record of the duration of specific events that occurred with His verbal creation of the universe.

- Finally, although God says the world He made was “very good” and that He governs it according to His wise providence, if the conventional timeline is accurate, His providential care has primarily been spent slowly forming galaxies over 9,000,000,000 years, overseeing a lot of volcanic activity and the growth of bacteria over 4,000,000,000 years, then managing various creation and extinction events of trillions of animals for the last 540,000,000 years. In terms of time, man’s recorded history of 4 to 5,000 years on earth is totally insignificant. As Mark Twain pointed out, if the duration of the conventional timeline can be compared to the height of the Eiffel Tower, then man’s existence is like the thin skin of paint at the pinnacle point, “and anybody would perceive that that skin was what the tower was built for.”

Of course, this is just a short list.

My conversations with well-meaning old earth creationists lead me to believe that many of them are unaware of the actual historical and theological implications of accepting the conventional view of

time.(1) I have seen a tendency for some to talk about “an old earth” and “billions of years” as something general and vague without realizing the consequences of their view.

They often rely on contemporary Bible scholars who are advancing new interpretations of Genesis 1. These scholars look at the first chapter in terms of a “framework hypothesis” or “analogical days” or a “cosmic temple” view.

What all these interpretations have in common is that they end up *de-historicizing the text*. It is as if they unscrew the six days of creation out of space-time history and set it aside, declaring it to be representative, theological, and non-literal. The conventional timeline of billions of years then quietly takes its place.

Yet time – as our calendars remind us – always ends up being specific.

THE OBVIOUS LINKS

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.... It was the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five.” – Charles Dickens

Many people know the famous opening to the novel, but are unaware of what actually happens in it.

After a comparison in which two sorts of time in *general* are compared, Dickens gets down to business and tells us *specifically* when his story takes

place: on the eve of the French Revolution. He then introduces people and events that are inextricably linked from the first pages to the end. Historical novelists do this because that's the way time works.

If you look at the Bible, this is how it presents history. The creation of the world is linked to Adam and the Fall, then to Noah and the Flood, then to Abraham and the Covenant, then to David and the Kingdom, and finally to Jesus and the Cross. Events and people are always causally connected in *time*.

It is not general, but specific time. Adam was 130 when he had Seth; Noah was 600 when the Flood began; Abraham was 75 when he left for Canaan; David reigned for 40 years over Israel; Jesus was about 30 years old when He began His ministry. Luke links all these people in the context of one genealogy (the best way to track time for the ancients) to give us a complete history of the world.

We would know nothing about these people and events if they weren't recorded for us in the Bible. For a Christian, knowledge of truth therefore rests on real history that has *universal* significance.

That history is essential for a proper understanding of everything around us. If we take parts away, replace it, or ignore things, there are significant consequences to how we see ourselves and the world.

This is important to remember as we consider the final comments in Paul's post. He ends by explaining why he thinks *time* shouldn't be the primary issue in

“the current philosophical and scientific landscape of opinion about origins.”

Instead, he thinks the division should be based on *epistemology*, or one’s theory of knowledge. The debate should turn on one’s commitment concerning “what causes would be allowed in scientific explanation and what would count as evidence.”

In other words, he sees the rational detection of design in the world as the primary issue for origins.

He goes on to say that, by basing the distinction on *time*, one is inevitably grouping together people with differing views of epistemology. Of course, by basing the distinction on *philosophy*, he is grouping together people with differing views of history.

So which is the true dichotomy?

THE TRUE DICHOTOMY

Although I have great respect for Paul and appreciate his thinking, by dividing the issue on philosophy, he creates a basic problem for Christians.

As a set of beliefs, Christianity has a unique relationship to history. The Apostle’s Creed is really just a list of what one believes is true about history. It is no coincidence that it starts with “I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth.”

The foundation of all true knowledge therefore rests on the history recorded in the Bible. Christians begin their understanding of the world and of themselves by recognizing that the Bible is an accurate and internally-coherent record of these events. Only after that has been established can they begin to build an epistemology.

If this sequence is not followed, Christians are cut off from knowledge in an area where divine revelation is essential: the origin of the universe and the global transformation of the earth by the Flood. If they can't go to the Bible to speak definitively on these issues, they can't go anywhere.

We see the results of this line of thinking in some of our pastors today.

One pastor I know referred to many in his denomination as being “agnostic” on the question of Genesis and origins. When marketing the film, our team spoke to a lot of pastors about promoting it, yet often received the curious response: “I personally agree with you, but I can't bring it up in my church.” I recently looked at a list of online sermons by a prominent evangelical pastor who has preached for over four decades; there was only one on Genesis 1, and that was a sermon on marriage.

I realize these are anecdotal, but there seems to be a desire among many smart and influential Christians to push away the debate from time and history when it comes to questions about our origins. The result, although perhaps unintentional, is a push away from Genesis as a source of knowledge about the world.

It reminds me of the story of Hercules and his struggle with Antaeus. According to Greek mythology, Antaeus was the half-giant son of Poseidon and Mother Earth. He would challenge people to wrestling matches, and so long as he was touching Mother Earth, he could never lose. Hercules eventually defeated him by lifting him up and killing him.

I think the comparison is that when Christians stand on the history revealed in the Bible, they cannot lose. When they combine that view of history with a solid understanding of the creation itself, they become even more formidable. It is only when they are disconnected from Biblical history and the clear statements of scripture that their strength leaves them.

In the same way, when one reads conventional scientists talking about these subjects, it is easy to see that their commitment to deep time precedes their philosophy of knowledge.(2) That, in turn, informs their scientific interpretation of the data. They, too, implicitly know that their strength comes from being solidly fixed on their view of history.

This is why the film is about time. It is only when Christians see that one's view of history is the defining question for origins that they can contribute toward building the positive scientific framework that will *replace* the conventional view.

And that is just a matter of time.

All verses taken from ESV, with exception of Romans 1:20 from NASB.

ENDNOTES:

(1) The handful of examples where old earth creationists are trying to work out the details leads to all sorts of strange historical and Biblical conundrums. The quite interesting work of the brilliant Hugh Ross in *Navigating Genesis* is a case in point.

(2) Evolutionist Stephen J. Gould explores this in *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle* in the history of the thought of James Hutton and Charles Lyell, two of the “fathers” of deep time.

Online article at <https://isgenesishistory.com/tale-two-dichotomies/>

By: Thomas Purifoy, Jr. – Writer, Director

APPENDIX III

Should Genesis 1 & 2 Be Taken Literally?

By: Thomas Purifoy, Jr. - Writer, Director

Today, there are some Christians who do not think Genesis 1 and 2 should be taken as a literal record of sequential days. Instead, they interpret the days and events of the first chapters of the Bible in a variety of ways, such as a 'literary framework,' 'God's workdays,' or as a 'functional cosmic temple.'

There are useful observations in all these approaches. Aspects of them, in fact, can be found throughout the history of the church's interpretation of Genesis.

Ancient, medieval, and early modern commentators noticed the parallel literary pattern of three days of forming and three days of filling, or that God acts like a workman in creating the earth, or that the garden of Eden has many similarities to the structure of the tabernacle and temple.

They saw these patterns as quite intentional. The metaphor of a master builder was used for God who, like the architects of the mighty cathedrals,

intricately designed real structures to communicate theological truths.

They knew God told Moses in Exodus 25:40 to build the tabernacle “*after the pattern...which is being shown you on the mountain.*” They also knew the author of Hebrews goes on to explain that this real structure was just “*a copy and shadow of the heavenly things.*” (Heb 8:5) They understood that God expected us to notice these patterns and figure out what they meant.

This intentionality is why there is so much similarity between Eden, the tabernacle, and “the heavenly things”: they were all designed by the same Designer to be His dwelling place with man. These sorts of connections between reality and theology were obvious to the commentators; when they read the Bible, they saw that God put patterns everywhere He revealed Himself.

Can history be both literal and symbolic?

What makes these patterns so fascinating is that they are actually embedded in real history. There are patterns and symbols throughout the Bible, from the life of Moses to the life of David to the life of Jesus, all of which are equally literal *and* symbolic.

If God is both transcendent and immanent—and far beyond us in creativity— we should expect that there are numberless things built into the creation and its history that uniquely reveal His delight in patterns as ways to understand Him better.

This is important to note: most commentators throughout the history of the church have understood that, for these patterns to have theological meaning, they had to be historically real. It was not until the era of modern philosophy that a whole discipline of theological thinking arose which separated theology from history. There began to be a view that if something has a pattern, it was structured that way by a later author and was likely not a reflection of real events.

This thinking seems to have influenced contemporary interpretations of the first chapters of Genesis.

Many interpreters see the obvious patterns in the days of creation, and therefore separate those patterns from real history. Whether the pattern is a literary structure, a relationship to workdays, or an image of the temple, commentators assert that the purpose of the early chapters of Genesis is to teach theology rather than history. As a result, these interpretations de-historicize various sections of Genesis.

This creates three basic problems.

1. Modern interpreters do not replace the record in Genesis with another history.

They simply say it isn't history. But if Genesis isn't a literal record of events, then what actually happened at the beginning? Considering that the role of Special Revelation is to provide us an accurate record of the words and actions of God in time, it seems strange

that the first chapters of that revelation would not do the very thing one would expect it to do: tell us how God created the world and everything in it.

Curiously, this is where modern commentators say they are not scientists and point to the conventional scientific community to provide that history. Although these interpreters would not do this with any other part of the Bible, they do it with Genesis 1 and 2. Leaving aside the question as to whether contemporary scientists are qualified to speak authoritatively on matters of history, the result is that these interpretations are used to justify replacing the Biblical timeline of creation in six days with the conventional timeline of universal formation over billions of years.

2. Modern commentators do not provide any clear consensus as to where to draw the line between what is only theological and what is theological-historical.

In other words, where does real history begin?

There is much discussion of “genre” as being the determining factor, but it quickly becomes subjective as to where one draws the historical line. Considering this is not a problem anywhere else in Genesis (much less the other historical books of the Bible), it leads one to believe that there is not a real distinction here either, and that the earlier commentators were right: Genesis is both literal and symbolic.

3. The witness of other inspired authors creates a significant problem for modern interpretations that seek to separate the theological and the historical.

Shouldn't we rely on the interpretations of men like Jesus, Paul, and Peter for understanding what the text actually means?

Even in the Old Testament, the prophet Isaiah provides more than sufficient evidence that the theology and history of Genesis are inseparably joined. He quotes God Himself saying that the doctrine of creation is the primary reason He can be trusted in all matters, including His control of world events.

It is obvious that Biblical authors were familiar with the text of Genesis and saw how it connects to the real world. This is why their views must come prior to recent attempts at re-interpretation through the discovery of Ancient Near Eastern texts such as the Gilgamesh epic, Enuma Elish, or others. If anything, these texts are confirmation that the ancient pagan world retained something of its memory of the global flood and the world before it.

Even in the Old Testament, the prophet Isaiah provides more than sufficient evidence that the theology and history of Genesis are inseparably joined.

When, however, one looks at the Biblical text in comparison with these pagan documents, the differences are significant.

From the transcendence of God, to the consequences of moral choices for the created order, to the realistic presentation of people and events, there are an overwhelming number of indicators, both within the early chapters and within other parts of the Bible, that Genesis is a literal account of history. This is the perspective of Jesus and His disciples.

Why Should Genesis 1 be considered History?

Besides what has already been said, here are a number of additional reasons why Genesis 1 should be seen as literal history formed by God with symbolic intent:

1. The Hebrew word for 'day'

The use of the Hebrew word 'day' (*yom*) modified by the cardinal numbers 'one,' 'two,' 'three,' 'four,' 'five,' and 'six,' alongside the nouns 'morning' and 'evening' are all specific time indicators referring to a normal week. This is the common vocabulary we see in ancient times, medieval times, and modern times.

Wherever these words are used in other parts of the Pentateuch or other historical narratives of the Bible, we interpret them as referring to normal time. In fact, the Hebrews who translated Genesis into Greek for the Septuagint in the 2nd century B.C. used the normal Greek word for a 24-hour day in Genesis 1, even though there were other Greek words that signified a long period of time.

2. The use of 'day' in the rest of the Old Testament

Although there are a handful of instances of ‘day’ being used in non-literal ways in the Old Testament, it is clear from usage and context these are not the case in Genesis 1. Theologian Geerhardus Vos explains, “It is not accurate to say that the days are God’s days. God *ad intra* does not have days. Creation is an act proceeding outwardly from God.... Appealing to the eternal Sabbath is also of no avail. Although God’s Sabbath is certainly endless, that cannot be said of the first Sabbath.... The use of the term ‘day’ in Genesis 2:4 is figurative, but in Genesis 1 figurative language is not used. What one must show is another place in Scripture where a first, a second, a third day, etc., are just as sharply separated and nevertheless describe periods of time. The ‘day of the Lord’ of the prophets refers to a specific day— that is, a day on which the Lord appears for judgment, even though His judgment may last longer than one day.”

3. Specific Statements in Exodus

There are numerous statements in Exodus that compare the duration of God’s creation to something already familiar to the enslaved Hebrews: one week of seven days. The most well-known of these is integral to the Fourth Commandment.

4. A Record of What Happened In the Beginning

Genesis provides what one would expect at the beginning of a universal history: a record of what actually happened *in the beginning*. Often, the

'superiority of the present' is invoked to say the Israelites were a primitive people who could not understand what actually happened; but this is pure speculation that runs counter to the witness of the rest of the Bible.

The observation that God provided an account so different in structure and content from other literature in the Ancient Near East is testimony that He gave them the one accurate account, especially considering they were surrounded by Egyptian creation stories. He certainly wasn't waiting 3500 years for a handful of scientists in the mid 20th-century to finally explain what He actually did in the beginning.

5. It is Consistent Narrative History

Genesis 1 and 2 are narrative history, as can be seen in the way events flow from one to another through chapter 3 and forward. Again, Vos explains, "within the narrative of Scripture, the creation narrative is interwoven like a link in the chain of God's saving acts. God does not make a chain of solid gold, in which the first link is a floral wreath. If the creation history is an allegory, then the narrative concerning the fall and everything further that follows can also be allegory. The writer of the Pentateuch presents his work entirely as history."

Any attempt to find additional time between the morning/evening/day repetition, or to see the days as a list of highlights over a long period, or to call it poetry, is a rejection of basic linguistic aspects of the text.

6. Statistical Analysis of Hebrew Verbs

Dr. Steve Boyd's statistical analysis of the Hebrew verbs used in Genesis 1:1-2:4 in comparison with other narrative passages of the Old Testament reveals a "99.5% confidence level" that the passage is narrative history. As he explains, "the weight of evidence is so overwhelming that we must acknowledge that Biblical authors believed that they were recounting real events. We must therefore call their work history."

7. Significant Numerical Harmony

There is a significant "numerical harmony" based on the numbers *three* and *seven* in Genesis 1:1-2:4. Rabbinic scholar Umberto Cassuto observes that:

- The entire section is divided into seven paragraphs, one per day.
- The nouns *God*, *heaven*, and *earth* are repeated in multiples of seven throughout the passage: *God* 35 times, *heaven* 21 times, and *earth* 21 times.
- *Light* and *day* are each mentioned seven times in the first paragraph. *Light* is mentioned seven times in the fourth paragraph.
- *Water* is mentioned seven times in paragraphs two and three together.
- *Beasts* is mentioned seven times in paragraphs five and six together.
- The expression *it was good* appears seven times.
- The first verse has seven words; the second verse contains fourteen words; and the seventh paragraph has three sentences, each of which contains seven words and has the expression *the seventh day* in the middle.

Cassuto finishes his overview with the final observation, “to suppose all of this is a mere coincidence is not possible.”

8. Numerous Chiastic Structures

James Jordan identifies numerous chiasmic structures in the first chapter of Genesis. Chiasm is a literary structure based on the Greek letter *chi* (χ). This structure basically follows a pattern that inverts itself as it describes a flow of events, such as A,B,C,D,C',B',A' with D being in the center. Jordan observes numerous chiasmic structures within the passage, from the days of creation, to what is being created, to what is being signified.

Chiasms linked to history can be found throughout the rest of the Bible, too, as Gordon Wenham has observed with the flood account and Kenneth Bailey with a large section of Luke. Such consistent patterns in historical narratives are additional evidence that God was ordering events according to His own purposes.

Final Thoughts

In light of all these points, how is it possible that some modern interpreters want to deny that Genesis 1 is literal history?

It seems the primary rationale to de-historicize Genesis is what Steve Boyd explains in the film. He observes, “the only way you’d want *yom* [day] to mean a longer period of time is if you impose an alien concept, a hermeneutical concept, to the text

and say, 'Well, I think that these are ages therefore *yom* has to mean ages.' What we have to do is start with the text. If we start with the text *yom* means 'day.'"

This desire to impose 'an alien concept' on Genesis is extremely strong today, especially in academic circles. We should therefore not underestimate its pervasive influence on the church, nor mistake its long-term consequences. The Bible's ability to accurately represent history is at the center of Christian doctrine, most particularly the doctrine of creation; it is this doctrine which sits at the foundation of all our theology.

This material is part of the 'Is Genesis History?' Bible Study. It includes 6 video segments and 6 in-depth chapters exploring Genesis in light of the entire Bible.

Thomas Purifoy, Jr.

Producer, Writer, and Director of "Is Genesis History?"