IV.1. Lambs to Rams: Creation Week: Days or Ages

If God could (not debating the fact since He actually did) create Adam on day six in his adult form, give him fruit trees to eat from in their adult forms and command all His creation to be fruitful and multiply, which cannot be done in infant form, then why couldn't He have created the mountains and other physical things in their adult form? What a feat it was to create anything to begin with by just speaking things into existence. I mean, who else could do that? (Read: Gen 1:3: 2 Pet 3:5-7)

Evolutionists and agnostics often cite the age of the earth and cosmos as being millions or even billions of years old; which depends on the source of information since none have come up with an exact system that all can agree on. They remark that the Genesis account of our existence can't possibly be true because of such ideologies; unless of course you can embrace either the day-age or 'gap' theories. Concerning measuring things based on when they appeared in the scheme of time, carbon and other radiometric dating methods are often cited by atheists and agnostics as being dependable, but according to Michael G. Houts, PhD.*, these methods are totally based on assumption.

"Because all dating methods ultimately rely on assumptions that cannot be empirically proven, the battle is no longer a scientific one (where the atheist or agnostic would lose), but a battle to convince individuals (and society) to accept atheistic assumptions without question".*

*PhD. Nuclear Engineering from MIT; Nuclear Research Manager, NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center

"Assumptions and the Age of the Earth"; Apologetics Press © 2015; apologeticspress.org

Some take the creation account literally, some as an allegory, while others figuratively as if some fairy tale. Numerous believers in the Genesis version are intimidated by the atheistic "pseudo-science" community toward accepting their beliefs that only the ignorant and fools will take at face value the creation account as presented in the Bible. They often take a middle of the road view while attempting to satisfy both sides of the issue, not wanting to appear ignorant, and in many circles, as an attempt to appear even more intelligent. Either way, it displays a lack of humility by ultimately not accepting God at His word.

1Co 3:18 Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. 19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. 20 And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, **that they are vain** (Gk.3152-empty)." (Emp. added)

But true science actually proves the Genesis account (see II.1-Evidences of the Bible's Accuracy- Through Science) and it would take a great leap of faith to believe all assumptions stating otherwise. Sadly, in order to not appear as ignorant and to appease this so called intellectual group, many weaker Christians have resigned to the teachings of a day-age or 'gap' theory as if proven to be 'fact'. The fact that evolution has been taught, without real opposition in public schools from elementary up, it has been thus accepted as true. Among a group of 'theistic evolutionists' are the likes of John Clayton, a former atheist, as well as others in or out of the church, who seem to think very highly of their own level of intelligence.

Gal 6:3 For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.

2Pe 2:1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be **false teachers among you**, who **privily** shall bring in **damnable heresies**, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. 2 And **many shall follow their pernicious ways**; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of 3 And **through covetousness** shall they **with feigned words** make

merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not. (Emp. added)

And not that what's written here should be taken at face value either. We all need to be more like the Bereans (Act 17:11) in personally discovering the truth without relying on others to have it fed to us. Whatever happened to "the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor 11:3)? By passing off such wild theories to the likes of the common folk it would seem these self-proclaimed experts "by good words and fair speeches [are truing to] deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom 16:18). But to what end? "To be seen of men" (Mat 6:5; 23:5)? If so, they've received their reward on earth because it doesn't exist in Heaven. (Now that may seem harsh but of all people in the New Testament, Jesus warned more people of Hell than all others out of His love for His creation. Why wouldn't we want to emulate that love by speaking the truth?)

Day/Age Theory

Theory (definition): 3. idea formed by speculation; an idea of or belief about something arrived at through conjecture hypothetical or 4. **circumstances**; a set of circumstances or principles that is hypothetical scientific principle 5. phenomena; a set of facts, propositions, or principles analyzed in their relation to one another and used, especially in science, to explain a phenomena >in theoryunder hypothetical or ideal circumstances but **perhaps not in reality.** (Emp. included- definitions 1 and 2 don't fit the context of the discussion here)

Encarta Dictionary

So, according to the definition of 'theory', any thought teaching or belief that doesn't explain the Genesis account from its original perspective is implying conjecture (speculation) and hypothetical (assumption) having no solid facts as its foundation, and may or may not be based in reality. It is quite the leap to assume a 24 hour period is actually a geologic period associated with eons.

Gen 1:5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day (*Heb.3117*).

Heb.3117- yom- From an unused root meaning to *be hot*; a *day* (as the *warm* hours), whether literally (from sunrise to sunset, or **from one sunset to the next**), or figuratively (a space of time **defined by an associated term**), (often used adverbially) (*Emp. added*)

Day

Moses emphasized a complete day by giving the parameter in terms of "evening" and "morning". Isn't 'day' here "a space of time defined by an associated term"? Plain and simple, six 24 hour days (from sunset to sunset) is all God used and without needing a complicated theory to supposedly explain what He 'actually' meant. After all, "God is not a God of confusion" (1 Cor 14:33). These "ravening wolves" in "sheep's clothing" (Mat 7:15) for some reason feel the Genesis account is too simple to be taken literally and only want to complicate it in order for the common folk to rely on them to make sense of it. If God would have wanted to He could have created everything in 6 minutes and ceased during the seventh minute. There are some good reasons He took the full six days to create while resting on the seventh which we will deal with shortly. And not that God needed to rest either. He was finished creating "everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good" (Gen 1:31). After seeing His work complete in every sense He stopped creating.

Rest- Heb.7673- to repose, that is, desist from exertion.

If the days were actually ages, how could plant life (created on day three) survive eons of darkness (evenings) without the photosynthesis required for survival from sunlight, or without the insects (created after day four) for pollination? Were these ages all sunlit? Did God employ ages in order for Adam to evolve from an ape or some other lower life form or just create him on day six as recorded in Genesis 1? The fact that He can create anything, again, states that He could do so as He saw fit without any input from His creation. How vain can man get?

How do we reconcile other passages of scripture that use "vom" as a 24 hour period from sunset to sunset? Did it rain for "40 eons" in Gen 7? Did Methuselah live 353,685 eons before he died (Gen 5:27)? If such were the case then when did eons morph into the 24 hour days that we know them today?

Discussing this with atheists or agnostics can be futile. Often a response you'll get is that the Bible can't be trusted because it was written by man, or "some or most of it came from God" to which the question begs "what part came from God and who decides"?

Confusion exists if "yom" cannot be accepted as a 24 hour period, whether in or out of scripture. History, science, age of the earth and so many other issues depend on this simple fact. If days in the Bible are not literally days then how do we account for months or years? Interpretation must be based on context.

IV.1. Questions

- 1. On what day did God create man? a) one; b) seven; c) six.
- 2. What do all dating methods rely on? A) fact; b) science; c) assumption.
- 3. What actually proves the Genesis account? a) theory; b) true science; c) assumption.
- 4. What is being taught in public schools without any real opposition concerning the origin of our existence? a) evolution; b) creation; c) science.
- 5. Any idea that doesn't explain the Genesis account from its original perspective is what? a) fact; b) theory; c) calculation.
- 6. The terms "evening" and "morning" describe what? a) one day; b) two days; c) one eon.
- 7. What does it mean that God "rested"? a) He took a nap; b) He stopped creating; c) He was tired.
- 8. What two things are necessary for plants to survive? a) water and minerals; b) fertilizer and oxygen; c) photosynthesis and pollination.