



EVOLUTION OR CREATION?

Paul Foutz, 8230 S. Laramie Avenue, Oak Lawn, Illinois 60459

GENESIS 1 AND 2 LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE?

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. IX, No. 12 – December, 1968, pp. 8, 9

We have been discussing for some months the controversial question CREATION OR EVOLUTION--WHICH? How did man come into being--by natural descent from, and common ancestry with, the lower animals through evolutionary processes or by the creation of Jehovah by Divine Fiat? I know of no subject or question that has as much bearing on this subject than the one which heads this article. Is Gen. 1 and 2 ('and other **related** Bible passages) figurative or are they literal? Do they describe actual events that took place--**HISTORICAL** events--or do they set forth figurative things and "spiritualized" symbols? Are all these matters simple allegories, parables, poems, myths? These, and other such terms, are used as descriptive of the narratives in Gen. 1 and 2.

I believe, if it would serve any purpose, I could mention and document **HUNDREDS** of Evolutionists who deny and reject the literal and historical nature of these two chapters and say they set forth, in various ways (such as those mentioned) symbols teaching spiritual lessons. In fact, I am unaware of any evolutionist that accepts these two passages as literal. Of course accepting them as literal and historical would prove no problem to them (even the "days" mentioned) except for the fact they have accepted a prior belief in the dogma of evolution from amoeba to man and they say such a process would involve hundreds of millions of years. They also accept the historical, geological, time-scale of the geologist, without question, which involves several billions of years although this "paper column", with its strata sequence, doesn't **really** exist (except on paper) but it has been foisted upon a great many people as "scientific" fact. (We will examine this matter thoroughly in the months to come). These evolutionists who reject the literal, historical Gen. 1 and 2 involve many religious people, many theologians, seminary professors, well know preachers like Fosdick, Pike, Peale, Abbott, etc. They are found in about all religious bodies, Roman

and Greek Catholics as well as "Protestant" denominations, even some who generally are considered more fundamental, such as the Baptists. (see Zimmerman's DARWIN, EVOLUTION AND CREATION, pages 42-47). Such "spiritualizing" of these two chapters will be found in the writings of ancient men like Augustine, later Brunner, Barth, Bultmann, Neibuhr; in a number of commentaries on Genesis; in metropolitan newspaper **Religious** Editors writings and their Science Editors accept it also. Many of these same men who refuses a "literal" application of Gen. 1 and 2 are the same ones who deny the LITERAL virgin birth, the LITERAL resurrection, the LITERAL miracles and the LITERAL VICARIOUS ATONEMENT.

As Miley says in his SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, "so ancient and remarkable a document could not escape a most searching criticism. A chief aim of such criticism has been to discredit its HISTORIC character. Thus it has been treated as a compilation of more ancient documents which contained the traditional notions of creation; as a poetic effusion; as a mythical or allegorical composition; as a philosophical speculation of a devout Hebrew upon the origin of the world. In such modes IT HAS BEEN ATTEMPTED TO DISCREDIT THE MOSAIC NARRATIVE OF CREATION." (My emphasis--P.F.) For instance, George Barclay says in The Early Chapters of Genesis, "These people about whom we read in the early chapters of Genesis are not people who ever had any real existence. They are not even legendary figures. --These people in the beginning of our Bible are purely mythical figures.--These early stories in Genesis are myths which have been turned into allegories for the purposes of religion." (p. 50, 54). So, the answer to the question heading our article is important. In Gen. 1 and 2 are we reading about and dealing with real, actual events, involving genuine people who were a part of historical events, or are they figurative symbols, spiritual lessons, myths, parables, poems or whet, AND **HOW CAN THIS BE DETERMINED?**

The interpretation of Gen. 1 and 2 **must** and **will be** determined by the HERMENEUTICAL approach which scholars employ in setting forth the meaning the writer intended to convey. There are certain rules by which the meaning of words shall be ascertained --the laws governing language, both literal and figurative. All writings must be either literal or figurative or a mixture of both. The Bible like most are of the latter kind. But the reader will admit that in human compositions there are fixed and necessary laws; that they are written in obedience to these laws and consequently that they must be interpreted by them. The Bible is written in human language--by human beings--for the instruction and benefit of human beings; therefore it **must** observe the laws of human language. So this is not only the nature of language in general; it follows also, and with even greater force, from the nature of the Bible in particular. It purports to be a REVELATION in human language; to have been written for the purpose of making known those things which are necessary to our enjoyment here and salvation hereafter. Now, unless it means what it says, **WHEN CONSTRUED AS HUMAN LANGUAGE REQUIRES TO BE CONSTRUED**, it is NOT A REVELATION! ALL IDEA OF REVELATION IN WORDS IS GIVEN UP AS IMPOSSIBLE, WHEN WE EXCLUDE SUCH

REVELATION FROM DEPENDANCE UPON THE LAWS OF WORDS. (see ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE by Lamar, pages 85-90). So if Gen. 1 and 2 cannot be interpreted LITERALLY there must be found a method of HERMENEUTICS circumventing the LITERAL approach.

Most any good book dealing with Guides or Rules for Bible Study will, in some degree, cover these rules and laws. We especially commend Dungan's HERMENEUTICS and Lamar's ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE and will later make some reference to these. The first quotes the great jurist Blackstone (pg. 87 fn), "To interpret law we must inquire after the will of the maker which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject-matter, the effects and consequences, or spirit and reason of the law. (1) Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known significance; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use... (2) if words happen still to be dubious we may establish their meaning from the context, etc.; of the same nature and use is the comparison of a law with laws that are made by the same legislator, that have some affinity with the subject, or that expressly relate to the same point."

Lamar says (p. 102) "Perhaps the best general rule that could be given in answer to this question (HOW CAN WE KNOW LANGUAGE IS "FIGURATIVE?" P.F.) is THAT IT IS TO BE DETERMINED JUST AS WE DETERMINE THE SAME THING IN ANY OTHER BOOK. (His emphasis-P.F.) Whatever rules and guides we have in ascertaining this matter in Homer or Plato, in Cicero or Virgil -- or Paradise Lost, -- the same will direct us in the Bible. In reading these works we have in our mind the definition of the various figures of speech employed in human language -- (all of which are in the Bible) -- and we observe the context, the subject matter, the scope or and all the circumstances of a given passage, in the light of these definitions, and SELDOM FIND LEAST DIFFICULTY IN DETERMINING WHEN A PASSAGE IS FIGURATIVE, OR WHAT PARTICULAR FIGURE IS EMPLOYED. THIS WE SHOULD THINK WOULD BE ALTOGETHER SUFFICIENT IN THE BIBLE.

(To be continued)

**GENESIS 1 AND 2–
LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE?
(No. 2)**

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. X, No. 1 – January, 1969, pp. 7, 8

Horne says (INTRODUCTION, Bk. ii, chap. 1, sec. 1, pages 371-378, 281-284, "The **literal** meaning of a word is to be given up if it is either improper, or involves an impossibility, or contains anything contrary to the doctrinal or moral precept delivered in other parts of scripture." Lamar affirms (p. 103) there is no instance of FIGURATIVE language that does not come under **SOME CLAUSE** of the following RULE and hence we can determine readily by it whether any given text is figurative or literal. "All scriptures are to be regarded as FIGURATIVE which are either declared to be such, or which the various attending circumstances show to be such, or which, when taken literally, contravene any general precept, or are contrary to evident reason and the nature of things." Taylor Lewis in THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION (p. 19) says, "We have no difficulty in detecting these styles- the mythical and the parabolical -- in the scriptures WHEREVER THEY MAY OCCUR. When we meet such a passage as this, 'The trees said to the bramble, Rule thou over us'--or--'Thou has brought a vine out of Egypt and planted it'--or 'My beloved had a vineyard in a very fruitful hill'--we have no trouble in determining its character." Zimmerman (Darwin, Evolution and Creation), after citing the quote of Lewis, adds, "The intelligent reader, whether he can read the original languages or not can recognize a myth and a parable and distinguish between prose and poetry, literal and figurative language." (p. 45). Your present scribe maintains the Bible contains matters that are HISTORICAL, POETICAL AND PROPHETICAL and it isn't very difficult for any **sincere** and **careful** student to ascertain **which is which**. Anyone can see the difference between the prose and historical record of Gen. 1 and 2 and the **Poetic** account of creation set forth in Psa. 104:5-9; 8; 19; and Job 38:8-11.

Zimmerman also says (p. 45), "NONE of the characteristics usually associated with **parables** can be found in the narratives in Genesis. W. W. Otey in his Origin and Destiny of Man discusses the "allegory" argument for Gen. 1 and 2 by stating, "the evolutionists (Theistic or Christian) says, 'The Bible is not a book on science'. No, but it is largely a book of **history**. And if the history is false, how can its moral teachings, that grow out of its history, be relied on?" (p. 127). Earlier Otey says, "It is sometimes said that the "history" in Genesis is an 'allegory'. We do not believe allegory; We believe historical facts. **Allegory is a figure to illustrate a historical fact**. If the supposed fact does **not** exist the allegory is meaningless -- it has no basis. If the "history" in Genesis is taken as an 'allegory', simply an illustration to reach a reality, then **what** is the reality that it teaches? **BY NO POSSIBLE TURN OF THE IMAGINATION CAN IT BE MADE TO FIT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION!!** It has to do with the origin of man on the earth. It is impossible to twist it so as to

describe the theory of evolution. Creation is the only theory advanced to explain the origin of man. The history of Genesis either records and explains the creation of man or it is entirely meaningless." (p. 122).

In the classic work of Joseph Angus (THE BIBLE HANDBOOK), written almost 100 years ago, we read, "The words of Scripture must be taken in their common meaning, unless such meaning is shown to be inconsistent with other words in the sentence, with the argument or context, or with other parts of Scripture--the meaning of a word will often be modified by the connection in which it is used. Interpret according to the context. **This rule is often of great THEOLOGICAL importance.** (pages 180, 186-187)." Further on Angus says (p. 406), "The word Genesis is from the LXX, in Greek, 'Origination.' The book is one of ORIGINS, and may be divided into two parts: I. OUTLINE OF PRIMAЕVAL HISTORY until the designation, in the call of Abraham of the Chosen Race, chapters 1-11." Dungan (mentioned earlier) gives the RULES by which the meaning of words shall be ascertained, "Rule 1" ALL WORDS ARE TO BE UNDERSTOOD IN THEIR **LITERAL SENSE, UNLESS THE EVIDENT MEANING OF THE CONTEXT FORBIDS.--Figures** are the EXCEPTION, literal language the RULE; hence we are not to regard anything as figurative until we feel **compelled** to do so by the evident import of the passage." (thirteen other Rules are given, pages 184-194.) On the next page (195) he begins a discussion of FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE and how we can know and recognize such as figurative? The sense of the **context** will indicate it -- when the literal meaning involves an impossibility if a literal interpretation will cause one passage to contradict another- when it is SAID to be figurative -- when the literal meaning demands actions that are wrong or forbids those that are good -- etc. Dungan then gives the RULES for the interpretation of figurative language. (for more detailed study read pages 195 to 225).

In Lamar's ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE we find a lot of the same type of material and arguments. "Thus the whole apparatus of verbal communication, however arbitrarily it may have been formed, is regulated by a principle as fixed and certain as anything else, viz: WORDS ARE TO BE UNDERSTOOD IN THEIR USUAL AND MOST OBVIOUS SIGNIFICATION--THAT WHICH MEN HAVE AGREED TO GIVE THEM--AND WHICH AGREEMENT IS INDICATED BY CUSTOM--EXCEPT WHERE CIRCUMSTANCES NECESSITATE A CHANGE, IN WHICH CASE THE AMOUNT AND KIND OF CHANGE IS TO BE MEASURED AND DETERMINED BY THE CIRCUMSTANCES. (p. 87-88)." Beginning on page 276, under THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WORDS, the writer lays down two axioms and then he says (p. 283), "upon these two foundations we now place two general principles or laws for the interpretation of words, which, it is believed, WILL COVER THE WHOLE SUBJECT AND SCIENCE OF HERMENEUTICS, SO FAR AS THE PRIMARY INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING OF WORDS IS CONCERNED." Lamar has two rules under his FIRST GENERAL PRINCIPLE and five rules under his SECOND GENERAL PRINCIPLES. Without going into detail we suggest he gives, with great thor-

oughness, the rules or points we have mentioned and others to which I did not refer. He says, "IN DETERMINING THE MEANING OF A WORD IN ANY GIVEN CASE, THE PRESUMPTION IS ALWAYS IN FAVOR OF ITS PRIMARY OR GENERAL USE. This is to be taken for granted UNLESS THERE EXISTS POSITIVE PROOF TO THE CONTRARY". (Lamar makes this good point for us to keep in mind, "throw the burden of proof upon the opposite side-- make them show why the normal, ordinary, meaning **COULD NOT AND SHOULD NOT BE USED**"). He continues, "No change or modification should be made in the primary sense, in any given case, except what is proved to be necessary by the circumstances of the case.- The general meaning of a word must be modified to the extent obviously REQUIRED by the context--the primary meaning of a word must yield to the NATURAL DEMANDS of the subject matter (context) -- the general meaning of a word must be modified to the extent required by the scope or design of the passage in which it occurs." (see pages 85, 87-90; 102-104, 276 to 312, -- Lamar's ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE). A brief but good work on this important theme, is HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE, by Way. mon Miller, Pages 27 to 34.

(To be concluded)

GENESIS 1 AND 2 LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE? (No. 3)

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. X, No. 2 – February 1969, pp. 8, 9

In the long battle between the forces of the Creationist and Evolutionist much has depended upon the answer to this question. Does the first two chapters of the Bible set forth literal language involving actual events, or are its words and terms used figuratively? Are we to "spiritualize" its language and say it is a "poem," "parable," "allegory," or "myth"? As mentioned in a previous article we are willing to apply the same rules, relative to the law of language involving interpretation and hermeneutics, to this literature and language as we would to ANY literature. (Read the previous two articles which give some of these laws or rules by which we can determine whether language is literal or figurative).

I know that if Gen. 1 and 2 are "figurative" they do not speak of actual events that transpired--they do not relate to HISTORICAL matters. Adam and Eve are "mythical"--no such people ever existed and yet, THE GENEALOGIES OF BOTH GEN. 5 AND 11 MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE EARLIER CHAPTERS OF GENESIS **ARE** HISTORY! Adam and Eve were real people and a part of a historical record of human beings. Was Enoch a REAL person? What about Noah or Abraham? **Adam** is found along with these men. Were David, Jacob and Ruth actual Old Testament beings (Matt. 1; Luke 3)? Most all would agree that they were HISTORICAL persons. But in Luke 3 we read not only of Abraham, Jacob and Enoch but "Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of ADAM. which was the son of God" (vs. 38). NOW, HOW CAN WE HAVE A "CHAIN" OF GENEALOGY, INVOLVING HISTORICAL, HUMAN, BEINGS WHEN THE FIRST "LINK" IS MISSING, BECAUSE IT IS A "MYTH"?

As we said in an article several months ago, trying to circumvent Gen. 1 and 2 by denying that it is literal does not really help the infidel and evolutionist, for God has so fixed the Bible that it stands or falls together. Not only do we encounter the Adam of Gen. 1 and 2 in Luke 3 but numbers of other passages refer to both Adam and Eve. II Cor. 11:3 mentions how Eve was led into sin. In I Tim. 2:13-14 Paul says, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Jude (vs. 14) refers to Enoch (mentioned above) and said he was the seventh from Adam. But we believe the strongest argument that Adam really was a person is to be found in Rom. 5:12-19 and I Cor. 15:21-22, 45-47 where there is a vivid contrast between what happened to a man named Adam and later with Jesus Christ. We have a contrast between the result of Adam's act and later what came about due to what Christ did. We have set forth the first Adam and the second Adam. We have the type and ante-type, the shadow and substance, which is all rather meaningless if there were no first Adam, a real, human, being. Let us quote

from these two contexts of scripture, "Wherefore, as by **ONE MAN** sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from **ADAM** to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of ADAM'S transgression, **WHO IS THE FIGURE OF HIM THAT WAS TO COME**. But not as the **offense** so also is the gift. For if through the **offense** of **one** many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, **WHICH IS BY ONE MAN, JESUS CHRIST**, hath abounded unto many.- For if by **ONE MAN'S OFFENSE** death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by **one, Jesus Christ**. Therefore as by the **offense** of **one**, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of **one** the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by **ONE MAN'S DISOBEDIENCE** many were made sinners; so by the **OBEDIENCE OF ONE SHALL MANY BE MADE RIGHT-EOUS**" (Rom. 5:12-19).

In another passage which relates in part to the same thing, we read, "For since **by man** came death, by **man** came also the resurrection of the dead. For as **IN ADAM** we all die, even so in **CHRIST** shall all be made alive.- And so it is written, the **FIRST MAN ADAM** was made a living soul; the **last Adam** was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The **FIRST MAN** is of the earth, earthy: the **SECOND MAN IS THE LORD FROM HEAVEN**" (I Cor. 15:21-22; 45-47). Now as a result of the ACT and SIN of the first man, ADAM, sin and death came into the world. As a result of what the first man did ALL MEN DIE PHYSICALLY. None can escape it. It is an appointment all men must meet. But from the **second man** came a certainty of the resurrection and just as surely as we die, because of what the **first Adam did**, we can be assured ALL will be raised by what the **last Adam did**. So Christ nullified or counter-acted what the first Adam did. (Of course I acknowledge Jesus Christ did "much more" (Rom. 5:15, 17) than set aside the certainty of and hopelessness in physical death by assuring men that there will be a resurrection and by His resurrection immortality is assured. He made salvation and forgiveness possible for all men because of their **OWN** individual sins, over and above the **effects** they all share due to Adam's transgression. But, the "much more" is not the point of discussion and argument in this article). I am interested in the meaning and argument of Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15 (cited above) IF NO SUCH PERSON EVER LIVED AS ADAM? IF JESUS CHRIST, THE SECOND ADAM, REALLY LIVED, HOW COULD ADAM BE A "MYTH" OR A "LEGENDARY" FIGURE? What did the second Adam cancel out, offset, counteract (or any such term one would use) IF THERE WERE NO FIRST ADAM? IF NO SUCH PERSON LIVED AND NO SUCH EVENT TOOK PLACE AS HIS "OFFENSE TRANSGRESSION" AND "DISOBEDIENCE"? We maintain the entire context and CONTRAST is meaningless and absurd if THERE WAS NO FIRST ADAM?--NO FIRST MAN?--IF THERE WAS NOTHING DONE? NO ACT OF OFFENSE OR TRANSGRESSION? IF THERE WAS NO SUCH ACT THERE COULD BE NO **PENALTY** FOR SUCH

AND HENCE NOTHING FOR THE SECOND ADAM TO COUNTERACT OR RECTIFY!

Let the Evolutionary fraternity tell us the meaning and argument of the inspired Paul in these two passages. Let the theologians, who tell us what a beautiful parable, poem and myth Gen. 1 and 2 are, enlighten us relative to this contrast. As stated in our last article the burden of proof RESTS WITH THEM. I accept the language and words in Gen. 1 and 2 in their ordinary and normal meaning and usage. This is the RULE in the law of language. Let them show us WHY these chapters and their words are EXCEPTIONS -- why they **cannot** be accepted in the literal way but **demand** that they be used in the figurative sense. I insist, if Gen. 1 and 2 are NOT literal and historical, there was no Adam and Eve! But what about the garden of Eden? the serpent? Satan-- the devil? the temptation? (II Cor. 11:3) the sin or offense? the disobedience and transgression? the penalty? the curse? a Savior or the need of a Savior and a remedy for Sin. **IF NO ONE SINNED? WHERE DOES THE "FIGURATIVE" END AND THE "LITERAL" AND "HISTORICAL" BEGIN? HOW DO YOU KNOW? BY WHAT LAW OR RULE DO YOU DETERMINE SUCH?**

– Paul Foutz

(Next month we will deal with a SPECIFIC example involving either **Figurative** or **Literal** language as we discuss the "DAYS" of CREATION. Was each day a "literal" day or was it an age or eon -- a period of tens and hundreds of thousands of years?)

THE "DAYS" OF CREATION (GEN. 1 AND 2)

—LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE? (No. 1)

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. X, No. 3 – March 1969 – page 12

The past few issues have been devoted to a discussion of the language of Genesis 1 and 2 and whether or not the various words and phrases shall be considered as literal or figurative. We suggest that all readers go back and review these articles and reread the rules of interpretation and laws of hermeneutics that enable us to determine how we distinguish between that which is figurative and that which is literal. **THESE SAME RULES MUST APPLY AS WE DETERMINE THE MEANING OF THE TERM "DAY" IN GENESIS 1 AND 2 AS IT REFERS TO THE CREATIVE ACTIVITY OF GOD** Were each of these "days" what we ordinarily think of when we hear the word used? Shall we regard them as 24 hour days or were they great ages, with each "day" an eon covering an immense period of time as all evolutionists regard them?

To the Bible believer, "age" is no problem. Twenty-four hours is ample "time" to do everything which was done on each "day" since **GOD AND DIVINE POWER WAS IN OPERATION**. But "time" is very important to the evolutionist and his "faith" for he reckons without Divine power (supernaturalism) and with his "theory" of natural processes he **MUST HAVE** a long span of time if his "theory" is true. We "believe" that God "created" the universe, the earth, life and finally man within the **CYCLE** of six days, involving evening and morning, darkness and light and Night and Day. This was adequate "time" for all the things enumerated to be brought into being. What the evolutionist needs is not "time" but **POWER**. He doesn't have the power adequate to all the effects we see if he were given 100 **BILLION** years. The Bible believer has the **POWER** and the "time," **ADEQUATE** to **EVERY EFFECT**, is **LONG ENOUGH** to accomplish all Gen. 1 says was done.

In Genesis we have a record of the **ORIGIN** of the universe and life, including man. It is written in normal, easy-to-be-understood words, the vehicle to convey God's thoughts and His record to man of "The Beginning." The language is **NOT** ambiguous. It is simple and concise. We are told that in six days God made the heavens, earth, sea and all that in them is. We are told that each day had its evening and morning. We are also told what God did **WITHIN** each creation day. We are told of God's purpose in creating the sun

and the moon AND THE FUNCTIONS EACH WAS TO PERFORM. They were to divide the day from the night; they were to be for signs and seasons and for days and years. The greater light was to rule the Day, the lesser light was to rule the Night, and they were to divide the light from the darkness. So, as specifically mentioned in Gen. 1:4-5, all six of these contrasting terms are used (evening, morning with darkness and light, each called night and day). WE ACTUALLY BELIEVE THE CONTEXT OF GENESIS 1 CALLS NOT PRIMARILY FOR INTERPRETATION; IT CALLS FOR SIMPLE FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE. It is too clear to be misunderstood.

When the sound and basic principles of hermeneutics are applied any "objective" person can see what is involved in the context. To make the Hebrew word "yom" (Day) mean millions of years, ages or eons has no more grammatical justification, as applied to the creation account in Genesis 1, than it does in Gen. 7:17,24, and many similar passages. We still must adhere to the rules and laws laid down (see previous studies), the literal is the "rule"; the figurative is the "exception." Words are to be taken in their ordinary, normal, meaning unless the CONTEXT demands otherwise or would be contrary to the narrative. We must take "day" in this ordinary way in Genesis 1, unless the context determines it to be otherwise. I am told by scholars who should know that in the 5 books of Moses "yom" (day) is found 396 times (14 times in Genesis 1) yet "those who hold to the day-age theory ask us to give to the word 'day' a meaning (i.e. an indefinite period of time such as age— P.F.) it NOWHERE has in the entire five books" (C.R.S. Annual 1965, pp 8-9). Leopold, a noted Hebrew scholar, in his Genesis, Vol. 1, says, "There ought to be no need of refuting the idea that "yom" means period. Reputable dictionaries like Buhl, B D E or KW know nothing of this notion. Hebrew dictionaries are our primary source of reliable information concerning Hebrew words. Commentaries with critical leanings utter statements that very decided in this instance" (CRS Annual, cited above— several are mentioned. P.F.).

Now "day" means in Gen. 1 and 2 just what we commonly regard it as meaning. There are two exceptions. In Gen. 1:5 the context shows it does NOT carry the ordinary accepted usage, for it is set over against, and contrasted with, the term Night. So Day and Night, IN **THIS CONTEXT ONLY**, means that portion of the entire 24 hour cycle wherein part involved Light and part Darkness. The only other exception in Gen. 1 and 2 is in Gen. 2:4 where **context** sums up God's activity and qualifies "day" by the definite length of time involved in the "creative" **week** of six normal, regular days. If "day" in Gen. 1 and 2, apart from these two exceptions, QUALIFIED BY CONTEXT, doesn't mean an ordinary "day" what does the term mean in 1:14 15 (mentioned previously) where the sun and moon were to regulate and "be

for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years? If not ordinary days what were they and how about the "seasons" and "years"? Delitzsch well says (Vol. 1 The Pentateuch, pg. 51), "If the days of creation are regulated by the recurring interchange of "light" and "darkness" they must be regarded NOT as periods of time of incalculable duration of years or thousands of years, but as simple earthly days."

(To be concluded)

THE "DAYS" OF CREATION (GEN. 1 AND 2)

—LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE? (No. 2)

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. X, No. 4 – April, 1969 – pp. 6, 7

As mentioned in the last issue, and according to sound rules of hermeneutics, the term "days" in Gen. 1 (as in all literature) is to be accepted in its normal, ordinary meaning, unless the context rules against it or determines otherwise. This is true of all 14 times "day" is used in Gen. 1, EXCEPT vs. 4 and 5 where it is used in contrast with "night" and hence refers to the light part of the 24 hour cycle while night refers to the dark portion. In Gen. 2:4 "Day" refers to a SPECIFIC period of time, for the CONTEXT shows it denotes the entire period of creative activity prior to the time when God rested as He ENDED such CREATIVE work. A parallel context where the normal usage for "day" is found is Num. 7:1-2, 10, 12, 18, 24, but verse 84, referring to this very same period of time, uses "day" in this EXCEPTIONAL sense. But in ALL OTHER PASSAGES IN Gen. 1 and 2 "Day" must be accepted in the normal, ordinary sense just as we would in Gen. 7-10-12, 17, 24 or Gen. 8:3-5, 12-14.

There are times when "day" is used in a figurative (exceptional) way but, again context will show this by the use of qualifying words or phrases. It could involve a time of judgment or of grace. Examples of such usage are, "the Day of Salvation," "the Day of the Lord," "the Day of visitation." But in Gen. 1 and 2 there are NO qualifying words or phrases (save the exceptions cited) and the recurring interchange of Day and Night, Evening and Morning, Light and Darkness, should cause anyone to see that a 24 hour day is involved. We also noted that the sun and moon were to so function as to make possible seasons, days and years and everyone should know what this means and what these two heavenly bodies do (Gen. 1:14-15). But vs. 16 also tells us the sun was to "rule the day" and the moon was to "rule the night." Now, if these two actions do not make one 24 hour day what do these expressions mean? an age? an eon? multiplied millions of years? Did the sun hold sway, shining in all its power and brilliance, for a million years and then the moon take over for a similar million years? How can we make the light and darkness of Day and Night anything but what we see in operation today— the complete cycle of one day? (see material in CRS Annual 1965, pp 7-13, also Bible-Science Newsletters, June 1966 and Jan. 1966. These various articles have all been put in booklet

form).

We also note that the "days," we have under consideration in Gen. 1, follow one another consecutively and are NUMBERED ONE THROUGH SIX. Authorities know of no instance where "day," associated with a numeral, means anything but an ordinary day. How can the 14th or 15th. day of Nisan involve an age or eon? Where does the first or seventh "day" of the week mean millions or billions of years? Arthur C. Custance at one time sent a letter to nine contemporary Hebrew scholars, members of the faculties of the leading universities, three each in England, Canada and the United States. He asked them questions about the meaning of the Hebrew word "yom" (day) in Genesis I. He asked them if "yore," when accompanied by a numeral, could be properly translated as (a) a day commonly understood, (b) an age, (c) an age or day without preference for either? ALL who replied (seven of the nine) stated that it means "a day commonly understood." Constance, *Between The Lines: An Analysis of Genesis 1:1-2*, Doorway Papers No. 11, p. 36.

The interpretation. of "yom" as a solar day is the interpretation which other scriptures indicate. In Exod. 20:8-11, the Sabbath is instituted and the passage states that because God worked six days and ceased his CREATIVE ACTIVITY on the seventh they are to work six days and rest the seventh day. The week (SIX DAYS) of creation is tied to Israel's six work days prior to a day of rest. Days are directly related to days. After God told His people to remember and keep the sabbath Day he said, "six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seven day is the sabbath of the Lord – FOR, in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea and all that in them is and rested the seventh day, WHEREFORE the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." (My emphasis, which shows one is "tied" to the other—P.F.) Now in this section of scripture we find the words "day" or "days" six different times. By what kind of interpretation twisting and torturing and hermeneutical acrobatics can we make four of these actual, ordinary "days" and the other two figurative indefinite periods of time such as ages or eons?

The Sabbath command can be adequately understood ONLY when the days of the week are considered as solar days. Six days of 24 hours each followed by another such period when God rested since he had CEASED from all such creative activity — this alone can furnish a CONSISTENT ANALOGY for the command given to Israel to work six days and then rest on the seventh. So the words and terms in Gen. 1 and 2 are very simple and ordinary. The "days" are associated with a numeral and each day's cycle is tied together by evening and morning with its darkness and light so we must conclude with Delitzsch that they MUST BE REGARDED NOT AS PERIODS OF TIME,

INVOLVING THOUSANDS AND MILLIONS OF YEARS, BUT AS
ORDINARY, SIMPLE EARTHLY DAYS.

(To be concluded)

THE "DAYS" OF CREATION (GEN. 1 AND 2)

– LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE? (NO. 3)

Paul Foutz

Searching The Scriptures

Vol. X, No. 5 – May, 1969 – page 5

In the two previous articles we have stressed the well known rule and law of hermeneutics and insisted that "day", in Gen. 1 and 2, must be accepted in its ordinary, normal usage, unless something in the context shows it must mean something else. We have shown that the "days" were tied together and identified by evening and morning", with its "darkness and light. These were Hebrew expressions denoting "solar" days. Note for example Dan. 8:14 where the ASV mentions 2300 EVENINGS AND MORNINGS while in the A.V. notice the footnote on the word "days." All "days" in Gen. 1 and 2, just as in Gen. 7 and 8, must be regarded in this normal sense. Only 2 passages show plainly by the context something else is meant and the context sets forth that meaning. These are Gen. 1:4-5 and 2:4, discussed in the two previous articles. Each creation day is associated with a numeral (one through six) and this is never done, scholars say, unless an ordinary day is meant. Then, God's "work" of creative activity is made the basis for, and definitely tied to, Israel's six days of "work" followed by a day of "rest" they (like God) ceased from their labors. (Exod. 20:8-11).

In this paper we want to conclude this specific study by considering three other arguments to show the "days" of Creation were "days" as we know them, and **COULD NOT HAVE BEEN AGES OF MILLIONS OF YEARS EACH.** (1) On the third day God **CREATED** the vegetable kingdom (Gen. 1:10-13)-grass, herbs, fruit trees. But we all know this realm needs sunlight or sunshine (the experience a few years ago with the natural grass in Houston's Astrodome proved that) but, according to the evolutionist's "theory", the next "**age**" or "**eon**" the lights were set in the firmament of heaven to **GIVE LIGHT ON THE EARTH** (Gen. 1:14-15) and the sun was set in the heaven to rule the day and **TO GIVE LIGHT UPON THE EARTH** (vs. 16-17). This all happened on the **FOURTH** day (vs. 19). How did the grass and plant world survive this age of millions of years with **NO LIGHT** being shed on the earth? We have already asked, based on Gen. 1: 15-16, how could the plant world survive ½ an age or eon while it was dark and then ½ an age while it was light? Both of these activities made up the cycle of each one of the Genesis days Half of it was darkness. Half of "an "eon" had no light, if this day-age theory is true! Before proceeding to the next point and because of the problem some pose and

the quibble they make, "there couldn't be a CYCLE, or earth revolution and a solar day before the 4th day when the sun and moon were set to regulate such". It would be well to always remember that should we grant this (although DIVINE POWER COULD CAUSE AND COULD **REGULATE** ANYTHING AS HE SAW FIT UNTIL "NATURAL LAW", BY HIS POWER, WAS INITIATED), IF THE 4TH, 5TH AND 6TH WERE DAYS OF ORDINARY LENGTH THEN THERE IS **NO ROOM FOR EVOLUTION** SINCE ALL ANIMALS AND MAN WERE CREATED ON THE 5TH AND 6TH DAYS! Since the theory of evolution is the **ONLY REASON**, that the first three days were infinitely long periods such as ages. Moreover ALL of the 6 days were described in the same way and tied together just the same. And if the first 3 days were "ages", while the last four were regulated by the sun and were "solar" days we are still faced with the problem considered under No. (I).

(2) Plants, as noted, were all created on the 3rd day, while the animal creation was created the 5th and 6th. This includes insects, birds, etc. So here we have TWO "AGES", from the time all plant life came into being, **before** ANY of the animal world was created. But, for several reasons, admitted by all, plant life can not live or survive without the animal world. We are told in God's "law" of checks and balances how insects and birds destroy certain things to make possible the survival of the plants and trees. We also know how some plants reproduce by the work and assistance of the animal world. They could not continue to live without such and **COULDN'T SURVIVE A SHORT SPAN OF TIME, MUCH LESS 2 "AGES" OF MILLIONS OF YEARS EACH**. It is interesting to read how the pollination of a flower takes place, and how the flower is fertilized by pollen being **PLACED** on the stigma to produce the sperm cells necessary to fertilize the cells in the ovary. Now no other **PLANT** did this "PLACING"—the plants depended upon the "birds and bees", of the animal realm, to do this and **NO PLANTS**, depending on this method, could have survived and would exist today had it been necessary to wait through long ages (**FAR BEYOND THEIR LIFE EXPECTANCY**) for the animal world to appear.

(3) Adam, the first spirit-endowed creature, came into being on the 6th day (1:31). This was the crowning work of God's creation and according to the narrative he was the last created. So, consider this action as **LATE** on the 6th day as you desire, he **WAS** created on the 6th day. He lived throughout the 7th day (and there is no rule to make this day anything but exactly the same as were the other 6 days. Israel's rest was made as an analogy to it (Exod. 20) where "day" is put for "day" in all of the seven. But Adam lived far beyond that 7th day. He had a full life for 930 years (Gen. 5:5). How did Adam live

through the 7th day, if it were an age of millions of years and yet live to be only 930 years of age?

(Note: We may later discuss other things relating to Gen. 1 and 2 (chaos—gap—reconstruction view, Creation Day — Revelatory view, "Two conflicting accounts of creation"?) but next month we shall begin, and continue for a good many months, the seven basic arguments used to prove Evolution. We shall examine them and deal with them thoroughly. P.F.)