

Literal 24 Days in Creation?

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 08 September 2010

Preacher: Don Coleman

[0:00] The Day-Age Theory That is, other than the view that they were 24-hour days.

But the Day-Age Theory, and I think I printed this for you, the six days of creation represent geological ages. That's basically the view. That we're not talking about literal 24-hour days, but rather day one, day two, day three, that they are geological ages, possibly, or they just simply represent, in a figurative sense, long periods of time, rather than literal 24-hour days.

The second theory is the Day of Decree. Not degree, but decree. D-E-C-R-E-E. The Day of Decree Theory.

You might not have heard of this one, but the idea here is that God issued His decrees of creation. That's what you have recorded here in Genesis 1, that it's not the actual creation, but God's decrees that He's going to create all these things.

Alright? And again, the decrees pertain to six consecutive geologic ages. Alright, that's the second theory.

[1:45] Third, the Day of Revelation. There's not a lot of difference between this view and number two. The Day of Revelation Theory. God simply revealed, rather than perform, the creation of all things in six literal days.

So it's just simply a revelation of what He's going to do, and not the actual performance of it. The actual performance of creation took place over thousands and thousands of years, according to this theory.

And then the fourth one, which is radically different from the other three, because the first three, obviously, those first three views support the same basic conclusion, don't they?

That the creation of all things occurred over long periods of time. But this fourth one is substantially different, and some would say radically different, and I guess that would be true enough, radically different, and that is the six literal 24-hour days of theory.

That's a mouthful, that's not always necessarily articulated in those terms, but that's just the way I put it down. So, all right, the six literal 24-hour days theory.

[2:54] All right? And that is to say that the creation of all things took place in six days and 24 hours in length, as if you needed an explanation for what that meant.

All right, and obviously, and this is kind of the way I present, I introduced our study tonight. This view, this fourth view, obviously represents a literal interpretation of Genesis chapter one.

All right? Objections to the literal interpretation of the days of creation in Genesis one. First one would be objections from science.

From science. As a matter of fact, I would say to you that those who hold any view that whose conclusion is that the days are not literal but rather figurative of long periods of time usually come to that conclusion not based upon the Bible but based upon science.

Generally so. Or things that they observe. You know, whether they have come to the conclusion emotionally or rationally, you know, they just look, well, see, just look at this.

[4:11] There's no way that all this could have just come about in six days, you know. So, generally that's the case. All right, so, I list this one first then. There is an objection from scripture.

We'll get to that in a minute. But the objection from science really comes first. And the argument is, of course, the literal view contradicts the general accepted assumptions of science.

The generally accepted assumptions of science. And isn't that true? Because, you know, what Christians have tried to do and that is those Christians who hold the view that the days represent long periods of time, what Christians have tried to do is reconcile the Bible with science.

But they've made a fatal mistake of relying more on science than on scripture. And really, they're not trying to reconcile science to the Bible. They're really trying to reconcile the Bible with science.

You know. So, the only way to do that is to bend the Bible to fit science. You know. Because, you know, after all, we don't want to be looked upon as dumb, idiot, Christian.

[5:26] You know, dumb, uneducated Christians Christians who don't know anything. And so, we don't want to be thought of as stupid in that way. And so, we've got to put the two together. We've got to somehow reconcile the two together.

And so, since the literal view is an absolute contradiction to the generally accepted assumptions of science, then we must come up with another view. There must be another explanation.

All right. So, there are two basic assumptions that they attempt to reconcile with scripture. And this is, these are no brainers. I mean, you could come up with these yourself.

The first one is that the earth is billions of years old. All right. That really is the basic assumption of science, a generally accepted assumption or conclusion of science that the earth is billions of years old.

In fact, the current consensus is that the earth is 4.54 billion years old. Although, there are many different views about them. and range anywhere from, I think, early in the 1800s, range from the first suggestion was that it might be as old as 75,000 years.

[6:42] Then it moved to 100 and up to a million and pretty soon 100 million. And it's kind of been going up over the years, but I think the latest conclusion is 4.54 billion.

All right. I don't know where they come up with an odd number like that. But they're scientists and they know what they're doing. You know. All right. That was tongue-in-cheek. I think it's really more pseudoscience.

Anyway. All right. Now, number one under A, a literal interpretation, and this is important that we get this, a literal interpretation of Genesis 1 would require a relatively young earth or a young earth. I don't think I have the word relatively on your notes. So there's the problem. See, we can't reconcile the Bible, we can't take a literal view and at the same time reconcile it with science because the literal view absolutely requires that the earth be young and not old.

And you say, why? Well, if one takes the literal view of the days of creation, that day one, day two, that those are 24-hour periods of time, then the age of the earth can easily be estimated by taking the five days or six days or the five days of creation of all things up to Adam and the sixth day would be the creation of Adam.

[8:13] You take those days then following the genealogies provided for us in Scripture from Adam to Abraham in Genesis 5 and also in Genesis chapter 11, then adding in the time from Abraham to the present day, then it's an easy thing.

See, Abraham was created on day, I mean, Adam was created on day six, right? Alright, day six, so there were five days before him and then the sixth one counting the day he was created and then if you add up the dates from Adam to Abraham you get about 2,000 years approximately.

There may be some gaps in the genealogies but we're not talking about billions of years of gaps but the best estimate is 2,000 years. Most scholars also, both Christian and secular by the way, agree that Abraham lived about 2,000 B.C.

or approximately 4,000 years ago. So just do the math, six days, that's the creation of the universe including earth and everything, in it, everything, even the universe, plus 2,000 years from the creation of Adam to Abraham, plus 4,000 years Abraham to the present time and so what did he come up with?

Give or take a few days or years, 6,000 years. He said, oh come on, are you trying to suggest that this planet is only 6,000 years old?

[9:49] Yes I am. Yes I am. If you take a literal view of Genesis 1, you have no other choice but to accept that truth. Now you can do one of, two other things.

You can take the days of creation and say that they represent long periods of time and then you can come up with millions or billions of years but as we're going to see, that view is problematic and we'll get to that in a minute or you can do like some have and that is see a gap between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 and since that was not the question I'm not going to deal with that.

The gap theory I think is a bunch of hooey. You know, it's one thing to look at scripture and the words of scripture as presented in Genesis 1 and draw your conclusions about what they mean. Quite another thing to pick a gap between two verses and build an entire theology around it. So, I think it's hooey.

So, if somebody wants to ask that question the next time maybe in 10 years when I decide to do this question and answer kind of thing then you can ask me then. Alright, number two under A. [11:11] Prior to the 1800s Matter of fact really I think we could probably say prior to the 1700s but I think 1800s will work here. Prior to the 1800s few if any believed in an old earth.

And so in relation to time the years of history the view that the earth is old as in terms of billions of years is a relatively new view.

Even though we've heard it so long we think it's been around forever. Relatively new. Theories of an old earth came on the scene in the mid to late 1800s with the advent of the age of enlightenment.

you really can't mark the term the shift from a young earth and the biblical view of creation you can really mark that a shift in that view to an old earth and interpretations or conclusions about the age of the earth based upon science rather than the bible you can mark the shift with the enlightenment. And why is that? Well if you know anything about the age of enlightenment you know that our thinking man's thinking began to change and so it was kind of the birth of rationalism and empiricism that is we're going to prove everything based upon empirical proof scientific proof and so that does not line up with the supernatural and God is supernatural so we've got to throw out a good portion of the bible if we're going to prove everything by so called science and so that's what happened in the age of enlightenment scientists began to use their interpretations of geology as the standard rather than the bible and it's a method called naturalistic uniformitarianism did you get that down naturalistic uniformitarianism and you know

[13:23] I could no sense in going into all of that but to say this that this method that approach to dating the age of the earth or to coming up with conclusions about geology and so forth that the method excludes any consideration of Noah's flood this is a crucial point in in our understanding of why the earth looks the way it does today I mean if the earth is really young then why do we have all these weird formations and old looking things and all kinds of fossils and things like that and so you know usually people will work in their minds backward they'll consider all the fossil records and so they'll work backward and say that means the earth must be really old and so one explanation that would explain all of the fossil records one explanation that would explain all of that would be the flood a worldwide universal global flood explains that but if you are going to prove everything empirically and rationalistically then you must throw out the flood because there's no way they say to prove that well there's no way they can prove evolution either and they can't prove what did or did not happen back in

Genesis chapter one because nobody was there either so you can't really call it science there's no way to prove that but we believe what the Bible says at least I do alright the church I would also add did not accept the claims of secular geologists who use this naturalistic uniformitarianism they didn't accept the church didn't come on board with this or any parts of the church didn't come on board with this until the 1840s and many Christians of course have already mentioned sought to reconcile the Bible with science and thus rejected a universal global flood and the biblical age of the earth in fact I think it probably gained its most strength in the early 1900s with the advent of theological liberalism you could say the theory of evolution that was popularized by

Darwin came out in the 1850s it wasn't good enough just to apply that to scientific explanations or the explanations of the earth and animals and so forth men began even Christians so called began to apply those theories even to theology and it really began to permeate every aspect of life so that they could apply the theory of evolution to even the history of the Bible and the writing of the Bible so they could then apply evolution theory of evolution things are progressing and changing and they apply it to Genesis 1 and say well that's what they believed then and it worked for them then but now we're smarter than they were and so they really believed and if Moses did indeed write Genesis and I believe he did but most liberal scholars would say he did not but even if they accepted that he did they would say well that's what that was the conventional wisdom of that day but things have progressed man has evolved and man needed say supernatural god who created all things man needed that then but he doesn't today so you see how how evolution the theory of evolution has really permeated thought in every context we don't need to get off on that and so the earth as it appears today this is B is the result of the processes of evolution taking place over billions of years so there here is the objection from science number two there is the objection from scripture I mean there is an objection from scripture it's pretty weak but and here's the argument according to 2nd Peter 3:8 the word day in

Genesis 1 could though most who hold the view would say certainly does refer to long periods of time day but most honest scholars would say they would argue that the word day could mean periods of time based upon 2nd Peter 3:8 so what does 2nd Peter 3:8 say well let me read it to you let's see if they're right about it 2nd Peter 3:8 in fact I'll start with verse 4 so we kind of set it up because it's important to set the passage in its context and say where is the promise of his coming that's what people were saying in Peter's day where is the promise of his coming for since the father fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation for this they willfully forget that by the word of God the heavens were of old and the earth standing out of water and in water by which the world that then existed perished being flooded with water but the heavens and the earth which are now preserved by the same word are reserved for fire until the day of judgment and perdition and ungodly men but beloved do not forget this one thing that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day so there you know [19:35] I've read those other passages to lead up to that text because we need to understand the context we'll get to that in just a minute but there's the argument and so see the word day at least to God can mean a thousand years just like a thousand years can mean a day and so then they draw from that this idea that day back there in Genesis chapter one could refer to long periods of time so that's the argument but the argument that the word day could mean say a thousand years or even more say millions or maybe even billions to suggest that it could mean that is logically listen to me you have to think about this a minute that argument is logically cancelled out within the very same sentence that is with the Lord one day is as a thousand years oh yeah there it is one day could be a thousand years in a thousand years could be one day see it cancelled the argument is cancelled out logically speaking and

I would say this in this passage this is B the subject this is more important really the subject is the second coming that's the subject that's why I read those passages that lead up to this verse the context the subject is the second coming of Christ that's the point here and Peter is writing to Christians who are waiting for it longing for it in fact they are fielding objections from skeptics that where is the coming that's been promised everything just keeps going on as it's gone for thousands of years so they're fielding those things they're longing for the coming of Christ waiting for it impatient for it and so the meaning of the passage is really this I may have included this on there to God here's what Peter's saying to God our waiting a day is like his waiting for a thousand years and our waiting a thousand years is like his waiting for a day that is because God is not God is outside of time that's his point here God's outside of time God is not governed by our sense of time see the focus here is not God God's problem with time and you know when is he going to do his thing it's not his problem he's you know that's not the deal the problem is with the people here and their sense of time and they have a problem with it and they want God to act and conform according to their sense of time but God is not governed by that that's the idea here and 2 Peter 3:8 has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with defining the days of creation nothing to do with that all right and then I would say furthermore see Peter's declaration in this passage presupposes an already established definition of the word day that is

God has already defined the day a day the word day Peter's not defining what the word day means it's already been defined it's a 24 hour period of time so he's working on that it's already been defined and the word day in 2 Peter 3:8 refers to a 24 hour period of time that's why Peter could use the word day here to compare it to a thousand years so he's not working with an indefinable period of time he's working with a definable period of time understand what I'm saying so you can't use this passage to come up with this idea that you know a day could be a longer period of time alright now let's move on here real quickly how should we then interpret the word day in the creation story and I include this and emphasize this strongly because this is the crux of the matter how we interpret the word day because that's the word that

Moses used that's the word that appears in the text and the theory that the earth took billions of years to be created or some process that took over billions of years you know the it's based upon the premise that the word day means something other than a 24 hour period so we need to understand the word day here in Genesis well the word translated day in our English Bibles is the word yom y-o-m that's at least that's how you would spell it in English if you were to just carry the Hebrew over y-o-m y-o-m and typical concordance by the way includes a range of meanings for the word y-o-m you jot these down if you want a period of light as contrasted to night would be a definition of the word yom a 24 hour period it can mean just simply time in fact it's translated that

way in

[25:08] Genesis 2:4 and also in Isaiah 11:16 where it's just simply yom it's just translated time but even there it does not refer to periods of time alright it can refer to or be defined as a specific point of time it can also in at least one place and I didn't jot it down the reference down sorry it can mean a year in fact since there's no reference here it may mean just the Hebrew word is used elsewhere extra biblically to refer to a year but it's not used that way in scripture alright so that's kind of the range of meanings for the word yom a standard Hebrew English lexicon which is just a scholarly way of saying dictionary in fact it's a Brown Driver and Briggs and that's a really good one very respected one defines the word yom under several headings and one of those would be a day as defined by evening and morning so you know in some of these big scholarly dictionaries they'll have the word there and then they define it under several different headings according to the way it's used in scripture and one of those headings is a day as defined by evening and morning and the reference that they give there is Genesis 1

Genesis 1 and so in Genesis 1 I think it's clear that God created the parameters for the word day for yom he created those parameters what are the parameters a daylight period I mean technically day is a daylight period in a regular succession of light and darkness produced as the earth rotates on its axis and that's how Brown Driver and Briggs defines it so still the word day is a 24 hour period secondly whenever a qualifying ordinal that is like the word first second third or a cardinal number one two three appears with the word yom it always refers to a literal day now folks that's important that may seem complicated to you and boring to you but I'm telling you the crux of the matter is our understanding of the word day as it appears in scripture and when that word yom appears in scripture with first second third or one two or three it always refers to a 24 hour period of time a literal day the word yom thirdly appears numerous times in scripture and each time it refers to a literal day for example a number combined with the phrase evening and morning appears with each of the six days of creation outside of genesis one yom appears with a corresponding number 359 times and each time it refers to a literal day outside of genesis one yom appears with the word evening or morning 23 times and without those words 38 times and in all 61 instances the text refers to a literal day outside of genesis one night appears with the word yom 53 times and each time it means a literal day

I don't have much evidence we need first I think you have to come to acknowledge that the word day is the important issue in our interpretation what does day mean does it mean a long period of time if so where is the support for that in scripture it's not there!

in fact in Hebrew literature it's not there the words fourthly let me add this the words evening and morning used in Genesis 1 to qualify the word yom limit its meaning to a literal day evening just the word evening now I'm kind of shifting to another word that appears in Genesis 1 the word evening evening there's not a single instance in all of scripture where the word refers to a period of time or age and so we have evening attached to the day to the word day in Genesis 1 and so it must mean a literal day and I would say also the word morning not a single example can be produced in scripture showing that the word morning refers to a period of time age now stick with me we're just building all the evidence here and it's very clear number five there are words in the biblical Hebrew I've given them to you such as olam and kadam these words communicate long periods of time or indefinite periods of time but neither of these words appear in Genesis 1 and so the authors intend Genesis 1 must have been to convey the idea that God created all things in the space of six 24 hour days else why would he not use the words that convey long periods of time I guess we could say well that's just what Moses believed he was wrong but that's what he believed that's what he hoped well that brings up a whole set of issues number six the fourth commandment this is important the fourth commandment substantiates the conclusion that day or yom in Genesis 1 refers to an ordinary day Exodus 28 well you know well let me just read real quick here

[31:08] Exodus 20 verse 8 you know the commandment remember the Sabbath day keep it holy six days you shall labor and do all your work six what by the way days but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God in it you shall do no work you nor your son nor your daughter nor your male servant nor your female servant nor your cattle nor your stranger who is within your gates for in six days how many days in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth the sea and all that is in them and rested the seventh day therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it now listen I guess we could say well Moses wrote Exodus 2 and so he's wrong in Genesis he's still wrong in Exodus but it is clear what he meant to say and it's even more important

more significant than that because the whole structure of man's work week as prescribed by God is grounded on the fact that God worked six days in creation and he rested the seventh it's all based on founded on that and so you know the real question is not how could

God create everything in six literal days the real question is why did God take six days to do it could he have done it in one day well certainly so why did he take six the fourth commandment is the answer to that some troubling implications of a figurative interpretation of Genesis 1 number one it denies the infallibility and reliability of scripture it just does I apologize or I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings but if you hold to Genesis 1 speaking of long periods of time rather than what it literally says then it is a denial of the infallibility and reliability of scripture since it is clear that the author of Genesis that would be Moses intended to convey the reality that God literally created all things in six 24 hour days to say that his account

Moses' account should be understood figuratively rather than literally is to deny the accuracy of either scripture or the accuracy of Moses which is saying the same thing saying the same thing and if we take liberties here now listen if we take liberties here Genesis chapter 1 and say well I it it clearly intended to convey the idea of literal literal days but I think really we ought to take that figuratively if we take that liberty here then what about for example Noah's flood well there would be many who would take liberties there too and would have no qualms about that or how about the parting of the Red Sea the Bible clearly gives us the narrative of that great miracle of the Lord in delivering his people

Israel and it was meant to be taken as a fact but if we're going to take liberties in one place then well let's just take liberties other places and say that all the miracles in the Old Testament and New Testament are meant to be symbolic or not to be taken literally how about the virgin birth are you willing to say well Genesis 1 I think we can understand that figuratively but when we get to the virgin birth we're to take that literally on what basis do you make that decision you can't have it both ways and the liberties how about the feeding of the 5,000 was that a real miracle or maybe an example of generosity or how about the resurrection maybe that too should be taken figuratively or how about the second coming the literal bodily coming of the Lord

Jesus Christ well you know maybe maybe that's literal how about the final judgment of the wicked you say how far do you go with this if you're going to take scripture that clearly intends to be literal and explain it as figurative then you open yourself up to using that same kind of approach with many many other places in scripture so it denies the infallibility and reliability of scripture number two it diminishes!

[36 : 14] is the created power of God I think at least among the Christian community in the Christian community few would question that God could create everything in six little days and so maybe you know a Christian would object now wait a minute preacher I believe that it took millions of years to create the earth but that doesn't mean that I have anything against or would lessen the power of God and yet I would say to you to prefer a figurative interpretation of Genesis 1 in order to accommodate popular views of evolution is simply is literally to relegate God to someone who just initiated creation ultimately that would be your conclusion it relegates God not as the sole creator of all things with his spoken word but it relegates him to the initiator of creation or at best the facilitator of creation and so you know

God got it all started and evolution took over after that is the basic view or a view of theistic evolution but that wasn't the question either so I'm not going to deal with that some object by the way to the literal days of creation based on supposed natural impossibilities like how could for example how could light light from the sun or light from the furthest stars in the universe how could they reach the earth in just 24 hours that's one objection by the way from Genesis 1 if God created light on one day I mean it would take millions of years for some of that light to even make it to the earth how could that be or how could there be trees in the garden trees mature enough to bear edible fruit within the space of a few days so that

Adam and Eve could eat you know after they were created when it takes you know it takes years for trees to grow here's the point I'm trying to make about diminishing the creative power of God because the answer to these questions is really very simple I mean is God able to create the light trails along with the light sources and to create them at the same time so the light is there immediately is God able to create full grown trees or did he have to just create little saplings or maybe just the seeds in the ground and then you know do the processes grow you know I often have the question if you cut down a tree in the garden of Eden would you find rings I don't have any

idea it's a silly question but I don't have a problem believing that God created full grown trees he did create a full grown man didn't he alright if God is the creator then everything is under his command and to embrace some of these other views is like it or not is an act of diminishing his creative power and thirdly it destroys the foundational premise of the gospel this is very important

I don't know if you thought about this but when you embrace just logically speaking if you embrace the belief that the earth is billions of years old then you must believe that God did not create it in six literal days you have to believe that you can't have it the other way and if you believe that then you have to believe the fossil record is also billions of years old right and when you believe that you have an insurmountable problem with the gospel the foundational truth of the gospel you say how so well what does the fossil record primarily represent what does it represent it represents death does it not fossils are dead things so the fossil record represents death in fact the death of billions and billions of living things both plants and animals including man that's what the fossil record represents now what is the most basic premise of the gospel that death is the result of sin that death is the result of sin now

Genesis 131 then God saw everything that he made and indeed it was very good there was no sin when God was finished with creation and because there was no sin there was also no death no death Genesis 2 17 but the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die so what is the result of sin death death Romans 5 12 therefore just as through one man sin entered the world entered the creation what one man was that Adam of course and death through sin he said and thus death spread to all men because all sin Romans 6 23 for the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus just get this straight in our minds if you believe the earth took millions and billions of years to create then you must believe the fossil record to be millions or billions of years old and therefore you must put the existence of death before Adam and Eve have to put them before

[42 : 41] Adam and Eve sinned in the garden and when you do that then the foundational message of the gospel and the atonement that's destroyed the doctrine of original sin is made null and void because if death disease and suffering came before Adam rebelled then what did his sin do to the world that would require the second Adam to come and die for that sin what would his sin do to the world it doesn't make any sense it can't work that way you destroy the gospel what about Romans well I don't have time to read it but don't worry guys let me just end with this how can I mean the whole message of the gospel falls apart if one allows millions of years of creation of the creation of the world you