

Days of Creation

Evolution's wild assertions have caused some to rethink their stand on the Bible account of creation. Such is especially sad when we consider that these assertions have no definite evidence to support them. For example, the radiometric dating done by scientists to determine the ages of things is flawed by the assumptions they must make to get a result (see [Why an Old Earth?](#)). Surprise, surprise!... Their assumptions just happen to coincide with the idea that the earth is billions of years old!... How do you think the test results will come out?

Now, if we cannot accurately determine the age of something thousands of years old (let alone millions, if the earth has stood that long), why should we be rethinking something clearly stated by God? I can see why someone would doubt it if they do not believe to begin with. But I cannot comprehend a Christian doing so. Yet we can see it around us.

The Days of Genesis...

I'm not one to become terribly technical about something that's simple. We could go to a definition of the Hebrew word for day (yom). And yes, it can (although not commonly) refer to a period of time other than just one period of daylight, so there really isn't any need to go there.

Wouldn't it be great if God had defined the word day in the creation account for us? But He did!... "And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night. So the evening and the morning were the first day." (Gen 1:4f) What is involved in this definition? The light is "called the Day", and the darkness "He called Night". I suppose we should assume that within spitting distance of this definition God will now use the word day to include time He has already defined as night. Absurd! The days in this passage are clearly delineated by "the evening and the morning". You either believe what God said, or you do not!

What Will Fit in a Day...

Much of a current dispute over the length of days in Genesis revolves around what could be accomplished in one day. In the second chapter we read: "Out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called each living creature, that was its name." (Gen 2:19) The modernist sees a second creation here, because they have not accurately discerned the purpose of Genesis two. You see, birds were created on the fifth day (Gen 1:21ff). Beasts of the field were created on the sixth day (Gen 1:24ff). Here in Genesis two, we are told that God created both. But is it saying that he did so again? He has already created every beast and bird. Does He now create every beast and bird again? You're reading into the passage what has not been intended by its author. The verse simply says that God created these things. It does not say that it was done on the day in question. The modernist reads this in to justify his criticism of the Bible.

But what of Adam naming every solitary beast and bird on one day? Think about it for a moment. God has made all these things. Now He says, "we need names for all these critters, and we need them today." What is the purpose of naming everything on the earth and in the air in one day? Obviously there was not an urgent need for all to be named on

one day. So what's the point here? It is stated in the preceding verse. God had determined that it was not good for man to be alone, so He's now going to make a mate for him. Does He then proceed to make a mate? No! He parades beasts of the field and birds of the air before Adam. Why? So he could see that there is no mate suitable already created. When this is established (v20), God then creates Eve to be his mate; and she is created from a part of Adam to emphasize that woman alone is to be his mate. When you understand this purpose, you see that the purpose is not to get names for the animals, but to establish an important point. Animals are not suitable mates for man.

The term "beasts of the field" has been viewed in various ways through the years. People usually read it and think of everything that lives upon land. It has been suggested that it refers only to domesticated animals and game that man would eventually hunt for food. Scholars have admitted to an uncertainty about what all is intended by the term "beasts of the field". It certainly is interesting to note the difference in reference to all beasts in chapter one (beasts of the earth), and these (beasts of the field). I suppose we could grope for some powerful argument to prove what we want it to be. I would rather leave it to anything in the realm of possibility, and then move on (after all, there are greater things to understand in the Bible). If we're not sure, why try to make it more than it needs to be? (unless you want to be viewed as a "great scholar")

In addition, keep in mind that many of the creatures we have today are relatives. Did Adam have to name a cougar, lynx, mountain lion, bobcat, etc...? Did he have to name a wolf, coyote, dog, etc...? Are these not within the same kind created by God in the beginning? It would be like saying that God had to create man black, brown, yellow, white, and red. Did we not all descend from one man and woman? You could get the representatives of an awful lot of current day creatures before Adam in just one hour in the beginning. It was possible because all of the variations we see today did not exist at that time. They had not developed yet. Every kind was created, but the variations would yet develop (after the flood).

Have Dominion...

Just as a sidelight, an interesting secondary reason for this naming may also exist. Man was to have dominion over these creatures. What creature has ever named a man (other than in a Disney flick)? Man was not only given dominion (Gen 1:28), but had already named them (showing an intelligence not possessed by the beasts).

Conclusion...

There is no good reason for making the days of Genesis one and two anything other than what they are said to be. The day was the period of light, and the night of darkness. To say otherwise is to deny the definition of such given by God. One may as well turn the entire Bible into a parable or fable with general lessons based on human reasoning.