



BIBLICAL CREATION TRUTH

✓/S TRADITIONAL SIX-DAY CREATIONISM

The proponents of the “*Traditional Six-day and Young Earth Creationism*” do not “**rightly divide the Word of Truth**” (2 Timothy 2:15) in Genesis 1 creation account. In doing so, they restrict themselves to a ‘*single narrow interpretation of the first chapter of the Bible*’. Accordingly, they *overlook*, if not bluntly ignore, certain important doctrinal aspects of the scriptural *accounts* of creation. And as a result, they have come up and still come up with unbiblical *interpretations* that fly ‘*in the face of scientific research and defy common sense*’. The resulting *bias* makes it even more difficult for them to unlearn error or to learn new truth, objectively.

If one only leaves aside at least for a while, if not completely shed away for eternal good, the traditional belief of a *creation of everything* during the six days of Genesis 1:3-31 and be next willing to look at the creation accounts in Genesis 1 objectively, then it won’t be difficult for such an honest soul to conclude and openly admit that the traditional doctrine of a *creation in six days* is indeed faulty. An objective study of the creation accounts in Genesis 1 will certainly lead one to confirm that the *traditional* concept of ‘*creation in six days*’ is *unbiblical*.

It should be obvious by now that the *traditional six-day creationists* have been focusing on narrowly interpreting Genesis 1 in its entirety as if it dealt with creation of the whole universe during the first six days. As such, the fact that Genesis 1:1 and **1:2** and 1:3-31 constitute three different creation accounts has been overlooked. Instead, these three distinct creation accounts are treated as a single creation account.

Moreover, *Traditional Six-day and Young-Earth Creationists* have not taken into account those Scriptures that point to the creation of angelic hosts as occurring earlier than the physical creation. So also they overlook the Scriptures that indicate that the angels and pre-adamite men lived on earth under Lucifer’s administration. They also need to consider those Scriptures that point to Lucifer’s rebellion and his consequent judgment that brought the chaotic conditions on earth. Only then, they will be able to accept and appreciate the fact that the *phased* work of the *six days* is totally *distinct*. And that, it was thus planned to depict the implementation of God’s program on earth for man’s ultimate redemption from remaining enslaved to Satan.

As is wrongly *presumed* by the *Traditional Six-Day Creationists*, the Bible doesn’t state that the whole *universe* along with the round *globe* we call *earth* was *created* during the work of the *six days*. Nowhere in the true *six-day-creation-account* of

Genesis 1:3-31, is it stated that the *heavens* and the round globe or *earth* were created during *any* of these *six days*. *Six day young-earth creationists* somehow *presume* the heavens and the earth were created on the *first* day; but the Bible certainly doesn't state it to be as such.

Moreover, as is erroneously presumed by the *Traditional Six-Day Creationists*, the Bible nowhere in it states that the *earth* is *only six* thousand years *old* or *even ten* thousand years *old*. Nor does it state that the *earth* is *billions* of years *old*. In fact, *the Bible doesn't at all talk about the age of the earth or of the universe; it says neither the earth is young nor it says the earth is old*. As such, it is of no use at all to keep oneself pre-occupied in *guessing* the ages of the earth or that of the universe. All we can do is to simply comply with God's silence about the *age* of the earth or universe by remaining *silent* ourselves; nor should we allow ourselves to be *troubled* by any scientific *guesses* about the ages of the earth or universe.

The Bible simply states that the *heavens* and the *earth* were created in "A" "Beginning"; but that "*Beginning*" is not the beginning of *Day One* or the beginning of *Time* as is *assumed* by the *Six-day Creationists*. The Bible briefly states in Genesis 1:1 that it was "*In a beginning God created the heavens and the earth*". It doesn't tell us *when* that *beginning* was! It was a '*creation*' not within the context of any measurable *time* but within the context of *eternity*, outside the *realm of time*. The Bible tells us that *that particular "Beginning"* was the '*beginning*' of a "*physical creation*". Therefore, it is not the "*Beginning of Time*" as we measure *time on earth*.

Actually, *Day One* begins much *after* the original creation of the *heavens* and *earth* mentioned in *Genesis 1:1*. It begins much *after* the original *perfect* earth became and then was found to be in a state of *chaos*, without '*form*' and '*void*' or '*empty*', inundated by *waters* and covered by *darkness* all over, as stated in *Genesis 1:2*. Moreover, the Bible is *silent* as to how long it was in a *chaotic condition* before God *commanded* the existing *light* to *shine* out of *darkness* on *earth* (2 Corinthians 4:6) thereby creating a recurring cycle of *day* and *night* regular periods, beginning with *Day 1* of *Genesis 1:3-5*. And, it has been as such, ever since the *beginning* of *Day One* of the creation week described in *Genesis 1:3-5*. As such, it is biblically inappropriate to assume *Genesis 1:1-2* is God's activity of *Day 1*.

CHAOS OF GENESIS 1:2-NOT A WORK OF CREATION **Chaos of Genesis 1:2-Not a Work of Creation**

The Bible tells us that the earth *was* or *became void* and *empty*; and that *darkness* covered the waters that in turn *covered* the earth. It doesn't say that it was created that way. It could never have been created that way seeing that God creates *perfectly* (Deut. 32:4)! How some dare to think of chaos in *Genesis 1:2* as a work of creation one cannot understand.

No matter how we choose to translate it, whether it is “*As to the earth, it was empty and void*” or whether it is “*And the earth was void and empty*” or “*And the earth became empty and void*”, the fact is that *that* was the *condition* on earth. It was not created as such by God whose works are perfect. God is not the Author of *confusion* or of *‘towhu’* or *‘bohu’*. As such, these chaotic conditions cannot be in accordance with His essence and perfect character as the Creator God who creates all things perfectly.

Even if “*The most straightforward reading of the verses sees verse 1 as a subject and-verb clause, with verse 2 containing three circumstantial clauses*”, in no way does it mean that these “*three statements that further describe the circumstances introduced by the principal clause in verse 1*” ([www.answersingenesis.org /articles/nab/gap /ruin-reconstruction-theories-ruin](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/gap/ruin-reconstruction-theories-ruin)) are essentially “*a description of the state of the originally created earth*”. To state as such, is to *foolishly* state that the *circumstantial clause* in verse 2c “*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters*” is also “*a description of the state of the originally created earth*”. Therefore, the chaotic *tohu* and *bohu* and *darkness* cannot be acts of original creation.

As such, it is definitely wrong to conclude that the clause “*And the earth was without form and void in Genesis 2a*” is a description of the state of the originally created earth, irrespective of the fact “*that the Hebrew conjunction waw, meaning “and” at the beginning of verse 2, is a “waw copulative,” “which compares with the old English expression “to wit”*”. In **no** way, the Hebrew conjunction ‘wau’ in Genesis 1:2 should prevent us from ‘*sharply dividing the Word of Truth*’ in a manner which is in *harmony with God’s character, whose works are perfect and beautiful*.

It is biblically wrong to state that it was all *darkness* all over when God created the heavens and the earth. The *stellar* heavens necessarily had to be full of light as the purpose of all *stars* is to give *light*. There are *no stars* that are totally *dark* or that do not emit at least *colored* light.

To state that it was all dark in the universe soon after its creation is to state contrary to known facts. The sextillions of solar systems comprising the vast galaxies necessarily had to emit light from the beginning. Darkness, therefore, had to be a much later condition as a result of judgment.

Jeremiah states that he saw as it was as it was in Genesis 1:2 “*without form and void*” and with no light (*cp.* Jeremiah 4:23); no man and no birds (*cf.* Jeremiah 4:25); and instead of vegetation or fruitful place, he saw wilderness and cities broken down (*cp.* Jeremiah 4:26). Jeremiah’s vision here seems to be more of a ‘*warning-reminder*’ of the historical past as well as it is a *prevision* of prophetic prediction of some future catastrophe.

The Bible doesn’t say that the light and darkness were *first created* on the *first day* of the creation week; that is, that there were no light and darkness periods before Genesis 1:3-5. Or, that the sun, moon and stars *were actually created* on the fourth day. That is, that there was no sun and moon in the *stellar heavens* prior to Genesis 1:14-19.

The *very fact* that the earth today *revolves around the sun* and is *held in its orbit* with *precision* by the *sun's gravitational pull* demands the existence of the sun from the beginning of earth's creation and not from the *fourth day as is wrongly assumed*.

Next, the Bible doesn't state that the *earth* brought forth *vegetation* for the *first time* on the *third day*; or that the *fowl* of the air and the *fishes* and other *creatures* were created for the *first time* on the *third day*; or that, the *cattle* and other *animals* were created for the *first time* on the *fifth day* of the *creation week*; that is, that there was no vegetation of any kind or that there were no aerial birds or aquatic creatures and terrestrial animal life of any kind prior to that which is described in Genesis 1:11-12, 20-28 accounts. In fact, a proper understanding of Genesis 1:11-12, 20-28 accounts will actually confirm that there was *an earlier* 'vegetation' on earth; or that, there were the 'fowl of the air' and 'aquatic creatures' and 'terrestrial animals' prior to their (*re-*) *creation* as described in the Genesis accounts.

When the Bible states that the "earth brought forth grass and earth with *seed after his (its) kind*", and the "*tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind*", it actually states *what has been overlooked* that the *vegetation* which the earth brought into existence in response to God's command on the *third day* was '*after its kind*' - it was *something* now brought forth '*after the same kind*' that was once there *earlier* on earth prior to its destruction as described in Genesis 1:2.

Similarly, when the Bible states that when "*God created great whales and every living creature ... , which the waters brought forth, after his kind, and every winged fowl after his kind*"; or next, when it states that "*God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that crept upon the earth after his kind*", it actually states *what has been overlooked*, that the *fauna* God created on the *fifth* and *sixth days* was actually *something* of the *same kind* that was *earlier* on earth prior to its destruction as described in Genesis 1:2 .

As otherwise, if the *earth* had brought forth *flora* and *fauna* for the *first time* on the third, fifth and sixth day , then what the earth *brought forth* could not be '*after its kind*', if there was no earlier *life* of the '*same kind*' .

The phrase '*after his/their/its kind*' has been commonly associated with *reproduction* of one's *own kind*, which *fact* is indeed *true*. After all, it is a biblical and scientific fact that all living forms reproduce '*after their own kind*'. However, in the Genesis 1:3-31 account referred to earlier, the phrase "*after one's kind*" in every case does not refer to any *reproduction* of the same kind as is assumed; for these are not accounts of reproduction but of a re-creation *after some original kind of the same type*.

Certainly, it is not stated here that which the earth newly brought forth eventually or immediately reproduced *after its own kind*. Rather, it states that the earth brought forth '*living forms*' '*after its own kind*', exactly "*like the ones that were earlier*". This is confirmed by other similar statements in the Bible.

As a matter of fact, Isaiah 14:12, Ezekiel 28:12c-16, 31:8-9 and 2 Peter 5-7 indicate the presence of life forms much before the creation of life recorded in the Genesis 1 account. Anyway, there had to be a *Garden of Eden* with vegetation on earth in the original creation as the same can be certainly and confidently inferred from Ezekiel 28:13, 31:8-9, 18. Unless proved to the contrary, Prophet Ezekiel talks of a pre-Adamic '*Garden of Eden*' (Ezekiel 28:13; 31:8-9, 18).

As a matter of biblical fact, Adam was placed in a Garden that was planted Eastward of an already known place called Eden (Genesis 2:15) and tested for his obedience (Genesis 2:16-17) and was then cast out for disobeying God (Genesis 3:23-24). So also, Lucifer was tested for his obedience in an earlier *Garden of Eden* (Ezekiel 28:13) and was next cast out from the same for disobeying God (Ezekiel 28:16). As such, it is very clear that there were two distinct '*Gardens of Eden*' on earth but at two different periods!

In the *footnote* to Ezekiel 28:13(see '*The MacArthur Study Bible*', page 1191). John MacArthur interprets the Garden of Eden of Ezekiel 28:13 as the *Garden of Eden* of Genesis 2:15. However, the Garden of Eden of Ezekiel 28:13 cannot be the same as the *Garden of Eden* of Genesis 2:15. For, in the *Garden of Eden* of Genesis 2:15, Satan is present as a Serpent (*cp.* 2 Corinthians 11:3). On the other hand, in the Garden of Eden of Ezekiel 28:13 it is Lucifer who is addressed wherein God talks of Lucifer's earlier wisdom, beauty and sinless-ness. This indicates that he was once in an earlier Garden of Eden when he ruled in a pre-Adamic world on earth, during which he eventually sinned and fell (Isaiah 14:12; Ezekiel 28:16).

That there has been an *earlier* Garden of Eden is further *confirmed* by the fact that when the Bible states the location of the newly (re-)created garden, it does so by referring to its *location* as if it were in a place or rather, *planted* in a place, that was *eastward* of an already known Eden – that is, that the "*LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden*" (Genesis 2:8).

In keeping with the *principle* or rather the "*Law of Double Reference*" of biblical *interpretation*, it may be stated that Ezekiel 28:12b is addressed to Lucifer and not to the King of Tyros as in Ezekiel 28:12a. Similarly, the passages in Ezekiel 31 though to begin with are addressed to Pharaoh, King of Egypt (Ezekiel 31:2), the focus is then next shifted. As such, *Ezekiel 31:8-9* are not actually addressed to Pharaoh but to Lucifer, referring to his original status of grandeur and splendor he once had when in the Garden of Eden (Ezekiel 28:13-15) before his fall (Ezekiel 28:15-18; 31:18).

In fact, God is actually addressing Satan by addressing to the King of Tyros or the King of Egypt *just as Christ addressed Satan by addressing to Peter* (Matthew 16:23; Mark 8:33). There could not be any Garden of Eden in Egypt during Pharaoh's time or at any other time anywhere on earth once the original Garden of Eden from which Adam after sinning was cast out, was destroyed. Therefore, the "Garden of Eden" of Ezekiel 28:13 should be pre-historic and, therefore, it is not the same garden that was planted eastward of Eden of Adam's time

As such, there had to be an earlier pre-Adamic Garden of Eden under Lucifer's dominion. It was, in a way, a *type* of the Garden that God would next create and plant on the eastern location of the original Garden of Eden after creation of Adam and Eve. Again, the pre-adamic Lucifer's Garden of Eden could be very well considered as a *type* of the millennial kingdom.

Next, during the millennial reign of Christ, the earth will be like the Garden of the Lord (Isaiah 51:3; Ezekiel 36:35), which is again a type of the Garden or heavenly Paradise of the 'Eternal State'. Isaiah also talks about pre-Adamic nations which were under Lucifer's rule when he was on earth (*cp.* Isaiah 14:12). These nations were swayed by him after he sinned in exalting himself and were destroyed. If this be the correct interpretation, then it can be confidently stated that anthropoid life was extant on earth prior to its condition as stated in Genesis 1:2 or before the *work* of the *six days*.

There must have been *nations* of primitive preAdamic '*sons of men*' (Proverbs 8:31b) which Lucifer *did weaken*. Or else, there must have been anthropoids like human beings, whose remains now discovered are wrongly claimed to be the *ancestors* of human beings. Perhaps, "*All the species ... must have been advanced apes or anthropoids possessed of considerable intelligence and resourcefulness – but who completely died off before Adam and Eve were created. ... There may have been advanced and intelligent hominids that lived and died before Adam, but they were not created in the image of God*" (1) the same as Adam was created after God's image/likeness.

Anyway, the fact that the anointed Cherubim Lucifer ruled on earth prior to Adam cannot be denied in the light of the Scriptures to that account. Isaiah 14:12 cannot refer to nations on earth under Satan's influence that are now; nor can they be of any other time. They refer to some *nations* which Lucifer ruled *before* he sinned and became Satan. Lucifer's creation and his subsequent rebellion described in Isaiah 14:28 cannot be '*some time after day seven*' of the creation week as assumed by the Young Earth Creationists.

Based on what is stated above we may, therefore, confidently state that Peter speaks of the world (social system) that "*then was*" (2 Peter 3:6-7). This social system, unlike the *ante-diluvian* world of Genesis 6, was totally destroyed by a universal flood. Such a universal destruction could be only explained and accounted for by treating Genesis 1:2 account as a later development or rather a judgmental outcome. Universal destruction as depicted in Genesis 1:2 could never be logically associated with the creation of the heavens and earth (Genesis 1:1) in "*A Beginning*". To state as such, is to impugn the character of God who creates all things perfect. Moreover, *darkness* and *sea* in the Bible, are often, almost always *symbolic* of Satan.

Some other Scriptures, such as Matthew 13:35; 25:34 also point to a destruction of a primeval pre-Adamic world that *was then*:-

For example, Matthew 13:35; 25:34 could as well be translated '*from the casting away of the world (cosmos)*' instead of being translated '*from the foundation of the world*' which is actually an *improper* translation of the Greek '*katabole kosmou*'. In all

instances of ‘*foundation*’ of any structure, whether it’s of heavens or earth or the heavenly city of Jerusalem, the original Greek word translated as “*foundation*” is “*themilioo*” and not ‘*katabole*’. Even ‘*katabole*’ used for Sarah’s conception involves the destruction of the ‘*sperm*’ once united with the ‘*ovum*’ and it is next followed by metabolism of new life; so also ‘*katabole*’ of the ‘*kosmos*’ is followed by the formation and birth of a new ‘*cosmos*’.

The events of *judgment* of which Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Peter talk about cannot refer to any other period of human history beginning from the creation of Adam and Eve. These events must be rightly interpreted as having occurred during the *world* that was then (2 Peter 3:6-7; Jude 6, 13) under Lucifer’s dominion. And this pre-Adamic sin-laden world is the one that was eventually destroyed subsequent to Lucifer’s rebellion as explained earlier! Therefore, it can be clearly stated that the conditions of Genesis 1:2 are not of original creation but as a result of judgment due to Lucifer’s sin. Again, it is also the result of judgment brought upon pre-Adamic ‘sons of men’ (Proverbs 8:31b) who along with the angels eventually sinned

Even though it is not stated as such in the Bible, the existence of sin in pre-Adamic world can be nevertheless inferred. As such, destruction if not suffering on earth in the *world* that was then should be due to Lucifer’s sin; just as destruction and suffering has been in Adam’s world as a consequence of Adam’s sin. Sin, whether that of Lucifer or of his angels or of Adam and his progeny could not be without its dire consequences.

The *argument* is so often made by the *six-day creationists* that there could not be any *suffering* and *death* prior to the sin of Adam. However, Lucifer had sinned prior to the creation of man; and it his *sin* and that of the pre-adamic races that brought destruction and chaos on earth (Genesis 1:2, cf. Job 38:9) Anyway, it is a biblical fact that Lucifer and his angels kept not their first state but sinned from the *beginning*. As a consequence of their rebellion and sin, they are, therefore, said to be kept reserved under chains of *darkness* unto the judgment of the last day (Jude 6). Obviously, Lucifer’s sin and that of the angels and pre-adamic races brought about the conditions of *chaos* and *universal flood* and *darkness* on earth. Such a chaotic situation on earth necessitated God’s phased work of the six days for restoration.

As otherwise, such a chaotic condition could never be the state of the newly created earth, notwithstanding the fact that “*The most straightforward reading of the verses sees verse 1 as a subject-and-verb clause, with verse 2 containing three circumstantial clauses (i.e., three statements that further describe the circumstances introduced by the principal clause in v. 1)*”. To state as such is also to conclude that the Holy Spirit is a part of creation. As such, the conditions on earth described in Genesis 1:2 are not a part of original creation.

Another argument raised by the *traditional 6-day creationists* is that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is *subverted* if sin and its consequences were prior to the creation week. However, the *everlasting* Gospel of Jesus Christ is not *subverted* but has relevant application in *cleansing* the defiling consequences of Lucifer’s sin, even prior to Adam’s

sin. We also need to be aware of the *evangelical* truth that refers to the *reconciling* aspects of Christ's sacrifice in relation to *all things*, not to *men only*. (Colossians 1:20).

Unfortunately, all of these biblical facts tend to be overlooked or are ignored by the *traditional six-day creationists*. Or else, the same are wrongly interpreted. All this shows one's prejudice or bias and a compulsion to comfortably hold on to one's accustomed and attuned, habitual beliefs. Subsequently, *it becomes much more difficult to admit and own and confess and unlearn error than to learn new truth!*

Anyway, these and other related biblical aspects will be dealt with more comprehensively as well as convincingly in Part Three of this Systematic Treatise by highlighting biblical facts that have been overlooked or not properly understood; if not, plainly ignored to accommodate one's traditional belief of a creation in six days, contrary to biblical revelation. Hopefully, the *traditional six-day creationists* and the modern Young Earth Creationists will come to terms with the biblical facts that hereto have been overlooked rather than to hold on to contradictory assumptions based on the *Traditional Six-Day Creationism*. To deliberately hold on to such 'hide-bound' traditional concepts, amounts to indulging in a wholesale denial of biblical truth. It certainly involves a denial of *True Scriptural Creationism*.

1: Gleason L. Archer, Encyclopedia of BIBLE DIFFICULTIES, Zondervan Publishing House, US, 1982, p. 64.

