

A Christian Perspective On The Earth's Age

“There is an appointed time for everything. And there is a time for every event under heaven”

Ec 3:1 NASB,1995

Richard Balogh

Ecclesiastes 3:1 alludes to the fact that time is a quality of everything under heaven. Everything has a “time stamp” to it. Can you think of any exceptions? According to the Law of Cause and Effect, anything that begins, or changes must have been caused to do so. Since God is eternal¹ He had no beginning and therefore was not caused. He created the earth at a point in time called the beginning as Genesis 1 states. How long ago was this moment in time when time began? Or, in other words, how old is the earth? A fair question to ask is who cares and why? The scientist cares immensely that his earth is old enough to accommodate his beliefs. A young earth places his belief structure in serious jeopardy. And embracing a miraculous origin is out of the question because miracles are outside the realm of scientific inquiry. But the theologian cares more about accurately understanding what Scripture says. He is most concerned with Who created Earth than its birthday. This stems from the fact that Scripture has many verses stating that God is the Creator but not one verse specifying when; only the general “In the beginning...” can be found. The miraculous is no obstacle for him and his age for earth does not need to be old or young; it just needs to be consistent with Scripture. Finally, there are those who believe in the scientist’s old earth, and believe Scripture supports an old earth. Where do you stand, if you care to take a stand, on the age of earth? We will demonstrate that both the scientist and theologian must assume or presume things that strongly affect their conclusions. Knowing these things and accepting or rejecting them is crucial to any conclusion, be it young or old. Your conclusion must be consistent with how you reason and reasoning on the age of earth always includes some uncertainty. We will discover that the age of the earth is a matter of faith, not a matter of fact, for everyone who cares to take a stand on this subject.

Science In Light Of Scripture Series

On Easter Sunday, 2022, we began this Science In Light Of Scripture Series where we address topics that overlap science and Scripture. How can Scripture shed light on understanding the natural? Because the **same God created everything** (Colossians 1). Therefore, what science learns about the natural realm should be relatable with their theological counterparts in Scripture. Sir Francis Bacon, founder of our scientific method put it this way:

¹ Dt 33:27, Ps 90:2, Rev 4:8-10

*"It is a correct position that "true knowledge is knowledge by causes. The cause and root of nearly all evils in the sciences is this—that while we falsely admire and extol the powers of the human mind we neglect to seek for its true helps ... **God has, in fact, written two books, not just one. Of course, we are all familiar with the first book he wrote, namely Scripture. But he has written a second book called creation.**"*²

Our main goal of this series is to develop a more complete understanding of several different overlapping subjects by considering what science and Scripture say about them. Some of these subjects are obviously the very same thing in science and in the Scriptures such as physical light, physical water, and the physical stars while others must be inferred such as metaphors. For example, the Bible speaks of the eye sensing physical light³ as well as the metaphor where light is the truth that righteously guides our life⁴. Since this metaphor from Psalm 119 compares light to Scripture - "*Your word is a lamp to my feet And a light to my path*" - there must be at least one property of light that relates to "God's word". If not, then why was light used instead of something else? The point is that we can learn even from metaphors. To this end, we have already covered the following topics. Complete notes can be read and downloaded at <https://www.valleybible.net/science-in-light-of-scripture>

- **What Will Our Resurrected Bodies Be Like?** 1Corinthians 15:35

In 1 Cor 15 Paul describes our future resurrected bodies in terms of our physical bodies and also in terms of a seed. He was correcting a pagan belief *of a disembodied immortality, not a bodily resurrection*. Since God invented the first human, He must have also invented the DNA we have all inherited. Our physical bodies built from our DNA instructions is unique because the order of atoms in our DNA is unique. It follows that this information (order of atoms) in our DNA may also be used in forming our resurrected bodies since the same God is the Author of both. The DNA information in our earthly bodies may be used again like blueprints to form our glorified bodies, although not using the actual atoms since they are subject to decay. It is the order of the atoms, not the atoms themselves, that define your DNA. Information is independent of what carries it. For example, the information "I Love You" can be transmitted to my wife in several ways so the information is not tied to only one method of transmission, therefore separate from how it is transmitted. This is similar to how a seed contains all the information to construct the same plant using new atoms. But this scenario is only speculation. Maybe this information will be used when He resurrects our bodies, maybe not. But what is clear is why we will be resurrected bodily, not as an unrecognizable spirit. It is so that no one can dispute that you, once dead, are no longer dead. Our future bodily resurrection will demonstrate for a fact that Jesus really conquered death and the grave not only for Himself but also for everyone.

² *The New Organon, or True Directions concerning the interpretation of Nature* by Francis Bacon [1620], p.121

³ Ecclesiastes 11:7

⁴ Psalm 119:105 and 129-130

- **"The Purpose of Creating Light"** Ps 36:9b *"In Your light we see light"*. Light was an essential ingredient in the creation of the first day because even though the earth turns, we would not be aware of it without light and darkness. Light shining on one half of earth meets darkness on the other half. This circular boundary separates day from night (Proverbs 8:27, Job 26:10). The earth's rotation carries us into night followed by day, evening then morning, on and on. Since light is a necessary part to this "earth clock", God provided light three days before creating the Sun so that time could be measured beginning on the first day of creation. We talked about how physical light and Spiritual light share similar attributes (such as being necessary for sight, dispelling darkness, and carrier of information) as well as some mysteries such as how light has properties of both waves and particles. Finally, how would you answer this question that God asked Job: *"Where is the way to the dwelling of light? And darkness, where is its place, That you may take it to its territory And that you may discern the paths to its home?"* Perhaps there is much more to learn about light than we currently understand!
- **The Super Importance Of Water**
"...the earth was formed out of water and by water" 2Pet 3:5b
We discussed the importance of water in making the earth a habitable place, essential to distributing heat thus making weather, allowing vegetation to grow producing oxygen and food for animals. Scientific American says *"...Understanding how water arrived on Earth is a key part of understanding how and when life evolved here... But we don't even know how or where it came from..."* Scripture answers this question...water did not arrive, it was created! Likewise, the origin of life is not evolution but God! ORIGINS: **O**bservation and **R**evelation **I**dentifies **G**od **I**nitiating **N**atural **S**ystems
- **Stars Of Heaven**
The heavens are telling of the glory of God; And their expanse is declaring the work of His hands. Psalms 19:1

God asks Job a series of science questions, prefaced by asking "where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth, tell me if you have understanding". In verses 31-33 God asks Job

"Can you bind the chains of the Pleiades, Or loose the cords of Orion? "Can you lead forth a constellation in its season, and guide the Bear with her satellites? "Do you know the ordinances of the heavens, Or fix their rule over the earth?"

God clearly reminds Job that God is the Creator and Job is the created. God is able to do things that Job cannot. And God is an eye witness to everything, the Author of truth. Half-way through the exam Job replies to God in Job 40

*“Behold, I am insignificant; what can I reply to You? I lay my hand on my mouth.
“Once I have spoken, and I will not answer; Even twice, and I will add nothing more.”*

Then the LORD answered Job out of the storm and the questions continued.

“Now gird up your loins like a man; I will ask you, and you instruct Me.”

As the exam came to an end Job replied in Job 42:1-6.

Then Job answered the LORD and said, “I know that You can do all things, and that no purpose of Yours can be thwarted. ‘Who is this that hides counsel without knowledge?’ “Therefore I have declared that which I did not understand, Things too wonderful for me, which I did not know.” ‘Hear, now, and I will speak; I will ask You, and You instruct me.’ “I have heard of You by the hearing of the ear; But now my eye sees You; Therefore I retract, And I repent in dust and ashes.”

Scripture is clear that God is the Author of everything. Consider the source when considering the sun, moon and stars. Astronomers are simply discovering what God has done.

We also saw that the meaning of “heavens” (Strongs 8064) can mean where the sun, moon and stars are located, but can have other meanings depending upon the context. Several places in Scripture God is described as “spreading out” the heavens. Any spreading is an expansion, such as dots drawn on a balloon as it is inflated will produce the same remarkable result: the farthest dot from any starting point is moving away at the highest speed compared to dots that are not as far away. This trend has been observed in galaxies, fueling an initial “big bang” cause to make the universe expand. But the same result can be produced by spreading out the stars...a coincidence?

- **The Conditions Of Our Earthly Existence**

*“For thus says the LORD, who created the heavens (He is the God who formed the earth and made it, **He established it and did not create it a waste place, but formed it to be inhabited**), I am the LORD, and there is none else”. Isaiah 45:18*

If every effect has a cause, why is the earth so well suited for life? What caused temperature, pressure, chemistry to be conducive to life on earth. Science answers that we are fortunate to live in such a place where such conditions all exist by chance. Christianity answers that God changed a formless and void earth to one that is hospitable for life – and He did so on purpose. We examined the attributes of God that make him the perfect eyewitness to this transformation.

- **"Biblical Paleontology"**

²¹All flesh that moved on the earth perished, birds and cattle and beasts and every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth, and all mankind; ²²of all that was on the dry land, all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, died. Genesis 7:21-22 (NASB1995)

Geologists have matched rock layers containing the same fossils worldwide to assemble on paper a 125-mile-high representation of the order of fossils: marine fossils at the bottom and humans at the top and the rest in between. It exists complete only on paper. The first explanation was that it is a record of the Noachian Flood when all creatures were buried roughly where they lived. So, the order of fossils mirrors ecosystems on earth: ocean floor at the bottom and dry land at the top. But this explanation changed to exclude that God created and that His flood buried their remains in sediment. Instead, it now represents the evolution of primitive marine organisms at the bottom generation after generation evolving to more complex land-dwelling life at the top. But to make the sketch by matching layers with the same fossils, it must be assumed that the same fossils lived only at that time – not earlier or later - something that cannot be proven. We are told that evolution produced them, and extinction removed them, thereby making the sketch a record of all life “fish to philosopher, molecules to man”. God was removed from fossils altogether. According to evolution, different organisms lived at separate times whereas Scripture tells us that all life lived at the same time, likely buried according to ecosystems. Furthermore, fossils thought to have been extinct have been found alive, challenging the usefulness of dating rocks by their fossils. Proving that some animal is extinct is a practical impossibility since we cannot look everywhere at the same time to rule out its existence.

- **"A Biblical Look At Dinosaurs and Dragons"**

“Behold now, Behemoth, which I made as well as you...”. Job 40:15a

Why does science adamantly insist that humans and dinosaurs lived at different times, separated by millions of years? According to Genesis 1 they were both created contemporaneously on the same day. The answer lies in how scientists interpret the fossil record we discussed in Biblical Paleontology. Formally stated, the *FOSSIL BASIS FOR DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION* states: *“once it was understood that each fossil represents a biologic entity, **instead of a special divinely created life form**, it became quite obvious that plants and animals of each stratigraphic division had simply evolved from those of the preceding epoch through gradual adaptation. They were, in turn, ancestral to those that followed. A **sedimentary rock, therefore, can be no older than the youngest fossil in it.**”⁵ Paleocryptozoology, (the study of historical animal sightings and drawings) has*

⁵ Ransom, Jay, *Fossils In America* p. 43, emphasis mine

identified the “fiery serpents” in Isaiah 30:6 to be a type of pterosaur seen alive in the 1500’s AD along the Nile River. We compared other historical sightings of dragons to pterosaur fossils and discovered remarkable similarities. We also compared the description of behemoth and leviathan in Job with dinosaur fossils, again finding evidence that some features best fit with dinosaur anatomy. Are dragons and dinosaurs the same creatures? No problem for the creation paradigm since beasts and Adam lived contemporaneously.

Future topics will be

- "Drifting Continents After the Flood"
- "An Ice Age Caused by The Great Flood"
- "Earthquakes in Scripture"
- "Eclipses in Scripture"

The Age Of Earth Is Not Obvious

I wore two hats at Antelope Valley College for 25 years: science professor and Christian Club Advisor. If anyone knows the age of the earth, it must be a geology prof, right? So when a student in the first row of my geology class (who was also in the Christian Club) asked me how old I believe the Earth is I replied between 6,000 and 10,000 years old. Several other students who heard my answer began snickering as Paul's famous statement ran through my mind “...*the natural man thinks the things of God are foolishness...*” I was judged to be foolish by nearly the entire room of 70 students when word spread of my unrealistic answer. My answer wasn’t even close to their expectations. If the thickness of a piece of paper represents one year then a stack of 6,000 would be as high as your knee whereas the stack of 4,000,000,000 would be 268 miles high...no small difference. I learned something valuable that day: in the future I would only tell them my opinion after they took the midterm exam because only then could they appreciate the complexity of the subject. About eight weeks into the semester, after lecturing on the age of the earth it was their turn to answer the same question on the midterm exam. In fact, for the next 50 semesters it was always on my geology 101 midterm exam. Their essay question was “How old do you believe the earth is in years, describe the method used to get your answer, the assumptions with that method and why you believe those assumptions are true?” It was time for each student to explain and defend their position on the age of earth. By the time of the midterm exam, they understood from my lectures that every method of dating earth has assumptions (something that is thought to be true but cannot be proven to be true). Therefore, all dating methods have uncertainty because all methods have at least one assumption. It boils down to what assumptions you believe are true. Only when the assumptions are identified and believed can that method be used with confidence. So I asked this question to determine if my students can explain and defend their position. For me, I accepted the assumptions using Biblical genealogies, so my answer is in the thousands of years. For students who felt that no method is believable they answered this question instead: “Describe two methods, state their assumptions and why you do not believe

them". I never graded their answer based on a numerical answer, only on completeness. The point was to clarify what they personally believed after giving it some thought. By the way their midterm exam had numerous questions about the most accepted radiometric method which their textbook favors for an age of 4.5 billion years. So they learned the favored method as well as the method they personally accepted which could have been the same as their textbook. In my mind that is what the goal of education should be, to explain and defend what is true. Of course, their textbook did not even mention the assumptions; that was my job. What do I mean by "my job"? The organization most critical of young earth proponents is the AAAS, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, publisher of the journal Science. This group strongly advocates critical thinking in the science classroom. So, that is exactly how I taught science. I taught the assumptions and presumptions that produced wrong published conclusions of every subject, and my students loved it! As Merriam Webster points out, to assume and to presume both mean to take something as true, and that **both are guesses** but there is this difference in their degree of confidence:

Assume and presume both mean "to take something for granted" or "to take something as true," but the words differ in the degree of confidence the person assuming or presuming has. Presume is used when someone is making an informed guess based on reasonable evidence. Assume is used when the guess is based on little or no evidence.⁶ The same source defines evidence as something that furnishes proof and proof is defined as something that induces certainty or establishes validity.

Some food for thought: Why did the well-known phrase "Doctor Livingstone I presume" use presume instead of assume?

Much of scientific reasoning includes assumptions and/or presumptions allowing room for skepticism when published conclusions are clearly unreasonable. Textbooks seldom point out such publications so students have no reason to believe science can be wrong. That is part of my job as a teacher to point out those instances when science has been wrong so that we can learn from them. So, my classes had less recall of information and more complete explanation and defense of every subject. They were rewarded for critical thinking, not for recalling something as true because of the integrity of who said it or that their textbook said so. When my students realized that much of science assumes and presumes conditions that may not be true, their thinking immediately piques, and they begin the adventure of critical thinking. Showing them just one example of bad scientific conclusions caused by accepting something as true when it should have been rejected turns them into "Sherlock Holmes "thinkers. This paper is an example of such teaching. I have also provided for you today another paper critiquing the radiometric dating method which is the accepted "flagship method", defender of the notion that earth is

⁶ "Assume." Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assume>. Accessed 26 Mar. 2023.

billions of years old. Since this method has nothing to do with Scripture, I have made it available as a separate handout. It is a compilation of what my geology students learned about this widely accepted dating method. **Anyone who believes that science has proved the earth's age in the billions of years must read it and/or download it at** Look for "A Simplified Critique Of The Currently Accepted Radiometric Age of Earth At About 4,000,000,000 years". It contains 35 incorrect radiometric dates and the wrong assumptions that led to grossly incorrect published dates.

Science Adamantly Believes The Earth and Universe Are Old

Why do scientists promote an old age for the earth? Evolution, stated directly or just implied, requires the earth to be old. The significance of believing whether Earth's age is young (in thousands of years), or old (in billions of years) lies in the paradigms being considered. Anyone who believes in biological evolution "fish to philosopher, molecules to man" evolutionary change must believe in an old earth because scientists believe many generations are required for evolution to effect change. The same is true for astronomers who believe that stars have lifetimes measured in billions of years. And the geologist who is trained to think according to the principle of uniformitarianism also believes in an old earth. This principle asserts that the present rate of erosion of the Grand Canyon by the Colorado River, for example, is so slow that millions of years of time were required to erode this one-mile-deep wonder. Such paradigms, by necessity, must embrace an old age for earth; a young earth position is completely out of the question! To the scientist, belief that earth and the universe is young negates just about all of what they believe about science. There is no way they will embrace a young earth...too much to lose by doing so. This fact is one of two reasons why an old earth is so popular today. The second reason is that every radioactive element used to measure the age of earth is incapable of measuring a young earth. In other words, every rock age is always old, never young. For example, radioactive potassium that changes to argon has a lower limit of 250,000 years and uranium-238 that changes to lead has a minimum of 1,000,000 years. So can dating of rocks be trusted when old rocks are the only possible conclusion? Now, let's imagine asking a theologian how they evaluate the same three paradigms. In all three, an old earth is not necessary because

- Instead of evolving, life was created in 6 days
- Instead of stellar evolution God made the stars on day 4
- Instead of assuming current rates of erosion and deposition have always been in effect, the world-wide flood of Noah's day produced unusually high erosion and deposition. In fact the rock layers in the Grand Canyon may have been soft when the Colorado River began eroding and/or the volume of water was greater both requiring, in principle, less time to erode the Grand Canyon. Scientists and theologians reach different conclusions because they reason from different knowledge. An old earth for the scientist is required whereas the theologian is not constrained to think of the earth as old. "In the beginning" is good enough.

A literal reading of Genesis shows that birds were created with sea creatures on day five while land animals were not created until day six. This is in direct opposition to the Darwinian view that birds evolved from land animals. The literalist account says birds preceded land animals. The theistic evolutionist view says exactly the opposite.

Creationists who differ on the age of Earth do not agree on the meaning of the Hebrew word *yom*, meaning “day.” Young earth creationists insist that the meaning of the word *yom* in the context of Genesis 1 is a 24-hour period of time. Old earth creationists disagree and believe that the word *yom* is being used to denote a much longer duration of time. Old earth creationists have used numerous biblical arguments to defend their view including the following ⁷ :

1) *Yom* is used elsewhere in the Bible where it is referring to a long period of time, particularly Psalm 90:4, which is later cited by the apostle Peter: “A day (*yom*) is like a thousand years” (2Pet 3:8)

2) The seventh “day” is thousands of years long. Genesis 2:2-3 states that God rested on the seventh “day” (*yom*). Scripture teaches that we are certainly still in the seventh day; therefore, the word “day” could also be referring to a long period of time with reference to days one through six.

3) The word “day” in Genesis 1–2 is longer than 24 hours. Genesis 2:4 reads, “This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created in the day that the LORD God made earth and heaven” (NASB). In this verse, “day” is referring to the first six days as a whole and thus has a more flexible meaning than merely a 24-hour period.

4) The sixth “day” is probably longer than 24 hours. Genesis 2:19 tells us that Adam observed and then catalogued every living animal on the earth. At face value, it does not appear that Adam could have completed such a monumental task in a mere 24-hour period.

Question...yes, *yom* can have different meanings, but what do we do to determine its meaning in a particular verse?...We use the context of that verse. So what is the context of Gen 1:1 where *yom* is first used?

There are significant problems with humanly acquired scientific knowledge.

The dictionary definition of science is

*“the state or fact of knowing; often as opposed to intuition, belief, etc.”*⁸

Notice that the definition is more general than what the stereotypical “scientist” does. That is why the word can be added to social and computer to get “social science” and “computer

⁷ These 4 points taken from <https://www.gotquestions.org/old-earth-creationism.html>

⁸ New Twentieth Century Dictionary, 1983

science". When your **conscience** bothers you its because you **know** something. In the new testament, the word translated as "knowledge" is "gnosis" (Strong's 1108) which means science. At the first or second meeting of a new semester I ask all my students "do we know all there is to know about geology (or astronomy if it is an astronomy class)? They invariably answer "no, of course not". Then I ask them to defend their answer. Usually their defense will include something like "if we knew all there was to know we would be able to predict earthquakes", or "weather forecasts would always be accurate" or "the explosion of a star wouldn't surprise us". Their reply is correct, and I then add that journals such as *Science, Nature, Scientific American, etc.*, wouldn't be in business if we knew everything since they are in the business of reporting about new discoveries. Then I ask this question: "If the total amount of all there is to know about geology (or astronomy) is represented by the distance between my two hands (say three feet or about one meter), how much of this distance - all there is to know - do we now know at the present time?" Now here is where it gets interesting because the response of the class is usually quite varied. The optimists space their hands one or two feet (30 or 60 centimeters) apart while the pessimists use their fingers spaced an inch (two to three centimeters) or less in answer to this question. But after a while someone usually replies with something like "**we don't know how much we do know because we don't know how much we don't know**". **Wow, reward that person for thinking critically!**

Physical, chemical and biological scientists collect knowledge about nature for the purpose of making conclusions. Think of a conclusion as the output humans produce after thinking about the input (knowledge). Notice that the human brain is the one doing the concluding.

Human Limitation #1: knowledge may be incorrect leading to incorrect conclusions.

Human Limitation #2: since knowledge is incomplete, conclusions made from incomplete knowledge can be wrong. One of my favorite quotes comes from Mark Twain:

"There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjectures out of such a trifling investment of facts"⁹

Without complete knowledge it is possible that several conclusions can be made from the evidence collected. Which one is the true one?

Human Limitation #3: conclusions can be influenced by biases of the people involved.



Is it possible for an **unbelieving** geologist, astronomer or biologist to conclude that God as described in Genesis created the universe and all it contains? Does he have a bias that will keep him from coming to this conclusion? Yes, the natural man believes the things of God are foolishness.

What Does God Think About Man's Knowledge?

God condemns any knowledge that is contrary to His knowledge. Consider the following verse:

⁹ Life on the Mississippi, p.156

*"We are **destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ,**"¹⁰*

The English word "**speculations**" is translated from the Greek word "logismos" (Strong's 3053) which means "computation, reasoning, imagination or thought". It is from another Greek word "logizomai" (Strong's 3049) which means "to conclude, esteem, reason, reckon, suppose, think on". The English word "**captive**" is translated from the Greek word "aichmalotizo" (Strong's 163) which means to **lead away** captive like a prisoner of war. The English word "**obedience**" is translated from the Greek word "hupakoe" (Strong's 5218) which means "attentive hearkening" (hearken, also spelled harken, means to hear, to pay attention to and to heed).

Here are some other verses condemning human knowledge.

*" For it is written, "**I WILL DESTROY THE WISDOM OF THE WISE, AND THE CLEVERNESS OF THE CLEVER I WILL SET ASIDE.**"¹¹*

*"For **the wisdom of this world is foolishness before God.** For it is written, "**He is THE ONE WHO CATCHES THE WISE IN THEIR CRAFTINESS**"¹²*

*" Therefore behold, **I will once again deal marvelously with this people, wondrously marvelous; And the wisdom of their wise men will perish, And the discernment of their discerning men will be concealed.**"¹³*

*"The wise men are put to shame, They are dismayed and caught; Behold, **they have rejected the word of the LORD, And what kind of wisdom do they have?**"¹⁴*

Balogh's Defense Of A Young Earth

The AD and BC we use is, of course, based upon the birth of Christ. It has been roughly 2,000 years since Christ was born. An interesting bit of trivia is that there is no year zero in the calendar, like there is on a graph of positive and negative numbers you made in math class. Add to this roughly 2,000 years from Christ to Abraham and another 2,000 years from Abraham to Adam. The total is approximately 6,000 years back to Adam with three assumptions.

1. The Bible is true, not fiction
2. There are no significant gaps in the genealogies
3. The earth is 5 days older than Adam. Since the reliability of the Bible as a truthful and complete history of earth is questioned by many people, please allow me to explain why I believe those assumptions are believable.

¹⁰ 2 Cor. 10:5, NAS'95, emphasis mine

¹¹ 1 Cor. 1:19, NAS'95, emphasis mine

¹² 1 Cor. 3:19, NAS'95, emphasis mine

¹³ Isaiah 29:14, NAS'95, emphasis mine

¹⁴ Jer. 8:9, NAS'95, emphasis mine

Reason Why I Assume There Are No Significant Gaps In Genealogies

The only apparent gap that I am aware of in this list is found by comparing Gen, 11:12 with Luke 3:35-36. The passage in Luke adds Cainan between Shelah and Arpachshad. Since we will be using the age of the father when his son was born, any gaps will affect our result. But, as some have pointed out, we only know of gaps when they are pointed out in Scripture so they are not gaps at all since they are known. Of the 20 generations from Adam to Abraham, 10 are prior to the Flood and the other 10 are after the Flood. Let's say that an error of 100% was made in recording genealogies prior to Christ. A 100% error means that there were really twice as many generations than what the Bible records. So, instead of 40 generations (20 from Adam to Abraham and 20 after Abraham to Christ), there were really 80 generations. This would double the time from Adam to Abraham so the total time would be 4,000 from Adam to Abraham and 4,000 from Abraham to Christ. Adding this to the time from Christ to the present gives a total of about 10,000 years. What is my point? If we assume major omissions from the Biblical genealogies, an age of less than 10,000 years results.

Reasons Why I Assume The Days Of Creation Were Literal Days

1. God constructed the first clock by which time was, and still is, measured. Genesis 1 tells us that God created light on the first day of creation before creating the sun, moon and stars on the fourth day. Cause and effect thinking provides a very plausible reason why light preceded the Sun. Without light and darkness morning and evening would have no meaning since both are caused by changes in light and darkness observed at a place as the earth's rotation carries us from day into night (from the half of the earth illuminated by light into the other half of darkness where light does not shine) then from darkness into back into light. Proverbs 8:27 refers to this circular boundary between day and night as "... *When He inscribed a circle on the face of the deep*". Another verse alluding to the circle of illumination is Job 26:10 "*He has inscribed a circle on the surface of the waters at the boundary of light and darkness.*". Genesis 1:2 describes the earth as *the deep and also as the waters just before* Genesis 1:3 states "*Then God said, 'Let there be light'; and there was light.*" This strongly suggests that the context of both Proverbs 8:27 and Job 26:10 is the same context as the creation narrative of Genesis 1:3. Time is always measured by a change in something. In fact, when the hands of our clock stop moving we always assume that the clock is broken; we never conclude that time has stopped. So light and darkness was an essential prerequisite ***before*** the first "*evening and morning, the first day*" could exist. And this clock has never stopped measuring time since then. Even though the earth turns, we do not feel like we are speeding at about 700 miles/ hour like we do feel making a turn in our car.. So the change of light and darkness is essential to give us something consistently repeatable as well as observable to use the rotation of earth as a clock. He used light and darkness like the hands of the first clock to define and measure each day of creation. Once again this is possible by using the law of cause and effect where complete knowledge is knowledge by causes.

2. Could God have taken six billion years to create the universe? Yes! Could He have done so in six seconds Yes! God can do anything consistent with His character in any time frame. The important question to ask is what did God say He did? He said six literal days and even defined each day by evening and morning.

3. What did God mean when He said:

“Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a sabbath of the Lord your God. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and made it holy.”

God certainly did not mean that man was to work for six hundred million years and then rest for one hundred million years!

4. The Hebrew word translated as “day” is yom”. If God really meant to convey a long period of time He could have modified yom in Genesis 1 with an adjective such as “rab” (meaning many) as in Dan 8:26 (NASB1995, brackets mine) where the Angel Gabriel is showing Daniel a vision of the future:

26 “The vision of the evenings and mornings Which has been told is true; But keep the vision secret, For it pertains to many[rab] days[yom] in the future.”

The two words together “rab yom” clearly mean a longer time than the length of one day, as the context of that passage demands. In fact, this verse in Daniel is the only verse outside of Genesis 1 where “evening and morning” and “day” (yom) occur together while lacking a number that conveys a long period of time.

5. He even defines the word yom in the context of Genesis 1 by “And there was evening and there was morning, one day” (Gen. 1:5), “a second day” (Gen. 1:8), “a third day” (Gen. 1:13), “a fourth day” (Gen. 1:19), “a fifth day” (Gen. 1:23), and “the sixth day” (Gen. 1:31). Every time He precedes the day with its definition of evening and morning that is caused by the rotation of earth. There may be some latitude given for how long the earth took for one rotation at that time. I am assuming that it was slightly less than 24 hours because the moon is constantly slowing the earth’s rotation causing the moon to speed up in its orbit and increasing distance from earth by about 6 inches per year.

6. If a day is really not a day then how are we to understand Gen.1:14(NAS)?

“Then God said, 'let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years;”

If a day is not a day then what is a year? Do you see that if our interpretation is faulty, inconsistencies result. One student suggested that the long life of men - up to 969 years, particularly before the Flood - is unrealistically too long. He proposed that if we divide those numbers of years by ten then they are more reasonable and comparable to a man's lifetime today. But if those years are really decades then the father of Methuselah - Enoch - was only 6.5

years old when Methuselah was born (take Gen. 5:21 and divide by ten) which must make Enoch the youngest father in history!

7. Adam was made on day six (Gen. 1:27-31), lived through day seven and died at the age of 930 years (Gen.5:5). Could this be true if the days of creation were thousands or millions of years?

8. I reject the most common argument I have heard people use to defend their position that the days of creation cannot be literal days from 2 Pet. 3.8 "... with the Lord one day is *as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day*"(NAS). Do we now define a day to be a thousand years? If so then Methuselah died at the age of 939 years (Gen.5:27). If one day is one thousand years then Methuselah lived 352,958,000 years and if one thousand years is one day then he lived only 23 hours, 15 minutes, 12 seconds. What do you think? Read all of 2 Pet. 3 and see if you don't agree that Peter is describing how God is not bound by time as we are. God is able to see all of time at once - like we see the paper in front of us.

The table below traces genealogies from creation to the destruction of Jerusalem in 588 BC

VERSE IN THE BIBLE	EVENT	TIME SINCE CREATION
Gen 1:1-31	Creation	0
Gen 5:3	Seth born when Adam was 130 years old	130
Gen 5:6	Enosh (Enos in KJV) born when Seth was 105 years old	235
Gen 5:9	Kenan (Cainan in KJV) born when Enosh was 90 years old	325
Gen 5:12	Mahalalel (Mahalaleel in KJV) born when Kenan was 70 years old	395
Gen 5:15	Jared born when Mahalalel was 65 years old	460
Gen 5:18	Enoch born when Jared was 162 years old	622
Gen 5:21	Methuselah born when Enoch was 65 years old	687
Gen 5:25	Lamech born when Methuselah was 187 years old	874
Gen 5:28-29	Noah born when Lamech was 182 years old	1056
Gen 11:10	Shem born when Noah was 502 years old {Shem was 100 years old when he became the father of Arpachshad, which was 2 years after the Flood. Since the Flood ended early in the 601 year of Noah's life (Gen. 8:14), Shem was 100 years old when his father was 602 (early in 601 + 2 years = 602 or 603). So, Shem was born 100 years earlier when Noah was 502.}	1558
Gen. 7:6,11	The Flood occurred when Noah was 600 years old	1656
Gen. 11:10	Arpachshad (Arphaxad in KJV and NIV) born when Shem was 100 years old	1658
Gen. 11:12	Shelah (Salah in JKV) born when Arpachshad was 35 years old	1693
Gen. 11:14	Eber born when Shelah was 30 years old	1723
Gen. 11:16	Peleg born when Eber was 34 years old	1757
Gen. 11:18	Reu born when Peleg was 30 years old	1787
Gen. 11:20	Serug born when Reu was 32 years old	1819
Gen 11:22	Nahor born when Serug was 30 years old	1849
Gen 11:24	Terah born when Nahor was 29 years old	1878
Gen 11:26-12:4	Abraham born when Terah was 130 years old {Terah was 205 years old when he died at Haran in the presence of Abram (Gen. 11:31-32). Abram left Haran with his wife Sarai to travel to Egypt when Abram was 75 years old (Gen. 12:4). Therefore, Abram was born when Terah was 130 years old since 205-75= 130.}	2008
Gen. 12:4-5	Abraham enters Canaan when he was 75 years old	2083
Gen. 12:10 & Exod. 12:40-41	From when Abraham left Haran to enter Canaan and Egypt until the Exodus, exactly 430 years to the day	2513
1 Kings 6:1	From the Exodus to start of the Temple 479 years (in the 480th year or after 479 years)	2992
1 Kings 11:42	From the start of the Temple to the division of the Kingdom 37 years (Solomon reigned 40 years and the Temple was started in his 4th year)	3029
Ezek. 4:4-6	From the division of the Kingdom to the destruction of Jerusalem 390 years	3419

Since the destruction of Jerusalem occurred in 588 BC (agreed upon by Bible and secular scholars), Creation took place 3419 years before that date on 4007 BC. This is approximately the same date - 4004 BC - that Archbishop James Ussher calculated. His analysis was much more exhausting and lengthy at 1600 pages!

On What Grounds Can Christians Agree?

Considering that every method to date the earth involves assumptions, is there any age for earth that Christians can all agree on? If there is such a thing, I have not found it. We have not addressed all dating methods, but there is, in my opinion, no method that escapes uncertainties. Lord Kelvin claimed the earth was several million years old because he believed that it has taken that long for earth to cool from a hot molten sphere. I would ask Lord Kelvin "what temperature was the earth to begin with? What thermometer did you use? What sources of energy are adding heat to the earth? I would have to tell him about heat from radioactive decay inside the earth because radioactivity was unknown to him." Or the famous geologist Dana who decided the earth was several hundred million years old from estimating how rapidly sediment of various sizes takes to settle out in water to account for the total thickness of sedimentary rock layers found world-wide up to the 1870's. He made no allowance for the flood of Noah in his analysis. Is there any theologically based reason why we should know the earth's age? I would conclude "no" because in the science exam that God gave Job beginning in Job 38, God repeatedly asks Job "Where were you when I" Not once did God ask Job the date of creation. I take from this fact of omission that the actual age of earth is insignificant compared to knowing that God was there creating it all. As Christians we are not to boast in wisdom, such as knowing the age of earth but only in this: that we know and understand the God who blesses us constantly with His lovingkindness. It is enough to know that He created and sustains everything. As Matthew Henry put it

*"...the Scriptures were written, not to gratify curiosity, or make us astronomers
but to lead us to God, and make us saints."*

The date of creation is a number. The fact that He is our Creator and our Savior is a life changing fact. That is the conclusion that all Christians can agree on. Also, an old earth is required for the scientific evolutionary paradigm whereas the Biblical creation paradigm does not require an old earth. In fact, a young earth is the most plausible age after closely examine Scripture. We are so constantly exposed to old earth dates that we can easily think that Scripture should wake up and accept an old earth. But remember that evolution replaces the creative genius of God as well as requiring the universe to be old. As Christians, we are compelled to follow where Scripture leads.