



The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism

Volume 3
Print Reference: Pages 397-406

Article 35

1994

Some Questionable Creationist Axioms Reexamined

Bernard E. Northrup

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings

[DigitalCommons@Cedarville](#) provides a publication platform for fully open access journals, which means that all articles are available on the Internet to all users immediately upon publication. However, the opinions and sentiments expressed by the authors of articles published in our journals do not necessarily indicate the endorsement or reflect the views of DigitalCommons@Cedarville, the Centennial Library, or Cedarville University and its employees. The authors are solely responsible for the content of their work. Please address questions to dc@cedarville.edu.

Browse the contents of [this volume](#) of *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*.

Recommended Citation

Northrup, Bernard E. (1994) "Some Questionable Creationist Axioms Reexamined," *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*: Vol. 3 , Article 35.

Available at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings/vol3/iss1/35

SOME QUESTIONABLE CREATIONIST AXIOMS REEXAMINED

BERNARD E. NORTHRUP, TH.D.
861 REDWOOD BLVD.
REDDING, CA 96003

ABSTRACT

In an amazing way the naturalistic geologist and the creationist tend to mistreat their major information sources concerning the order and nature of earth's earliest events. The geologist reads into the record of the rocks his own or his forerunners' presumptions about geological time even as he seeks to understand the message of the formations concerning those early events. In the same way many creationists hamper their field research by ignoring crucial areas of revelation concerning the order and the nature of those early events. Without realizing it, they frame and limit their thinking about their field research within the bounds of dogmas propounded by their creationist forerunners. As a result, scholars in both fields subject their research to an authority that is higher than the field evidence or the Biblical evidence which they study. This restricts one's research, either on the rock record or on the written record of creation, to a framework of superimposed, prior conclusions and this inevitably closes the door to accurate research.

We creationists often allow others' conclusions to shape and often to distort our own interpretation of the Biblical record or of the record of the rocks. I have a friend who has done some excellent work collating information on dinosaurs from a creationist viewpoint. He speaks with bold dogmatism on dinosaurs, but is totally unaware that his interpretative model of how and when the dinosaurs died not only ignores massive geological evidence to the contrary but gives no credence to Biblical evidence which contradicts his position. As a result, his field studies, like those of the unbelieving researcher, are distorted by a framework of questionable creationist axioms. These prevent both the record of the rocks and the Creator's own statement about earth's early events from speaking accurately for themselves. The harmony which should exist between the physical evidence (Psa. 19:1-6) and the testimony of the Word of the Creator (Psa. 19:7-8) never is achieved in detail. This research flaw which causes most creationists to attempt to explain the details of the physical, geological record only in a very general way, using nonspecific terms that never face all of the facts. This study is an attempt to draw attention to some creationist conclusions concerning the Biblical text which are both questionable and axiomatic. These play a major role in blocking the harmonization of the very real geological evidence with the true intent of the statements of the Creator's Word (Psa. 19:7-14).

Few creationists recognize that their explanation of the order of events in creation actually contradicts the Bible's own statements concerning the actual creation event series. The key axiom which actually triggers an entire series of misunderstandings relates to the timing of the creation of planet earth with reference to the rest of the universe.

Axiom # 1: THE EARTH WAS CREATED BEFORE THE SOLAR SYSTEM

It is a firmly entrenched conclusion among Biblical interpreters that Genesis 1:14-19 teaches that the sun, moon and stars were not created until the fourth day of creation. As a result, Biblical researchers postulate that a temporary sun produced the evening and morning of the first three solar days. God's Word neither teaches nor allows that presumption. This interpretative approach is the result of a serious misunderstanding of Genesis one for it is a conclusion which directly contradicts another major source of information in the Scripture concerning the order of events in creation. It directly contradicts and ignores the order of events which are set forth in Psalm 104:1-5. It also ignores the clear statement of verses 19-23 of the psalm concerning what actually happened on the fourth solar day of creation. The activity of the fourth day largely relates to the regulation of the heavenly bodies and of earth in its relationship to them. "He appointed the moon for its seasons" (The verb 'asah' repeatedly is used of work done on existing material). "The sun knew its going down. It brings darkness and night comes. In it all of the beasts of the forest come forth. . . . When the sun rises, they sneak away and crouch down in their dens" (Psa. 104:20, 22). This agrees with Genesis 1:17. Here the verb 'nathan' is similarly is used in its sense of appointment. "And God appointed them over the expanse of the (atmospheric) heavens to give light upon the earth." A parallel use of this sense in the verb 'nathan' is observable in its use in Pharaoh's appointment of Joseph

over all Egypt in Genesis 41:41. There Pharaoh says to Joseph: "See, I appoint you over all the land of Egypt." It is obvious that the sense of physical transporting and placing is not present in this use. And this use is most appropriate where the sun dog and moon dog on the lower surface of the canopy are appointed their responsibilities relevant to man's time.

Most creationists do not realize that they are contradicting Genesis 1:1 by holding that earth was created *before* the sun. They hold that Earth was created either in Genesis 1:1 or in 1:1-3, while they interpret Genesis 1:14-19 as saying that the sun and moon were created on the fourth 24 hour day of creation. This "axiom" actually produces an apparent, man made contradiction in Genesis 1 itself that should be so obvious as to render the position untenable. The conclusion that the solar system comes into existence in Genesis 1:14-19 absolutely contradicts Genesis 1:1-5 and the revelational material which directly follows. First of all, Genesis 1:1 is the only place in the text of Genesis one which in any way discusses the origin of planet earth. The first verse says: "In beginning [there is no article] God created the heavens [a dual noun in Hebrew] and the earth." The translator must recognize that the compound direct objects of the verb must be considered as coming into existence together in some way. And it is crucial to note that from Genesis 1:1 onward in the chapter, earth clearly exists. Note that in verse 2 earth not only exists but already has been covered by a universal sea and shrouded in darkness. This perfectly harmonizes with the Creator's own description to Job of the earth's creation in Job 38:1-9. Earth most certainly was not created later in Genesis 1 for its rotation on its axis before a giant, distant mass which is a single, distant point, light source is required by the context. It is earth's rotation before this body in the heavens which produced the first *solar day* in verses 3-5. (Most creationists unwisely insist that these are "24 hour days," an reverse extrapolation of earth's present rotational speed into the creation week! But this assumption is axiomatic and is not specifically revealed in the text. (Shades of uniformitarianism!) What can be proven is that the rotation of the earth before a heavenly body, remarkably like the sun if not the sun itself, produced the solar days of the chapter). Therefore it should be logical to conclude from the statement of Genesis 1:1 and the evidence of the six solar days in that chapter that the solar system and possibly the entire universe had to come into existence at the same time. Is that confirmed or denied by the context? These thoughts on the subject seem to me to be worth consideration.

- Earth must exist for it to rotate before an existing light source. Earth's creation can only be described as taking place in Genesis 1:1.
- Earth must exist and begin rotating by Genesis 1:3 in order to produce the first solar day. It has become standard dogma in most creationist circles to say that earth was created *within* the first six 24 hour days of the creation week. (This seems odd, since not only the earth but the sun and moon are involved in the production of earth's days and weeks!) It is a dogma which grows out of Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 as these verses so often are translated. This will be considered in a later section.
- The "lights in the firmament of the heavens" in Genesis 1:14-19 are not the sun and moon. Of course this interpretation will trouble those who assume that ". . . the lights in the firmament of the heaven" (v. 14) are the sun and moon. But such a position is totally inconsistent with the definition of "the firmament of the heaven," that is, "the expanse of the atmospheric heavens" where the birds fly (v. 20) between the universal sea and the canopy. In no place in Genesis one does Moses redefine the *rachi'a*, the expanse of the atmospheric heavens so that it means "the vault of the stellar heavens" in verses 14, 15 and 17. And it is certain that the sun and moon were not placed in our "atmospheric heavens! A cardinal rule of hermeneutics is: "Interpret Scripture by Scripture." Had that rule been followed by early creationists, the untenable idea that earth was created before these heavenly bodies never would have troubled those seeking to understand the order of events in Genesis One.
- The "lights in the firmament of the heavens" simply are refracted light spots in the upper atmosphere on the lower surface of the canopy. Since the command of God directs that "lights" should be placed in the expanse of the atmospheric heavens, only one possible explanation can be given. Above the atmospheric heavens was the canopy, ". . . the waters which were above the expanse of the atmospheric heavens" (v. 7). The sun and moon, already in place in the galaxy, had been shining since their creation. The dense layer of water vapor, or most likely, ice crystal, prevented any light from reaching the surface of the earth except sufficient to distinguish day from night during the first three days. As earth was increasing its rotational velocity while approaching the 24 hour day (we assume) on the fourth day, centrifugal forces undoubtedly were acting upon the canopy. Surely these were the factor used by the Creator to elevate the canopy to its position. As it moved out above atmospheric space, it would have thinned as it occupied more and more space. I suggested long ago that the "lights" which the Creator called for "in the expanse of the atmospheric heavens" simply were the sun dog and the moon dog as the light of these heavenly bodies now shined through the thinning vapors or crystals to produce bright spots of light in the

expanse of the atmospheric heavens. Adam and his descendants, by this means which had been provided by the Lord, would have regulated their day, season, month and year until Noah's sons removed the cover of the ark and looked up in amazement at the remarkable display of the heavenly bodies available after the "windows of heaven" had been opened with the collapse of the canopy. Is there any wonder that Josephus records the fact that, soon afterwards, mankind began the worship of the brilliant objects which fill the day and evening skies? This, then, would be the meaning of the phrase, "and God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night, and the stars also" (v. 16). On the fourth day God provided man with the two major lights which are needed that he may recognize them ". . . for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years" (v. 15). Apparently the phrase ". . . and the stars" (v. 16d) is the direct object of the infinitive in the phrase: "And God made two great lights; . . . the lesser light to rule the night and the stars," although most translations obscure this relationship of the phrase. As a result, it is easy to reach the additional illogical conclusion that the stars were created in the fourth day with the sun and moon.

- The conclusion that the sun was not created until after the creation of plant life produces another problem. Without the heat of the sun, even though that undoubtedly was widely diffused by the canopy, the seas of Genesis 1:2-9 would have been ice. Otherwise one must postulate some other source of heat. The same is true of the plants which were placed on the continent or at least in the garden on the third solar day of creation. Plant life would have been impossible unless the creationist, in order to defend his position, becomes the Creator for that day. Does not plant life require the sun to warm the soil and to produce photosynthesis?
- The setting of the "lights in the atmospheric heavens" speaks of the giving of governmental responsibility rather than physical placement. Another phrase by which the English reader easily is stumbled in trying to understand the events described as occurring on the fourth solar day is found in Genesis 1:17. "And God set them (the two great lights) in the expanse of the atmospheric heavens to give light upon the earth." The Hebrew verb which is translated "set" is the progressive form of the verb nathan. To the English reader this implies the act of moving an object and of placing it in a new location. However, the verb nathan is used in contexts of appointment to rulership in quite a different way. Its use in Genesis 41:41 is very suggestive, and indeed, instructive. There Pharaoh says to Joseph: "See, I do appoint you over all of the land of Egypt." That meaning is exceedingly appropriate here in Genesis 1:17. "Then God appointed them (the sun dog and the moon dog, bright refracted spots of light on the lower surface of the canopy) in the expanse of the atmospheric heavens to give light upon the earth."
- No light source can replace the sun as the axial point of the universe about which earth rotates in orbit. To postulate a temporary light source to produce the solar days produces a remarkably imaginative scenario that is totally unsupported by Scripture. Such an unsupportable postulate always suggests that an error is being propounded to clear up another error. Furthermore this appears to contradict Job 38:1-7. If the morning stars of verse 7 are literal, then these existed at the time that God lay the foundations of the earth. Furthermore this error requires the presence, not only of a distant light source to produce the solar day but the presence of a vast, but temporary heat source which had to keep the waters which covered the earth from Genesis 1:2-8 from freezing solid. The adoption of this assumption of a convenient heat source, apart from our sun, has serious problems. As mentioned above, this is mentioned nowhere in Scripture. No vague, phosphorescent light can possibly fill the bill. No undefined heavenly radiance provides the heavenly axis about which earth must revolve even as it begins rotating on its axis to produce the first solar day in Genesis 1:3-5. Furthermore the position contradicts another great creation passage. It directly contradicts Psalm 104:2-5 when that passage is interpreted correctly. It is plain in that passage that the first act of creation was the stretching out of the heavens like a curtain and that this took place before the casting down of the foundations of planet earth. It is inescapable that the Psalmist understood, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that the heavens were being spread out by the Hand of the Lord before the creation of planet earth and its subsequent covering with the preAdamic universal sea and the darkness of closely shrouding clouds as described in Genesis 1:2 and in Job 38:8-9.
- This assumption that earth existed as a solitary heavenly body contradicts every mention of the "heavens and earth" in that order. The only exception to that order in the Old Testament is Genesis 2:4. I suggest that the sense there is ". . . in the day that the Eternal Lord God worked on the earth and the heavens." That is, the material bodies have been created in

Genesis 1:1. The discussion of God's work on the earth precedes His work on the heavens for the regulating of their orbits to produce man's day, season, month and year is not described until day four.

AXIOM # 2: "IN SIX DAYS THE LORD MADE THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH. . . ."

The concept which has dominated creation thought on the days of creation is the idea that the heavens and the earth are created within the six days of creation. To suggest otherwise is considered heresy because of the statement found in most translations: "For *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day. . . ." (Exo. 20:11; 31:17). The problem which makes this axiom very dubious is the fact that, first of all, it does directly contradict Genesis 1:1 and the implications of the following passage. In that text the creation of the earth is spoken in conjunction with the heavens as the one part of the double, direct object of the main verb. The Hebrew grammar of verse 2 very carefully singles out one of these two objects to discuss its condition. "But the earth, it was waste and desolate, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. . . ." (Gen. 1:2, my translation). Furthermore, if earth was not created in Genesis 1:1, then Genesis one never describes that event. Earth must be created in verse one, and if that is true, then the heavens are created in verse one. I therefore conclude that the Eternal created out of nothingness (bara) the heavens and the earth as the first act of creation mentioned in the chapter. This omits the detail of the creation of the angels which actually took place before the founding of the earth according to Job 38 and between the creation of the heavens and earth according to Psalm 104. This creation of the earth can only be an event which precedes the initial inception of rotation of the earth, the event which divided the creation week which followed into its 7 parts. It was the initiation of the rotation of the existing earth which provided the mechanism to divide evening and morning. Then began the six solar days described in Exodus 20:11 and 31:17. In these six solar days God did the work of preparation and of finishing the earth as an habitation for mankind and all of the creatures which preceded him in creation. This view which places the creation of the earth within the six 24 hour days obviously creates a logical problem. Remember the consistent formula by which each of the six creation days are introduced, "and God said." This formula is found in Genesis 1:3, 6, 9, 14, 20, and 24 as each day began. If the earth was not created until the first 24 hour day of creation, a day which had begun with evening and had proceeded on to morning as the earth rotated before a distant point of light, how could it cause that solar day? How could earth rotate to produce the solar day before it and the sun existed to move in the mechanics which produce the solar day described in verses 3-5? It is logically impossible for the earth to be created in the solar day which its own rotation produced!

The thesis that earth was created within the six solar days of creation also contradicts Exodus 20:11 and 31:17, the very texts used to prove the faulty thesis. But this statement is true only if the reader is studying the original Hebrew text! The problem is that the position is built upon a presupposition of the 1611 translators which required them to insert the preposition "in" in the verse. (Note that the preposition "in" is in italics, acknowledging that fact in the Authorized Version). When the insertion of this preposition was done, that act immediately required the translators to ignore the normal use of the Hebrew verb asah throughout the Hebrew Old Testament. In spite of the insistence of many students of English translations and some Hebrew students, the Hebrew verbs bara and asah do not have the same meaning or usage. Such a view is inconsistent with a verbal plenary view of inspiration which holds that precisely the right word was used by the human author under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to convey the exact meaning intended by the Revelator. Now the Hebrew verb asah consistently is used of work which is performed on existing material.

The axiom that each of these days was 24 hours long also is highly unlikely. The language used to describe the fourth day of creation strongly suggests that the regulation of the day, season, month and year took place at that time. "Let there be lights in the expanse of the atmosphere to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years. . . . And God appointed them in the expanse of the atmosphere to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night" (Gen. 1:14, 17-18). A far more appropriate way to describe these days is to say that they are solar days. Besides, if earth existed when the first rotational day began, strongly intimated by Genesis 1:4-5, then it is highly likely that each of the first four solar days was of a different length as earth continued speeding up in its rotation until its rotational speed was regulated in the fourth day. It is inconsistent to say that the first solar day began in Genesis 1:1, especially in the light of the previous discussion of the required presence of the earth and the celestial mechanism which are spoken of in verses one and two in order for the first rotational day of creation to begin. And the evidence is in the text that these were rotational, solar days. Verse 5 closes the discussion of the first solar day with language which inescapably refers to the rotation of the earth before the center of our galaxy. "And the evening and the morning were the first day. Furthermore, the language used to describe that day requires that rotation began in that darkness shrouded scene which is described in Genesis 1:2. The expression, "the first day" means exactly that. The Hebrew expression could have been translated "day first" to emphasize this factor even more. The formula which closes the discussion of God's activities in each of these solar days follows the same pattern. It is found in verses 8, 13, 19, 23 and 31. This is evidence which we cannot ignore to maintain our pet harmonization model. Otherwise we are guilty of the same evasion of evidence which characterizes the uniformitarian who will not listen to the report concerning these events which came from the Lord of Hosts, the Creator of the universe.

Some will immediately assume that this position is being taken by the author to provide room for geological ages before the six days of creation. Absolutely not. My Catastrophe Series Harmonization Model harmonizes the physical, geological column with the five great, geological catastrophes found in Genesis and Job without modifying Biblical time in the least. My position is taken to account for the Biblical evidence and to acknowledge the impossibility of insisting that the sun, moon and earth which produced the solar days and week described in Genesis actually were created within those solar days! It also recognizes that the manner in which the problem text is translated has caused several other hermeneutical problems of interpretation for the student of creation.

AXIOM # 3: THE NOAHIC FLOOD WAS EARTH'S ONLY UNIVERSAL FLOOD

Both Job 38:8-9 and Psalm 104:6 plainly state that, immediately after its creation, the Creator covered the earth with the universal, preAdamic, universal flood. That flood covered the crust of the earth entirely through the first two solar days of creation. The common rejection of this obvious Biblical fact is an over-reaction to the error of the gap theorist who assumed that this was a judgmental flood, a universal flood which destroyed an entire, complete, previous creation. That model certainly is untenable and to be rejected as a means of harmonizing the geological record with Genesis. It does not work. But that fact is no cause for rejecting the fact that a preAdamic, universal flood actually is described in the Bible in three places. To discard that crucial fact while discarding the gap theory is "throwing the baby out with the bathwater." It results in another error that hinders creation research in the same way that the gap theory once did. In this case the fact of the reality of the preAdamic universal flood, which played such a significant role in preparing the surface of the earth for the remarkably brief event series which followed blissfully ignored. That flood was preparatory, an essential step in the preparation of the earth for the creation of plant, marine and animal and human life in the last four solar days of creation. The physical evidence found in the Archeozoic and Proterozoic sections of the geological deposits closely parallels the Biblical evidence concerning earth's first universal flood and the uplift and drainage of the continent at the beginning of the third solar day of creation. Nothing in Genesis 7 harmonizes with that physical evidence. When the researcher finds that his harmonization model does not work, it is a sure sign that the model is faulty. This physical evidence can only be accounted for by the model which states that the Archeozoic structures are the deposits laid down by the eruption of that first sea from within the crust of the earth as described by Job. Immediately following His description of the creation of the earth before the created (and surely unfallen) Sons of God, which all shouted for joy at the event, the Eternal then describes the eruption of that sea out of the crust of the earth. "Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it" (Job 38:8-9).

When reexamined in this setting, Psalm 104 also remarkably parallels the Biblical evidence in Genesis 1:2-9 and in Job 38:8-9. The real significance of Psalm 104 is lost when verses 6-17 of the psalm are misapplied to the events of the Noahic flood. This is an error which is produced when the interpreter makes the mistake of "throwing the baby out with the bathwater." That is, having correctly concluded that the Gap Theory explanation of Genesis 1:1-2 as a prior creation and destruction is in error, the researcher ignores the clear teaching the text of Genesis 1:2-9, Job 38:4-10 and Psalm 104 that there really was such a flood, even if the gap theorists misinterpreted its function. These passages clearly teach that, after earth's creation, the newly created world immediately was covered by a universal flood which in some way contributed positively to scene of the six days of creation which follow. Psalm 104 is a psalm which, in a remarkable way, exults in the greatness of the Eternal Lord, the Creator, by scanning His activities in the creation week. The misapplication of the psalm to the Noahic flood long has obscured the contribution of this great creation Psalm to our appreciation of two very important events in the creation week. These Biblical events provide an explanation for the early portion of the geological record. As a result, creationists' explanations of the deposits at the Grand Canyon almost always confuse the event series which deposited the lower half of the canyon.

The Divine Author gives the order of the events of creation in Psalm 104 as follows:

- (1) Just as in Genesis 1:1 the creation of the heavens is mentioned first. After exulting in the greatness of the Creator, he says: "Oh Eternal Lord, . . . You continually are covering (a participle) Yourself with light as with a garment, stretching out [or 'having stretched out'] (a participle) the heavens like a curtain. . . ." (Psa. 104:1-2). Surely there is a reason for the mentioning of this at the beginning of the discussion.
- (2) Recognizing truth not mentioned in Genesis, the writer of Psalm 104 identifies the next creative event by the Eternal as the creation of the ranks of spirit beings. He probably was drawing on truth revealed by the Creator's own speech to Job in Job 38:4-7. There the Eternal Lord plainly says that the Sons of God were present and that they all rejoiced when He laid the foundations of the earth. The Psalmist goes back before that and tells of the creation of these heavenly beings. He speaks of the Lord as ". . . making His messengers spirits, His ministers a flaming fire" (Psa. 104:4). Note that this text, with Job 38:4-7, also reveals that the angels were created even before the earth was. This strongly suggests that the book of Job probably was available to the Psalmist. Hebrews one also indicates by its

quote of Psalm 104:4 that it was the Son of God who is referred to here.

- (3) According to the Psalmist, earth next was established unmoveably on its foundations. ". . . Who laid the foundations of the earth in order that it should not be moved forever" (Psa. 104:5). And that precisely agrees with Genesis 1:1. That verse has a compound direct object which follows the verb bara, "he created" and its subject, "God." The two elements which God created are "the heavens" (a dual) and "the earth." Now earth clearly exists in Genesis 1:2. There it lies covered with the first universal flood that is not removed until verse 9. It therefore is difficult for one to postulate otherwise than that the universe and the earth both were created before verse 2. Indeed, the Hebrew grammar of Genesis 1:1, with its compound object, demands that the heavens came into being either at the same time as the earth or just before it. Part of the problem which creationists have had in recognizing this has been the remarkable variety of ways that translators have mistreated Genesis 1:2. I insist that since the waw which introduces verse 2 isolates the earth from this pair of direct objects "the earth" alone, that is the second of these direct objects. The introductory conjunction must be translated adversatively as "but" and not coordinately as "and." "But the earth, it was in a state of being (a stative or state of being verb) waste and desolate, for darkness was upon the face of the deep (ocean). And the Spirit of God was moving about on the face of the waters (of that ocean)" (Gen. 1:2). For waters to cover the surface of the earth, the earth must exist in the form of a solid and not as some nebulous stream of gasses as I have heard a mislead Laurence Radiation Laboratory scientist mistakenly interpret the text. And for those waters to remain liquid, unless the crust of the earth was much warmer than would appear possible in the immediately following verses, solar radiation had to be entering the cloud cover. That cloud layer is nicely described in Job 38:8-9 as well as in Genesis 1:2.
- (4) In perfect accord with Genesis 1:1-2, the Psalmist recognizes that after the creation of the earth, the next creative event described in Genesis is God's act of covering the earth with the deep as with a garment. He indicates that all of earth's mountains which then existed were covered by its waters. "You covered it with the *deep* as with a piece of clothing. The waters stood above the mountains" (Psa. 104:6). "Deep" here translates a Hebrew word that almost always refers to the depths of the ocean. (Cf. Genesis 1:2) The recognition of this fact, which so clearly is testified to in Genesis 1:2, does not require one to adopt the error of the gap theorists. They assume that this was a judgmental flood which destroyed a perfect creation that was complete with animals and man. This error, utterly unjustified by the teaching of Scripture, has been used to provide a very ill fitting pigeon hole into which to fit earth's teeming fossils. It is a model of explanation which totally fails to account for the physical evidence. It must achieve this if the view is correct, but it is not.
- (5) The next event described by the psalmist is so catastrophic that many translations ignore and twist the obvious intent of the Psalmist's language. He actually says (in the original Hebrew text) that at the Creator's command, a great land mass abruptly was lifted out of the sea. The mountains rose up and earth's valleys were deepened. A new phenomenon, sea level, soon was established at the Creator's command. (Compare Job 38:10). At this point the researcher must avoid the error found in many "translations" which reject the grammatical subjects of the two clauses. These are "the mountains" and "the valleys." These translations erroneously make the waters the subjects and transfer the subjects to become objects. My own translation acknowledges the Psalmist's grammar and obvious intent of providing a clear interpretation of Genesis 1:9. "At Your rebuke they (the waters) fled. They hurried away at the thunder of Your voice. The *mountains* went up. The *valleys* went down to the place which You had established for them. You established a boundary which they [the waters of the newly established seas surrounding the newly exposed, single continent] should not pass over, that they should not continue to pass over the earth" (Psa. 104:7-9).
- (6) Now the psalm turned in verses 10-17 to describe the drainage of the newly risen landmass, the single continent which stood above sea level for the extended period that lasted from Genesis 1:10-7:11. The psalmist speaks of newly developed streams which drain the land mass as God's wonderful provision for earth's land creatures which soon would be created in the fifth and sixth solar day of creation. "He sent the springs into the valleys which ran among the hills. These give drink to every beast of the field. The wild asses (would) quench their thirst. The fowls of the skies, which (would) sing among the branches, (would) have their dwelling places beside (the streams)" (Psa. 104:10-12).
- (7) The Psalmist next meditated on God's provision of water from the heavens to provide for the vegetation which He created for the benefit of man, beast and bird. "He watered the hills from his chambers. The earth was satisfied with the fruit of Your works." The now turns to

consider the second half of the third solar day of creation and to the months following and to His purposeful provision for the continental lifeforms which would be created on the fifth and sixth solar days of creation. "He caused the grass to grow for the cattle and vegetation for the needs of man. He did this in order that man might bring forth food out of the earth and wine that makes the heart of man glad and oil which makes his face to shine and bread which strengthens the heart of man. The trees of the Eternal Lord were full of sap. There were the cedars of Lebanon which He had planted where the birds would make their nests. As for the stork, the fir trees would be her house. The high hills would be a refuge for the wild goats and the rocks for the conies." (Psa. 104:13-18). The growing of the grasses for the needs of the grazing animals obviously was an ongoing provision that continues even today.

- (8) The Psalmist then identifies the next creative act as the regulation of the sun and moon, an act which will govern the activities of all of the beings which were created on the sixth solar day. Failure to recognize the significance of the contribution of this text to our understanding of the events of the fourth solar day of creation greatly has fogged for many the explanation of the event series of the creation week. "He appointed [a participle from the same verb that is found in Genesis 1:16] the moon for seasons. The sun knew its goings. (Psa. 104:19-23). This misunderstanding of the time of the creation of the sun, moon and stars by most creationists is another of the "axioms" which is not soundly based upon the text of Genesis one itself. The cause of this misunderstanding will be discussed later.
- (9) The Psalmist then rejoices in all of the Lord's wonderful works of creation and in His wisdom for His provision of food for all of the living creatures in earth's biosphere. This included marine life which he had not mentioned previously (vv.24-30). He closes exulting in the glory and praise of the Lord, the Creator of all things (vv.31-35).

Apart from the recognition of the universal, preAdamic flood and its catastrophic retreat on the third solar day of creation as described in Psalm 104, the creationist has no explanation for the earth's oldest marine, sedimentary structures, the now fiercely distorted Archaeozoic series. It is devoid of fossils, a factor which forbids any attempt to explain these materials by the Noahic flood. Similarly, the creationist must ignore or misplace the evidence that the continentally derived, Proterozoic materials were deposited in the littoral, marine zone which surrounded a great continent. These not only contain pollen grains from mature trees (derived from the creative acts which occupied the latter part of the third day of creation in Genesis 1:11-13) but mature marine fossils (derived from the creation of the fifth day as described in Genesis 1:20-23). That evidence in itself might be adjusted somehow to fit into the Noahic flood except for the fact that the Proterozoic materials, wherever found, end in a great depositional break and never are depositionally connected with the Paleozoic materials. It is inescapable to the careful creation researcher that the Paleozoic deposits record the beginning of the Noahic flood in the ocean bottoms, its encroachment of the landmass, its stabilization after reaching universality, its early retreat stages as the wind signs of Genesis 8:1 begin to appear and finally, the oscillation signs as the retreating waters begin going and returning repeatedly on the newly exposed shorelines of the single continent (Gen. 8:3). The fact that the Proterozoic and the Paleozoic are not a single, uninterrupted deposit (as they should be if both are part of the Noahic flood) suggests that the Archaeozoic and Paleozoic deposits were deposited by two abrupt, indeed violent events in the beginning of earth's history and not by the Paleozoic, Noahic flood which universally exhibits similar fossil deposits on the continents. It requires one to recognize the possibility that the Archaeozoic and Paleozoic deposits relate to Genesis one and its catastrophic events and not to the Noahic flood. It implies that the depositional break which separates the Proterozoic deposits from the Paleozoic deposits should be identified with the more than 15 centuries which lie between these earlier geological catastrophic events and the great Noahic flood of Genesis seven and eight. This crucial harmonization clue usually is ignored in creation studies today.

But how can we explain the remarkable distortion of the Archaeozoic materials which now are almost vertically refoiled in many places? This can only be explained by recognizing that the forces which produced this preNoahic orogeny was the very catastrophically abrupt uplift of the great single continent in the very beginning of the third solar day of creation (Gen. 1:9). This event is most precisely described in Psalm 104:7-9. "At Your rebuke they (the preAdamic flood waters) fled; at the voice of Your thunder they hasted away. The mountains went up; the valleys went down to the place which You established for them. You set a bound (i.e. established sea level) that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to cover the earth." It is impossible to escape the fact that violent diastrophism is described here when one correctly reads the text in Hebrew. Those creationists demand that the passage be applied to the Noahic flood because of the last sentence should recognize the danger of over-reading Biblical evidence. What do they say about the phrase: "Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed forever" (Psa. 104:5). By that applying that same type of interpretation which they apply to verse 9, they would contradict Revelation 20:11. That verse looks forward to the day when the earth and the heaven will flee away from the face of the Judge of the whole earth. And in reality they make verse 9 to contradict Genesis 7 when they insist upon applying this verse to the promise of Genesis 9:11 that after the Noahic flood, there never again would be a universal flood. In reality Psalm 104:9 simply refers to the establishment of sea level in the same

way that Job 38:10-11 refer to the establishment of sea level after that initial period of darkness and universal sea which also is found in Genesis 1:2-8.

There is yet another factor which is ignored when one refuses to acknowledge the preAdamic, universal flood. Genesis 1:6-8 clearly indicates that in the 2nd solar day of creation (vs.6-8), the canopy is separated from the universal sea. The rachia, the expanse of the atmospheric heavens where the birds would fly on the fifth day of creation, is stretched out, and in the process divides the waters which were under the expanse, (that is, the universal sea which lay below the expanse of the atmospheric heavens) from the waters which were above the expanse . . ." (Gen. 1:7). To ignore the expanse of the atmospheric heavens and the two bodies of water which it separated leaves the creationist unable to understand what happened geologically when the great single continent of Genesis 1:9 lifted out of the sea. The testimony of the Proterozoic structures to the Creator's activities is obscured. In the same way the door is closed to his understanding the second source of the Noahic flood, the waters from above the expanse of the atmospheric heavens, the canopy. It should be obvious that the researcher must not ignore a fragment of the evidence, whether he is studying the physical record or the Biblical record of earth's early events. How can one ignore the fact that the sea universally covers the earth until that great command, the sound of the thunder of the Creator's voice, causes part of the ocean bottom to be erected above sea level? We must acknowledge that this sea which retreats from the landmass has existed, wholly covering the earth from Genesis 1:2. To do otherwise is to pay little attention to all of the extended events of the third solar day.

AXIOM # 4: IT NEVER RAINED BETWEEN CREATION AND THE NOAHIC FLOOD

Psalm 104:10-12, in a context which describes the draining of the land mass after its erection out of the sea in Genesis 1:9, says this: "He watered the hills from His chambers. The earth was satisfied with the fruit of Your works." Notice that this statement in the Psalm utterly contradicts the steadfast distortion of Genesis 2:5 so common in creation conferences today. This verse plainly says that God supplied rainfall from heaven in the days of Adam. What Genesis 2:5 actually is talking about is the time immediately before the creation of mankind. That was a time when the field plants (i.e. those outside of the garden) and the field shrubs had not yet sprouted forth. In that time between the third day creation of the special garden and the creation of mankind, it did not rain on the earth. It says nothing whatsoever about the period between Adam and the Noahic flood! Nevertheless, this idea which is very common among creationists is the result of the misinterpreting of the Hebrew word B-terem, "before" in Genesis 2:5. The word means "not yet" or "before." What the section actually is saying is that, in that time before the field plants and field shrubs had spread from the garden where they had been planted (Gen. 2:8) to the world outside of the garden, while there yet was no man to till the ground, the Eternal Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth. It has been very dramatic to picture the surprise of antediluvial man, having laughed at the monstrosity which Noah had been building, now that the door of the ark had been shut, to see gushing rain falling from the heavens for the first time in history. But a careful consideration of three key phrases in the verse, which ignored in the presentation of this axiom, would have prevented this interpretative blunder. The verse actually says: "Now field shrubs were not yet in the earth and field herbs had not yet sprouted forth. (This is not referring to the third day planting of the garden of Eden which already has taken place according to Genesis 2:8 when one recognizes the previous time element in the verb. See the discussion immediately below). The reason was that the Eternal Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth and there was no man to work the ground." The time being discussed was before Adam's creation as is obvious from the very next verse. Therefore the reference has to be to the third through the fifth solar days of creation.

AXIOM # 5: THE BIBLE CONTRADICTS ITSELF, SAYING IN GENESIS 1 THAT THE ANIMALS WERE CREATED BEFORE MAN BUT IN GENESIS 2 THAT MAN WAS CREATED BEFORE THE ANIMALS. (This axiom is held by those seeking to fault the accuracy of Genesis):

The problem here is found in translator's rendition of the syntax of Genesis 2:19. Many translations seem to indicate that after God had concluded that man was incomplete without a mate, He then " . . . formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. . . ." This actually is a problem which lodges in the translator's failure to grasp the fact that the context of a verb alone may indicate that the time element of a perfect or an imperfect verb can be previous past. Actually most translations occasionally render some verb forms this way. Illustrations may be found in this very context in the following passages: Genesis 2:2, "God ended His work which He had worked upon . . ." Genesis 2:3: "God . . . rested . . . from all His work which He had worked on." Genesis 2:5: "The Eternal Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth." Genesis 2:8b: ". . . There He placed the man whom He had formed. The previous past time of the verb also would have fit the context precisely in Genesis 2:8: Now the Eternal Lord God had planted (on day 3?) a garden. . . ." Genesis 2:9: "Now out of the ground the Eternal Lord God had made every tree to grow . . ." This is the correct solution for Genesis 2:19. The context of Genesis 1:24-27 requires the translator to supply the English helping particle (which Hebrew does not use) so that the section reads in this way. "Then the Eternal Lord God said: Man's being alone is not good. I will make for him a counterpart. Now out of the ground the Lord God had formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and he had brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatsoever Adam had called every living creature, that had become the name of it. And Adam had given names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air, and to the beast of the field; but for Adam there had

not been found a counterpart for him" (Gen. 2:18-20. What is the scene being presented? In order to make the "self-satisfied old bachelor" aware of his need, to awaken his hunger for the completeness which was enjoyed by every animal pair, God brought those pairs before the man. He gave him the responsibility of naming them. This responsibility sensitized the man for the mate who was missing from his life. This strongly is suggested by the words: ". . . But for Adam there had not been found a counterpart for him." Now that the man emotionally ready for that, the Lord expresses the determination which had been part of His plan all along. "Male and female He created them" (Gen. 1:27).

Note that failure to understand the Hebrew syntax involved and failure to recognize the previous past action of the first verb, "...God had created every beast of the field and every fowl of the air," introduces a man-made contradiction into the translation through failure to observe previous context. That man-made contradiction now contradicts Gen. 1:20-27. There the order of events clearly has been established. The birds were created on the fifth day. The animals were created during the first part of the sixth day. Mankind (apparently both male and female) was created in the latter part of the sixth day. By recognizing the previous past in the first statement of Gen. 2:19, conflict disappears. By recognizing the rest of the previous perfect translations that I have suggested in Gen. 2:19 and 20, it will be seen that verses 19 and 20 give the explanation for the statement which is found in verse 18. God deliberately has brought the animals and birds pair by pair for the explicit purpose of preparing the man to recognize that something was missing from his life, that he did not have a counterpart like all of the rest of the created beings of earth.

CONCLUSION

Axioms attempt to state succinctly facts that are self evident. But when an axiom is found to contradict the evidence which it attempts to explain, it is time to revise or to discard the axiom. When the axiom seeks to explain Biblical passages and events, it is crucial that those who postulate the axiom be critical of their assumptions and lay aside those which do not work. In my study of creation over the last 43 years I have laid aside the monocatastrophic gap theory as an inadequate harmonization model. I also have been forced to lay aside the monocatastrophic Noahic flood theory and its attempt to harmonize all of geology with the Bible by that flood. It is hoped that the very controversial material contained in this presentation will help to sharpen the focus of creation studies and return them to a more thoughtful perusal of the actual evidence, whether it be Biblical or in the realm of physical geology. While Biblical evidence always must take precedence, it must never be forgotten that, properly understood, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the expanse of the atmosphere declares His handiwork" (Psa. 19:1).

