

Chapter 1

Can the Bible be Trusted?

Before we begin to analyze the Biblical genealogical record in an attempt to understand the earth's timetable and the date of man's origin, we must examine the question of the reliability of Scriptures. All Christians agree that the Bible is trustworthy when it addresses the question of salvation, but there is not always such confidence in the Bible when it speaks in the area of scientific or historical truth. The opening chapters of Genesis are especially suspect to many insofar as historical and scientific accuracy are concerned.

Increasingly in recent years, geologists, paleontologists, anthropologists, and those committed to other scientific disciplines have insisted that their research is producing more and more evidence to prove that the concept of long periods of time is the only valid rationale for explaining the existence and condition of our present world. They also conclude that the idea of a universal, earth-inundating flood must be discarded.

Are these scientists correct? Must we reread the Bible from a point of view that is different from what we have done in the past? Were our forefathers misguided in believing the six days of creation were six literal days as the Bible evidently teaches? Were they misled into believing that the Bible tells of a literal flood that covered the entire surface of the earth and rose to fifteen cubits above the highest mountain?

Unfortunately, the great majority of those attempting to draw scientific conclusions from evidence being discovered are unsaved men who have no regard for nor any understanding of the Bible. This is true simply because a great majority of all the people in the world are unsaved, including scientists. But the problem of Biblical unbelief arises because a small but significant number of those who accept these conclusions are scientists who are born-again Christians.

Their accommodation of these conclusions, often speculations such as theistic evolution, has encouraged their acceptance by an ever-increasing number of non- or partially-scientifically oriented

Christians. I must confess that some years ago, I too, held the position that the Bible allowed for six long creative periods.

Many serious Christians, however, sense that there is something critically amiss. They may not be able to adequately express their fears in this regard, but they are nevertheless uneasy. Perhaps they fear that acceptance of this new scientific thought can only lead men away from the Bible rather than toward it.

A number of valid reasons may be suggested which have contributed to the development of the acute polarity of opinions concerning the earth's origins. First of all, few ministers, theologians, or laymen are educationally equipped to talk intelligently about scientific matters with physicists, geologists, and other scientists who are highly trained in their fields. Therefore, communication between the scientific world and the theological world is very poor.

Moreover, our theological posture is cast in the crucible of the Reformation. The reformers were not required to speak in any great detail about the questions raised in this discussion, which have become so vital in recent years. Thus, our ministers and teachers have not been schooled as well as they should have been to face these questions. Because they have not, none of us sitting at their feet have received adequate scriptural training. All of us have been trained to think clearly in the areas of sin, salvation, and service; but we have been given no clearly defined framework for understanding the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Therefore, even the Christian who has obtained his doctorate in a scientific field has the same Biblical training as the rest of us; he, too, is limited in his efforts to establish a framework for Biblical truth in the areas of his concern.

Thus, the polarity exists between those who sense that anything but a literal reading of the Genesis account is a direct violation of the rest of the truths of the Bible, and those who believe that the widest possible latitude must be given to the interpretation of the Genesis account in order to establish any concordance with scientific truth. Believers on each side of the question are equally sincere in their desire to find truth.

One other point might be raised. In II Peter 3 we read that in the latter days scoffers will arise who would deny the Biblical teaching of the worldwide destructive flood of Noah's day.

II Peter 3:3-7: Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is

the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

The reason for their denial is a conscious or subconscious reluctance to accept the certainty of Christ's personal return to earth to bring judgment. Obviously, the thought of man in some form upon an old world for millions of years does make the concept of the termination of this world, perhaps within our lifetime, appear rather quaint and untenable. If God's judgment on Noah's world was not extensive and conclusive as Genesis 6 to 9 portrays, then there is serious doubt about whether the language of the Bible that relates to the forthcoming judgment upon this present world is to be taken seriously.

This problem was brought home to me vividly when I heard a prominent minister deliver a sermon in which I thought he said that the same trees which we presently see around us could be present after Christ's return. In a discussion with him afterwards, I asked him if he agreed with the statements in II Peter 3 that this world would be destroyed by fire prior to the new heavens and new earth. His reply was very enlightening. "Don't you think this language could be symbolical, and must it necessarily be understood literally?," he asked.

Upon reflecting on his answer to me, the rationale for it is easily seen: If the literal universal flood of Noah did not really happen, then the language of Genesis 6-9 must be symbolical or figurative in some sense, and possibly the language of II Peter 3 also. Then, too, all statements in the Bible that relate to Christ's coming could be symbolical. The ultimate development of such thinking could lead to a complete denial of the truth of His second coming to bring judgment.

This experience has been cited only to indicate the importance of the question under discussion and the necessity to take a clear and forthright stand.

In regards to this question, I would like to make a few general observations.

1. All of the Bible is accurate and authoritative. A modern cliché is often expressed to the effect that the Word of God was never intended to be a textbook of history, science, or psychology, and that the supreme purpose of the Bible is to reveal the Creator's wonderful redemptive plan for fallen man through Jesus Christ. This statement in itself is true, but unfortunately the impression is often left that the Bible is, therefore, less than accurate when it speaks in the areas of science or history. Thus, the authority of the Scriptures is undermined and much valuable Biblical truth is disregarded. The fact is that when the Scriptures speak in the areas of science or history, or, for that matter, in any other field of learning, they do so with exceeding great care, accuracy, and authority. There are three reasons for this: (1) these subjects are often an integral part of the plan of salvation; (2) the words and the subjects are part of God's message to man; and (3) by reason of His very nature, God is accurate when He speaks.

It appears that two events in history are perhaps especially important contributors to the present resistance to the acceptance of the entire Bible as completely authoritative and trustworthy in every detail. The first was the development of the evolutionary theories of Charles Darwin together with the uniformitarianism theories of Lyell and others. Darwin and Lyell offered systems of origins which appeared to be substantiated by much evidence from scientific research. Because their theories run counter to the teachings of the Bible, a serious question was raised regarding the trustworthiness of the Scriptures.

The second event was the uncovering of the ancient sites of Mesopotamia and Egypt. While the first archaeological effort was begun by Napoleon's Expedition in 1798, substantial digging at these old sites occurred almost simultaneously with the presentation of the theories of Darwin and Lyell. Not only were ancient cities brought to light but also their primitive libraries were unearthed. Once the languages of these bygone civilizations were deciphered, the libraries of clay tablets were read. The archaeologists, many of whom were trained as theologians, discovered many tablets that appeared to disagree with the Bible or they found little evidence that would support the Bible. So immediately the Bible was placed on the same level as that of other ancient writings. They thought the Bible was to be reckoned as one account developed by man but it was not to be regarded as any more authoritative than any other account.

The words of Sir Alan Gardiner, an archeologist of international

fame who regarded Exodus as legendary, tells very succinctly of his feelings:

I will admit that the lack of logic and imperviousness to facts shown by those who treat the book of Exodus as a good historical document soon ranged me to the other side.¹

It is true that whenever a Biblical statement was discovered to be true, it was acknowledged, but even this often was done reluctantly.

Because archaeological discovery was of such great interest to Bible scholars, the findings and conclusions of the archaeologists were read eagerly. Unfortunately, however, too few dared to reject the scientific conclusions when such conclusions ran contrary to God's Word. Even in conservative commentaries, questions are raised regarding the trustworthiness of certain parts of the Biblical record. For example, the editors of the highly esteemed *Pulpit Commentary* allow one of its writers to say:

The conclusion, therefore, seems to be that, while Scripture does not imperatively forbid the idea of a partial Deluge, science appears to require it, and, without ascribing to all the scientific objections that are urged against the universality of the Flood that importance which their authors assign to them, it may be safely affirmed that there is considerable reason for believing that the 'mabbul' which swept away the antediluvian men was confined to the region which they inhabited.²

At a time when the Biblical record was being threatened by the secular record, we entered the age of modern science. Scientists in the last several decades have covered themselves with glory as they made advances in medicine, physics, chemistry, and biological research. Among other discoveries, they found ways of dating the materials of the earth, both inorganic and organic. Their conclusion that the earth must be at least several billion years old seems to agree with the earlier findings of Darwin, Lyell, and others. Because the Bible says that God made the creation in six days several thousand years ago, these modern-day scientists have come to the same conclusion as many of the archaeologists: the Bible is untrustworthy in these areas of scientific thought.

At the same time, Christians have attempted to harmonize and explain the Biblical account in relation to the scientific evidence and conclusions. Some Christians who are scientists have decided that the Bible does not speak at all in areas of history and science; they say it

is a book only for the theologian. A statement which reflects the current position of many Christians of scientific background is found in *The Encounter Between Christianity and Science*.³ In this book, which was written and edited by leading Christians of scientific stature, the premise is set forth that the Bible is trustworthy when it speaks about God, Jesus, and salvation. They contend that since these are apparently the key subjects of the Bible, the supporting data, that is, historical and scientific data, need not be accurate. Consequently, they allege that the scientific theories of evolution and uniformitarianism cannot be studied in the light of the Bible but can be understood only in the light of God's natural revelation. In my judgment, such assumptions have led these writers to a kind of neo-orthodoxy which reminds one of the theories of Barth and Brunner. Barth and Brunner approached the Bible from a philosophical background whereas the scientists approach the Bible with the viewpoint that science is the final authority; both are offering less than the whole counsel of God.

The point is that the belief that the supporting Biblical data is not necessarily accurate and true ultimately will lead the believer away from spiritual truth. The conclusions of the writers of the book, *The Encounter Between Christianity and Science*, show this trend:

In conclusion, then, the writer takes the following position:

(1) Organic evolution has been verified with sufficient evidence to justify scientific acceptance.

(2) Acceptance of organic evolution does not negate creation or the supernatural. Rather, organic evolution is a natural process accomplishing a supernatural purpose.⁴

It seems to me that such conclusions effectively destroy the whole purpose of the Bible. Without an historical Adam and an historical confrontation between Adam and Satan, the purpose of Christ's coming is put into question. Furthermore, what Scripture can anyone offer to support such conclusions? In my judgment, these conclusions offer the scientist maximum latitude in examining scientific evidence, but this in no sense makes these conclusions true. For example, it can be shown that the Bible has much to say in the area of evolutionary theory. I trust that this volume will show how wonderfully God, in His Word, helps us to understand the chronology of mankind, and this chronology impinges directly upon the conclusions which are derived from the secular evidence.

For too long many well-meaning Christians have yielded to the temptation to deny the relevancy and wisdom of the Scriptures which relate to many fields of learning. We must accept all of the Bible as totally accurate and authoritative.

2. Whenever we have to force a verse or struggle with a verse to make it fit into our idea of what the Word says or will allow, we are on very dangerous ground. One of the most fundamental concepts of Bible exegesis is to let the Bible be its own interpreter. Some subjects are mentioned in more parts of the Bible than other subjects, and can be interpreted in more ways than others, depending upon the context, but if the Bible does not allow for alternatives, then none can be taken. The Bible must set the limits on interpretation. Unless Biblical evidence of a parallel nature, including but not limited to, the context of the verse itself allows us to do so, we may not take liberties to try to understand a verse. What we do not understand, we must simply accept by faith. Later, either in this life or in the life beyond the grave, the Holy Spirit will clarify the verse.

Let us consider, for example, the findings of world-renowned archaeologist Sir Leonard Wooley concerning the Noachian Flood.⁵ After examining evidence obtained during twelve years of excavating at the ancient site of Ur of the Chaldees, Sir Leonard expressed the opinion that the flood of Noah's day was limited to the Mesopotamia Valley.

The archaeologist had found indisputable proof of a major flood. A deposit of silt to a maximum depth of eleven feet was discovered with evidence of human dwellings below the level of the silt. In his findings, Sir Leonard stated that in his opinion the flood recorded in the Book of Genesis had extended across the flat, low-lying land of Mesopotamia to a depth of twenty-five feet and over an area three hundred miles in length and a hundred miles in width.

Viewed under the searchlight of God's Word, however, the conclusions of this eminent authority are invalid. It can be shown that the flood of Noah's day must have been universal if the Scriptures mean what they say. This fact is clearly set forth in the Bible. When we look at the Scriptures which relate to the flood, we will be amazed at the clear language and the repeated emphasis of universality that God uses to describe this flood.

The Bible uses language such as the following.

Genesis 6:7: And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have

created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.

Genesis 6:13: And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.

Genesis 6:17: And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die.

Genesis 7:4: For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and every living substance that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the earth.

Genesis 7:19-23: And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered. Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.

Genesis 8:5: And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.

Genesis 8:8-9: Also he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground; But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him into the ark, for the waters were on the face of the whole earth: then he put forth his hand, and took her, and pulled her in unto him into the ark.

Genesis 8:21: And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.

Genesis 9:11: And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.

Genesis 9:15 And I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.

Could words be more explicit or exact to indicate the universal character of the flood, from the standpoint of the destruction of all flesh and the destruction of the entire face of the earth, than the words used in the Genesis account? To question such positive and clear-cut statements is to impugn the authority of God's Word. Few events in history are as clearly delineated in the Scriptures as the flood and inundation of the earth during Noah's day. Therefore, we may not assume any different conclusion than that the flood literally happened. Moreover, the parallel passages in the Bible give no suggestions that these verses are to be taken other than literally; actually, they reinforce the truth of the nature and extent of the flood (II Peter 3:5-7, Psalm 104:6-9).

In the light of the Biblical record of a deluge of cataclysmic proportions, we must carefully appraise many of the conclusions of geologists, anthropologists, and paleontologists of our day. Such men of science frequently base their conclusions on the premise that all change since the beginning of time has continued in a uniform and noncatastrophic fashion. This is an assumption that the Christian cannot accept since all archaeological findings must be examined under the searchlight of God's clear-cut statement that the whole earth was destroyed by a flood in one period of history. In fact, the Holy Spirit contends with the premise of uniformity in II Peter 3:3-6:

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.

3. Scientific conclusions regarding the earth's origins are often based on hypothesis rather than fact.

We often receive the impression that the theory set forth by many scientists that the origins of the world required long periods of time is the only valid one due to an abundance of unquestionable evidence. Almost every article on this subject written for popular consumption appears to say that the evidence for the conclusion is quite free from uncertainty and the supporting evidence is amenable only to that conclusion. However, we find that much of the evidence is fragmentary when we read what scientists write to each other in scientific journals such as the *American Journal of Science*. We notice how carefully they indicate the assumptions and hypothesis that they have adopted to arrive at the theories they offer, and how carefully they state the exceptions and problems that remain which weaken their conclusions. In other words, they understand that their conclusions must be tentative and subject to radical change if necessary because of the paucity of available data and the sometimes speculative nature of some of their basic assumptions.

Unfortunately, the layman is seldom given information regarding the tenuous nature of many of these conclusions. In addition, relevant statements of the Bible are normally not used in the evaluation of the evidence that is being studied.

The Biblical account of the days of creation must be recognized before any scientific evidence concerned with origins can be evaluated. Does the Bible suggest or permit long periods of time as a valid option to that of six solar days? The Biblical record of the first day is given in Genesis 1:3-5:

And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.

The first day appropriately began with the words “and God said,” even as each of the other five days began with the same words. Let us assume for the moment that the first day was a long period of time, say, one million years. This appears to be a valid assumption since the Bible sometimes uses the words “day” or yom to describe an activity that lasts more than a solar day. Genesis 2:4, for example, says:

These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.

This particular day probably includes all of the events spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis or as a bare minimum the events of the second and third days. So our beginning assumption that the first day was a long period of time could have Biblical support.

Since the verse speaks of an evening and morning, the first day must have been divided into two periods, each approximately 500,000 years long. Ordinarily, the division of day and night is approximately on a 50/50 basis inasmuch as the entire Bible was written in an area of the world where this is true. However, for maximum freedom in following this discussion, the hypothetical million years could be divided on almost any basis and the argument will hold. The first was a period of light which was called day and the second a period of darkness called night. The “evening” and “morning” must be related to the “day” and “night” of the same verse. This is the logical and obvious reading of verse 5, and no other relationship is intimated.

When we look at the second and third days of creation, we should conclude that their time spans must be like day one. The statements, “And the evening and the morning were the second day,” and “And the evening and the morning were the third day” are almost identical to the statement of verse. Could we not then assume that the second and third days were of like duration to that of day one? Since the second and third days also had an evening and a morning, each must have consisted of a period of light lasting some 500,000 years and a period of darkness lasting some 500,000 years.

The first major problem soon arises, however. What happened to the plants and trees, which came into existence the third day, during the long night of half a million years? Since there were no moon nor stars, the darkness must have been total. Surely, no plant life could be sustained during this long night.

On the fourth day, God created the sun, moon, and stars. The greater light (the sun) was to rule over the day. The lesser light (the moon) was to rule over the night. Inasmuch as this, too, was a period of an evening and a morning, the fourth day, which lasted a million years in accord with our initial assumption, also must have been divided into a period of 500,000 years of light and 500,000 years of darkness. What about the sun during this 500,000 years of night? Was it shining during this long night? The obvious conclusion is that the evening and morning could have lasted only the length of a solar day. In fact, if we start again with Genesis 1:5 and recognize that each day of creation was of 24 hours duration and that the “day” of Genesis

1:5a was more specifically the light portion of the first day, we will solve all of the problems raised above.

The first three days continued 24 hours without the sun. The fourth day continued with the same rhythm but with the sun. Although the light of the first day was the substitute for the sun's light of the fourth, the earth could have been turning on its axis every 24 hours the first day even as it does today. The rhythm of 24 hours, therefore, could have been manifested in this phenomenon as well as the alternate light and dark periods of 12 hours each. Only by this understanding can harmony be provided throughout the entire first chapter of Genesis. Of the some 1480 times that the Hebrew word *yom* is used in the Bible, the preponderant usage is of that suggested above, namely, the period of time the sun is shining or the calendar day of twenty-four hours. These are the usual ways in which we use the word "day" in our ordinary speech. The concept of solar days for Genesis 1 is not only the most obvious understanding of *yom* in Genesis 1, also it is in complete harmony with the entire Bible.

Let us look a moment at the seventh day when God rested. Does the Bible support the concept that this was a long period of time? And if God's cessation from creation is to continue from the end of the six days of creation until the end of the age, does this suggest that the six days were also long periods of time? It is true that at the end of the six days God rested from his work and never again began his initial creation. But did he never more create? We read in John 5:17:

But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

This verse shows that God surely is not resting. We cannot conclude, then, that there is anything peculiar about the seventh day that automatically makes it longer than any other day.

Secondly, when the thought is expressed in the Bible that God rested on the seventh day, for instance, in Exodus 20:11 and Exodus 31:17, the context never implies a day longer than a solar day. God completed his initial creation, as recorded in Genesis 1, but, can we say that God does not continually create throughout history? For example, He brings new lives into existence. We read in Psalm 104:30:

Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth.

And Psalm 102:18 says:

This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the LORD.

In both of these instances, we see God continuing His work of creation as He brings new life into being. Furthermore, dramatic acts of Jesus, such as multiplying the loaves and fish, must be considered acts of creation. Since His creative work must have continued with the birth of Cain and with the new plants that began growing each year after the initial creation, the seventh-day rest of God can be understood to have been of very short duration. Then the only logical time span for understanding this seventh day must be a solar day. This in turn reinforces the interpretation that insists on six solar days for the days of creation.

Therefore, we see that the logical, harmonious way to understand the verses of Genesis, in the language of the text itself, in the context of the entire chapter, and in the context of the Bible, is to see creation as an activity continuing the equivalent time period of six days. We submit that all scientific evidence should be viewed within this framework.

4. A false system of knowledge may appear true. In many systems of thought, there appears to be much evidence within the system to indicate the validity of that system. Thus, men of high scholarship have adopted as truth many false religions. We know from God's Word that regardless of how much truth appears to be found within these religions, they must be rejected because they are not built upon the foundation of Jesus Christ. Similarly, many fine thinkers have accepted Communism as a true and enlightened politico-religious system even though we know that it is totally unacceptable because it does not begin with the infinite God and man created in the image of God.

In the same manner, the concept of long periods of time as a solution to the six days of Genesis appears to have much truth within it. We hear much about concordant dates, for example, but the whole system must be rejected unless its foundation rests squarely and unequivocally upon the Bible. The seeming internal consistency of parts of this system may be a reward that keeps scientists in pursuit, but ultimate truth can be obtained only when the foundation is trustworthy.

I recently had the privilege of spending several hours with a scientist who is a serious born-again Christian. He has much training

and experience in radioactive isotopes which are used for dating purposes. He, too, had adopted long periods of time as a valid conclusion and appeared uncertain about the universality of the flood. I must confess that I felt quite uneasy during our discussion because I sensed that somehow there was a tremendously important missing ingredient in our conversation. For that reason, we were not able to arrive at an agreement, even though as fellow born-again Christians we ought to finally find the same truth.

In analyzing my feelings, I discovered that I felt much like I did when I visited the Mystery Spot in Santa Cruz, California. This is a spot on the side of a hill which does not appear to have the usual direction of the force of gravity, or at least the owners make this declaration. On this property, water apparently runs uphill, people often feel ill, water appears to flow uphill, and many other curious phenomena are apparent. This is achieved by removing any known plane of reference. A cabin, surrounded by an outside wall, was constructed, and all normally horizontal planes, such as floors and ceilings, were constructed to slope, and all normally vertical planes and lines, such as walls, door jambs, and window frames, were constructed so they are not vertical. Obviously, a visitor in this cabin tries to reconcile what his eye tells him is the direction of the force of gravity, and which he relates to normally vertical or horizontal lines, with the direction of the force of gravity that he feels in his own body. This produces a conflict which sometimes makes him ill or uneasy.

In other words, a system of truth has been developed on the side of this mountain which appears quite cogent in many respects, but is totally erroneous in relation to the true plan of reference which can be found when one leaves this spot. Without the missing ingredient of a true plane of reference, apparent truth poses as real truth.

After I left the scientist, I read again the Biblical accounts of the flood, Psalm 104, and other passages. True relief came to me when I read in Hebrews 11:3:

Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

The missing ingredient in our discussion was faith in the plain teachings of the Bible. This is the foundation that must underlie all scientific inquiry if we are to find truth. When Abraham was told to sacrifice his son, Isaac, the command appeared ridiculous. If he killed

his son, it would negate the promises God had given to him: that he would be the father of a multitude of nations and that in his seed all of the nations would be blessed. But Abraham believed that in spite of these apparent inconsistencies God should be obeyed. He obeyed because he had implicit trust in God. This is faith. Faith is the element that pervades all aspects of Biblical knowledge and makes the difference between human theories, which appear to be true because of internal agreement, and the Word of God, which is true because He is objectively and absolutely trustworthy.

The point at issue is not the quality or quantity of either my or my scientist friend's faith. Far be it from me to pass judgment upon another. I should be the first to cry out, "I believe, help thou my unbelief." The point at issue is that we will miss the value and significance of Scriptural truth, as it applies to all areas of our observable universe, unless we view Scriptures consistently with eyes of faith. Without faith the Bible offers no assistance in our understanding of non-Biblical evidence. This applies not only to salvation truth but also to every other area of knowledge which the Bible addresses.

Jesus emphasizes the matter of faith in His reference to His purpose for preaching in parables. Mark 4:2:

And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine.

We might speculate that He did this in order to make the Gospel that He preached more easily understood, but the very reverse is the case. In Mark 4:11-12 we read:

And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.

The problem of the Jews was that they were looking for a Messiah who would make logical sense to them. Jesus did not logically fill their idea of what the Messiah ought to be so they rejected Him. Because they were not humbly, with repentant hearts of faith, looking to God's Word, Jesus preached in parables so that even the glimmer of truth that could have come from His Gospel was taken from them. Peter, Mary, Martha, and others, on the other hand, by faith accepted Jesus

as the Messiah. Then they were able to see the wonderful logic of God's Word. In similar fashion, Bible truths are hidden to those who look to it for truth without first humbly trusting it as God's infallible Word.

I am afraid that in the whole area of knowledge that relates to the beginning of man and the earth, we have begun to accept a system of truth that appears quite valid and has much internal consistency. Because many elements of this system of truth do not square with the Bible, the Bible appears illogical, and, therefore, is apparently not to be trusted for what it says. We forget that most of the contributions to scientific inquiry have been made by unsaved men who know nothing of faith. We must remember that only when we begin with a deep and abiding faith in the inerrancy of the Scriptures will the beautiful logic of the Bible be revealed to us. We must begin scientific inquiry with the available evidence set forth in the Biblical record, and accept the Biblical record by faith as a completely valid foundation for understanding the evidence brought in from other sources.

5. The evidence is not all in. Years ago, archaeologists insisted that in spite of the numerous Biblical references to the nation of Hittites, there could have been no such nation. Archaeological research had produced no evidence of its existence. Thus, Bible students could have concluded that the Bible was mistaken. Or perhaps the Bible was saying something different from what it appeared to say. Maybe it was to be understood only in the light of the culture of the time in which it was written. Today, we are often told that when a passage of the Bible seems to be in contradiction to scientific conclusions, that perhaps it was given to the culture of that day and has no meaning for us. Thus, the word "Hittites" could have meant one thing to the people of Moses' day and appear to mean something quite different to the Bible student a couple thousand years later. But then archaeologists discovered extensive evidence that there was a great nation of Hittites. The Bible was vindicated and now could be understood to say exactly what it had always appeared to say.

So it is with much of the present thinking regarding the origins of man. Fragmentary evidence of fossils of animals and man have been discovered. The evidence seems to indicate an antiquity of millions of years for these origins and does not show conclusively that at one time in history there was a universal flood. Thus, the language of the

Scriptures that indicates there were six days of creation several thousands of years ago and a universal flood some time later seems to require a different explanation than that of a literal understanding. But the evidence is not all in, and when the evidence is all in, the conclusions derived from the evidence must agree with the plain language of the Bible. Until the evidence is all in, we must not accept conclusions that are not in harmony with the teachings of the Bible. Since there appears to be no Biblical warrant for understanding the six days of creation and the universality of the flood in any way other than a literal fashion, we must accept this teaching by faith and patiently wait for all of the evidence to be brought.

6. May we dare trust the Bible when it speaks in areas of scientific inquiry? Did not such trust lead an earlier generation of Christians astray when they concluded that the earth was flat? It is true that scarcely a millennium ago, our forefathers considered the flat expanse of their relatively small portion of the globe (the only world they knew), and observed how unerringly the sun travels across the heavens from one end of the land to the other, and they were convinced that the earth was shaped like a table whose four ends come to a sudden halt somewhere beyond the line of ocular vision. And the sun, they concluded, was a ball of fire travelling around the flat earth.

When Christians of much earlier generations reviewed these conclusions, they agreed that the Bible supported the idea that the earth was flat and that the sun was a ball of fire. Sufficient evidence to bolster such conclusions indeed appears to be found in the Scriptures, for God's Word does refer in Psalm 59:13, to "the ends of the earth," in Isaiah 11:12 to "the four corners of the earth," in Ezekiel 7:2 to "the four corners of the land," and in Psalm 50:1 to "the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof."

However, a more comprehensive study of God's Word would have shown them that their conclusions were erroneous. A number of truths were apparently not considered in earlier days. Nowhere does the Bible state positively that the earth's configuration is flat. On the contrary, a round configuration is indicated in Isaiah 40:22:

It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in.

The Book of Job uses an interesting metonym in referring to the earth. Job 26:10:

He hath compassed the waters with bounds, until the day and night come to an end.

The word “compassed” is the same Hebrew word which is translated “circle” in Isaiah 40:22. Many other statements are found in God’s Word that suggest much more than a flat earth with a flaming ball moving across the sky, from one end of the four-cornered table to the other. The following statements clearly say something different.

Proverbs 8:27: When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth.

Ecclesiastes 1:6: The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits.

Job 26:7: He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing.

Therefore, we must conclude that when all of the Biblical notices concerning the shape of the earth are considered, we cannot conclusively give its configuration. It surely does not insist in any way upon a flat earth, and there are these many statements which point to a round earth or a sphere. The secular evidence shows that the earth is a sphere in space; the Bible does not contradict and actually supports this concept. Thus, we can see how the Holy Spirit guided men to write only that which was accurate and dependable.

7. How do we regard the Bible? A minister and I were discussing the drift of the Christian community from the Word of God. As we parted, my friend declared, “After all, the Bible is not God!” As I reflected on his assertion, I began to see the serious trouble the church was in, for in this statement I believe we find evidence of the weakened spiritual condition of the church. Let us see why this is so.

Much has been written in recent months and years concerning the infallibility of the Bible. With scholarly rhetoric, those who write insist that the Bible is the Word of God and is altogether true and trustworthy when it speaks. The Bible is the final authority because it is inspired by God; it is dependable and accurate.

With all this verbalizing, one wonders if all of us really believe that the Bible is inspired. In the area of salvation, God says faith without works is dead. Thus, a man can talk at length about his vital and wonderful faith in Christ, but if his works do not show the evidence of that faith, his faith is dead. Likewise, talking about how

one accepts the infallibility of the Bible means nothing unless it translates into concrete substance when the Bible is interpreted.

For example, attention is sometimes called to the fact that the parable of the sower recorded in Matthew 13:23 is different from that recorded in Luke 8:15. The conclusion is therefore drawn that this is so because the Biblical authors interpret and apply for us the literal words of Jesus. This conclusion makes us wonder if we are then to believe that the quotations found in the Bible are not necessarily verbatim quotes? Does this mean, for example, that the seven statements of Jesus on the cross were not necessarily spoken by Jesus? Is it possible that we have only Spirit-guided interpretations of whatever words He actually spoke?

Since the Bible is its own interpreter, where do we get permission for this kind of reasoning? Where does the Bible say or suggest that the quotations found in the Bible were not actually uttered? How dare we entertain this kind of thinking!

It is true that there are times when the Bible writer, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, does interpret or change the wording of a statement being quoted. This is seen in the New Testament quotations of fulfilled Old Testament prophecy. However, in these cases the Bible gives ample indication that this has occurred. We have both the Old Testament record and the New Testament restatement, which can be compared to discover God's unfolding revelation as He gives additional insights into the intent and purpose of the Old Testament statement. When similar statements are recorded in slightly different fashion in each of several of the Gospels, the Bible does not say that one Gospel account is a fulfillment or a quotation from the other Gospels. Therefore, we must assume that the precise words found in each Gospel are the actual words spoken. This is readily understood if we realize the Gospel record is but a tiny fragment of all the words spoken (John 21:25). Jesus surely must have frequently repeated the parable of the sower, and each telling must have included different details, and therefore, each recorded account is slightly different from the others. God follows this rule as He describes salvation in a number of different ways in the Bible..

Similarly, the conversation between the rich young ruler and Jesus (Luke 10:25, Matthew 19:16), probably lasted several minutes. One Gospel writer presents some of his actual words and another Gospel writer gives some other of his actual words. Combining the two accounts, we have an enlarged but probably still incomplete view

of the total conversation, but the words God wanted us to know about are faithfully recorded for our perusal.

In an effort to give as much latitude as possible to an understanding of Genesis, attention is called to an apparent discrepancy between Genesis 4:26 and Exodus 6:3 (*Banner*, Jan. 21, 1972, p. 19). Genesis 4:26 declares that in the days of Enosh, man began to call on the name of *Jehovah*, while Exodus 6:3 insists that God had not made himself known by the name *Jehovah* prior to Moses' day. Therefore, the suggestion is made that Genesis 4:26 is expressed in terms of a revelation of God given at a later date.

Thus, we are led to assume that possibly men of Enosh's generation did not actually use the name *Jehovah* even though the Bible says they did. Then we must also conclude that neither did Abraham, even though the Bible quotes Abraham as saying, in Genesis 24:3:

And I will make thee swear by the LORD [Jehovah], the God of heaven, and the God of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell.

See also Genesis 22:14, 24:7, and 24:12.

Because of this apparent discrepancy between Exodus 6:3 and the statements of the Book of Genesis, many are encouraged to call into question the veracity of the Bible.

What are we to do with this seeming contradiction? Can Exodus 6:3 be reconciled with the statements of Genesis? It can indeed if we look more closely at the Bible statement.

The name *Jehovah* is not only God's covenant name, but it is also His saving name. (Actually God's covenant is never separate from His work as Savior.) This was declared so beautifully by Jacob in Genesis 49:18:

I have waited for thy salvation, O LORD.

It is stated so well in the preamble to the Decalogue, Exodus 20:2:

I am the LORD [Jehovah] thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

It is repeated in many other places in the same context, for example, Isaiah 43:3:

For I am the LORD [Jehovah] thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.

Significantly, we read in Genesis 22:14 that Abraham called the mount where he offered up Isaac, “Jehovah-jireh” (Jehovah will provide).

Although the name Jehovah was familiar to the ancients from the pages of Genesis, and they had some information on the saving character of God as revealed by this name, they had not personally experienced in visible fashion the salvation offered by Jehovah, their Savior. Therefore, God declares in Exodus 6:3:

And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

And He says in verse 6:

Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments.

In other words, God insists to the nation of Israel that they were going to have a personal encounter with God as Savior when He redeemed them from Egypt, the house of bondage. Then they would know Him by His covenant-saving name, Jehovah. Today, we would say, in analogous fashion, that an unbeliever does not know Christ. The unbeliever may be aware of Him; he may know many facts about Him, but until he is saved, the unbeliever does not know Him.

The statement of Genesis 4:26, that when Enosh was born men began to call on the name of Jehovah, therefore, tells us that as early as 235 years after Adam was created, mankind saw that God was the Redeemer. They were to look to Him for help. How well they understood the Messianic work of God is not disclosed, but the fact that they looked upon Him as Savior is surely indicated.

These illustrations (and many more of a similar nature could be offered), are sufficient to show the low opinion many have today of the integrity of the Word of God. No wonder we are so ready to accept the conclusions of secular science that address the question of the origins of man and the world. The Bible has lost its authority. God says, for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that

is in them, but they set this aside with a wave of the hand, almost as if it does not exist. The fact that this same truth is detailed in Genesis 1 seems to make no impression whatsoever on many of our scientists, who apparently cannot wait to adopt conclusions of their secular colleagues, regardless of how alien those conclusions are to the Bible. No wonder we have arrived at a point where even an account so carefully articulated as the Noachian Flood (Genesis Chapters 6 to 9), is set aside as so much nonsense, which is effectively what is done when we talk about a Mesopotamia Valley flood rather than a universal flood.

There are verses that may appear unsolvable. The Bible is the revelation of God. God is infinite. He is from everlasting to everlasting. Our finite minds cannot possibly begin to grasp all of the truths from the mind of God. At times we must wait for a clearer understanding, for God does have a timetable for the revealing of His Word.

Sometimes He does speak symbolically or allegorically. But invariably a careful analysis of the verses, in the context of the whole Bible, will show us how to view these verses. We must never demean or question the integrity of God's Word.

"The Bible is not God," my friend had said. The physical Bible we hold in our hand is not God (it is only paper with ink on it). But when we read the Bible it is as closely related to God as anything can be. It is the voice of God. It is the statement of His perfect will. It is the command of the King. Because it is the voice of God, it is not to be changed or altered or questioned as to its authority or veracity. Every word in the original is God's choice, even though it comes from the personality and environment of the human author. No word is accidental or coincidental.

God is a Spirit so we cannot see Him with our physical eyes. But we can see Him in His revelation, the Bible, where God tells us about Himself and His creative as well as His redemptive work. His Word is as holy as He is. His Word is to be treated with the same deference, respect, honor, and fear as God Himself. It is for good reason that His Word is called the Holy Bible.

The sin of questioning the integrity of God's Word is not an incidental sin. It is a sin of the first magnitude. God says in Exodus 20:3-5:

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.

When we put the authority of science above the authority of the Bible, we have begun to worship science. When we put the authority of a theologian above that of the Bible, we have begun to worship man's mind rather than God. These sins will bring down the wrath of God.

The ominous phrase "unto the third and fourth generation" has eternal implications of the most serious nature. God is declaring that our progeny will be cut off, that hell is in view. We are reminded of God's word to Israel in Deuteronomy 4:25-26:

When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall do evil in the sight of the LORD thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed.

The scientist can be very helpful in our study of the Bible. The evidence found by him will never contradict Bible truth. But the conclusion of the scientist which is a result of viewing evidence in the light of his own assumptions must never be accepted unless it agrees with untempered Bible truth.

The views of a theologian may be studied and are surely helpful, but we are not to accept statements that show weakness regarding Biblical authority. We should build on theology that is absolutely true to the Bible. We should reject out of hand any ideas that suggest that the Bible is less than absolute truth, regardless of how reputable the theologian who suggests the idea may be.

What are we to do? I fear that large segments of the church have arrived at a terrible condition. God's wrath is upon us. We have sown the wind and are about to reap the whirlwind. If we do not think this

is true, watch what is happening to the thinking of our sons and our daughters, many of whom are not following in the faith of our fathers.

We are in trouble. We have sinned grievously. And when anyone sins there is only one course of action to follow, and that is to beg the Lord to show mercy as we turn from our sin.

This is not the time to defend with pious arguments our faithfulness to God's Word. This is the time to acknowledge our sin. We have impugned the Word. We have begun to worship science. We have spent too much time listening to Barth and Brunner. We have entertained the unbiblical heresies of Lever and others. No wonder theology (true Bible understanding) is almost at a standstill today.

We ought to put on sackcloth and ashes, so to speak, and cry out for mercy. Perhaps God will stay the judgment He has begun to visit upon us. We ought to repudiate and turn away from those teachings and teachers who are unknowingly leading us to the worship of other gods.

May God have mercy on us.

NOTES:

¹ Alan H. Gardiner, "Tanis and Pi-Ramesse: A Retraction," in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* (London, Egypt Exploration Society, Vol. 19, 1933).

² Vol. 1, p. 121.

³ Richard H. Bube, ed., *The Encounter Between Christianity and Science*, William B. Eerdmans, 1968.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁵ Sir Leonard Wooley, *Excavations at Or*, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1954.

Chapter 2

The Genesis Authorship

Since so much of our subject matter concerns the first book of the Pentateuch, it would be well at this point to examine the Genesis authorship. Too often, consciously or subconsciously, we allow our thoughts to dwell on the antiquity, on the primitive human instruments God used to compile it. Instead, we ought to give due recognition to the overshadowing presence of the Holy Spirit of God “who moved holy men of old” to prepare an accurate and authoritative record of earth’s beginnings for future generations.

Within the last one hundred years, a veritable gold mine of clay tablets has been found on the sites of ancient Nineveh, Babylon, Ur, and other cities of ancient Babylonia as well as in many other parts of the world. Significantly, at least a small number of these ancient tablets were concerned with subject matter very similar to that discussed in Genesis.

Thus, much ancient literature is available today that is concerned directly or indirectly with creation. Also, tablets have been discovered which deal with a flood that at one time covered the earth.

Because these ancient accounts at times bear some similarity to the Biblical account and are thought to be much earlier than the earliest books of the Bible, the assumption has often been made that the first books of the Bible are simply a restatement of the themes and details covered in these earlier secular accounts. This assumption has led men to the conclusion that the Bible is untrustworthy even as these secular accounts have been proven to be untrustworthy in many instances.

It might be well to look at some of these tablets to see the difference between them and the Bible. One creation story of man is set forth in Tablet I of the *Enuma elish* (When above). This poem was discovered by Austen H. Layard and George Smith among the ruins of the great library of King Ashurbanipal about 630 B.C. in Nineveh. Some of the lines read as follows.¹

Tablet 1

1. When above the heaven had not (yet) been named.
2. (And) below the earth had not (yet) been called by a name;
3. (When) Apsu primeval, their begetter.
4. Mummu (and Ti amat), she who gave birth to them all,
5. (Still) mingled their waters together.
6. And no pasture land had been formed (and) not (even) a reed marsh was to be seen;
7. When none of the (other) gods had been brought into being,
8. (When) they had not (yet) been called by (their) name (s, and their) destinies had not (yet) been fixed.
9. (At that time) were the gods created within them.
10. Lahmu and Lahamu came into being; they were called by (their) names.
11. Even before they had grown up (and) become tall,
12. Anshar and Kishar were created; they surpassed them (in stature).
13. They lived many days, adding years (to days).
14. Anu was their heir presumptive, the rival of his fathers;
15. Yea, Anu, his first-born, equaled Anshar.
16. And Anu begot Nudimud, his likeness.
17. Nudimud, the master of his fathers was he;
18. He was broad of understanding, wise, mighty in strength.
19. Much stronger than his grandfather, Anshar;
20. He had no rival among the gods of his brothers.

Another is recorded on a badly mutilated and weather-worn tablet of the First Babylonian Dynasty.²

1-2. (Destroyed.)

3. "What is little he shall raise to abundance;

4. The . . . of creation (?) man shall bear.
5. The goddess they called, 111
6. The help (?) of the gods, the wise Mami:
7. “Thou art the mother-womb,”
8. The creatress of mankind;
9. Create Man that he may bear the yoke,
10. That he may bear the yoke . . .
11. The . . . of creation (?) man shall bear”
12. Mintu opened her mouth
13. And said to the great gods.
14. “With me alone it is impossible to do;
15. With his help there will be Man.
16. He shall be the one who fears all the gods.
17. Clay . . . “
18. Enki opened his mouth.
19. And said to the great gods.
20. “In the month of substitution (?) and help,
21. Of the purification of the land (and) the judgment of its shepherd,
22. Let them slay a god,
23. And let the gods . . .
24. With his flesh and his blood
25. Let ninhursag mix clay.
26. God and man
27. . . . united (?) in the clay.

A third is that which was related on a tablet discovered among the ruins of the city of Ashur and dating about 800 B.C.³

1. When heaven had been separated from the earth, the distant trust twin,

2. (And) the mother of the goddesses had been brought into being;
3. When the earth had been brought forth (and) the earth had been fashioned;
4. When the destinies of heaven and earth had been fixed;
5. (When) trench and canal had been given (their) right courses,
6. (And) the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates had been established,
7. (Then) Anu, Enlil, Shamash, (and) Ea.
8. The great gods,
9. (And) the anunnaki, the great gods
10. Seated themselves in the exalted sanctuary.
11. And recounted among themselves what had been created.
12. "Now that the destinies of heaven and earth have been fixed,
13. Trench and canal have been given their right courses.
14. The banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates
15. Have been established
16. What (else) shall we do?
17. What (else) shall we create?
18. O Anunnaki, ye great gods,
19. What (else) shall we do?
20. What (else) shall we create?"
21. The great gods who were present.
22. The Anunnaki, who fix the destinies.
23. Both (groups) of them, made answer to Enlil;
24. "In Uzumua, the bond of heaven and earth,
25. Let us slay (two) Lamga gods.
26. With their blood let us create mankind.
27. The service of the gods be their portion.
28. For all times.

29. To maintain the boundary ditch.

The above are offered as typical examples of Babylonian accounts. The conclusion of Heidel regarding a comparison between these and the Biblical account is well stated:⁴

A comparison of the Babylonian creation story with the first chapter of Genesis makes the sublime character of the latter stand out in even bolder relief. Enuma elish refers to a multitude of divinities emanating from the elementary world matter; the universe has its origin in the generation of numerous gods and goddesses personifying cosmic spaces or forces in nature, and in the orderly and purposeful arrangement of pre-existent matter; the world is not created in the biblical sense of the term but fashioned after the manner of human craftsmen; as for man, he is created with the blood of a deity that might well be called a devil among the gods, the sphere of activity assigned to man is the service of the gods. In Genesis 1:1 to 2:3, on the other hand, there stands at the very beginning one God, who is not co-united and co-existent with an eternal world-matter and who does not first develop Himself into a series of separate deities but who creates matter out of nothing and exists independently of all cosmic matter and remains one God to the end. Here the world is created by the sovereign Word of God, without recourse to all sorts of external means. God speaks, and it is done; he commands, and it stands fast. Add to this doctrine that man was created in the image of a holy and righteous God to be the lord of the earth, the air, and the sea, and we have a number of differences between Enuma elish and Genesis 1:1 to 2:3 that make all similarities shrink into utter insignificance. These exalted conceptions in the biblical account of creation give it a depth and dignity unparalleled in any cosmogony known to us from Babylonia or Assyria.

Furthermore, if we keep in mind that throughout history two kinds of men existed, we shall be able to put these secular accounts of origins and flood stories into proper perspective. On the one hand, there is the secular man, and on the other, the man of God. The secular man is spoken about in Genesis 4 as the descendant of Cain. Later, he is referred to as the descendant of Ham and Japheth, of Ishmael, of Moab and Ammon, of Esau, etc. He never receives the full truth from the Holy Spirit because he will not acknowledge the God of the Bible. His records are subject to error. He surmises and guesses at the origins

of man. Because he is human and lives amongst the men of God, he occasionally gets very close to truth. The king's lists belonging to the third millennium B.C. are typical in this sense. One list reads as follows.⁵

The Kings Before the Flood

<u>Name</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Length of Reign</u>
A-lu-lim	NUN	28,000 years
A-la-(1)-gar	NUN	36,000 years
En-me-en-lu-an-na	Bad-tabira	43,000 years
En-me-en-gal-an-na	Bad-tabira	28,800 years
Dumuzu 'the shepherd'	Bad-tabira	36,000 years
En-Sib-zi-an-na	Larak	28,800 years
En-me-en-dur-an-na	Sippar	21,000 years
(?) Che-du	Suruspak	18,600 years

Total: 8 kings, 5 cities, 241,200 years

The flood came.

After the flood came, kingship again was sent down from on high.

Note that eight kings are listed beginning with a first king way back in antiquity and ending with a worldwide flood. This parallels the seven generations of Genesis 4 or the 10 generations of Genesis 5. It can be seen that this approaches Biblical truth, but it is altogether imperfect and untrustworthy. Obviously, as secular man's records became more complete, his records became more trustworthy. But never can they approach the perfect accuracy of the Biblical account.

In addition to secular man, there is the line of God's men. These are the descendants of Seth, of Shem, and of Abraham. The record produced by them as recorded in God's Word is the true and trustworthy record. It is on a much higher level than the secular record because God Himself was involved in its preparation. Thus, we can learn little or nothing from the early secular creation accounts for no one was able to guard the truth. The truth recorded in the Bible was guarded by God Himself.

Moses: A Man of Great Learning and Wisdom

The first five books of the Bible were written by Moses, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We often think of Moses as a rather primitive ancient who could not have been qualified to understand the implications of what he wrote when he prepared in final form the first books of the Bible. Let us consider, however, the consummate care God took to prepare the author of the book of beginnings for his great calling. Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the martyr Stephen was led to declare, in Acts 7:20-22:

In which time Moses was born, and was exceeding fair, and nourished up in his father's house three months: And when he was cast out, Pharaoh's daughter took him up, and nourished him for her own son. And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds.

Moses was indeed well prepared and qualified, under the moving of the Holy Spirit, to be author of the first books of the Bible. The Bible declares that he was instructed in all of the wisdom of the Egyptians, while the secular record shows us the advanced culture in which he was trained.

A few quotations from Margaret Murray's book, *The Splendor That Was Egypt*, should prove of interest at this point.

The education of the children, especially of the boys, was considered to be of great importance. They appear to have been sent to boarding school at the age of four, but food does not seem to have been supplied by the school, for the mothers went every day carrying bread and beer for their little sons. The subjects taught at school were chiefly reading, writing, and arithmetic. Great pains were taken that the boys would be well-trained as they were all being educated to be clerks in government offices, or priests, or artists; reading and writing were essential for these three professions, and for the government service arithmetic was of great practical value on the account of the complicated system of taxation.⁶

Though the prehistoric people erected little hovels of mud-and-brick, real building does not appear till the first dynasty. The great royal tombs of that period show that the knowledge of such building was well advanced. The bricks were made in moulds of what is now known as 'English bond' in a mortar of clay. The bricks

are as well and truly laid as any modern bricklayer could lay them, showing that the Egyptian builders had a complete mastery of material and method.⁷

The great conquests of Thothmes III brought into Egypt many craftsmen from foreign countries, and among others there seem to have been glassmakers. Glass beads, black, white, and blue, became increasingly common, but it was not until a century later that other colours were used in glassmaking.⁸

Spinning and weaving were practiced from the Badarian period, and by the time of the first dynasty the Egyptians were producing the finest linen of the ancient world.⁹

The sciences in which the Egyptians excelled were applied mathematics and medicine.¹⁰

In dealing with Egypt it is impossible to overstate the importance of the Nile, for the river is the only source of water in the whole country. Waterworks, therefore, always engaged the attention of the engineers. The great problem was how to conserve the excess water of the inundation and store it up for use in the dry season. The problem was solved in the XIIth dynasty, when that great system of dykes, canals, and sluices was instituted in the Fayum, a system which remained in use till the Roman occupation. Irrigation canals were made in other parts of Egypt, but nothing on the scale of Amonemhat III's work in the Fayum.¹¹

Astronomy again was one of the sciences which the Egyptians studied. In a country where clouds are the exception and not the rule, the study of the heavens is comparatively easy. The positions of the constellations and the courses of the planets were known.¹²

There is no record of any fear of eclipses for there are no religious services and no charms for averting the danger of the sun or moon. It would seem that the date of an eclipse was so accurately calculated that the populace knew what to expect.¹³

They undoubtedly knew a great deal of the properties of drugs, and many medical papyri are extant giving the names and uses of medicinal plants. Their medical knowledge was far in advance of medieval Europe, and their anatomical knowledge and treatises were the foundation of the Greek writings on the subject.¹⁴

All of these quotations describe Egypt from its earliest beginnings, more than 1500 years before Moses, to the days of Moses.