

Book Review - The Answers Book
Chapter 2 – Did God Really Take Six
Days?
Review by Greg Neyman



First Published 11 June 2003
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/abc2.htm

Yes He did! However, the length of these days was not twenty-four hours. Unfortunately, this chapter is flawed right from the first sentence. The authors say the gospel message is undermined by millions of years. From my discussions on time in this book's rebuttal and elsewhere on the Answers In Creation website, you can see that there is no problem with old earth belief and the gospel. In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the authors warn that the Bible cannot be interpreted on the basis of fallible theories of sinful people. Rest assured, old earth believer, that we can say the same thing...the Bible cannot be interpreted on the basis of fallible theories of sinful people...which includes old and young-earth believers.

The second paragraph can be summed up with two words..."don't think." We can see here the basis of young-earth belief...it consists of accepting everything you see and read at face value, instead of using your God-given capacities to reason and think. By using your God-given reasoning, you are not "questioning God." In fact, you are doing exactly what God wants you to do. Acts 17:11 is an example of this, where the believers examined the words, to see if they were true.

If you only remember one thing from this chapter, remember this...do your own thinking, and don't take my words, or the words of the young-earth creationists, as true, without first examining them.

Why "Long Days"? (Page 34)

The first sentence is a quote from Romans 3:4, "Let God be true, and every man a liar." I'm not sure why the authors would use this. It does not flow well with the following paragraph. They wish to cast doubt upon the supposed "lies" of the millions of years in each day of creation. However, one must remember...the young-earth authors, and all their believers, are also men, and as such, are just as guilty of being liars.

The second paragraph says that those who have accepted long days of creation have been influenced by ideas from outside of Scripture. This is a lie. You can believe in millions of years long days of creation, and still believe in an inerrant Scripture. Unfortunately, it is a misinterpretation of the Bible which causes the young-earth authors to make this false claim. You can research this further in other articles on the Answers In Creation website.

The authors mention the fact that the church fathers mostly accepted the creation days as ordinary days. It is important to remember that the early church

fathers, up until the early 1800s, did not have the scientific evidence that we have today. As such, their viewpoint was based on incomplete evidence. We have much more information in today's world, and can make a much more accurate estimation of the age of the earth than they could have.

The "Days" of Genesis 1 (Pages 37-39)

The authors make an argument against the Hebrew word for day, *yom*, for meaning anything but a 24-hour day. God used the word "day" to convey something that man could understand. Would early man, such as Adam, Moses, etc, have understood it if God had said, "Over the first 2 billion years, God created heaven and earth?" We are talking about simple people, who were not educated at Harvard or MIT...they probably didn't even have a word for "million" in their language.

However, they could understand "day." And by using the "day" He gave us a model for the week. The message was tailored to the education level of the people at the time of revelation. It did not matter if they understood it as "day" or millions of years...the length of time is irrelevant to an eternal God...man was the limiting factor in understanding the concept of time, and thus it was given to us in a manner so that early man could understand.

Why Six Days?

On page 41, 13 lines down, the authors mention Exodus 20:11 as referring to literal days. This has nothing at all to do with the six days of creation, and no comparison can be implied for the work week, and the actual length of the creation days. God used the seven days as the basis for man's week, but this does not imply any length of "man's days" to the creation week. After all, man was not around until the sixth day, so these "days" are as God sees days, not as man sees them.

Objection 1 (Page 41)

Science has proven the earth to be old, therefore creation must be long periods of time.

In A, the authors say that man's fallible methods have not proved a billions of years old earth. On the contrary, they have. Fortunately, man's fallible interpretation of God's Scripture has not proved a young earth. This entire section is based upon incorrect assumptions dealing with man's interpretation of Scripture, and not upon the "fallible" methods of man.

The authors claim the Bible states that death and disease are a consequence of sin. It is true that spiritual death came by Adam's sin, but not physical ([click here for more](#)). The authors appeal to the fact that Jesus took Scripture literally, so we should also, based on Matthew 19:3-6. This passage makes no claim about the literal interpretation of Genesis, and I, as an old-earth believer, can agree completely with this passage with no problems. If the young-earth

proponents want to take all of Scripture literally, then they should have both their hands and feet cut off, and their eyes put out (Matthew 18:8-9).

The authors make the claim that man was permitted to eat meat only after the flood of Noah. They claim there was a change in the way animals reacted to man (Genesis 9:2). However, that is not what the passage says. It is written in the form of a simple statement, and does not imply a before and after condition, and thus does not indicate any change...it merely states facts.

The authors make the claim that Genesis 2:17 says that physical death came as a result of Adam's sin. However, no such conclusion can be reached based on this verse, given the weak evidence of the authors.

After Adam's sin, God clothed them. The authors tie this in to Hebrews 9:22, and read into the text something that is not present. God simply clothed them, and there is no connection between these two passages of Scripture.

Using Romans 8:19-22, the authors argue against physical death before the sin of Adam. However, there is no connection between physical death and this passage...it is put there by the young-earth interpretation. Then the authors claim that thorns were created after Adam and Eve sinned...there is no reference given for this claim, nor proof of any kind. If this is true, then God created thorns, AFTER the creation week was over. However, at the end of Day 6, God entered into rest, and did no more creating. Therefore, belief in the thorns after sin theory is contrary to even a young-earth interpretation of Scripture.

In concluding, the authors state that millions of years destroys the foundations of the Cross. However, I am here, as are millions of other old-earth Christians. I am saved by Christ's shed blood, and I look to the Cross and thank God for His saving me. I fail to see how I am resting on a Cross with a crumbling foundation...I only see a strong God, and a Savior that is as solid as a rock to me.

Objection 2 (Page 44)

How could they be 24-hour days if the sun was not created until Day 4?

To answer this, the young-earth authors step way out on a thin limb. They give very weak answers, and even claim the sun was not needed for the "day and night" of the creation week.

The old-earth, progressive creationist explanation fits both the scientific record, and the Bible. It all depends on the observers (or, author's) frame of reference. In this case, the author of Genesis was observing the creation from the viewpoint of the surface of the earth. Even though the sun came into existence before the Day four point, it was not visible yet (for a fuller explanation, see the book, *Creation and Time*, by Dr. Hugh Ross, or visit his website, *Reasons to Believe*).

Objection 3 (Page 45)

II Peter 3:8 makes it possible for the days of creation to be long periods of time.

Again, empty answers. The main point here for the true answer is in section b, six lines down. It states "God is outside of time." Since time has no meaning

to an eternal God, who are we to limit the creation to 24-hour days. Old-earth creationists have long pointed to this verse, and there is no reason from this book that would cast doubt upon this.

Objection 4 (Page 46)

Imposing Limits on God

The authors use the weak argument that the billions of years belief diminishes God by implying he needed large amounts of time for creation. However, so do the six 24-hour days of the young-earth creationist. God didn't create the universe in six seconds...therefore He must be weak!

I challenge any young-earth creationist to do this...starting right now, create a new universe, complete with stars, planets, and at least one planet with life. And, I'll be generous and give you 40 billion years to do it. Can you do it? Of course not...but God can, and did. Again, since God is eternal, time has no meaning.

Objection 5 (Page 46)

Adam had too much to do on Day Six.

The standard objection is that since Adam had to name all the animals on the day he was created, it must have been a long period of time. They dismiss this because he only had to name the animals God brought to him. The authors make a distinction between the animals of Genesis 2:20 and 1:25. However, there is no basis for their claim

The next few paragraphs are very interesting. The authors claim Adam's brain was perfect, and that he knew what death was, even though he had not seen any death. I had no idea Adam was omniscient! If Adam was so perfect, why did he sin? He would have known the exact consequences, and would not have made that choice! If Adam was so smart, God could have easily said, "I started the Big Bang, and the first several billion years I spent forming the stars and galaxies...and Adam would have understood Him perfectly. However, God simplified it by breaking the creation into days, so that Adam could understand.

Objection 6 (Page 47)

Genesis Chapter 2 is a different account of creation. No problems here.

Objection 7 (Page 48)

Evening and Morning, Day Seven.

The authors arguments are inconclusive and weak. No need to provide a rebuttal.

Objection 8 (Page 49)

Genesis 2:4

The authors claim that since the word "yom," or day, in this passage, is not qualified by a number, nor by the terms "evening and morning." Indeed, it is quantified by a number...it says, "In the day that the Lord God made the earth and heavens." The number is one, and I agree with the authors, that it refers to the creation week. However, since God, in His Word, refers to the creation both

as “six days” and “one day”, it is further evidence that God is not bound by time, so a day to God cannot be strictly implied to mean a 24-hour day, which is man’s interpretation of a day, based on man’s viewpoint here on the rotating earth. If you are in deep space, for example, how long is a day? Even on other planets in our solar system, a day varies, from Jupiter (9 hours, 50 minutes) to Venus (243 days).

Other Problems (Page 49)

These present no problems from a progressive creationist viewpoint...some of these silly explanations border on senseless babbling. For instance, implying that Adam would be millions of years old! By the time of the end of creation, the days and years that man observed were normal periods of time. For further explanations, see the works of Dr. Hugh Ross.

The “framework hypothesis” discussion makes no sense at all!

Long Age Compromises (Page 51)

The authors claim that all long-agers reject Noah’s flood as being global...not true. I know old-earth creationists who believe in a global flood.

Does It Really Matter? (Page 52)

No, it doesn’t. Jesus still died for our sins...no matter how long the creation week was. I am a Christian, and I believe in an old earth. You can be too! If you want to remain a young-earth believer, that great! It does not matter when it comes to your salvation.