

Session 1:
Genesis 1 - 9

Other non-fiction books by the author:

Even So, Come, Lord Jesus

Collected Sunday School Lessons (2008 – 2009)

Collected Sunday School Lessons (2010 - 2011)

Dinosaurs in History

Summary of Old Testament Events

Chapter Summary of the Bible

Creation: A Study of Origins

Theology: An Assortment of Articles

Heresy: A Study of False Teachers

Eschatology: A Study of the Second Coming

C S Lewis

Bill Gothard

Translation Issues: The KJV Controversy

The Catholic Church: A Study of Heresy

Session 1: Genesis 1 - 9

by Jonathan Cooper

First Edition
7/30/2013

Table of Contents

Before The Beginning.....	7
Biblical Creationism.....	21
In The Beginning.....	37
Cain and Abel.....	57
The Sons of Adam.....	73
The Nephilim.....	81
The Flood.....	89
How Did Noah Fit All the Animals on the Ark?.....	93
What Did the Dinosaurs Eat?.....	94
How Were the Animals Cared For?.....	94
How Did the Animals Breathe?.....	95
What Did Noah and His Family Do with the Animal Waste?.....	96
Appendix A: Does The Bible Say The Flood Was Global?.....	111
Appendix B: Evidence for Creation.....	119
Part 1: Mutations.....	119
Part 2: Monkeys Typing Shakespeare.....	125
Part 3: The Age Of The Earth.....	127
Part 4: Radioactive Dating Methods.....	129
Part 5: Dinosaurs And The Bible.....	130
Appendix C: The Ultimate Proof of Creation.....	137
Appendix D: The Ocean in the Sky.....	145

Before The Beginning

Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”

Genesis 1:1 starts the Bible by saying that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. By “beginning” it is referring to the beginning of *our* history – the history of this world and the things that are in it. Before our history began, however, God already existed. This raises several key questions.

Q1. What existed before the beginning?

A We know that God (by which we mean the Trinity – God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) must have existed before the beginning because He was there to create the world. God is not a part of Creation; He has always existed and will always exist. This can be seen in several passages:

Psalms 90:2: “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.”

Revelation 1:8: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”

John 1:1: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

2 The same was in the beginning with God.
3 All things were made by him: and without him was not any thing made that was made.
4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.”

The reason that mankind exists is because God chose to create us. We continue to exist because God sustains us by His power. God, however, is entirely different. God has life in Himself. He does not need someone else to sustain Him because He is self-existent:

John 5:26: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;”

The Bible goes on to say that everything was created by God – specifically, by God the Son:

Colossians 1:16: “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:”

As you can see, everything that exists was created by Jesus. He is our Creator.

What about the angels? While we know that God made them, the creation of the heavenly beings is not mentioned in the creation account. We do know that everything in this universe was created during the six-day creation week:

Exodus 20:11: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

As we can see, in six days the Lord made the heavens, the Earth, the sea, and everything that is in the heavens, the Earth, and the sea. This sounds pretty definitive, but the heavens it is speaking of is the Universe at large – the giant construct in which we find planets, stars, and galaxies. It is *not* referring to Heaven, the place where the Lord dwells. So, while this verse tells us that everything in this universe was created during the six-day creation week, it does not necessarily include the angels.

We do know that the angels were created and have not always existed. The creation of one angel in particular is recorded in Ezekiel. There we find a record of Lucifer, the angel who fell and became Satan:

Ezekiel 28:11: “Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,

12 Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.

13 Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.

14 Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.

15 Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.”

Although this verse seems to be talking about the “king of

Tyrus”, it is actually talking about the devil. How do we know this? Well, the human king of Tyrus could not possibly have set foot in Eden, as it was destroyed long before he was born. The only beings who could have been in Eden and yet still be alive thousands of years later are angels, and the only angels that have sinned are fallen angels. This may seem like an odd way to refer to a demon, but the Bible has a habit of referring to demons by the nations that they control. For example, in Daniel 10:13 we see another demon referred to as the prince of Persia.

As we can see, this passage records Satan's early history and makes note of “the day that thou was created”. Satan is a created being, not an eternal one – and this applies to the rest of the angels as well.

While it is possible that the angels were created during the creation week, it is also possible that they are older than that. Job tells us that the angels were present at the creation of the Earth, and shouted for joy when they saw what God was doing:

Job 38:4: “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding.

5 Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it?

6 Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof;

7 When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?”

The phrase “sons of God” is a reference to the angels. They shouted for joy when God created the world on the first day of creation, so they must have existed at that time. This means it's possible that the angels also existed “before the beginning” – but they have not *always* existed. They are not eternal, like God. They had a beginning and they have a Creator. God, on the other hand, has no beginning and has no creator – which leads us to our next

question.

Q2. How could God have always existed? Didn't someone have to create God?

A. God is eternal – He has no beginning and He has no ending. The Bible is clear that God has life in himself (John 5:26) and did not need anyone to create Him.

This may seem strange, but it's actually perfectly logical. Think of it this way. If something comes into existence then it *must* have had a cause. Why? Because something must have *caused* it to come into existence. There must have been some outside force that took some action that led to its creation. For example, there was a point at which the universe did not exist, and then one day it *did* exist. Therefore, the universe must have a cause. Everything that has a beginning must have a cause; there are no exceptions.

However, if something did not have a beginning then it does not need to have a cause. In fact, things that are eternal *cannot have causes*. After all, if they had a cause then they would have a beginning, and if they had a beginning then they would not be eternal! God has always existed, and therefore God does not have a cause. Nothing “caused” God to come into existence. Therefore, God does not have a creator.

As Christians we will live forever, and have been given everlasting life. However, we are not eternal like God. Our life will never end, but our lives did have a beginning. There was a point at which we came into existence. God, however, did not have a beginning. He has always existed and will always exist.

Q3. Did God know what was going to happen before He created the world?

A. Yes. God knows all things; nothing escapes Him. He sees the

past, the present, and the future. He knew exactly what would happen when He created the world. This can be seen in these Scriptures. (These verses touch on many different points of doctrine, but I want to focus on a specific idea – that God knew everything that would happen before He created the world.)

Ephesians 1:4: “According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:”

If God chose to love us “before the foundation of the world”, then He must have known that we would exist and would need saving. Our existence did not take God by surprise. He knew that each and every one of us would exist before He created the world!

But there is more to it than that:

Revelation 13:8: “And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world.”

If Christ, the Lamb of God, was “slain from the foundation of the world”, then God must have already known that man would fall and need redeeming. What this means is that Jesus already planned to come and die for our sins *before He spoke the world into existence*. He knew exactly how things were going to turn out. The Fall did not catch Him by surprise. When Adam sinned, God did not call an emergency meeting to decide what to do about it. Everything was known long in advance.

This idea is echoed in this verse:

Titus 1:2: “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world

began;”

If God promised us eternal life “before the world began”, then He must have known that we would need it. Before mankind even sinned God had a plan to redeem us and give us everlasting life. Nor is this the only verse that mentions this. That idea is echoed here:

2 Timothy 1:9: “Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,”

Once again, here we see that God's grace was given to us “before the world began” – which would be long before we ever existed. God saw our need and moved to meet it before we were even born – and before our world was even created. God's grace was given to us *before the world began*. That is an amazing thought!

1 Peter 1:18: “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;
19 But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:
20 Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,”

Here again we see that Christ was offered “before the foundation of the world”. God knew what would happen: He saw the Fall, our sin, and our desperate need for a savior – all before we had even been created. In fact, our names were written in the

Book of Life before the world began:

Revelation 17:8: “The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is.”

Some people think that our names were written in the Book when we become saved, but that is not the case. Our name was written in the Book of Life “from the foundation of the world” – and all those whose names are written in the Book inherit everlasting life.

Now, can a name be blotted out of the Book? I have searched the Scriptures, and I have only found one case where this can happen. It is found in the last chapter of the Bible:

Revelation 22:18: “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.”

Some people have interpreted this passage to be speaking about just Revelation itself, while others have applied it to the whole Bible. I think it's just speaking about Revelation, since it clearly says “the words of the prophecy of *this* book”. It does not say “any words that God has ever said at any time”, or “any books that God has written”. There are other verses that warn

against modifying God's Word in general; there is no need to force this verse to say something that it simply does not say.

What it says is quite chilling. Those who take it upon themselves to *edit* this book – to remove portions of it and change it as they see fit – will have their name removed from the Book of Life. This verse is not speaking about those who try to interpret the book; it address those who *physically alter its words*.

The reason this is so frightening is because there are people who do exactly that. Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, have come out with their own translation of the Bible that removes a great many things – including some things found in the book of Revelation. They don't like what the Bible says so they have edited it to suit themselves. God takes a *very* dim view of those who edit His Word. As you can see, He has promised *eternal damnation* to those who dare to edit the book of Revelation. That is not something that we should take lightly.

Q4. Why did Jesus create the world?

A. First of all, we need to make a few things very clear. God did *not* create the world because He was bored, or because He wanted someone to talk to, or because He needed friends. God is self-sufficient (a property that theologians refer to as His **aseity**). There is absolutely nothing we can do that can add to Him or that can subtract from Him:

Acts 17:24: “God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;

25 Neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;”

Moreover, even if God did need something (and the

passage above makes it clear that He does not), God already owns the entire universe and everything it contains:

Psalm 50:7: “Hear, O my people, and I will speak; O Israel, and I will testify against thee: I am God, even thy God.

8 I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings, to have been continually before me.

9 I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he goats out of thy folds.

10 For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills.

11 I know all the fowls of the mountains: and the wild beasts of the field are mine.

12 If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof.”

Job 41:11: “Who hath prevented me, that I should repay him? whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine.”

God is not a poor person who is hoping that we will give Him a handout. He owns everything; there is nothing that does not belong to Him. As Job said, everything “under the whole heaven” belongs to God. When we give money to God we're not giving *our* possessions to God; we're just giving back to Him what was already His.

On top of that, God is perfect and complete. God is not growing. He never changes:

Malachi 3:6: “For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.”

God has not changed one bit since the creation of the world. He is the same now as He was in the eternity before

creation. A billion years from now He will not have changed one iota. Creating the world has not somehow improved God. It has not made Him more than He was before. As Acts 17:25 said, God does not even need our worship. He delights in it and He commands it, but He does not need it. He got along without it quite fine in the ages before we were created. God would not somehow be lessened if we were not there to worship Him. He is complete; He needs nothing.

In other words, God did not create us because He needed something that only we can give. That is *not* the reason. The reason for Creation is straightforward. The universe was created to glorify God:

Revelation 4:11: “Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.”

Romans 11:34: “For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counselor?
35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?
36 For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen.”

Hebrews 2:10: “For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”

In other words, God created everything for His own pleasure. The universe exists to glory God. The purpose of life – the purpose of our very existence – is to bring glory and honor to God. As someone once said, our greatest goal and duty in life is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. *This purpose will never*

change. Our lives in Heaven may be quite different from what they are now, but our purpose in life will be the same, and it will remain so *for all eternity*.

So, then: how does the universe glorify God? We have established that God existed before the world began and that He knew what would happen when He created the world. He knew that the Fall would occur and that men would need salvation, and yet He still chose to create the world. But *why* did He do it? How does God's creation bring Him glory?

The answer is found here:

Romans 9:22: “What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:

23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,

24 Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?”

What these verses are saying is that the existence of this world, including the existence of evil, allows certain elements of God's character to be demonstrated that would otherwise have remained forever hidden. For example, God's wrath and mercy can only be demonstrated if evil exists. If there was no sin then God would have no way to demonstrate His grace or His judgment. In that case, some mighty facets of God's character (such as mercy, forgiveness, grace, longsuffering, and wrath) would remain hidden for all of eternity. God would still have had those character qualities, but they would never have been demonstrated. God uses the universe to reveal who He is in a way that would have otherwise not been possible.

Does this mean that God wants people to go to Hell? Absolutely not! God makes it quite clear that He feels no joy when the wicked perish, and would much rather see them repent:

Ezekiel 33:11: “Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord GOD, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?”

Ezekiel 18:23: “Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways, and live?”

As you can see, God wants men to repent – but there are some who do and some who do not. Through those who *do* repent, God demonstrates His forgiveness, grace, mercy, and love, and makes known “the riches of his glory”. Through those who do *not* repent, God demonstrates His justice and wrath and makes His power known. God demonstrates His character through both groups, and reveals parts of His being that were hidden in the ages before Creation.

Biblical Creationism

There are a number of passages in the Bible that are very difficult to understand. There are other passages that people understand but simply don't like. Then there is a third class of passages: verses that people simply refuse to believe. In the past this third category was quite small, but recently there has been an ever-growing number of Christians who read the Bible and dismiss large portions of it. It is no longer considered shocking or horrifying to say that you disagree with the Bible. At one time that would have considered proof of heresy, but today it's quite fashionable. The church has abandoned the idea of inerrancy – but as I have already defended inerrancy elsewhere I will not dwell on it here.

If I had to pick one passage that I thought was the most rejected passage out of the entire Bible (and I mean rejected by those who call themselves believers), it would be this one:

Exodus 20:11: “For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

The Church today does not believe that God created the world in six days. This idea is mocked, laughed at, and ridiculed. It is seen as an insane, extreme position that is as embarrassing as believing that the Earth is flat or that the Moon is made of cheese. There are very few churches left that agree with Exodus 20:11. Worldly, godless scientists have told mankind that God did not create the world in six days, so the Church has obediently abandoned this verse and moved on. The Church makes this mistake over and over again on issue after issue. When the culture tells us that divorce is acceptable, the Church agrees. When the

culture says that homosexuality is normal and good, the Church abandons its position against it. When the culture says that abortion is simply a woman's right to choose, the Church makes peace with it. In all of these fights the Bible's position has not changed, but the Church has changed tremendously. It has tried hard to win the approval of the world by abandoning the teachings of the Bible. This has terrible consequences, as the Lord plainly tells us that "friendship with the world is enmity with God". A church that has won the world's approval is one that has lost God's approval.

Now, there are scores of people who have tried very hard to reinterpret "six days" to mean "14 billion years". However, let's just be brutally honest: the Bible doesn't say anything remotely like that. No one has ever read Genesis 1 and came away thinking "Oh, life came to exist gradually over incredibly long periods of time, as simple organisms gave rise to more complex ones." The chapter doesn't even hint at that line of thinking; in fact, it *directly contradicts it*. The reason that people try so hard to reinterpret Genesis 1 is because they hear the culture saying that evolution created the world, and so they look for creative ways to force that interpretation upon the chapter. No, no one *really* believes that the actual Hebrew text has been teaching evolution all along and people simply overlooked it for 4000 years. The reason people make that ludicrous claim is because today's culture has decided that evolution is the truth, and there are many people who are willing to "reinterpret" rather straightforward passages of the Bible so that they agree with whatever our culture wants them to say. The great problem with this is that it simply *does not work*. It is impossible to reconcile evolution with Genesis because the Bible goes out of its way to contradict evolution. The Bible really *does* teach that God created the world in six days – and the reason it teaches that is because *that is what God actually did*.

If you stop and read the first chapter of the Bible, you can't escape the idea that the person who wrote it actually, honestly believed that the entire universe was created in just six

ordinary days. For example, look at how many times the phrase “evening and morning” is associated with the word “day”:

Genesis 1:5: “And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day. ...

8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day. ...

13 And the evening and the morning were the third day. ...

19 And the evening and the morning were the fourth day. ...

23 And the evening and the morning were the fifth day. ...

31 And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.”

In the Jewish culture a day consists of *an evening and a morning*. No Jew who read this chapter could escape the idea that these days were ordinary days, not vast ages of time. God could not possibly have communicated this any clearer to a Jewish audience. Exactly six days are mentioned, with the phrase “evening and morning” attached to each one. Just in case we missed it, this “six day” idea is repeated in Exodus 20:11, which I quoted at the top of the paper. What that verse is saying is that God wanted Israel to work six days and rest one day *because God worked six days and rested one day*. If God had actually created the world over an incredibly long stretch of time then that verse would have been a great place to mention this fact, but no such mention can be found. Instead the Bible uses the word “day” each time it talks about creation – not words like “year”, or “age”, or “unfathomable period of time”.

Keep in mind that if God had wanted to say that evolution created the world He could have easily done so. But Genesis does

not even hint that the life forms we see today arose from more primitive ancestors. Instead it says that they sprouted out fully-formed, with birds appearing at the same time as aquatic life, and land animals appearing only *after* birds came into existence – something no evolutionist would agree with:

Genesis 1:21: “And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

22 And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

23 And the evening and the morning were the fifth day.

24 And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

25 And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.”

This tells us that birds and fish were created on day five, while land animals were created on day six. This doesn't “basically agree” with evolution; it directly contradicts it! Evolution teaches that fish gave rise to land animals, which in turn gave rise to birds. No evolutionist would agree that birds existed *before* land animals. That idea is considered to be preposterous – but that is what Genesis 1 says.

The Bible goes even further than that, however, and claims that plants existed *before* stars:

Genesis 1:12: “And the earth brought forth

grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

13 And the evening and the morning were the third day.

14 And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

15 And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

16 And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.

17 And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

18 And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good.

19 And the evening and the morning were the fourth day."

In other words, Genesis 1 says that on the third day God created plants, grasses, herbs, and trees. Then on the fourth day God created the Sun, Moon, and stars. Once again, this does not "basically agree" with evolution; this contradicts it. No evolutionist would agree that plant life existed before the Sun came into being. Evolution teaches that the stars existed for *billions* of years before the first plant ever took root. The Bible, however, says that plants came first.

Anyone who interprets Genesis 1 in a normal, straightforward manner cannot escape the idea that it really *does* teach that God created the world in six days. Think about it: if God was trying to say that He used evolution to create the world then He did an *unbelievably* poor job. Instead of using words that

convey enormous periods of time, He used the word “day” over and over, and then took the extra step of defining the word “day” to mean an “evening and morning” – something any Jew would interpret to mean an ordinary day, not an age of time. Instead of saying that the stars were created first, then the Earth, then plants, then sea creatures, then land animals, and then birds, He instead said that the *Earth* was created first, then plants, and then the stars came long – followed by fish and birds at the same time, then land animals came later. Instead of saying that one kind of living creature gradually turned into more complex creatures He insisted that each animal reproduced after its *own kind*:

Genesis 1:24: “And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

25 And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.”

And just in case that was too complicated to follow, this same idea was repeated in the New Testament:

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.”

This is not “basically the same” as evolution, as many people have claimed. This is a *direct and total contradiction of it*. You simply *cannot* read Genesis 1 in a normal, straightforward way and come away thinking that it teaches evolution. The only way to do it is to take one of three approaches, all of which are grossly unbiblical:

- Reinterpret words to mean things that they don't mean and have never meant. For example, some have said that the word “day” means “a long age of time”, and that “evening and morning” refer to the start and end of that period. They then say that these ages overlapped and some took place before others, even though the text itself presents them in a strict chronological order. However, it is fundamentally dishonest to interpret words to mean the *opposite* of what they actually mean, *especially when there is no textual support for it*. If your approach to interpreting the Bible is to say “Well, I want this passage to say this so I'm going to change the meaning of words until it says what I want it to say”, then *you are doing it wrong*.
- You can dismiss the entire chapter (or the first 11 chapters of Genesis, for that matter) as a myth. Some argue that it's not intended to be history at all; it's simply a make-believe fable filled with “spiritual truths”. However, doing this has severe consequences, which we'll get to in a moment.
- You can say Genesis 1 is just plain wrong. This is much more honest than trying to force the chapter to say something it doesn't actually say. However, this also has very grave consequences.

Some people see this entire discussion as a rather minor issue. Rather than debate it or defend what the Bible teaches, they would rather move on to some other subject that the culture doesn't have a problem with. However, I believe that this is an *extremely* serious issue. There is no getting around this basic truth: if evolution is true then Christianity is false. The two belief systems are mutually exclusive; they cannot both be true.

Now, I realize there are many Christians who believe in evolution, and I am not doubting their salvation. I am not saying that belief in evolution will send you to Hell. What I *am* saying is that if evolution is actually *true* then it is not possible for anyone to be saved. You see, the Bible tells us that before man sinned

nothing ever died. The sin of man is what brought death into the world:

Romans 5:12: “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:”

The Scriptures go on to say that death is an enemy, but one day God will put an end to it:

1 Corinthians 15:26: “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”

In other words, the Bible says that God created a perfect world in which there was no suffering, pain, or death. However, mankind sinned, and that sin brought death into the world and upon all creation. Christ then came to provide a solution to this problem. Since death was caused by the actions of *one man*, it was possible for the sacrifice of one man to undo sin and provide salvation:

Romans 5:17: “For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. ...

18 Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

Now, as an aside, it will not do to say that the death this

speaks of is a simple spiritual death, and that physical death is normal. Christ did not die a spiritual death on the cross: He died a genuine, brutal, *physical* death. Nor did He experience a spiritual resurrection, with His body remaining in the tomb. He took on Himself the punishment for sin, which was *physical* death – and then experienced the joys of *physical* resurrection. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is not spiritual death, but physical death. The Bible is very clear on this point.

The reason this is important is because the gospel message depends upon the idea that there was no death before Adam sinned, and everyone today who dies does so because of what Adam did. (As a technical point, we do not die because Adam sinned; we die because we inherit Adam's sin nature, which causes us to sin and therefore become worthy of death. But that is beyond the scope of this paper.) As Romans 5:19 points out, the obedience of one man is sufficient to save us *only* because the disobedience of one man is what made us all sinners. But all of this hinges on a couple key points: that Adam was the first man, that there was no death before Adam, and the Fall in the Garden actually happened. Notice that *all of these points depend upon Genesis 1-3 being literally true.*

What happens if you dismiss Genesis 1-11 as myth? In that case there is no Adam and no Fall. However, since there is no Adam there can be no salvation either. The gospel also becomes a myth and our faith becomes vain. Interpreting the “days” of Genesis 1 to be “billions of years” does not help either because evolution *depends upon death*. In order for evolution to work its magic there must be *countless* generations of living creatures that are born, live, have offspring, and die. Biblical creationism says that death is the enemy, inflicted upon the world because of Adam's sin. Evolution says that death is a friend who has always been here. Biblical creationism says that pain, suffering, cancer, disease, and destruction were *not* a part of God's original creation and came into existence because of sin, and that one day God will put an end to them. Evolution says that pain, suffering, cancer, disease, and destruction were a vital part of our creation and are

simply how the world works.

To put this another way: Biblical creationism says that God created a perfect world in which there was no suffering or death, and then mankind ruined it through sin. Theistic evolution says that God *deliberately* created a world filled with suffering, cancer, and death, and then used death for *billions of years* to bring about the creation of mankind. These two Gods *could not be more different*. One of them hates death, sees it as an enemy, and has vowed to destroy it. The other loves death, has called it “very good”, and used it for billions of years – and then lied to all of us and claimed that there was no such thing as death before a mythical Adam sinned.

Evolution is *not* a trivial matter: it attacks the heart of the gospel, the character of God, and the accuracy of the Bible. It is a devastating belief system. If it is true then none of us can be saved, and God is a sadistic liar who enjoys tormenting His creatures for no real purpose.

For what it's worth, Jesus was not an evolutionist. He believed that the world was created in six days. We can find this in Mark:

Mark 10:6: “But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.”

Evolutionists laugh at statements like this. According to their belief system, the male/female distinction did *not* appear “at the beginning of creation”. In fact, something like 10 *billion* years supposedly went by without any life forms existing anywhere. It wasn't until quite recently (in the past two billion years or so) that male and female organisms arose. In other words, according to evolution, the male/female distinction occurred near the very *end* of creation, not at its beginning. The only way you could say that God made them male and female from the very beginning is if you believed that God created the world in six days.

Now, some might argue that Jesus was simply mistaken – that He had accepted the values of His culture and just didn't

know any better. The problem with this theory is that Jesus *is actually the one Who created the world in the first place*:

Colossians 1:13: “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:

14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:

15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

16 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:”

In other words, the very same person that died and shed His blood for us is the same One who created all things. If Jesus used billions of years of suffering, pain, and death to create the world then He certainly could have said so – but instead He stuck to the Genesis account and claimed that Abel was a real person who actually existed.

The point I am trying to make is that the Bible directly contradicts evolution, and does so in very plain language. Furthermore, the Bible cannot be reconciled with evolution: if evolution is true then Christianity is false. The two are mutually exclusive. If evolution is accurate then the Bible is wrong, and all of Christianity is nothing but a hoax. However, if the Bible is accurate – and I believe it is – then evolution *must* be wrong, and those who believe evolution and support it are also wrong. They may be quite sincere and they may think that they have a good case, but they are mistaken.

The real question is one of authority. Who do you ultimately believe is the source of truth? Is your authority the Word of God or the culture around you? The way that you answer this question is extremely important. There are three different

ways this question has been answered:

1. There are some people who have placed their full confidence in the Bible. They say “The Bible is true and this is what it says, so those things must be true no matter what anyone else claims.”
2. There are others who will only trust the Bible as long as it agrees with what the culture around them is saying. They say “The Bible says this, but the culture disagrees. Therefore, the Bible must be wrong.”
3. There is another group who trusts only themselves. They say “This is what the Bible teaches, but I disagree with it. Therefore, I am right and the Bible is wrong.”

These views are *radically different*. The first person uses the Word of God as their source of truth. The other two have rejected the Bible's authority and replaced it with a different source of truth. (As a side-note, I hope you realize that these views do not mix well. If you are willing to go along with the Bible most of the time but then occasionally reject it for personal reasons, then claiming that the Bible is your ultimate authority is silly. Your true ultimate authority is the one that you use to override everything else.)

As Christians, our source of truth *must* be the Bible. It can never be the ever-changing culture around us, whose standards differ from generation to generation. If we are evaluating the Bible by what the culture tells us then the Bible isn't our source of truth – the culture is. What is even worse is to evaluate the Bible in the light of what *we* think, instead of letting the Bible *tell us* how we should think.

Jesus was quite clear as to what our source of truth should be:

Matthew 4:4: “But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but

by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

Notice that Jesus did not command us to follow the dictates of our culture or to simply do whatever we thought was best! No, Jesus commanded us to obey God, not our peers. The reason we can do this is because every word of God is flawless and fully able to be trusted. Those who add to it, however, are liars:

Proverbs 30:5: “Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. 6 Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.”

Notice that this verse does not say “Every word of God should be subjected to whatever the culture around you has to say. Feel free to add to God's Word or take away from it as you deem necessary.” It is simple, direct, and to the point: God's Word can be trusted, but those who would add to it or replace it with something else are liars.

This point is repeated in the New Testament, where we are told that the Bible really is all we need:

2 Timothy 3:15: “And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

Note the clarity of this passage! *All* scripture was inspired by God. *All* of it is trustworthy. Verse 17 tells us that the Scripture

was given so that we might be “perfect” and have what we need to accomplish *all* good works. That means the Scriptures left nothing out. There are no truths that we need that are not found in its pages. There are no works that we can only accomplish with doctrines that are found outside its pages. Christ echoed this, pointing out that the Scriptures could not be wrong:

John 10:35: “If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;”

Jesus also expected people to know the Bible:

Matthew 22:29: “Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.”

Of course, Jesus knew the Bible quite well and frequently used it to support His teachings. He was not of the opinion that parts of it were good and other parts of it were bad, and that the culture had the final say. However, this is a topic I've discussed at length elsewhere so I will not elaborate here.

Let me point out that there are a great many scientific reasons for believing that God created the world in six days and for believing that evolution is merely a modern superstition, but that is beyond the scope of this paper. In a sense the science is not the real issue anyway. You see, facts do not speak for themselves; they have to be interpreted, and a person's presuppositions have a tremendous impact on how they interpret facts. The same fact can be interpreted in wildly different ways, depending on your assumptions.

For example, a few years ago a researcher found live blood cells inside a bone that once belonged to a Tyrannosaurus Rex. Creationists looked at that and said “See, this is proof that dinosaurs lived recently.” Evolutionists looked at it and said “See,

this is proof that blood cells can survive for millions of years under the right conditions.” The evidence was the same, but since the presuppositions were different the two groups arrived at completely different conclusions.

That is why there is no such thing as “evidence for creation” or “evidence for evolution”. What matters is *how you interpret the evidence*. The way that you interpret it depends on what you believe, and what you believe depends on *who your authority is*. As the blood cell example demonstrates, if your authority is the Bible then you will interpret scientific evidence in light of what it teaches. If your authority is yourself then you will interpret the evidence in light of what you already believe. If your evidence is your culture then you will use modern assumptions to interpret the evidence.

For example, the Bible strongly condemns homosexuality. Those whose authority is the Bible looks at that and says “See, this is proof that we live in a depraved culture that needs God.” Those whose authority is their culture look at those same verses and say “See, this is proof that the Bible is a bigoted, homophobic book that should be banned for its intolerant attitudes.” Those whose authority is themselves look at the verses and say “See, this is evidence that the Bible is mired in its times. Times have changed, so those verses just aren't important anymore.” In each case the verse says the same thing, but people have drawn completely different conclusions. Their belief system drives their interpretation.

The final question is this: who do you believe, and why? Who is *your* authority? By whose orders are you living your life – by God's Word, by your words, or by the words of your peers? The answer will make an enormous difference on how you live your life – and on where you spend eternity.

In The Beginning

There are few passages of Scripture that are attacked or doubted more than Genesis 1-3. A great many Christians today have rejected them altogether. I believe that this is a terrible tragedy, because the doctrine of salvation is built upon these first three chapters. If we abandon them to the cries of an unbelieving world then we are left with nothing.

One key fact that we must keep in mind is that the Scriptures are always correct. The Bible is not true because science validates it; the Bible is true because it was written by God and therefore cannot be wrong. If we want to know the truth we must always start with the Bible. Science can be wrong (and often is) but the Bible is never wrong. It is our foundation.

In Genesis 1 we find the account of the creation of the world – an act that took place over six days. The days of creation are:

Day 1: On the first day of creation God creates the light and divides it from the darkness:

Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

3 And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

4 And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the **first day**.”

As we can see, God names the light “Day” and the darkness “Night”. A few points:

- God creates things and then names them, signifying His ownership of them. This will be a common, repeated theme.
- In verse 5 we are told that “the evening and the morning were the first day”. In the Jewish calendar a day consists of an evening and a morning; Genesis 1 is the reason behind this.
- The “evening and morning” theme is repeated for each of the six days of creation. God seems to be going out of His way to emphasize the fact that these are normal days, with one evening and one morning each – not incredibly long periods of time. God could have said “and all this happened over an incredibly long period of time”, but He did not.
- Note that God created Day and Night before creating the sun, moon, and stars (which were not created until day four).
- Also, note that God creates things simply by His Word – He said it, and it happened. If we want to make something we have to form it using whatever materials are available. God, however, needs no raw materials; He can simply speak and it is so. This is far beyond anything that man can do.

Day 2: On the second day of creation God creates the sky:

Genesis 1:6: “And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it

divide the waters from the waters.

7 And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the **second day.**”

Here we see that God creates a “firmament in the midst of the waters”, which He names “Heaven”. Some of these waters are gathered under the firmament and become Seas in verse 10. The waters above the firmament are not mentioned again in this chapter. What this verse is saying is that God created the sky to separate the water under the sky from the water *above* the sky.

But just where is this ocean that is above the sky? This verse has puzzled a great many people over the years. I have a theory about what is going on, but since it is rather complicated I will not explain it here. You can find the theory in Appendix D – The Ocean in the Sky.

Day 3: On the third day of creation God separates the dry land from the water:

Genesis 1:9: “And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.

10 And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good.

11 And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

12 And the earth brought forth grass, and herb

yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

13 And the evening and the morning were the **third day.**”

God names the dry land “Earth” and the gathering of water “Seas”. God then commands the dry land to bring forth plants.

It is interesting to note that God commands the plants to bring forth “after his kind”. There is no hint that the plants are supposed to evolve into other creatures, as evolution proposes. Each creature that God creates was commanded to reproduce after their own kind. That pretty much shuts the door on the idea that God used evolution to create the world.

Also, note that at this point God has still not created the sun, moon, or stars.

Day 4: On the fourth day of creation God creates the sun, the moon, and the stars:

Genesis 1:14: “And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and years:

15 And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

16 And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.

17 And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

18 And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and

God saw that it was good.

19 And the evening and the morning were the **fourth day**.

A few points:

- God gives His purpose for creating these celestial objects: they are to “divide the day from the night”, and they are to be for signs, seasons, days, and years. All of these functions are used to denote the concept of time – hours, days, seasons, and years. The Lord established the calendar – He instituted the day, the week, the year, and seasons. The idea of using celestial objects to chart the passage of time is established here. (It's worth noting that the Jews used a lunar calendar.)
- The Egyptians and Babylonians divided a day into 12 parts, since there were 12 lunar cycles in a year. This was later changed into 12 hours of the day and 12 hours of the night. Older cultures probably had their own way of dividing the day into smaller increments, but not much is known about them.
- The idea of dividing an hour into 60 parts and dividing those parts further into 60 parts came from the Sumerians, whose number system was sexagesimal (base 60 – or, as some have said, alternating base 10 and base 6). Some have speculated that they used a base 6 number system because they had 6 fingers on each hand.
- Verse 17 explicitly says that the Lord created the stars of the heavens, with all of their galaxies and heavenly bodies, for the express purpose of *giving light to the earth*. This planet is not one lonely sphere lost in a vast universe; the rest of the universe was created *for this planet*. It is the Earth that is special; the rest of the universe is actually there to act as a light source. This is an awesome example

of the character of God: the Lord decided that Earth needed some light, and so created an *entire universe*, filled with a mind-boggling number of galaxies (*125 billion* according to recent estimates), to act as a *light source*. That is the power of God. When the Bible says that the Lord “is able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think” (Eph. 3:20), it's not kidding. The creation of the stars in space (10^{21} , by a recent estimate) is a mind-boggling array of power, but in Genesis 1 it is tossed in almost as an aside - “he made the stars also” (1:16). So when you are praying to the Lord, never forget His awesome extravagance and power – He is the one that decided the best way to light the Earth was to create *125 billion stellar galaxies*. And all of that was created in *one day*. God is not a stingy God.

- How, exactly, did the light from all of those distant stars get to Earth? We can see galaxies that are billions of light-years away, but the Earth is only 6000 years old. How is that possible?

Some have theorized that God created light already en-route to Earth. The problem with this is that light contains information – it shows things that have happened. If starlight was “pre-created” then we would be seeing things that never actually took place. The light would essentially be lying to us, bearing record of a nonexistent past. Given the character of God, it is unlikely that He would do such a thing.

Others have theorized that the speed of light was much, much faster in the past. The problem with this theory is that the speed of light impacts the physical nature of the universe – it changes other constants of nature. (This can most easily be seen in the famous equation $E=mc^2$, or energy = mass times the speed of light squared; if you change the speed of light you change the amount of

energy in mass, which impacts all sorts of things.) A changing speed of light would create all kinds of problems.

Still others have theorized that the Earth is in a “gravity well” and that time flows at a very different rate here than it does in the rest of the universe. It may be that while only a small amount of time is passing in the Solar System, incredibly long amounts of time are passing in deep space. (If this is true, it would mean that while Creation occurred 6000 years ago, billions of years could have passed in space – because time is flowing much faster in space than it is here.) Here is one explanation of how this idea would work:

Suppose that our solar system is located near the center of a finite distribution of galaxies. Although this cannot be proven for certain at present, it is fully consistent with the evidence; so it is a reasonable possibility.

In that case, the earth would be in a gravitational well. This term means that it would require energy to pull something away from our position into deeper space. In this gravitational well, we would not “feel” any extra gravity, nonetheless time would flow more slowly on earth (or anywhere in our solar system) than in other places of the universe. This effect is thought to be very small today; however, it may have been much stronger in the past. (If the universe is expanding as most astronomers believe, then physics demands that such effects would have been stronger when the universe was smaller). This being the case, clocks on earth would have ticked much more slowly than clocks in deep space. Thus, light

from the most distant galaxies would arrive on earth in only a few thousand years as measured by clocks on earth. This idea is certainly intriguing. And although there are still a number of mathematical details that need to be worked out, the premise certainly is reasonable. Some creation scientists are actively researching this idea.

Day 5: On the fifth day of creation God commands the waters to bring forth aquatic animals and birds:

Genesis 1:20: “And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

22 And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

23 And the evening and the morning were the **fifth day.”**

Once again, notice that these creatures (and the land animals the next day) are commanded to reproduce after their own kind – the Lord did not command them to turn into entirely different creatures. There is no hint in Genesis 1 that the Lord created a simple creature and used it to evolve more complicated creatures. Instead, each animal was to reproduce “after its own kind”.

Day 6: On the sixth day of creation God commands the dry land to bring forth land animals:

Genesis 1:24: “And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

25 And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

29 And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding see; to you it shall be for meat.

30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so.

31 And God saw every thing that he had made,

and, behind, it was very good, And the evening and the morning were the **sixth day.**”

God then makes man.

- In verse 26 God says “Let us make man” – us being a plural word. This is a reference to the Trinity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.
- When the Lord creates man in his image, He was not referring to the physical form of the man but to the spiritual aspect – the immortal soul. We have a likeness to God that is not shared by any of the other creatures that God created on this planet.
- When mankind was created, God gave him dominion (authority) over every living thing on Earth. Mankind was instructed to fill the world, subdue it, and have dominion over it. In other words, God created this world and then gave it over to mankind to care for it. This command has never been revoked or changed. Mankind is not “just another animal”, as evolutionists would claim; we were created distinct from the animals, in the image of God, and were given authority over them. The race of men is not just another species of animals; we are something different altogether, created by God to serve Him by caring for the Earth.
- The word “replenish” in verse 28 does not mean to “repopulate”, as if the Earth had been populated at one time and then lost its inhabitants. When the King James Bible was translated that word meant simply to “populate”. It did not have the extra connotation that it has today.
- When men and animals were created they were only given plants as food. Men (and presumably animals) were not allowed to eat meat until after the Flood (Genesis 9:1-3).

This means that originally all animals (including dinosaurs) were plant-eaters. In Isaiah the Lord tells us that one day the original order will be restored and animals will once again become vegetarians (Isaiah 11:7).

Now, there are additional things that happened on this day that are not recorded in chapter 1, but *are* recorded in chapter 2. Genesis chapter 2 does not take place after the creation week; it is simply a closer look at what happened on the sixth day of creation.

The way we know this is because Exodus clearly states that in *six* days the Lord made the heavens, the earth, and everything in them. That means that all of the creating that God did was done during those six days. He rested on the seventh day because *He was done*. God did not start creating more things on day eight. Everything was completed during those six days.

There's quite a bit going on in chapter 2. First of all, there is the **Garden of Eden**:

Genesis 2:8: “And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.”

When God created the garden He placed mankind inside it and changed him with dressing and keeping it:

Genesis 2:15: “And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.”

The phrase “Garden of Eden” refers to a garden *within the land of Eden* – specifically, in the eastern part of that country. Once the Lord had planted this garden He placed Adam in it to take care of it. As you can see, the very first profession of mankind was actually gardening.

The garden was watered by a river that parted to become four other rivers: Pison, Gihon, Hiddekel, and Euphrates. There is a modern river named Euphrates but it is not the same river that is mentioned here. The land of Eden, along with these rivers, was destroyed in the Flood. The people who lived after the Flood named some of the new rivers after the ones they remembered from the old world (just as in America, the city of “New York” was named after the old “York” in Great Britain). That is also why it is impossible to know where the garden of Eden was located – it could have been anywhere.

As a side-note, the word tenses in verses 10-14 are interesting. It is clear that when that passage was written those rivers were still in existence, since the writer is speaking in present tense, not past tense. Note that the writer comments that there *is* high-quality gold in Havilah, that a river “compasses the whole land of Ethiopia”, and so forth. It is very likely that the person who wrote those verses lived *before* the Flood and was an eyewitness to what the old world was like. In other words, what we have here is an eyewitness account of Eden.

One of the key centerpieces in the Garden was the **Tree of Life**:

Genesis 2:9: “And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.”

Within the garden the Lord created a great many trees - “every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food” (2:9). There were also two special trees: the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. As fantastic as it seems, these were real trees with real fruit. They seem like something out of a fairy tale but they really were real trees.

Adam was forbidden to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, but he was *not* forbidden eat from the Tree of

Life. The Lord later said that any man who ate of the Tree of Life would live forever (Genesis 3:22). When Adam and Eve were driven out of the Garden the Lord did not destroy the Tree of Life; instead, cherubims and a flaming sword were sent to keep people away from the Tree.

The Tree of Life was not lost in the flood. Revelation tells us that this tree can be found in the New Jerusalem:

Revelation 22:2: “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.”

The Lord has further promised that “him that overcometh” (which are all those who have put their trust in Christ – 1 John 5:5) will have the privilege of eating the fruit from this tree (and living forever):

Revelation 2:7: “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.”

One day, we will not only see this legendary tree, but we will enjoy its fruit!

Of course, the Garden of Eden also contained another tree – the **Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil**. Mankind was strictly forbidden from eating of this tree:

Genesis 2:16: “And the Lord God commandeth the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that

thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

As we all know, this tree led to the Fall of mankind.

As a side-note, in Genesis 1 the Lord said that mankind could eat of any tree, but in Genesis 2 the Lord makes an exception to this rule. This exception was not mentioned in chapter 1 because that tree was not yet in existence.

Something else we find in Genesis 2 is the **naming of the animals**:

Genesis 2:19: “And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air: and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.

20 And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found a help meet for him.”

The first recorded act of Adam was to name the animals. In the Bible, naming something is an act of authority; if you name something then you are exercising dominion over it. God sometimes changed people's names – for example, He changed Abram's name to Abraham. In this case the Lord is having Adam exercise his dominion over the animal kingdom by naming the animals.

It is worth noting that from the very beginning Adam was a fully-formed adult with the full use of his senses. He was capable of language and analysis from day one. Language did not evolve over millions of years; mankind was created with the ability to communicate.

Last but not least, we also find the account of the creation of Eve:

Genesis 2:21: “And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;

22 And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.

23 And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.”

In Genesis 2:18 the Lord says that “it is not good that the man should be alone”. To solve this problem the Lord took a rib from Adam and created the first Woman: Eve.

It should be noted that Eve was not a “helpmeet”, as people today like to say. What the Lord said is that He would make “a help meet for him”. The word “meet” here means “suitable”. The Lord is saying that He will make someone for Adam that is well-suited to being his companion.

Also, Adam did not permanently lose a rib as a result of this operation. Ribs are unique in that if they are removed they have the ability to grow back.

Day 7: After God finished creating the world, He rested:

Genesis 2:1: “Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.”

Q. Could Genesis 1 be recounting the creation of creatures on a planet that already existed?

A. Some people have theorized that God created the Earth long before Genesis 1 and populated it with another race of beings. A number of terrible things then happen and the planet was all but destroyed. They claim that Genesis 1 is the account of God populating the Earth for the *second* time. As evidence, they point out that in Genesis 1:1 the Earth is already there; the account of its creation is never given in the chapter.

This theory sounds interesting but it is wrong. Exodus 20 disproves it:

Exodus 20:11: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

Notice what God claims to have created in just *six days*:

1. Heaven and Earth
2. The sea
3. Everything in heaven and earth, and everything in the sea

In other words, in those six days God created *the Earth itself* along with all the creatures that it contains. God did not use a pre-existing planet; instead He actually created the planet itself during the creation week. If God was just populating an already-existing planet He could have said “For in six days the Lord made everything in the heaven and the earth” – but *that is not what God said*. God included “heaven and earth” in the list of things that He formed during the creation week.

It is also instructive to note that the Hebrew words for “heaven and earth” in Exodus 20:11 are the same words that are used for heaven and earth in Genesis 1:1. The entire universe was

created during those six days.

Q. Do Genesis chapters 1 and 2 contradict each other?

A. There are some people who claim that the first two chapters of Genesis contradict each other. For example:

Problem #1: Were plants created before man, or was man created before plants?

First, notice what Genesis 2:4 states:

Genesis 2:4: “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,

5 And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. ...

7 And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”

In Genesis 1 God creates plants on day three (1:11) and man on day 6 (1:26). However, Genesis 2:7 talks about God forming man out of the ground *before* “every herb of the field” had grown. How is this possible?

The answer is actually very simple. God did indeed created plants before man. However, notice the phrase “herb of the field”. The word “field” here refers to *cultivated fields*, as opposed to normal ground. When God created man there were no cultivated fields because there *were no men around to cultivate them*. It is as simple as that. Cultivated fields didn't exist until

after Adam was created.

Problem #2: Were birds created from the water or from the ground?

In Genesis 1:20 we are told that birds came from the Seas. However, Genesis 2:19 says this:

Genesis 2:19: “And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.”

What is going on here? Why does Genesis 1 state that the birds came from the water while Genesis 2 states that birds came from the air?

This is because these two passages are talking about *different events*. In Genesis 1 God created the birds and the aquatic animals from the water on the fifth day, and God created the land animals from the ground on the sixth day.

When it came time to name the animals, however, God did not round up animals that already existed. Instead, God formed new copies of them *right out of the ground and brought them to Adam*. (That is, after all, exactly what the verse says!) That is what Genesis 2 is talking about.

Problem #3: Can mankind eat from all trees or just some trees?

In Genesis 1:29 God gives mankind the right to eat from “every tree”, yet Genesis 2:17 says this:

Genesis 2:17: “But of the tree of the knowledge

of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

What is the difference? Well, as was said earlier, when God spoke in Genesis 1:29 the Garden of Eden had not yet been planed and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil did not yet exist. When God planted the Garden and created that tree He instituted a new rule to cover it.

Q. Why would God create the tree of knowledge of good and evil?

A. The Bible does not give us an answer to this question but there are several possibilities. One theory is that the tree was created to demonstrate God's authority over Adam. By creating a tree and then denying mankind access to it, God was exercising His authority and right to rule. The presence of a forbidden tree was an ever-present reminder that mankind was subject to God.

The creation of the tree also offered a choice to mankind: they could now choose to obey or disobey God. If there were no commandments to break then disobedience would have been impossible.

Cain and Abel

In Genesis 3 mankind suffered a devastating Fall and was evicted from the Garden of Eden. As we all know, however, that is not the end of the story. In the next chapter Adam and Eve start a family:

Genesis 4:1: “And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord.

2 And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.”

Cain was born before Abel, which makes him Abel's older brother. The text doesn't say how many years separated the two brothers, but it does seem safe to say that Cain and Abel were Adam and Eve's first two sons.

According to Strong's Concordance, the name Cain means “spear” and the name Abel means “vanity”. These names are actually important – there's something going on here that is not immediately apparent. You see, the Hebrew text of verse 1 does not have the words “from the”; that phrase was added by translators. What the verse actually says is this: “I have gotten a man, the Lord”.

The reason this is significant is because when God judged the serpent in the Garden of Eden He made a promise:

Genesis 3:14: “And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life:

15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Verse 15 is actually a Messianic prophecy that looks forward to the crucifixion. The crucifixion accomplished two things: Christ died (and thus the reference to "bruise his heel"), and Satan was defeated (and thus the reference to "bruise thy head"). Eve understood this prophecy and assumed that her firstborn son Cain was the promised Messiah – "the Lord". She named him "spear" because she thought that God would use him to destroy the devil. She must have realized her mistake pretty quickly, though, because she named her second son "vanity". Eve thought that the Messiah was going to come immediately, but the Messiah did not actually come until approximately 4,000 years later.

The Bible does not tell us anything about the childhood of Cain and Abel. What we do know is that one day the two brothers made offerings to the Lord:

Genesis 4:3: "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.
4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. . ."

People have made a lot of assumptions about these verses that are not actually true. For example, there is no evidence that God commanded them to give this offering. The Mosaic Law does have a long list of required offerings, but that Law was not given until thousands of years later. The laws that Moses gave regarding sacrifices and offerings *cannot* be applied to these verses! Cain and Abel would have been completely unaware of them. There is no hint in the passage that God had required something or that Cain and Abel were trying to get their sins

forgiven.

We also need to realize that Cain's offering is the first one that is mentioned. It is quite likely that *Cain* made his offering first, and Abel only made his offering *after* Cain did. There is no evidence that Cain was copying Abel. In fact, the very first person ever recorded as making an offering to God is *Cain*.

Some people have argued that God was upset with Cain's offering because it was “of the fruit of the ground”, while Abel's offering was “of the firstlings of his flock”. It is true that Abel offered a blood sacrifice and Cain did not. However, there is nothing in the text to indicate that grain offerings were prohibited. When people today think of offerings they usually think of animal sacrifices, but the levitical system had other types of offerings as well. There were even grain and drink (wine) offerings! Even if the Mosaic Law was binding at the time (and it was *not*), a grain offering would have been perfectly fine. The issue had nothing to do with *what* Cain offered.

What we see is that Cain offered something he had grown and Abel offered something he had raised. Both gave of the work of their hands. The offering was something they had raised, not something they purchased. Cain was a farmer and offered the bounty of his land; Abel was a shepherd and offered the bounty of his flock. They were both perfectly logical choices and they both made sense. *The problem was not the offering itself.*

(As a side-note, notice that the professions of farming and raising sheep appeared extremely early in human history! It did not take people millions of years to learn how to farm or how to raise livestock. Early man was quite intelligent. Cain and Abel were *not* brutish cavemen who spent their time grunting at each other. The advancement of mankind was extremely rapid.)

The passage goes on to say that the Lord had very different reactions to the two offerings:

Genesis 4:4: “. . .And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

5 But unto Cain and to his offering he had not

respect. . .

Notice the very precise language of this passage. We tend to focus on the offerings, but the Bible clearly says that “the Lord had respect unto *Abel* and to his offering”. The actual person is mentioned *before* the offering! The verse is not saying “The Lord respected Abel's offering, and that offering made Abel acceptable to God”. What it actually says is this: “The Lord respected Abel, and therefore He respected Abel's offering”. The reason the Lord had respect for Abel's offering is because *He respected Abel*. The reason the Lord rejected Cain's offering is because *He did not respect Cain*.

The same thing is true today. Jesus had tremendous respect for the small offering of the poor widow, even though the monetary amount that she gave was utterly insignificant:

Mark 12:41: “And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much.

42 And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing.

43 And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury:

44 For all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living.”

However, God has no respect at all for the offerings of the wicked, regardless of how large they might be:

Proverbs 15:8: “The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD: but the prayer of the upright is his delight.”

Proverbs 15:29: "The LORD is far from the wicked: but he heareth the prayer of the righteous."

People who don't know the Lord often think that if they just give money to the poor, or make a donation to church, or do some good deed, that the Lord will see their offering and accept them. However, they are quite wrong. The Lord *despises* the gifts and offerings of the wicked. Their sacrifices are an abomination in His sight. He does not hear their self-righteous prayers and He does not accept their gifts. You cannot earn God's favor by bribing Him with gifts because God cannot be bought. God will only accept your gifts *if He has already accepted you*. It does not work the other way around. In fact, Jesus gave a stern warning about this:

Matthew 7:21: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?

23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

Jesus is saying that when He returns there will be many people who think they are Christians but who will end up rejected. The true Christian is one who has repented of his sins and believed on Christ (which, according to John 6:40, is "the will of my Father"). However, there are many false Christians who have rejected the lordship of Christ and have refused to turn their lives over to Jesus. Instead, they have based their salvation

on their own works. They spend their lives doing “many wonderful works” and assume that those works are buying God's favor. When Jesus returns they will try to claim that their works have earned them salvation, and they will be rejected. Jesus will plainly tell them “I *never* knew you”. They were never saved at all; they were just deluding themselves. You cannot earn your salvation through works and you cannot bribe God into liking you. A Christian's relationship with God is based on grace, not works.

Cain and Abel are a classic example of this. Both brothers made offerings to God. The works were the same, but Cain was rejected and Abel was not! What's the difference between Cain and Abel? The New Testament tells us that it was a matter of *faith*:

Hebrews 11:4: “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.”

In other words, *Abel had faith* and Cain did not. Abel made his offering in faith and God respected that faith. Cain lacked faith and so God rejected his offering. Faith and faith alone was the difference between Cain and Abel. (It is also the difference between every saved person and every lost person.)

Cain quickly realized that he had been rejected, and he did not take it very well:

Genesis 4:5: “. . . And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.

6 And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen?

7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt

rule over him.”

Cain noticed that God accepted Abel and rejected him. Instead of seeking understanding and repentance, however, Cain simply got angry about it. The Lord warned him that he was going down the wrong path but Cain ignored God's warning. Rather than repenting of his sin and turning from it, he chose to seek out and murder the one who had faithfully served the Lord:

Genesis 4:8: “And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.”

The fact that Cain would actually murder Abel is rather astonishing. Cain had to know that he wouldn't get away with it. When Adam and Eve sinned, the Lord was immediately aware of it and confronted them. Cain would have known this but it didn't stop him. If Cain wanted to keep this a secret he failed spectacularly – this is one of the most famous murders in all of history! The one fact that everyone knows about Cain is that he murdered his brother.

The New Testament tells us exactly why Cain did this:

1 John 3:12: “Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous.”

In other words, Cain was furious that his brother was righteous. He couldn't stand the fact that his brother was not wicked, so he went out and killed his brother. Cain had a passionate hatred for righteousness, and that hatred drove him to murder the one person who had been declared righteous.

Nothing has really changed over the years. The world still hates righteousness and it still hunts down and kills those who are

righteous. Jesus put it this way:

John 15:18: “If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you.

19 If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

20 Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.”

Abel was simply the first person to experience this. Since he was righteous, the world hated him. Since he loved the Lord, the world hunted him down and murdered him. If we are righteous then we can expect the world to hate us as well. The world that hated Jesus will never love His followers.

As we all know, Cain did not get away with his scheme. The Lord confronted him about it, just as He confronted Cain's parents in the Garden of Eden:

Genesis 4:9: “And the Lord said unto Cain, where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper?”

When Adam sinned and the Lord confronted him, Adam tried to shift the blame to his wife. Cain, however, takes a more direct approach: he just tells a blatant lie (a lie that is tinged with disrespect and thinly-veiled contempt). Unfortunately for Cain, the Lord knows everything. God did not question Cain because He noticed that Abel was missing and wasn't sure what had happened to him. Whenever the Lord asks questions it is for *our* benefit, not His. God knew perfectly well that Cain had killed his brother. This was simply the first step in Cain's judgment.

This does bring up a question, though: why did God talk directly to Cain? Why didn't someone just call the police and have Cain arrested? Why is Cain getting the same treatment that Adam and Eve got in the Garden of Eden?

Well, it's important to note that human government was not instituted by God until *after the Flood*. When Noah and his family finally left the Ark the Lord changed a number of things. One of those things was making mankind responsible for the execution of justice:

Genesis 9:5: “And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man.

6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.”

This is why governments and the police have the right to hunt down and prosecute criminals. Not only has God given them that right, but He has actually commanded them to exercise it. Notice, though, that these verses appear in Genesis 9, not Genesis 4. There was no justice system in place when Cain was alive. Instead, God apparently handled things personally. This is just one of the many ways in which life was quite different before the Flood. Throughout history God periodically changed the rules, and this is one example of this. (Theologians refer to this as different *dispensations*. That, however, is a topic for another time.)

Cain's attempt to deny any knowledge of what happened to his brother did not fool God. The Lord confronted Cain directly with what he had done:

Genesis 4:10: “And he said, What hast thou

done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.”

Nothing that we do is hidden from God; He knows everything and sees everything. People may think that they are “getting away with it”, but they are not. God is simply biding His time until the day of judgment, when all sins that are not covered by the blood of Christ are judged once and for all. No one will get away with anything; all sins that are not forgiven will be brought up and judged. There is no escaping God and there is no hiding from Him.

God did not kill Adam and Eve when they sinned, and He does not kill Cain either. Instead He curses him – just as He had cursed Cain's parents:

Genesis 4:11: “And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand;
12 When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.”

The curse is very similar to the one that we find in Genesis 3. Since Cain was a farmer, God cursed his livelihood. The ground would no longer yield crops for him. With his profession taken from him he would be a fugitive and a vagabond.

Why didn't God just kill Cain? Well, think of it this way: if God killed us the first time we sinned, how many of us would live long enough to be saved? The Bible tells us that God is longsuffering and merciful. He withholds His final judgment in order to give men a chance to repent:

2 Peter 3:9: “The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any

should perish, but that all should come to repentance.”

Some people accept this opportunity and repent, while others – like Cain – do not. All Cain does is complain about it:

Genesis 4:13: “And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear.

14 Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me.”

Notice that Cain shows absolutely no remorse for what he's done. Instead he immediately starts complaining that God isn't being fair! Keep in mind that *Cain just killed his own brother*. Cain expresses no gratitude that God didn't strike Cain dead on the spot (as God later did to others throughout the Old and New Testament). There isn't even any sense of shame! Cain is just a remorseless murderer who lashes out at the very God who showed him mercy.

Some people may wonder why Cain was worried about being killed by other people. After all, aside from his parents, who else was there around to kill him? In order to answer this question we need to realize a couple things.

First of all, when Cain slew Abel the two of them were probably at least a hundred years old. This can be calculated from the fact that the Lord gave Adam and Eve another son (Seth) after Abel was killed, and according to Genesis 5:3 this other son was born when Adam was 130. If we assume that Seth was born shortly after Abel was murdered, then it seems pretty likely that Cain and Abel were *not* teenagers. The brothers could have easily been more than a hundred years old.

Second, Adam and Eve probably had other children in the decades that passed between the birth of Abel and the birth of

Seth. These children could have had children of their own, and even grandchildren, long before Cain murdered Abel. Seth was almost certainly *not* Eve's third son. There was enough time for several generations to be born. There could have been dozens of people alive when the murder took place – perhaps more than a hundred, depending on how many children Eve had and how soon her children had children of their own.

To answer the common question “Who did Cain marry?”, the answer is that he probably married his sister. It is true that the Mosaic Law forbids this, but the Mosaic Law was not given until thousands of years later. Before the time of Moses siblings were allowed to get married – in fact, Abraham married his half-sister Sarah.

Why did God change things? Well, it's important to remember that when God created mankind our genetic code was perfect and free from mutations. Under those circumstances inbreeding would not have caused any problems. It was only millennia later, when mutations had crept into our DNA, that inbreeding would cause serious harm. When the situation changed God changed the rules.

As we can see from the passage, Cain – who had no concern whatsoever for his brother's life – was concerned about *his* life. He was afraid that someone might kill him and he wanted God to do something about it. Stop and think about that for a moment! Cain, who killed his brother, *doesn't want other people to kill him*. He demands divine protection *from other murderers*. He apparently believes that it's ok for *him* to go around killing people, but no one should be allowed to kill *him*.

Amazingly, the Lord heard Cain:

Genesis 4:15: “And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.”

The Lord protected Cain by putting a mark upon him. No one knows exactly what that mark was; the passage does not say. (It is also important to note that no one today has somehow inherited the mark of Cain. All of mankind is a descendent of Noah, and Noah descended from Seth, not Cain. There is also no evidence that the mark was something that could be passed down genetically.) Whatever the mark was, it must have been effective because Cain went on to build a city and have children of his own (who, apparently, were as evil as he was).

Cain's death is not recorded so it's not known how long Cain lived. Before the Flood most people lived to be around 900 years old, so Cain may have lived for another 800 years. At some point, however, he died, and had to face the God that he so despised. The judgment of God was delayed, but it was not put off forever.

It's interesting to note that after this conversation Cain went as far away from God as possible:

Genesis 4:16: “And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.”

The passage does *not* say that Cain was evicted from the presence of the Lord, or that the Lord drove him off. Cain *chose* to leave God and moved to the land of Nod. There he had children and built himself a city:

Genesis 4:17: “And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.”

It should be noted that this is *not* the famous Enoch who never died; that was another person entirely. It's also interesting that Cain did not take up residence inside a cave; instead he built

a *city*. Ancient man did not consist of dumb cavemen! It takes a lot of intelligence to build a city, and the fact that Adam's children were *building cities* should make us sit up and take notice. These people were not cavemen! They were city dwellers and had civilization.

Cain's line did not end with Enoch. He had grandchildren and great-grandchildren, some of whom were quite clever and created some pretty important inventions:

Genesis 4:18: “And unto Enoch was born Irad: and Irad begat Mehujael: and Mehujael begat Methusael: and Methusael begat Lamech.

19 And Lamech took unto him two wives: the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah.

20 And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle.

21 And his brother's name was Jubal: he was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ.

22 And Zillah, she also bare Tubal-cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron: and the sister of Tubal-cain was Naamah.”

As you can see, Cain's children were not dummies. By seven generations after Adam (Cain, Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, Methusael, Lamech, and Lamech's children) mankind had already invented animal husbandry and music, and had entered the brass and iron age (at the same time). They were not scratching out a meager existence in a cave somewhere – they were building a civilization!

As a side-note, it takes intelligence to invent musical instruments – and this was not just *a* musical instrument, but *the first musical instruments ever to exist* in all of history. These were very intelligent people. They were *not* moral people, however, as the chapter goes on to tell us:

Genesis 4:23: “And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt.

24 If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold.”

Cain's children were no different from Cain. He had created a line of murders who thought only of themselves. Evil was on the rise in humanity, and this trend would ultimately lead to the Flood.

Genesis 4 is not the last time that Cain is mentioned; Cain and Abel are referred to in the New Testament as well. We have already discussed Hebrews 11:4 and I John 3:11. Another mention can be found in Jude:

Jude 1:11: “Woe unto them! For they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.”

Those who follow their own path instead of God are said to be going in “the way of Cain”. He is forever remembered as one deeply associated with evil. That is a remarkable legacy.

Christ referred to Abel as the first martyr:

Matthew 23:34: “Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city:

35 That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zechariah son

of Berechiah, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

36 Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.”

The Lord pronounced judgment upon the generation of His day and said that because they rejected Him they would have to pay for all the righteous blood that was ever shed, starting with the blood of Abel. This sentence was carried out when the Romans destroyed Jerusalem in 70 AD and killed more than a million people.

The book of Hebrews also mentions Abel:

Hebrews 12:24: “And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.”

Here Christ's death is contrasted with Abel's. Abel died a righteous death, but his blood only cried out for vengeance. Christ's death was different because He died a death of *atonement* and His blood washes away our sins. The blood of Jesus does indeed speak better things than the blood of Abel.

The Sons of Adam

In Genesis 5 we find a listing of some of Adam's children:

Genesis 5:1: “This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him;
2 Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created.”

This chapter tends to get ignored because it is a genealogy. However, it contains some important information that doesn't usually get covered. Because of that I'd like to spend some time going over its contents.

The first thing I'd like to point out is that this genealogy has some peculiar features. For example, take a look at the entry for Adam:

Genesis 5:3: “And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, and after his image; and called his name Seth:
4 And the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were eight hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters:
5 And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.”

This verse tells us that Adam had a son named Seth, had other sons and daughters, and then died. All of the listings in this chapter follow the same template: each person had a son, then had other sons and daughters, and then died. I won't quote the entire

passage here (you can read it for yourself, if you're interested), but the pattern is repeated time and again.

This brings up a question: was the firstborn child of every single person *really* a son? Nobody had firstborn daughters? For that matter, is this really a listing of *firstborn* children or is there something else going on?

Verse 3 tells us that Adam had a son named Seth. However, we already know that Seth *wasn't* Adam's firstborn; that distinction goes to Cain. Adam had at least two other male children before Seth was born – and possibly more than that, given the fact that Seth was born when Adam was 130 years old. Adam could have had *many* children between the birth of Abel and the birth of Seth. This passage, however, only records one of Adam's children. Cain and Abel don't get mentioned at all.

This passage, then, is *not* a listing of firstborn children, and it's not even a listing of firstborn sons. **This is actually the genealogy of Noah.** The only person mentioned in each generation is the male ancestor of Noah. All of these people had others sons and daughters (as Genesis 5:4 tells us), but they are ignored because they are not in the male line of Noah – who, in turn, is one of the ancestors of Jesus, the Messiah. This is not just Noah's ancestry or our ancestry; it's also the ancestry of Jesus.

Another fact I'd like to point out is that the people in this list **lived for a very, very long time**. There were only 10 generations in the 2,000 years that passed between Adam and the Flood. The following table lists the fathers of each generation, along with how long they lived:

Adam:	930
Seth:	912
Enos:	905
Cainan:	910
Mahalaleel:	895
Jared:	962
Enoch:	365 (He was “translated” at

that time.)

Methuselah: 969
Lamech: 777
Noah: 950

If you discount Enoch (who never died) and Lamech, then people on average lived to be 929 years old. These are not “figurative” ages but real ones. These people really did live to be almost a thousand years old. That seems like a staggeringly long time, but remember that mankind was created to live *forever*. If Adam had not sinned then he would have *never died at all*. Even with the consequences of sin, though, he still lived for more than nine centuries.

As I'm sure you've noticed, people don't live this long anymore. Despite what evolutionists will tell you, mankind has *not* improved over the millennia. Instead we've decayed. Our genetic code, which was once perfect, is now filled with mutations. We are becoming *less* fit over time. We aren't evolving into a higher life form; instead we're degrading.

Imagine building a mansion in the middle of a forest and then abandoning it for a few centuries. When you returned you wouldn't find an even bigger mansion that had been upgraded with all of the latest amenities. No, I'm afraid that you would only find ruin and decay. The human race is like that. We are not improving; instead we're falling apart. At one time men lived for nine centuries, but now it's remarkable if someone lives for nine decades. That is just a glimpse at how far we've fallen.

Another interesting thing is that people had children at remarkably old ages:

Seth: 105
Enos: 90
Cainan: 70
Mahalaleel: 65
Jared: 162
Enoch: 65

Methuselah: 187
Lamech: 182
Noah: 500

By modern standards it seems astounding to be having children when you're 90 years old (to say nothing of 187), but given their incredibly long lifespan it's not as strange as it seems. According to the 2008 CIA World Factbook, the average life expectancy for someone living in the United States is 77.5 – 80 years. This means that before the Flood people lived **12 times longer** than we do today. Having a child at 116 would be the equivalent of having a child at the age of 10. People lived so much longer before the Flood that for them being 100 was practically still being in your childhood. Even Noah, who had his first child at the age of 500, has an “equivalent” age of just 42.

After the Flood the average lifespan dropped off dramatically. The following table lists how old each person was when they had their first son, along with how many years they lived after the birth of that child:

Noah: 950

Shem: $100 + 500 = 600$ (but had his firstborn 2 years after the Flood, so the flood happened when he was 98.)

Arphaxad: $35 + 403 = 438$

Salah: $30 + 403 = 433$

Eber: $34 + 430 = 464$

Peleg: $30 + 209 = 239$

Reu: $32 + 207 = 239$

Serug: $30 + 200 = 230$

Nahor: $29 + 119 = 148$

Terah: bore Abraham at the age of 70 but lived to be 205.

Abraham: 175 years, but had Isaac when he was 100.

Isaac: 180 years. Had his twin sons when he was ~40.

Looking at these genealogies reveals some interesting facts. Noah lived a normal lifespan for someone born before the

Flood, but his children did not. Even though his children were born before the Flood, their lives were dramatically shortened. In fact, the lives of *everyone* were shortened. In just eight generations the average lifespan of man dropped from 929 years down to less than 200 years.

This indicates that there were probably two factors involved with the shortening lifespans: an environmental cause (after all, something shortened Shem's life by 350 years) and a genetic cause. It's difficult to say what these causes were because we don't have access to any pre-Flood human DNA and we also don't really know what the pre-Flood Earth was like. What we do know is that the Flood destroyed the world and devastated the lifespan of mankind. After the Flood the world was never the same.

If we look closely at the data we will discover another interesting fact. Abraham was born less than three centuries after the Flood:

Flood to Abraham: 292 years

Abraham to Isaac: +100 years = 392

Isaac to Jacob: +40 years = 432 years

Why is this interesting? Well, Noah lived for 350 years after the Flood. Only 292 years elapsed between the Flood and the birth of Abraham, so Noah would have died when Abraham was about 58 years old. Shem lived 502 years after the Flood, so he would have lived long enough to have known Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (as Jacob was born ~432 years after the Flood). I do not know if these people actually knew each other, but they were contemporaries.

It's amazing to think that Shem was still alive when Jacob and Esau were growing up. At that point in history you could still talk to someone who had lived in the pre-Flood world. The Flood was not a mere memory; there was still a living eyewitness.

Of course, you can't talk about Genesis 5 without talking

about **Enoch**:

Genesis 5:21: “And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah:

22 And Enoch walked with God after he beget Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters:

23 And all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years:

24 And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.”

Enoch is one of the most famous characters in the Bible. His fame stems from the fact that he is one of only two people who have never died (the other being Elijah). Genesis says very little about Enoch except that he “walked with God” and one day he was not found, for God had taken him. However, other passages in the Bible have more to say on this topic.

Hebrews 11:5: “By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.”

6 But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.”

This passage states that Enoch was “translated” (or *raptured*) because of his faith. Enoch pleased God and therefore God supernaturally delivered him from death. The passage goes on to say that you must have faith in order to please God. His faith in God is what led to his translation.

This is one of the reasons why some believe that Enoch's translation is a foreshadowing of the Rapture. Christ told us that

the time before His return would be as the days of Noah:

Matthew 24:37: “But as the days of Noah were,
so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.”

We know that the world of Noah's day ignored Noah's warnings about the coming judgment and perished in the Flood. God told Noah to build an ark, and Noah had to live through the Flood and through the judgment of the entire world. Enoch, however, was different. The Lord removed Enoch from the world before the Flood took place – not only sparing his life, but also sparing him from having to live through the judgment of the world. Why was Enoch “raptured”? Because he had faith in God.

The same things can be said about the Church. The true Church – those who are born-again believers in Christ – have faith in God and please Him. Before God judges the world for its sins the Lord will “translate” the Church so that it will not see death. We will then be with God. The parallel between Enoch's translation and the Rapture is quite remarkable.

Nor is this all that the Bible has to say about Enoch. The last mention of Enoch in the Bible is found here:

Jude 1:14: “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints,
15 To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.”

This passage mentions a prophesy from Enoch, who was the seventh generation from Adam. (Yes, the number seven is a special number; it signifies completion.) It turns out that Enoch was a prophet; in fact, as far as anyone knows, Enoch was the very first prophet. In this passage he prophesied about a time

when the Lord would return to Earth with his saints (also known as “The Church”) to judge the wicked. This event has not yet happened, but will occur as a part of the Second Coming. Enoch, then, prophesied about the Second Coming *thousands of years before the first coming of Christ!* This is the oldest prophesy about the Second Coming in the Bible.

There is one other area where we can see Enoch's prophetic gift. Enoch named his son Methuselah, which literally means “When he dies, it will come”. This name was actually a prophecy. Methuselah lived to be 969 years old, which is longer than anyone else recorded in the Bible. The year that he died the Flood came and put an end to the old world – just as Enoch had prophesied.

On a related note, the name “Noah” means “comfort”. It is thought that Lamech named his son Noah because he thought that Noah would be the Messiah and put an end to the world's evil. This is what he said when naming his son:

Genesis 5:28: “And Lamech lived an hundred eighty and two years, and begat a son:

29 And he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.”

Here Lamech refers to the curse that God inflicted upon the world because of Adam's sin. Lamech was 56 years old when Adam died, so it's possible that he had heard firsthand of what life was like in the Garden of Eden. He apparently believed that Noah would reverse the curse and put things back to the way they were, but that did not happen. It's true that a descendant of Lamech will one day reverse the curse, but that descendant is Jesus, not Noah.

The Nephilim

Genesis 6 begins with a tale of intermarriage between the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men”. This union created giants, or “nephilim” in Hebrew. This intermarriage was so evil that it prompted a terrible punishment from the Lord and led to the great Flood. The question is, who were these giants? This is not a topic that is commonly discussed but I believe it's worth investigating.

Let's start by taking a look at the passage itself:

Genesis 6:1: “And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them,
2 That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.
3 And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.
4 There were giants⁵³⁰³ in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men¹³⁶⁸ which were of old, men of renown.”

There are a few interesting things about this passage. First of all, no “daughters of God” married “sons of men” – it went strictly the other way. Second, the union resulted only in *sons*. None of the children became “mighty women” and there is no evidence that any *daughters* were born to these couples. That in itself is quite strange and hints that something unusual is going on.

Some claim that the “sons of God” refers to godly men and the “daughters of men” refers to sinful women, and that the passage is speaking about the dangers of marrying unbelievers. But if that is the case then why weren't any daughters born to these couples and why did their offspring become giants? Verse 4 clearly says that each one of these children became “mighty men” of extraordinary ability. All of these facts make it highly unlikely that this is a simple case of believers marrying unbelievers. I think that something else is going on – something quite unusual and disturbing.

We can learn a little more about what is going on by examining the passage's key words. In Hebrew, they are:

Mighty men: 1368. Powerful, warrior, tyrant, champion, chief, giant, mighty, strong.

Giants: 5303. Hebrew: “nephil”. “It means a bully, a tyrant, a giant. It appears three times in the OT (Gen 6:4, Num 13:33). Since the etymology is uncertain, there is much speculation among reputable scholars concerning the nature of these individuals. Until more evidence becomes available, perhaps it is wise to do as the RSV and NIV translations did: render it “Nephilim”.

Right away we can see that we've stumbled across a mystery. The very definition of the Hebrew word “nephil” is so fraught with uncertainty that scholars recommend the world *remain untranslated!* Once again, if these people are simply humans then why is there all this mystery? If the author had wanted to describe sinful people then there are a lot of clear and well-understood Hebrew words that he could have used, but instead he chose a word that is cloaked in mystery and uncertainty. There is clearly something significant going on here.

For the record, the only other use of the word “nephilim”

(giants) in the Bible can be found here:

Numbers 13:33: “And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.”

Notice the description of these beings. The Israeli spies reported that the nephilim were giants of extraordinary size, which matches the description in Genesis 6. These were clearly not normal people and the Israelites were terrified at the sight of them. Of course, this just deepens the mystery. What is going on here?

I believe the key to understanding this passage can be found in the use of the phrase “sons of God”. Each nephilim had two parents: a “son of God” and a “daughter of man”. The phrase “daughter of man” literally means “female”, so that's easy enough to understand. But who were the sons of God? As it turns out, that phrase is used in exactly three other places in the Old Testament. All three occur in the book of Job, and in each case the phrase refers to *angels*:

Job 1:6: “Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them.”

Job 2:1: “Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them to present himself before the Lord.”

Job 38:4: “Where was thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding.

5 Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? Or who hath stretched the line upon

it?

6 Whereupon are the foundations thereof
fastened? Or who laid the corner stone thereof;
7 When the morning stars sang together, and all
the sons of God shouted for joy?"

As you can see, in each case the beings known as the “sons of God” are angels, not men. It's true that in the New Testament believers are called “sons of God” (John 1:12) but at the time when Genesis 6:1-4 was written that was not the case. Job is one of the oldest books of the Bible and it is not a stretch to imagine that the Hebrew phrase “sons of God” carries the same meaning in both Job and Genesis. Therefore, if “sons of God” means “angels” in Job then it also means “angels” in Genesis 6. In this particular case it refers to *fallen* angels, or demons. If the nephilim were the product of a demonic father and a human mother then they would be half-demon and half-human. It's no wonder they were beings of terrible power and breathtaking evil!

It's also worth noting the difference between a “son of man” and a “son of God”: sons of men are *born* while sons of God are *created*. A son of God refers to a being that was created directly by God Himself, which would include Adam and the angels. Once Christ appeared He made it possible for others to become “sons of God” by becoming Christians, but that was not an option in the Old Testament. (Many Old Testament people were saved, but none of them were ever called sons of God. That only started happening in the New Testament after the appearance of Christ.) Aside from Adam and Eve, all humans are born from human parents and are not created by a direct act of divine will.

(As a side-note, notice that all angels were created directly by God Himself. Angels do not have other angels as parents, nor do they bear offspring. They were all divinely created and therefore they are all “sons of God”).

Some have objected to this interpretation and say that in the New Testament Jesus says that angels are not given in marriage. That statement is true: in Heaven angels do not marry.

However, the Bible never says that angels are *incapable* of intermarrying with humans, nor does it say that angelic creatures never marry *on Earth*. What *is* clear is that they are not allowed to marry humans, and that doing so is a great sin that damns the angel for all of eternity. It is not surprising that angels don't marry in Heaven because in Heaven the Lord's will is done. *Demons, however, have no interest in doing the Lord's will.*

I believe Genesis 6 teaches that in the days before the Flood, demons intermarried with humans and produced a new race of powerful, evil beings. This race (which was composed entirely of men) was destroyed by the Flood, which wiped out everyone except for the line of Noah. What's particularly interesting about this is that Noah's genealogy did not include any of these "sons of God". This is critically important because *the Messiah had to be a pure human*. No Messiah could be part human, part God, and part demon! (This, by the way, is what the Bible means when it says that Noah was perfect in his generations. He was a purebred human and had no demons in his ancestry.)

The nephilim were actually a clever plan by Satan: he was trying to corrupt the genetic line of man in order to make it impossible for the Messiah to come. God solved that problem by wiping out the nephilim in the Flood. In this context the Flood makes a lot of sense – it was *vital* for everything that was tainted by demonic DNA to be wiped out. Of course, Satan wasn't content with just attempting this once; he later tried it again in the land of Canaan in order to stop the Israelites from entering the Promised Land. This could be another reason why God ordered every last Canaanite destroyed – He wanted the nephilim wiped out.

There are a couple of other passages that may be related to the nephilim. The first one can be found in 2 Peter:

2 Peter 2:4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell⁵⁰²⁰, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be

reserved unto judgment;
5 And spared not the old world, but saved Noah
the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness,
bringing in the flood upon the world of the
ungodly;”

The word that is used for “hell” in this passage is a very special one that is used *only in this one passage*. This is its definition:

Hell: 5020. “Found only in its verbal form in 2 Peter 2:4, meaning to consign to Tartarus (which is neither Sheol of the OT, nor Hades of the NT, nor Gehenna, nor hell, but the place where certain angels are confined, reserved unto judgment). This punishment for these angels is because of their special sin.”

Notice what this says here. These fallen angels (or demons) are confined to a special place called Tartarus. This is actually *not* the same “hell” that we're all familiar with. When people die without accepting Jesus they go to hell, not Tartarus. Tartarus is a special place that is populated only by demons who committed a very special and terrible sin. To put it another way, there are actually *two* hells – the normal one and Tartarus. Humans cannot be sent to Tartarus. It is reserved strictly for a special class of demons.

Now it's obvious that there are many demons that are not bound in Tartarus. Quite a few of them wander over the surface of the Earth and cause all sorts of horrors. Yet there are some demons who committed a sin so terrible that they are no longer permitted to wander the earth. If this is an accurate reading of the text then what sin did they commit? Isn't it quite likely that the demons that are spoken of here are the “sons of God” that created the nephilim in Genesis 6, and that their great sin was intermarrying with humans?

I think it's worth noting that in the *very next verse* Peter speaks of Noah and the Flood. Isn't it possible that the two verses are related – that the great sin of these angels had something to do with the Flood that destroyed the old world? If fallen angels did intermarry with humans and produced a race of evil offspring, then it would make sense that the Lord would judge it, and it would make sense to mention the Flood when referring to this event. It would also be easy to understand why the Lord imprisoned these demons; He didn't want them doing it again.

There is one other possible mention of this event. It can be found in Jude:

Jude 1:6: “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation³⁶¹³, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.
7 Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”

Here we have another mention of angels that are “reserved in everlasting chains” and waiting for the final judgment. The very next verse speaks of Sodom and Gomorrha, highlighting it as *a second* example of what happens to those who engage in fornication and immorality. Note the use of the phrase “even as”, which seems to indicate that both the angels *and* Sodom were guilty of the same type of sin. If Jude is speaking of fallen angels that intermarried with humans then this makes a lot of sense, for in that case both the demons and the residents of Sodom were guilty of fornication and gross sexual misconduct.

In summary, Genesis 6 teaches that before the Flood, demons took human women for wives and had children with them, producing a strange, fallen, depraved race called the

nephilim. The Lord judged this act of wickedness by destroying that race in the Flood and imprisoning the demons who committed this sin in Tartarus, awaiting judgment in the last day.

The Flood

There came a time when the wickedness of man became exceedingly great:

Genesis 6:5: “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

6 And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.

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.

8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.”

We have already talked about the nephilim so I will not repeat that discussion here. Even aside from the nephilim, mankind had become incredibly depraved. According to verse 5, every single thought, hope, and dream of man was pure evil. Mankind had become completely corrupt. This grieved the Lord to such an extent that he decided to annihilate all living creates off the face of the Earth.

Noah, however, found grace in the eyes of the Lord. God decided to spare Noah and the animal kingdom, so He commanded Noah to build the Ark:

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.

14 Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch.”

The Ark's builder was Noah. It was to be constructed out of **gopher wood** and coated inside and outside with pitch. Nobody knows what gopher wood is or even what that particular Hebrew word means; in all likelihood it refers to either an extinct type of tree or some sort of long-lost lamination process. But we do know the boat was a wooden vessel; after all, it was made of gopher **wood**, not gopher metal.

The Ark was to contain rooms (“...rooms shalt thou make...”). These rooms would contain the **animals, the living quarters for Noah's family, and the supplies** that Noah needed to make the voyage. I think it's possible that Noah may have taken some other things as well. The Bible does not say this, but I imagine that Noah would have taken along as much of the Old World as he could – things like books, **scientific knowledge**, and anything else that could help him establish a new life in the new world. After all, he knew that God was about to destroy the entire world. When Noah got off the Ark the only things that he would have with him are the things that he brought along. The future of civilization depended entirely upon him and his family. Any knowledge that he did not take with them would simply be lost.

Could you imagine what it would be like to be told that all life on Earth was going to be destroyed *except for you and your family*, and that it would be your job to rebuild afterward? How would you handle such a monumental task? In a very real and literal way the survival of *all living creatures* would depend on **you**. How would you like to have *that* job?

It is not known if Noah had help building the Ark or if he did all of the work himself. Also, since almost all knowledge of the pre-Flood world has been lost, there's no way to tell what tools he used to build it. What we do know is that **Noah was charged with the responsibility for building the Ark** and Noah

executed that charge faithfully. According to Genesis 6:3, Noah had **120 years** in which to build the Ark. It is fairly certain that it took Noah all 120 of those years because I Peter 3:20 says that **the Lord staved off His judgment of Earth until the Ark was done.**

Genesis gives us the exact dimensions of the ark:

Genesis 6:15: “And this is the fashion which thou shalt make it of: The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breath of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits.”

The Ark was **450 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet high.** It had a **total floor space of 100,000 square feet**, a **volume of about 1.4 million cubic feet**, and a **cargo capacity of 15,000 tons.** Tests have shown that the Ark's dimensions would have given it incredible stability. It could have stayed afloat in even the most unruly seas.

Boats larger than the Ark were not built again until **the end of the 19th century.** It was truly an enormous ship, and was one of the largest wooden vessels of all time. To put it into perspective, the *Titanic* was only 300 feet longer than the Ark. Even by today's standards it would be considered a mid-sized cargo ship.

Genesis 6:16: “A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above; and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.”

The Ark was to have **an exterior door and three floors.** It was also to have **a window** that measured **18 inches** on each side. Having only one window and one door would probably have **added to the hull's integrity and strength.** After all, the Ark had to stay afloat in very rough seas. The boat did not need sails or a

rudder because it wasn't trying to go anywhere – all it needed to do was **keep floating and not capsize** or break apart. The dimensions the Lord specified would enable it to accomplish exactly that.

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.

18 But with thee will I establish my covenant; and thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee.

19 And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female.

20 Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive.

21 And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten, and thou shalt gather it to thee; and it shall be for food for thee, and for them.

22 Thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded him, so did he.”

Noah was commanded to bring into the ark **fowls, cattle, and creeping things**. (Notice that he did not have to go and find them; verse 20 tells us that **they would come to him**. Also notice that aquatic animals such as fish were not included.) He was to have on board **two** of every kind – **one male and one female** (although further details are given in the next chapter). These “kinds” are not necessarily the same thing as species today. For example, it's quite possible that Noah brought on board just one

type of dog, which then gave rise to all of the breeds that now exist. This would have dramatically reduced the number of animals that he would have brought on board.

Estimates of the number of animals that would have been on board range from **a few thousand to 16,000**. It's important to remember that the animals did not necessarily have to be enormous, full-grown adults; juveniles would have worked just as well. Studies have suggested that **only about half of the Ark's space would have been needed for the animals**, leaving the other half for **food, water, supplies, and even other people**.

As it turned out, there were only **eight people on board the Ark: Noah, his wife, his three sons (Shem, Ham, and Japheth), and his sons' wives**. These eight people were charged with caring for the most amazing zoo that ever existed. It would have been quite a feeling to know that the only surviving animals in the entire world were the ones that were on the Ark with you! If you accidentally stepped on an animal and killed it, that species would be wiped out *permanently*.

Caring for the animals would have been a challenge, but Noah did have one big advantage: in his day all animals were vegetarians. Animals and people did not become carnivores until after the Flood.

For answers to a few other technical questions¹:

How Did Noah Fit All the Animals on the Ark?

According to the Bible, the Ark had three decks (floors). It is not difficult to show that there was plenty of room for 16,000 animals (the maximum number of animals on the Ark, if the most liberal approach to counting animals is applied), assuming they required approximately the same floor space as animals in typical farm enclosures and laboratories. The vast majority of the creatures (birds,

¹ Source: www.answersingenesis.org

reptiles, and mammals) were **small** (the largest only a few hundred pounds of body weight). What's more, many could have been **housed in groups**, which would have further reduced the required space.

It is still necessary to take account of the floor spaces required by large animals, such as elephants and rhinos. But even these, collectively, do not require a large area because **it is most likely that these animals were young**, but not newborns. **Even the largest dinosaurs were relatively small when only a few years old.**

What Did the Dinosaurs Eat?

Dinosaurs could have eaten basically the same foods as the other animals. The large sauropods could have eaten compressed hay, other dried plant material, seeds and grains, and the like.

How Were the Animals Cared For?

We must distinguish between the long-term care required for animals kept in zoos and the temporary, emergency care required on the Ark. **The animals' comfort and healthy appearance were not essential for emergency survival during one stressful year, where survival was the primary goal.**

Studies of nonmechanized animal care indicate that eight people could have fed and watered 16,000 creatures. The key is to avoid unnecessary walking around. As the old adage says, "Don't work harder, work smarter."

Therefore, Noah probably **stored the food and water near each animal**. Even better, **drinking water could have been piped into troughs**, just as the Chinese have

used bamboo pipes for this purpose for thousands of years. The use of some sort of **self-feeders**, as is commonly done for birds, would have been relatively easy and probably essential. **Animals that required special care or diets were uncommon** and should not have needed an inordinate amount of time from the handlers. Even animals with the most specialized diets in nature could have been switched to readily sustainable substitute diets. Of course, this assumes that animals with specialized diets today were likewise specialized at the time of the Flood.

How Did the Animals Breathe?

Based on two decades of research, nothing more was needed than a basic, non-mechanical ventilation system. The density of animals on the Ark, compared to the volume of enclosed space, was much less than we find in some modern, mass animal housing used to keep stock raised for food (such as chicken farms), which requires **no special mechanical ventilation**.

It is reasonable to believe that **one relatively small window would have adequately ventilated the Ark**. Of course if there were a window along the top center section, which the Bible allows, all occupants would be even more comfortable. It is also interesting to note that **the convective movement of air**, driven by temperature differences between the warm-blooded animals and the cold interior surfaces, **would have been significant enough to drive the flow of air**. Plus, wind blowing into the window would have enhanced the ventilation further. However, if supplementary ventilation was necessary, it could have been provided by wave motion, fire thermal, or even a small number of animals harnessed to slow-moving rotary fans.

What Did Noah and His Family Do with the Animal Waste?

As much as **12 U.S. tons (11 m. tons) of animal waste may have been produced daily**. The key to keeping the enclosures clean was to avoid the need for Noah and his family to do the work. The right systems could also prevent the need to change animal bedding. Noah could have accomplished this in several ways. One possibility would be to **allow the waste to accumulate below the animals**, much as we see in modern pet shops. In this regard, there could have been **slatted floors**, and animals could have trampled their waste into the pits below. Small animals, such as birds, could have **multiple levels** in their enclosures, and waste could have simply accumulated at the bottom of each.

The danger of toxic or explosive manure gases, such as methane, would be alleviated by the **constant movement of the Ark**, which would have allowed manure gases to be constantly released. Secondly, methane, which is half the density of air, **would quickly find its way out of a small opening such as a window**. There is no reason to believe that the levels of these gases within the Ark would have approached hazardous levels.

Alternatively, **sloped floors** would have allowed the waste to flow into large central gutters. Noah's family could have then **dumped this overboard** without an excessive expenditure of manpower.

The problem of manure odor may, at first thought, seem insurmountable. But we must remember that, throughout most of human history, **humans lived together with their farm animals**. Barns, separate from human living quarters, are a relatively recent development.

While the voyage of the Ark **may not have been comfortable or easy**, it was certainly doable, even under such unprecedented circumstances.

After the Ark was ready, the Lord commanded him to board it:

Genesis 7:1: “And the Lord said to Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.

2 Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female.

3 Of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.

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.”

A week before the Flood occurred the Lord gave Noah some last-minute instructions. Noah was to have **seven pairs of every clean beast, two pairs of every unclean beast, and seven pairs of every bird**. The purpose of this was to make sure that they did not become extinct.

Also, notice that the reason the Lord spared Noah and his family is because He found Noah to be righteous. **His righteousness spared him and his family** from the judgment that destroyed the rest of mankind. In a like manner, our own salvation through Jesus Christ will spare us from the final judgment of the Lake of Fire.

Genesis 7:5: “And Noah did according unto all

that the Lord commanded him.

6 And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth.

7 And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark, because of the waters of the flood.

8 Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth,

9 There went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female, as God had commanded Noah.

10 And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth.”

The Bible states that **Noah did everything that the Lord commanded him**. This is quite a testimony! Would it not be amazing if the Lord could say the same thing about us? It is no wonder that the Lord found him to be righteous; when the Lord gave him commands they were obeyed.

The Flood happened when Noah was **six hundred years old**. When you account for the fact that people before the Flood lived 12 times longer than we do, that would be equivalent to about 50. Just as God had said, the animals came to Noah and boarded the Ark two by two – male and female.

Genesis 7:11: “In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broke up, and the windows of heaven were opened.”

The water that created the Flood came from two sources: a **vast source of water deep underground** (the “fountains of the great deep”), and a **vast source of water in the sky** (the “windows of heaven”). No people or land animals survived:

Genesis 7:12 “And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

13 In the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark;

14 They, and every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, every bird of every sort.

15 And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life.

16 And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him: and the Lord shut him in.”

It would appear that both the animals and Noah's family **boarded the ark on the very day that the Flood occurred**. The Bible gives an exact day – the **600th year** of Noah's life, in the **second month**, and the **17th day**. It is possible to use the chronologies in the Bible to pinpoint the time between Creation and the Flood. If you add up the years in the genealogies, the Flood happened when the world was **1656 years old**:

Verse	Event	Earth's Age
1:1-31	Creation	0
5:3	Seth born when Adam was 130	130
5:6	Enos born when Seth was 105	235
5:9	Cainan born when Enos was 90	325
5:12	Mahalaleel born when Cainan was 70	395
5:15	Jared born when Mahalaleel was 65	460
5:18	Enoch born when Jared was 162	622
5:21	Methuselah born when Enoch was 65	687
5:25	Lamech born when Methuselah was 187	874

5:28	Noah born when Lamech was 182	1056
11:10	Shem born when Noah was 502	1558
7:6	Flood when Noah was 600	1656

This can be used to calculate the year that the Flood happened. The calculation goes like this:

11:10	Arphaxad born when Shem was 100	1658
11:12	Salah born when Arphad was 35	1693
11:14	Eber born when Salah was 30	1723
11:16	Peleg born when Eber was 34	1757
11:18	Reu born when Peleg was 30	1787
11:20	Serug born when Reu was 32	1819
11:22	Nahor born when Serug was 30	1849
11:24	Terah born when Nahor was 29	1878
11:32, 12:4	Abraham born when Terah was 130	2008
12:4	Abraham enters Canaan was 75	2083

Time from Abraham left Haran until the Exodus: exactly 430 years to the day. (Ge 12:10, Ex 12:40, Gal 3:17)	2513
Exodus to start of Temple: 479 years (1 Ki 6:1, in the 480th year or after 479 years)	2992
Start of Temple to division of Israel into two kingdoms: 37 years (Solomon reigned 40 years, 1Ki 11:42, temple started in his 4th year)	3029
Division of the Kingdom to final deportation about four years after Jerusalem fell: 390 whole years plus part of one year (Eze 4:4-6)	3421

Final deportation in 584 BC	
-----------------------------	--

Hence the date creation: 584 BC + 3421 years – 1 year = 4004 BC

So, if creation happened in 4004 BC, and the Flood happened 1,656 years after creation, then **the Flood would have occurred in 2348 BC**. If creation happened in October (which is a topic for another time), then the Flood would have happened in December.

As a side-note, notice that verse 16 says that **the Lord shut Noah in**. Noah was not the one who decided when the door should be closed; that was done by God Himself. This makes sense, because when that door was closed no one else could be saved. At that point it was too late.

Genesis 7:17: “And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth.

18 And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters.

19 And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered.

20 Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered.

21 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:

22 All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of

all that was in the dry land, died.

23 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.

24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.”

Here we are given details of the Flood itself. The storm raged for **40 days and nights**, and the flood waters covered the entire planet for **150 days**. The flood waters rose above the highest mountain to a height of **23 feet**, and it was so severe that **everything except for aquatic life died**. All birds and cattle died; all animals and insects died; and the entire human race died. The only survivors were those who were on board the Ark.

Genesis 8:1: “And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged;

2 The fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained:

3 And the waters returned from off the earth continually: and after the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters were abated.

4 And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.

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.”

Here the Bible talks about the end of the Flood. Notice that **the Flood did not just slowly die down**; instead the Lord acted to put an end to it. He did this through the **creation of a wind**, which calmed the waters. He **closed the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven**, and He allowed the waters to recede.

Where did all of the water go? It actually didn't go anywhere. It's still here! About **75% of the planet is covered by water** (to say nothing of the vast quantities of water that are underground or in the Earth's crust). The only reason the entire planet is not underwater is because the Lord formed ocean basins to contain the vast amounts of water that we find on the planet today. (If the basins were smoothed out the planet would still be flooded.) By creating these basins He drained the water off of the rest of the planet, which allowed the mountains to re-emerge.

It took quite a bit of time to drain the water: the Flood started in the **second month** with a storm that lasted **40 days**, but the tops of the mountains weren't seen until the **tenth month**. Once the initial storm was over (which only lasted a little over a month), Noah and his family spent the rest of the time waiting for the water to calm and then recede.

Genesis 8:6: "And it came to pass at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the window of the ark which he had made:

7 And he sent forth a raven, which went forth to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the earth.

8 Also he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground;

9 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.

10 And he stayed yet other seven days; and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark;

11 And the dove came in to him in the evening; and, lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf plucked off: so Noah knew that the waters were abated from off the earth.

12 And he stayed yet other seven days; and sent forth the dove; which returned not again unto him any more.”

After the flood waters started receding from the ground, Noah ran a series of tests to see if he could leave the ark. The test consisted of releasing two birds – **a raven and a dove**. When the dove returned with an **olive leaf** Noah knew that trees were growing once more and that the Flood must finally be over. The next time he released the bird it did not come back. The great Flood had finally come to an end, and there was once more life upon the surface of the earth.

However, even though he knew there was life on the earth, he was not yet ready to leave the ark. One more thing needed to happen first.

Genesis 8:13: “And it came to pass in the six hundredth and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth: and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and, behold, the face of the ground was dry.

14 And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried.”

This passage gives us a timeline of events. The Flood began on the in the **2nd month and 17th day of Noah's 600th year**, and the ground finally dried in the **2nd month, 27th day, and 601st year**. This means the Flood lasted **one year and ten days**. That is

also how long Noah's family spent in the Ark with all of the animals.

Genesis 8:15: “And God spake unto Noah, saying,

16 Go forth of the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee.

17 Bring forth with thee every living thing that is with thee, of all flesh, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth; that they may breed abundantly in the earth, and be fruitful, and multiply upon the earth.

18 And Noah went forth, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him:

19 Every beast, every creeping thing, every fowl, and whatsoever creepeth upon the earth, after their kinds, went forth out of the ark.”

It is interesting to note that Noah **waited for the Lord's command to leave the Ark**, and when that command came he left, bringing with him every other living creature that was on board the Ark. The Lord commanded the remaining living creatures to **repopulate the Earth** and they did, giving rise to the amazing variety of life that still remains to this day. **Every living human being is a direct descendant of Noah**, and **every living animal is a descendant from a pair of creatures that were on board the Ark**. That is an amazing fact to think about.

Genesis 8:20: “And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar.

21: And the Lord smelled a sweet savor; 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.

22 While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.”

The remainder of the passage is a covenant between the Lord and mankind. (This covenant is often called the Noahic Covenant.) The Lord makes a number of promises, one of which is that **as long as the earth lasts He will never again destroy every living creature.**

Of course, one day the world will be **destroyed in fire and then made new.** But a disaster like the Flood will never happen again. Until the very end nature will continue on its normal course, bringing seasons and the rising sun.

Genesis 9:1: “And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.

2 And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air; upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered.

3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.”

Here we see one of several changes that happen after the Flood. **When the Lord originally created mankind He gave them only plants to eat.** All living creatures were created to be **vegetarians** – which makes sense when you realize that **in the beginning there was no death,** and all of creation was intended to live forever. Plus, before the Flood mankind lived in harmony with the animal kingdom. Men and animals did not hunt or fear

each other.

Now, however, things are different. The Lord put the **fear of man into animals**; their close relationship was gone. Now men could eat animals for food. This is not a guilty pleasure, but one the Lord Himself gave to us and urged us to enjoy with gratitude.

Genesis 9:4: “But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.

5 And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man.

6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.”

Here the Lord establishes **human government** and charges mankind with the pursuit of justice. The crime of murder is to be met with capital punishment, which mankind is authorized to carry out against the guilty party. No more would God confront criminals personally and execute the sentence against them, as He did with Cain. Now **mankind was responsible for judging the guilty and carrying out their sentence**. This is why the state may execute criminals – the Lord gave them that responsibility.

Genesis 9:7: “And you, be ye fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein.

8 And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying,

9 And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you;

10 And with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast

of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth.

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."

Here the Lord makes a promise, not only to all of mankind but to all of creation. The Lord promised that He would **never again destroy the entire world in a flood**. The terrible and awesome event that destroyed the whole world would never be repeated. Noah and his sons did not have to fear that another flood would destroy all life on the planet. What just happened would never happen again.

The Lord did *not* promise to never destroy the Earth. The day will come when it will be destroyed, but this time it will be destroyed by fire instead of water. That, however, is a topic for another time.

Genesis 9:12: "And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations:

13 I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.

14 And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud:

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.

16 And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every

living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.
17 And God said unto Noah, This is the token of
the covenant, which I have established between
me and all flesh that is upon the earth.”

After promising to never again send a Flood to destroy all life on Earth, the Lord gave mankind a token of that promise. That token, of course, is the **rainbow**. It is amazing to realize that the incredibly beautiful rainbow was given as part of a promise from God – a promise that no matter how it may seem at the time, the rain will stop and the flood waters will abate. The great Flood will never happen again.

Appendix A: Does The Bible Say The Flood Was Global?

In Genesis chapters 6 – 8 we find the Biblical account of the Flood. The passage tells us that the Flood was sent because of the overwhelming wickedness of man:

Genesis 6:5: “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

6 And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.

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.

8 But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.”

In modern times many people have attacked the idea that God sent a Flood to destroy the whole world, and even many Christians no longer believe it. Some scholars teach that the Flood was simply a minor local event, not a planetary cataclysm that destroyed the entire ancient world. This has caused many people to start wondering what the Bible really teaches. Did God really say that the Flood was global?

Since these questions have become increasingly common I'd like to take some time to discuss what the Bible teaches about Noah and the Flood. Believe it or not, the Bible really *does* teach that the Flood destroyed the entire planet; the evidence *against* a

purely local flood is incredibly strong. For example, in Genesis 6 – 8 there numerous verses that speak of the epic scope of the Flood:

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.”

Do you see the magnitude of what God had planned? These verses say that the wickedness of mankind had become so great that the Lord decided to destroy “all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven”. *All flesh!* In verse 17 God emphasized that “every thing that is in the earth shall die.” This is *far more* than a simple local flood; God is clearly talking about a planetary event. The Lord wanted to destroy *all flesh* from the *entire planet!* The only survivors would be those on board the Ark (aside from aquatic life, of course, which would not be affected).

In fact, the whole reason God told Noah to build an Ark was to preserve life. If the Flood was just a local event then Noah and his family could have survived by simply leaving town for a few days. The only reason he would need a boat is if the *entire planet* was under water.

The passage goes on to say that the waters rose above the

world's highest mountains:

Genesis 7:17: “And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth.

18 And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters.

19 And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered.

20 Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered.

21 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:

22 All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died.

23 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.

24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.”

This passage could not be more clear: “All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died”. Verse 19 tells us that the water rose above every hill that was under the whole heaven. Every mountain was covered! The only people who survived were those on board the Ark. These verses do *not* teach that a local flood destroyed a few pockets of local wildlife; instead they report the global destruction of all land

creatures. *Everything* died.

On top of all this, when the Flood ended the Lord gave Noah a promise:

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.

12 And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations:

13 I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.

14 And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud:

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.

16 And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.”

The Lord promised Noah that He would never again send another flood like the one that had just occurred. He then gave the rainbow as a sign to remind everyone that such a terrible event would never happen again. If the Flood was just a local event then the Lord has broken His promise hundreds of thousands of times, because local floods happen constantly. The only way His promise makes sense is if the Flood was indeed global in scope – which is precisely what the Bible teaches.

You may not realize this, but Genesis is not the only book

of the Bible that speaks of the Flood. For example:

Isaiah 54:9: “For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so I have sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee.

10 For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.”

Here the Lord uses the Flood as an example of His faithfulness, saying that just as He swore that the Flood of Noah would never happen again, so He swears that He would never stop loving the nation of Israel. If the Flood was just a local event then the Lord has broken His promise many, many times. However, we know that the Lord never breaks His word and cannot lie. If (as Genesis teaches) the Flood was a global event then the Lord has kept His word, just as He promised.

In Ezekiel we find this verse:

Ezekiel 14:14: “Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God.”

This isn't really a reference to the Flood but it's interesting all the same. When the Lord wanted to give an example of people who had truly outstanding character He picked Noah, Daniel, and Job. Noah is clearly held in very high esteem by the Lord. If you believe that the Genesis account of the Flood is accurate then that makes sense; after all, Noah was the only righteous person on the entire planet! Hebrews explains that it was Noah's faith in God that prompted him to act:

Hebrews 11:7: “By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.”

This passage raises some great points. If the Flood was just a local flood then why didn't God just ask Noah to leave the area? After all, if Noah has enough time to build an enormous boat then he surely had enough time to leave town! And how would building a boat “condemn the world” if the Flood was confined to his local area? This passage only makes sense if the Flood was a global judgment on *all* of mankind. By building a boat he saved his family and condemned the world, because the world was offered a chance to repent and escape judgment but they refused. As Peter says, the ungodly world rejected God's offer and as a result only eight people were saved:

I Peter 3:20: “Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.”

II Peter 2:5: “And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing the flood upon the world of the ungodly;”

II Peter 3:5: “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:

6 Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.”

Notice how clearly these passages state that only *eight people* survived the Flood. Everyone else in the world died! These verses emphasize the fact that the *entire world* perished (as it says in II Peter 3:6). II Peter 2:5 does *not* say “And spared not Noah's village”, or “And spared not Noah's country”. No, it says it spared not *the world*.

Jesus also spoke of the Flood:

Matthew 24:37: “But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

38 For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark;

39 And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.”

Luke 17:26: “And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.

27 They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.”

The Lord Jesus Christ compared His Second Coming to the Flood of Noah, which He clearly believed was a real event. Jesus did not speak of the Flood as if it were a myth or merely a local disturbance; instead He taught that the Flood “destroyed them all” and “took them all away”. The scope and suddenness of His Second Coming is likened to the scope and suddenness of the Flood. The Second Coming is never depicted as a small, local event that only impacts a few people; the Bible speaks of it as the culmination of time itself – a terrible time in which God's judgment will be poured out on the entire world.

As you can see, the Bible quite clearly teaches that the Flood was a global event that killed *every last person on Earth* except for the eight people that were on board the Ark. In those days the world was full of wickedness and violence, and one day the Flood came and destroyed them all. Noah and his family were saved because they believed God and accepted His offer of grace. The rest of the world ignored Noah's warning that destruction was coming, and when it came it caught them completely by surprise.

The Second Coming will be just like that. Today the world is full of wickedness and violence. People are sounding the alarm that Jesus' Second Coming is at hand, but they are ignored. One day Jesus will return, and those who accepted His offer of grace will be saved – but the rest will be caught completely off guard and will face judgment and destruction.

Appendix B: Evidence for Creation

Part 1: Mutations

According to evolutionary theory, the engine that drives evolution is mutations. The idea is this: a small, random change is made in an animal's genetic structure that yields some sort of benefit. This benefit gives the animal a survival advantage over other animals, so the mutated gene gets passed on to its offspring while creatures without the gene die off. Over time these accumulated changes result in the development of entirely new species.

This theory may sound plausible, but there are a number of serious problems with it.

1. You need a genetic structure before you can get started.

First of all, you have to have a genetic structure to work with before you can even get started. Just where did that structure come from? After all, evolutionists tell us that in the beginning there was no life; there was only a pond full of chemicals. Then one day the chemicals magically turned themselves into a life form, and life was born.

The problem with this is that the requirements of being a life form are rather high. In order to actually be alive and have offspring you have to have a way to do all these things:

- take in nourishment

- expel waste
- keep yourself separate from other chemicals
- survive
- reproduce yourself

That is a *lot* of functionality that had to suddenly appear *all on its own* at the *same time*, and it had to appear without any “evolution”. To quote Russell Grigg:

Harold J. Morowitz, Professor of Biophysics at Yale University, has taken into account the covalent bond energies required to actually form such a DNA molecule. He arrives at a probability figure for the spontaneous formation of one complete bacterium of *Escherichia coli* in the history of the universe, of less than one chance in 10 to the power 100 billion (which can be written $10^{-100,000,000,000}$).

To put that number in perspective, there are only 10^{81} atoms in the universe. It simply *could not have happened*.

2. You are trying to improve a complicated system by making random changes to it.

Assuming that you *did* have a genetic structure to work with, what are the odds that you could improve an animal's DNA by making random changes to it? The simple truth is that it doesn't work that way. Making random changes to complex systems doesn't improve them; it harms them.

As an illustration, let's say that you had an encyclopedia from 1961 and you wanted to bring it up-to-date. If you started randomly removing and adding letters to it, how long would it take before you had a modern encyclopedia? It obviously doesn't work that way: randomly changing its contents would actually *corrupt* it and make it unreadable. Adding more time to the

equation just results in a more badly corrupted encyclopedia.

But what if you had billions of encyclopedias and billions of years to try it? Given enough time, can't monkeys type the complete works of Shakespeare? The answer is no. Let's say that you wanted a monkey to type the 23rd Psalm, which contains just 603 characters (and is therefore much shorter than even *one* of the works of Shakespeare). If you gave a monkey a typewriter and that monkey typed one key per second without ever stopping, it would take 9.552×10^{1016} years for it to finish (The math for this is found in Part 2 of this appendix). Even if you filled the entire world with nothing but monkeys, they would not have completed that short psalm before every star in the universe burned itself out. Even *trillions* of years aren't enough time, and all we want to do is to recreate *a very short and simple psalm!* Monkeys *cannot* type the works of Shakespeare, nor can mutations create the human genome (which contains a *lot* more than just 603 “letters”).

But it gets even worse. The chance of a mutation is estimated to be 1 in 10^7 (1 in 10 million) – which is rare, but it does happen. The problem is that in order for evolution to occur you have to have *related* mutations. Related mutations are extremely rare. The odds of having two related mutations is 1 in $10^7 \times 10^7$, which is 1 in 10^{14} . That is one chance in 100 trillion. Even if that were to happen, though, it still wouldn't do much good; you need a lot more than two related mutations to create a species. For example, the human genome has about *3 billion* base pairs. In order to create that out of nothing (which is what evolution claims) you would need *billions* of related mutations!

Mathematics tells us that this simply could not have happened. The odds of getting three related mutations is 1 in 10^{21} . That chance is so small that if you filled all of the oceans with bacteria you *still* wouldn't have enough bacteria to find even *one* that had experienced three related mutations.

The odds of having four related mutations is 10^{28} , and the Earth itself isn't large enough to hold all of the bacteria that you would need to search through if you wanted to find an example of

that. Needless to say, you need a *lot* more than just four mutations to turn pond scum into a geologist.

3. Mutations are overwhelmingly destructive.

The odds of having four related mutations is 10^{28} . That, however, is just the odds for *any* kind of mutation. It is *not* the odds of having mutations that are actually beneficial. More than 99.99% of all mutations are destructive, and the few that aren't destructive are neutral – they do neither harm nor good. Helpful mutations are extremely rare – and the odds that it will actually make a sizable difference in the organism's ability to survive (which is one of the key requirements of natural selection) is even smaller than that. The odds are *tremendously* against it, and yet evolutionists would have us believe that this process is so effective that it led to the evolution of *millions* of creatures. It simply could not have happened.

Notice, for instance, that no one believes that if you stand in front of an X-ray machine for an hour or so and let it mutate your DNA that you will evolve into a higher life form. At the same time, no one believes that if we eliminate the ozone layer and let the sun's UV rays mutate our DNA that it will improve life on earth. Everyone realizes how foolish that is – and that is because people understand that mutations are *destructive*. They don't create new species; they destroy them.

4. Even billions of years is not enough time.

Even if you add billions of years to the picture you still have problems; the additional amounts of time just aren't enough. Five billion years may seem like a lot of time, but it's only 10^{17} seconds. When you look at the odds of having just four related mutations and then consider the number of mutations you would need in order to turn a bacteria into a horse, you can begin to appreciate the magnitude of the task. An evolutionist once put the

odds of a horse evolving at 1 in $10^{3,000,000}$ – and that is just to evolve *one creature*. Even five billion years (5×10^9) isn't enough to make a dent in those kind of odds.

This is what Sir Fred Hoyle (Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge) said about the idea that time plus chance could have created life – and this was said by someone who was not a Christian:

“Now imagine 10^{50} blind persons [that's 100,000 billion billion billion billion billion people; standing shoulder to shoulder, they would more than fill our entire planetary system], each with a scrambled Rubik cube, and try to conceive of the chance of them all simultaneously arriving at the solved form. You then have the chance of arriving by random shuffling [random variation] of **just one** of the many biopolymers on which life depends. The notion that not only the biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial soup here on earth is evidently *nonsense of a high order*.”

Here is another quote:

‘When we come to examine the simplest known organism capable of independent existence, the situation becomes even more fantastic. In the DNA chain of the chromosome of the bacterium *E. coli*, a favorite organism used by molecular biologists, the [DNA] helix consists of 3-4 million base pairs. These are all arranged in a sequence that is ‘meaningful’ in the sense that it gives rise to enzyme molecules which fit the various metabolites and products used by the cell. This unique sequence represents a choice

of one out of $10^{2,000,000}$ alternative ways of arranging the bases! We are compelled to conclude that the origin of the first life was a unique event, which *cannot be discussed in terms of probability.*' (Ambrose, E. *The Nature and Origin of the Biological World.*)

5. Our genetic structure is decaying.

Another important factor to consider is that our genetic structure is *decaying*. It is not improving; it is becoming corrupted!

Why does this matter? Well, in order for evolution to occur, the information that is added by mutations has to overcome genetic decay; otherwise you would never get ahead. In other words, evolution has to improve the organism faster than decay is taking it apart. Is the observed rate of beneficial mutations outpacing the rate of decay? Absolutely not! Mutations are overwhelmingly destructive, and a mechanism that does more genetic harm than good can never lead to the creation of a more advanced genetic structure. Instead it will destroy it – which is what we actually see happening.

6. Mutations result in the loss of information.

In the news you will often hear that a strain of bacteria has evolved resistance to an antibiotic. Evolutionists like to use this as proof of evolution, but the reality is that this is an entirely different situation. You see, in order for pond scum to evolve into a horse, the mutations have to *add new genetic information*. However, a bacteria that evolves resistance to an antibiotic has actually *lost* genetic information. The reason it is now resistant to treatment is because it has lost the vector that the antibiotic was attacking. While that may help it survive, the result is a net *loss* of information. You can never turn a bacteria into a horse by losing

information.

It is entirely possible for a creature to experience a mutation that helps it survive while still resulting in a net loss of genetic information. For instance, on one windy island a species of winged beetles experienced a mutation that caused them to lose their wings. As long as they lived on that island this was beneficial: since they didn't have wings they weren't as likely to be blown into the ocean, and so they had a better chance of survival over the beetles that still had their wings. Over time this natural selection advantage would lead to the extermination of beetles with wings. However, *losing* wings is not going to help the beetle evolve into a more complex creature, since it now has less genetic information than it had in the past! *You can't evolve into a higher life form by losing information.*

Another example would be cave fish. There are some species of fish that have become trapped in caves, and over time they have lost their eyesight. Inside a cave this is a beneficial change: since there's no light to see with anyway, eyes are just a large, vulnerable body part that serves no useful function. A mutation that caused a fish to lose its eyes would give it a huge advantage over its neighbors – although *outside* the cave that same mutation would be a huge disadvantage. The loss of eyes still represents a genetic setback because the creature has *lost* information.

Bacteria that “evolve” resistance to drugs are in the same type of situation – the bacteria has lost some piece of information that the drug was using to target it. While this may help it survive, it can't evolve into a higher life form by losing information.

Part 2: Monkeys Typing Shakespeare

Let us imagine a special typewriter, ‘user-friendly’ to apes, with 50 keys, comprised of 26 capital letters, 10 numbers,

Part 3: The Age Of The Earth

There is a great deal of evidence that demonstrates that the Earth is *not* billions of years old. For example:

1) The continents are eroding too quickly.

If the continents were billions of years old, they would have eroded by wind and water many times over. Mountain uplift and other ‘recycling’ processes are nowhere near capable of compensating for this.

2) There is not enough helium in the atmosphere.

Helium, a light gas, is formed during radioactive alpha-decay in rock minerals. It rapidly escapes and enters the atmosphere much faster than it can escape Earth’s gravity. Even if God had created the world with *no* helium to begin with, the small amount in the atmosphere would have taken *at most* around two million years to accumulate. This is far less than the assumed 3,000-million-year age of the atmosphere.

3) Many fossils indicate that they must have formed quickly, and could not have taken long time-spans.

There are billions of fossil fish in rock layers around the world which are incredibly well-preserved. They frequently show intact fins and often scales, indicating that they were buried rapidly and the rock hardened quickly. In the real world, dead fish are scavenged within 24 hours. Even in some idealized cold, sterile, predator-free and oxygen-free water, they will become soggy and fall apart within weeks. A fish buried quickly in sediment that does not harden within a few weeks at the most will still be subject to decay by oxygen and bacteria, such that the delicate features like fins, scales, etc. would not preserve their

form. Rapid burial in the many underwater landslides (turbidity currents) and other sedimentary processes accompanying Noah's Flood would explain not only their excellent preservation, but their existence in huge deposits, often covering thousands of square kilometres.

4) Many processes, which we have been told take millions of years, do not need such time-spans at all.

a) Coal formation.

Argonne National Laboratories have shown that heating wood (lignin, its major component), water and acidic clay at 150°C (rather cool geologically) for 4 to 36 weeks, in a sealed quartz tube with no added pressure, forms high-grade black coal.

b) Opals.

Despite the common teaching that it takes millions of years to form opal, Australian researcher Len Cram has long been growing opal in his backyard laboratory. His opal is indistinguishable, under the electron microscope, from that mined in the field. He was awarded an honorary doctorate (by a secular university) for this research. All he does is mix together the right common chemicals — no heat, no pressure, and *definitely* no millions of years.

c) Rock and fossil formation.

Scientists have long known that petrification can happen quickly. A 'petrified' bowler hat is on display in a mining museum in New Zealand. Another example is a roll of no. 8 fencing wire which, in only 20 years, became encased in solid sandstone, containing hundreds of fossil shells. Petrified wood can also form quickly under the right conditions—one process has even been patented.

The famous multiple levels of ‘fossil forests’ in America’s Yellowstone National Park have now been shown to have formed in one volcanic event. Successive mudflows transported upright trees (minus most of their roots and branches) whose tree-ring signatures confirm that they grew at the one time.

5) The oceans are nowhere near salty enough.

Each year, the world’s rivers and underground streams add millions of tonnes of salt to the sea, and only a fraction of this goes back onto the land. Using the most favourable possible assumptions for long-agers, the absolute maximum age of the oceans is only a tiny fraction of their assumed billions-of-years age.

Part 4: Radioactive Dating Methods

1. All dating methods (including ones that point to thousands, not billions of years) are based on assumptions—beliefs, no matter how reasonable-sounding, that you can’t prove but must accept by faith. For example:

- Assuming how much of a particular chemical was originally present
- Assuming that there has been no leaching by water of the chemicals in or out of the rock
- Assuming that radioactive decay rates have stayed the same for billions of years

2. Radiometric ‘dating’ labs do *not* measure age—they measure amounts of chemicals, then from this they *infer* age based on the underlying *assumptions*.

3. When the assumptions are tested by measuring rocks of known age—e.g. recent lava flows—they often fail miserably.
4. Objects of the same age, tested by different methods, have been shown to give ‘dates’ varying by a factor of *a thousand*.
5. The fact that there is some consistency to radiometric dates is explained in part by the tendency to publish only data consistent with the ‘evolutionary age’ already ‘established’ by fossils. Most radioactive dating laboratories prefer you to tell them what age you expect. It is hard to see why this would be necessary if these were ‘absolute’ methods. The entire geological ‘millions of years’ system was largely in place, based on the philosophical assumptions of men like Charles Lyell and James Hutton, before radioactivity was even discovered. Where a radioactive date contradicts the ‘system’ it is invariably discarded.
6. If a ‘radiometric’ date and a ‘fossil’ (evolutionary) date conflict, the radiometric date is *always* discarded.

Part 5: Dinosaurs And The Bible

Dinosaurs are actually mentioned several times in the Bible. They are not called “dinosaurs” because that word was not coined until long after the King James Bible was written. Although they are given different names, their description makes them easy to identify.

First, there is the **behemoth**:

Job 40:15: “Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee; he eateth grass as an ox.

16 Lo now, his strength is in his loins, and his

force is in the navel of his belly.

17 He moveth his tail like a cedar: the sinews of his stones are wrapped together.

18 His bones are as strong pieces of brass; his bones are like bars of iron.

19 He is the chief of the ways of God: he that made him can make his sword to approach unto him.

20 Surely the mountains bring him forth food, where all the beasts of the field play.

21 He lieth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed, and fens.

22 The shady trees cover him with their shadow; the willows of the brook compass him about.

23 Behold, he drinketh up a river, and hasteth not: he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth.

24 He taketh it with his eyes: his nose pierceth through snares.”

This passage describes the “behemoth” as being “chief in the ways of God”. It is an enormous creature with strong bones and has the ability to drink enormous amounts of fluid. The behemoth is an herbivore; it eats grass, not other animals.

Some people claim that this is describing an elephant, but there is a problem with that theory: the behemoth has a tail that is compared to a cedar tree! If you have ever seen an elephant then you know that they have ridiculously scrawny tails. When you think of a giant, plant-eating animal with a tail the size of a tree, what do you think of? A brontosaurus, or something like it.

There is also the **leviathan**. It is such an impressive animal that God devotes an entire chapter of the Bible to it. Rather than quote the entire chapter I will just list some excerpts:

Job 41:11: “Canst thou draw out leviathan with

an hook? or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?

2 Canst thou put an hook into his nose? or bore his jaw through with a thorn? . . .

5 Wilt thou play with him as with a bird? or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?

6 Shall the companions make a banquet of him? shall they part him among the merchants? . . .

8 Lay thine hand upon him, remember the battle, do no more.

9 Behold, the hope of him is in vain: shall not one be cast down even at the sight of him?

10 None is so fierce that dare stir him up: who then is able to stand before me? . . .

14 Who can open the doors of his face? his teeth are terrible round about.

15 His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal.

16 One is so near to another, that no air can come between them.

17 They are joined one to another, they stick together, that they cannot be sundered.

18 By his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning.

19 Out of his mouth go burning lamps, and sparks of fire leap out.

20 Out of his nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a seething pot or caldron.

21 His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth. . .

25 When he raiseth up himself, the mighty are afraid: by reason of breakings they purify themselves.

26 The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold: the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon.

27 He esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood.

28 The arrow cannot make him flee: slingstones are turned with him into stubble.

29 Darts are counted as stubble: he laugheth at the shaking of a spear.

30 Sharp stones are under him: he spreadeth sharp pointed things upon the mire.

31 He maketh the deep to boil like a pot: he maketh the sea like a pot of ointment.

32 He maketh a path to shine after him; one would think the deep to be hoary.

33 **Upon earth there is not his like, who is made without fear.**

34 He beholdeth all high things: he is a king over all the children of pride.

This is quite an impressive animal! The leviathan is covered with airtight scales and has incredible strength. It literally breathes fire and causes the river to boil. No one dares attack him; even mighty warriors are terrified at its presence. Arrows and swords are useless against him. God says that there is no other creature like it on earth who is made without fear. It is so severe that no one dares stir it up.

Some have claimed that this is a crocodile, but that's ridiculous. Crocodiles don't breathe fire! What we have here is a dragon – a real, live, fire-breathing dragon. Countless cultures have stories of dragons and left records of them in their art. Today we dismiss their written accounts of dragons as mere myth, but I think that's a mistake. Dragons were real creatures that existed long ago. Job was clearly familiar with them, and the leviathan is even mentioned in Psalms (Psalm 74:14, 104:26) and Isaiah (Isaiah 27:1).

But that is not the only Biblical evidence that we have. The Hebrew word *tanniyn* (Strong's #8577) appears 28 times in the Bible. In the King James it is often translated as “dragon”.

Even though the word is translated in numerous different ways, it is actually the *same word*. If you look at the passages where *tanniyn* appears you will see a fascinating picture. The passages are:

Gen 1:21: And God created great -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ (KJV: great whales; NASB: great sea monsters; NIV: great creatures of the sea)

Exd 7:9: . . . Take thy rod, and cast [it] before Pharaoh, [and] it shall become a -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ (KJV: serpent; NASB: snake; NIV: serpent)

Exd 7:10: . . . Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ (KJV: serpent; NASB: snake; NIV: serpent)

Exd 7:12: For they cast down every man his rod, and they became -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods. (KJV: serpent; NASB: snake; NIV: serpent)

Deu 32:33: Their wine [is] the poison of -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, and the cruel venom of asps. (KJV: dragons; NASB: serpents; NIV: serpents)

Neh 2:13: And I went out by night by the gate of the valley, even before the -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ well, and to the dung port, and viewed the walls of Jerusalem . . . (KJV: dragons; NASB: dragons; NIV: jackals)

Job 7:12: [Am] I a sea, or a -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, that thou settest a watch over me? (KJV: whale; NASB: sea monster; NIV: monster)

Job 30:29: I am a brother to -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, and a companion to owls. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Psa 44:19: Though thou hast sore broken us in the place of -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, and covered us with the shadow of death. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Psa 74:13: Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ in the waters. (KJV: dragons; NASB: sea monsters; NIV: monsters)

Psa 91:13: Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ shalt thou trample under feet. (KJV: dragons; NASB: serpent; NIV: serpent)

Psa 148:7: Praise the LORD from the earth, ye -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, and all deeps: (KJV: dragons; NASB: sea monsters; NIV: sea creatures)

Isa 13:22: And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their

desolate houses, and -----?08577 in [their] pleasant palaces: . . . (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Isa 27:1: In that day the LORD with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the -----?08577 that [is] in the sea. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: monster)

Isa 34:13: And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be an habitation of -----?08577, [and] a court for owls. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Isa 35:7: And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of -----?08577, where each lay, [shall be] grass with reeds and rushes. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Isa 43:20: The beast of the field shall honour me, the -----?08577 and the owls . . . (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Isa 51:9: . . . [Art] thou not it that hath cut Rahab, [and] wounded the -----?08577 (KJV: dragons; NASB: dragons; NIV: monster)

Jer 9:11: And I will make Jerusalem heaps, [and] a den of -----?08577; and I will make the cities of Judah desolate, without an inhabitant. (KJV: dragons; NASB; jackals; NIV: jackals)

Jer 10:22: . . . to make the cities of Judah desolate, [and] a den of -----?08577. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Jer 14:6: And the wild asses did stand in the high places, they snuffed up the wind like -----?08577; their eyes did fail, because [there was] no grass. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Jer 49:33: And Hazor shall be a dwelling for -----?08577, [and] a desolation for ever . . . (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Jer 51:34: Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured me . . . he hath swallowed me up like a -----?08577 . . . (KJV: dragons; NASB: monster; NIV: serpent)

Jer 51:37: And Babylon shall become heaps, a dwellingplace for -----?08577, an astonishment, and an hissing, without an inhabitant. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Lam 4:3: Even the -----?08577 draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones . . . (KJV: sea monsters; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Eze 29:3: . . . Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I [am] against thee, Pharaoh king of Egypt, the great -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ that lieth in the midst of his rivers . . . (KJV: dragon; NASB: monster; NIV: monster)

Eze 32:2: . . . Thou art like a young lion of the nations, and thou [art] as a -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷ in the seas: . . . (KJV: crocodile; NASB: monster; NIV: monster)

Mic 1:8: . . . I will make a wailing like the -----?⁰⁸⁵⁷⁷, and mourning as the owls. (KJV: dragons; NASB: jackals; NIV: jackals)

Is it possible that the Bible is not talking about jackals or crocodiles but actual *dragons*? These verses paint an interesting picture of a very interesting animal.

Appendix C: The Ultimate Proof of Creation

Some time ago I read a book by Dr. Jason Lisle entitled *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*. In it he presents an argument against evolution that cannot be logically refuted, which he calls the “ultimate proof”. The book is very thorough, and I strongly recommend reading the entire thing. What I wanted to do here is give a brief summary of his argument.

Sometimes when creationists debate evolutionists the debate turns into a contest to see who has the most evidence. Creationists bring out things they believe prove their case, and evolutionists bring out things they believe prove their case. They then try to see who has the most evidence on their side.

Dr. Lisle points out that evidence doesn't work that way. Evidence does not speak for itself; it must be interpreted. For example, the History Channel once aired a documentary on some dinosaur bones that someone had dug up. To their surprise they found *living blood cells* inside those bones! When creationists learned of this they argued that the bones proved that dinosaurs lived recently and therefore Creation is true. However, evolutionists argued that the bones proved that blood cells can live for millions of years, because they were clearly still alive “after all that time”! The evidence was the same but the interpretation was vastly different because evolutionists and creationists have different *worldviews*.

The worldview is all-important. An evolutionist believes that evolution is true and interprets everything in that light. If he finds living blood cells in a dinosaur bone then *to him* that proves that blood cells can live for million of years, since he *assumes* that evolution is true. The idea that evolution is true is a founding assumption that *he does not question*. To him *there can be no*

such thing as evidence against evolution – he can always find some way to explain away problems.

Dr. Lisle said that is accomplished through a “rescuing device”. The example he gave in his book was the Oort Cloud. Scientists know that comets can only last for a few tens of thousands of years before the Sun's heat burns away all the comet's ice and gasses and destroys them. If the solar system is billions of years old then there should no longer be any comets. Creationists argue that this is evidence for creation. Evolutionists argue that since comets exist, that means there must be a cloud of comets on the edge of the solar system, and occasionally one of them gets disturbed and is thrown into orbit around the Sun. They say this not because anyone has ever *seen* the Oort Cloud (they say it is too far away to be seen even with our best telescopes), but because this “rescues” their theory. In order for their theory to be true the Oort cloud *must* exist – and so evolutionists simply assume that it does.

So, while there is all sorts of evidence for creation, the evidence is not the real issue. The real problem is two competing worldviews – the Biblical one of creationists and the evolutionary one of evolutionists. It is the *worldview* that needs to be addressed. No matter what evidence creationists bring to the table, evolutionists can always use a “rescuing device” to explain it away (just as they do with comets and the Oort Cloud). In other words, *the real battle is between competing worldviews*. In order to disprove evolution once and for all you must show that the evolutionary worldview is irrational. That is what the ultimate proof of creation is all about.

This is how Dr. Jason Lisle defines the ultimate proof:

“The ultimate proof of creation is this: if biblical creation were not true, we could not know anything!” (Page 40)

He goes on to say that “only the Christian worldview...can rationally make sense of the universe.” Evolution cannot explain

the laws of logic. Evolution cannot give a reason for the uniformity of nature (the idea that physical laws apply equally everywhere, and will continue to work in the future). Evolution also cannot give any basis for morality or even knowledge itself. This is how he puts it:

“In fact, if evolution were true, there wouldn't be any rational reason to believe it! If life is the result of evolution, then it means that an evolutionist's brain is simply the outworking of millions of years of random-chance processes. The brain would simply be a collection of chemical reactions that have been preserved because they had some sort of survival value in the past. If evolution were true, then all the evolutionist's thoughts are merely the necessary result of chemistry acting over time. Therefore, an evolutionist *must* think and say that “evolution is true”, not for rational reasons, but as a necessary consequence of blind chemistry...

“Evolution is anti-science and anti-knowledge. If evolution were true, science would not make sense because there would be no reasons to accept the uniformity of nature upon which all science and technology depend. Nor would there be any reason to think that rational analysis would be possible since the thoughts of our mind would be nothing more than the inevitable result of mindless chemical reactions. Evolutionists are able to do science and gain knowledge only because they are inconsistent – professing to believe in evolution while accepting the principles of biblical creation.”
(page 62)

This is not necessarily intuitive, so let me expound on this a bit. Let's take the example of morality. If evolution were true then there could be no such thing as *right* or *wrong*. After all, "right" means it conforms to a universal standard of behavior and "wrong" means it falls short of that standard. This makes sense in a Biblical worldview because God sets the standard. Murder and theft and lying are wrong because they violate God's standard. That is the *only* reason they are wrong.

However, in an evolutionary worldview there is no absolute moral standard. Nothing, therefore, can actually be wrong. Individuals may have their own personal beliefs about right and wrong, but there could never be a standard that applies equally to everyone. Person A may think that stealing is wrong while Person B thinks that stealing is right. Person A would have no grounds to condemn Person B because apart from God there cannot be a higher standard that applies to everyone. I've heard some argue that "Well, if it hurts people it's bad", but *that is a Christian idea*. If there is no God then why is hurting people bad? Why would anyone's definition of "bad" apply to anyone else? After all, if evolution is true then we are all just chemical reactions. Does it really matter what one chemical reaction does to another? Evolutionists claim that there is no real difference between an animal and a person, and if an animal kills another animal we don't call it murder.

People inherently believe that things are right and wrong because there *is* a God and He *has* set a very clear standard that He put into all of our hearts. In a Biblical worldview there is a *reason* to believe in morality. But in an evolutionary worldview there is no reason to believe in a universal standard of behavior. Therefore, if evolution were true, morality would be *irrational*. If an evolutionist believes in morality then he is borrowing that concept from a Biblical worldview, because his own worldview provides no rational basis for that belief.

The same thing can be said about the laws of logic. Dr. Lisle points out that people believe in the law of non-contradiction, which says that something cannot be both true and

false at the same time. For example, I cannot say that my car *is* parked in my garage and that my car is *not* parked in my garage *at the same time*. It must be one or the other. The laws of logic are foundational to our ability to perform science, make sense of the universe, and perform reason.

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in the laws of logic. This is what Dr. Lisle said:

“For the Christian there is an absolute standard for reasoning; we are to pattern our thoughts after God’s. And we know (in a finite, limited way) how God thinks because He has revealed some of His thoughts through His Word. According to Genesis, God has made us in His image (Gen 1:26) and therefore we are to follow His example (Eph. 5:1). The laws of logic are a reflection of the way God thinks, and thus the way He expects us to think. The law of non-contradiction is not simply one person’s opinion of how we ought to think, rather it stems from God’s self-consistent nature. God cannot deny Himself (2 Tim. 2:13), and all truth is in God (John 14:6, Col. 2:3), therefore truth will not contradict itself. Since God is constantly upholding the universe by His power (Heb. 1:3), the consistent Christian expects that no contradiction will ever occur in the universe.

“Laws of logic are God’s standard for thinking. Since God is an unchanging, sovereign, immaterial Being, His thoughts would necessarily be abstract, universe, invariant entities. In other words, they are not made of matter, they apply everywhere, at all times. Laws of logic are contingent upon God’s unchanging nature. And they are a prerequisite

for logical thinking. Thus, rational reasoning would be impossible without the biblical God.”
(Page 52)

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe that the laws of logic are universal and unchanging because they reflect the character of God and are upheld by His power. However, an evolutionist has no reason to believe any of those things. He has no reason to believe that the laws of logic will not change this afternoon, or that they apply equally on Mars as they do on Earth, or that he will never find a logical contradiction. He may *believe* that the laws of logic are universal, but he does not have a *reason* to believe this. Since he has no reason to believe in logic, logic is therefore *irrational* in an evolutionary worldview. If he believes in logic then he must borrow that concept from a Biblical worldview, since evolution provides no reason to believe in logic.

The book has a great deal more to say about all of this but I'll close with just one more point. Dr. Lisle states that if evolution were true then science would actually be impossible. This is because science depends upon something called uniformity. Uniformity is the idea that if you perform an experiment and get a certain result, you will *always* get that same result as long as the conditions are the same. In other words, the physical laws that we see today are going to be exactly the same tomorrow, and next week, and next year, and the year after that. Physical laws *do not change*. Science is only possible because we believe that the experimental results that we get today will *never change*. This allows us to make predictions about the future and learn how the universe works.

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in uniformity. This is how Dr. Lisle put it:

“The biblical creationist expects there to be order in the universe because God made all things (Gen 1:1; John 1:3) and has imposed

order on the universe. Since the Bible teaches that God upholds all things by His power (Heb. 1:3), the creationist expects that the universe would function in a logical, orderly, law-like fashion. Furthermore, God is consistent (1 Sam. 15:29; Num. 23:19) and omnipresent (Psalm 139:7-8). Thus, the creationist expects that all regions of the universe will obey the same laws, even in regions where the physical conditions are quite different. The entire field of astronomy depends upon this important biblical principle.

“Moreover, God is beyond time (2 Pet. 3:8) and has chosen to uphold the universe in a consistent fashion throughout time for our benefit. So even though conditions in the past may be quite different than those in the present and future, the way God upholds the universe (what we could call the “laws of nature”) will not arbitrarily change. God has told us that there are certain things we can count on to be true in the future – the seasons, the diurnal cycle, and so on (Gen. 8:22; Jer. 33:20-21). Therefore, under a given set of conditions, the consistent Christian has the right to expect a given outcome because he or she relies upon the Lord to uphold the universe in a consistent way.”
(Page 58)

Science would become impossible without the concept of uniformity. If the laws of physics changed arbitrarily or if experimental results were constantly changing then it would be impossible to know anything. In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in uniformity. In an evolutionary worldview, however, there is no reason to believe in it. Scientists may believe that uniformity is true but they must borrow from a Biblical

worldview in order to do so.

Some may say that “in the past things have always been the same, so I believe that things will continue to be the same in the future,” but those who say that are just assuming that their argument is true in order to prove their argument. As Dr. Lisle pointed out, you might as well say that I believe I will never die because I have never died in the past! Evolutionists have no *reason* to believe in uniformity. Therefore, their belief in uniformity is irrational.

In conclusion, the Biblical worldview provides a reason to believe in morality, the laws of logic, and uniformity – but the evolutionary worldview does not. If evolution is true then morality is irrational, logic is irrational, and science itself has no rational basis. If evolution were true it would be impossible to know anything; our thoughts would just be chemical reactions in our brain, and a chemical reaction doesn't “know” anything. Evolution destroys the very possibility for science or knowledge. Since it cannot rationally explain the universe it must be wrong – and since only Biblical creation *can* provide reasons for explaining the universe, it must be true. That is the ultimate proof.

Appendix D: The Ocean in the Sky

This is one of the strangest things I have ever found in the Bible, and its implications are staggering. Until I started researching this issue I had no idea how strange Genesis 6:7 really was. This is truly a Biblical oddity – and it occurs in one of the best-known passages of the Bible. The only reason we miss it is because we’re not really paying attention.

Take a look at it for yourself:

Genesis 1:6: “And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

7 And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.”

Verse 7 is very straightforward: on the second day of creation God divided the waters that were under the sky *from the waters that were above the sky*. That’s a bit odd, isn’t it? After all, as far as we can tell there aren’t any waters above the sky. That is a well-established fact and is not up for debate. There is no ocean in the sky.

Some people have suggested that the Bible is just referring to clouds. After all, clouds are made of water vapor and there is a whole lot of water vapor in the sky. That sounds like a great theory, until you get to these verses:

Genesis 1:14: “And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

15 And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.”

Genesis 6:7 tells us that God created the firmament to divide two great bodies of water. In this passage God puts the Sun, Moon, and stars right in the firmament itself. Since the Sun, Moon, and Stars are in the firmament, and since there is a layer of water under the firmament *and above the firmament*, that can only mean that the entire universe is actually surrounded by a layer of water. In other words, if you went to the edge of the universe and poked it, you would find an ocean.

But that’s not all. Do you see the word “firm” in FIRMament? The Hebrew word for “firmament” literally means something that is hard and has been beaten out (like a sheet of copper). If you don’t believe me you can look it up yourself: “firmament” is Strong’s #7549, and according to my Lexicon it means “broad plates which have been beaten out”. It refers to something *solid*. When God created the firmament He created a solid barrier.

Some people have said that the waters above the firmament are some kind of water canopy that used to encircle the Earth above the atmosphere. There are several problems with this theory: not only would such a canopy be a gross violation of numerous physical laws, but the Bible clearly says that the Sun, Moon, and stars are within the firmament, and that there is a body of water *above them*.

As far as the “firmament” goes – is it really so strange to think that God may have put a solid boundary around the Universe, and that beyond that boundary might lie a vast expanse of water? I know it sounds crazy, but we need to keep in mind

that this “ocean in the sky” is referenced in other Bible verses. For example:

Psalm 148:4: “Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens.”

The waters above the heavens! There’s another reference to that mysterious ocean. The psalmist is clear that there are waters *above* the heavens. Just as Genesis said, these waters are literally above the stars.

This verse is also a bit odd, if you think about it:

Exodus 20:11: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

If you read Genesis 1:10 you will see that God called the waters on the Earth *Seas* – plural. This makes sense because the Earth has more than one body of water. Exodus 20:11, though, doesn’t refer to “Seas”; instead it refers to one single body of water – something that is apparently separate from the heaven and earth, since it is listed by itself. God lists the heaven, the earth, and “the sea”. That looks an awful lot like a reference to the waters that are above the firmament.

What if this firmament is actually the boundary between the Universe and the place where God lives? After all, we find a very curious “sea of glass” in the throne room of God:

Revelation 4:6: “And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal: and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind.”

Revelation 15:2: “And I saw as it were a sea of

glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God.”

How do we know that this “sea of glass” is somehow connected to the firmament? Because *that is exactly how the book of Ezekiel describes it:*

Ezekiel 1:22: “And **the likeness of the firmament** upon the heads of the living creature was as the colour of the terrible crystal, stretched forth over their heads above.”

Ezekiel tells us that the firmament *is like crystal* – and Revelation 4:6 describes the sea of glass *using that same term*.

There’s one more curious thing about this Sea that is above the firmament: one day it will be done away with. This is what the book of Revelation has to say about it:

Revelation 21:1: “And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.”

Notice that this passage does not refer to “seas”, but to a singular Sea. Notice also the categories involved: there is the heaven, the earth, and the sea – as if the Sea is somehow separate and distinct from both.

Why would there be no more Sea? Well, consider this: right now the firmament divides the domain of God from the domain of Men. We desperately need that divider because mankind is simply not holy enough to live with God. One day, though, God will judge mankind and put a final end to sin and death. He will then remake the universe and dwell with mankind

forever. When that day comes there will no longer need to be a dividing firmament or a Sea. It will have served its purpose and its time will have ended.

It's something to think about, isn't it?