

meat" (Gen. 1:30). In the coming Kingdom of God predatory animals will revert to a vegetarian diet: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain" (Isa. 11:6-9).

Under the heading "Theories of Creation" the article concludes with three 'models' of Creation, with the third appearing to be the author's preferred choice. Here it is propounded that "the literal days of Genesis 1 are human time frames during which God revealed His creative work occurring over millions of years", and that "Death is seen as an integral part of God's creation from the beginning of the natural world".

But the Bible says: "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD [Yahweh] thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the LORD [Yahweh] made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD [Yahweh] blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it" (Ex. 20:8-11). Here we have the time frame during which Creation took place simply defined: six days, and not "millions of years". Certainly that is how the Israelites who heard the Ten Commandments would have understood it.

May I suggest that the author has not based his thesis upon Scriptural revelation but upon the shifting sands of scientific theory. The danger of such is that we might cease understanding Genesis (chapter 1 in particular) as literal and that a foundation may be laid for unsound exposition on the atonement involving a premise that death preceded sin in the world and that mortal flesh is now therefore neither clean nor unclean (*cf.* Rom. 7:18; 8:3).

*Russell Ebbs
Colchester*

Brother Fowler failed to explain in [his article](#) the words, "cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee" (Gen. 3:17,18). Adam was not simply forced to leave a weed-free garden to cultivate an already cursed field. There was a change to creation as dramatic as the change to Adam's nature, of which the thistles were a permanent and vexa-

tious reminder. Speaking typically of the removal of this curse in the Kingdom, Isaiah wrote: "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree" (55:13).

It is untrue that most young-earth creationists believe that carnivores were created after the Fall, and I know of none who do. We believe that all animals were created in the beginning, and surmise that carnivorous behaviour began after the Fall amongst various land animals, birds and reptiles that were originally herbivorous. Invertebrates and marine animals were not included (Gen. 1:30). Imagine Adam's dismay as he witnessed the peaceful creation descend into violence and predation! Scripture indicates a reversal of this calamity in the Kingdom when these animal groups revert to vegetarianism: "the lion shall eat straw like the ox" (Isa. 11:7).

Because carnivores are perfectly designed for their present way of life they must have been prepared for it like the dormant thistles and diseases. The anatomy of serpents was definitely changed at the Fall (Gen. 3:14), and they will not be restored to their original form in the Kingdom (Isa. 65:25), although their 'sting' will be removed so that children may safely handle them (11:8).

Animals were never undying, and will still die from natural causes and in sacrifices (Ezek. 40:42). Before the Fall, animals died for much the same reasons as they die today; the elephant crushes a lizard underfoot or the wind blows a chick from the nest. The largest dinosaurs were, and the largest mammals still are, herbivores. Most land vertebrates are herbivores, and many captive carnivores, such as lions, can thrive on a vegetarian diet. Menacing teeth do not necessarily denote a meat eater.

Brother Fowler overstates the number of extinct species—for example, 150 elephant and 200 rhino species—and it is unclear how this serves his proposal. A superabundance of genetic variety is compatible with the "very good" state of the Creation, and a tribute to the amazing intelligence and power of the Creator. Such figures are usually presented to discredit the possibility of fitting all the necessary animal species in Noah's Ark. The definition of a species is 'a group of animals that can interbreed and produce fertile offspring'. As it is impossible to test-breed extinct animals, it cannot be claimed that two extinct rhinos, for example, are from different species. Physical differences do not necessarily

indicate separate species. The great range of dogs, from Great Danes to Chihuahuas, from wolves to dingoes, are all one species of dog. All horses, from Clydesdales to Shetland ponies, belong to the one species.

We must take care not to credit the evolutionary interpretation of the fossil record and its corresponding dating system with the authority to challenge clear Scripture. God wrote these important words in stone: “for in six days the LORD [Yahweh] made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is” (Ex. 20:11). That is, Yahweh made everything in our universe in six literal days about 6,000 years ago, and this repeated scripture excludes all other interpretations of Genesis 1.

The Fiat-Age theory proposes that God made creative pronouncements over six days, but that these took effect in progressive creations over billions of years. Such a theory is not based on any scripture, and is a concession to atheistic geology. There is no harmony between this theory and the Genesis record of Creation. If we accept the evolutionists’ fabricated geologic column and dating we will also be required to concede that mortal humans lived up to, and for many years before, Adam’s time. This would be a step onto seriously shaky doctrinal ground, contradicting Paul’s teaching that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men” (Rom. 5:12).

The truth is that Adam was the first man, and all humans spring from him. His nature was changed at the Fall and he became mortal and prone to sin. The ground rebelled under his cultivation as he rebelled under God’s instruction. Eve’s physiology changed, as did the serpent’s anatomy. Sin altered creation suddenly, dramatically and visibly. Animals that once lived in harmony killed one another, and Cain killed Abel. All these tragedies were the results of Adam’s sin. No wonder “the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together” (8:22). One day soon it will all be fixed.

Brian Hurn
Perth, Australia

[I would like to comment on the three “Theories of Creation”](#) at the end of the article, “Was the creation cursed?”. I believe that the earth, sun, moon and stars were in existence before the Almighty began His creative works as recorded in Genesis 1, but consider it important that we accept the account as it stands, namely that Crea-

tion took place in six literal days. I can think of seven reasons for this, as follows:

- 1 Everything in the early chapters of Genesis is literal.
- 2 The only way to understand Moses’ words in Exodus 20:9-11 concerning the sabbath is that he is referring to literal days.
- 3 The sense of the words, “He spake, and it was done”, in Psalm 33:9 conveys the idea of the creative works following immediately upon the command of the Lord God.
- 4 The seventh day must have been literal, otherwise Adam could have been a very old man before the day came to an end, which is absurd.
- 5 The works of creation are interdependent. The trees and plants, which were created on the third day, were dependent on the bees, which were created on the sixth day, to pollinate them. If these days were long periods, then the plants would not have survived without the insects necessary for their continuance.
- 6 If we fail to believe that the Lord God was able to carry out these mighty creative works in six successive and literal days, and instead believe that they occupied long periods, how can we believe in the resurrection to life, which will take place in “the twinkling of an eye” (1 Cor. 15:52)?
- 7 The Bible was written, not for the wise of this world, but for the simple, and a mind uneducated by the wisdom of this world would apprehend that Genesis chapter 1 is speaking of seven literal days.

Carlo Barbaresi
High Wycombe

Israel’s dwelling safely

It seems fairly clear from recent correspondence that reaching any kind of conclusion as to the actual timing of Gog’s invasion (Ezek. 38,39) by looking at the term ‘dwell safely [*betach*]’ (38:8,11) and the use of this Hebrew word *betach* in the Old Testament is not as easy as some would imagine.

Perhaps in focusing so much attention on this point we might be neglecting other important details in these chapters. There are several significant points here, on top of those mentioned by Brother Cave (Jan. 2002, p. 22) and others, that, I would suggest, together form a formidable weight of evidence in favour of the idea that