

THE CREATION WARS

Rodger Dalman

Copyright by Rodger Dalman, 2008

This book may be read online or downloaded to your computer. If you save it to your computer for over 30 days or print it, send us a gift of \$10.00 to fund further research, to expand the Evangelical Virtual Seminary, and to keep EVS on the internet.

Gifts of support for the Evangelical Virtual Seminary can be sent to:

Rodger W. Dalman
5549 Girard Ave. N.
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

CHAPTER 5: EVANGELICALS, GENESIS, AND AN OLD EARTH

A. COMMON EVANGELICAL OLD EARTH INTERPRETATIONS OF THE EVIDENCE

Old earth proponents in the Evangelical world have often defended Concordism. This perspective looks for ways to affirm both the Biblical text and the scientific evidence. One of the more popular early forms of this approach was the Day Age interpretation of Genesis 1. Davis noted that the Day Age position appealed to such great 19th century exegetes as Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, B. B. Warfield, James McCosh, James Orr, and Alexander Maclaren.¹ This is almost a Who's Who of conservative, evangelical, Reformed Biblical scholarship.

There has been quite a bit of debate about what the "days" of Genesis 1 may have been. One of the more interesting approaches was suggested by Robert Newman and Herman Eckelmann. They proposed that the six creation days were indeed 24 hour periods, but they were not consecutive days. Instead, each of the creative days marked the beginning of a long period when the events decreed on that creative day slowly appeared.²

The grammatical evidence for the meaning of *yom* in Genesis 1 was studied at length by David Sterchi. He noted that evangelicals who study Genesis 1 often fall into either of two mistakes. They may see things in the Biblical text that are not actually there, or they may miss things in the Biblical text that really are there. Sterchi then noted that it has become popular to suggest that the days of Genesis were simply a literary device used to organize the account. Authors like Mark Throntveit suggested that the days of Genesis 1 had nothing to do with chronology even though the text was full of chronological language. So Sterchi argued that a careful study of the passage's chronological language should be valuable. Sterchi noted that there are surprising differences in the ways that Genesis 1 recorded the numbers of days. The number one was a cardinal number. Sterchi argued it had to be translated as one instead of first. The numbers two through seven were ordinal numbers. Sterchi argued that these had to be translated as second through seventh. Another surprising difference was that the word *yom* does not have a definite article. It means simply "day," not "the day." The numbers one to five also do not have a definite article. However, the numbers six and seven do have a definite article.

What does all of this mean? Sterchi argued that the number seven was a definite number. The numbers one and six could be either definite or indefinite, while the numbers two through five were clearly indefinite. Sterchi argued that the days of Genesis 1 record specific things that were done, but they do not necessarily record the correct sequence in which these things were done. While the English translations of Genesis 1 give the impression that they record things that occurred within one week, the Hebrew text does not need to be translated that way. While this conclusion may seem strange at first, Sterchi argued that the Bible often ignores the sequence in which things happen. For example, the accounts of Christ's temptation in Matthew 4 and Luke 4

¹ Davis A. Young, "Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part Two)," *Westminster Theological Journal* 49 (1987): 290-91.

² Robert C. Newman and Herman J. Eckelmann Jr., *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth*, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1977).

list the same temptations but put them in a different order. Sterchi argued that Matthew's list of temptations was probably chronological while Luke's list was probably thematic.³

The genealogical argument for a young earth has been addressed in a number of ways by the old earth community. One response has been that the Biblical genealogies were not intended to include every person in the line of descent.⁴ Some genealogies included names that were not included in other Biblical genealogies.⁵ Richard Hess noted another interesting point that may have a bearing on the genealogical problem. Hess noted that the genealogy in Genesis 4 used primarily *qal* and *niphal* verb forms. The genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 used primarily *hiphil* verb forms.⁶ The *qal* and *niphal* verb forms often simply record what happened in the active and

³

David Sterchi, "Does Genesis 1 Provide a Chronological Sequence?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 39 (1996): 529-36.

⁴ Currid discussed the problem of gaps in the Biblical genealogies. John D. Currid, *A Study Commentary on Genesis: Volume 1: Genesis 1:1-25:18*, (Darlington, UK: Evangelical Press, 2003), 167.

⁵ The textual problem in Lk. 3:33 may serve as an example of this phenomenon. While Lk. 3:33 reads in a variety of ways in ancient Greek manuscripts, most manuscripts add either one or two descendants between Ram and Nahshon. The NASB follows published Greek texts like the Nestle Aland text. It lists the genealogy from Ram to Nahshon as Nahshon/Amminadab/ Admin/Ram. The NIV translates Lk. 3:33 in light of Mat. 1:4 and reads the verse as Nahshon/Amminadab/Ram. The NIV translates I Chron. 2:10 the same way, while the NASB translates I Chron. 2:10 as simply Nahshon/Ram. In general, the NASB attempts to follow the best texts, while the NIV tries to find a way to reconcile the different textual traditions. A related problem can be seen in Lk. 3:35-36. In both the NASB and the NIV, Luke understood the genealogy as Shelah/Cainan/Arphaxad. However, the name Cainan did not appear in the genealogies of Gen. 11:10-14 and I Chron. 1:24. If the Biblical text is assumed to be inspired and inerrant, this may suggest that the text was not intended to record every person in the genealogical record. It is also often noted that the Massoretic text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch list different numbers in their genealogies. The problematic nature of Biblical genealogies can also be seen by comparing different text traditions. For example, the MT lists 1,656 years between Adam and Noah. The LXX lists 2,242 years for the same time period. The Samaritan Pentateuch lists only 1,307 years for this period. Similar New Testament textual problems can be seen in the wide diversity of readings for Lk. 3:33. While the western Christian church (of Europe and the Americas) has always favored the Massoretic Hebrew text, the Eastern Orthodox half of the Christian church has always thought that the LXX preserves the original readings of the Hebrew most accurately. Either position is possible. A Hebrew text of Jeremiah at Qumran was clearly the Hebrew equivalent of the LXX reading of the book. This has led authors like F. M. Cross to argue that the whole LXX was a translation of a different Hebrew text family than the Massoretic text. The Massoretic text was preserved with great care, but only after 600 AD. Before that time, the Jewish and Christian communities had been locked in a bitter polemical battle. It is not clear whether that battle affected the choice of textual traditions to be preserved and the form in which the Massoretic text was preserved. This textual diversity may suggest difficulties in the transmission of the original texts of the autographs.

⁶ Richard S. Hess, "The Genealogies of Genesis 1-11 and Comparative Literature," 58-72 in Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, eds. *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood,"* (Winona

passive voice. *Hiphil* verb forms describe what someone caused to happen. It may be worth exploring whether there could be a difference between genealogies written with *qal* verb forms and genealogies written with *hiphil* verb forms. Is it possible that the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 record how old a person was when he caused a line of descent to begin that would later produce the person listed as his offspring?

Another response to the genealogical problem has been that the genealogies showed clear signs of being structured in literary patterns instead of being literal lists of descendants. There were ten generations between Adam and Noah and ten generations from Noah to Abraham. So the Genesis genealogies could be understood as two sets of ten names. The New Testament genealogies were based on a similar structure. Matthew 1:17 stressed that there were 14 generations from Abraham to David, 14 generations from David to the Babylonian captivity, and 14 generations from the captivity to Christ's birth. Bruce Metzger noted that Luke's genealogy was more complex. Metzger noted that there were 21 generations from Adam to Abraham. There were 14 generations from Isaac to David. There were 21 generations from Nathan to Salathiel who lived before the exile. There were 21 generations from Zerubbabel to Jesus. So there were a total of 77 generations from Adam to Jesus.⁷ It is very striking that Matthew recorded two sets of 14 generations during the same time period that Luke recorded two sets of 21 generations. Of course, Matthew and Luke were tracing Jesus' descent through different sons of David. It is not impossible that both of these lists may be literally correct even though they give the appearance of being literary constructions.

Another response to the genealogical argument has been that the Biblical genealogies did not seem to fit Israel's history very well. This becomes apparent when Old Testament genealogies are compared with Old Testament historical events.⁸ David's ancestors included Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, and Jesse. Nahshon was a leader of Judah during the wilderness journey. Salmon was a leader of Judah during the conquest, and he was married Rahab. Between the conquest and David, there were only three generations, Boaz, Obed, and Jesse. If Israel entered Palestine during the Egyptian 19th Dynasty, that would be possible, though each would have been of advanced age when their first son was born. Old Testament passages like I Kings 6:1 suggest that Israel left Egypt during the 18th Dynasty after the death of Thutmose III. That pushes the conquest date back to 1400 BC, 400 years before David's reign. If an 18th Dynasty exodus is defended, it becomes difficult to explain David's genealogy. Boaz, Obed, and Jesse would have been over a hundred years old when their next descendants were born. While possible, it is easier to believe that the purpose of the genealogies was not to include every person in a genetic line. I Chronicles 6:33-37 noted that there were 18 generations in the genealogy of Heman the singer during the same time period. A similar problem can be seen in

Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 68.

Bruce A. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, (London: U. B. S., 1971), 136.

The genealogical information in the MT seems to suggest that Noah's son Shem was still alive in Abraham's day. Samaritan tradition suggests that Shem was actually Melchizedek in Gen. 14. For a discussion of this tradition, see C. R. A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 19. The presuppositions brought to the debate will determine whether it is likely that Shem and Abraham could be contemporaries.

Genesis 15:13-16. This verse claimed both that the Israelites would live in Egypt for 400 years, and that the Israelites would return to Palestine in the fourth generation. How can four generations and 400 years refer to the same time period?⁹ Of course, Moses' own lineage could be used to explain this passage. Within Moses' family, only four generations were recorded during Israel's Egyptian sojourn.¹⁰

Another response to the genealogical argument has been that Biblical genealogies were theological statements rather than simply genealogical records.¹¹ The lesson taught by the genealogy as a whole was at least as important as the list of people recorded in it. That may be why the genealogies were somewhat inconsistent.¹² This has been an important element in the theological debate about the Biblical genealogies. Karin Plum wrote an article titled "Genealogy as Theology."¹³ Plum argued that a new interest in Biblical genealogies was instigated by Claus

9

Kitchen offered an interesting solution to this problem. He argued that the four generations (*dôr*) promised in Gen. 15:16 could be compared to West Semitic and Old Assyrian use of the word *daru*. Kitchen argued that the use of *dôr* in Genesis 15:16 was probably just another way to express the promise of 400 years in Gen. 15:13. Kitchen, "Historical Method and Early Hebrew Tradition," 82-4.

10

Gal. 3:17 could be used to argue for a 19th Dynasty exodus. It claimed 430 years from the promise to Abraham instead of the entrance into Egypt. Kitchen noted that the genealogy of Moses in Ex. 6:20 included only four generations during the Egyptian sojourn, but Kitchen argued that this was not a full genealogy for this period. It simply indicated the tribe, clan, and family to which Moses belonged. Kitchen, "Historical Method and Early Hebrew Tradition," 82-4.

11

T. D. Alexander argued Genesis was crafted to tell the story of one family line. The genealogies in Genesis served as the framework for tracing this family history. T. D. Alexander, "Genealogy, Seed and the Compositional Unity of Genesis." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993): 255-70. Frank Crüsemann, "Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel's Self-Definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis," 57-76 in Mark G. Brett, ed. *Ethnicity and the Bible*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996). J. W. Lee discussed the theology of the Genesis genealogies. Lee noted that Cain's genealogy began with losing access to God's face. It went on to list men who did amazing things, although their accomplishments were in revolt against God. Seth's genealogy simply recorded those who handed down God's promises. Lee noted that the only speakers in the genealogies of Seth and Cain were two men named Lamech. Cain's descendant Lamech bragged about his violence while Seth's descendant Lamech spoke about God's promise. Jeong Woo (James) Lee, "A Glimmer of Hope," *Kerux* 11 (1996).

12

For a discussion of the textual problems with Genesis genealogies, see: Donald V. Etz, "The Numbers of Genesis V 3-31: A Suggested Conversion and its Implications," *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993): 171-87.

13

Karin Friis Plum, "Genealogy as Theology," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1989): 66-92. Crüsemann, "Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel's Self-Definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis," 57-76. Edward L. Greenstein, "Teaching Genres and Individual Texts," 102-05 in Barry N. Olshen and Yail S. Feldman, eds. *Approaches to Teaching the Hebrew Bible as Literature in Translation*, (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1989). John Nolland, "Genealogical Annotations in Genesis as Background for the Matthean Genealogy of Jesus," *Tyndale Bulletin* 47 (1996): 115-22

Westerman's commentary on Genesis and anthropological and literary analysis pursued by men like Claude Lévi-Strauss. These studies have been conducted by comparing the genealogies in the Old Testament with genealogies preserved in other cultures. One finding has been that linear genealogies in the ancient Near East rarely included more than a dozen names. When longer time periods were covered by genealogies, it was common for less important names to be omitted from the list. Plum also noted that genealogies tended to be fluid depending on their purpose.

The difficulties with Biblical genealogies have led many authors to suggest that the original Garden of Eden may have been as early as 10,000 BC instead of the 4,000 BC date often claimed for the Biblical text. However, it is not at all clear that the problems with Biblical genealogies can give an adequate answer to the problems raised for an old earth perspective by the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 with their stress on the number of years at which a descendant was born.

B. THE BIBLICAL CASE FOR AN OLD EARTH

There has been nearly endless academic debate about how Genesis 1-3 should be interpreted. Part of the problem is that contemporary authors regularly read content into the text that may or may not actually have been intended by Moses. For example, Genesis 1:1-2 reads, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, and the earth was formless and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep." Much debate has centered on whether these words were intended to describe creation *ex nihilo*, or a gap between eras of creation, or something else entirely. Various schools of interpretation have added content of their own into the words of Genesis 1:1-2. The text itself simply claimed that God made the world, and when God did so, the world was in some ways "formless." Anything beyond this adds content to the text that may or may not have been intended by Moses.

Several authors have argued from the structure of Genesis 1 that the chapter could not be intended as a literal record of historical events. Several authors have noted that "evenings and mornings" were included in the first three "days," and plants were created in the third day. These things were true despite the fact that the sun was only created in the fourth day. The argument is that there were no literal evenings and mornings before the fourth day because the sun had not yet been created. So the "days" of Genesis must have involved imagery of some kind. Against this argument, it could be noted that light was created on the first day even though the sun as such was only created on the fourth day. So periods of light and darkness were not impossible.

The nature of the events that occurred in the sixth day has also been used to argue against 24 hour creation days. A surprising number of things happened during the sixth day. Adam was created. At some point after Adam was created, God realized that it was not good for Adam to be alone. Then God created Eve from Adam's rib or side. During the same day, God brought all of the animals to Adam so that he could name them. How could all of these things have happened within 24 hours? If this many things could not be done within 24 hours, does this prove that the creation days of Genesis 1 were longer than 24 hour periods? Walter Booth tried to answer this argument by noting that only a few animals might have been named, and those may have been

created in Eden specifically so that they could be named by Adam.¹⁴ This would seem to change the apparent meaning of the text to accommodate the needs of an interpretive system.

Another argument against 24 hour creation days has been based on Genesis 2:2. It has been argued that the seventh creation day was an indefinite period of time since it may be unlikely that God rested for exactly 24 hours. It is not clear in the Genesis text why God would need rest at all or why He would rest for 24 hours. Genesis 2:2 was used in an eschatological context in Hebrews 4:4. If Genesis 2:2 was intended to refer to the Eschaton, would this suggest that the phrase "evening and morning" in Genesis 1 was not used to describe 24 hour days? It is striking that the phrase "evening and morning" was not used in Genesis 2 this way. Walter Booth argued that the seventh day was blessed and hallowed by God as the first Sabbath. Booth argued that this blessing suggested that a specific 24 hour day was intended in Genesis. Booth noted McCone's suggestion that God returned to His creative activity after the end of that 24 hour period.¹⁵

Walter Booth also noted that the word *yom* in the Old Testament was used to mean a number of things. It often referred to literal 24 hour periods. It sometimes referred to daylight. When the word *yom* was preceded by a prefix, it had an adverbial meaning like "when" or even "if." In Numbers 7:10, the word refers to a period of 12 days. The word *yom* also often referred to a period of time that was not related to a 24 hour day. In Genesis 1 and 2, the word *yom* was used in at least two or three ways.¹⁶ Genesis 2:4 used the word *yom* with the preposition "in" to describe the entire creative week. This use of *yom* did not refer to a 24 hour period. This could be used to argue that the examples of the word *yom* in Genesis 1 need not refer to 24 hour periods either, although it is unclear whether *yom* in Genesis 2:4 should be applied this way.

Some suggest that the days of Genesis 1 may be heavenly days instead of earthly days. This position is supported by II Peter 3:8 which claimed that a day with the Lord was as a thousand years. This could suggest that a heavenly day was represented on earth as a very long period of time on earth. The "heavenly days" could be interpreted in the context of Hebrews 8:5. This passage noted that the earthly tabernacle was a copy or image of the heavenly reality. This could be paralleled by the fact that earthly days are simply a copy of heavenly days. Morris argued that this would remove any meaning from the word day.¹⁷

Several authors have argued that the purpose of Genesis 1 was to teach theological lessons instead of narrating the history of God's creative acts. It has been suggested that Genesis 1 may have provided a theological basis for creation, the Sabbath, humanity, and the conflict between good and evil. One form of this position can be seen in Meredith Kline's Framework Hypothesis. Kline argued that Genesis 1 should be interpreted in the context of the framework of the account. Kline suggested that the chapter was structured topically instead of chronologically. Kline argued that Genesis 2:5-6 was inconsistent with Genesis 1. Genesis 2:5 claimed that there was no vegetation on the earth because it had not rained. Yet vegetation had covered the earth in the third day. Kline argued from this that the creative days could not then have been literal

¹⁴

Walter M. Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14 (2003): 108.

¹⁵ Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" 110.

¹⁶ Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" 102. Booth was using James Stambaugh, "The Days of Creation - a Semitic Approach," *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 5 (1991): 73-5.

¹⁷ Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" 111.

descriptions of 24 hour days. Kline also argued that the sequence of days in Genesis 1 was impossible in the light of Genesis 2:5-6. Vegetation that was created on the third day would not survive without the sun which was created on the fourth day. Booth noted that since plants can survive brief periods of darkness, this would only apply to a day age perspective.¹⁸ Kline noted that the stars were created on the 4th day, so they would then be much younger than the earth.¹⁹ The Framework Hypothesis is becoming surprisingly popular in the Evangelical community because it offers an alternative to the conflict over the age of the earth. The Framework Hypothesis recently has been supported by both Bruce Waltke and Tremper Longman III.²⁰

C. WHEN A DAY WAS AS A THOUSAND YEARS

A common assumption today is that Biblical genealogies date the world's creation at 4004 BC. This was not an assumption shared by either Jews or Christians in the 1st century AD. Both communities based their understanding of history on Psalm 90:4. This Psalm claimed, "For a thousand years in Your eyes are as yesterday when it passes by." The apostle Peter illustrated the common interpretation of this Psalm when he claimed in II Peter 3:8, "But do not let one thing be hidden (from) you, loved ones, that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years is as one day." The Jewish and early Christian communities interpreted these words in a very different way than they are understood today.²¹ Both communities believed that the course of human history would be patterned after the creation "days" of Genesis 1. They believed that human history would occur in seven periods of a thousand years. The first 5,000 years would be made up of normal history. The next 1,000 years would be God's millennial reign on earth exercised through the promised Messiah. The final 1,000 years would be a period of primal chaos as God entered His rest. There was quite a bit of uncertainty and debate about what would happen after God's 1,000 year rest.

The 1st century view of history can be seen in IV Ezra which was written around 100 AD. The author of IV Ezra claimed to have acted, "in the seventh year of the sixth week of 5,000 years of the creation, and three months and twelve days."²² So the author of IV Ezra claimed to be writing in the year 5007 after creation. Josephus assumed a similar chronology in his

¹⁸ Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" 118.

¹⁹ Futato supported Kline's position. Mark D. Futato, "Because it Had Rained: A Study of Gen 2:5-7 with Implications for Gen 2:4-25 and Gen 1:1-2:3." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 60 (1998): 1-21. Arguing in a somewhat similar direction, David Sterchi noted that the events recorded in Genesis 1 need not be seen as chronologically arranged. The text may simply record a list of things that happened without a clear sequence to them. David A. Sterchi, "Does Genesis 1 Provide a Chronological Sequence?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 39 (1996): 529-36.

²⁰ Bruce K. Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 57. Tremper Longman III, *How to Read Genesis*, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 105.

²¹ Hasel noted that II Pet. 3:8 only claimed that a day was "like" a thousand years, not equal to it. He argued that interpretations of Gen. 1 can not be supported from II Pet. 3:8. See the discussion in Booth, "Days of Genesis 1: Literal or Nonliteral?" 107.

²² Abba Hillel Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 16.

Antiquities. Josephus traced Israel's history from creation to the revolt against Rome. When the itemized periods in his history are added together, they add up to roughly 5,000 years. Then in Josephus' work *Contra Apionem*, Josephus claimed, "Those *Antiquities* contain the history of 5,000 years, and are taken out of our sacred books."²³ In the Christian world, a similar view of history was common. In the 2nd century, Theophilus claimed that Christ was born 5,529 years after creation. Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, and Julius Africanus all claimed that Christ was born 5,500 years after creation.²⁴ In the 4th century, Augustine claimed that Christ was born in the year 5000.

First century chronology was far more than a historical curiosity. The 1st century Jewish community believed that they lived at the beginning of the Messianic Age. They believed that the chronology of the age would produce the Messiah. Six different Messiahs arose in Israel during the 1st century. Each of these Messiah's led an armed revolt against Rome. The Jewish wars of 70 AD and 135 AD were motivated by Jewish faith in the coming Messiah and their understanding of his promised conquests. After years of polemical debate with Christians, and after Israel's complete destruction produced by messianic speculation, the Jewish community altered the way that it counted the years in the Old Testament genealogies. Eventually this recounting of history led to an acceptance of the present Jewish calendar based on a creation date of 3760 BC. So according to the current Jewish creation calendar, 2003 AD was 5,763 years after the earth's creation, so it is the year 5763. The current Jewish creation calendar only came into use around 600 AD. There are only two references to it in the whole Talmud.²⁵ In the Christian world, Bishop Ussher argued that creation occurred in 4004 BC. Since Christ was actually born in 4 BC, Bishop Ussher was claiming that Christ was born exactly 4,000 years after creation. This was a strongly theological statement. Bishop Ussher was making a chronological argument that Jesus was the Messiah. His date for creation may, or may not, have been accurate. There are a number of chronological uncertainties in the text. The point of all this is that popular dating schemes for Old Testament history might not be correct. The 1st century world would have applied the creation days in a very different way than is common today. This at least raises several questions. To what extent are current interpretations of the creation days determined by contemporary world views, and to what extent are they actually drawn from the Biblical text itself? To what extent has our young earth interpretation of Genesis been shaped by our culture instead of being shaped by the ancient world in which the Bible originated? How would Moses and the wilderness generation have understood the age of the world and the implications of the genealogies in Genesis? The answers to these questions may not be easy to find, but they may be worth serious consideration.

²³ Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, 17-8.

²⁴ In 221 AD, Julius Africanus wrote a five volume chronology that stretched from Eden to his time. He taught that human history fell into six "days" of a thousand years each. He taught that Christ was born in the creation year 5500. He taught that the millennium would begin 500 years later. His chronology was widely accepted in the Eastern church. His work influenced Hippolytus, Eusebius, the Paschal Chronicle in the seventh century AD, and Georgius Syncellus in the eighth century AD. http://www.holytrinitymission.org/books/english/early_literature_go.

²⁵ The Talmud references are Zar. 9b and San. 97b. See the discussion in Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, 16.