

Topic: Biblical inconsistencies rule out a literal interpretation of the Genesis creation story

May 2001 - CSFNM Rebuttal to NMSR Essay by Jeff Childs

This is Essay6b in a series of debate topics between CSFNM and NMSR.

Space does not permit addressing all six "inconsistencies."

The "inconsistency" between Genesis 12 and Acts 7:4 can be resolved with study. It is one thing to say that everything in the bible is truthful, and another to say that everything is true. For example, Genesis 4:3 is a truthful account of Satan's words, but his words were a lie. A similar situation exists between Genesis and Acts, though not to the same extreme. Acts 7:4 is a truthful account of what Stephen said during his trial. That Stephen misunderstood or misstated the chronology does not impugn the accuracy of the Genesis narrative.

The "inconsistency" with the animals can be resolved with study. Genesis 6:19-20 indicates that all animals were to be loaded in pairs, a male and a female. Genesis 7:2-3 gives additional information. Because some animals were considered "clean" there was a need to have more than one pair. Mr. Thomas correctly observes that dietary laws were introduced 1,000 years after the flood (compare Gen. 9:3 with Deut. 14:3-21). Therefore, the function of the "clean" animals was not dietary, it was sacrificial (Gen: 4:4). Sacrifice had occurred from the beginning and the knowledge of what was acceptable would have been common.

The "inconsistency" with the Nephilim can be resolved with a literal interpretation and an acceptance of the supernatural. The "sons of God" are wicked angels. The "daughters of men" are human women. Their genetically mixed offspring were giants. Human procreation cannot produce giants. New genetic information is required. That the nephilim reappeared after the flood suggests a reoccurrence of activity by wicked angels.

The "inconsistency" with the extent of the flood can be resolved with study. Mr. Thomas turns "can mean many things" into "cannot mean world-wide." Evolutionists find justification for their rejection of a world-wide flood in the semantic range of *erets*. However, even evolutionists now recognize that all of the continents used to be a single super-continent, they call it Pangaea. Given that Genesis 8:9 uses the adjective "whole" to describe the amount of land that was covered means the entire super-continent was covered.

Mr. Thomas' focus on the semantic range of *erets* may be technical, but it is also a diversion. Genesis 7:19-20 gives the best information concerning the extent of the flood. All of the mountains everywhere were under at least 15 cubits of water (22.5 feet). Given that the ark was 30 cubits high (Gen. 6:15), it is likely this means that the ark was buoyant and able to float freely over the highest mountains. Only a world-wide flood could produce this effect.

Inconsistencies can be resolved through additional study, a literal interpretation, and the elimination of anti-supernatural biases. There is one final requirement, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The unsaved cannot accept the things of God. They are foolishness to him, because they are spiritually appraised.