

Adam was lonely? How long does it take for God to put Adam to sleep and perform 'surgery'? If He created the universe by His omnipotent command (*ex nihilo*), and upholds it all the same way (that is, 'the word of His power' — Hebrews 1:3), I would be more inclined to ask why God needed the 24-hours at all. Furthermore, to object that Adam could not have named the animals in 24 hours requires that one object to Peter walking on the water. After all, God was involved. God worked the supernatural to bring the animals to Adam in the first place. Is God unable to work the supernatural that Adam name them all in 24 hours? Not only that, but who requires that there be as many 'species' then as there are now and that 'kind' corresponds to today's species rather than genus or family?¹³

The bottom line is that those opting for any version of day-age or day-revelation, etc. do so at the expense of, and in opposition to, the **clear** statements of Scripture.

REFERENCES

1. Helweg, O., 1995. How long an evening and morning? **Facts and Faith**, 9(3):8-9
2. Helweg, Ref. 1.
3. Grigg, R. M., 1996. How long were the days in Genesis 1? What did God intend us to understand from the words He used? **Creation Ex Nihilo**, 19(1):23-25.
4. Stambaugh, J., 1991. The days of creation: a semantic approach. **CEN Tech.J.**,5(1):7Q-76.
5. It should be mentioned that Helweg stresses the importance of context at the outset of his article. How unfortunate that he didn't take his own advice.
6. Archer, G., 1985. Daniel. **The Expositor's Bible Commentary**, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Vol. 7, pp. 102-103.
7. Archer, Ref. 6, p. 103.
8. Archer, Ref. 6, p. 103.
9. Though I do not know, I would guess that Helweg rejects verbal inspiration in favour of dynamic inspiration. This probably accounts for his placing the **purpose** God has above the words God used.
10. Archer, Ref. 6.
11. Kaiser, W., 1964, reprinted 1994. **A Survey of Old Testament Introduction**, Moody Press, Chicago, 196ff.
12. Kaiser, Ref. 11, p. 201.
13. Grigg, R. M., 1996. Naming all the animals: all in a day's work for Adam. **Creation Ex Nihilo**, 18(4):48-49.

David G. Shackelford has a B.S.E. from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, and a M.Div. and Ph.D. from the Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, Memphis, Tennessee, the latter majoring in New Testament and Greek and minoring in Theology, Old Testament and Hebrew. He is Associate Professor of New Testament and Greek at the Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary/Northeast Branch, Schenectady, Albany area, in the state of New York.

RESPONSE 2 — DAVID M. FOUTS

I recently read with interest the article 'How long an evening and morning?' by Otto J. Helweg.¹ Inasmuch as I hold an earned doctorate in Old Testament Studies with concentration in Biblical Hebrew, I had thought it might be of interest to the readership of **Facts and Faith** to observe a slightly different perspective on a few topics considered in the article. However, they declined to publish my findings, ostensibly because they disagree with those of Helweg.

The first concern is the designation Dr Helweg gave to Genesis 1 as poetry.² I would concur that from the standpoint of the non-Hebrew mind, the repetition of command, then fulfilment, and then 'evening and morning' would appear to be poetry. However, repetition is not a necessary component of Biblical Hebrew poetry. Repetition is actually more of a characteristic of Biblical Hebrew prose. Biblical Hebrew poetry is characterised on the other hand by:

- (a) parallelism of juxtaposed lines,
- (b) metrical characteristics, and
- (c) figures of speech.

With the possible exception of Genesis 1:1 (which may reflect the figure of speech called a merism — two words combined into a single concept, so 'heavens and earth' mean 'the entire creation'), none of these features are present in

Genesis 1. Genesis 1 therefore should not be considered poetry. Historical support of this is seen in the fact that no edition of the Hebrew text of which I am aware ever indented the passage in a poetical format (though I understand the NIV could be interpreted as doing so).

The second concern has to do with Dr Helweg's comments (p. 8) concerning the Hebrew word for 'day' (*yom* — יוֹם). He correctly mentions that this word is polysemantic and does not always refer to a 24-hour day. He then cites as an example Genesis 2:4 ('in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens') as a near reference to Genesis 1 where one 'day' refers to all six days of creation (Augustine's view, by the way). This is not a typical meaning of the term 'day' however. The use of *yom* with the *bet* (2) preposition (*b^eyom* — בַּיּוֹם) is in construct with the infinitive *'āśōt* (עָשָׂה), a syntactical construction which often is simply translated idiomatically as 'when'. So Genesis 2:4 may be safely translated 'when the Lord God made' without any mention of 'day' at all. Similar constructions are found in Genesis 2:17, 3:5, 5:1,5:2,21:8,35:3 and Exodus 10:28 to name a few. English versions will vary between 'in the day' and 'when' in these instances. To negate the meaning of *yom* as a 24 hour day in chapter 1 using *b^eyom* in Genesis 2:4 is at best an imprecise argument.

The third concern (and the main point of his article) is Dr Helweg's discussion of the use of the phrase 'evening and morning' in Daniel 8:26.^{3,4} He is absolutely correct that the phrase in Hebrew employs singular nouns rather than plural, yet he fails to note that this is normal Hebrew practice for these words. In fact, of the hundreds of occurrences of these two words (evening and morning), less than 5 per cent ever occur in the plural. Quite often in fact, when the context warrants, the singulars are used as collectives and translated as plurals. This appears to be the case contextually in Daniel 8:26. The same phrase (evening and morning) occurs in Daniel 8:14, which is the antecedent reference to Daniel 8:26. In Daniel 8:14, the singular phrase 'evening and morning' may legitimately be translated as plural terms, since the phrase includes the numerical modifier 2,300! Though many commentators deny the predictive element of Daniel's prophecies, I know of none who would deny that the author's intended meaning in '2,300 evenings and mornings' was 2,300 24-hour days. (In fact, the KJV translates the phrase 'evening and morning' here as 'days'.) Thus Daniel 8:26 mentions the vision of the 'evenings and mornings' (singular collective used as plurals), which refers back to the '2,300 evenings and mornings' (singular collective used as plurals) of Daniel 8:14 understood by the Hebrews to be 2,300 24-hour days. Daniel 8:26 therefore cannot be used to argue against the meaning of a 24-hour day for 'evening and morning' in Genesis 1. Instead, its use here actually supports 24 hour days elsewhere.

In conclusion, Dr Helweg's arguments are an unconvincing reason to deny the plain meaning of a 24-hour day in Genesis 1.

REFERENCES

1. Helweg, O. J., 1995. How long an evening and morning? **Facts and Faith**, 9(3): 8-9.
2. Helweg, Ref. 1, p. 8.
3. Helweg, Ref. 1, p. 9.
4. The transliterated phrase Dr Helweg offers there is misspelled. Daniel 8:26 in the most recent **Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia** at this point reads *hā'ereb w'habbōqer* (הָעֶרֶב וְהַבֹּקֶר). Allowing for printing difficulties in regard to diacritical markings, as near as I can tell, rather than writing 'evening and morning', Dr Helweg wrote 'the swarm (of flies) and the herd (of oxen)', assuming he meant *hā'arab w'habbaqar* (The article printed *ha'arow wahabaqar*. To give them the benefit of doubt, a softened b in Hebrew is pronounced as a v, but the published ' [aleph] incorrectly transliterated the ' ['ayin], and someone forgot to double the b of the correct *w'habbōqer*).

David M. Fouts has a Th.D. and is Associate Professor of Bible and Hebrew at Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee. He has had papers published in **Vetus Testamentum**, the **Journal of Near Eastern Studies**, the **Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society**, and in Zondervan's recently released **New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis**. Together with Dr Kurt Wise, he is working to build a solid Biblical model for young-Earth creationism.

REPLY — OTTO J. HELWEG

I understand the concern both responders have to defend the inspiration of the Bible; it is a concern I share. I can also understand the difficulty they have of believing I accept the Bible as God's Word when our hermeneutical approaches are so different. I do appreciate the editor, Dr Snelling, placing the disagreements into perspective by saying

'... we nonetheless accept and treat one another as brethren in the Lord, our salvation not being dependent on what we believe about the days of Genesis...'

There are so many people who need to hear the Gospel, that we need to be careful not to allow minor controversies to absorb too much of our time and effort. Of course, what one person may consider minor another may consider major.

Having said this, I will address some of the responses of Dr Shackelford. First, he believes I use 'liberal hermeneutical approaches to undermine Biblical authority'. Actually, I have attempted just the opposite. My aim is to use a Biblical hermeneutical approach that enhances the authority of the Bible, even though Dr Shackelford believes it does otherwise. The basic issue is how to interpret the

various passages of the Bible. I believe that we should look to the Bible as much as possible to see how it interprets itself.

Dr Shackelford believes both the **how** and the **who** are important in the creation narratives. I maintain there is **NO how** statement in Genesis 1. I would also argue that there is no **how** in Genesis 2-4, but to deal with that would go beyond the scope of this reply.

Dr Shackelford writes that my approach 'has the distinctive hollow ring of liberalism'. Depending on how one defines the theological spectrum, I would classify myself as 'Biblical'; others have called me 'conservative-evangelical'. 'Liberalism' is a pejorative term to many and might be classified as an *ad hominem* argument.

The accusation that I have 'succumbed to the temptation of seeking to retain the facade of an authoritative science at the expense of an authoritative Bible' depends, again, on one's hermeneutical approach. As I concluded in my article, I subscribe to the 'two book' hypothesis. That is, the Bible is the book of God's Word and the universe is the book of God's works. Both of these have the same Author and do