

1. Against the error of assuming that we can take a word or phrase by itself and can read into it implications beyond what is clearly expressed. 2. The error of assuming that every section of the creation occurred instantaneously, instead of recognizing the possibility that in certain parts of His creative work God might have chosen to use certain processes.

Some verses in Genesis 1 point very clearly to instantaneous acts of God, but others point equally strongly to His also having used processes at certain points in the course of the creation. Thus verses 11 and 12 do not say that God commanded that the earth should suddenly be covered with grass and herbs, and ^{that there should be} with trees standing high above the ground. ^{These verses i-read!} Instead, ~~they say:~~ "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass..and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind...And the earth brought forth grass..and the tree yielding fruit." Similarly verse 20 does not say, "Let the waters be filled with fish," but "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." The same type of phraseology is used in verse 24.

THE ORIGINAL CREATION OF MATTER

While being careful to avoid reading into Genesis ideas that are not there, we still find that a number of extremely important facts about the creation are definitely taught. The first of these relates to Genesis 1:1. This verse is correctly understood as describing the original creation of all the matter and energy in the universe. Here evolution has no counter-suggestion to make. If one does not recognize the fact that God by His great creative act originated all matter and energy there is no alternative explanation that sounds at all reasonable.

It should be noted that many interpreters today insist that verse 1 is not an independent statement, but merely a temporal clause, and that it should be translated in some such way as, "When God began to create the heavens and the earth." Such an interpretation, while possible, is not required by Hebrew grammar, and sharply contradicts all the ancient translations of the verse. Furthermore, it is based entirely