

How Scholars' Perceptions of the Semantic Range of יום Have Affected Their Discussions of the Age of the Universe: Part 3

John C. P. Smith, Independent Scholar, Grayslake, Illinois.

Abstract

Before the Enlightenment, most theologians believed the earth was created in the space of a literal week, a notable exception (among others) being Augustine, who interpreted the days of creation figuratively. Most believed that the universe began sometime between approximately 3600BC and 7000BC. However, between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries—with the growing acceptance of geological uniformitarianism and, later, Darwinian evolution—an increasing number of eminent scholars advocated a multi-billion-year-old universe and questioned the validity of the biblical account. In order to accommodate billions of years into the Genesis account of origins, theologians proposed a range of new interpretations. Some, such as the Gap Theory, sought to retain a literal understanding of יום. Others, particularly the Day-Age Theory, maintained that the term had a broad semantic range that could include a sense of vast periods of time. Over the past two centuries, the issue of the meaning of יום in relation to the age of the universe has been vigorously debated by many scholars, though ignored as irrelevant by others.

Following an introductory survey of the biblical, historical and theological, and linguistic contexts of this issue, the study looks at delineations and definitions of יום in Scripture, and in lexical and other sources. The central analysis examines how the semantic range of יום has been discussed in the context of the creation account and in relation to the age of the universe, both historically, and, more particularly, by 40 scholars (or teams of scholars) over the past 50 years. It is evident that a great variety of opinion exists regarding the semantic range of יום. It is also clear that there is a considerable disconnection between lexicography regarding יום and the formation of creation theology. Most respected lexical sources do not allow for a broad semantic range for יום, yet many theologians believe it to be rather flexible.

Keywords: יום; יום in Creation account; age of the universe; הַיּוֹם (הַיּוֹם); Analogical Days Position; Augustine; Church Fathers' view of Genesis 1–2:4; Cosmic Temple Inauguration Theory; Creation days; Day-Age Theory; Day of the Lord; Dual Perspective Theory; Exodus 20:8–11; extended definitions of יום; Fiat Theory; Framework Interpretation; Gap Theory; Genesis 1–2:4; Historical Creationism; historical survey of יום from 1967–2017; Intermittent-Day View; modern interpretations of יום; Multiple Gap Theory; 2 Peter 3:8b; Psalm 90:4; Reformers' view of Genesis 1–2:4; Revelatory Day Theory; semantic range of יום.

Prologue

I am very thankful for having had the opportunity to do this study, which was facilitated through the guidance of Drs. Richard E. Averbeck and Eric J. Tully at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

I acknowledge with gratitude the kind granting of permission by Robert I. Bradshaw for inclusion of his data regarding early Jewish and Christian views on the length of the days of creation (see page 105).

Hebrew Bible quotations are taken from the text of the 1997 second edition of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (based on the Leningrad Codex B19^A), as found in *Accordance* and *BibleWorks*, “which has been edited over the years to bring it into greater conformity with the Leningrad Codex” (*BibleWorks*, WTT Version Info). Both the *Accordance* and *BibleWorks* versions of *BHS* include the 2010 *WTM* Release 4.14.

Unless indicated otherwise, all Scripture translations into English are my own rendering.

Unless stated otherwise, all instances of emphasis within a quotation are those of the cited author.

I have indicated wherever I have added my own emphases, except in the case of Scripture quotations. My preferred means of emphasis is italics. If the quotation already contains italics, then I resort to underlining (and specify so). Additionally, even where the quotation does not contain italics, I sometimes still use underlining for the sake of consistency with underlining in other nearby quotations.

Introduction

This work examines how scholars' perceptions of the semantic range of יום have affected their discussions of the age of the universe. While each of the key elements in this relationship—the semantic range of יום and the age of the universe—have indeed been studied before, I am not aware of any other study that specifically focuses on the interaction between the two, across a range of scholarly works.

The subject of creation and origins is popular and is often vigorously debated. A key element of enquiry and discussion within this topic is the age of the universe. Some scholars feel that the Bible does not

speak to the question of the age of the universe. Certainly, the Bible does not make any outright statement like, “The universe was created by God x thousand or million or billion years ago.” However, other scholars believe that the biblical text does indeed give indications concerning the age of the universe. In their interactions with the text, many such scholars make reference to the Hebrew word יוֹם , usually translated “day,” which occurs fifteen times in the thirty-five verses of the Genesis creation account (Genesis 1:1–2:4). This work examines (1) how scholars have understood the semantic range of יוֹם —whether as always having a narrow, restricted sense, or as having a broad range of meanings across different contexts, or as somewhere in between these two extremes—and (2) how these perceptions have affected their discussions of the age of the universe. Must the word יוֹם always indicate a normal day, or can it refer to a longer period of time? Does its flexibility or inflexibility of meaning have anything relevant to say regarding the age of the universe according to the Genesis account of creation?

There are several reasons why this subject might be viewed as important. Within the Christian church there has been much discussion, sometimes heated and confused, on the issues of creation and, in particular, the age of the universe. It is often asked what the word יוֹם could potentially mean in Genesis. It would be helpful to gain a degree of clarity on the breadth of views regarding the semantic range of יוֹם —including those of lexicographers, theologians, and other scholars—and the kind of reasoning employed in their discussions of יוֹם with respect to the age of the universe. All of this could potentially aid people in making better-informed decisions about how they see the place of יוֹם within the creation debate, and in better understanding those with different opinions from their own.

Outside the Christian Church, many people view the Bible as irrelevant or unreliable, especially when it comes to science. Even some biblical scholars believe that the Genesis account of creation has little, if anything, that is pertinent or authoritative to say regarding modern science. The biblical word יוֹם in the creation account can be seen as irreconcilable

with the prevailing view of origins. This work may help people understand the various ways that some biblical scholars, by engaging with the semantic range of the word יוֹם , have explained the Genesis account of creation as being relevant to the issue of the age of the universe.

This third part of the larger work presents the core of the study, the analysis of the works of forty scholars (or teams of scholars) published in (or translated into) English over the past fifty years, which mention the semantic range of יוֹם with reference to the age of the universe. The sources include monographs, creation theologies, Genesis commentaries, contributions to creation debates, and other scholarly works. Key data extracted from these works are tabulated in Appendix 1. Preceding the central analysis is a brief historical survey of interpretation, to show how the semantic range of יוֹם has been understood since biblical times, particularly in relation to the age of the universe. Then, reflection is made upon the findings of the central analysis, highlighting some of the main links, patterns, and trends in the relationships between scholars’ perceptions of the semantic range of יוֹם , and their discussions of the age of the universe. Finally, I draw salient conclusions from throughout the study.

יוֹם in Discussions of the Age of the Universe

The temporal focus of this study is 1967–2017. But before analyzing how יוֹם has been handled in discussions pertaining to the age of the universe over the past fifty years, we will briefly survey the history of interpretation of the days in the creation account prior to 1967.

Brief Historical Survey of Interpretation Prior to 1967

Old Testament Period

According to mainline conservative tradition, Genesis was written by Moses in the latter half of the fifteenth century BC (or a couple of centuries later, according to advocates of a late date for the exodus).¹ Elsewhere in the Pentateuch (Exodus 20:11, 31:17), references to the time frame of creation use the same kind of terminology, viz., שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים (“six days”) followed by a day of rest. While a number of scholars

¹ “Until about three hundred years ago Jews and Christians almost universally believed that Moses wrote the Torah or Pentateuch around 1400 BCE” (Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1n). With regards specifically to authorship see, for example, Longman III and Dillard (2006, 41), who note, “Early Jewish and Christian tradition ... is virtually unanimous in ascribing Genesis through Deuteronomy to [Moses].... Jesus and the early church connected much, if not all, of the Torah with Moses.” Archer (2007, 93–94) suggests, “When all the data of the Pentateuchal text have been carefully considered, and all the evidence, both internal and external, has been fairly weighed, the impression is all but irresistible that Mosaic authorship is the one theory that best accords with the surviving historical data.”

With regards to the date of the original composition of Genesis and the rest of the Pentateuch, which, assuming Mosaic authorship, is intrinsically tied to the dating of the exodus, see, for example, Wood and O’Brien (1986, 20), who assert, “The date of the Exodus, while debated even among conservative scholars, probably occurred shortly after the middle of the fifteenth century. {Footnote:} A number of conservative writers take a contrary position [including] F.F. Bruce ...; Charles Pfeiffer ...; Kitchen ...; or Harrison ... {Body text:} This date, commonly placed c. 1446 B.C., is called the ‘early’ date in contrast to one in the thirteenth century called the ‘late’ date. {Footnote:} Often placed early (c. 1290 B.C.) in the reign of Rameses II (1304–1238 ...).” Wood and O’Brien (1986, 69–86) consider arguments set forth by adherents of the late date.

see the Exodus references as strong evidence that the days of creation are literal days, others are not convinced. Nevertheless, however we may understand the term, we can at least assert that Moses was consistent in using the word יום in relation to the time frame of creation.

Throughout the rest of the Old Testament no further reference is made explicitly to the six days of creation, but neither is any alternative timescale mentioned. Thus, for approximately 1,500 years (or 1,300 years if following a late date for the Exodus) from the composition of Genesis up to the time of Jesus, there is no explicit biblical evidence that Israelites regarded the time frame of creation as being anything other than an ordinary week. If, as proponents of an old universe argue, Jewish tradition understood the term יום to mean something other than an ordinary day, or understood there to be vast eons between or following the days of creation, such a tradition is lacking explicit evidence in the rest of the biblical canon.

New Testament Period

While there has been much debate about the form and completeness of genealogies in both Old and New Testaments, a straightforward reading of Luke 3:23–38 links Jesus all the way back to “Adam, the son of God” (v. 38). Taken together with Jesus’ declaration about marriage partners, “But from the beginning of creation, ‘God made them male and female’” (Mark 10:6), this certainly gives the impression that Jesus and Luke regarded the creation of everything, including humans, as having taken place about eighty generations earlier. If there is another explanation, it is not immediately obvious. Moreover, while nothing explicit is mentioned by Jesus or the New Testament writers concerning their interpretation of יום in Genesis 1, neither do they give any indication that they interpreted the days of creation in anything other than their ordinary sense. Terry Mortenson (2008, 342) concludes, “There is nothing in [Jesus’] teachings that would support an old-earth view (that Adam was created long ages after the beginning of creation).”

Regarding the common reckoning of a day in the New Testament period, D.A. Carson (1991, 156–157, underlining added) comments,

Counting the hours from midnight to noon and noon until midnight ... is alleged to be the ‘Roman’ system, unlike the Jewish system which counts from sunrise to sunset (roughly 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.). But the evidence in support of a Roman system for counting hours turns out to be unconvincing. The primary support is from Pliny the Elder; but all he says is that Roman priests and authorities, like the Egyptians, counted the official day, the civil day, from midnight to midnight—useful information in leases and other

documents that expire at day’s end. Nowhere does he suggest that any of his contemporaries count the hours of a day from midnight; indeed, he says that ‘the common people everywhere’ think of the day running from dawn to dark. Jews, Romans and others divided the daylight ‘day’ into twelve hours.

2 Peter 3:8b (and Psalm 90:4)

Advocates of a broad semantic range for “day” very often point to Peter’s allusion (in 2 Peter 3:8b) to Psalm 90:4. Because of the ubiquity of this line of reasoning, and because of its relevance to this thesis, I will discuss it below in some detail.

In the Greek Bible, the phrase χίλια ἔτη (“a thousand years”) is found together with ὥς (“as”) only in LXX Ps 89:4 (equivalent to HB 90:4), and in 2 Peter 3:8b. In Psalm 90:4 (LXX 89:4) Moses writes, “For *a thousand years* in Your eyes are *as* yesterday when it passes, or a watch in the night,” and the apostle comments, “With the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and *a thousand years as one day*” (ESV).

James L. Kugel (2007, 50) explains—with reference to the problem of both the six-day time frame in Genesis 1, and God’s promise in Genesis 2:17 that Adam would die on the day that he ate of the forbidden fruit—that, for some,

The answer suggested by Ps. 90:4 was that the days mentioned in the creation of the world were *days of God*, a thousand-year unit of time known to Him and quite independent of the sun. The world was thus really created over a period of six thousand years. This idea is alluded to in a number of ancient texts: apparently, it simply became common knowledge that a ‘day of God’ lasts a thousand years.

In support of this notion, in addition to 2 Peter 3:8b, Kugel (2007, 50) cites the following:

- “For with Him a ‘day’ signifies a thousand years,” *Letter of Barnabas* 15:4
- “Adam died ... and he lacked seventy years of one thousand years [that is, he died at the age of 930]. One thousand years are as a single day in the testimony of heaven; therefore it was written concerning the tree of knowledge, ‘On the day that you eat of it, you will die,’” *Jubilees* 4:29–30
- “It was said to Adam that on the day in which he ate of the tree, on that day he would die. And indeed, we know that he did not quite fill up a thousand years. We thus understand the expression ‘a day of the Lord is a thousand years’ as [clarifying] this,” Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 81:3.

While the phraseology and context of the latter three clearly demonstrate that the authors interpretively equated “day” with “a thousand years,” the same cannot so readily be said of 2 Peter 3:8b, particularly when read in light of Psalm 90:4.

The precise phraseology in Psalm 90:4, כִּי יוֹם לַיהוָה כִּי אֶלְפִי

leaves little doubt that the language being employed is figurative. The formula, *היה* (היה) *כְּ*—lit., “to be in [someone’s] eyes as/like [something/someone],” i.e., “to seem as/like [something/someone to someone]”—occurs six times in the Old Testament to provide an analogy for how somebody experienced, or felt something (see Table 1).

For example, in describing the depth of Jacob’s love for Rachel, Genesis records, “Jacob served for Rachel seven years, but they *seemed like* several days *to him* because of his love for her” (Genesis 29:20). Upon returning from their scouting trip into Canaan, the fearful spies reported to the people of Israel, “And there we saw the Nephilim—the sons of Anak, who come from the Nephilim—and we *seemed like* grasshoppers *to ourselves*, and so we *seemed to them*” (Numbers 13:33). Of course no one would suggest that the Israelites were really grasshoppers; or that seven years equates to a few days. The phrase *היה* (היה) *כְּ* is not an equation (contrary, for example, to the wording of the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Hierosolymitanus versions of the *Letter of Barnabas* 15:4, “For with Him a ‘day’ signifies [σημαίνει] a thousand years”). Rather, it is a linguistic tool for conveying how something is valued, or feared, or regarded, by comparing it with something else. So, for instance, Jacob’s love for Rachel was so intense, that working for Laban for seven years was a small price to pay in return for marrying her; in his estimation it felt like it was as easy as just a few days of work. And the trepidatious Israelites were so fearful of the giants they had seen in Canaan, that they felt powerless and incapable of confronting them; from their perspective—and indeed also from the perspective of the giants themselves—they were as insubstantial as grasshoppers.

So returning to Psalm 90:4 it seems that Moses is not attributing the word *יום* with the value of “one thousand years,” as Barnabas does in his letter. The context of Psalm 90 is the fragile nature of mortal man compared to the powerful, eternal nature of God: “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever You had formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting You are God. You return man to dust and say, ‘Return, O children of man!’” (Psalm 90:2–3, *ESV**). We may live for seventy or eighty years, Moses says, yet the fleeting lives we value so much are filled with toil and trouble (v. 10). But for an eternal God, a millennium seems but a brief span of time.

To this thought Peter adds another, that “with the Lord one day is as a thousand years.” For an omnipotent God, unimaginable feats can be accomplished in what we would regard as an impossibly short time frame. Furthermore, God pays great attention to all of the intricate happenings of His creation, second by second. He cares about the details. Indeed, Peter adds, “The Lord is not slow to fulfill His promise as some count slowness, but is patient toward you, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should reach repentance” (v. 9).

Psalm 90:4 and Peter’s second clause in 2 Peter 3:8b are like a telescopic perspective on God’s majestic power and mind-boggling, eternal nature. Peter’s first clause is like a microscopic view, focusing right down to the smallest details that matter to God.

Neither verse seems to impinge upon the semantic range of “day” or “year.” Henri Blocher ([1979] 1984, 45) explains, “In Psalm 90:4 ... ‘day’ has its most commonplace meaning, but it is used in a comparison and that is what brings out the relativity of human time for God (as also in 2 Peter 3:8).” *יום* is no more equal to a millennium than Jacob’s seven years were equal to a few days, or than the Israelites were to grasshoppers.

Table 1. Occurrences of the formula *היה* (היה) *כְּ*, “to seem as/like [something/someone to someone].”

[Jacob said to Rebekah his mother] “Perhaps my father will feel me, and I will <i>seem like a mocker to him</i> , and bring upon myself a curse and not a blessing.”	Gen 27:12	אולי ימשלי אבי ויהייתי כעניו כמתעטע והבאתי עלי קללה ולא ברכה:
So Jacob served for Rachel <i>seven years</i> , but they <i>seemed like several days to him</i> because of his love for her.	Gen 29:20	ויעבד יעקב ברחל שבע שנים ויהיו כעניו כמים אחרים באהבתו אתה:
“And there we saw the Nephilim—the sons of Anak, who come from the Nephilim—and we <i>seemed like grasshoppers to ourselves</i> , and so we <i>seemed to them</i> .”	Num 13:33	ושם ראינו את הנפילים בני ענק מורפלים ויהי כענינו כחגבים וכן היינו כענינו:
And Achish answered, and said to David, “I know that <i>you seem as good as an angel of God to me</i> . Nevertheless, the commanders of the Philistines have said, ‘He shall not go up with us into the battle.’”	1Sam 29:9	וישן אכיש ויאמר אל־דוד ידעתי כי טוב אתה כעני כמלאך אלהים אך עשרי פלשתים אמרו לא־ יעלה עמנו במלחמה:
For <i>a thousand years seem to You as a day</i> , yesterday that passes by, or <i>as a watch in the night</i> .	Ps 90:4	כי אלף שנים כעניו כיום אתמול כי יעבר ואשמורה בלילה:
I am a wall, and my breasts are like towers; therefore, I have <i>seemed to him as one finding peace</i> .	Cant 8:10	אני חומה ושדי כמגדלות אז הייתי כעניו כמוצאת שלום:

Others scholars have drawn attention to the misapplication of these verses for the purpose of positing a broad semantic range for יום. For instance, Whitcomb (1973, 68) writes,

Note carefully that the verse does *not* say that God's days last thousands of years, but that "one day is with the Lord *as* a thousand years." In other words, God is completely above the limitations of time in the sense that he can accomplish in *one literal day* what nature or man could not accomplish in thousands of years, if ever. Note that one day is "*as* a thousand years," not "*is* a thousand years," with God. If "one day" in this verse means a long period of time, then we would end up with the following absurdity: "a long period of time is with the Lord as a thousand years." Instead of this, the verse reveals how much God can accomplish in a 24-hour day, and thus sheds much light upon the events of Creation Week.

Morris (1974, 226–227) argues,

The familiar verse in II Peter 3:8 ... has been badly misapplied when used to teach the day-age theory. In the context, it teaches exactly the opposite, and one should remember that "a text without a context is a pretext." Peter is dealing with the conflict between uniformitarianism and creationism prophesied in the last days. Thus, he is saying that, despite man's naturalistic scoffings, God can do in one day what, on uniformitarian premises, might seem to require a thousand years. God does not require aeons of time to accomplish His work of creating and redeeming all things.

Kulikovsky (2009, 149) explains, "Rather than defining the meaning of 'day,' these verses [Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8] are similes which indicate that God is eternal, is not constrained by time, and does not experience the passage of time as humans do."

From the Early Church Period until the Twentieth Century

Much has already been written on the history of interpretation of the days of creation in Genesis since the time of the church fathers. Here we will briefly make some general observations, before surveying a range of modern perspectives from prominent and respected scholars leading up to 1967.

In his introduction to *The Days of Creation: A History of Christian Interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3*, the culmination of "nine and a half long years of study" (Brown 2014, ix), Andrew J. Brown (2014, 3) suggests,

The opening part of Genesis has been not only (probably) the most commented-on written text in human history, but also one of the greatest influences on Western thought over the last two millennia, and if we want to avoid a gaping ignorance about the course of Western history, thought and culture, not to mention Christian theology and the formation of the sciences concerned with origins, we simply cannot afford to ignore this particular interpretive story.

Brown's book "examines the history of Christian interpretation of the seven-day framework of Genesis 1:1–2:3 in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament from the post-apostolic era to the debates surrounding *Essays and Reviews* (1860)" (back-cover blurb). He describes this history as "a story of *difference*," and he laments the oversimplification of "the interpretive 'playing fields' of the past" by some scholars, in an "attempt to line up past thinkers behind a modern ... viewpoint" (284). Brown (284) cites two opposing sets of debaters in *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*,² as making what he describes as "sweeping" or "blanket generalization[s]" about historic interpretation in order to support their respective positions.³ The "difference" in hermeneutical landscapes," Brown (285) argues, "makes it incumbent upon us to study the history and thinking of the different eras concerned, in aid of a better-informed appreciation of their approaches to this and other biblical texts."

Others have expressed a similar desire for greater judiciousness in approaching the history of interpretation of Genesis 1. For example, John Millam (2011) bemoans, "Most attempts to use the church fathers by both old-earth and young-earth creationists are seriously flawed, just in different ways." Although Millam defends an old-earth position, he acknowledges that he appreciated the "lucid and well-documented" introduction by the young-earth advocate Robert I. Bradshaw (1999) in his work *Creationism and the Early Church*. Millam (2011) explains, "What I found so refreshing and educational about Bradshaw's work was that rather than simply cataloging the church fathers according to their interpretations, he analyzed the complex history and undercurrents behind their views." Indeed, under the heading, "The Use and Abuse of Church History," Bradshaw (1999) begins the first chapter of his book by stating, "A great deal of effort has been expended in recent years by all sides in the debate over the biblical view of origins setting about

² Hagopian (2001).

³ Here Brown cites Ross and Archer (2001, 125–126) as claiming, "All [the ante-Nicene fathers who wrote on Genesis] accepted that *yôm* could mean 'a long time period.' The majority explicitly taught that the Genesis creation days were extended periods (something like a thousand years per *yôm*);" and J. Ligon Duncan and David W. Hall (2001, 22) as asserting, "The historic Christian tradition ... has viewed these days mainly as normal days because it has viewed the Genesis account as historical. No significant debate existed on the matter before the nineteenth century because the plainest and most straightforward reading of the text had no sustained challenges."

what the early church believed to be the correct interpretation of Genesis 1–11.... The result has been that a number of often contradictory positions have all been presented as ‘the early church’s view.’”

Notwithstanding Brown’s important point about ‘difference,’ and the need to avoid generalizations, neither would it be helpful, or true, to imply that all modern viewpoints were represented equally in earlier times. Thus, Brown’s (285, emphasis added) statement, “Non-literal interpretations of the days of Genesis formed a sustained *minority* strand throughout the period in view in this study,” is roughly compatible with Feinberg’s (2006, 597, emphasis added) assessment, “Though at various times in church history some questioned whether the days of creation were literal solar days, the *predominant* view at least until the 1700s was that the days of creation were six twenty-four-hour days. Both Luther and Calvin held this position.”

Early Writings

In his chapter on “The Early Church and the Age of the Earth,” Bradshaw (1999) tabulates “how the

writers of the early church [and other early writers] viewed the days of creation” (see Table 2). In nearly half of those he lists, their view of the length of the days of creation is not explicitly stated. Of the rest, nine out of thirteen (69%) advocate literal days, with four (31%) preferring a figurative interpretation. While Bradshaw admits, “We cannot be sure of the views of most writers for a variety of reasons,” he opines, “My own view based upon the style of exegesis of other passages of Scripture would lead me to think that the vast majority of those listed as having an unclear view would opt for 24 hours had they discussed the subject.”

Notwithstanding these important statistical observations, theological discussions are ideally to be evaluated objectively on the merits of each position, not merely by the quantity of adherents of a particular perspective. Indeed, history (including church history) has repeatedly demonstrated that a majority may, at times, be wrong. Thus, scholars pay attention not only to how many advocates a particular position has, but also specifically who the advocates are, and whether or not they are deemed reliable.

Table 2. How early Jewish and Christian writers viewed the length of the days of creation (data reproduced, with kind permission, from Bradshaw 1999, Table 3.3).

Writer	Date	24 hours	Figurative	Unclear	Reference
Philo	ca. 20 BC–ca. AD 50		✓		<i>Creation</i> , 13
Josephus	AD 37/38–ca. 100			✓	<i>Antiquities</i> , 1.1.1 (1.27–33)
Justin Martyr	ca. 100–ca. 165			✓	
Tatian	110–180			✓	
Theophilus of Antioch	ca. 180	✓			<i>Autolycus</i> , 2.11–12
Irenaeus of Lyons	ca. 115–202			✓	
Clement of Alexandria	ca. 150–ca. 215		✓		<i>Miscellanies</i> , 6.16
Tertullian	ca. 160–ca. 225			✓	
Julius Africanus	ca. 160–240			✓	
Hippolytus of Rome	170–236			✓	<i>Genesis</i> , 1.5
Origen	185–253		✓		<i>Celsus</i> , 6.50, 60
Methodius	died 311	✓			<i>Chastity</i> , 5.7
Lactantius	240–320	✓			<i>Institutes</i> , 7.14
Victorinus of Pettau	died ca. 304	✓			<i>Creation</i>
Eusebius of Caesarea	263–339			✓	
Ephrem the Syrian	306–373	✓			<i>Commentary on Genesis</i> , 1.1
Epiphanius of Salamis	315–403	✓			<i>Panarion</i> , 1.1.1
Basil of Caesarea	329–379	✓			<i>Hexameron</i> , 2.8
Gregory of Nyssa	330–394			✓	
Gregory of Nazianzus	330–390			✓	
Cyril of Jerusalem	died 387	✓			<i>Catechetical Lectures</i> , 12.5
Ambrose of Milan	339–397	✓			<i>Hexameron</i> , 1.10.3–7
John Chrysostom	374–407			✓	
Jerome	347–419/420			✓	
Augustine of Hippo	354–430		✓		<i>Literal</i> , 4.22.39

For instance, for those who believe in a figurative interpretation of יום in the creation account, the relative scarcity of support for their position among the early church fathers is counterbalanced by the theological giant, Augustine. Significantly, in this regard, Frank Robbins (1912, 64; quoted in Brown 2014, 59) notes, “Augustine was ‘the chief authority of the medieval Latin writers on creation,’ and his treatment of the sequence of creation days was the most influential one to emerge from the patristic era.” R. J. Bauckham (1999, 300) makes reference (albeit in a different context) to “that extraordinary weight of influence that only Augustine has had on Western theology.” Jaroslav Pelikan (1971, 1:292–293) asserts even more forcefully,

There is probably no Christian theologian—Eastern or Western, ancient or medieval or modern, heretical or orthodox—whose historical influence can match his.... In a manner and to a degree unique for any Christian thinker outside the New Testament, Augustine has determined the form and the content of church doctrine for most of Western Christian history.

Not surprisingly, therefore, many proponents of a non-literal interpretation of יום in the creation account have enlisted Augustine in support of their theses. For example,

- Henri Blocher ([1979] 1984, 49): “Augustine ... constructed a brilliant and startling interpretation of the days in *De Genesi ad litteram*. In his view, their temporal character is not physical but ideal”;
- Dick Fischer (1990, 15–16): “Many of the early church fathers took their clues from Scripture alone in the scarcity of natural evidence. Irenaeus, Origen, Basil, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, to name a few, argued that the days of creation were long periods of time”;
- R. Laird Harris (1995, 22): “Long ago Augustine had held that the days were periods of indefinite length”;
- N.H. Ridderbos (1957, 11): “[The] view [that the arrangement of seven days is intended as a literary form] was already current in the early Church (Philo of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine)”;
- Davis A. Young (1982, 58): “It was argued in the line of Augustine that at least the first three days cannot be treated as ordinary days inasmuch as the sun, in relation to which Earth’s rotation is utilized as a chronometer, was not even yet in existence.”

Augustine, as others, had a multi-layered approach to the interpretation of Scripture, including the literal (by which he meant historical) sense, and also the allegorical meaning (cf. Ortlund 2017). He believed that God’s creation was instantaneous, and

that the word “day” was employed pedagogically, in order to aid our understanding. As such, he was “taking the days as a kind of framework or literary device” (Ortlund 2017). Augustine reasoned:

1. Being omnipotent, God would not need longer than an instant to create everything, and certainly would not require as long as six days. In the Latin version that Augustine read of the Wisdom of Sirach (or Book of Ecclesiasticus), which he regarded as canonical, it states, “He Who lives for eternity created all things at once [*simul*]” (18:1).
2. The creation account does not seem to present ordinary days, since (a) the sun was not created until the fourth day, (b) the word “day” is used differently in Gen 2:4, and (c) Gen 2:5a appears to preclude a straightforward chronological reading.

The Middle Ages and the Reformers

In his “Treatise on the Work of the Six Days,” Thomas Aquinas (ca. 1225–74) asserts regarding יום in Genesis 1:5b, “The words ‘one day’ are used when day is first instituted, to denote that one day is made up of twenty-four hours. Hence, by mentioning ‘one,’ the measure of a natural day is fixed” (Aquinas 1947). In summing up the Middle Ages, Brown (2014, 102) observes,

Frank Robbins characterized medieval exegesis of the Hexameron as a gradual defection from Augustine’s abstractness ...

Thomas Aquinas’ decision not to endorse Augustine’s viewpoint perhaps constituted a turning point. The literal sense was clearly coming into favour in the later centuries, and was destined to prevail in the era of the Reformation, and not only among Reformers.⁴

With regards, specifically, to Martin Luther, Brown (2014, 111) notes, “Augustine’s *Literal Meaning* seems to Luther a fundamentally allegorical or figurative understanding. The Reformation emphasizes on the clarity of Scripture and the priesthood of all believers implied that God did not intend the Genesis accounts to be comprehensive only to an intellectual elite. Augustine is implicitly reproved for his presumption.” In his *Lectures on Genesis*, Luther (1958, 1:5; quoted in Brown 2014, 111–112) argues,

If, then, we do not understand the nature of the days or have no insight into why God wanted to make use of these intervals of time, let us confess our lack of understanding rather than distort the words ... We assert that Moses spoke in the literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read. If we do not comprehend the reason for this, let us remain pupils and leave the job of teacher to the Holy Spirit.

⁴ See the discussion of some of the Protestant Reformers’ views on literal interpretation in Smith 2019a, 82–83.

Some modern scholars are nervous of accepting Luther's literal approach to creation because of reservations about some of his other beliefs. Against Luther's reliability in such matters—where a literal reading of the Bible seemingly clashes with scientific observation—Lennox (2011, 17) notes, “It is alleged that ... Martin Luther ... rejected the heliocentric point of view in rather strong terms in his *Table Talk* (1539).” However, Lennox (2011, 18) admits, “There is considerable debate about the authenticity of this quote.” Furthermore, as neither theologians nor scientists are right all of the time, evidence and testimony regarding each interpretive dilemma ought to be weighed separately in any attempt to arrive at the truth.

Like Aquinas several centuries earlier, Calvin (n.d., s.v. “Gen 1:5”) uses the occasion of commenting on Gen 1:5b to affirm the literal sense of ׀יׁ:

Here the error of those is manifestly refuted, who maintain that the world was made in a moment. For it is too violent a cavil to contend that Moses distributes the work which God perfected at once into six days, for the mere purpose of conveying instruction. Let us rather conclude that God himself took the space of six days, for the purpose of accommodating his works to the capacity of men.

Moving into the seventeenth century, but prior to the “nascent scepticism” that would soon take

hold with the flourishing of biblical criticism, Brown (2014, 132–133) notes,

The literal interpretation of the creation week reached a peak in British Protestant interpretation of the early seventeenth century ... This dominant literalism was the offspring of the overwhelmingly literal example of continental Protestants. It was normal for Protestant Genesis commentaries from around this time, both British and continental, to emphasize the six-day span of creation. In time this usage was adopted, probably thanks to Calvin's influence, into creedal documents such as the Irish Articles of Religion (1615), compiled by James Ussher, and subsequently in the Westminster Confession, finalized in 1648.

Hitherto, the vast majority of historians and theologians held that the age of the universe was to be measured in thousands of years. In his monumental four-volume work, *A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy*, William Hales listed over one hundred and twenty different opinions regarding the date of creation, ranging from 6,984BC to 3,616BC (see Table 3). Given that the modern consensus accepts an age in terms of billions of years, it is ironic that Hales regarded the comparatively tiny discrepancy of over three millennia as a “disgraceful discordance” (1830, 1:214).

Table 3. A selection of mostly pre-Enlightenment views on the date of creation (from Hales's [1830, 1:211–214] list of more than one hundred and twenty suggested dates, in *A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy*).

Originator (date, where specified)	Source	Date of Creation
Alphonsus (AD 1252)	Muller	6,984 BC
	Strauchius	6,484 BC
Indian Chronology	Gentil.	6,204 BC
	Arab. records	6,174 BC
Babylonian Chronology	Bailly	6,158 BC
Chinese Chronology	Bailly	6,157 BC
Egyptian Chronology	Bailly	6,128 BC
Persian Chronology	Bailly	5,507 BC
Eutychius (AD 937)	Uni. Hist.	5,500 BC
Eusebius (AD 315)	Uni. Hist.	5,200 BC
Bede (AD 673)	Strauchius	5,199 BC
Justin Martyr (AD 140)	Playfair	5,000 BC
Origen (AD 230)		4,830 BC
Usher, Lloyd, Simpson, Spanheim, Calmet, Le Chais, Blair, etc.		4,004 BC
Kepler	Playfair	3,993 BC
Bullinger		3,969 BC
Melancthon	Playfair	3,964 BC
Luther		3,961 BC
Lightfoot		3,960 BC
Strauchius		3,949 BC
Jerom (AD 392)	Uni. Hist.	3,941 BC
Rabbi Lipman	Uni. Hist.	3,616 BC

Modern Interpreters Prior to 1967

As discussed earlier, the Enlightenment occasioned a significant challenge to traditionally held beliefs. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, increasingly bold voices raised major doubts and objections concerning the Bible. Alternative readings of Genesis 1, such as the Gap Theory and the Day-Age Theory, were put forward. It is in this climate of interpretive pluralism, and fundamentalist backlash, that we begin our survey of modern perspectives on the days of creation.

In 1871, Charles Hodge (1797–1878), “the great Princeton theologian, ... as solidly Scriptural as anyone” (Young 1977, 82–83),⁵ made the following significant contribution:

Admitting the facts to be as geologists would have us to believe, two methods of reconciling the Mosaic account with those facts have been adopted. First, some understand the first verse to refer to the original creation of the matter of the universe in the indefinite past, and what follows to refer to the last reorganizing change in the state of our earth to fit it for the habitation of man. Second, the word day as used throughout the chapter is understood of geological periods of indefinite duration.

In favour of this latter view it is urged that the word day is used in Scripture in many different senses ... sometimes for an indefinite period ...

It is of course admitted that, taking this account by itself, it would be most natural to understand the word in its ordinary sense; but if that sense brings the Mosaic account into conflict with facts, and another sense avoids such conflict, then it is obligatory on us to adopt that other. Now it is urged that if the word “day” be taken in the sense of “an indefinite period of time,” a sense which it undoubtedly has in other parts of Scripture, there is not only no discrepancy between the Mosaic account of the creation and the assumed facts of geology, but there is a most marvellous coincidence between them. (Hodge 1871, 1:570–571)

But then, in 1878, Robert L. Dabney (1820–98) objected to what he described as the “most fashionable ... theory of six symbolic days,” in which each day “is symbolical of a vast period” (Dabney [1878] 1972, 254). In the fifth of his six objections, Dabney (255) reasons,

It is freely admitted that the word day is often used in the Greek Scriptures as well as the Hebrew (as in our common speech) for an epoch, a season, a time. But yet, this use is confessedly derivative. The natural day is its literal and primary meaning. Now,

it is apprehended that in construing any document, while we are ready to adopt, at the demand of the context, the derived or tropical meaning, we revert to the primary one, when no such demand exists in the context.

In 1881, the conservative German Lutheran Old Testament commentator, C.F. Keil (1807–88) wrote, “The account of the creation, its commencement, progress, and completion, bears the marks, both in form and substance, of a historical document in which it is intended that we should accept as actual truth, not only the assertion that God created the heavens, and the earth, and all that lives and moves in the world, but also the description of the creation itself in all its several stages. (Keil [1881] 2006, 1:23)

Regarding, specifically, the days of creation, Keil ([1881] 2006, 1:32, 43) reckoned, “if the days of creation are regulated by the recurring interchange of light and darkness, they must be regarded not as periods of time of incalculable duration, of years or thousands of years, but as simple earthly days.... The six creation-days, according to the words of the text, were earthly days of ordinary duration.”

In 1903, the respected conservative theologian Benjamin B. Warfield (1851–1921) wrote, “The conflict as to the age of man on earth is not between Theology and Science ... It is between two sets of scientific speculators, the one ... [using] physics ... and the other ... biology. Theology as such has no concern in this conflict and may stand calmly by and enjoy the fuss and fury of the battle” (Warfield 1903, 241–252; quoted in Warfield 2000, 227). Similarly, in 1911, he stated, “The question of the antiquity of man is ... a purely scientific one, in which the theologian as such has no concern” (Warfield 1911, 11). According to Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone (2000, 14), “One of the best-kept secrets in American intellectual history [is that] B.B. Warfield, the ablest modern defender of the theologically conservative doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible, was also an evolutionist.” However, Fred G. Zaspel (2017, 971) counters, “The claim that Warfield held to theistic evolution goes beyond the evidence,” explaining, “Warfield did not endorse theistic evolution as it is understood and advocated today” (953). He notes, “Warfield asserted in 1916 that he had left theistic evolution behind him years earlier” (972).⁶ Zaspel (2010, 211) concludes, “The prevailing understanding of Warfield as an evolutionist must be rejected.”

In commenting on “Calvin’s Doctrine of the Creation” in 1915, Warfield (1915, 190–255, 196) observed, “The six days he, naturally, understands

⁵ Enlisting Hodge in support of the Day-Age theory.

⁶ “In a 1916 piece written for the college newspaper, Warfield reminisces on his time as an undergraduate student in Princeton. Here Warfield affirms that he was a convinced (theistic) evolutionist in his teenage years when he entered the College of New Jersey (Princeton), but he also affirms that he had abandoned the theory by the time he was thirty years old (1881)” (Zaspel 2017, 971).

as six literal days; and, accepting the *prima facie* chronology of the Biblical narrative, he dates the creation of the world something less than six thousand years in the past.” But Warfield suggests that Calvin believed Moses “accommodated himself to [the] grade of intellectual preparation [of men at large], and confines himself to what meets their eyes” (196). He further posits,

Calvin doubtless had no theory whatever of evolution; but he teaches a doctrine of evolution... [But] his doctrine of evolution is entirely unfruitful. The whole process takes places [sic] in the limits of six natural days. That the doctrine should be of use as an explanation of the mode of production of the ordered world, it was requisite that these six days should be lengthened out into six periods,—six ages of the growth of the world. Had that been done Calvin would have been a precursor of the modern evolutionary theorists. (209)

It would seem from this that Warfield viewed the semantic range of יום as flexible enough to stretch to a period longer than a day, even an age.

Augustus H. Strong (1836–1921) wrote, “The Scriptures recognize a peculiar difficulty in putting spiritual truths into earthly language ... Words have to be taken from a common, and to be put to a larger and more sacred, use, so that they ‘stagger under their weight of meaning’—e.g., the word ‘day,’ in Genesis 1” (Strong [1886] 1907, 35). Strong (393–394) outlines his position as follows:

We adopt neither (a) the allegorical, or mythical, (b) the hyperliteral, nor (c) the hyperscientific interpretation of the Mosaic narrative; but rather (d) the pictorial-summary interpretation,—which holds that the account is a rough sketch of the history of creation, true to all its essential features, but presented in a graphic form suited to the common mind and to earlier as well as to later ages.... This general correspondence of the narrative with the teachings of science, and its power to adapt itself to every advance in human knowledge, differences it from every other cosmogony current among men.

He reacts to a literal interpretation of יום in this way:

The *hyperliteral interpretation* would withdraw the narrative from all comparison with the conclusions of science, by putting the ages of geological history between the first and second verses of Gen. 1 ... To this view we object that there is no indication, in the Mosaic narrative, of so vast an interval between the first and the second verses; that there is no indication, in the geological history, of any such break between the ages of preparation and the present time (see Hugh Miller, *Testimony of the Rocks*, 141–178); and that there are indications in the Mosaic record itself that the word “day” is not used in its literal sense;

while the other Scriptures unquestionably employ it to designate a period of indefinite duration. (Strong [1886] 1907, 394; underlining added)

In 1909, C.I. Scofield (1843–1921) first published his famous reference Bible. A few of his remarks concerning the creation account were to prove immensely influential over the course of the ensuing decades, including advancing the Gap Theory, which was “enormously popularized” by a mere footnote (Fields 1976, ix). Concerning the semantic range of יום, Scofield ([1909] 1917, 4) asserted,

The word “day” is used in Scripture in three ways: (1) that part of the solar day of twenty-four hours which is light (Gen. 1. 5, 14; John 9. 4; 11. 9); (2) such a day, set apart for some distinctive purpose, as, “day of atonement” (Lev. 23. 27); “day of judgment” (Mt. 10. 15); (3) a period of time, long or short, during which certain revealed purposes of God are to be accomplished, as “day of the LORD.”

This definition was modified slightly in the 1967 edition of the *Oxford NIV Scofield Study Bible*, edited by E. Schuyler English:

The word “day” is used in Scripture in four ways: (1) that part of the solar day of twenty-four hours which is light (Gen. 1:5,14; Jn 11:9); (2) a period of twenty-four hours (Mt. 17:1; Lk. 24:21); (3) a time set apart for some distinctive purpose, as “Day of Atonement” (Lev. 23:27); and (4) a longer period of time, during which certain revealed purposes of God are to be accomplished (cp. 2 Pet. 3:10). (Scofield and English 1967, 1)

In his 1930 Genesis commentary, John Skinner (1851–1925) opposed the idea of יום standing for a long age. Instead, he advocated a plain sense reading: “The interpretation of יום as *æon*, a favourite resource of harmonists of science and revelation, is opposed to the plain sense of the passage, and has no warrant in Heb. usage (not even Ps. 90⁴).... If the writer had had *æons* in his mind, he would hardly have missed the opportunity of stating how many millenniums each embraced” (Skinner 1930, 21).

In 1942, Leupold (1942, 57) cites Skinner when arguing for a literal reading of יום in the creation account in his commentary on Genesis:

There ought to be no need of refuting the idea that *yôm* means period. Reputable dictionaries like Buhl, B D B or K. W. know nothing of this notion. Hebrew dictionaries are our primary source of reliable information concerning Hebrew words. Commentators with critical leanings utter statements that are very decided in this instance [e.g., Skinner, Dillmann].... There is one other meaning of the word “day” which some misapprehend by failing to think through its exact bearing: *yôm* may mean “time” in a very general way, as in 2:4 *beyôm*, or Isa. 11:16; cf. B D B, p. 399, No. 6, for numerous illustrations. But

that use cannot substantiate so utterly different an idea as “period.” These two concepts lie far apart.

Nevertheless, Wilbur M. Smith (1894–1976) proceeded to assert quite the opposite in his 1945 apologetics book:

First of all, we must dismiss from our mind any conception of a definite period of time, either for creation itself, or for the length of the so-called six creative days. The Bible does not tell us when the world was created. The first chapter of Genesis could take us back to periods millions of years antedating the appearance of man....

In the second place, we must disabuse ourselves of the idea that these six periods of creation corresponded to our “day” of twenty-four hours. Some still hold this view, but it certainly is not necessary, and the fact that the word day in the Old Testament, even in the first three chapters of Genesis carries many meanings other than that of a period of twenty-four hours, give us perfect freedom in considering it here as an unlimited, though definite period. (Smith 1945, 312)

The same year, Karl Barth (1886–1968) published Volume III, Part 1, of *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*, on the subject of *The Doctrine of Creation: The Work of Creation*. His writings were later to be commandeered by Dutch theologian N.H. Ridderbos (1909–2007) in defense of the Framework Hypothesis (Ridderbos 1957, 12–16). Ridderbos argued, “Regarding the ‘days,’ according to Barth one must think of days of twenty-four hours; but this does not mean that Barth believes the world to have been in fact created in six such days” (15).

According to Louis Berkhof (1873–1957), by the late 1940s his *Systematic Theology* was “used as a textbook in many Theological Seminaries and Bible Schools” in the USA (Berkhof [1941/1949] 1979, 5). It is significant, therefore, at least with regards to this study, that, while he favors a “literal interpretation of the term ‘day’ in Gen. 1,” (154) in his discussion he admits,

The Hebrew word *yom* does not always denote a period of twenty-four hours in Scripture, and it is not always used in the same sense even in the narrative of creation. It may mean daylight in distinction from darkness, Gen. 1:5, 16, 18; daylight and darkness together, Gen. 1:5, 8, 13 etc.; the six days taken together, Gen. 2:4; and an indefinite period marked in its entire length by some characteristic feature, as trouble, Ps. 20:1, wrath, Job 20:28, prosperity, Eccl. 7:14, or salvation II Cor. 6:2. (152–153)

In 1948 Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871–1952) was more equivocal:

Genesis clearly declares that there were six successive days in which God created the heavens and the earth of today. The best of scholars have

disagreed on whether these are literal twenty-four hour periods or vast periods of time.... A literal twenty-four hour period seems to be implied when each is measured by words like, ‘And the evening and the morning were the first day,’ etc. On the other hand, it is reflected in nature that much time has passed since the forming of material things, and the Bible does use the word *day* symbolically when referring to a period of time. (Chafer 1948, 108–109; underlining added)

The Day-Age advocate Edwin K. Gedney (1950, 51), a science professor with master’s degrees in geology, wrote in 1950,

The students of the last century put much study upon the uses of the word [“*yom*”], for it was the basis for the chief difficulty in the controversy between the Biblical and scientific accounts. They quickly discovered that the word may be interpreted in a number of ways....

With this orientation we may proceed to suggest a harmony of Genesis with geological facts and with recent geological speculation.

Indeed, in his article on “Genesis” in *The New Bible Commentary*, E. F. Kevan (1953, 77) noted in 1953,

A ... view ... held by many at the present time ... is that each ‘day’ represents, not a period of twenty-four hours, but a geological age. It is pointed out that the sun, the measurer of planetary time, did not exist during the first three days; further, that the term ‘day’ is used in [Gen] ii. 4 for the whole sixfold period of creation; and that in other parts of Scripture the word ‘day’ is employed figuratively of a time of undefined length, as in Ps. xc. 4.

According to John W. Haas Jr. (1979, 177), Ramm’s 1954 book, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, was “a pivotal event for evangelicals concerned with the relation between science and Christian faith.” Regarding יום Ramm (1954, 222) wrote,

The problem of the meaning of *yom* is not fully decided as to whether it can mean period or not. The word is one which has many uses as we have already indicated. We are not presently persuaded that it can be stretched so as to mean *period* or *epoch* or *age*, as such terms are used in geology. Though not closing the door on the age-day interpretation of the word *yom*, we do not feel that lexicography of the Hebrew language will as yet permit it.

However, he concludes, “We believe that the six days are *pictorial-revelatory* days, not literal days” (Ramm 1954, 222).

Though Ramm was “a progressive creationist,” and “not a theistic evolutionist” (293), he nevertheless suggests, “Evolution may be entertained as a possible *secondary* cause or *mediate* cause in biological science” (280). His book evidently provoked a strong reaction

from literal creationists, but was received positively by many.⁷ For instance, writing in *A Bernard Ramm Festschrift* in 1979, Richard T. Wright (1979, 195) testified that Ramm's book affirmed his belief in evolution, adding, "I think it is safe to say that today the majority of Christian biologists have accepted the evolutionary hypothesis as God's creative method, and have successfully integrated it into their theistic world view. Much of the credit for this can certainly be traced to Ramm's book."

However, in 1961, John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris published their seminal work, *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*. Here they deal very briefly with the days of creation, asserting, "Since God's revealed Word describes ... Creation as taking place in six 'days' and since there apparently is no contextual basis for understanding these days in any sort of symbolic sense, it is an act of both faith and reason to accept them, literally, as days" (Whitcomb and Morris 1961, 228). The authors point to an earlier article by Morris "for a brief summation of Biblical evidence that these 'days' are intended to be understood literally," and among several additional corroborating sources they include Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*.

While finding "strong reasons for taking the word [yôm] literally in [the] particular context" of Genesis 1, D.F. Payne (1964, 8) nevertheless conceded in a 1962 lecture in Cambridge, United Kingdom, "Those who make the 'days' aeons can reasonably claim that the word yôm is often used figuratively in the Old Testament." The same year, Buswell II Jr. (1962, 1:141) reasoned,

Since the material which is narrated in stages of six "days" in chapter one is all summarized as having taken place "in the day that Jahweh God made the earth and the heavens" in 2:4, it would seem quite obvious and clear that the author uses the word "day" in a figurative sense, just as we often do in modern English, and as the Hebrew prophets did in such expressions as "the day of the Lord," etc....

When we say that the word "day" is used figuratively, we mean that it represents a period of time of undesignated length and unspecified boundaries, merging into other "days" or periods.

How יוֹם Has Been Handled in Discussions Pertaining to the Age of the Universe over the Past Fifty Years

Appendix 1 is a compilation of the key points made by over forty scholars in their discussions of the days in the creation account, and of the age of the universe.

The data are arranged such that the viewpoints of each scholar, or team of scholars, are contained on a single page in three rows. Each row presents, across three columns,

- the position advocated,
- the argumentation employed in favor of that position,
- references to any supporting evidence, whether Scriptural or scholarly.

The three rows cover the subjects of

1. the semantic range of יוֹם,
2. the meaning of יוֹם in Genesis 1,
3. the age of the universe.

Brown (2014, 285) speaks for many scholars when he observes that, from the time of the early church fathers right up to the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, "Non-literal interpretations of the days of Genesis formed a ... minority strand." Even in the modern era, with the growth of interest in alternative interpretations, such as the Day-Age Theory, there has been a consistent voice, from both conservatives and liberals, in support of the traditional literal reading. Furthermore, the literal sense of a term is, by definition, its usual or most basic sense. For these reasons, since the burden of proof lies with advocates of non-literal interpretations, the following analysis of data will focus primarily on argumentation given in support of such a stance.

Extended Definitions of יוֹם, and Lines of Argument in Support of an Extended Semantic Range of יוֹם

Archer (1984, 327) observes, "All biblical scholars admit that yôm ('day') may be used in a figurative or symbolic manner, as well as in a literal sense." Beyond the basic meaning of יוֹם as the daylight period in the daytime-nighttime cycle, and its secondary application (by implication) in covering a full 24-hour cycle, a range of extended definitions has been suggested.

An attempt has been made below to list the proposed extended definitions of יוֹם roughly in order, from less specific time frames to more specific time frames, and with increasing length of time frame. Phrases having equivalent meaning are grouped together. Scholars describe יוֹם in the following terms:

- "used 'figuratively'" (Fields 1976, 175), "not literal days" (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 164);
- "used figuratively of opportune time ... [if] limited by some ... qualifying statement" (Dake 2001);⁸
- "time period other than day" (Bradley and Olsen

⁷ Ramm relates, "The book was a problem to those who had a very literal approach to the book of Genesis or who thought that any kind of positive word about evolution was a betrayal of the cause. It was that kind of person I got the most static from. But over the years, for every letter of protest, there've been something like 20 of approval" (Haas, Ramm, and Ramm 1979, 179).

⁸ Page 37 in *Complete Concordance and Cyclopedic Index*, and 83 in main text.

- 1984, 299), “another sense [other] than ‘twenty-four hours’” (Kelly 1997, 108);
- “a point of time” (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 44), “a specific point of time” (Stambaugh 2003, 52);
 - “more time than a standard day” (Craig 2008, 201), “periods of time greater than twenty-four hours” (Kulikovsky 2009, 149), “figuratively ... to denote a period of time longer than twenty-four hours” (D.A. Young 1977, 83);
 - “time in a general sense” (Morris 1974, 223), “a general or vague concept of time” (Stambaugh 2003, 52);
 - “a period of time” (Longman III 2005, 104), “some period” (Mathews 1996, 149);
 - “a period of time ... [if] limited by some ... qualifying statement” (Dake 2001);⁹
 - “with a preposition, as in *bēyôm*, it is an indefinite temporal clause” (Craig 2008, 201), and many other scholars state or imply the same;
 - “the whole period of creation” (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 163), “all the days [of creation] together” (Williams 1988, 108), and many other scholars state or imply the same;
 - “an occasion when God acts” (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 163), “a time of divine visitation or judgment” (Oden 1987, 234);
 - “days of God [having] no human analogies” (Kidner 1967, 56);
 - “a longer period of time, during which certain revealed purposes of God are to be accomplished” (Schofield and English 1967, 1);
 - “a portion of the year” (Kelly 1997, 108);
 - “a particular season or time” (Fischer 1990, 17; citing *WOTWS* [1870] 1990, 109);
 - “a year” (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 44), “a period of a year” (Stambaugh 2003, 52);
 - “an indefinite period of time” (Beall 2017, 159; Oden 1987, 234), “a period of unspecified length” (Collins 2006, 128), “indefinite periods of time” (Feinberg 2006, 592), “time of undesignated length” (Fischer 1990, 15), “unmeasured period of time” (Hamilton 1990, 53; Sarfati 2015, 119, citing Hamilton 1990, 53), “periods of indefinite length” (Harris 1995, 22), “a period of time ... of undefined length” (Lennox 2011, 51), “indefinite time” (Morris 1976, 54, 56), “periods of indeterminate time” (Munyon 1995, 231);
 - “stages of unspecified length” (Archer 2007, 159);
 - “a more extended space of time” (Archer 1984, 328), “a longer period of time” (Grudem 1994, 293; Strauss 2017b, 169, citing Schofield 1967, 1), “a long ‘time’” (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 44), “longer periods of time” (Newman and Eckelmann Jr. 1977, 61), “a long but finite time period” (Ross 2017, 162; Ross and Archer 2001, 125);
 - “indefinite or considerable length of time” (Blocher [1979] 1984, 44), “a period of time, however short or long ... even ages” (Williams 1988, 108);
 - “epoch ... season ... time” (Gentry Jr. 2016, 96; citing Dabney [1878] 1972, 255);
 - “epochs or long periods of time” (Erickson 2013, 351), “a long time; a whole period” (Fischer 1990, 17; citing *WOTWS* [1870] 1990, 109), “a long period of time” (Geisler 2003, 642), “era” (Hamilton 1990, 53; Sarfati 2015, 119, citing Hamilton 1990, 53), “age” (Irons and Kline 2001, 250), “ages ... ‘epoch’” (Kidner 1967, 56), “generations—eons, long historical ages” (Schwab 2017a, 137);
 - “unusually long period of time, even up to a millennium” (Hamilton 1990, 53; Sarfati 2015, 119, citing Hamilton 1990, 53);
 - “[Hosea’s] ‘third day’ ... possibly ... a year [or] ... the Millennium” (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 164);
 - “the coming messianic age” (Blocher [1979] 1984, 44);
 - “God’s ‘day’ ... as a thousand years” (Mathews 1996, 149);
 - “an epoch that extends [from the seventh day] onward into eternity” (Lennox 2011, 50), “forever” (Harris 1995, 23; Schwab 2017a, 137).
- What is immediately striking is the wide range of expression given to a whole spectrum of meanings, from “a specific point of time” (Stambaugh 2003, 52) right up to “forever” (Harris 1995, 23; Schwab 2017a, 137; similarly, Lennox 2011, 50). Such semantic flexibility contrasts markedly with most lexical entries for יום, though it accords with the definitions found in *TWOT* (1980) and *WOTWS* ([1870] 1990).
- Table 4 summarizes and merges all the types of non-literal ‘day’ advocated by scholars whose writings were examined in this study (see Appendix 1).¹⁰ Most are of indefinite duration. However, there are three firm proposals for non-literal days of limited duration:
1. a ‘day’ of creating/making lasting a week (or longer),
 2. a ‘day’ of God’s speaking with Moses on Mount Sinai lasting forty days and forty nights,
 3. a ‘day’ in YHWH’s eyes lasting a millennium.
- We will briefly discuss each of these three proposals in turn, before looking at days of indefinite duration.

A Day Equating to a Week

Archer (1984, 327) speaks for many when he asserts, “It is perfectly evident that *yôm* in Genesis 2:4 could not refer to a twenty-four hour day.”

⁹ Page 37 in *Complete Concordance and Cyclopedic Index*, and 83 in main text.

¹⁰ In Table 4, wording in parentheses is either for explanatory purposes or indicates that the enclosed text is from some, but not all, scholars.

Table 4. Suggested types of non-literal 'day' with associated biblical references. (Full reference details of the advocates were omitted in this table for the sake of clarity. Readers wishing to locate the place in which a given scholar advocates a particular value for דַּי may consult their entry in Appendix 1 and/or the Scripture index of their work listed in the reference list.)

Referent	Proposed Value	Reference(s)	Advocates
Definite Limited Duration (in sequence of increasing length)			
'day' of making/creating	6 days (whether literal days or longer days)	Genesis 2:4 (Schwab includes 5:1 and suggests that in both instances "day" is "a synonym for 'generations'—eons, long historical ages")	Archer, Beall, Craigen, Feinberg, Fischer, Geisler, Grudem, Harris, Irons & Kline (?), Lennox, Lewis & Demarest, Newman & Eckelmann, Schwab, Strauss, Williams
'day' of God's speaking with Moses on Mount Sinai	40 days and nights	Numbers 3:1	Williams
'day' in YHWH's eyes	millennium	Psalms 90:4; 2 Peter 3:8	Blocher, Geisler, Hamilton, Irons & Kline, Kelly, Kidner, Lewis & Demarest, Mathews, Ross, Sarfati, Williams
Indefinite Limited Duration (in alphabetical order)			
'day' of adversity	period	Proverbs 24:10; Ecclesiastes 7:14	Dake, Grudem
'day' of affliction	period	Jeremiah 16:19	Dake
'day' of battle	(indefinite) period	Proverbs 21:31	Feinberg, Grudem
'day' of calamity	period	Jeremiah 18:17	Dake
'day' of Christ	period	Philippians 2:16	Dake
'day' of darkness	period	Joel 2:2	Dake
'day' of death	period	Ecclesiastes 8:8	Dake
'day' of distress	(indefinite) period	Proverbs 24:10; Obadiah 14	Dake, Feinberg
'day' of evil/disaster	(indefinite) period	Jeremiah 17:17–18	Dake, Oden
'day' of exodus from Egypt	indefinite period	Jeremiah 11:4–7	Oden
'day' of gladness	period	Song of Solomon 3:11	Dake
'day' of God	period	2 Peter 3:12	Dake
'day' of God Almighty	period	Revelation 16:14	Dake
'day' of grief	period	Isaiah 17:11	Dake
'day' of harvest	(indefinite) period	Proverbs 25:13	Archer, Feinberg, Grudem
'day' of His anger/wrath	(indefinite) period	Job 20:28; Psalm 110:5; Proverbs 11:4; Romans 2:5; Revelation 6:17	Dake, Feinberg, Grudem, Lewis and Demarest, Oden, Ross and Archer
'day' of His coming	period	Malachi 3:2	Dake
'day' of His fierce anger	period	Isaiah 13:13	Dake
'day' of His indignation	period	Ezekiel 22:24	Dake
'day' of judgment	period	2 Peter 2:9	Dake
'day' of power	period	Psalm 110:3	Dake
'day' of prosperity	(indefinite) period	Ecclesiastes 7:14	Dake, Feinberg, Grudem
'day' of redemption	period	Ephesians 4:30	Dake
'day' of salvation	period	2 Corinthians 6:2	Dake
'day' of sickness	indefinite period	Jeremiah 17:16	Oden
'day' of temptation	period	Psalm 95:8	Dake
'day' of the Son's revelation	period	Luke 17:30	Dake
'day' of trouble	(indefinite) period	Psalms 20:1; 102:2	Dake, Feinberg, Grudem
'day' of vengeance	period	Isaiah 61:2	Dake
'day' of visitation	period	1 Peter 2:12	Dake
'day' of/for YHWH/the Lord	(long, indefinite) period, known only to God	Isaiah 2:12, 21; 13:6, 9; Jeremiah 46:10; Ezekiel 13:5; 30:2, 3; Joel 1:15; 2:1, 31; Amos 5:18, 20; Obadiah 15; Zephaniah 1:14–18; Zechariah 14:7; 1 Thessalonians 5:2; 2 Peter 3:10	Archer, Collins, Dake, Feinberg, Geisler, Grudem, Hayward, Lennox, Lewis & Demarest, Longman III, Newman & Eckelmann, Oden
"(in) that 'day'"	messianic age	Isaiah 2:11; 4:2; Amos 9:11; Zechariah 12:3; 2 Thessalonians 2:3	Blocher, Kidner, Lewis & Demarest, Oden
Hosea's third 'day'	perhaps a year or a millennium	Hosea 6:2 (cf. 2 Kings 19:29)	Hayward, Irons & Kline, Ross, Ross & Archer
Jesus' three 'days'	figurative	Luke 13:32	Hayward
the last 'day'	indefinite period		Lennox
Indefinite Unlimited Duration			
'day' of God's Sabbath rest	indefinite, forever	Psalms 95:11; John 5; Hebrews 4:1–11	Harris, Lennox, Mathews, Ross, Schwab

Together with Ross he affirms, “Here the word day refers to all six creation days ... Obviously, then it refers to a period longer than 24 hours” (Ross and Archer 2001, 147). Mathews (1996, 149) agrees, “*Yôm* ... is used as a temporal expression for the entire creative period of six days in the *tôlēdôt* section ..., ‘in the day they were created.’” Fischer (1990, 16) states, “In Genesis 2:4 ... ‘day’ [is] a coverall to apply to the previous six days of creation.” Craigen (2008, 201), while advocating a literal reading of the creation days in Genesis 1, admits, “Since in the case of Genesis 2:4 the immediate context focuses on the creation of the heavens and the earth and everything in them, then ‘in the day’ here covers the whole six days of creation.” Geisler (2003, 643) comments, “‘The day’ [in Gen 2:4] means six ‘days,’ which indicates a broad meaning of the word day in the Bible, just as we have in English.” Similarly, Feinberg (2006, 593) writes, “Since ‘day’ in this verse refers to all six days of creation, plus the events of Gen 1:1 (creation *ex nihilo*), it cannot in 2:4 mean one twenty-four-hour solar day. The different uses of *yôm* show that the days of Gen 1 could be literal twenty-four-hour days, but they could just as easily be much longer.” Other scholars advocating this week-long ‘day’ include Grudem (1994, 293), Strauss (2017b, 169), Williams (1988, 108), and Young (1982, 58).

A Day Equating to Forty Days

With regards to the second suggestion, J. Rodman Williams (1988, 108) alone asserts that, in Numbers 3:1, “the day that the Lord spake with Moses’ ... lasted forty calendar days and nights!” However, Moses’s extended time on Mount Sinai was recorded in Exodus 34:28, whereas more recently, Numbers 1:1 opens with the immediate and very specific temporal context, “YHWH spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the tent of meeting, on the first day of the second month, in the second year after they had come out of the land of Egypt, saying” (Numbers 1:1, *ESV**). So יום in Numbers 3:1 would appear to refer to the precise date mentioned in Numbers 1:1.

A Day Equating to a Millennium

Many scholars advocating a relatively broad semantic range for יום—including Blocher, Geisler, Hamilton, Irons and Kline, Kelly, Kidner, Lewis & Demarest, Mathews, Ross, Sarfati, and Williams—point to Psalm 90:4 or 2 Peter 3:8 as evidence that “day” can equate to a long period of time, such as a millennium see discussion on pages 106–107). A few refer to Hosea 6:2, including Hayward ([1985] [1995] 2005, 164), who observes,

In Hosea 6:2 it says that ‘on the third day he [God] will raise us [Israel] up.’ Long before the present controversy, commentators were pointing out that this ‘third day’ was evidently figurative, and was quite possibly a reference to the events described in 2 Kings 19.29, in which case it would represent a year. Some expositors even equated Hosea’s ‘third day’ with the Millennium.

Similarly, Ross and Archer (2001, 148) note, “For centuries Bible commentators have noted that the term *days* in [Hosea 6:2] ... refers to a year, years, a thousand years, or maybe more.”¹¹ However, McComiskey (2009, 88), in his commentary on Hosea, though not specifying precisely what “days” in 6:2 equates to, intimates that it represents a relatively brief period:

The period of three days represents a short while.... Hosea assures the people that God will respond to their repentance in a short time. He designates this brief period “after two days” and says that the nation will arise on the “third day.” ... The point is that when the people respond in sincerity to God, his response to them will be quick; they will have to wait only a short time for relief.

Days of Indefinite Limited Duration

Regarding the instances in which יום is said to indicate a period of indefinite limited duration, Finis Jennings Dake (2001)¹² lists “28 Kinds of Days in Scripture” that he believes equate to “a period of time.” His list is by far the longest of its kind among the works studied in this thesis. Several entries, e.g., “day of darkness” (Joel 2:2), relate to the special Day of YHWH, which many scholars—including those who read יום literally in the creation account—believe to be figurative. For example, Feinberg (2006, 592) states, “‘The day of LORD,’ ... in most cases is an eschatological day whose length only God knows (Isa 13:6, 9; Joel 1:15; 2:1; Amos 5:18; Zeph 1:14).” Williams (1988, 108) speaks for many when he writes, “Many apocalyptic passages in the Bible ... speak of a coming ‘day of the Lord’ in which a great number of events will occur. There is little or no suggestion that everything will occur in twenty-four hours.” Hayward ([1985] [1995] 2005, 163) asserts, “The expression ‘a (the) day of the Lord’ is used many times in both Old and New Testaments as a figure of speech. It means ‘an occasion when God acts’ and gives no indication of how long that action by God will last.” Similarly, Newman and Eckelmann Jr. (1977, 74) regard “day of the Lord” in many places as an example of an exception to the usual meaning of יום. They reason, one cannot “prove that *yom*, when used with a number, takes on the more restricted idea of a twenty-

¹¹ Ross (2017, 163) writes much the same.

¹² Page 1040 in main text, and 37 in *Complete Concordance and Cyclopedic Index*.

four-hour day. Zechariah 14:7, it appears, speaks of the day of the Lord as a continuing period of time, and uses exactly the same Hebrew construction as is used for the ‘first day’ in Genesis 1:5” (61). Ross and Archer (2001, 125) state, “The Hebrew terms *yôm* (singular) and *yamim* (plural) often refer to an extended time frame. Perhaps the most familiar passages are those referring to God’s ‘day of wrath.’”

While many scholars would agree with Dake about the figurative nature of יוֹם יְהוָה (and related phrases), some of the entries in his list find less support, including “day of prosperity” and “day of adversity” in Ecclesiastes 7:14. Together with Feinberg, and Grudem, Dake (2001, 1040) sees “day of prosperity” here as referring to a period of time.¹³ In the same verse, Grudem (1994, 293) also regards “day of adversity” as a period. Some modern EVV also evidently prefer this reading. For instance, the *NIV* has “when times are good” and “when times are bad,” respectively. Most other EVV render both phrases with the definite article, viz., “the day of prosperity,” and “the day of adversity” (including, *ESV*, *NRSV*, *NKJV*, *KJV*, *NASB*, *HCSB*, *JPS*). The use of the definite article in such a context, implies a generic sense that is somewhat akin to the idea of “a period.” However, the Hebrew phrases lack the definite article, viz., יוֹם טוֹבָה (“a day of good/prosperity”), and יוֹם רָעָה (“a day of evil/distress/calamity”).

Days of Indefinite Unlimited Duration

A few scholars maintain that “day” in the Bible can even refer to an indefinite unlimited timeframe, viz., “forever.” For example, Harris (1995, 23; underlining added) argues that the seventh day “rest of God is cited in Ps. 95:11 as lasting until Joshua’s time and is further interpreted in Heb. 4:8–11 as lasting forever.” Schwab (2017a, 137; underlining added) asserts, “The Hebrew word for ‘day’ can mean any number of things. Genesis 2:4 reads, ‘In the day that God created the heavens and the earth.’ There and in 5:1, ‘day’ seems to be a synonym for ‘generations’—eons, long historical ages. Day Seven does not have an evening and a morning and seems to go on forever.” Lennox, like many scholars, sees the seventh day of the creation account as distinct from the previous six days, especially given the absence of the evening-and-morning formula. He reasons,

The omission is striking and calls for an explanation. If, for instance, we ask how long God rested from his work of creation, as distinct from his work of upholding the universe, then Augustine’s suggestion, that God sanctified the seventh day by making it an epoch that extends onward into eternity, makes good sense; and this is followed by many commentators. (Lennox 2011, 50; underlining added)

Lines of Argument in Support of a Non-Literal Interpretation of יוֹם in Genesis 1

A variety of argumentation is used in support of a non-literal interpretation of יוֹם in Genesis 1. In addition to the numerous points presented in Appendix 1, see, for instance, the key headings listed in Geisler (2003, 642–644), Ross (2017, 162–163), and Ross and Archer (2001, 144–153). Table 5 presents the most frequently used arguments encountered in this study, in approximately descending order of use.

Most Common Lines of Argument

The most common three arguments are exegetical in nature: (1) the perceived indefinite, ongoing duration of the seventh ‘day,’ (2) the apparent impossibility of fitting all the many events of the sixth ‘day’ into a single daytime period, and (3) the fact that the sun was not created until the fourth ‘day.’ Regarding the first, D.A. Young (1982, 59) asserts,

The seventh day, the day of God’s rest, is still going on and is therefore a long period of time. The fact that it does not say of the seventh day, as it does of the other six, that ‘there was evening and there was morning—the seventh day,’ was viewed as one clear indication that the seventh day was never terminated. Further, New Testament passages such as Hebrews 4 gave further credence to the continuing existence of God’s Sabbath. If the seventh day was a long period of time then it is also clear ... that the preceding six days might also legitimately be treated as long periods of time of indeterminate length.

Regarding the second most common argument, Grudem (1994, 294) writes, “The sixth day includes so many events [Genesis 2:15–25] that it must have been longer than twenty-four hours.... If the sixth day is shown by contextual considerations to be considerably longer than an ordinary twenty-four-hour day, then does not the context itself favor the sense of *day* as simply a ‘period of time’ of unspecified length?” Regarding the third most common argument, Longman III (2005, 104) reasons, “Even a superficial reading of Genesis 1 should lead the interpreter to question whether the Hebrew word *yom* (day) should be understood as a twenty-four-hour day. After all, a twenty-four-hour day is defined by the alternation of sun and moon. But these are not even created until the fourth ‘day!’”

The next two most common arguments relate to the integrity of the semantic range of יוֹם, which, if combined into a single argument, would be top of the list. The first looks for support for a long creation ‘day’ from suggested non-literal occurrences of יוֹם elsewhere in the OT. For example, Geisler (2003, 642) argues, “There are many indications within the text of Scripture to support the belief that the creation

¹³ Back in 1941, Berkhof (1979, 153) had also understood the day of prosperity in Ecclesiastes 7:14 as “an indefinite period.”

Table 5. Some of the most commonly used arguments in support of a non-literal interpretation of יום in the creation account, listed in approximately descending order of frequency of use.

1	The seventh day cannot be an ordinary day since it does not conclude with the formula, “and there was evening, and there was morning,” and Hebrews 4 indicates that it is an ongoing ‘day’ e.g., “The seventh day, the day of God’s rest, is still going on and is therefore a long period of time. The fact that it does not say of the seventh day, as it does of the other six, that ‘there was evening and there was morning—the seventh day,’ was viewed as one clear indication that the seventh day was never terminated. Further, New Testament passages such as Hebrews 4 gave further credence to the continuing existence of God’s Sabbath. If the seventh day was a long period of time then it is also clear ... that the preceding six days might also legitimately be treated as long periods of time of indeterminate length” (Young 1982, 59)
2	The sixth day is too long to be a normal-length day e.g., “The sixth day includes so many events [Gen 2:15-25] that it must have been longer than twenty-four hours.... If the sixth day is shown by contextual considerations to be considerably longer than an ordinary twenty-four-hour day, then does not the context itself favor the sense of <i>day</i> as simply a ‘period of time’ of unspecified length?” (Grudem 1994, 294)
3	The sun was not created until the fourth day, so ‘day’ cannot be literal prior to this e.g., “Even a superficial reading of Genesis 1 should lead the interpreter to question whether the Hebrew word <i>yom</i> (day) should be understood as a twenty-four hour day. After all, a twenty-four-hour day is defined by the alternation of sun and moon. But these are not even created until the fourth ‘day!’” (Longman III 2005, 104)
4	יום is used elsewhere in the HB with a non-literal meaning, including to refer to an indefinitely long period e.g., “There are many indications within the text of Scripture to support the belief that the creation ‘days’ were longer than twenty-four hours... [the first being that] the word <i>day</i> (<i>yom</i>) often means a long period of time [Ps 90:4; Joel 2:31; 2 Pet 3:10]” (Geisler 2003, 642)
5	יום has two or three different meanings in the creation account, viz., twelve hours (Gen 1:5a) and/or twenty-four hours (Gen 1:5b), and six days (Gen 2:4) e.g., “The ... understanding of the days ... [as] 24-hour periods ... is ... rather unlikely [because] the word ‘day’ ... is used in several different ways in the Genesis 1:1–2:4 passage. First, it refers to the light that was separated from darkness ... (1:5). Second, it refers to light and darkness together ... (also 1:5). Third, it refers to all the days together ... (2:4 ...).” (Williams 1988, 108)
6	Key church fathers, like Augustine, interpreted the days figuratively e.g., “Augustine held a nonliteral interpretation of the days, and he was followed by Anselm, Peter Lombard, and others.... No one can deny that nonliteral approaches to the creation days have a venerable place in the history of Christian interpretation” (Irons and Kline 2001, 219)
7	The creation account is unique, and therefore it is illegitimate to interpret יום in Genesis 1 in light of its use elsewhere in Scripture e.g., “There is no other place in the Old Testament where the intent is to describe events that involve multiple and/or sequential, indefinite periods of time. If the intent of Genesis 1 is to describe creation as occurring in six, indefinite time periods, it is a unique Old Testament event being recorded.... [Arguments for the use of ‘yom’ as a normal day] elsewhere in the Old Testament cannot be given as unequivocal exegetical significance [—and constitute a common fallacy—] in view of the uniqueness of the events being described in Genesis 1 (i.e., sequential, indefinite time periods)” (Bradley and Olsen 1984, 299)
8	The literary style, especially the arrangement of the days, favors a figurative interpretation e.g., “The whole of Genesis 1 [has] a surreal quality ... Perhaps Moses dreamed the chapter or saw it in a prophetic vision. Hence it is symbolic. Or maybe God took a week to reveal it. Thus Moses lived through the six days, and they are not a timescale for creation at all. The best explanation is that the seven days are a literary device” (Schwab 2017b, 166)
9	Scientific evidence, especially geology, contradicts a literal interpretation of days e.g., “Ultimately, responsible geology must determine the length of the Genesis days, even as science centuries earlier settled the issue of the rotation of the earth about the sun” (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 29)
10	יום is the only, or most appropriate, Hebrew word that could have been used to designate long periods of time e.g., “Biblical Hebrew has no word other than <i>yôm</i> to denote a long timespan” (Ross and Archer 2001, 125)
11	The lack of uniformity in the syntax of the days—viz., “day one,” “a second day,” “a third day,” “a fourth day,” “a fifth day,” “the sixth day”—suggests a non-literal reading of the creation account e.g., “The presence of the article indicates that the final two days are special ... This point of grammar may ... be a signal to us ... There is ... [a] possibility ... that the writer did not intend us to think of the first six days as days of a single earth week, but rather as a sequence of six creation days ... that might well have been separated by long periods of time” (Lennox 2011, 53–54)

‘days’ were longer than twenty-four hours.... [the first being that] the word *day* (*yom*) often means a long period of time [Psalm 90:4; Joel 2:31; 2 Peter 3:10].” The second main argument relating to the semantic range of יום, is the perceived inconsistency of its meaning within the creation account itself. Williams (1988, 108) concludes,

The ... understanding of the days ... [as] 24-hour periods ... is ... rather unlikely [because] the word ‘day’ ... is used in several different ways in the Genesis 1:1–2:4 passage. First, it refers to the light that was separated from darkness ... (1:5). Second, it refers to light and darkness together ... (also 1:5). Third, it refers to all the days together ... (2:4 ...).

Arguments and Counter-Arguments Regarding the Relevance of Exodus 20:8–11

We now turn to an issue that is not included in Table 5, because it is not an argument in support of a non-literal interpretation of דִּי in the creation account. Rather it originates with young-universe advocates of a literal reading of “day.” We discuss it here because it is often the subject of counter-arguments by those who prefer a figurative reading.

Exodus 20:11 forms part of YHWH’s commandments at Sinai, specifically the injunction regarding the weekly day of rest, in which He makes explicit reference to the days of creation. The pertinent verses are reproduced in Table 6 from the *ESV** and *BHS*.

Exodus 20:11, along with 31:17, is understood by a number of scholars as pertinent to the interpretation of דִּי in Genesis 1. For example, Noel Weeks (1978, 18) maintains, “Exodus 20:8–11 is significant in that it gives us a clear answer to the debated question about whether the ‘days’ of Genesis are to be taken literally. The commandment loses completely its cogency if they are not taken literally.” Similarly, Allen P. Ross (1985, 28) comments, “the normal understanding of the fourth commandment (Ex. 20:11) would suggest [the] interpretation” that “the days of Creation ... are literal 24-hour days of divine activity.” Beall (2013, 98) writes in response to C. John Collins’s analogical reading of creation days,

Exodus 20:8–11 sets up the Sabbath, where man is to work six literal days and rest the seventh, to pattern God’s work of creation in six literal days! The Hebrew word *yom* is used six times in Exod 20:8–11; are we really to believe that it means a literal day in four usages (20:8, 9, 10, 11b) but an undetermined amount of time in the other two (20:11), all in the same context? No, the seven-day week and the Sabbath were based on the actual creation week, and there is nothing in the text of Gen 1 or Exod 20 (or Exod 31) to indicate that these were God’s ‘workdays’ rather than actual days.

However, others disagree. For example, Archer (1982, 62) writes,

Some have argued that the reference in the Decalogue (commandment four) to God’s resting on the seventh day as a basis for honoring the seventh day of each week strongly suggests the literal nature of ‘day’ in Genesis 1. This is not at all compelling, however, in view of the fact that if there was to be any day of the week especially set aside from labor to center on the worship and service of the Lord, then it would have to be a twenty-four-hour day (Saturday) in any event. As a matter of fact, Scripture does not at all teach that Yahweh rested only one twenty-four-hour day at the

conclusion of His creative work. No closing formula occurs at the close of the seventh day, referred to in Genesis 2:2–3. And, in fact, the New Testament teaches (in Heb. 4:1–11) that that seventh day, that “Sabbath rest,” in a very definite sense has continued on right into the church age. If so, it would be quite impossible to line up the seventh-day Sabbath with the Seventh Day that concluded God’s original work of creation!

Collins (1994, 117, 118), believing the six days of creation to be “anthropomorphisms: that is, they are ‘God’s days,’” reasons,

This picture [of anthropomorphism] continues in the institution of the Sabbath and the Biblical reflections on it (passages which young earth theorists hold as proving 24-hour days): in Exod 23:12 the seventh-day rest is so that the ox and donkey may rest, and the handmaid’s son and the resident alien may **be refreshed** after six days of hard work. In Exod 31:17 the perpetuity of the Sabbath finds its reason in God’s example: “for in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh he abstained from work and **was refreshed**.” The Hebrew word rendered “be refreshed” suggests recovery from exhaustion {Footnote;} *hinnāpēš*: Exod 23:12; 31:17; 2 Sam 16:14; we dare not literally predicate that of God (Isa 40:28)! It is, of course, an anthropomorphism.

More recently, Lennox (2011, 57) maintains, “It is not possible to draw straight lines from Genesis to our working week. God’s week is a pattern for ours, but it is not identical. Thus Exodus 20:8–11 does not *demand* that the days of Genesis 1 be the days of a single week, although it could of course be interpreted that way.”

Potential Old-Universe Readings of דִּי in Genesis 1

We are now in a position to list the various ways in which דִּי has been interpreted such that the billions of years posited by geological uniformitarianism and Darwinian evolution can be accommodated.¹⁴ I acknowledge that not all advocates of these interpretations necessarily believe that the creation account indicates an old universe; a number of such proponents are indifferent concerning the length of the creation days and the age of the universe. But what all these positions have in common is that they at least allow the possibility of compatibility between Genesis 1 and mainstream scientific perspectives regarding a multi-billion-year-old universe. I am, therefore, calling these “*potential*” old-universe readings.

Before briefly exploring each of these theories in turn, we may first categorize potential old-universe approaches as follows:

¹⁴ Cf. Norman L. Geisler’s (2003, 469) list of ways in which “old-earth (progressive) creationists allow for millions (or even billions) of years.”

Table 6. Exodus 20:8–11 in the Hebrew Masoretic text, with the *ESV**.

<p>⁸Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. ⁹Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, ¹⁰but the seventh day is a Sabbath to YHWH your God. On it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates. ¹¹For in six days YHWH made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore YHWH blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy”</p>	<p>זָכוֹר אֶת-יְוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ׃ שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל- מְלֶאכֶתְךָ: 10 וַיְוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שָׁבַת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה כָל-מְלָאכָה אַתָּה וּבִנְךָ וּבִתְּךָ עַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ וּבְהֶמְתְּךָ וּגְרֶךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ: 11 כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת-יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ אֶת-הַיָּם וְאֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר- בָּם וַיָּנַח בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי עַל-כֵּן בֵּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת-יְוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ: ס</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. adhering to a theory that simultaneously accepts the time frames (dual perspectives) of days and millions of years; 2. fitting long ages, or “any length of time between the first and second verses of the Bible” (the Gap Theory) (Pember [1876] 1975, 32), or between the creation days (the Multiple Gap or Intermittent-Day Theory); 3. viewing the days literally, but not as relating to the timeframe of creation, rather, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. as “days in which God issued his creative commands” (the Fiat Theory) (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 167); b. as “days of dramatic vision, the story being presented to Moses in a series of revelations” (the Revelatory Day Theory) (Kevan 1953, 77); c. as days of preparation of a land for Adam and Eve, “the same land later promised to Abraham and his descendants” (Historical Creationism) (Sailhamer 1996, 44); d. as comprising a week-long “cosmic temple inauguration” (Walton 2009, 87); 4. adopting a figurative (i.e., non-literal) interpretation of יום, in which, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the days symbolically represent much longer time-frames (the Day-Age or Age-Day Theory, also known as the Geologic-Day or Divine-Day Theory, or Concordism); b. the days are not concerned with chronology, and have a purely literary or poetic function (e.g., the Framework Interpretation, also known as the Literary Framework or Pictorial Day or Historico-Artistic Theory; and the “analogical days” or “God’s workdays” position).¹⁵ 	<p>categories of interpretation allow for a literal understanding of יום, while simultaneously accommodating the billions of years that are necessary according to mainstream scientific opinion. However, for Barr ([1978] 1981, 40), all such interpretations are departures from “a literal interpretation of the creation story in Genesis” as a whole, which “would hold that the world was created in six days, these days being the first of the series which we still experience as days and nights.”</p> <p>The following descriptions of each potential old-universe reading are deliberately brief and selective. The aim is not to present an exhaustive account of each viewpoint. Rather, for each interpretation, the goal is to sketch the main idea, to provide any pertinent historical context, to list the names of one or more of the key advocates, and to note some sources for further reading. In addition, at some points, the specific issue of literality is addressed in light of the earlier discussion of the relationship between literal and figurative meanings (Smith 2019a, 82–85).</p>
<p>Only the fourth category of interpretation, the figurative view, intrinsically departs from a literal reading of “day,”¹⁶ thereby implicitly acknowledging a broader semantic range for יום. The first three</p>	<p>Dual perspective theory</p> <p>Gerald L. Schroeder (2013), a Jewish physicist and theologian, believes that the “the universe is billions of years old but from the biblical perspective those billions of years compress into five and a half, 24 hour days.” According to his theory, which differs from the Day-Age Theory (where each day represents a long age), both time frames are correct, but represent differing perspectives: “The universe is 14 billion years old as measured from the time-space coordinates of the earth; that is, as measured from our view, our location, within [the] universe. But there is an aspect of the universe that changes the perception of the timing of events when those events are viewed, not ‘on location,’ but from afar, across a great galactic distance.”</p>

¹⁵ Collins (2006, 124) advocates the “analogical days position” seeing the days as “God’s workdays.”

¹⁶ However, not all adherents of the first three categories necessarily accept a literal view of the days of Genesis 1. For example, Ramm (1954, 222) states, “We believe that the six days are *pictorial-revelatory* days, not literal days.” Munyon (1995, 225) notes a dichotomy among adherents of the Gap Theory: “Some gap theorists take the creative ‘days’ as twenty-four-hour days. Others view the ‘days’ of Genesis 1 as indefinitely long periods.”

Gap theories

Weston W. Fields (1976, ix) observes, “It was in 1814 that Dr. Thomas Chalmers of Edinburgh University first proposed what has since become known as the Gap Theory of Genesis 1:2.” The Gap Theory was popularized in the late nineteenth century by Pember ([1876] 1975), and in the twentieth century by Arthur C. Custance (1970). It was also given widespread credence through *The Scofield Reference Bible* of 1917 (which, commenting on Gen 1:2, states, “The earth had undergone a cataclysmic change as the result of divine judgment ... a previous testing and fall of angels”) (Scofield [1909] 1917), and *The New Scofield Reference Bible* of 1967 (which notes at Genesis 1:1, “Scripture gives no data for determining how long ago the universe was created”); and through *Dake’s Annotated Reference Bible* (Dake 2001). The latter, while providing “7 Proofs 6 Days Were 24-Hour Days” (83; compact edition) at the same time asserts,

When men finally agree on the age of the earth, then place the many years (over the historical 6,000) between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2, there will be no conflict between the book of Genesis and science....

We cannot say how old the earth is because we do not know WHEN the beginning was. God’s creation of the heavens and the earth in the beginning could have been millions and billions of years ago. If geologists can prove the age of the earth to be what they claim, we have no scriptural authority to disagree.... The Bible ... does not reveal any time element in connection with the earth’s original creation. This much is certain according to Scripture: the earth is more than 6,000 years old, and was inhabited before the days of Adam. (76, 78; emphasis in original)

Donald England (1972, 103) states, “From the many scientific dating methods one gets the very strong general impression that the earth is quite ancient,” and he sees “no reason” for stretching his “imagination in order to suppose that a few catastrophic events over a relatively short period of a few thousand years could have given the earth its general overall appearance of great antiquity” (105–106). He suggests a resolution for accommodating the biblical account of origins with an old earth: “The days of Genesis 1 could easily have been twenty-four-hour days and the earth still date to great antiquity, provided that indefinite periods of time separated the six creation days” (110), though he admits that there is “no Scriptural basis for assuming indefinite periods between 24-hour days” (117). England refers to this concept of origins as “Multiple Gap” (116), whereas Robert C. Newman (1999, 106) calls it the

“intermittent-day view,” explaining, “each successive day opens a new creative period” (107).¹⁷ More recently Lennox (2011, 54) wrote, “There is ... [a] possibility ... that the writer did not intend us to think of the first six days as days of a single earth week, ... but days that might well have been separated by long periods of time.”

Fiat theory

Christadelphian Alan Hayward (1923–2008) viewed the occurrences of יום in Genesis 1 as “days in which God issued his creative commands” (Hayward [1985] [1995] 2005, 167). He explained,

According to the Fiat Theory, the rest of the chapter [vv. 3–31 of Genesis 1] is basically an account of the great creative fiats, which were uttered upon the six (presumably literal and consecutive) days. Inserted into this primary narrative is a whole series of parentheses, which describe the subsequent fulfilments of the fiats. These out-workings of the fiats, of course, could have taken any amount of time to occur. The fiats of God are uttered swiftly, but his mills grind slowly. (170–171)

Revelatory day theory

Bernard Ramm (1954, 218–219) records that, in the mid-nineteenth century, Johann Heinrich Kurtz (1809–90)¹⁸ “defends the gap theory ... but also defends the pictorial method of revealing the acts of creation.” For himself, Ramm asserts, “We believe ... that creation was revealed in six days, not *performed* in six days. We believe that the six days are *pictorial-revelatory* days, not literal days nor age-days” (222). P.J. Wiseman (1948, 127–128) concludes,

The first chapter of Genesis ... does not say anything about the period taken by God in *creating* the universe, but it does tell us about the period taken in *revealing* to man the account of the creation....

The days of Genesis are intended to be literal days, but not of creation, and the time occupied in the events described may well be as long as the ‘geological’ interpretation asserts.

Kevan (1953, 77) lists this as the second of three viewpoints on the days of creation. He describes it as “an intensely interesting suggestion, but [one that] can scarcely be regarded as more than a conjecture.”

Historical creationism

The Historical Creationism theory, proposed by John Sailhamer (1946–2017) in his 1996 book, *Genesis Unbound*, “re-presents a medieval Jewish view of the creation account” (Longman III, 1996). The theory has adherents in Matt Chandler (2012, 96–97), Mark Driscoll and Gerry Breshears (2010, 93), and John

¹⁷ See also Newman and Eckelmann Jr. (1977, 65), where the phrase “modified intermittent-day view” is used.

¹⁸ Kurtz ([1842] 1857).

Piper (2010). While his view has similarities with the Gap Theory, Sailhamer (1996, 44) asserts, "There are no 'gaps' in the creation account of Genesis 1, nor is there a 're-creation' or 'restitution' of an original creation." He "understands Genesis 1 and 2 to be a literal and realistic account of God's creation" (44), which comprises two great acts. In the first act, described in Genesis 1:1, "God created the universe we see around us today" (14). This is where vast ages may be accommodated:

Since the Hebrew word translated "beginning" refers to an indefinite period of time, we cannot say for certain when God created the world or how long He took to create it. This period could have spanned as much as several billion years, or it could have been much less; the text simply does not tell us how long. It tells us only that God did it during the "beginning" of our universe's history. (44)

What particularly distinguishes Sailhamer's theory is his proposal that the second act of creation is "God's preparation of a land for the man and woman He was to create. That 'land' was the same land later promised to Abraham and his descendants. It was that land which God gave to Israel after their exodus from Egypt. It was that land to which Joshua led the Israelites after their time of wandering in the wilderness" (44). This second act took place within an ordinary six-day work week. "The 'days' of Genesis are ... real and literal twenty-four-hour days ... That first week was a real and literal week—one like we ourselves experience every seven days" (243–244).

Cosmic temple inauguration theory

John Walton (2009, 92) argues that the seven days of Genesis 1 do not concern material origins. He writes,

We have suggested that the seven days are not given as the period of time over which the material cosmos came into existence, but the period of time devoted to the inauguration of the functions of the cosmic temple, and perhaps also its annual reenactment. It is not the material phase of temple construction that represents the creation of the temple; it is the inauguration of the functions and the entrance of the presence of God to take up his rest that creates the temple. Genesis 1 focuses on the creation of the (cosmic) temple, not the material phase of preparation.

Day-Age Theory

Though not an advocate himself, Ramm (1954, 211; referencing Gedney 1950) outlined the Day-Age Theory in 1954 in the following terms:

The suggestion put forth and ably defended [from the mid-nineteenth century] by such men as Hugh Miller, James Dana, and J.W. Dawson, was that the days of Genesis were periods of time representing in brief the geological and biological history of the earth.... This theory has been called the *age-day* theory because it considers the days of Genesis as being periods of time; it has been called *geologic-day* theory for similar reasons; it has been called the *Divine-day* theory after Augustine who said they were God-divided days, not sun-divided days. It is called *concordism* because it seeks a harmony of the geologic record and the days of Genesis interpreted as long periods of time briefly summarizing geological history. The most scientific and thorough defense of it has been made by J.W. Dawson in his various works, and an excellent modern defense is made by Gedney.

More recent advocates of the Day-Age Theory include D.A. Young (1977, 1982), Archer (1982 58–63; 1984; 2007, 156–160),¹⁹ and Ross (2017).²⁰ Ross (2017, 162) explains,

Day-age creationists believe God miraculously transformed the earth and created all its life within six literal days—that is, six long but finite time periods. The Hebrew word *yôm*, translated "day," has four distinct definitions, all of which are "literal" in the sense that they fall within the strict, accurate meaning of the word:

1. Part of the daylight hours
2. All the daylight hours
3. One rotation period of Earth
4. A long but finite time period

In biblical Hebrew there is no word other than *yôm* for a long, finite time period.

Here Ross uses the term 'literal' loosely to include meanings beyond the normal sense of "day" (see the discussion on the meaning of 'literal' and 'figurative' [Smith 2019a, 82–85]). It is undeniable that many scholars, like Ross, maintain that the sense of "a long but finite time period" falls *within the semantic range* of יום. But it is not a *literal* denotation according to the standard definition of 'literal,' viz., taking words in their usual or most basic sense.

Framework interpretation

J.A. Thompson (1962, 271) asserts, "Gn. i has an artificial literary structure and is not concerned to provide a picture of chronological sequence but only to assert the fact that God made everything." And Meredith G. Kline (1922–2007) argues, "The creation week itself is a poetic figure and ... the several pictures of creation history are set ... not chronologically but topically" (Kline 1970, 82). Lee Irons and Kline (2001, 250–251) explain the Framework Interpretation more fully as follows:

¹⁹ See also Ross and Archer (2001).

²⁰ Among a number of other works, including Ross and Archer (2001).

Framework advocates give *yôm* its normal sense of an ordinary day. But then, unlike literalists, they take account of the fact that the *days* are part of an extended chronological metaphor. In all metaphors, words are employed to make a comparison between a literal referent and a metaphorical referent....

The temporal language (“day,” “evening and morning”) of Genesis 1 is being used metaphorically. Terms properly used to denote lower-register units of time have been appropriated to refer to upper-register time.... The Holy Spirit ... employed terms with lower-register significance to describe upper-register realities beyond our ordinary experience. Thus, the word *yôm* in Genesis 1 denotes an ordinary, lower-register, solar day. Yet it is being used metaphorically to describe an upper-register unit of time that is not defined by the earth’s rotation with respect to the Sun. A word with a literal denotation has been employed to describe a nonliteral referent. This metaphorical usage is appropriate due to the analogical relationship between the literal denotation (solar day) and the nonliteral referent (upper-register unit of time).

In light of the earlier discussion of the relationship between literal and figurative meanings (see Smith 2019a, 82–85), it would appear that Irons and Kline are either reading the creation account (1) allegorically (with two sets of referents, one literal and one metaphorical), or (2) simply metaphorically (in which case, their insistence that “Framework advocates give *yôm* its normal sense of an ordinary day” [250–251] would be invalid). Either way, their interpretation is a figurative one, with *יִּוֵּם* “being used metaphorically to describe an upper-register unit of time that is not defined by the earth’s rotation with respect to the Sun” (251).

Concerning the history of the Framework position, Irons and Kline record, “Dutch theologian Arie Noordtzij pioneered this approach to the creation week in 1924. The substance of his work has been made available in English by N.H. Ridderbos in his book *Is There a Conflict Between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?*, published in the United States in 1957” (225).²¹ John Jefferson Davis (1999, 138), another proponent, notes, “A form of this view is also found in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pt.1, qq. 65–74, ‘Treatise on the Work of the Six Days.’” John S. Feinberg (2006, 603) writes, “This option is ... defended by N.H. Ridderbos, Ronald Youngblood, Meredith G. Kline, Willem VanGemeren, and Henri Blocher, to name a few.” Beall (2008, 151–152) lists other advocates of the framework view as including Mark D. Futato, W. Robert Godfrey, Victor P. Hamilton (in *NICOT*), Mark Throntveit, Bruce K. Waltke, and Gordon Wenham (in *WBC*).

Regarding nomenclature, Irons and Kline (2001, 254) express, “Though popularly referred to as ‘the framework hypothesis’—a label which might give the impression that we regard the view as a tentative interpretive suggestion—we prefer ‘the framework interpretation’ or ‘the framework view.’” Henri Blocher ([1979] 1984, 49) notes that this interpretation has also been called “historico-artistic,” by Franciscus Ceuppens.²²

Analogical Days Position

In his commentary on Genesis 1–4, C. John Collins (2006, 124) states,

The view that I shall advocate can be called the analogical days position: namely, the days are God’s workdays, their length is neither specified nor important, and not everything in the account needs to be taken as historically sequential. This position found advocates in the American Presbyterian William Shedd and the Dutch Reformed Herman Bavinck, although both can point to precursors in the history of exposition.

Collins summarizes his conclusions as follows:

1. Genesis 1:1 describes the initial creation of all things, some unspecified time before the first day begins in 1:3. Hence the creation week is not necessarily the same as the first week of the universe.
2. The days are God’s workdays, which are understood by analogy to human work; the analogy in its turn serves to structure the workweek of the covenant people.
3. The days are broadly sequential, which means they are successive periods of unspecified length; but since this sequence is part of the analogy, it is possible that parts of the days overlap and that events on a particular day may be grouped for logical rather than chronological reasons.
4. The creation week must be some years long, at least, in order to harmonize Genesis 1 and 2.
5. The creation Sabbath continues into the present. (129)

Lennox evidently respects Collins’ position. He cites Collins a number of times in support of his own reading of the creation account in *Seven Days That Divide The World*.

Like Irons and Kline, both Collins and Lennox appear to suggest that figurative meanings of *יִּוֵּם* are at the same time literal. Collins (2003, 95) explains, “The analogical days view takes the word [‘day’] in its ordinary meaning, but applies that meaning analogically. (This is just what we do with other analogical terms like ‘eyes of the Lord’: we don’t need a new entry in the dictionary for ‘eye’; we use the ordinary meaning and apply it by analogy to God.)”

²¹ Referencing Noordtzij (1924) and N.H. Ridderbos (1957). See especially Ridderbos’s conclusions (45–46).

²² Referencing Ceuppens (1946, 72ff.).

Lennox (2011, 51) does something similar when he asserts that all of the several distinct meanings of the word 'day' that he has identified in Gen 1:1–2:4 (viz., daytime, a twenty-four-hour day, a period of time of undefined length, and an epoch that extends from the seventh day onward into eternity) "are ... natural, primary, 'literal' meanings." But judging by widely accepted definitions (see Smith 2019a, 82–85), only Lennox's first two senses could be deemed 'literal'—the other two are 'extended' (to use Sæbø's terminology) or figurative uses of the word. Similarly, Collins' (2006, 129) reading of the days as "periods of unspecified length" does not accord with the "ordinary meaning" (Collins 2003, 95) of יום as he claims.

Lines of Argument in Support of a Multi-Billion-Year-Old Universe

The great majority of biblical scholars who are proponents of an old universe argue from *scientific* evidence, with relatively little recourse to *biblical* data. This is reflected in the extensive scientific argumentation in books such as Davis A. Young's *Creation and the Flood: An Alternative to Flood Geology and Theistic Evolution* (1977), and *Christianity and the Age of the Earth* (1982); or Hayward's *Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence from Science and the Bible* (2005).

Dick Fischer, described in *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 42, no.1 (March 1, 1990) as "an outspoken critic of young-earth creationism" (16), asserts, "The sheer abundance of scientific evidence which only permits one answer—an old earth—is a heavy persuader" (16), adding, "[Those] who [say] the earth and heavens *are young* ... are 'willingly ignorant' [that ... the heavens were of old, 2 Pet 3:5]" (20). In his *NICOT* volume on Genesis, Hamilton (1990, 53) concludes, "Over the last few centuries science has shown that it is absurd and preposterous to think that the universe was created in one week."

Fields of evidence marshaled in support of this position include the following:

- anthropology that "that pushes the origins of mankind back millions of years" (Hamilton 1990, 54);
- archaeology, including Egyptology;
- astronomy and astrophysics, especially the Big Bang Theory and background radiation, but also the speed of light, the distance of stars, the rate of expansion of the universe, meteorites and lunar material;
- biology, with some scholars advocating evolution;
- cosmology (physical);
- geology, including stratigraphy, geochronology, geochemistry, sedimentary rocks, fissionable minerals in the geologic strata, liquid magma cooling, metamorphic rock formation, continental drift, the earth's magnetic field;
- glaciology;
- oceanography, including sea floor sediments, the rate and amount of salt deposition, sea floor spreading, coral growth rates;
- paleontology;
- radiometric and carbon-14 dating.

In his article, "Age of the Universe and Earth (Billions-of-Years View)," Michael G. Strauss (2017a, 28–32) sets out an array of specific data in support of a fourteen-billion-year-old universe, including,

- "tree ring patterns ... over 12,400 years";
- "lake varves ... over 60,000 years";
- "ice core data ... about 800,000 years";
- cave speleothems "over 200,000 years";
- "radiometric dating ... [up to] 4.6 billion years";
- "astronomical measurements ... about 14 billion years";
- "nucleocosmochronology²³ ... 12 to 16 billion years";
- "cosmic microwave background radiation ... about 13.82 billions years";
- "star cluster and white dwarf dates ... between 11 and 15 billion years."

It is outside the remit of this biblical-theological thesis to discuss such scientific issues. They are listed here to demonstrate the kind and extent of evidence in Appendix 1 cited by scholars in defense of an old universe.

Some Links, Patterns, and Trends

Before drawing salient conclusions from throughout the thesis, we now reflect upon the findings of the central analysis, highlighting some of the main links, patterns, and trends in the relationships between scholars' perceptions of the semantic range of יום, and their discussions of the age of the universe.

By definition, the Day-Age Theory and the Analogical Days Interpretation rely upon יום having a relatively broad semantic range. In other words, they require that יום can be readily understood figuratively to mean something other than a literal day. Though all the other theories naturally comport with a literal reading of יום, the relationships between scholars' perspectives of the semantic range of יום and their views on the age of the universe are not predictable (see fig. 1).

²³ "Astronomy: Nucleochronology, especially as used to infer the age of the universe from the ages of the chemical elements." "From nucle- + cosmo- + chronology" (<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/nucleocosmochronology>), accessed August 16, 2018. Bradley S. Meyer and James W. Truran provide a more specific definition in the abstract of their article on the subject of nucleocosmochronology: "Nucleocosmochronology is the use of the abundances of radioactive nuclear species and their radiogenic decay daughters to establish the finite age of the elements and the time scale for their formation" (Meyer and Truran 2000).




Fig. 1. Pictorial representation of relationships between scholarly perspectives of the semantic range of יום, and various theories about the creation account and the age of the universe. Solid lines indicate connections that are intrinsically demanded by certain hypotheses, namely those between a broad semantic range and the Analogical Days Interpretation and the Day-Age Theory. Dashes indicate connections that are theoretically possible, but not essential.

The general pattern is that Young-Universe Creationists tend to advocate a relatively narrow semantic range for יום. In other words, they believe that יום normally means a literal day, and only under certain, exceptional circumstances means anything else. However, the young-universe position does not require belief in a narrow semantic range for יום. Kulikovsky (2009, 149), for example, asserts, “יום (yôm) has a large semantic range,” and Stambaugh (2003, 52) concedes, “The semantic range of יום does allow the interpreter to select from a variety of meanings of ‘day.’” Both propose an age for the universe in the order of thousands, not billions, of years.

Conversely, many who endorse a very ancient universe believe יום must be handled circumspectly, with due regard to its restricted categories of use in specific contexts. Indeed, the growth of alternative theories in the nineteenth century was largely guided by a determination not to corrupt a literal reading of the days in Genesis 1, while accommodating the perceived overwhelming geological and biological

evidence for millions and billions of years. Pember ([1876] 1975, 65), for instance, in promoting the Gap Theory, wrote in 1876, “It is ... clear that we must understand the Six Days to be six periods of twenty-four hours each.”

Any sensitive reading of history leads to the inexorable conclusion that a relatively few individuals have had a disproportionately great influence. This may be true in any area of historical research, and it is certainly the case with the subject of this study. For example, the shadow of Augustine’s figurative or analogical reading of the days of creation stretches right down the centuries.

In more recent history, the writings of respected conservatives such as Warfield and Scofield opened many minds to the idea of an older universe than a straightforward reading of Genesis 1 might suggest. Even those upholding a strict adherence to biblical inerrancy have endorsed such an interpretation, including Archer, whose outspoken views have, in turn, influenced a number of scholars, notably Fischer, Strauss, and Williams. As noted earlier,

Geisler (1999, 273) observed, "Many orthodox, evangelical scholars hold the universe is millions or billions of years old, including Augustine, B.B. Warfield, John Walvoord, Francis Schaeffer, Gleason Archer, Hugh Ross, and most leaders of the movement that produced the famous 'Chicago Statement' on the inerrancy of the Bible (1978)."

While the Day-Age Theory, with its necessary flexible handling of *רֵאשִׁית*, continues to be strongly promoted by Hugh Ross and his popular Reasons to Believe ministry, an alternative strand of influence can be seen in the writings of Walton, another respected figure in the conservative evangelical community. Passionate about careful semantics, Walton (2001, 81) is adamant, "The [semantic range] categories [of *yom*] cannot be merged carelessly... One cannot pull the word *yom* out of [a given] setting and still retain the meaning it has in that setting." His proposal that, in light of an ANE context, the creation account be read as a cosmic temple inauguration conducted over a literal six-day period, seems to be well received. Certainly, it has the potential to gratify those who, like their eighteenth-century counterparts, wish to adhere to a 'literal' reading of *רֵאשִׁית* in Genesis 1, while at the same time avoiding a confrontation with secular science regarding the age of the universe.

Like Walton, Hamilton (1990, 53) represents conservatives having regard for the semantic constraints of *רֵאשִׁית* and its "normal and most common interpretation," while holding to an old-earth position. This he does by means of "a literary reading of Gen. 1 [that] still permits the retention of 'day' as a solar day of 24 hours. But it understands 'day' not as a chronological account of how many hours God invested in his creating project, but as an analogy of God's creative activity" (55–56). Indeed, forms of the Framework Interpretation that take *רֵאשִׁית* literally, and other variations of a literary emphasis, have enabled conservative scholars to maintain a form of inerrancy that avoids what is widely perceived as the extremist position advocated by young-universe creationists. Kenneth L. Gentry Jr. (2016, 14) acknowledges, "Contemporary evangelical proponents of the framework hypothesis hold a high view of Scripture, as well as a devout and reverential view of God as the Creator."

John S. Sailhamer is another conservative scholar who upholds a normal "day" while allowing for an old universe. In his Historical Creationism scheme, the literal week in Genesis 1 describes God preparing the promised land. He writes, "The 'days' of Genesis 1 are ... real and literal twenty-four-hour days" (Sailhamer 1996, 243), and "to suggest that the biblical writer intended the 'days' in Genesis 1 to correspond to thousands, or millions, of years is a conspicuous

attempt to harmonize the Bible and science" (111). However, he also reports that scientists have argued "that the age of the universe ... is ... about eight billion years," adding, "It is unlikely ... that scientists will ever project that the earth is only ten thousand years old" (111). He suggests,

If my interpretation of [the] term ["beginning" in Gen 1:1] is correct ..., then God's creation of the universe *could* have occurred over a vast period of time (although it certainly is not required)....

If billions of years really are covered by the simple statement, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," then much of the processes described by modern scientists fall into the period covered by the Hebrew term "beginning." Within that "beginning" would fit the countless geological ages, ice ages, and the many climatic changes on our planet.

The many biological eras would also fit within "the beginning" of Genesis 1:1, including the long ages during which the dinosaurs roamed the earth. By the time human beings were created on the sixth day of the week, the dinosaurs already could have flourished and become extinct—all during the "beginning" recorded in Genesis 1:1. (28–29)

As is evidenced in books such as *Three Views on Creation and Evolution* and *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*, much can be written on the creation account with little, if any, reference to the meaning of *רֵאשִׁית*, much less its semantic range and its relevance to the age of the universe. Indeed many scholars would prefer to maintain a sharp distinction between secular cosmogony and the biblical account of creation. Representing a Jewish perspective, in *Understanding Genesis* Nahum M. Sarna (1923–2005) argued,

It should be obvious that by the nature of things, none of these stories [in biblical literature about the events connected with the creation of the world] can possibly be ... in any modern sense of the word scientific accounts of the origin and nature of the physical world....

It is a naive and futile exercise to attempt to reconcile the biblical accounts of creation with the findings of modern science. Any correspondence which can be discovered or ingeniously established between the two must surely be nothing more than mere coincidence.... The literalistic approach serves to direct attention to those aspects of the narrative that reflect the time and place of its composition, while it tends to obscure the elements that are meaningful and enduring, thus distorting the biblical message and destroying its relevancy. (Sarna 1966, 2–3)

Similarly, Walter Brueggemann (1982, 16) writes in his commentary on Genesis,

Comment needs to be made on the matter of creation, world-beginnings and attempts to correlate creation narratives with modern scientific hypotheses. No special attention is given to this issue here because it is judged as not pertinent to our purpose. The expositor must move knowingly between two temptations. On the one hand, there is the temptation to treat this material as historical, as a report of what happened. This will be pursued by those who regard science as a threat and want to protect the peculiar claims of the text. If these materials are regarded as historical, then a collision with scientific theories is predictable. On the other hand, there is the temptation to treat these materials as myth, as statements which announce what has always been and will always be true of the world. This will be pursued by those who want to harmonize the text with scientific perceptions and who seek to make the texts rationally acceptable.

Later, he reinforces,

At the outset, we must see that this text is not a scientific description but a theological affirmation. It makes a faith statement. As much as any part of the Bible, this text has been caught in the unfortunate battle of “modernism,” so that “literalists” and “rationalists” have acted like the two mothers of I Kings 3:16–28, nearly ready to have the text destroyed in order to control it. Our exposition must reject both such views. On the one hand, it has been urged that this is a historically descriptive account of what “happened.” But that kind of scientific, descriptive reporting is alien to the text and to the world of the Bible. In any case, believers have no stake in biblical literalism, but only in hearing the gospel. (Brueggemann 1982, 24–25)

The widely respected Bible expositor, John R. W. Stott (1921–2011), wrote in the 1970s,

Not many Christians today image that the ‘days’ of creation were intended to be understood as precise periods of twenty-four hours each. Indeed, speaking for myself, I cannot see that at least some forms of the theory of evolution contradict or are contradicted by the Genesis revelation. Scripture reveals religious truths about God, that He created all things by His word, that His creation was ‘good’, and that His creative programme culminated in man; science suggests that ‘evolution’ may have been the mode which God employed in creating. (Stott 1976, 63)

More recently, Michael S. Horton (2011, 381) asserted, in his systematic theology,

The point of these narratives [in Genesis 1 and 2] is not to provide a scientific description of natural origins....

I take the days of creation to be *analogical*. That is, they are not literal twenty-four-hour periods, but God’s accommodation to the ordinary pattern of six

days of labor and a seventh day of rest, which he created for humankind.

Similarly, Tremper Longman III (2013, 103; emphasis added) argues,

My view is that [the] main purpose of Gen 1–2 is to proclaim in the midst of contemporary counter-claims that Yahweh the God of Israel was the creator of everything and everyone. However, *the biblical text is not at all interested in telling us how God created the cosmos and humanity*. Since the Bible does not tell its readers how God created the world and humanity, it is perfectly acceptable and even reasonable to turn to the sciences to explore that question.

Barr ([1978] 1981, 41) was appalled when he encountered a similar view in the “venerated conservative publication, *The New Bible Dictionary*.” There, J.A. Thompson had suggested in 1962, “If we allow that Gn. I has an artificial literary structure and is not concerned to provide a picture of chronological sequence but only to assert the fact that God made everything, we avoid ... speculations [about the days of creation, and attempts to correlate them with current scientific theories]” (1962, 271). To this, Barr ([1978] 1981, 41) responded, “*Only* that God made everything! How are the mighty fallen! and how ridiculous a mouse has the mountain of fundamentalist interpretation brought forth!”

Faced with the challenge of trying to reconcile the biblical six-day creation account with a suggested age of the universe of billions of years, some have lost their faith in Scripture, some in God altogether, and others have been put off investigating the Bible further. Testimony to this phenomenon is, by its very nature, often located in unpublished autobiographical accounts, such as that of author, lawyer, and former minister, Brennan Hughes (2014), whose crisis of faith led him to suggest that making “Young-Earth Creationism ... a central aspect of the Christian message ... will repulse people who would otherwise be interested” in Christianity.

This view is evidently shared by Lennox. In the introduction to his book, *Seven Days That Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science*, Lennox (2011, 12) relates an encounter with “a brilliant professor” who told him she had been “taught at school that the Bible starts with a very silly, unscientific story of how the world was made in seven days.” Lennox continues, “This book is written for people ... who have been putting off even considering the Christian faith for this kind of reason.”

Similarly, Hugh Ross and Gleason L. Archer (2001, 157) assert, “Because of [a] failure to withstand rigorous testing, young-earth creationism has become a frequent excuse for rejecting the Christian gospel and worldview.... On the Reasons To Believe [RTB]

telephone hotline, this is by far the most frequently expressed objection by secularists for accepting the Bible as the inspired word of God.” The RTB ministry reaches out to those with doubts and questions regarding the Bible/science dilemma. Their mission is “to spread the Christian Gospel by demonstrating that sound reason and scientific research—including the very latest discoveries—consistently support, rather than erode, confidence in the truth of the Bible and faith in the personal, transcendent God” (RTB, n.d.b). Specifically regarding the age of the earth, “RTB holds the position that the six days of creation represent long time periods and that the creation accounts reconcile well with the scientific date for Earth’s formation 4.6 billion years ago” (RTB, n.d.a).

In the final sentences of his book, *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*, Davis A. Young (1982, 164) exhorts, “We Christians need to stop expending our energies in defending a false [literal] creationism ... A vigorous Christian science will be of far more service in meaningful evangelism and apologetics than the fantasies of young-Earth creationism.” Dick Fischer (1990, 21) puts it in stronger language:

The tactics currently in use [by young-earth creationists] are deplorable. The Bible is made to appear to be in error while, in fact, it is these young-earth creationists themselves who do error through inaccurate interpretation compounded by their denial of a preponderance of carefully compiled scientific evidence which points in only one direction. When authors who purport to be Bible scholars put forth an erroneous theory which they claim is based on “inerrant” Scripture, it’s biblical credibility that suffers. Biblical error is the conclusion! The lamentable effect is for the baby of Christianity to go right out the window with the bath water of creationism! ...

If evangelicals can’t be trusted in a simple matter such as the age of the earth, which can be easily verified, then how can they be believed on the doctrine of vicarious atonement, for example, where the corroborative evidence is far less abundant. Therein lies the tragedy. The unbeliever may remain in unbelief because the Bible is presented in an unbelievable fashion right from the first chapter.

Conclusion

Here, I attempt to draw salient conclusions from throughout the study. First we may note that there are biblical, historical, theological, and linguistic contexts to the debate over the interpretation of יום and the age of the universe (Smith 2019a, 73–89). The biblical issues of contention begin with the very first verse. Most modern interpreters view Genesis 1:1 as an independent clause, rather than a temporal one. Among those favoring the independent clause

reading, some see it as only a title for what follows (Smith 2019a, 75–76), whereas others interpret it instead (or additionally) as being part of the first day (the traditional view) (Smith 2019a, 76–77). These differing perspectives have resulted in several alternative paragraph structures among the EVV. In this regard, the six-fold Masoretic paragraph structure of Genesis 1 (Smith 2019a, 77–78), dating back at least two millennia, is notable. While, for some, this may not constitute definitive proof of the traditional view that v. 1 incorporates the first day, the correspondence of the six Masoretic paragraphs to the six days of creation certainly draws attention to the significance of the word יום.

Historically, the theological debate over the meaning of יום and the age of the universe intensified significantly from the eighteenth century onwards (Smith 2019a, 79–80). Previously, most theologians believed the earth was created in the space of a literal week, and that the universe was just a few thousand years old. However, between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries an increasing number of eminent scholars began to advocate a multi-billion-year-old universe and questioned the validity of the biblical account. In order to accommodate billions of years into the Genesis account of origins, theologians proposed a range of new interpretations (see pages 121–125 of this paper). Some, such as the Gap Theory, sought to retain a literal understanding of יום. Others, particularly the Day-Age Theory, maintained that the term had a broad semantic range that could include a sense of vast periods of time. Over the past two centuries, the issue of the meaning of יום in relation to the age of the universe has been vigorously debated by many scholars, though ignored as irrelevant by others (Smith 2019a, 76).

Linguistically there seems to be some confusion regarding the intrinsic distinction between literal and figurative meanings within the semantic range of any given term, at least according to widely held understandings of the terms ‘literal’ and ‘figurative’ (Smith 2019a, 82–85). In particular, some scholars, advocating figurative interpretations of יום in the creation account, at the same time argue that they are understanding the word literally, including Ross, Irons and Kline, Collins, and Lennox (see pages 124–125 of this paper). A referent is either literal or figurative, but never both at the same time; Jesus’ parables have two sets of referents, but the ultimate meaning lies in the hidden, figurative sense.

The definitions given to the word יום vary considerably between three general sources (Smith 2019b, 91–101)

1. God’s explanation in Genesis 1:5, 4–18 (Smith 2019b, 92–94) in which He designated the period of daytime light as marking a day, roughly

equivalent to twelve hours, such that nights are not reckoned in the counting of days;

2. lexical entries (Smith 2019b, 94–98) and other scholarly studies (Smith 2019b, 98–99), which describe a limited number of extended temporal senses in certain contexts, such as the Day of YHWH;
3. expositions by theologians in systematic theologies, Genesis commentaries, and monographs, many of whom advocate a broad semantic range, such that the word can readily be understood as referring to an extended period of time (see pages 115–125 of this paper).

A major, general shortcoming in some lexicons is that they give little, or misleading, information about the frequency of occurrence and validity of each suggested sub-category of meaning for any given term. This problem can lead to a ‘candy-store’ approach to exegesis, where the interpreter picks the lexical sub-category that best suits their presuppositions, with little discernment as to the appropriateness of applying that sense in the given context (Smith 2019b, 98).

In reviewing the interpretation of ‘day’ in reference to the creation account (see pages 105–126 of this paper), it is evident that, throughout the biblical era, there is no explicit Scriptural evidence that Israelites regarded the timeframe of Genesis 1 as being anything other than an ordinary week (see page 105 of this paper). In the NT era, Carson (1991, 157) observes, citing Pliny the Elder, “‘The common people everywhere’ think of the day running from dawn to dark. Jews, Romans and others divided the daylight ‘day’ into twelve hours.” Contrary to popular understanding, the oft-cited texts of Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8 do not support the idea of a day equating to a millennium (see pages 106–108 of this paper).

In terms of historical Christian theology regarding creation (see pages 108–111 of this paper), “Though at various times in church history some questioned whether the days of creation were literal solar days, the *predominant* view at least until the 1700s was that the days of creation were six twenty-four-hour days. Both Luther and Calvin held this position” (Feinberg 2006, 597; emphasis added). A notable exception was Augustine who interpreted the days of creation figuratively, and many proponents of a non-literal reading of יום in the creation account have enlisted Augustine in support of their theses (see pages 109–110 of this paper). As to the age of the earth, most theologians prior to the Enlightenment believed it was created in the space of a literal week, and that the universe began sometime between approximately 3,600BC and 7,000BC (see page 111 of this paper).

Since the rise of geological uniformitarianism and Darwinian evolution, a variety of interpretations of

יום have been proposed (see pages 111–115 of this paper). While most theories have sought to retain a literal understanding of יום, the popular Day-Age Theory and the Analogical Days Interpretation rely intrinsically upon a non-literal reading. However, the study of how יום has been handled in discussions pertaining to the age of the universe over the past fifty years (see Appendix 1) clearly demonstrates that, among other theorists also—even young-universe creationists—many scholars advocate a broad semantic range for יום (see pages 115–125 of this paper). Schwab (2017a, 137) asserts, “The Hebrew word for ‘day’ can mean any number of things.”

And here we approach the crux of an answer to the central question of this study: how have scholars’ perceptions of the semantic range of יום affected their discussions of the age of the universe. On the one hand, the question has been answered throughout the entirety of this study and Appendix 1, both of which are replete with specific examples of how scholars have understood the semantic range of יום and how they have explained that understanding in the context of interpreting the creation account and discussing the age of the universe. (See also the observations regarding some of the more obvious links, patterns, and trends discussed earlier on pages 126–130 of this paper.)

On the other hand, the question can be addressed by observing a general historical trend, as follows:

1. Whereas “up to the year 1750 a general consensus existed among Protestants that God created the universe ex nihilo in six solar days some six millennia ago” (Lewis and Demarest 1990, 23), the widespread acceptance of a multi-billion-year-old universe exerted enormous pressure on theologians to reinterpret the creation account.
2. Although many theologians sought solutions that enabled them to retain a literal reading of יום, such as the Gap Theory, a significant number embraced the Day-Age Theory.
3. The overall impact of the above two phenomena seems to have been a general broadening or loosening of perceptions of the semantic range of יום, even among those who do not hold to the Day-Age Theory. In extreme cases there is evidence of a ‘candy-store’ approach, seen particularly in the discussions of Day-Age proponent, Fischer (1990, 17), and even young-universe advocate, Stambaugh (2003, 52), with the latter claiming, “The semantic range of יום does allow the interpreter to select from a variety of meanings of ‘day.’”
4. The ultimate effect of this trend is that many scholars’ acceptance of a relatively broad semantic range of יום has caused them to be more accommodating of a range of interpretations of the creation account including the age of the universe.

Thus we could respond to the thesis question concisely as follows: many scholars' perception of יום as being a relatively flexible term with a broad semantic range has freed them to consider and propose a variety of interpretations of the creation account, which allow for a great spectrum of potential ages of the universe ranging from thousands to billions of years.

Such seems to be the general state of affairs. But, while many argue that the semantic range of the word יום is broad, flexible, or fuzzy, and would have been understood as such by the readers of Genesis 1, others maintain that its meaning is much more clearly defined, and consistently applied. As an example of the former, Grudem (1994, 294–295) asserts, “[It] is clearly the case ... [that] the original readers [of Genesis 1] knew that the word *day* could mean a long period of time,” in addition to a twenty-four-hour day. Walton (2001, 154) argues the opposite, namely, “The original Israelite audience would have taken the word [*yom* in the creation account in Genesis] to refer to twenty-four-hour days.” He explains, “The [semantic range] categories [of *yom*] cannot be merged carelessly” (81); “the aspects of the semantic range [of יום] connected to idiomatic phrases cannot be extended to nonidiomatic occurrences” (Walton 1996, 167).

Among those who interpret יום in Genesis 1 figuratively, the most common supporting arguments are exegetical: (1) the indefinite, ongoing duration of the seventh ‘day,’ (2) the impossibility of fitting all the many events of the sixth ‘day’ into a single daytime period, and (3) the fact that the sun was not created until the fourth ‘day’ (see page 119 of this paper). Regarding the age of the universe, many scholars, including conservative evangelicals, accept a multi-billion-year-old cosmos (see pages 121–125 of this paper). The great majority of such proponents argue from scientific evidence, with relatively little recourse to biblical data (see pages 125–126 of this paper).

It seems that there is a disconnection between lexicography regarding יום and the formation of creation theology (see pages 91–101 of this paper). The idea that יום has a broad semantic range is relatively popular among evangelical scholars (see pages 115–125 of this paper), yet it is not reflected in the most respected lexical sources, the notable exceptions being Coppes in *TWOT*, and Wilson in *WOTWS* (see Smith 2019b, Table 2). This evidence suggests that there is a need for greater care in attending to the nuances of lexical semantics. Indeed, Schreiner ([1990] 2011, 126) notes, “Lexical study is one of the most important elements of the exegetical process. Unfortunately, it is also an area that suffers from great abuse.”

In summary, this study has demonstrated that many scholars believe the meaning of יום is flexible, including even a number of young-universe advocates. The perception that יום has a relatively broad semantic range, along with the widespread acceptance of scientific evidence for an ancient universe, has resulted in a variety of interpretations of the creation account, and proposals for an age of the universe ranging from thousands to billions of years.

References

- Ambrose. 1961. *Hexameron*. In *The Fathers of the Church: St. Ambrose, Hexameron, Paradise, Cain and Abel*, translated by John J. Savage, 3–283. Vol. 42. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 1947. *Summa Theologica* (also known as *Summa Theologiae*). Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Benziger Bros. (Version 2.4 in Accordance).
- Archer, Gleason L. Jr. 1974. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Illinois: Moody.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. 1982. *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Zondervan's Understand the Bible Reference Series. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Archer, Gleason L. Jr. 1984. “A Response to The Trustworthiness of Scripture in Areas Relating to Natural Science.” In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II*, edited by Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, 319–334. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. 1994. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction: Revised and Expanded*. 3rd ed. Chicago, Illinois: Moody.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. 2007. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction: Revised and Expanded*. 4th ed. Chicago, Illinois: Moody.
- Augustine of Hippo. 1982. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. 2 vols. Translated and annotated by John Hammond Taylor. Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation 41. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press.
- Augustine of Hippo. (1886) 1994. *The Confessions of St. Augustin*. In vol. 1 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1, edited by Philip Schaff. 14 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Augustine of Hippo. (1887) 1994. *The City of God*. In vol. 2 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1, edited by Philip Schaff. 14 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Barr, James. (1978) 1981. *Fundamentalism*. 2nd ed. London, United Kingdom: S.C.M. Citations refer to the 1981 edition.
- Bauckham, R.J. 1999. “Sabbath and Sunday in the Medieval Church in the West.” In *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, edited by D.A. Carson, 299–309. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock.
- Beall, Todd S. 2008. “Contemporary Hermeneutical Approaches to Genesis 1–11.” In *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*, edited by Terry Mortenson and Thane H. Ury, 131–162. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.

- Beall, Todd S. 2013. "Todd S. Beall [A Response to C. John Collins, 'Reading Genesis 1–2 with the Grain: Analogical Days']." In *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*, edited by J. Daryl Charles, 95–98. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Beall, Todd S. 2017a. "Age of the Universe and Earth (Thousands-of-Years View)." In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 32–36. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Beall, Todd S. 2017b. "Creationism, Old-Earth (Critical View)." In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 132–135. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Beall, Todd S. 2017c. "Days of Creation (24-Hour Day View)." In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 158–162. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Berkhof, L. (1941 with 1949 preface) 1979. *Systematic Theology*. Reprint. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bevan, Edwyn. 1947. "The Religious Value of Myths in the Old Testament." In *In the Beginning*. (The Clarendon Bible: Old Testament), Vol. VI edited by Samuel H. Hooke, 149–162. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press.
- BibleWorks (version 10). 2016. Norfolk, Virginia: BibleWorks. <https://www.bibleworks.com/>.
- Blocher, Henri. (1979) 1984. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Translated by David G. Preston. Originally published as *Révélation des origines* (Lausanne, Switzerland: Presses Bibliques Universitaires). Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press. Citations refer to the 1984 edition.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. 1977–2006. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bradley, Walter L., and Roger Olsen. 1984. "The Trustworthiness of Scripture in Areas Relating to Natural Science." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II*, edited by Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, 283–317. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.
- Bradshaw, Robert I. 1999. *Creationism & the Early Church: An Examination of the Interpretation of the Early Church's Interpretations of Genesis 1–11 from the Time of the Close of the New Testament until the Death of Augustine of Hippo (430AD)*. Version 2.0. United Kingdom: self-published. Accessed July 21, 2017. <https://robibradshaw.com/contents.htm>.
- Brown, Andrew J. 2014. *Days of Creation: A History of Christian Interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3*. History of Biblical Interpretation 4. Blandford Forum, United Kingdom: Deo Publishing.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. (1907) 1979. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers. Citations refer to the 1979 edition.
- Brown, Walter T. 1995. *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*. 6th general ed. Phoenix, Arizona: Center for Scientific Creation.
- Brueggemann, Walter. 1982. *Genesis: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Interpretation. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press.
- Buswell II, James Oliver, Jr. (1935) 1982. "The Length of the Creative Days." In *Evolution: Nature and Scripture in Conflict?*, 301–313. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Buswell II, James Oliver, Jr. 1962. *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Calvin, John. n.d. *Commentary on Genesis*, edited and translated by John King. Version 2.6 in Accordance. Christian Classics Ethereal Library.
- Calvin, John. 1948. *Commentaries of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis*, edited and translated by John King. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Carson, D.A. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Cassuto, Umberto. (1944) 1989. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part I: From Adam to Noah, Genesis I–VI 8*. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Orig. pub. in Hebrew in 1944. Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press. Citations refer to the 1989 edition.
- Ceuppens, Franciscus. 1946. *Genèse I–III*. Bruges, Belgium: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. 1948. *Systematic Theology Volume VII: Doctrinal Summarization*. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Seminary Press.
- Chandler, Matt. 2012. *The Explicit Gospel*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.
- Collins, C. John. 1994. "How Old Is the Earth? Anthropomorphic Days in Genesis 1:1–2:3." *Presbyterion* 20, no. 2 (September): 109–130.
- Collins, C. John. 2003. *Science and Faith: Friends or Foes?* Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.
- Collins, C. John. 2006. *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing.
- Coppes, Leonard J. 1980. "אֶרֶץ." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke, 1: 370–371. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.
- Cosner, Lita. 2013. "How Does the Bible Teach 6,000 Years?" *Creation* 35, no. 1 (January): 54–55.
- Cosner, Lita, Jonathan D. Sarfati, and Carl Wieland. 2013. "6,000 Years of Biblical History: Questions and Answers." Creation Ministries International. January 27, 2013. <https://creation.com/6000-years-qa>.
- Craig, Trevor. 2008. "Can Deep Time Be Embedded in Genesis?" In *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*, edited by Terry Mortenson and Thane H. Ury, 193–210. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- Custance, Arthur C. 1970. *Without Form and Void: A Study of the Meaning of Genesis 1.2*. Brockville, Canada: Doorway Papers.
- Dabney, Robert L. (1878) 1972. *Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Reprint. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. Citations refer to 1972 edition.
- Dake, Finis Jennings, ed. 2001. *Dake's Annotated Reference Bible (KJV)*. Compact Edition. Lawrenceville, Georgia: Dake Publishing.

- Davis, John Jefferson. 1999. "Response to Robert C. Newman." In *Three Views on Creation and Evolution*, edited by J.P. Moreland and John Mark Reynolds, 137–141. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Delitzsch, Franz. 1888. *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Clark's Foreign Theological Library—New Series, XXXVI. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- Dods, Marcus. 1888. *The Book of Genesis*, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. The Expositor's Bible 1. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- Driscoll, Mark, and Gerry Breshears. 2010. *Doctrine: What Christians Should Believe*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.
- Duncan, J. Ligon, and David W. Hall. 2001. "The 24-Hour View." In *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, 21–66. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press.
- England, Donald. 1972. *A Christian View of Origins*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Erickson, Millard J. 1983–1985. *Christian Theology*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Erickson, Millard J. 2013. *Christian Theology: Third Edition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Feinberg, John S. 2006. *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God*. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.
- Fields, Weston W. 1976. *Unformed and Unfilled: A Critique of the Gap Theory*. Collinsville, Illinois: Burgener Enterprises.
- Fischer, Dick. 1990. "The Days of Creation: Hours or Eons?" *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 42, no. 1 (March 1): 15–22.
- Free, Joseph P. 1950. *Archaeology and Bible History*. Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books.
- Fretheim, Terence E. 1990. "Were the Days of Creation Twenty-Four Hours Long? Yes." In *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions about Creation and the Flood*, edited by Ronald Youngblood, 12–35. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Gedney, Edwin K. 1950. "Geology and the Bible." In *Modern Science and Christian Faith: A Symposium on the Relationship of the Bible to Modern Science*, 23–57. Wheaton, Illinois: Scripture Press.
- Geisler, Norman L. 1999. *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Geisler, Norman L. 2003. *Systematic Theology, Volume Two: God, Creation*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House.
- Gentry, Kenneth L., Jr. 2016. *As It Is Written: Dismantling the Framework Hypothesis*. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- Gentry, Kenneth L., Jr. 2017. "Age of the Universe." Personal email correspondence with author, October 7, 2017.
- Gersonides (Levi ben Gershom) (1329) 1886. *מלחמות השם Milchamot Ha-schem*. Leipzig, Germany: Carl B. Lorck.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. 1979. *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Groves-Wheeler Westminster Morphology and Lemma Database (version 4.14 [2010; accessed via BibleWorks version 10]). Chestnut Hill (Philadelphia), Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 2008.
- Grudem, Wayne. 1994. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Gunkel, Hermann. (1901) 1997. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Trans. from 3rd German ed., 9th printing, 1977. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press. Citations refer to the 1997 edition.
- Haas, John W., Jr. 1979. "The Christian View of Science and Scripture: A Retrospective Look." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 31, no. 4 (December): 177.
- Hagopian, David G., ed. 2001. *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press.
- Hales, William. 1830. *A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy*. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. 4 vols. London, United Kingdom: C.J.G. & F. Rivington.
- Hamilton, Victor P. 1990. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament 1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. 1980. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago, Illinois: Moody Press.
- Harris, R. Laird. 1995. *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Scriptures*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock.
- Hartmann, Benedickt, Philippe Reymond, and Jakob Stamm. 1990. *Hebraisches Und Aramisches Wörterbuch Der Hebraischen Sprache*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. 1974. "The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (April): 81–102.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. 1994. "The 'Days' of Creation in Genesis 1: Literal 'Days' or Figurative 'Periods / Epochs' of Time?" *Origins* 21, no. 1: 5–38.
- Hayward, Alan. (1985) (1995) 2005. *Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence from Science and the Bible*. London, United Kingdom: SPCK. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock. Citations refer to the Wipf and Stock (2005) edition.
- Hearn, Walter R.. 1979. "An Interview with Bernard Ramm and Alta Ramm." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 31, no. 4 (December): 179–186.
- Henry, Carl F. H. 1983. *God, Revelation and Authority*. Vol. 6. 6 vols. Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Hodge, Charles. 1871. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. New York, New York: Charles Scribner and Company.
- Holladay, William L. 1971. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Horton, Michael S. 2011. *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims On the Way*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Hughes, Brennan. 2014. "How Young-Earth Creationism Made Me Lose My Faith (For a While)." Heaven's Muscle (blog). BrennanHughes.com. April 7, 2014. <http://brennanhughes.com/how-young-earth-creationism-made-me-lose-my-faith-for-a-while/>.
- Hummel, Charles E. 1986. "Interpreting Genesis One." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 38, no. 3 (September): 178–185.
- Hyers, M. Conrad. 1984a. *The Meaning of Creation: Genesis and Modern Science*. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press.
- Hyers, M. Conrad. 1984b. "The Narrative Form of Genesis 1: Cosmogonic, Yes; Scientific, No." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 36, no. 4 (December): 208–215.

- Institute für Neutestamentliche Textforschung Münster/ Westfalen, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th revised ed., Version 1.6 in Accordance. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Irons, Lee, and Meredith G. Kline. 2001. "The Framework View." In *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, edited by David G. Hagopian, 217–256. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. 1971. *Theologisches Handwörterbuch Zum Alten Testament*. 2 vols. Munich, Germany: Kaiser.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. 1997. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by M.E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Josephus. 1987. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged—New Updated Edition*. Translated by William Whiston. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Keil, C.F. (1881) 2006. *The Pentateuch*. Translated by James Martin. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark. Reprint. Vol. 1. 10 vols. Commentary on the Old Testament. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers. Citations refer to the 2006 edition.
- Kelly, Douglas F. 1997. *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1–2.4 in the Light of Changing Scientific Paradigms*. Fearn, United Kingdom: Mentor (Christian Focus).
- Kelly, Douglas F. 2017. *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1–2.4 in the Light of Changing Scientific Paradigms—Revised and Updated Edition*. Fearn, United Kingdom: Mentor (Christian Focus).
- Kevan, E.F. 1953. "Genesis." In *The New Bible Commentary*, edited by Francis Davidson, A.M. Stibbs, and E.F. Kevan, 75–105. Chicago, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship.
- Kidner, Derek. 1967. *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, United Kingdom: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Kittel, Rudolph, Paul Kahle, Albrecht Alt, and Otto Eissfeldt, eds. (1906) 1937. *Biblia Hebraica*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Württembergische Bibelanstalt. Citations refer to the 1937 edition.
- Kline, Meredith G. 1970. "Genesis." In *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*, edited by Donald Guthrie, J.A. Motyer, A.M. Stibbs, and D.J. Wiseman, 79–114. London, United Kingdom: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. 1958. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. 2001. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition*. Translated by M.E.J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Kofahl, Robert E., and Kelly L. Segraves. 1975. *The Creation Explanation: A Scientific Alternative to Evolution*. Wheaton, Illinois: Harold Shaw Publishers.
- Kugel, James L. 2007. *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now*. New York, New York: Free Press.
- Kulikovskiy, Andrew S. 2009. *Creation, Fall, Restoration: A Biblical Theology of Creation*. Fearn, United Kingdom: Mentor (Christian Focus).
- Kurtz, Johann Heinrich. (1842) 1857. *The Bible and Astronomy: An Exposition of the Biblical Cosmology, and Its Relations to Natural Science*. Translated by T.D. Simonton from the 3rd and improved German ed. Originally published as *Die Astronomie und die Bibel* (Mitau: Friedrich Lucas). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Lindsay and Blakiston. Citations refer to the 1857 edition.
- Lagrange, M.J. 1896. "Hexaméron (Genèse I A II, 4)." *Revue Biblique* (1892–1940) 5, no. 3: 381–407.
- Lennox, John C. 2011. *Seven Days That Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Letham, Robert. 1999. "In the Space of Six Days: The Days of Creation from Origen to the Westminster Assembly." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 61, no. 2 (September): 149–174.
- Leupold, H.C. 1942. *Exposition of Genesis, Volume 1: Chapters 1–19*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Lewis, Gordon R., and Bruce A. Demarest. 1990. *Integrative Theology, Volume 2: Our Primary Need, Christ's Atoning Provisions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, Zondervan.
- Lewis, Jack P. 1989. "The Days of Creation: An Historical Survey of Interpretation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32, no. 4 (December): 433–455.
- Lewis, Tayler. 1855. *The Six Days of Creation; or, the Scriptural Cosmology, with the Ancient Idea of Time-Worlds in Distinction from Worlds in Space*. Schenectady, New York: G.Y. Van Debogert.
- Longman III, Tremper, and Raymond B. Dillard. 2006. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Longman III, Tremper. 1996. Endorsement of *Genesis Unbound*. In Sailhamer, John H. *Genesis Unbound: A Provocative New Look at the Creation Account*. Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books.
- Longman III, Tremper. 2005. *How to Read Genesis*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Longman III, Tremper. 2013. "What Genesis 1–2 Teaches (and What It Doesn't)." In *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*, edited by J. Daryl Charles, 103–128. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Luther, Martin. 1958. *Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Luther, Martin. 1958. *Lectures on Genesis: Chapters 1–5*, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Translated by George V. Schick. Vol. 1. 8 vols. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia.
- Mathews, Kenneth A. 1996. *Genesis 1:1–11:26*. The New American Commentary 1A. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman.
- McCabe, Robert V. 2000. "A Defense of Literal Days in the Creation Week." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 5, no. 1 (September): 97–123.
- McCabe, Robert V. 2008. "A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Week." In *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*, edited by Terry Mortenson and Thane H. Ury, 211–249. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. 2009. "Hosea." In *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, edited by Thomas Edward McComiskey, 1–237. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

- Meyer, Bradley S., and James W. Truran. 2000. "Nucleocosmochronology." *Physics Reports* 333–334 (August): 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-1573\(00\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-1573(00)00012-0).
- Millam, John. 2011. "Coming to Grips with the Early Church Fathers' Perspective on Genesis, Part 1 (of 5)." Reasons to Believe. September 8, 2011. <http://www.reasons.org/articles/coming-to-grips-with-the-early-church-fathers-perspective-on-genesis-part-1-of-5>.
- Morris, Henry M., ed. 1974. *Scientific Creationism*. San Diego, California: Creation-Life.
- Morris, Henry M. 1976. *The Genesis Record: A Scientific and Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Morris, Henry M. 1984. "A Response to The Trustworthiness of Scripture in Areas Relating to Natural Science." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II*, edited by Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, 335–348. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.
- Morris, Henry M., and John D. Morris. 1989. *Science, Scripture and the Young Earth*. El Cajon, California: Institute for Creation Research.
- Mortenson, Terry. 2008. "Jesus' View of the Age of the Earth." In *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*, edited by Terry Mortenson and Thane H. Ury, 315–346. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- Mortenson, Terry, and Thane H. Ury, eds. 2008. *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- Munyon, Timothy. 1995. "The Creation of the Universe and Humankind." In *Systematic Theology: Revised Edition*, edited by Stanley M. Horton, 215–253. Springfield, Missouri: Logion Press.
- Newman, Robert C. 1999. "Progressive Creationism ('Old Earth Creationism')." In *Three Views on Creation and Evolution*, edited by J.P. Moreland and John Mark Reynolds, 105–133. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Newman, Robert C., and Herman J. Eckelmann Jr. 1977. *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Noll, Mark A., and David N. Livingstone. 2000. "Introduction: B.B. Warfield as a Conservative Evolutionist." In *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, edited by Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone, 13–44. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Noordtzi, Arie. 1924. *Gods Woord en der Eeuwen Getuigenis*. Kampen, The Netherlands: J.H. Kok.
- Oden, Thomas C. 1987. *The Living God*. Systematic Theology 1. New York, New York: Harper Collins.
- Origen. (1885) 1994. *De Principiis*. In vol. 4 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Ortlund, Gavin. 2017. "Did Augustine Read Genesis 1 Literally?" Rooting the Faith. *Sapientia*, September 4, 2017. <http://henrycenter.tiu.edu/2017/09/did-augustine-read-genesis-1-literally/>.
- Payne, David F. 1964. *Genesis One Reconsidered*. Tyndale Old Testament Lecture. London, United Kingdom: The Tyndale Press.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 1971. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1. 5 vols. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pember, G. H. (1876) 1975. *Earth's Earliest Ages and Their Connection with Modern Spiritualism, Theosophy, and Buddhism: New Edition—Edited, with Additions*, by G.H. Lang. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel. Citations refer to the 1975 edition.
- Piper, John. 2010. "What Should We Teach about Creation?" (video), June 1, 2010. Accessed June 8, 2018. <https://www.desiringgod.org/interviews/what-should-we-teach-about-creation>.
- Pun, Pattle P.T. 1982. *Evolution: Nature and Scripture in Conflict?* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Rad, Gerhard von. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary (Revised Edition)*. Translated by John H. Marks. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press.
- Ramm, Bernard. 1954. *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Ridderbos, N. H. 1957. *Is There a Conflict Between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?* Translated by John Vriend. Originally published in Dutch under the title *Beschouwingen over Genesis 1* (Assen, The Netherlands: G.F. Hummelen). Contemporary Evangelical Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Robbins, Frank. 1912. *The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries in Genesis*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. (1885–1897) 1994. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Ross, Allen P. 1985. "Genesis." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament—An Exposition of the Scriptures by Dallas Seminary Faculty*, edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, 15–101. Colorado Springs, Colorado: David C. Cook.
- Ross, Allen P. (1988) 1996. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books. Citations refer to the 1996 edition.
- Ross, Hugh. 1994. *Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective on the Creation-Date Controversy*. Colorado Springs, Colorado: NavPress.
- Ross, Hugh. 2015. *A Matter of Days: Resolving a Creation Controversy—Second Expanded Edition*. Covina, California: Reasons to Believe.
- Ross, Hugh. 2017. "Days of Creation (Day-Age View)." In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 162–165. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Ross, Hugh, and Gleason L. Archer. 2001. "The Day-Age View." In *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, edited by David G. Hagopian, 123–163. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press.
- RTB (Reasons to Believe). n.d.a. "Biblical Evidence for an Old Earth." Accessed May 14, 2019. <https://www.reasons.org/explore/publications/rtb-101/biblical-evidence-old-earth>.
- RTB (Reasons to Believe). n.d.b. "Our Mission: Engage & Equip." Accessed May 14, 2019. <https://www.reasons.org/about/mission-beliefs>.
- Sæbø, Magne. 1990. "יום" (Sections II–VI). In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, VI:12–32. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Sailhamer, John H. 1996. *Genesis Unbound: A Provocative New Look at the Creation Account*. Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books.
- Sarfati, Jonathan D. 2015. *The Genesis Account: A Theological, Historical, and Scientific Commentary on Genesis 1–11*. Powder Springs, Georgia: Creation Book Publishers.
- Sarna, Nahum M. 1966. *Understanding Genesis*. The Melton Research Center Series 1. New York, New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America; McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. (1990) 2011. *Interpreting the Pauline Epistles*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. (1886–1889) 1994. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1. 14 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Schroeder, Gerald L. 2013. “The Age of the Universe.” *Articles* (blog), October 2013. Accessed July 13, 2017. http://geraldschroeder.com/wordpress/?page_id=53.
- Schwab, George. 2017a. “Creationism, Old-Earth (Supportive View).” In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 135–139. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Schwab, George. 2017b. “Days of Creation (Framework-Hypothesis View).” In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 165–168. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Scofield, C.I., and E. Schuyler English, eds. 1967. *Oxford NIV Scofield Study Bible*. Incorporating *The New Scofield Reference Bible*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scofield, C.I., ed. (1909) 1917. *The Scofield Reference Bible, Authorized Version (New and Improved Edition)*. 2nd ed. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scofield, C.I., ed. 1967. *The New Scofield Reference Bible*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, John. 1930. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. 2nd ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T. & T. Clark.
- Smith, John C.P. 2019a. “How Scholars’ Perceptions of the Semantic Range of חַיָּה Have Affected Their Discussions of the Age of the Universe: Part 1. *Answers Research Journal* 12: 73–89.
- Smith, John C.P. 2019b. “How Scholars’ Perceptions of the Semantic Range of חַיָּה Have Affected Their Discussions of the Age of the Universe: Part 2. *Answers Research Journal* 12: 91–101.
- Smith, Wilbur Moorehead. 1945. *Therefore, Stand: A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity*. 6th ed. Boston, Massachusetts: W.A. Wilde Co.
- Snelling, Andrew A. 2009. *Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation and the Flood*. 2 vols. Dallas, Texas: Institute for Creation Research.
- Snow, R.J. 1977. “How Long Is the Sixth Day? (Appendix III).” In Newman, Robert C. and Herman J. Eckelmann Jr. *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth*, 125–135. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Stambaugh, Jim. 1991. “The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach.” *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 5, no. 1 (April): 70–78.
- Stambaugh, Jim. 2003. “The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach.” *Journal of Ministry and Theology* 7, no. 2 (Fall): 42–68.
- Stambaugh, Jim. 2004. “The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach Part II.” *Journal of Ministry and Theology* 8, no. 1: 37–54.
- Stek, John H. 1990. “What Says the Scripture?” In Van Till, Howard, Robert E. Snow, John H. Stek, and Davis A. Young. 1990. *Portraits of Creation: Biblical and Scientific Perspectives on the World’s Formation*, 203–265. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. 2011. “Night and Day, Evening and Morning.” *The Bible Translator* 62, no. 3 (July): 145–150.
- Stott, John R.W. 1976. *Understanding the Bible*. Revised ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Strauss, Michael G. 2017a. “Age of the Universe and Earth (Billions-of-Years View).” In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 28–32. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Strauss, Michael G. 2017b. “Days of Creation, Interpretations.” In *Dictionary of Christianity and Science*, edited by Paul Copan, Tremper Longman III, Christopher L. Reese, and Michael G. Strauss, 168–170. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. (1886) 1907. *Systematic Theology: A Compendium Designed for the Use of Theological Students (Three Volumes in One)*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Judson Press.
- Tertullian. (1885) 1994. *Against Hermogenes*. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Reprint, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence. (1949) 1979. *Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Revised ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Thompson, J.A. 1962. “The Genesis Account.” In *The New Bible Dictionary*, edited by J.D. Douglas, F.F. Bruce, J.I. Packer, R.V.G. Tasker, and D.J. Wiseman, 270–272. London, United Kingdom: InterVarsity Press.
- Till, Howard J. Van, Davis A. Young, and Clarence Menninga. 1988. *Science Held Hostage: What’s Wrong with Creation Science and Evolutionism*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Touati, Charles. 1973. “La Lumière de l’Intellect, création du Premier Jour: L’exégèse de Genèse 1, 1–3 chez Gersonide.” In *In Principio: Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse*, 37–45. Paris, France: Études Augustiniennes.
- Ussher, James. (1650–1654) 2003. *The Annals of the World* (also referred to as *The Annals of the Old and New Testament* [Latin, *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti*]). Revised and updated by Larry and Marion Pierce. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books.
- Waltke, Bruce K. 1991. “The Literary Genre of Genesis, Chapter One.” *Crux* 27, no. 4 (December): 2–10.
- Walton, John H. 1996. “Principles for Productive Word Study.” In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, 1:158–168. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Walton, John H. 2001. *The NIV Application Commentary Genesis: Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

- Walton, John H. 2009. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. 1903. "The Manner and Time of Man's Origin." *The Bible Student* n.s. 8, no. 5: 241–252.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. 1911. "On the Antiquity and the Unity of the Human Race." *The Princeton Theological Review* 9, no. 1 (January): 1–25.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. 1915. "Calvin's Doctrine of the Creation." *The Princeton Theological Review* 13, no. 2 (April): 190–255.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. 2000. *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, edited by Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Weeks, Noel. 1978. "The Hermeneutical Problem of Genesis 1–11." *Themelios* 4, no. 1 (September): 12–19.
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. *Genesis 1–15, Volume 1*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan (formerly published by Thomas Nelson).
- Westermann, Claus. 1974. *Genesis*. Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament, Band I. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins.
- Whitcomb, John C., Jr. 1972. *The Early Earth*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker.
- Whitcomb, John C., Jr. 1973. "Science of Historical Geology in the Light of the Biblical Doctrine of a Mature Creation." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 36, no. 1 (September): 65–77.
- Whitcomb, John C., Jr. 1986. *The Early Earth*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker.
- Whitcomb, John C., Jr. 2010. *The Early Earth: An Introduction to Biblical Creationism*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, Indiana: BMH Books.
- Whitcomb, John C., and Henry M. Morris. 1961. *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.
- Williams, J. Rodman. 1988. *Renewal Theology: God, the World and Redemption—Systematic Theology From a Charismatic Perspective*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books, Zondervan.
- Wilson, William. (1870) 1990. *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies*. Originally published under the title *The Bible Student's Guide to the More Correct Understanding of the English Translation of the Old Testament by reference to the original Hebrew*. London, United Kingdom: Macmillan. 2nd ed. Reprint. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers. Citations refer to the 1990 edition.
- Wiseman, P.J. 1948. *Creation Revealed in Six Days: The Evidence of Scripture Confirmed by Archaeology*. London, United Kingdom: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Wood, Leon J., and David O'Brien. 1986. *A Survey of Israel's History: Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Wright, Richard T. 1979. "Evolutionary Biology." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 31, no. 4 (December): 194–195.
- Young, Davis A. 1977. *Creation and the Flood: An Alternative to Flood Geology and Theistic Evolution*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Young, Davis A. 1982. *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Young, Edward J. 1964. *Studies in Genesis One*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Presbyterian and Reformed.
- Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd. 2008. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. London, United Kingdom: Equinox.
- Zaspel, Fred G. 2010. "B.B. Warfield on Creation and Evolution." *Themelios* 35, no. 2 (July): 198–211.
- Zaspel, Fred G. 2017. "B.B. Warfield Did Not Endorse Theistic Evolution as It Is Understood Today." In *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*, edited by J.P. Moreland, Stephen C. Meyer, Christopher Shaw, Ann K. Gauger, and Wayne Grudem. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway.

Abbreviations

AD	"Anno Domini," meaning "In the year of our Lord"	NIV	<i>New International Version</i> (2011)
ANE	Ancient Near East(ern)	NKJV	<i>New King James Version</i> (1982)
ANF	<i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> ([1885–1897] 1994)	NOAD	<i>New Oxford American Dictionary (American English)</i> (2016)
BC	"Before Christ"	NPNF ^a	<i>The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers</i> , Series 1 ([1886–1889] 1994)
BDB	<i>The New Brown—Driver—Briggs—Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> ([1907] 1979)	NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i> (1989)
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> (2nd ed., 1997)	NT	New Testament
ESV	<i>English Standard Version</i> (2016)	OT	Old Testament
ESV*	<i>English Standard Version</i> (2016; but substituting "YHWH" for "the LORD," and capitalizing the first letter of divine pronouns)	RTB	Reasons to Believe (Christian ministry)
EVV	English Versions	s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> (Latin for "under the word")
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition</i> (2001)	TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> (1977–2006)
HB	Hebrew Bible (Old Testament)	THAT	<i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT</i> (1971–78)
HCSB	<i>Holman Christian Standard Bible</i> (2017)	TLOT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (1997)
JPS	<i>Jewish Publication Society Tanakh</i> (1917)	TWOT	<i>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</i> (1980)
KJV	<i>King James Version</i> (1769 Blayney Edition)	WBC	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i> (1982–2014)
lit.	literal(ly)	WOTWS	<i>Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies</i> ([1870] 1990)
LXX	Septuagint	WTM	<i>Groves-Wheeler Westminster Morphology and Lemma Database</i> (v. 4.14, 2010)
NASB	<i>New American Standard Bible</i> (1995)		
NICOT	<i>The New International Commentary on the Old Testament</i> (1976–2017)		

Appendix 1

Tabular Presentation of Core Data: How יום Has Been Handled in Discussions Pertaining to the Age of the Universe Over the Past Fifty Years

The following alphabetical tabular presentation concisely documents for each source (a) the position, (b) argumentation, and (c) supporting evidence for the proposed (1) semantic range of יום, (2) meaning of יום in Genesis 1, and (3) age of the universe. The following points should be noted:

- Due to space limitations and a desire to keep the data clear and concise, a maximum of one page has been allocated for each record. Subsequently, not all points of argumentation or supporting evidence are necessarily included, especially from lengthy discussions.
 - In the support column, the citation information for the source quoted within the work is given first, including the source page numbers. The page number(s) where the source is quoted within the work itself follows within parentheses. For example, on p. 195 of Craigen’s 2008 work he alludes to the source of Fields (1976, 165–179); so this is represented in the support column of Craigen 2008 as, “Fields 1976, 165–179 (195).”
 - It is freely admitted that the choice of what to include in each record is necessarily subjective.
- Nevertheless, I have endeavored to represent the position of each scholar as fairly as possible.
- Every quotation, and every numbered or bulleted point, is followed in parentheses by the source location to which it corresponds. Where all the source locations within a table cell are identical, the parenthetical information is listed just once, on a separate line at the bottom.
 - Regarding the semantic range of יום, only argumentation for an extended meaning beyond a literal day (viz., twelve to twenty-four hours) is presented, since likely all scholars would agree that the semantic range at very least includes a literal day.
 - In the “Support” column, sources are listed in the following order: (i) biblical references in (Christian) canonical order, (ii) secondary sources in alphabetical order, and (iii) any other sources.
 - The abbreviation “n/a” (“not available” or “not applicable”) in the “Support” column does not necessarily indicate that the source lacks supporting evidence. It is used merely in the absence of any explicit support relating to the specific position or argumentation.

Archer 1982, 1984, 2007 (see also Ross and Archer 2001)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "sunrise-to-sundown day" (1982, 62); "twelve-hour period" (1984, 327) 2. "twenty-four-hour day" (1982, 62) 3. "a more extended space of time" (1984, 328) 4. "stages of unspecified length" (2007, 159) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "All biblical scholars admit that <i>yōm</i> ('day') may be used in a figurative or symbolic manner, as well as in a literal sense.... It is perfectly evident that <i>yōm</i> in Genesis 2:4 could not refer to a twenty-four hour day. In the frequent phrase, <i>yōm Yahweh</i>, 'Day of Yahweh' (Isa. 2:12; 13:6, 9; Amos 5:18, 20; Jer. 46:10; Ezek. 13:5; 30:3 and many more) it is impossible to take this period of God's vengeance upon His foes as restricted to a mere twenty-four hours. The same is true of <i>yōm gāsir</i>, '(in the) day of harvest.' Nowhere on earth is an entire ingathering of crops accomplished in a single day" (1984, 327) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 • Isaiah 2:12; 13:6, 9 • Jeremiah 46:10 • Ezekiel 13:5; 30:3 • Amos 5:18, 20 (1984, 327)
יוֹם In Genesis 1	<p>"a longer process of time than a single calendar day.... a symbol of the beginning and completion of a distinct stage" (1984, 328);</p> <p>"intended to represent stages of unspecified length, not literal twenty-four-hour days" (2007, 159)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "An absolute literalism [in all biblical interpretation, e.g., in Matt 19:24, John 2:19] ... would amount to heresy" (1982, 59) • "Since the term <i>yōm</i> may refer to an interval of time when the transaction referred to achieves completion (whether it be a twelve-hour period, as in Genesis 1:5, or in a twenty-four hour period, or in a more extended space of time), it is necessary to establish in the light of the context and of comparable usage elsewhere in the Scripture, in which sense <i>yōm</i> is used" (1984, 327–328) • "Genesis 1 was not intended by either the Divine Author or by the human author (Moses) to teach that the whole work of creation took only six calendar days to complete" (1984, 329) • "Each of the creative days was symbolized by a complete twenty-four-hour cycle ... There were definite and distinct stages in God's creational procedure" (1982, 62) • "There are at least two main fallacies which discredit [the Young Age] viewpoint so seriously as to make it well-nigh untenable.... [viz.,] the problem of contradiction between Genesis 1 and 2 ... [and] an underlying preoccupation with the 10,000 year deadline that controls their entire line of investigation" (1984, 325, 330–331) • "The more serious difficulty with the twenty-four hour theory is that it gives rise to an insoluble contradiction [of 1:27] with Genesis 2 [vv. 7, 15, 18–20]. Since this contradiction is easy to prove, it results in a fatal undermining of the inerrancy of Scripture" (1984, 325) • "It would seem to border on sheer irrationality to insist that all of Adam's experiences in Genesis 2:15–22 could have been crowded into the last hour or two of a literal twenty-four-hour day" (1982, 60) • "The long interval of time between the creation of Adam and the creation of Eve utterly precludes a twenty-four hour interpretation" (1984, 328) • "None of the six creative days bears a definite article in the Hebrew text ... Thus they are well adapted to a sequential pattern, rather than to strictly delimited units of time" (1982, 60–61) • "Some have argued that the reference in the Decalogue ... strongly suggests the literal nature of 'day' in Genesis 1. This is not at all compelling, however ... Scripture does not at all teach that Yahweh rested only one twenty-four-hour day at the conclusion of His creative work. No closing formula occurs at the close of the seventh day ... in Genesis 2:2–3. And, in fact, the New Testament teaches (in Heb. 4:1–11) that that seventh day, that 'Sabbath rest,' in a very definite sense has continued on right into the church age. If so, it would be quite impossible to line up the seventh-day Sabbath with the Seventh Day that concluded God's original work of creation!" (1982, 62) • "<i>Yōm</i> in Genesis 2:4 cannot possibly be meant as a twenty-four-hour day—unless perchance the Scripture contradicts itself! [D.A. Young]" (1982, 63) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:2–4, 15–22 (1982, 60, 62, 63) • Matthew 19:24 (1982, 59) • John 2:19 (1982, 59) • Hebrews 4:1–11 (1982, 62) • D.A. Young 1977 (1982, 63)
Age of Universe	<p>"billions of years" (1982, 58)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[The] conflict between Genesis 1 and the factual data of science ... is only apparent, not real" (1982, 58) • "Evidence from the fossils and fissionable minerals in the geological strata ... indicate Earth is billions of years old" (1982, 58); "Modern Scientific Evidence," includes fossils, and radiometric and carbon 14 dating (2007, 156–157) • "The realization that the six stages of Genesis 1 do not represent calendar days leaves the Christian geologist free to draw tentative conclusions from his data" (1984, 332) 	n/a

Beall 2017a, 2017b, 2017c			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	1. "24-hour day" (32 and <i>passim</i>) 2. "an indefinite period of time" (159)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Yôm may mean an indefinite period of time in 65 instances in the OT (such as Gen. 2:4) ... The main exceptions to the literal 24-hour meaning are found with the combination of a preposition plus yôm plus a verb following" (159) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 2:4 (159)
יום In Genesis 1	"literal, sequential 24-hour days" (161)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The predominant meaning of yôm ... is a 24-hour day (the word has this meaning 2,239 out of 2,304 occurrences, or 97 percent of its usage).... The phrase 'evening and morning,' used six times in Genesis 1, reinforces the idea of a 24-hour day. Passages such as Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8 ... are simply teaching that God's view of time is different from man's. The comparison in these texts is to a single 24-hour day, with the comparative particle like used in these texts, but not in Genesis 1.... Exodus 20:8-11 ... explicitly links the days of creation to the days of the workweek.... The term yôm is used six times in the passage. It hardly makes sense for the term to mean a literal 24-hour day in the first three usages (describing the workweek) but then to mean an undetermined length of time in the final three usages (dealing with creation)" (133) "In the book of Genesis as a whole, the term yôm occurs 83 times in the singular, including 72 times in the absolute state. In each of these 72 occurrences, yôm means a normal 24-hour day, not an indefinite period of time. In addition, in virtually every passage where a limiting number is attached (first, second, third, etc.), as is the case in 9 of the instances of yôm in Genesis 1:1-2:3, the meaning is a 24-hour day" (159) "Since the Protestant Reformation, with its insistence on the supremacy of Scripture and a more literal understanding of the text, the predominant view until recently has been that the creation days were 24 hours. As Luther states, 'We assert that Moses spoke in the literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read' (Luther 1958, 5)" (158-159) "All of the major Hebrew lexicons similarly affirm that yôm in Genesis 1 is used to communicate a 24-hour day" (159) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 1:1-2:3, and <i>passim</i> (133, 159) Exodus 20:8-11 (133) Luther 1958, 5 (158-159)
Age of Universe	"between 6,000 and 10,000 years old" (32)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Biblical evidence" (32ff.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Genesis 1. Genesis 1:1-2:3 describes the creation of 'the heavens and earth' in six days.... The predominant meaning of yôm ... is a 24-hour day" (32) "Genealogies. The genealogies of Genesis 5, 10, and 11 similarly indicate a recent creation of mankind" (33) "Universal flood..... Genesis 6-8 indicates that there was a universal catastrophic flood that likely caused most of the geological features that are often perceived as the end result of a process lasting millions of years (Kulikovsky 2009, 223-237; for detailed geological discussion, see Snelling 2009)" (33) "Jesus's statement in Mark 10:6..... Jesus states that mankind was created at the beginning of creation, not millions of years later (Kulikovsky 2009, 175; Mortenson and Ury 2008, 318-25)" (33) "Death before sin? ... Since God's creation was originally declared 'very good' by the Lord himself (Gen. 1:31), it was only after the fall that death and corruption entered the world.... There is no room in the Scripture for millions of years of death and corruption prior to Adam's sin" (33-34) "Scientific issues" (34f.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Some Christians ... hold that the universe is 13-14 billion years old ... because they are persuaded by the scientific arguments for an old universe and earth.... [However] all of these dating methodologies contain assumptions that are either scientifically unprovable or are actually refuted by a global catastrophe such as the flood" (34-35) "The biblical record and true science can never be in conflict, but empirical science has its limitations when it comes to origins. It seems wisest to stick with the consistent testimony of Scripture rather than the questionable assumptions of current scientific theory" (35) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 1:1-2:3; 5-8; 10; 11 (32-34) Mark 10:6 (33) Kulikovsky 2009, 175, 223-237 (33) Mortenson and Ury 2008, 318-325 (33) Snelling 2009 (33)

Blocher (1979) 1984			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "24-hour rotation of the earth" 2. "indefinite or considerable length of time" 3. "the coming messianic age" (44) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Yôm ... is not always restricted to the 24-hour rotations of the earth. It can be used for an indefinite or considerable length of time. In this respect Kidner [56] cites Psalm 90:4, ... and the expression 'in that day' for the coming messianic age (Is. 4:2; there is no shortage of examples)" (44) • "[But] the metaphorical use of a word like 'day' is a function of style which must not be confused with the presence of a broad meaning amongst the usual meanings of the word" (44) • "True, yôm is not always used in its more precise sense in the Old Testament, but the reader is given a false impression if he is led to believe that yôm in Hebrew behaves very differently from 'day' in English.... The context makes the sense clear" (44) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps 90:4 • Isaiah 4:2 • Kidner 1967, 56 (44)
יום In Genesis 1	"ordinary days ... in the context of one large figurative whole" (50)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The numbering of the days and more particularly the mention of the evenings and the mornings [Payne, 8] diminish the possibility of ... a loose [indefinite period] usage here. Inevitably the mind turns to clearly defined days in the ordinary sense, days of twenty-four hours" (44–45) • "The seventh day does not conclude with the formula, 'there was evening and there was morning', from which one must with Augustine [<i>Confessions</i> XIII, xxxvi, 51] deduce its permanence; in the same sense F. Delitzsch [<i>Genesis</i>, 110] spoke of its 'infinite perspective' [Kidner, 53].... Our Lord himself [cf. John 5:17, 19] did not see the seventh day of Genesis as a literal day" (44, 57) • "Claus Westermann, who has no apologetic interests in the question, believes he sees ... indications [of non-literal language in Genesis 1], since from examining the text he concludes that the days 'have something of the character of a parable' [Westermann, <i>Genesis</i>, 126].... If ... [these indications] are sufficiently clear, they will justify a ['literary'] interpretation" (49) • "Both the genre and the style of the Genesis 1 prologue ... provide strong grounds for presuming in favour of the literary interpretation. We discerned a composite literary genre, skilfully composed. We admired its author as a wise man, supremely able in the art of arranging material and very fond of manipulating numbers, particularly the number seven. From such writer the plain, straightforward meaning, as in two-dimensional prose, would be most surprising when he is setting out the pattern of seven days. From such a writer, you would expect the sort of method which is discerned by the 'artistic' interpretation" (50–51) • "This hypothesis overcomes a number of problems that plagued the commentators.... The differences in order between the two 'tablets' no longer cause difficulties, neither does the delay in the creation of the stars" (50) • "Augustine ... constructed a brilliant and startling interpretation of the days in <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i>. In his view, their temporal character is not physical but ideal ... In the Middle Ages, Gersonides (1288–1344) considered that the days 'indicate the prior order between beings in logical and natural terms, not not in chronological terms' <i>מ' להמנות השם</i>, 427–428.... Nearer our own day ... M.J. Lagrange, writes without hesitation: 'the author's intention is crystal clear ... his procedure is one of logic: it is a literary form' [1896, 395f.]. For several decades quite a number of theologians in the evangelical churches have been advocating the same opinion.... [including Noordtzij, Ridderbos, Ramm, Kline, D.F. Payne, J.A. Thompson]. There is no questioning their competence or, generally speaking, their respect for Scripture" (49–50) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John 5:17, 19 (57) • Augustine (1886) 1994, <i>Confessions</i> 13.36 (<i>NPNF</i>¹ 1:207) (44); <i>The Literal Meaning of Genesis [De Genesi ad litteram]</i> 1982 (49) • Delitzsch 1888, 110 (44, 57) • Gersonides (1329) 1886, 427–428 (Blocher is translating from Charles Touati's French essay on Gersonides in Touati 1973, 38–39) (50) • Kidner 1967, 53 (44) • Lagrange 1896, 395f. (50) • Payne 1964, 8 (44) • Westermann 1974, 126 (44) • various evangelical theologians (50)
Age of Universe	"billions of years" (40); "13 billion years" (215)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Current scientific theory attributes [billions of years] to the origin of the universe" (40); "The big bang theory holds that the universe has been expanding for 13 billion years" (215) • "The days of Genesis 1 contradict the proposed datings only if interpreted literally" (215); "[With the literary interpretation] the confrontation with the scientific vision of the most distant past [no longer causes difficulties]" (50) 	n/a

Bradley and Olsen 1984			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	1. "twenty-four hour day" 2. "time period other than day" (299)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "In ... sixty-five ... cases [of over 1900 times that the Hebrew word 'yom' and its plural form 'yamim' are used in the OT it is] translated as a time period other than a day in the King James Version [Kofahl & Segraves, 232]" (299) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kofahl and Segraves 1975, 232 (299)
יוֹם In Genesis 1	<p>"uncertain from an exegetical point of view ... either 'day' or 'epoch'" (300, 310);</p> <p>"an indefinite period of time ... is a legitimate interpretation ... [even] the more compelling interpretation [cf. Kaiser, Snow]" (300);</p> <p>"we prefer the day/age model in which 'yom' is interpreted to be some indefinitely long period of time" (309);</p> <p>"creative epoch" (300)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "There is no other place in the Old Testament where the intent is to describe events that involve multiple and/or sequential, indefinite periods of time. If the intent of Genesis 1 is to describe creation as occurring in six, indefinite time periods, it is a unique Old Testament event being recorded.... [Arguments for the use of 'yom' as a normal day] elsewhere in the Old Testament cannot be given as unequivocal exegetical significance [—and constitute a common fallacy—] in view of the uniqueness of the events being described in Genesis 1 (i.e., sequential, indefinite time periods)" (299) "It is unreasonable ... to <i>demand</i> that 'morning and evening' be given a literal significance. If 'yom' can mean creative epoch, then 'mutatis mutandis' (evening and morning) could reasonably be interpreted to have the metaphorical significance of beginning and ending" (300) "A figurative or metaphorical interpretation of the 'yom' of Genesis 1 does not necessarily lead to a denial of the historicity of the Genesis 1 account (as some claim), but only rejection of the interpretation of the creative 'week' as being of 168 hours duration. Furthermore, God's supernatural creative activity in these longer creative 'days' is still affirmed" (300) "Exodus 20:11 is often suggested to be convincing evidence for a six-day creative week, but arguments by analogy can only be suggestive, and never conclusive. There is simply no reason why our seven-day week demands a creative week of seven twenty-four hour days" (300) "Davis A. Young has recently argued that God's creative week is still in progress, based on the absence of the 'morning and evening' phraseology with referent to day seven (Gen. 2:2-3) and the references in Hebrews 4 to entering into God's rest, which suggests the seventh 'yom' continues to the present" (300) "It has been argued over the years that a twenty-four hour day translation for the 'yom' of Genesis 1 creates more problems than it solves because the sense of the passage, and especially the sixth 'yom' seems to suggest a much longer period of time. R. J. Snow has recently discussed this problem, concluding that the activities of the sixth day as well as the response of Adam when he meets Eve clearly suggest a much longer time frame than a day" (300) "The accusation that [the] interpretation for 'yom' [as an indefinite period of time] is simply a capitulation to modern science is seen to be groundless when one recognizes that [many church fathers, cf. Free, Ramm] held such an interpretation long before modern geology and astronomy adopted their current view of the antiquity of the universe" (300–301) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 2:2–3 (300) Hebrews 4 (300) Free 1950, 20 (301) Walter Kaiser, panel discussion (Wheaton College, May 2, 1978) (300) Ramm 1954, 147 (301) Snow 1977, 125 (300) Young 1977, 84 (300)
Age of Universe	"15 ... billion years" (304)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Developments in geology and biology ... suggest the universe and the earth are quite old ... The data from science [radiometric dating, sea floor spreading, coral growth rates, sea floor sediments, astronomy and astrophysics] for an old earth [are] overwhelming" (285, 308) "The Roman Catholic Church historically made a serious mistake when it refused to reconsider its interpretation of certain passages of Scripture in light of the theory of Copernicus ... We should seek to avoid similar mistakes today where the possibility of the exegetical error may be for a quite different reason" (285) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> various scientific and Christian sources (302–311)

Collins 2006			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the period of light between dawn and dusk" 2. "the whole period of twenty-four hours" 3. "a period of unspecified length" (128) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "יום ... can have several senses ... [including] a period of unspecified length, as in 'day of the LORD.' ... When 'day' has [this latter] sense, it has a qualifying genitive, such as 'day of the LORD' or 'day of wrath'" (128) 	n/a
יום In Genesis 1	"analogical days ... the days are God's workdays, their length is neither specified nor important" (124)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The days are God's workdays, which are understood by analogy to human work" (129) • "The days are not ordinary, and at least some of them involve longer elapsed time than twenty-four hours" (127) • "God [is presented] as a workman going through his workweek, taking his daily rest ... and enjoying his Sabbath 'rest.' To speak this way is to speak analogically about God's activity; that is, we understand what he did by analogy with what we do ... The analogy cautions us against applying strict literalism to the passage" (125) • "The days are broadly sequential, which means they are successive periods of unspecified length" (129) • "The absence of the refrain on the seventh day ... [implies] this Sabbath rest continues into the present, a notion that underlies John 5:17 and Hebrews 4:3–11 [see Augustine]. It follows that this day lacks the refrain because it has no end—it is not an ordinary day by any stretch of the imagination, and this makes us question whether the other days are supposed to be ordinary in their length. Their length makes little difference to the account, which is based on analogy rather than identity between God's work and man's" (125) • "The process of transforming the 'unproductive, unfruitful and uninhabited world' into a fit place for mankind to live and love—the six creation days—took some length of time, longer than an ordinary week (in order to allow the climate cycle of Gen. 2:5–6 to be established)" (254) • "The ordinary day reading ... does not allow enough time for the climate cycle to be relevant" (128) • "The creation week must be some years long, at least, in order to harmonize Genesis 1 and 2" (129) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:5–6 • John 5:17 • Hebrews 4:3–11 • Augustine (1886) 1994, <i>Confessions</i> 13.36 (NPNF¹ 1:207) (125)
Age of Universe	"unspecified" (57), but "compatible" with the Big Bang theory (256–257)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "God created the universe ([Genesis] 1:1) and then at some unspecified time afterward the first day began (1:2–3)" (57) • "The first day starts in [Genesis] 1:3, and thus our author has not necessarily presented the six days as the first six days of the universe: the author presents the origin of everything, 1:1, as taking place an unspecified amount of time before the workweek" (125) • "Genesis 1:1 describes the initial creation of all things, some unspecified time before the first day begins in 1:3. Hence the creation week is not necessarily the same as the first week of the universe" (129) • "Genesis 1:1–2:3 ... makes no claim about how old the universe is or about how old the earth itself is, since the author does not specify how long God waited between verses 1 and 2. Further, it makes no claim about how long the creation period was, because it is noncommittal about how long the days were" (126) • "The Big Bang theory ... is compatible with the reading of Genesis for which I have argued here" (256–257) • "Usually when someone discusses Genesis and science, he is thinking about what is called creation science, the idea that we must see the world as being something less than 100,000 years old (most today would say between 6,000 and 10,000). Most creation scientists oppose evolution on a large scale, preferring instead to think of 'created kinds,' from which all of today's living things are descended. By my exegesis Genesis itself gives no support to this kind of creation science" (265) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:1–2:3 (126)

Craigien 2008			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "period of daylight" 2. "complete 24-hour day" 3. "with a preposition, as in בַּיּוֹם, it is an indefinite temporal clause" 4. "more time than a standard day" (201) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "An extended, non-literal meaning is permissible for <i>yôm</i> when it is not used as an unadorned noun (i.e., one without prefix or suffix). Grammatically, <i>yôm</i> can stand in an indefinite temporal clause or in a definite temporal clause. Combining with a preposition, as in <i>בַּיּוֹם</i>, it is an indefinite temporal clause and is translated as 'in the day' or simply 'when.'... Since in the case of Genesis 2:4 the immediate context focuses on the creation of the heavens and the earth and everything in them, then 'in the day' here covers the whole six days of creation" (201) • "<i>Yôm</i> is sometimes used in the Old Testament in an indefinite way to refer to more time than a standard day" (201) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (201)
יום In Genesis 1	"literal, sequential, and chronological" [Hasel 1994, 31]" (202)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In ... <i>The Early Earth</i> ... [Whitcomb observes]: (1) when <i>yôm</i> is used with a numerical adjective it always restricts the meaning to a literal 24-hour day in the OT, (2) the accompanying, qualifying phrase 'the evening and morning' in Genesis 1 also indicates a normal 24-hour cycle of the earth rotating on its axis in reference to a fixed astronomical light source, (3) the analogy for the cycle of human work and rest in Exodus 20:8-11 would be meaningless, if the creation 'week' were made up of long, indefinite periods of time, and (4) two well-known units of time, 'days' and 'years,' are linked in Genesis 1:14, their duration being determined 'by the fixed movements of the earth in reference to the sun'" (194) • "[<i>Yôm</i>'s] semantic range does not easily promote indefiniteness to the days in Genesis [Stambaugh; McCabe; Fields]" (195) • "[With regards to] the cluster of terms used with <i>yom</i> in Genesis 1 ... Hasel persuasively argued, 'This triple interlocking connection of singular usage, joined by a numeral, and the temporal definition of "evening and morning," keeps the creation "day" <i>the same throughout</i> the creation account.... The author of Genesis 1 could not have produced more comprehensive and all-inclusive ways to express the idea of a literal "day" than the ones that were chosen.... The creation "day" is meant to be <i>literal, sequential, and chronological</i> in nature' [emphasis added]" (201–202) • "[Von Rad, Wenham, Hamilton, Gunkel, Stek, and Barr, none of whom would be classified as a recent-creationist or young-earth proponent concur] in their judgment that 'day' in Genesis 1 should be taken literally and normatively" (203) • "In the rest of the chapters of Genesis there are no unusual uses of <i>yôm</i> in either singular or plural. None of the contexts of those uses leads the reader to interpret the terms "day" or "days" in an indefinite way that could be equivalent to <i>deep time</i>" (204) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barr, [erroneously listed as being in Stek's article, but the pages don't match; Craigien is probably referring to <i>Fundamentalism</i>], (1978) 1981, 41–43 (204) • Fields 1976, 165–179 (195) • Gunkel (1901) 1997, 108 (203) • Hamilton 1990, 53 (203) • Hasel 1994, 26, 31 (201) • McCabe 2000 (195) • Rad 1972, 65 (203) • Stambaugh 2003 (195) • Stek 1990, 237–38 (204) • Wenham 1987, 19 (203) • Whitcomb 1986, 28–31 (194)
Age of Universe	"young" (back-cover blurb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The answer to the question ['Can deep time be embedded in Genesis?'] is an immediate negative" (193) • "A point often overlooked by those attempting to add millions of years to Genesis 1 is the sharp contradiction between the order of creative events in Genesis and the order of events in the evolutionary proposals" (195) • "In regards to the non-literal interpretations, the time frame adopted by the interpreter appears not to have arisen from the biblical text but from some other kind of criteria or influence being brought to bear upon the text. That is, because it is assumed that vast amounts of deep time are necessary for everything to have come into being, the biblical account of one literal week of creation is deemed, frankly, just too short. But is this not eisegesis being put into practice, rather than exegesis?" (205–206) 	n/a

Dake 2001			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<p>"The word <u>day</u> is used 2,611 times in Scripture and always of a literal day unless ... limited by some ... qualifying statement" (83)</p> <p>"<u>Day</u> (1,732). <u>Used 4 ways in Scripture</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of daylight (Gen. 1:5; 8:22; Josh. 1:8) 2. A 24-hour period of day and night (Gen. 1:3-31; 2:2-3; Lev. 23:32; Mt. 12:40; 17:1; 2 Cor. 11:25) 3. A period of time. See 1040 [28 Kinds of Days in Scripture] 4. Used figuratively of opportune time (Jn. 9:4; 1 Th. 5:5-8)" (37 of Complete Concordance and Cyclopedic Index) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if "qualified as <u>the day of the Lord, the day of God, the day of judgment</u>, or similarly limited by some other qualifying statement" (83) • "28 Kinds of Days in Scripture", e.g., "Day of wrath (Job 20:28; Rom. 2:5)," "Day of temptation (Ps. 95:8)," "Day of trouble (Ps. 20:1; 102:2)," "Day of the Lord (1 Th. 5:2; Zeph. 1:14-18)" (1040) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job 20:28 • Pss 20:1; 95:8; 102:2 • Zephaniah 1:14-18 • Romans 2:5 • 1 Thessalonians 5:2 • etc. (1040)
יום In Genesis 1	"24-hour day" (83)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The fact that God named the light <u>day</u> and the darkness <u>night</u>, ending each day with <u>evening</u> and each night with <u>morning</u> proves the days and nights of the 6 days were as literal as all days and nights since then (v 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31)" (83) • "The days of Gen. 1 are literal because they are not so qualified [as the day of the Lord, the day of God, the day of judgment, or similarly limited by some other qualifying statement]" (83) • "They are numbered 1 to 7" (83) • "Evening" and "morning" are "always used in a literal sense" (83) • "It is definitely stated in Ex. 20:8-11; 31:14-17 that God made ... the heavens ... and the earth in 6 days—the same kind and length of days man is to work" (83) • "When these days ... of Gen. 1 are clearly stated to be ordinary days and nights made up of periods of light and darkness as we know days, then there is no reason for making them long periods of time" (83) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exodus 20:8-11; 31:14-17 (83)
Age of Universe	"the earth is more than 6,000 years old"; "God's creation of the heavens and the earth ... could have been millions and billions of years ago" (78)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The earth was cursed and flooded, as in Gen. 1:2, because of sin <u>before</u> the 6 days of re-creation in 1:3-2:25. Lucifer was already a fallen creature when he came into Adam's Eden, having already ruled the earth and rebelled, causing the first flood (Gen. 1:2; Isa. 14:12-14; Jer. 4:23-26; Ez. 28:11-17; Lk. 10:18; 2 Pet. 3:5-7)" (78) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:2 • Isaiah 14:12-14 • Jeremiah 4:23-26 • Ezekiel 28:11-17 • Luke 10:18 • 2 Peter 3:5-7 (78)

Duncan and Hall 2001			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	ambiguous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The issue is not whether <i>yôm</i> can ever mean something else; it is whether there are any positive indications that it means something other than a normal day in this particular context” (35–36) 	n/a
יום In Genesis 1	“normal [24-hour] days” (25)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “[There is] no reason ... to understand <i>yôm</i> in Genesis 1:1–2:4 as anything other than a normal day.... At most, <i>yôm</i> bears one other nuance (not a different meaning) when it refers to the fraction of a normal day that is characterized by light” (54) • “We have heard no compelling internal exegetical evidence to prove that <i>yôm</i> means anything other than a normal day” (36) • “We believe that the burden rests upon our counterparts to prove conclusively that the intention of Scripture, particularly Genesis 1–2, somehow has been altered with age or with the ‘progress’ of scientific knowledge” (24) • “One should simply interpret day/light in the same fashion as he interprets night/darkness in the same verse (1:10 is another parallel)” (54) • “Were we to take <i>day</i> in 1:14 in other than its literal sense, consistency would require us to bracket as nonliteral the terms ‘seasons’ and ‘years,’ which, in the context, is nonsensical” (54) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • normal days in the creation narratives (25–36), the Pentateuch (36–39), other sections of the OT (39–43), and the NT (43–47) • normal days in the history of interpretation (47–52)
Age of Universe	unspecified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Our defense of the historic Judeo-Christian view does not imply that we agree or disagree with various ‘creationist’ positions on the age of the universe. The age of the universe is a matter of inference and sometimes speculation ... We decline to speculate about unbiblical theories ... In short, we take no position on the age of the universe precisely because that question is not directly addressed by the canon” (22) 	n/a

Erickson 2013			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	1. "most frequently ... a twenty-four-hour period" 2. "epochs or long periods of time" (351)	n/a	n/a
יום In Genesis 1	"epochs or long periods of time" (351)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The view that I find most satisfactory [and most plausible at present] is a variation of the age-day theory," partly due to various difficulties with the alternative theories (352) • "The age-day theory fits quite well with the geological record, especially if one sees some topical groupings as well. For example, while the sun, moon, and stars were created on the first day, they did not become clearly visible (as if the earth were covered with a cloud envelope) until the fourth day. Similarly, green plants were created on the third day, but were given to humans for food only on the sixth day" (352) • "God created in a series of acts over long periods of time. The geological and fossil records correspond to the days of his creative acts [Gedney 1950, 23–57]" (351) • "Interpreting יום as a period of indefinite length is not a forced understanding of the word" (352) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bradley and Olsen 1984, 299–301 (352) • Gedney 1950, 23–57 (351)
Age of Universe	billions of years (350)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[When] geology of the type that we know today came of age ... in the nineteenth century ... serious problems arose for the traditional dating of creation [no more than six thousand years ago]" (350) • "A number of methods have been developed for dating the earth, many of them relating to the characteristics of radioactive materials. Out of these methods came a consensus that the earth is perhaps five or six billion years old or even more" (350) 	n/a

Feinberg 2006			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	1. "daylight" 2. "twenty-four-hour day" 3. "indefinite periods of time" (592)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Scripture uses the word 'day' (Heb. <i>yōm</i>) in various ways, not just to refer to a literal twenty-four-hour day.... It also refers to indefinite periods of time in phrases such as 'the day of His anger' (Job 20:28); 'the day of trouble' (Ps 20:1); 'the day of battle' (Prov 21:31); 'the day of distress' (Prov 24:10); 'the day of prosperity' (Eccl 7:14); and 'the time [day] of harvest' (Prov 25:13). It is also used of 'the day of LORD,' which in most cases is an eschatological day whose length only God knows (Isa 13:6, 9; Joel 1:15; 2:1; Amos 5:18; Zeph 1:14).... In Gen 2:4 ... [it] refers to all six days of creation, plus the events of Gen 1:1" (592–93) • "The word study data on <i>yōm</i> ... shows that the word can mean lengthy periods of time" (611) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 • Job 20:28 • Ps 20:1 • Proverbs 21:31; 24:10; 25:13 • Ecclesiastes 7:14 • Isaiah 13:6, 9 • Joel 1:15; 2:1 • Amos 5:18 • Zephaniah 1:14 (592–593)
יום In Genesis 1	roughly twenty-four-hour days: "I am uncomfortable with adopting the literary framework view in its entirety.... At one time, I [held] something like [the twenty-four-hour-day] view, but the concerns of both age-day theorists and literary framework proponents have convinced me that a modified twenty-four-hour-day view is preferable" (615); "I am most comfortable with a combination of the twenty-four-hour-day and the literary framework position" (610); "the actual number of days it took to create may be more than six days, but I doubt that we are talking about vastly longer periods than the days so numbered" (615)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "If the days are not literal ... how do we know that other elements of the account are not also figurative? ... What is the hermeneutic that tells us that some elements in this story are figures of speech and literary devices and others are not? ... If biblical authors want to make some theological points about creation, why do it with this literary device (the six days), a device that for all the world looks like an account of actual happenings on real days of some sort?" (600, 613, 614) • "[Most frequently <i>yōm</i>] refers to a twenty-four-hour solar day" (598) • "While the term has various uses throughout the OT, ... context shows [when] it must refer to more time than twenty-four hours" (598) • "The various uses of 'day' that supposedly show it can mean more than a twenty-four-hour period ... are all uses of 'day' in compounds or bound expressions [Waltke, Collins 1994]" (599) • "When one reads Genesis 1 in its most natural sense, the context seems to refer to literal twenty-four-hour days" (598) • "The phrase 'it was evening and it was morning' ... seems to clarify the length of each day as a literal day [Berkhof 1979, 154]" (599) • "Twenty-four-hour-day creationists point to Exod 20:9-11 and 31:17 and the Sabbath regulation [Berkhof 1979, 155; Fretheim, 19–20]" (600). "[On the other hand] while there is an analogy between God's work week and ours, it doesn't require absolute identity" (617) • "When <i>yōm</i> is used with a specific number, it seems invariably to mean a twenty-four-hour day (cf. Gen 8:14; 17:12) [Fretheim, 18; Thiessen]" (599). "[On the other hand, Genesis 1] is the only place in the OT where we have a list of days with numbers attached, so it is hard to say for sure exactly what the number plus <i>yōm</i> means" (616) • "The actual number of days it took to create may be more than six days, but I doubt that we are talking about vastly longer periods than the days so numbered.... If the time extends too far beyond a literal day, it would be hard ... to call it a day. But numbers in Scripture are not always precise, nor is the counting of days or years" (615). "An example is the time between Jesus' death and resurrection" (843) • "Even if some days actually took more than twenty-four hours [e.g., the first three days, the sixth day], so long as they didn't last extended amounts of time (for example, ten years ...), we need not demand just twenty-four hours per day" (615) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berkhof 1979, 154, 155 (599, 600) • Collins 1994, 110 (599) • Fretheim 1990, 18–20 (599, 600) • Thiessen (1949) 1979, 115 (599) • Waltke 1991, 10 (599)
Age of Universe	young	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There is no need to hold the twenty-four-hour-day view with an unusually rigid chronology that mandates the earth's creation in 4004 B.C. or even in 10000 B.C. None of this means, of course, that we are warranted in postulating the lengthy dates proposed by science and the age-day position" (619) • "Several ... considerations [e.g., death as a result of sin; suffering; divine revelation to the human race] lead me to think that all of God's creative activities do not require an ancient earth or universe" (622) 	n/a

Fields 1976			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Day, opposite of night" (170; cf. 171) 2. "Day, or 24 hours" (171) 3. "Day, as a division of time" (170) 4. "Special days, such as the 'day of prosperity,' or the 'day of adversity'" (171) 5. "The day of Yahweh" (170; cf. 171) 6. "The days of someone, equaling his life, or his age" (170; cf. 171) 7. "Days. a. indefinite ... b. of a long time: 'many days.' c. days of old" (170; cf. 171) 8. "Plural of day in a usage to refer to a month or year" (171) 9. "Time" (170) 10. "Used in phrases with and without the prepositions" (170; cf. 172) (170–172, drawing from <i>BDB</i>, 398–401, and Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372–374) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Day" is used 'figuratively' in many Scripture passages" (175) • <i>BDB</i> (1907) 1979, 398–401 (170–171) • Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372–374 (171–172)
יום In Genesis 1	"literal 24-hour days" (178)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Day-Age Theory ... rests on very scanty exegetical evidence. The lexical exility on which it is based is almost unbelievable; consequently, we must conclude that it springs from presuppositions" (165) • "As in the case of other problems involving meanings of words, our study must begin with Hebrew lexicography. Nearly all the defenders of the [Day-Age] theory fail, however, to give any lexical backing to the theory. The reader is left completely uninformed concerning the uses of <i>yôm</i> (day) in the Old Testament. Therefore, we have listed a complete summary of both Brown, Driver, and Briggs's as well as Koehler and Baumgartner's listings. Nothing less than a <i>complete</i> examination of the evidence will suffice.... [abridgments of <i>BDB</i> {1907} 1979, 398–401, and Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372–374] Far from supporting the notion that the creative days of Genesis 1 are vast ages, extending, perhaps, over millions of years, the lexicons suggest that 'day,' as used to refer to creation is of the normal 24 hours duration. This is the <i>natural</i> interpretation" (169, 172) • "The constant use of 'morning and evening' to denominate each of the six creative days utterly precludes any references to anything but normal days in this account. Only presuppositions which will not allow this normal interpretation can force an interpreter to understand them otherwise" (173) • "Genesis 1:14 ... makes even more obvious the meaning of the word here" (173) • "'Day' is used 'figuratively' in many Scripture passages. But the point is really not how it is used <i>elsewhere</i>; the point is—how is it used in <i>Genesis 1</i>, where its use is qualified by 'evening and morning' and 'one day,' 'second day,' etc.? To argue from its usage outside this context is really just begging the question" (175) • "When <i>yôm</i> is used in the general sense of 'time' ... it is always used in conjunction with some other qualifier ... It <i>cannot</i> be reckoned in any sense of the term by <i>indefinite</i> periods. It must always refer to definite periods" (176) • "Throughout the Old Testament <i>yôm</i> is <i>never used figuratively</i> (that is, to refer to something other than a normal day) <i>with the numerical adjective</i> [Whitcomb Jr. 1973, 66]" (176) • "Perhaps the most telling argument against the Day-Age Theory is, 'what else could God say to convey the idea that the days of creation were <i>literal</i> days?' He used the <i>only</i> terms available to him to communicate that idea. There was a word, on the other hand, which Moses could have used had he wanted to signify <i>ages</i>, or vast <i>periods of time</i>. He could have used the word <i>dôr</i> (דור) which has that very meaning [<i>BDB</i> {1907} 1979, 206]. But instead he used the word 'day,' and we think the reason he did is very obvious to the unbiased reader: He wanted to tell his readers that all of creation took place in six literal 24-hour days!" (177–178) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:14 (173) • <i>BDB</i> (1907) 1979, 206, 398–401 (169–171, 177) • Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372–374 (169, 171–172) • Whitcomb Jr. 1973, 66 (176)
Age of Universe	"a few thousand years ago" (222)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "One must choose either the chronological scheme of uniformitarianism or the chronological scheme of the Bible, but the inconsistencies of this sort of interpretation [viz., the Day-Age theory] of the Hebrew text for the purpose of harmonizing mutually exclusive and hopelessly contradictory positions can no longer be tolerated" (179) • "The Young Earth: Indications of Recent Creation" (197–220): "The Magnetic Field" (201–8); "Radiocarbon Dating" (209–220) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • various (201–220)

Fischer 1990			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "daylight portion of a day" (15) 2. "entire 24-hour period" (15) 3. "time of undesignated length" (15) 4. "'a long time; a whole period' [WOTWS, 109]" (17) 5. "'a particular season or time' [WOTWS, 109]" (17) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[WOTWS] sums up the possible variations, 'A day; it is frequently put for time in general, or for a long time; a whole period under consideration ... Day is also put for a particular season or time when any extraordinary event happens' [109]" (17) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson (1870) 1990, 109 (17)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"long periods of time" (16);</p> <p>"periods of time of indefinite length" (18);</p> <p>"a time of long duration" (20)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Many of the early church fathers took their clues from Scripture alone in the scarcity of natural evidence. Irenaeus, Origen, Basil, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, to name a few, argued that the days of creation were long periods of time [Ross]" (15–16) • "In Genesis 2:4 ... 'day' [is] a coverall to apply to the previous six days of creation.... If a day of creation is reckoned as a time of indefinite length, then one large time of indefinite length could easily equal six smaller times of indefinite length.... To inappropriately apply a 24-hour period definition to the word 'day' when that word has a variety of meanings, puts Scripture at odds with Scripture when it is completely unnecessary" (16) • "Gleason Archer in his book <i>Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties</i> [concludes], '... it is abundantly clear [read 'evident'] that 'yom' in Genesis 2:4 cannot possibly be meant as a twenty-four hour day—unless perchance the Scripture contradicts itself! [63]" (17) • "In Hebrew, just as in English, the word 'day' is frequently used for varying amounts of time.... [WOTWS] sums up the possible variations, 'A day; it is frequently put for time in general, or for a long time; a whole period under consideration ... Day is also put for a particular season or time when any extraordinary event happens ...' [109] The 'days' of creation certainly do appear to be periods of extraordinary happenings which fit 'a long time' definition better than a 24-hour definition" (17) • "'It may be true that this is the only case in which the word day is used figuratively when preceded by any numeral, but the reason is that this is the only case in Scripture in which any indefinitely long periods of time are enumerated' [Buswell {1935} 1982, 310]" (17) • "If the sun's appearance is not until the fourth day, it could not have been used as a means of measuring the length of the previous three days" (21); "These first days of creation are periods of time of indefinite length as many theologians maintain, and not 24-hour days as some would have us believe ... From day one to day four, God's timing alone applied" (18–19) • "Barring two creations, we would have to cram the entire saga [of Satan's creation and fall] into just five or six 24-hour time periods if we were to believe in young-earth creation theory" (19) • "The sixth day of creation is just too loaded with events to be stuffed into 24 hours" (21); "Archer narrates: 'It must have required some years, or, at the very least, a considerable number of months' [68]" (20) • "If the seventh day, the Lord's day of rest, is a long period of time encompassing thousands of years as conclusively demonstrated by Scripture [Heb 4:1, 3], then consistency demands that the first six days be given similar treatment—that is, ages or eons, but positively not 24-hour time periods!" (20) • "[The] words [of Ps 90:4] leave not one shred of doubt that God's timing and man's timing are not to be confused.... How long is a day of God's creation? We're not told. But we are told how long it isn't [2 Pet 3:8]! We are told specifically that His time and our time are dissimilar. So a 24-hour day is the one interpretation which is explicitly eliminated as a possibility. In the words of Augustine, they were 'God-divided days,' not 'sun-divided days'" (20) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (16) • Hebrews 4:1, 3 (20) • Aquinas 1947, (16) • Archer 1982, 63, 68 (17, 20) • Augustine (15) • Basil (15) • Buswell (1935) 1982, 310 (17) • Irenaeus (15) • Origen (15) • H. Ross, <i>Biblical Evidence for Long Creation Days</i> (unpublished), 1 (16) • Wilson (1870) 1990, 109 (17)
Age of Universe	"16 billion years" (17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The sheer abundance of scientific evidence which only permits one answer—an old earth—is a heavy persuader" (16) • "[Those] who [say] the earth and heavens <i>are young</i> ... are 'willingly ignorant' ['that ... the heavens were of old,' 2 Pet 3:5]" (20) 	n/a

Geisler 2003			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "twelve hours of light" (644) 2. "twenty-four hours" (642) 3. "a long period of time" (642) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The word <i>day</i> (<i>yom</i>) often means a long period of time. First of all, 'day' sometimes means a prophetic day; that is, a future time period of differing lengths, as in 'the day of the Lord' (Joel 2:31; cf. 2 Peter 3:10). Furthermore, ... 2 Peter 3:8 ... is based on Psalm 90:4" (642) • "As with any other word, the meaning of the word <i>day</i> must be determined by the context in which it is used. In many contexts, 'day' means much more than twenty-four hours. It can mean thousands, or even more" (643) • "'The day' [in Gen 2:4] means six 'days,' which indicates a broad meaning of the word <i>day</i> in the Bible, just as we have in English" (643) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (643) • Ps 90:4 (642) • Joel 2:31 (642) • 2 Peter 3:8 (642)
יום In Genesis 1	"long periods of time" (642)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There are many indications within the text of Scripture to support the belief that the creation 'days' were longer than twenty-four hours" (642) • "<i>Day</i> (<i>yom</i>) often means a long period of time [Ps 90:4; Joel 2:31; 2 Peter 3:10]" (642) • "Even in the creation passage, <i>yom</i> is used of a period of time longer than twenty-four hours.... (Gen. 2:4)" (643) • "The seventh 'day' is thousands of years long. Everyone agrees that it has been at least thousands of years since the time of creation, yet the Bible declares that God rested on the seventh day after His six days of creation (Gen. 2:2–3). According to the book of Hebrews, God is still in His Sabbath rest from creation (4:3–5); hence, the seventh day has been at least six thousand years long, even on the shortest of all the chronologies of humankind" (643) • "The third 'day' is longer than twenty-four hours. On the third 'day,' God not only created vegetation, but it grew to maturity. The text says that on the third day 'the land <i>produced vegetation</i>: plants bearing seed according to their kinds and trees bearing fruit with seed in it according to their kinds' (Gen. 1:12, emphasis added). To grow from seeds to maturity and produce more seeds is a process that takes much longer than a day, a week, or even a month for most plants. There is no indication in the text that its <i>growth</i> was anything but natural; it is its <i>origin</i> that was supernatural" (643) • "The sixth 'day' of creation was considerably longer than a solar day," comprising (1) the creation of animals (Gen 1:24–25), (2) the formation of man (Gen 2:7, Jer 18:2f.; Newman and Eckelmann, 128–129), (3) the promise of a helper (Gen 2:18), (4) Adam's naming of animals (Gen 2:19; Newman and Eckelmann, 128–129), (5) Adam's search for a helpmate (Gen 2:20), (6) God's operation on Adam (Gen 2:21), (7) Adam's encounter with Eve (Gen 2:22–25). "It seems highly unlikely that all of these events—especially the fourth one—were compressed within a twenty-four-hour period or, more precisely, within the approximately twelve hours of light each day afforded" (643–644) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:24–25; 2:2–4, 7, 18–25 (643–644) • Ps 90:4 (642) • Jeremiah 18:2f (643) • Joel 2:31 (642) • Hebrews 4:3–5 (643) • 2 Peter 3:8 (642) • Newman and Eckelmann 1977, 128–129 (643–644)
Age of Universe	"billions of years old" (646)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There are numerous ways that one can account for long periods of time and still accept a literal understanding of Genesis 1–2.... There is no necessary conflict between Genesis and the belief that the universe is millions or even billions of years old" (646) • "In addition to the biblical evidence for long periods of time, there are scientific arguments that the world has existed for billions of years. The age of the universe is based on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the speed of light and the distance of the stars; (2) the rate of expansion of the universe; (3) the fact that early rocks have been radioactively dated in terms of billions of years; (4) the rate that salt runs into the sea and the amount of salt there, which indicates multimillions of years" (644) 	n/a

Gentry Jr. 2016 (except where explicitly stated as 2017)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "'daylight period in contrast to night' [<i>TDOT</i>, 6:23]" (94) 2. "'full day' (twenty-four hours)' [<i>TDOT</i>, 6:25]" (94) 3. "'epoch ... season ... time' [Dabney {1878} 1972, 255]" (96) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "It is freely admitted that the word day is often used in the Greek Scriptures as well as the Hebrew (as in our common speech) for an epoch, a season, a time.... This use is ... derivative' [Dabney {1878} 1972, 255]" (96)
יום In Genesis 1	"successive 24-hour days" (89)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The preponderant usage of the word <i>yôm</i> in the Old Testament is of the well-known temporal period.... There are two primary meanings of <i>yôm</i>: (1) 'The basic meaning of <i>yôm</i> is "day (from sunrise to sundown)" and (2) 'in the sense of the astronomical or calendrical unit' (<i>TLOT</i> 1997, 2:537, 538)" (94) • "In Genesis 1:1–2:3, <i>yôm</i> appears 13 times in the singular. As McCabe (2008, 226) notes, 'The noun <i>yôm</i> ("day") always refers to a normal day when it is used as a singular noun and is not found in a compound grammatical construction'" (94) • "It also appears one time in the plural in Genesis 1 so as to require its literal meaning ... [Gen 1:14]. Clearly, the 'days' here mark out our naturally created, short-term time measure, just as 'years' speaks of our naturally created, long-term time measure" (94) • "[<i>TLOT</i> 1997, 2:528] defines the day of Genesis 1 as 'a day of 24 hours in the sense of an astronomical or calendrical unit of time'" (94–95) • "The overwhelming majority of the appearances of <i>yôm</i> in the Old Testament clearly refer either to a normal, full day-and-night cycle, or to the lighted portion of that cycle. And both of these directly related options would be easily understood without any difficulty by the casual reader [<i>TLOT</i> 1997, 2:528, <i>TDOT</i>, 6:8]" (95) • "On day 1 God Himself 'called' the light 'day' (Gen. 1:5), establishing the commonly understood, temporal significance of the term in the creation week. The daylight hours being the most productive portion of the day ..., the designation 'day' can apply to the full cycle that brings the daylight back around" (95) • "The Jewish Mishnah refers to the creation days as literal [<i>m. Hul.</i> 5:5] ... The first-century Jewish historian Josephus does, as well [1987, <i>Ant.</i> 1:1:1]" (95) • "As conservative theologian Berkhof (1941, 154) declares in defending the historic exegesis of a six-day creation: 'In its primary meaning the word <i>yom</i> denotes a natural day; and it is a good rule of exegesis, not to depart from the primary meaning of a word, unless this is required by the context'" (96) • "Dabney (1973, 254–255) ... points out: 'The narrative seems historical, and not symbolical; and hence the strong initial presumption is, that all its parts are to be taken in their obvious sense.... The natural day is its literal and primary meaning' Why would Moses employ a temporal term ('day') in an (allegedly) anthropomorphic context ...?" (96) • "This periodical time measurement was established directly by God on the first day of creation to lock in the <i>temporal pattern</i> for all earth history (Jer. 33:20, 25; compare Gen. 8:22; Ps. 74:16–17; Jer. 31:35).... [Cassuto 1998, 27] But it also provides the <i>temporal measure of God's creative activity</i> as a pattern for man's workweek [Calvin 1948, 1:78, 107]" (96–97) • Additional arguments from "Explicit Qualification" (97–101), "Numerical Prefix" (101–103), "Numbered Series" (103–107), etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:5, 14; 8:22 (94–96) • Ps 74:16–17 (96) • Jeremiah 31:35; 33:20, 25 (96) • Berkhof 1979, 154 (96) • Calvin 1948, 1:78, 107 (97) • Cassuto (1944) 1989, 27 (97) • Dabney (1878) 1972, 254–255 (96) • Josephus 1987, <i>Ant.</i> 1.33 (1:1:1) (95) • <i>m. Hul.</i> 5:5 (95) • McCabe 2008, 226 (94) • <i>TDOT</i> 1990, 6:8 (95) • <i>TLOT</i> 1997, 2:528, 537, 538 (94–95)
Age of Universe	"young ... several thousand years" (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Gen 1:1 is a part of the creation account and not just a heading. So that does limit the amount of time involved.... I do not see a gap between Gen 1:1 and Gen. 1:2. I agree with Weston Fields: <i>Unformed and Unfilled</i>" (2017) • "Jesus says 'from the beginning' Adam and Eve were made one flesh in marriage [Mark 10:6], which doesn't seem to allow for billions of years.... I would follow the standard genealogy approach, which would not allow for gaps of millions of years" (2017) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark 10:6 • Fields 1976 (2017)

Grudem 1994			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	"all admit" (296) that "yôm, 'day,' is sometimes used to refer not to a twenty-four-hour literal day, but to a longer period of time" (293)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "We see this when the word is used in Genesis 2:4, for example: 'In the <i>day</i> that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens,' a phrase that refers to the entire creative work of the six days of creation. Other examples of the word <i>day</i> to mean a period of time are Job 20:28 ('the <i>day</i> of God's wrath'); Psalm 20:1 ('... the <i>day</i> of trouble!'); Proverbs 11:4 ('... the <i>day</i> of wrath'); 21:31 ('... the <i>day</i> of battle'); 24:10 ('... the <i>day</i> of adversity ...'); 25:13 ("the <i>time</i> [<i>yôm</i>] of harvest"); Ecclesiastes 7:14 ('... the <i>day</i> of prosperity ..., and ... the <i>day</i> of adversity ...'); many passages referring to 'the <i>day</i> of the LORD' (such as Isa. 2:12; 13:6, 9; Joel 1:15; 2:1; Zeph. 1:14); and many other ... passages predicting times of judgment or blessing.... This is a frequent sense for the word <i>day</i>" (293–94) "Both senses [a 24-hour-day and a longer period of time] were commonly known meanings in the minds of the original readers [of Genesis and Exodus]" (295) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 2:4 Job 20:28 Ps 20:1 Proverbs 11:4; 21:31; 24:10; 25:13 Ecclesiastes 7:14 Isaiah 2:12; 13:6, 9 Joel 1:15; 2:1 Zephaniah 1:14 (293–294)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"Much more likely [than Davis A. Young's figurative days of indeterminate duration] ... is the modified day-age view" (308)</p> <p>"The six 'days' of Genesis 1 refer not to periods of twenty-four hours, but rather to long periods of time, millions of years, ... extremely long 'ages' of time" (293, 298)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "In favor of viewing the six days as long periods of time is the fact that the Hebrew word <i>yôm</i>, 'day,' is sometimes used to refer not to a twenty-four-hour literal day, but to a longer period of time" (293) "The sixth day includes so many events [Gen 2:15–25] that it must have been longer than twenty-four hours.... If the sixth day is shown by contextual considerations to be considerably longer than an ordinary twenty-four-hour day, then does not the context itself favor the sense of <i>day</i> as simply a 'period of time' of unspecified length?" (294) "The seventh day ... is not concluded with the phrase 'and there was evening and there was morning, a seventh day.' ... (Gen. 2:2–3). The possibility, if not the implication, suggested by this is that the seventh day is still continuing. It never ended but is also a 'day' that is really a long period of time (cf. John 5:17; Heb. 4:4, 9–10)" (294) The context (cf. 'day' referring "to a longer period of time" in Gen 2:4) does not make it clear that a 24-hour day is intended (294–295) "If (as is clearly the case) the original readers knew that the word <i>day</i> could mean a long period of time, then there was no need to use some other word, for the word <i>yôm</i> conveyed the intended meaning quite well" (294–295) "The words of the Hebrew text [in Genesis 1] do allow for the days to be long periods of time" (298) "The greatest difficulty for [the day-age] view is that it puts the sun, moon, and stars (Day 4) millions of years <i>after</i> the creation of plants and trees (Day 3).... But a modification ... seems possible. The verbs in Genesis 1:16 can be taken as [plu] perfects, indicating something that God had done before ... This option remains as a genuine possibility for the day-age view, and in fact this view is the one that seems most persuasive to the present author, if an old earth position is to be adopted" (299–300) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 2:2–4, 15–25 John 5:17 Hebrews 4:4, 9–10 (294–295)
Age of Universe	"about 15 billion years" (298)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "[Davis A.] Young's arguments for an old earth [about 4.5–4.7 billion years] based on many kinds of scientific data from different disciplines [including radiometric dating, liquid magma cooling, metamorphic rock formation, continental drift, coral reefs (298–299)] seem (to the present writer at least) to be very strong. This is particularly true of arguments based on fossil-bearing rocks, coral reefs, continental drift, and the similarity of results from different kinds of radiometric dating" (307) "Newman and Eckelmann's arguments from astronomy [including light travel time, universe expansion, background radiation, kind of light from certain stars (299)] indicating a very old universe give significant added weight" (307) "Old earth advocates seem to me to have a greater weight of scientific evidence on their side, and it seems that the weight of evidence is increasing yearly" (307) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.A. Young 1977 (279, 292, 304, 307) D.A. Young 1982 (298, 304, 307) Newman and Eckelmann 1977 (298–299, 307)

Hamilton 1990			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "solar day of 24 hours" (55) 2. "unmeasured period of time" (53) 3. "era" (53) 4. "unusually long period of time, even up to a millennium" (53) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There are, to be sure, places where [yôm] may refer to an unmeasured period of time or to an era such as in the prophets' phrase 'in that day,' or to an unusually long period of time, even up to a millennium (Ps. 90:4)" (53) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps 90:4 (53)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"a solar day of 24 hours ... as an analogy of God's creative activity" (55–56)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In the Hebrew Bible the normal understanding of <i>yôm</i> is a day of the week. There are, to be sure, places where it may refer to an unmeasured period of time or to an era ... The burden of proof, however, is on those who do not attribute to <i>yôm</i> in Gen. 1 its normal and most common interpretation, especially when <i>yôm</i> is always described as being composed of an evening and a morning" (53) • "It is highly debatable whether the interpretation of Genesis' days as metaphorical for geological ages can be sustained. For one thing, it allows the concerns of establishing concord with science (ever changing in its conclusions) to override an understanding of a Hebrew word based on its contextual usage. Furthermore, one would have to take extreme liberty with the phrase, 'there was evening, and there was morning the x day.' Lastly, how would one possibly take in stride scientifically a major stage in the creation process that has an epoch which brings about vegetation precede an epoch which brings about the sun and stars?" (54) • "[However,] the literal understanding of 'day' is not necessarily a more spiritual and biblical interpretation, and therefore is not inherently preferable" (53) • "The third approach to 'day' in Gen. 1 is the literary interpretation. This approach leaves open the possibility for taking 'day' literally or nonliterally. It begins by placing the Gen. 1 Creation story in its historical context.... Gen. 1 is written, at least partially, to present an alternative to [the] worldview [of the surrounding nations, whose cosmology is informed by polytheism and the mythology that flows out of that polytheism; see Hasel 1974, 78–80]" (54–55) • "The point of [the] deliberate and delightful symmetry in Gen. 1 [between days 1–3 of preparation, and days 4–6 of population] is that form is as important as content [see Hyers 1984a]" (55) • "A literary reading of Gen. 1 still permits the retention of 'day' as a solar day of 24 hours. But it understands 'day' not as a chronological account of how many hours God invested in his creating project, but as an analogy of God's creative activity [see Hummel 1986, 181–183]. God reveals himself to his people in a medium with which they can identify and which they can comprehend. The Creation account portrays a God who speaks, who evaluates, who deliberates, who forms, who animates, who regulates. The intended audience of Gen. 1 will fully identify with that model. The Creation account also portrays a God who created on six days and rested on the seventh. The audience, accustomed to their own workweek, will identify with that model too" (55–56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hasel 1974, 78–80 (55) • Hummel 1986, 181–183 (56) • Hyers 1984a, 67–71; Hyers 1984b, 211 (55)
Age of Universe	<p>at least "millions of years" (54)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Over the last few centuries science has shown that it is absurd and preposterous to think that the universe was created in one week" (53) • "Every so often anthropologists announce the discovery, usually in Africa, of the remains of a human-like being that pushes the origins of mankind back millions of years" (54) 	<p>n/a</p>

Harris 1995			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "a twenty-four hour day" (23) 2. period "of indefinite length" (22) 3. "forever" (23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "That <i>yom</i> often means a twenty-four hour day is, of course, true, but that it always means this is not the case" (23) • "[The] indefinite use of the word 'day' is evidenced by [Gen 2:4]" (22) • "[The seventh day] rest of God is cited in Ps. 95:11 as lasting until Joshua's time and is further interpreted in Heb. 4:8–11 as lasting forever" (23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (22) • Ps 95:11 (23) • Hebrews 4:8–11 (23)
יום In Genesis 1	not necessarily twenty-four hours (22); probably "periods of indefinite length" (22); "could be ... long days" (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "It need not be held that the six creative days of Genesis were each twenty-four hours long. This ... would be an inference from Scripture which has been common enough in some times but is by no means declared in the Bible" (22) • "Long ago Augustine had held that the days were periods of indefinite length, as indeed seems probable from the fact that their reckoning begins before the sun and the moon appear. Also this indefinite use of the word 'day' is evidenced by the very next chapter (2:4), where the entire work of creation is said to have been done in a 'day.' (קַיָּו). The NIV rightly here translates <i>beyom</i> as 'when,' but the point remains that <i>yom</i> does not mean a twenty-four hour day" (22) • "That <i>yom</i> often means a twenty-four hour day is, of course, true, but that it always means this is not the case. To the contrary in Genesis one, it has often been pointed out that the markers for the day were not made (or were not visible in the sky?) until the fourth day" (23) • "Perhaps more significant is the reference to the seventh day as the day of God's rest from creation. This rest of God is cited in Ps. 95:11 as lasting until Joshua's time and is further interpreted in Heb. 4:8–11 as lasting forever. There is no 'evening and morning' after the seventh day. If the weekly twenty-four hour Sabbath of Israel was symbolic of God's long day of rest from creation, it would seem natural that the other twenty-four hour days of man's work could be symbolic of God's long days of creation" (23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (22) • Ps 95:11 (23) • Hebrews 4:8–11 (23) • Augustine (1886) 1994, <i>Confessions</i>, 11–13 (NPNF¹ 1:163–207) (22)
Age of Universe	"God gives us no date for creation" (23); it may be billions of years ago (23), or it may be recent (24), but "it [is] almost impossible to hold to ... 4004 B.C." (22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "New discoveries have made it almost impossible to hold to the dates determined by Ussher and Lightfoot in the seventeenth century ... [according to which] the creation of the world was in 4004 B.C." (22) • "If [the above argument for God's long day of rest from creation implying that the other days of creation were also long] be allowed, then the ancient earth which scientists now allege, poses no problem for the Christian. This is not to say that the earth is actually very old. There are interesting arguments against its great antiquity as Whitcomb ... and others have alleged. But if our argument be allowed, the Christian has no problem regardless of the result of the debate on the antiquity of the earth and the universe. When God gives us no date for creation, we should not go beyond Scripture in our affirmations" (23) • "Current views of an expanding universe envisage a beginning some 20 (some now say 8) billion years ago which started it all with a <i>big bang</i>.... Some fine Christian scholars question the big bang theory and argue for a recent universe ... [Whitcomb; Morris and Morris] Whether or not the big bang theory is true, it at least seems to support Genesis 1:1!" (23–24) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morris and Morris 1989 (24) • Whitcomb 1972 (24)

Hayward (1985) (1995) 2005			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "12 hours" (163) 2. "24 hours" (163) 3. "the whole period of creation" (163) 4. "an occasion when God acts" (163) 5. Hosea's "'third day' ... possibly ... a year [or] ... the Millennium" (164) 6. non-literal days (164) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The expression 'a (the) day of the Lord' is used many times in both Old and New Testaments as a figure of speech. It means 'an occasion when God acts' [for example, Isaiah 13.6; Jeremiah 46.10; Ezekiel 30.2, 3; Joel 1.15; Amos 5.18; Obadiah 15; 2 Peter 3.10—and many others (221)] and gives no indication of how long that action by God will last" (163) • "In Hosea 6:2 it says that 'on the third day he [God] will raise us [Israel] up.' Long before the present controversy, commentators were pointing out that this 'third day' was evidently figurative, and was quite possibly a reference to the events described in 2 Kings 19.29, in which case it would represent a year. Some expositors even equated Hosea's 'third day' with the Millennium" (164) • "[The] three 'days' [referred to by Jesus in Luke 13:32] were undoubtedly not literal days" (164) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isaiah 13:6 (221) • Jeremiah 46:10 (221) • Ezekiel 30:2, 3 (221) • Hosea 6:2 (164) • Joel 1:15 (221) • Amos 5:18 (221) • Obadiah 15 (221) • Luke 13:32 (164) • 2 Peter 3:10 (221)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"presumably literal and consecutive ... days" (170);</p> <p>"days in which God issued his creative commands" (167);</p> <p>followed "in God's own eternal framework... [by] the endless succession of day and night ... even though ... the dawn of the first material day was yet to come" (175)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Yom (day) is used in three different ways in the creation narrative ... The first 'day' [Genesis 1:5a] ... appears to be about 12 hours long, the second [Genesis 1:5b] is evidently 24 hours, and the third [Genesis 2:4] refers to the whole period of creation. This being so, it is hardly wise to be dogmatic about the length of the days in Genesis 1" (162–163) • "The strongest point [for the recent-creationist dogma about the days of creation] is based on Exodus 20, verses 9–11 ... [But when] the sabbath commandment is repeated in Exodus 31.12–17 ... [since the words referring to God at the end of v. 17] <i>and was refreshed</i> ... are obviously figurative ... it is unreasonable to insist that the word 'days' in the same sentence are unquestionably literal days.... To reason that God's days must necessarily be of the same length as ours is on a par with deducing from 1 John 3.16 that our sacrifices must be of the same magnitude as our Lord's" (163–164) • "Genesis 1 is unique, as being the only passage that describes how God once worked on a cosmic scale. It is hardly wise to derive a rule about <i>human</i> days of work, and then insist on applying that rule to <i>divine</i> days of work" (164) • "There is strong evidence that the sixth day of creation must have lasted more than 24 hours [because of] how much took place in that sixth day! [Gen 2:8–9, 19–21, 23] ... The expression translated 'at last' [v. 23] ... indicates that Adam had been kept waiting a long time ... all on the sixth day" (164–165) • "Genesis does not attribute an evening and a morning to [the] seventh day, as if to imply that it did not possess the boundaries of an ordinary sabbath. This hint is taken up in Hebrews [4:4, 9, 10], which tells us that the real 'sabbath' of God is still future" (177) • "[On account of the aforementioned arguments regarding the semantic range of יום and the meaning of יום in Genesis 1] dogmatism about the length of days of creation is therefore not justified" (165) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:5; 2:4 (162–163) • Genesis 2:8–9, 19–21, 23 (164–65) • Exodus 20:11; 31:17 (163) • Hebrews 4:4, 9, 10 (177) • 1 John 3:16 (164)
Age of Universe	<p>"ancient" (6 <i>passim</i>);</p> <p>"billion[s of] years" (172)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In Parts I [The Genuine Scientific Objections to Darwinism] and II [The Age of the Earth] we saw some of the evidence that our planet has been maturing for several billion years" (172) • "The Witness of the Sedimentary Rocks," and other geological phenomena (c. 6) • "Evidence of Age" from astronomical phenomena and radiometric dating (c. 7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • various citations (214–217 <i>passim</i>)

Irons and Kline 2001				
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)		Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	“The word <i>yōm</i> normally denote[s] a normal, solar day,” but “ <i>yōm</i> may have [the] meaning [of ‘age’ in certain] texts” (250)	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Genesis 2:5 [presumably an error for 2:4]• Ps 30:5 [does not contain יוֹם; presumably Irons and Kline are referring to בֹקֶר]• Ps 49:14 [does not contain יוֹם; presumably Irons and Kline are referring to בֹקֶר]• Ps 90:6 [does not contain יוֹם; presumably Irons and Kline are referring to בֹקֶר]• Hosea 6:2• 2 Peter 3:8 (250, pointing to endnote 46 on 256)	
יוֹם In Genesis 1	“Framework advocates give <i>yōm</i> its normal sense of an ordinary day. But ... the <i>days</i> are part of an extended chronological metaphor” (250–251)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The seven-day scheme ... [is] a figurative framework. While the six days of creation are presented as normal solar days, ... the total picture of God’s completing His creative work in a week of days is not to be taken literally. Instead it functions as a literary structure in which the creative works of God have been narrated in a topical order. The days are like picture frames. Within each day-frame, Moses gives us a snapshot of divine creative activity.... The creative fiat-fulfillments ... are narrated in a nonsequential order within the literary structure or framework of a seven-day week” (219)• “The temporal language (‘day,’ ‘evening and morning’) of Genesis 1 is being used metaphorically. Terms properly used to denote lower-register units of time have been appropriated to refer to upper-register time.... The word <i>yōm</i> in Genesis 1 denotes an ordinary, lower-register, solar day. Yet it is being used metaphorically to describe an upper-register unit of time that is not defined by the earth’s rotation with respect to the Sun. A word with a literal denotation has been employed to describe a nonliteral referent” (251)• “The critical question is not the meaning of <i>yōm</i> but the nature (literal or metaphorical) of the total image of the week of days” (252)• “Decisively demonstrating the upper-register nature of the creation week is the upper-register nature of the beginning of the creation week.... the starting point of the first day” (Prov 8:22–31, John 1:1-3) (244–245)• “Just as the initial point of the creation week is a part of the upper register, so is the conclusion of the creation week.... This seventh day is not an earthly day of rest for man, but the heavenly rest of God Himself.... As an eternal day, it argues for the nonliteral nature of the creation days” (Numbers 14, Ps 98, Hebrews 3–4) (245)• “The absence of the evening-morning formula at the conclusion of the seventh day flags this day as unique in that it has no end” (245)• “If both the threshold and the conclusion of the creation week have an upper-register time frame, then certainly the six days, which are part of the same temporal series, must be upper-register days” (Ps 104) (246)• “Augustine held a nonliteral interpretation of the days, and he was followed by Anselm, Peter Lombard, and others.... No one can deny that nonliteral approaches to the creation days have a venerable place in the history of Christian interpretation” (219)• “The institution of the solar day on the fourth day, after the creation week has already begun, indicates that the days are not to be understood literally as solar days” (219–220)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Genesis 2:2• Numbers 14• Pss 95; 104• Proverbs 8:22–31• John 1:1–3• Hebrews 3:7–11, 13, 15–19; 4:1–4, 7, 9–10• C. J. Collins 1994, 125 (254)• J. P. Lewis 1989, 433–455 (254)• R. Letham 1999, 149–174 (254)		
Age of Universe	indeterminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “At present we cannot translate [any given upper-register unit of time] into its lower-register equivalent—God has not chosen to reveal that information” (248)	n/a	

Kelly 1997 (his 2017 revised edition made no substantial changes on this issue)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the daylight portion" of a twenty-four hour solar day (107) 2. "twenty-four hour solar day" (107) 3. "a portion of the year" (108) 4. exceptionally with "another sense [other] than 'twenty-four hours'" (108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "'Day' (<i>yom</i>) can ... occasionally be used of a portion of the year, such as wheat harvest (Gen. 30:14 [but here pl.])" (108) • "There are a few Scriptural texts which make it clear that 'day' is being employed in another sense than 'twenty-four hours'. 2 Peter 3:8 is the pre-eminent example of such usage" (108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 30:14 • 2 Peter 3:8 (108)
יום In Genesis 1	"normal solar days" (108)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "When modified by a number or ordinal (as 'Day One' or 'Day Two') its universal Scriptural usage means normal solar day. {Footnote:} The apparent exception to this universal usage ... of Hosea 6:2 ... is not a clear exception" (107) • "The very context [of extraordinary uses of 'day,' as in 2 Peter 3:8] indicates plainly that the normal, historico-literal significance is not intended. This kind of exceptional usage cannot legitimately be read back into a normal sequence of days (as though, for instance, because of 2 Peter 3:8, the seven creation days automatically lasted seven thousand years), unless the literary and grammatical context of the passage in question required such a shift in meaning. Textual evidence in Genesis 1 and 2 indicates no such shift, but rather seems to require a sequence of normal solar days" (108) • "Scientist Henry M. Morris seems correct in marshalling the evidence that 'day' in Genesis 1 and 2 signifies a normal solar day" (108) • "Further confirmation of Genesis 'days' as plain, solar days is provided by the reason annexed to the fourth commandment ... in Exodus 20:11" (109) • "Arguments for making creation week several thousand (or million) years long ... seem contrived and artificial when one looks closely at the immediate text of Genesis and the wider biblical context. Exegetes have to engage in a sort of modern casuistry to make Genesis 'day' mean anything other than ordinary solar day. After grappling with similar evangelical reconstructions of creation week, one has to appreciate the exegetical honesty of the liberal, nineteenth-century Scottish Professor Marcus Dods ..., when he wrote that 'if, for example, the word "day" in these chapters does not mean a period of twenty-four hours, the interpretation of Scripture is hopeless'" (112) • "Fourth-century church father, St. Ambrose of Milan, faithfully summarized the biblical usage of day in his <i>Hexameron</i>: '...Scripture established a law that twenty-four hours, including both day and night, should be given the name of day only, as if one were to say the length of one day is twenty-four hours in extent'" (112) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exodus 20:11 (109) • Ambrose 1961, 42:42–43 (112) • Dods 1888, 4 (112) • Morris 1976, 55, 56 (108–109)
Age of Universe	"less than ten thousand years" (139)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "To question the high antiquity of the universe on the basis of Scripture, seems no more unreasonable than to have questioned biological evolution on the same basis. After all, since scientific research has rendered macroevolution implausible (through a fuller understanding of such matters as the first two laws of thermodynamics and the irreducible complexity of living structures), it has at least indirectly pointed to the viability of something like biblical creation. What could be more rational than to assume that the same Word is just as true in the realm of chronology as it was in the realm of 'intelligent design'" (139) • "The biblical documents seem clearly to indicate a relatively young earth and solar system. Genesis chapters one and two speak ... of a completed creation within the space of six days as we know them from an earthly perspective. Then the genealogies of chapters ten and eleven of Genesis, and those of Matthew chapter one and Luke chapter three all concur in indicating a date of human and terrestrial history in terms of something less than ten thousand years since creation" (139) • "While ... the Bible itself never gives us anything approaching an exact date of creation week, the procedure of Ussher and Lightfoot does not seem inherently unreasonable, since the genealogies are central to the unfolding of both creation and redemption" (139) • various scientific arguments, e.g., "the speed of light has been slowing down" (144), "the distortion of time in white holes" (151), "reassessment of dating methods" (162) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1, 2, 10, 11 (139) • Matthew 1 (139) • Luke 3 (139) • Brown 1995 and works by other creation scientists (144, <i>passim</i>) • Ussher (1650–1654) 2003 (139)

Kidner 1967			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> literal day "days of God [having] no human analogies" "ages ... 'epoch'" (56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "One may argue that 'day' can bear the sense of 'epoch' (cf., e.g. Ps. 90:4; Isa. 4:2), or that days of God have no human analogies (as Augustine [<i>The City of God</i>, XI. vi.], and Origen [<i>De Principiis</i>, iv. 3] before him, urged)" (56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ps 90:4 Isaiah 4:2 Augustine (1887) 1994, 11.6 (<i>NPNF</i>¹ 2:208) Origen (1885) 1994, 4.1.16 (Kidner refers to Edwyn Bevan 1947, 155, whose quotation of Origen from "<i>De Principiis</i> iv. 3," corresponds to 4.1.16 in ANF 4:365) (56)
יוֹם In Genesis 1	"ages" (58)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The <i>days of creation</i> may be ... understood [as giving] the reader a simple means of relating the work of God in creation to the work of God here and now in history. While a scientific account would have to speak of ages, not days, and would group them to mark the steps that are scientifically significant, the present account surveys the same scene for its theological significance. With this in view it speaks of days, not ages, and groups them into a week" (56) "The significance of the week is explicit in the sabbath-hallowing (2:3; cf. Exod. 20:11; 31:17) which makes man's proper rhythm of work and rest a reminder and miniature of the Creator's; and the division of the period into days may be meant to imply no more than this [Payne 1964, 17ff.]" (56) "The full meaning of an inspired utterance was often hidden from the speaker: even Caiaphas exemplifies this [John 11:49-53], and the same is said of Daniel [Daniel 12:8, 9] and of the prophets [1 Peter 1:10-12]" (57-58) "A God who made no concessions to our ways of seeing and speaking would communicate to us no meaning. Hence the phenomenological language of the chapter (like our own talk of 'sunrise', 'dewfall', etc.) and its geocentric standpoint; but hence also the heavy temporal foreshortening which turns ages into days. Both are instruments of truth, diagrams enabling us to construe and not misconstrue a totality too big for us. It is only pedantry that would quarrel with terms that simplify in order to clarify" (58) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daniel 12:8, 9 (58) John 11:49-53 (58) 1 Peter 1:10-12 (58) Payne 1964, 17ff. (56)
Age of Universe	"immense" (27)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Palaeontology ... depicts a species fashioned over perhaps a million years or more into the present human form, showing the outward characteristics of modern man upwards of twenty thousand years ago" (26) "It could be that the events are presented here [in Genesis] in simplified pictorial form ..., or are landmarks punctuating an immense tract of time.... If Genesis is abbreviating a long history, the sheer vastness of the ages it spans, on this view, is not so sharp a problem as the fact that almost the whole of this immensity lies, for the palaeontologist, between the first man and the first farmer" (27) "The text of Genesis would by no means disallow [that] God initially shaped man by a process of evolution. {Footnote:} Cf., e.g. Job 10:8ff., Ps. 119:73, where God's use of natural processes is described in terms of the potter's art as in Gen. 2:7" (28) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genesis 2:7 Job 10:8ff. Ps 119:73 (28)

Kulikovsky 2009			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the period of daylight during a 24-hour day" (149) 2. "a 24-hour day" (149) 3. "periods of time greater than twenty-four hours" (149) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "יום (<i>yôm</i>) has a large semantic range and can refer to periods of time greater than twenty-four hours" (149) • "יום ... can refer to something other than a 24-hour day ... when situated in certain contexts. Hasel explains: '[E]xtended, non-literal meanings of this Hebrew term have special linguistic and contextual connections which indicate clearly that a non-literal meaning is intended'" (163–164) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hasel 1994, 18 (164)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"The days of creation are a sequence of normal 24-hour days which occurred in history around 6,000 to 10,000 years ago. In other words, the days of creation are a record of the very first week of the history of the universe" (175)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The most common and basic meaning [of יום] is in reference to a 24-hour day or the period of daylight during a 24-hour day" (149) • "Contra Hugh Ross, there were other lexical choices available to the author which are far better suited to expressing the idea of an age or long period of time. For example, דור (<i>dôr</i>) is used in various combinations to express the idea of an age or period of time [Isa 51:9; Deut 32:7; <i>TWOT</i>, 1:186–87]. The word עולם (<i>ʿolām</i>) could also have been used [<i>TWOT</i>, 2:673; <i>HALOT</i>, 798]" (150) • "In the final analysis, interpreting the days as long ages cannot be sustained. It allows the ever-changing conclusions of science to override the well-attested usage of the common Hebrew word <i>yôm</i> in its context" (153) • "[The Literal Day View] has been the orthodox position of the church throughout history up until the early nineteenth century, and virtually everyone agrees that this is the most natural reading of the text" (162) • "Elsewhere, whenever a number modifies <i>yôm</i> it always refers to a literal 24-hour day, and the presence of וַיְהִי־עֶרְבַּ וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר ... strongly suggests a 24-hour day was meant [Wenham 1987, 19; Blocher {1979} 1984, 44–45]" (163) • "In Deuteronomy 4:32 ... <i>yôm</i> is part of a temporal phrase: מִיְּמֵי הָאֵשֶׁר בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים ... This same phrase occurs twenty-three times in the Old Testament and clearly refers to a normal 24-hour day, implying that 'the day God created man on the earth' (day six) was also a normal 24-hour day" (163) • "In Genesis 1:5, 'day' is defined as the period of light, and 'night' as the period of darkness. The description is then terminated by 'and there was evening and there was morning—one day.' Therefore, a day ('one day') is defined as period of light and a period of darkness separated by an evening and a morning—a literal 24-hour day. Indeed, Thomas Aquinas stated: 'The words "one day" are used when the day is first established, to denote that one day is made up of 24 hours. Hence, by mentioning "one," the measure of a natural day is fixed' [cited in Lewis 1989, 451–52]" (163) • "In their entries under <i>yôm</i>, the standard Hebrew lexicons explicitly cite Genesis 1:5 as an example of where this word refers to a 24-hour day. {Footnote:} See entries for יום in Holladay, BDB, <i>HALOT</i>. See also <i>TDOT</i> 4:7–32 and <i>THAT</i> 1:707–726" (164) • "The use of 'day,' 'days' and 'night' in Genesis 1:14–18 can <i>only</i> possibly refer to literal 24-hour days" (163) • "Both Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 clearly state that God created the universe 'in six days.' ... Neither Exodus 20:11 nor 31:17, however, contain anything that could possibly indicate an analogical comparison or correspondence. On the contrary, the use of כִּי (<i>kî</i>, 'for,' 'because') to link the creation week to the working week indicates that the creation week forms the <i>basis</i> of, and establishes the pattern for, both the working week and the observance of the Sabbath [Lewis 1989, 450]" (171) • "The literal day view ... is ... the most exegetically sound" (173) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:5, 14–18 (163) • Exodus 20:11; 31:17 (171) • Deuteronomy 4:32; 32:7 (150, 163) • Isaiah 51:9 (150) • Aquinas; cited in Lewis 1989, 451–452 (163) • <i>BDB</i> (1907) 1979, s.v. יום (164) • Blocher (1979) 1984, 44–45 (163) • <i>HALOT</i> 2001, s.v., יום, 798 (150, 164) • Holladay 1971, s.v., יום (164) • Lewis 1989, 450 (171) • <i>TDOT</i> 1990, 4:7–32 (164) • <i>THAT</i> 1971, 1:707–726 (164) • <i>TWOT</i> 1980, 1:186–187, 2:673 (150) • Wenham 1987, 19 (163)
Age of Universe	<p>"about 6,000 to 10,000 years" (173; cf. 175)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Although the Scriptures give relatively few absolute temporal references and indicators, by applying elementary arithmetic to those temporal markers that are given—in particular, the genealogies of Genesis, Matthew, and Luke—it is possible to arrive at an approximate age of the earth.... Those who accept the literal-day view generally believe that the earth is about 6,000 to 10,000 years old" (173) 	<p>genealogies of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis • Matthew • Luke (173)

Lennox 2011			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "'daytime'—roughly twelve hours" (Gen 1:5; cf. John 11:9) (50) 2. "a twenty-four-hour day" (50) 3. "a period of time ... of undefined length" (51) 4. "an epoch that extends [from the seventh day, the Sabbath,] onward into eternity" (50) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Augustine's suggestion, that God sanctified the seventh day by making an epoch that extends onward into eternity, makes good sense; and this is followed by many commentators" (50) • "[God] is still resting up to this present day. That is, we are still today in God's Sabbath rest" (50); "[Endnote:] See Heb. 4:3–11" (64); "the seventh day ... [is] a long period of time" (55) • "Clearly the author has no more got a twenty-four-hour day in mind here [in Gen 2:4] than an elderly man would if he said, 'In my day there were very few aircraft in the sky.' He would be using the word 'day' quite correctly to describe a period of time, not a particular day of a particular week. We might compare this use of the word with expressions like 'the day of the Lord' and 'the last day,' which clearly refer to periods of undefined length, and not twenty-four-hour days" (51) • "The word 'day,' ... has several distinct meanings in the short text of Genesis 1:1–2:4 alone. Each of these meanings is familiar from ordinary usage. They are all natural, primary, 'literal' meanings, each referring to something real and perfectly comprehensible" (51) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (51) • Hebrews 4:3–11 (64)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"creation days" (54); "possibl[y] ... twenty-four-hour days" (53), "but ... not ... form[ing] a single earth week" (55)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The presence of the article indicates that the final two days are special ... This point of grammar may ... be a signal to us ... There is ... [a] possibility ... that the writer did not intend us to think of the first six days as days of a single earth week, but rather as a sequence of six <i>creation</i> days; that is days of normal length (with evenings and mornings as the text says) in which God acted to create something new, but days that might well have been separated by long periods of time" (53–54) • "The six days encompass a sequence of creation acts, each of which involved at least one creation fiat ... The outworking of the potential of each creative fiat would occupy an unspecified period of time after that particular creation day. One consequence of this is that we would expect to find what geologists tell us we do find—fossil evidence revealing the sudden appearance of new levels of complexity, followed by periods during which there was no more creation" (55) • "Exodus 20:8–11 does not <i>demand</i> that the days of Genesis 1 be the days of a single week" (57) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newman and Eckelmann 1977, 64–65 (65) • Newman 1999, 105–133 (65) • Hayward (1985) (1995) 2005, 169–171, 176–177 (65)
Age of Universe	<p>"indeterminate ... possibl[y] very ancient" (53)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The initial creation act (Gen. 1:1–2) is separated from the six days of creation that follow it.... This means that, according to the text, day 1 begins in verse 3 and not in verse 1.... This implies that 'the beginning' of Genesis 1:1 did not necessarily take place on day 1 as is frequently assumed. The initial creation took place before day 1, but Genesis does not tell us how long before. This means that the question of the age of the earth (and of the universe) is a separate question from the interpretation of the days, a point that is frequently overlooked. In other words, quite apart from any scientific considerations, the text of Genesis 1:1, in separating the beginning from day 1, leaves the age of the universe indeterminate. It would therefore be logically possible to believe that the days of Genesis are twenty-four-hour days (of one earth week) <i>and</i> to believe that the universe is very ancient... Although Scripture could be understood as that the earth is young, it does not have to be interpreted this way" (53) • "Science helps us to decide what meaning to go for ... There is a way of understanding Genesis 1 that ... takes into account our increased knowledge of the universe, as Scripture itself suggests we should (Rom. 1:19–20)" (61) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romans 1:19–20 (61)

Lewis and Demarest 1990			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יָמִים, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יָמִים	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the period of light in contrast to the period of darkness" 2. "a period of twenty-four hours" 3. "a point of time" 4. "a year" 5. "a long 'time'" (44) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Yôm in Scripture frequently connotes an extended period of time (Gen. 2:4; Joel 1:15; Zech. 12:3)" (24) • "'Day' in Scripture frequently connotes a long period of time (Gen. 2:4; Job 20:28; Amos 9:11; 2 Thess. 2:3). Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8 indicate that from God's perspective a thousand years are as one day. In addition, yôm in its nearly 1,300 occurrences in the Old Testament is variously translated by the AV time, year, age, life, space, weather, etc." (29) • "'Day' [but pl. in all four references that follow] meant a month (Gen. 29:14), seven sabbaths of years (Lev. 25:8), 'a long time' (forty years) in the desert (Josh. 24:7), and another 'long time' when Israel was without the true God (2 Chron. 15:3)" (44) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4; 29:14 (24, 29, 44) • Leviticus 25:8 (44) • Joshua 24:7 (44) • 2 Chronicles 15:3 (44) • Job 20:28 (29) • Ps 90:4 (29) • Joel 1:15 (24) • Amos 9:11 (29) • Zechariah 12:3 (24) • 2 Thessalonians 2:3 (29) • 2 Peter 3:8 (29)
יָמִים in Genesis 1	"creative epochs" (29)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "'Day' in Scripture frequently connotes a long period of time (Gen. 2:4; Job 20:28; Amos 9:11; 2 Thess. 2:3 [Joel 1:15; Zechariah 12:3; Ps 90:4; 2 Peter 3:8]).... Carl Henry observes that 'the term day in Genesis has no consistent chronological value' [Henry 1983, 6:133]" (24, 29) • "The words 'evening' and 'morning' often signify longer periods of time (Ps. 90:5-6; Jer. 6:4)" (29) • "The identical application of 'evening' and 'morning' to each of the six days may suggest that they were all of equal length. Yet the first three days existed before the sun, moon, and stars were 'made'" (29). "The literal meaning is not invariable even after the fourth day. Sometimes the beginning of the day is evening (Est. 4:16; Dan. 8:14) and sometimes morning (Deut. 28:66-67) [Scofield (1909) 1917 on Gen 1:5]" (44) • "In the context of Genesis 1 the solar system was not arranged to regulate days and nights until the fourth day, and then the 'day' was not twenty-four hours, but the period of light in contrast to the darkness of the night (Gen. 1:18). This most literal use of 'day' for, say, twelve hours of light as distinct from the period of darkness lacked a literal referent before the fourth creative period" (44) • "Other indications in the Genesis account also suggest a period of time involved between the successive creative acts [1:11, 20]" (44) • "A period of time longer than twenty-four hours is also indicated between the creation of Adam and of Eve [1:27; 2:15, 18-23]" (44) • "Scripture seems to indicate that the seventh day continues through the present age (Heb. 4:1-11)" (29) • "Ultimately, responsible geology must determine the length of the Genesis days, even as science centuries earlier settled the issue of the rotation of the earth about the sun. Derek Kidner judges on the basis of empirical evidence that 'a scientific account would have to speak of ages, not days' [Kidner 1967, 56]. Since Scripture elsewhere teaches that God <i>made</i> the universe in six days (Exod. 20:11; 31:17), it is probable that the 'days' represent the creative epochs. {Endnote (498):} As suggested, for example, by Millard J. Erickson, ... 1:382" (29) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:11, 18, 20, 27; 2:4, 15, 18-23 (24, 29, 44) • Exodus 20:11; 31:17 (29) • Deuteronomy 28:66-67 (44) • Esther 4:16 (44) • Job 20:28 (29) • Ps 90:4-6 (29) • Jeremiah 6:4 (29) • Daniel 8:14 (44) • Joel 1:15 (24) • Amos 9:11 (29) • Zechariah 12:3 (24) • 2 Thessalonians 2:3 (29) • Hebrews 4:1-11 (29) • 2 Peter 3:8 (29) • Erickson 1983-1985, 1:382 (cf. 3rd ed., 2013, 352) (29) • Henry 1983, 6:133 (29) • Kidner 1967, 56 (29) • <i>Scofield Reference Bible</i> (1909) 1917, on Gen 1:5 (44)
Age of Universe	"15 or 20 billion years ago" (50)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Most astronomers now hold that the universe had an instant of origin in a fireball explosion 15 or 20 billion years ago" (50) 	n/a

Longman III 2005			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	1. "a twenty-four-hour day" 2. "a period of time" (104)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[There are] passages ... where <i>yom</i> appears to be used in reference to a period of time.... These occurrences come in formulas like 'day of the Lord'" (104) 	n/a
יום In Genesis 1	ambiguous (104)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Even a superficial reading of Genesis 1 should lead the interpreter to question whether the Hebrew word <i>yom</i> (day) should be understood as a twenty-four hour day. After all, a twenty-four-hour day is defined by the alternation of sun and moon. But these are not even created until the fourth 'day'! Attempts to suggest that there were alternative and temporary light sources are really cases of special pleading" (104) • "However, the suggestion that 'day' does not mean a literal day but rather a period of time also has its problems. This idea is supported by passages outside of the creation account where <i>yom</i> appears to be used in reference to a period of time. The only problem with this argument is that these occurrences come in formulas like 'day of the Lord.' Furthermore, Genesis 1 accompanies the word <i>yom</i> with the phrase 'and evening passed and morning came'" (104) • "It appears that Genesis itself is not interested in giving us a clear and unambiguous understanding of the nature of the creation days. This ambiguity fits in with the overall impression we get of the passage, that it is not concerned to tell us the process of creation. Rather it is intent on simply celebrating and asserting the fact that God is Creator.... God created creation!" (104, 107) 	n/a
Age of Universe	"old" (104)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Scientific research concluded that the world is old, the process that brought the cosmos into being took huge amounts of time, and that human beings are relative latecomers to the process and are themselves the product of a long evolution. It seemed that scientific models of creation clashed with the biblical description. But did they really? Some theologians immediately adopted an apologetic stance and tried to so doubt concerning the validity of the scientific model. However, cooler heads raised the question of the interpretation of Genesis 1—2. They used the new discoveries as an occasion not to review the truth of the Genesis account but to review whether the traditional interpretation was correct" (104) 	n/a

Mathews 1996			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "daylight" 2. "a full solar day" 3. "God's 'day' ... as a thousand years" 4. "some period" (149) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In Psalm 90 ... God's 'day' (<i>yôm</i>) is as a thousand years, but human life is like daylight (<i>yôm</i>) that passes by or as a nightwatch, and youth gives way to old age like 'evening' overtakes 'morning' (90:4–6). Also the seventh day [of creation] does not have the concluding refrain 'evening and morning,' which suggests its continuation for some period and thus its nonliteral nature. Theological significance is attached to this feature by the writer to the Hebrews (2[?4]:1–3)" (149) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps 90:4–6 • Hebrews 2[?4]:1–3 (149)
יום In Genesis 1	"a nonliteral 'day'" (149)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There are many indications that 'day' in its customary sense may not be intended. The most obvious indication is the sun's absence for the first three 'days.' That 'day' might not have its normal meaning here is not surprising since other Hebrew terms, such as 'heaven' and 'earth,' also have varying meanings in the narrative (e.g., vv. 1,8). <i>Yôm</i> is a designation for the 'daylight' of the first creative day, not a reference to a full solar day (v. 5), and it is used as a temporal expression for the <i>entire</i> creative period of six days in the <i>tôlēdôt</i> section that follows, 'in the <i>day</i> they were created' (2:4a [the quotation is actually 2:4b; but the word <i>tôlēdôt</i> occurs in 2:4a]; NIV 'when')" (149) • "Some argue that only יום ('day') without a numerical qualifier is used figuratively in the OT. When 'day' occurs in the singular, with a number, or in a numbered series, it always means either 'solar day' or 'daylight,' never an undefined period of time.... Yet it is begging the question to argue on this basis since it assumes that the author could not use a numbered series to describe nonliteral days sequentially" (182) • "If we keep in mind the colloquial use of the language, 'day' cannot have its common meaning before the sun is created. The very expression 'evening and morning' demands the planetary arrangement of our solar system that does not come into existence until the fourth day. On the other hand, 'evening and morning' in a literal sense had figurative meaning for the Hebrew reader in Psalm 90, also attributed to Moses" (149) • "God's 'day' (<i>yôm</i>) is as a thousand years, but human life is like daylight (<i>yôm</i>) that passes by or as a nightwatch, and youth gives way to old age like 'evening' overtakes 'morning' (90:4–6)" (149) • "The seventh day does not have the concluding refrain 'evening and morning,' which suggests its continuation for some period and thus its nonliteral nature. Theological significance is attached to this feature by the writer to the Hebrews (2[?4]:1–3). As the climactic seventh day of the six-day series, it implies that all six days are nonliteral" (149) • The weight of the arguments favors a nonliteral 'day,' but definitive answers to the meaning of 'day' and the duration of creation remain elusive" (149) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:1, 5, 8; 2:4a • Ps 90:4–6 • Hebrews 2[?4]:1–3 (149)
Age of Universe	"ca. 12–20 billion years ago" (103)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The most widely accepted theory of the late twentieth century is that the universe resulted from the sudden appearance of a single particle out of an absolute vacuum (ca. 12–20 billion years ago)" (102–103) • "Modern interpreters are puzzled by the brevity of creation in light of geology's testimony to the age of the earth" (148) 	n/a

Morris 1974, 1976, 1984			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the 'light' period in the cyclical succession of light and darkness" (1984, 340; cf. 1974, 224); "the daylight portion of the twenty-four hours" (1976, 56) 2. "day (in the twenty-four hours sense)" (1976, 55–56) 3. "time in a general sense" (1974, 223); "indefinite time" (1976, 54, 56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "There is no doubt that <i>yom</i> can be used to express time in a general sense. In fact, it is actually translated as 'time' in the King James translation 65 times" (1974, 223) • "It may occasionally be possible for ... <i>yom</i> ... to mean an indefinite time" (1976, 54) 	n/a
יוֹם In Genesis 1	"literal days" (1974, 225; 1976, 54)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Though it may occasionally be possible for the Hebrew word for 'day' (<i>yom</i>) to mean an indefinite time, the specific context in Genesis 1 precludes any such meaning here" (1976, 54) • "The very first usage of <i>yom</i> clearly defines its meaning, in context.... (Genesis 1:5). God defines His terms! The <i>yom</i> is the 'light' period in the cyclical succession of light and darkness, which began with the first <i>yom</i> and has continued ever since" (1984, 340) • "[<i>Yom</i>] is translated as 'day' almost 1200 times. In addition, its plural form <i>yamim</i>, is translated as 'days' approximately 700 times. It is obvious, therefore, that the normal meanings of <i>yom</i> and <i>yamim</i> are 'day' and 'days,' respectively. If a parabolic or metaphorical meaning is intended, it is made obvious in the context. In approximately 95% of its occurrences, the literal meaning is clearly indicated" (1974, 223) • "Even in those cases where a general meaning is permitted in the context, it is always indefinite as to duration, such as the 'time of adversity' or the 'day of prosperity.' In fact, it would be very difficult to find even a single occurrence of <i>yom</i> which could not be interpreted to mean a literal solar day, and would have to mean a long period of time" (1974, 223); "<i>Yom</i> without exception never means 'period'" (1976, 55) • "Whenever the writer really intended to convey the idea of a very long duration of time, he normally used some such word as <i>olam</i> (meaning 'age' or 'long time') or else attached to <i>yom</i> an adjective such as <i>rab</i> (meaning 'long'), so that the two words together, <i>yom rab</i>, then meant 'a long time.' But <i>yom</i> by itself can apparently never be proved, in one single case, to <i>require</i> the meaning of a long period of time, and certainly no usage which would suggest a geologic age" (1974, 223) • "It might still be contended that, even though <i>yom</i> never <i>requires</i> the meaning of a long age, it might possibly <i>permit</i> it. However, the writer of the first chapter of Genesis has very carefully guarded against such a notion, both by modifying the noun by a numerical adjective ..., and also by indicating the boundaries of the time period in each case as 'evening and morning.' Either one of these devices would suffice to limit the meaning of <i>yom</i> to that of a solar day, and when both are used, there could be no better or surer way possible for the writer to convey the intended meaning of a literal solar day.... Whenever a limiting numeral or ordinal is attached to 'day' in the Old Testament (and there are over 200 such instances), the meaning is always that of a literal day. Similarly, the words 'evening' and 'morning,' each occurring more than a hundred times in the Hebrew, never are used to mean anything but a literal evening and a literal morning, ending and beginning a literal day" (1974, 223–224) • "Genesis 1:14–19 further clarifies the meaning of 'day' and 'days' ... It would certainly seem that there could be no possible doubt as to the meaning of <i>day</i> after at least this fourth day" (1974, 225) • "In Exodus [20:8–11] in the Ten Commandments.... it is quite clear that the six work days of God [in creation] are identical in duration with the six days of man's work week. The basis for this very precise commandment is trivial and vacuous otherwise" (1974, 225). "If man's 'days' are not the same as God's 'days,' then language becomes meaningless" (1984, 340) 	n/a
Age of Universe	6,000–12,000 years "with the probabilities ... favoring the lower end of this spectrum" (1976, 46)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In view of the highly equivocal and contradictory data from all extra-Biblical sources, the only possibility of obtaining anything approximating an exact chronology would have to lie in the Bible itself," including Genesis 1, 5, 11, the OT historical books, etc. (1976, 43) • "There are many physical processes which ... can be shown to agree in order of magnitude with the short Biblical chronology [cf. <i>Scientific Creationism</i>]" (1976, 45) • "In addition to Ussher's date of 4004 B.C. for the creation, many other dates have been computed, some of which are as follows (all in years B.C.): Jewish, 3760; Septuagint, 5270; Josephus, 5555; Kepler, 3993; Melanchthon, 3964; Luther, 3961; Lightfoot, 3960; Hales, 5402; Playfair, 4008; Lipman, 3916; and others" (1976, 45) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis, 1, 5, 11, OT historical books, etc. • Morris 1974 • Ussher et al. (see left)

Munyon 1995 (discussing Progressive Creationism)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "a literal twenty-four-hour day" 2. "periods of indeterminate time" (231) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Progressive creationists typically point to passages in the Old Testament where 'day' meant something broader than a literal, twenty-four-hour day" (231) 	n/a
יום In Genesis 1	"periods of indeterminate time" (231)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Proponents of this model contend that the creative days of Genesis 1 connote overlapping periods of indeterminate time" (Newman and Eckelmann 1977) (231) • "The [latter part] of Genesis 1 [vv. 20–31] reveals the final distinct creative acts of God's progressive creation, all of which possibly took place with the passing of time" (Ramm 1954) (231) • "They note that the events of Genesis 2:7–23 included the naming of all the animals and birds, which took place on the latter part of the sixth 'day.'" (231) • "Many progressive creationists believe that we are still living in the sixth creative day [Newman and Eckelmann 1977, 85–86] and that God's Sabbath Day of rest will occur in the eternal state. Others believe that we are in the seventh creative day because the word 'rested' means 'ceased,' and no end is indicated for the seventh day in Genesis 2:3. Nothing in the Bible indicates that God is now creating new universes" (232) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:7–23 (231) • Newman and Eckelmann 1977 (231–232) • Ramm 1954, 78 (231)
Age of Universe	"vast ages" (233)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[Progressive creationists] recognize ... that the genealogies of the Bible were not intended for the construction of an accurate chronology" (Pun 1982) (231) • "Progressive creationists take the fossil record preserved in the geologic strata as a silent witness to rather long periods of time that have passed" (232) • "Concerning the young-earth theory, one progressive creationist says, 'By its failure to deal with a wealth of relevant data, the recent creation-global flood model is unable ... to account for a wide diversity of geological phenomena' [Till et al.]" (232) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pun 1982, 228, 256–259 (231) • Till et al. 1988, 124 (232)

Newman and Eckelmann Jr. 1977			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "roughly twelve hours" 2. "a twenty-four-hour day" 3. "longer periods of time" (61) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Yom ('day') ... is used rather like our English word 'day.' ... Less frequently it is used for longer periods of time (Gen. 2:4; Eccl. 12:3). Which of these usages should be called 'literal' and which 'figurative' is somewhat a matter of semantics. In any case, the claim that <i>yom</i> always means a twenty-four-hour day cannot be substantiated by a survey of its actual use" (61) • Other "exceptions to the usual meanings [include] 'day of the Lord' in many places" (74); "Zechariah 14:7, it appears, speaks of the day of the Lord as a continuing period of time" (61) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 • Ecclesiastes 12:3 • Zechariah 14:7 (61)
יוֹם in Genesis 1	<p>"The 'days' of Genesis 1 are twenty-four-hour days, sequential but not consecutive, and ... the creative activity largely occurs between days rather than on them. That is, each Genesis day introduces a new creative period" (74)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The exegetical support for a young earth created in six consecutive, twenty-four-hour days a few thousand years ago is inconclusive and overlooks important biblical data" (66) • "The exceptions to the usual meanings of ['day,' 'evening,' and 'morning'] ... make it possible to suggest that the days of creation were long but strictly bounded periods of time, for which no more suitable Hebrew word is available" (74) • "One [cannot] prove that <i>yom</i>, when used with a number, takes on the more restricted idea of a twenty-four-hour day. Zechariah 14:7, it appears, speaks of the day of the Lord as a continuing period of time, and uses exactly the same Hebrew construction as is used for the 'first day' in Genesis 1:5" (61) • "The ... claim, that <i>yom</i> means a twenty-four-hour day when used with <i>ordinal</i> numbers ..., has the advantage that no clear counter-example can be cited with <i>yom</i> meaning a long period of time. The force of this observation is greatly reduced, however, when one considers that the Bible has no occasion to mention several long periods of time which might be numbered, except the days of creation. In any case, it is not clear why an adjective such as an ordinal number should change the range of meaning of the noun <i>yom</i>" (61–62) • "Concerning the question of which usages of <i>yom</i> are 'literal' and which 'figurative,' the dictum 'always take the literal meaning where possible' should not be used to rule out an alternative interpretation. Such a methodology ... should give way to any real contextual evidence available" (62) • "The argument [from Exodus 20:8–11] ... is not necessarily valid, because it is an argument from analogy, not from identity. The work-week and Sabbath day ... are repeated again and again, but the [creation week] is not. Since the passage does not explicitly say that 'day' is to be understood the same way in both cases, this may differ also, just as Protestants will agree that the 'blood' we drink 'in the Lord's Supper is different from the blood he shed on Calvary, that the baptism we experience as we enter the church is different from the 'baptism' Jesus experienced (Lk. 12:50), although our human activities in these cases commemorate God's activity. Perhaps twenty-four-hour days are used in the work-week to commemorate long periods in creation week.... God also established two other kinds of sabbath: a year-long sabbath ... (Ex. 23: 10–11; Lev. 25: 3–7) and a jubilee sabbath of disputed length (... Lev. 25:8–17) ... These examples should at least instruct us to pause and reflect before claiming that Exodus 20:8-11 proves the creation week consisted of seven consecutive twenty-four-hour days" (62–63) • "R. John Snow [125–35] has examined the events of ... the sixth day, and he has shown that a much longer period seems to be implied by the context" (63) • "The fourth chapter of Hebrews tells us that believers can still enter into the rest of God mentioned in Genesis 2:2.... God has not yet <i>begun</i> to rest as the seventh day is still in the future [John 5:17]" (65) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exodus 23:10–11 (63) • Leviticus 25:3–17 (63) • Zechariah 14:7 (61) • Luke 12:50 (63) • John 5:17 (65) • Hebrews 4 (65) • R. J. Snow 1977 (63)
Age of Universe	"more than 10 billion years old" (18, 22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific evidence: "Astronomical Evidence" (15–29); "Meteorites and Lunar Material" (29); "Geological Evidence" (30–34); "Evidence from the Solar System" (c. 2); and an appendix by Daniel E. Wonderly with "Nonradiometric Data" (89–103) • Scriptural evidence (c. 4), with an appendix by William Henry Green on "Priveval Chronology" (105–123), and an appendix by R. John Snow about the length of the sixth day (125–135) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • various

Oden 1987			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "twenty-four-hour day" 2. "a time of divine visitation or judgment" 3. "an indefinite period of time" (234) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The word <i>day</i> (<i>yōm</i>) has several levels of meaning. It is used in biblical Hebrew to mean not only a twenty-four-hour day but also a time of divine visitation or judgment, or an indefinite period of time, as in Psalms 110:5, Isaiah 2:11, 12, and Jeremiah 11:4–7; 17:16 ff" (234) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps 110:5 • Isaiah 2:11–12 • Jeremiah 11:4–7; 17:16ff. (234)
יום In Genesis 1	"a pattern of six 'days,' or periods" (234)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "To insist on a twenty-four-hour day as the word's only meaning is to intrude upon the text and to disallow the poetic, metaphorical, and symbolic speech of Scripture (Pss. 2:7; 18:18; Isa. 4:1, 2; Jer. 44:1–23)" (234) • "Christian teaching of creation has sometimes distinguished between God's immediate creation and mediated creation, that is, between immediate or primordial origin of creaturely beings, followed by and distinguished from its ordering and growth. Such a distinction is implied in Genesis 1, in that God called into being light and then subsequently ordered it; God called the waters and earth into being and only then ordered them with 'plants bearing seed, fruit-trees bearing fruit' (Gen. 1:1–11). Such development may be viewed as implicitly analogous to evolutionary development, which lends itself to reliable laws of evolutionary development so that scientific inquiry can proceed into various steps of the history of nature" (266–267) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps 2:7; 18:18 • Isaiah 4:1–2 • Jeremiah 44:1–23 (234)
Age of Universe	"perhaps thirty thousands of millions of years ago" (231); "one gets the impression [from Rom 8:19–22] of the cosmos laboring for birth on a multibillion-year scale" (249)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Christian faith in creation is compatible with accurate scientific description" (231) • "The Bible does not rule out scientific cosmologies and other ways of understanding the primitive history of the world. The natural emergence of the cosmic, geological, vegetative, and animal spheres can remain a matter of scientific investigation. The creation narratives do not pretend to describe in empirical detail, objectively, descriptively, or unmetaphorically, the way in which the world came into being" (233) • "Classical Christian doctrines of creation do not necessarily deny an evolution, or the possibility of a natural evolutionary development of nature and history.... Everything is created out of nothing, but once something is created out of nothing, then something else can be in due time created out of the prevailing and developing conditions. God continues to create something out of all kinds of somethings. One can posit a gradual evolutionary process that is not a denial of creation (cf. Tertullian, <i>Ag. Hermogenes</i> XXIX, <i>The Gradual Development of the Cosmical Order</i>, ANF III, pp.493, 494)" (265) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertullian (1885) 1994, 29 (ANF 3:493–494) (265)

Ross 2017 (see also Ross and Archer 2001)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<p>"The Hebrew word <i>yôm</i>, translated 'day,' has four distinct definitions, all of which are 'literal' in the sense that they fall within the strict, accurate meaning of the word:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part of the daylight hours 2. All the daylight hours 3. One rotation period of Earth 4. A long but finite time period" <p>(162)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The seventh day continues.... [Psalm 95; John 5; Hebrews 4]" (162) • "God's days need not be the same as our days.... [Ps 90:4; Isaiah 55:9]" (163) • "Numbered days need not be 24-hour days.... [Hosea 6:2] For centuries Bible commentators have noted that the 'days' in this passage (where the ordinal is used) refer to years, perhaps as many as 1,000 or more" (163) • "Sometimes the <i>Sabbath</i> refers to a full year (cf. Lev. 25:4 [but here there is no mention of יום])" (163) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leviticus 25:4 (163) • Pss 90:4; 95 (162, 163) • Isaiah 55:9 (163) • Hosea 6:2 (163) • John 5 (162) • Hebrews 4 (162)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"literal days—that is, ... long but finite time periods.... sequential, non-overlapping long periods of time" (162)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In biblical Hebrew there is no word other than <i>yôm</i> for a long, finite time period" (162) • "Biblical Evidence for Long Creation Days <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The events of creation day 6 require a long time.... [Genesis 2] 2. The seventh day continues.... [Psalm 95; John 5; Hebrews 4] 3. God's days need not be the same as our days.... [Ps 90:4; Isaiah 55:9] 4. Scripture makes explicit statements about the earth's antiquity.... [Habakkuk 3:6; 2 Peter 3:5] 5. Scripture compares God's eternal existence to the mountains and the earth's longevity.... [Ps 90:2–6; Proverbs 8:22–31; Ecclesiastes 1:3–11; Micah 6:2] 6. Numbered days need not be 24-hour days.... [Hosea 6:2] 7. Sabbath day for man and Sabbath year for the land are analogies to God's 'work' week.... [Exodus 20:11; Leviticus 25:4] 8. Bloodshed before Adam's sin does not alter the atonement doctrine.... [Hebrews 10:1–4]" (162–163) • "Many more biblical evidences for long creation days exist, all described in the book <i>A Matter of Days</i> (Ross 2015)" (163) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2 (162) • Exodus 20:11 (163) • Leviticus 25:4 (163) • Pss 90:2–6; 95 (162, 163) • Proverbs 8:22–31 (163) • Ecclesiastes 1:3–11 (163) • Isaiah 55:9 (163) • Hosea 6:2 (163) • Micah 6:2 (163) • Habakkuk 3:6 (163) • John 5 (162) • Hebrews 4; 10:1–4 (162, 163) • 2 Peter 3:5 (163) • Ross 2015 (163)
Age of Universe	billions of years (163)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Scripture compares God's eternal existence to the mountains and the earth's longevity. Figures of speech used in Psalm 90:2–6; Proverbs 8:22–31; Ecclesiastes 1:3–11; and Micah 6:2 all depict God's immeasurable antiquity. Compared to 3 billion years, a 3,000-year terrestrial history (at the time these words were written) seems an inadequate metaphor for God's eternity" (163) 	n/a

Ross and Archer 2001			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יָוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יָוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "daylight hours" 2. "24 hours" 3. "a long (but finite) time period" (Coppes 1980; WOTWS) (125) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Biblical Hebrew has no word other than <i>yôm</i> to denote a long timespan [H. Ross 1994; TWOT 1980, 672–673; Gesenius and Tregelles 1979] (125); "<i>olam</i> [would not have been a suitable alternative since] in biblical times it meant 'forever,' 'perpetual,' 'lasting,' 'always,'" etc (148) • "The word <i>yôm</i> appears repeatedly in the Hebrew Scriptures with reference to a period longer than 12 or 24 hours" (125) • "The Hebrew terms <i>yôm</i> (singular) and <i>yamim</i> (plural) often refer to an extended time frame. Perhaps the most familiar passages are those referring to God's 'day of wrath'" (125) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coppes 1980, 370–371 (125) • Gesenius and Tregelles 1979, 612–613 (125) • H. Ross 1994, 47 (125) • TWOT 1980, 672–673 (125) • WOTWS (1870) 1990, 109 (125)
יָוֹם In Genesis 1	"sequential, long periods of time" (123); "literal, chronological sequenced long days or epochs" (144)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "All [the] early [Church father] scholars [prior to the Nicene Council] accepted that <i>yôm</i> could mean 'a long time period'" (H. Ross 1994) (125) • "The majority [of early scholars] explicitly taught that the Genesis creation days were extended time periods (something like a thousand years per <i>yôm</i>)" (H. Ross 1994, 17–23; plus extensive list of Church fathers sources) (125–126) • "Not one Ante-Nicene Father explicitly endorsed the 24-hour interpretation" (126) • "We certainly cannot charge the Church fathers with 'scientific bias' in their interpretations" (126) • "The Long Time Required by the End of the Sixth Day" (Genesis 2:18) (144–145) • "The Continuation of the Seventh Day" (Psalm 95; John 5:16–18; Hebrews 4) (145–146) • "God's Days Not Necessarily the Same as Our Days" (Ps 90:4; Isaiah 55:9) (147) • "The Wording of Genesis 2:4 for the Creation Week ... Here the word <i>day</i> refers to all six creation days ... Obviously, then it refers to a period longer than 24 hours" (147) • "Numbered Days Not Necessarily 24-Hour Days ... For centuries Bible commentators have noted that the term <i>days</i> in [Hosea 6:2] ... refers to a year, years, a thousand years, or maybe more" (148) • "The Unusual Syntax Regarding Specific Creation Days" (149) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4, 18 (144, 147) • Ps 90:4 (147) • Ps 95 (146) • Isaiah 55:9 (147) • Hosea 6:2 (148) • John 5:16–18 (146) • Hebrews 4 (146) • extensive list of Church fathers sources (126) • H. Ross 1994, 16–24 (125–126)
Age of Universe	"about 13 billion years" (128)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The universe by its sheer vastness testifies of a beginning much earlier than just a few or even several hundreds of thousands or millions of years ago.... A galaxy measured to be about 13 billion light-years away must have existed about 13 billion years ago" (128) • "Explicit Biblical Statements of Earth's Antiquity ... The Bible does consider the antiquity of the founding of the earth a suitable metaphor for God's eternity" (Habakkuk 3:6; 2 Peter 3:5) (147–148) • "Biblical Statements about the Vastness of the Universe ... A universe with so many stars must be truly huge, and if huge, then old, since matter can travel no faster than light speed" (149–150) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habakkuk 3:6 • 2 Peter 3:5 (147–148)

Sarfati 2015			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “~24-hour day” (118) 2. “unmeasured period of time or ... era” [Hamilton 1990, 53]” (119) 3. “unusually long period of time, even up to a millennium” [Hamilton 1990, 53]” (119) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ““There are, to be sure, places where [yóm] may refer to an unmeasured period of time or to an era such as in the prophets’ phrase ‘in that day,’ or to an unusually long period of time, even up to a millennium (Ps. 90:4) [Hamilton 1990, 53]” (119) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton 1990, 53 (119)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>“~24-hour day” (118); “normal-length ... day” (118)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Day 1 sets the pattern for all the creation days: the repeating formulas for all the creation days: evening + morning + numeric. By comparing Scripture with Scripture, we can see that this means a ~24-hour day [numbers from Stambaugh 1991]: o ‘Day’, singular or plural, with number, 410 times outside Genesis 1—always normal-length day. o ‘Evening’ plus ‘morning’ without ‘day’, 38 times outside Genesis 1—always normal-length day. ‘Evening’ plus ‘morning’ with ‘day’, 23 times outside Genesis 1—always normal-length day. o ‘Night’ with ‘day’, 52 times outside Genesis 1—always normal-length day” (118) • “The above usages show that there is no reason <i>in the text</i> to deny that the Creation days of Genesis 1 are ordinary days in length. Thus the denial of ordinary days must be the result of <i>imposing outside ideas upon Scripture</i>” (118) • “The plain meaning of ‘day’ is hardly a theological novelty. For example, the leading theologian/apologist of the Middle ages, Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), pointed out: ‘Thus we find it said at first that “He called the light Day”: for the reason that late on a period of 24 hours is also called day, where it is said that “there was evening and morning, one day” [question 69]’” (118) • “Steinmann ... has likewise shown the force of this argument. He has analyzed parallel passages, sequences, and cardinal/ordinal distinctions to show that the phrase ‘there was an evening and there was a morning’ refers to ‘one day’. He argues cogently that the evening/morning combination is a merism for a 24-hour day” (118–119) • “That the days were normal-length days should be clear from the text [Hamilton 1990, 53]” (119) • “After the rise of uniformitarian geology with its long ages, theologians resorted to hermeneutical gymnastics to try to explain away this clear teaching” (119) • “The analogical day view ... essentially claims that God’s meaning is different from man’s meaning, which undermines the ability of Scripture to communicate. That is, since God wrote the Bible to teach (2 Timothy 3:15–17), He intended His words to be understood. Scripture would have no ability to communicate if words didn’t mean the same to God and man” (120–121) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Timothy 3:15–17 • Stambaugh 1991 (118) • Steinmann 2011 (119) • Aquinas 1947, 1.69 (118)
Age of Universe	6,197 years ± 50 years (125)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best way [to consider the <i>timing</i> of the creation of the world] is from an eye-witness account of the beginning, from the Creator—the Bible. This provides a wealth of chronological information. And chronological information for over half of the history covered by the Bible is found in Genesis 1, 5, and 11. It’s notable that long before Darwin, scholars who calculated the earth’s age from the biblical data arrived at the same ball-park figure, of about 6,000 years ago. My calculations are in this ball-park, with God creating the universe in 4178 ± 50 BC” (125) • “The Bible provides enough data to calculate a ‘ball-park figure’ for the following periods [Cosner 2013; Cosner et al. 2013]: Creation to Adam: six 24-hour days ... Adam to Flood: 1656 years ... Flood to Abraham: 356 years ... Abraham to Sojourn: 290 years ... Sojourn: exactly 430 years ... Exodus to Solomon’s Temple: 480 years ... Start of Temple to division under Solomon’s son Rehoboam: 37 years ... Division to Exile: 345 years ... Exile: 588 BC ... Thus Creation was 4178 ± 50 (3590 + 588)” (126–127) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cosner 2013 • Cosner et al. 2013

Schwab 2017a, 2017b			
Issue	Position		Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "ordinary (what we would call 24-hour) days" 2. perhaps "generations—eons, long historical ages" 3. "forever" (137) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4; 5:1 (137)
יום In Genesis 1	"a literary device and not a sequence in time" (138)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Old-earth creationists argue that the Hebrew word for 'day' can mean any number of things. Genesis 2:4 reads, 'In the day that God created the heavens and the earth.' There and in 5:1, 'day' seems to be a synonym for 'generations'—eons, long historical ages. Day Seven does not have an evening and a morning and seems to go on forever. Perhaps each of the days also continues on. There was no sun during the first three days, so obviously those 'evenings' and 'mornings' could not be meant in a strictly literal sense. Perhaps 'evening and morning' is like 'heavens and earth' or 'springtime and harvest,' a figure of speech meaning no time period per se but rather the idea of completeness—that is, everything God wanted to have happen in that 'day' was accomplished. Thus there is plenty of 'wigggle room' in the mornings and evenings to accommodate alternative interpretations" (137) • "One way of harmonizing an old cosmos with six literal days is to employ Einstein's theory of relativity. In a strong gravitational field or at high velocity, time is 'dilated,' or slowed down. Thus in the gigayears it took for the universe to develop, only six 24-hour days may have occurred relative to some universal frame of reference" (137) • "But some old-earth approaches consider that science and Scripture do not answer the same sort of questions, and thus one can have an old earth and affirm Genesis also. Answers from Genesis are of one sort, while answers from the physical sciences are quite another. The 'Framework Hypothesis' is one such approach. The days of Genesis are regarded as a literary device and not a sequence in time.... It is this brand of old-earth creationism that ultimately satisfies. It exalts the Creator and finds a theological message that the Hebrews would have understood and modern believers can still affirm, while leaving the question of technical detail to the scientists who study such things" (138–139) • "Because [the first] day lacked the sun, the meaning of 'evening and morning' is obscure. What sort of morning has no sunrise? This gives the whole of Genesis 1 a surreal quality and may be a purposeful clue to its genre. Perhaps Moses dreamed the chapter or saw it in a prophetic vision. Hence it is symbolic. Or maybe God took a week to reveal it. Thus Moses lived through the six days, and they are not a timescale for creation at all. The best explanation is that the seven days are a literary device, and the light did not ever physically exist apart from sun, moon, and stars" (166) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4; 5:1 (137)
Age of Universe	"about 13.7 billion years old" (135)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The hypothesis that the universe is old gradually became the dominant view among Christian naturalists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, through the study of geological formations and fossils.... By the time Charles Darwin published his <i>Origin of Species</i> (1859), it was already conceded that the earth was ancient. 'The modern view that the Earth is extremely old was developed by Christian men who believed whole heartedly in creation and the Flood and were opposed to evolution' (D.A. Young 1982, 66)" (136) • "Young-Earth Creationism ... is at odds with the consensus view of every relevant field of science, including stratigraphy, paleontology, astronomy, glaciology, coral reef study, radiometric dating, geochronology, physical cosmology, and even archeology and Egyptology" (135) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.A. Young 1982, 66 (136)

Scofield and English 1967			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "that part of the solar day of twenty-four hours which is light (Gen. 1:5, 14; Jn. 11:9)" 2. "a period of twenty-four hours" (Mt. 17:1; Lk. 24:21) 3. "a time set apart for some distinctive purpose, as 'Day of Atonement' (Lev. 23:27)" 4. "a longer period of time, during which certain revealed purposes of God are to be accomplished (cp. 2 Pet. 3:10)" (1) 	n/a	• 2 Peter 3:10 (1)
יום In Genesis 1	ambiguous (1–2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The use of 'evening' and 'morning' may be held to limit 'day' to the solar day; but the frequent parabolic use of natural phenomena may warrant the conclusion that it simply means that each creative day was a period of time marked off by a beginning and ending (cp. Ps. 90:6)" (1–2) • "The sun did not become a measure of time before the fourth day, as seen in vv. 14–18" (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 1:14–18 • Ps 90:6 (2)
Age of Universe	indeterminate (1, 9, 17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Scripture gives no data for determining how long ago the universe was created" (1) • "[Genesis] (5:3) Scripture does not reveal the exact date of Adam's creation" (9) • "([Genesis] 11:10) Scripture does not provide data by which the date of the flood can be discovered.... The Hebrew word rendered 'became the father of' (or KJV 'begot') does not necessarily mean <i>only</i> that, but often means <i>became an ancestor of</i>, and the Biblical word for 'son,' though often indicating an immediate child, may also be the equivalent of our English word 'descendant.'" (17) 	n/a

Stambaugh 2003, 2004			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "a period of light in a day/night cycle" 2. "a period of time that is commonly denoted as a 'day' (i.e., twenty-four hours)" 3. "a general or vague concept of time" 4. "a specific point of time" 5. "a period of a year" [Coppes 1980, <i>TWOT</i>, 370–371] (2003, 52) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The semantic range of יוֹם does allow the interpreter to select from a variety of meanings of 'day'" (2003, 52) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coppes 1980, <i>TWOT</i>, 370–371 (2003, 52)
יוֹם In Genesis 1	<p>"twenty-four hour day" (2003, 56, 57)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "One would expect that if the meaning of 'day' in Genesis 1 were uncertain, lexicographers would indicate such uncertainty, yet they uniformly point to this time period as a 'day of 24 hours' [Hartmann et al. 1990, 382; Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372; Holladay 1971, 130; <i>BDB</i> {1907} 1979, 398; <i>TDOT</i> 1990, 6:23]" (2003, 52) • "It would seem that the classical Hebrew language used numbers to modify those things which are well known by human experience. Although ... Newman and ... Eckelmann hold to a 'long day' view, they admit that those who view 'day' in Genesis 1 as signifying a normal day have 'the advantage that no clear counter example [of "day" with a number] can be cited with יוֹם meaning a long period of time' [61]. So when the word 'day' is combined with a number, it would appear that the author meant to communicate that the time period was a twenty-four-hour day" (2003, 55) • "The words 'morning' and 'evening' are individually combined with 'day' outside of Genesis 1.... and with each occurrence a twenty-four hour day is signified" (2003, 55–56) • "The word 'night' is similarly associated with 'day.' ... outside of Genesis 1.... The meaning communicated by these combinations is also a twenty-four hour day" (2003, 57) • "The syntagmatic relationships of 'day' throughout the OT have been examined. It appears that the use of יוֹם by Moses in Genesis 1 was intended to refer to a time period humans experience as a morning/evening cycle. This seems to be the most natural interpretation for two reasons. First, the word-use pattern is 'day' with numbers or 'day' combined with 'morning,' 'evening,' 'night,' 'month,' 'year,' 'light,' and 'darkness'; each combination suggests a twenty-four-hour day. Second, the extra-linguistic referential significance suggests that the concept which is communicated by the word 'day' has its basis in physical reality and can be clearly observed by the reader in the text and the world. If something other than a twenty-four-hour day was intended by the use of יוֹם in Genesis 1, then the words of the text and reality would have nothing in common. It seems clear from the syntagmatic evidence that the word designated as a 'day' by Genesis 1 is a reference to the time period humans experience called 'day'" (2003, 60–61) • "Moses had available to him five various options to communicate an event as taking place a long time ago in history" (2003, 64) • "Moses had seven different options if he had wished to communicate that God used a protracted creative process in Genesis 1, but he (under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit) chose not to do so" (2003, 66) • "Moses ... could have communicated an ambiguous length of time, but instead he chose to use the word 'day'" (2003, 67) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>BDB</i> (1907) 1979, 398 (2003, 52) • Hartmann et al. 1990, 382 (2003, 52) • Holladay 1971, 130 (2003, 52) • Koehler and Baumgartner 1958, 372 (2003, 52) • Newman and Eckelmann 1977, 61 (2003, 55) • <i>TDOT</i> 1990, 6:23 (2003, 52)
Age of Universe	<p>"thousands of years" (2003, 44; 2004, 52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The words used in Genesis 1 point to a time frame much shorter than the supposed 4.6 billion years of earth history" (2003, 60) • "While the early church fathers almost uniformly thought of the 'days' as twenty-four-hour days, there were some notable exceptions. However, even those who viewed the 'days' as something other than twenty-four-hour days did not think the earth to be very old, maybe on the order of thousands of years" (2004, 52) • "The best evidence that science can offer this question is mixed; in fact one could say that science is agnostic about the age of the earth" (2004, 52) 	n/a

Strauss 2017a (28–32), 2017b (168–170)			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<p>“C. I. Scofield’s classic reference Bible says, ‘The word “day” is used in Scripture in four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that part of the solar day of twenty-four hours which is light...; 2. a period of twenty-four hours...; 3. a time set apart for some distinctive purpose, as ‘day of atonement’ ...; and 4. a longer period of time” (169) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Like the English word ‘day,’ <i>yōm</i> can have many different meanings depending on the context” (169) • “C. I. Scofield’s classic reference Bible says, ‘The word “day” [can mean] ... a longer period of time during which certain revealed purposes of God are to be accomplished.... Cp. Gen 2:4, where the word “day” covers the entire work of creation” (169) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (169) • Scofield 1967 (169)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>“not ... a literal twenty-four-hour day” (Archer 1994) (169)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Some claim that the language and context of Genesis 1 clearly indicate that the days of creation are 24 hours long. However, in the original Hebrew such a conclusion is not necessarily warranted. Some of the most prominent Hebrew scholars have concluded the opposite. Gleason Archer, a renowned scholar of ancient Hebrew and one of the primary translators of <i>The New American Standard Bible</i>, writes, ‘On the basis of internal evidence, it is this writer’s conviction that <i>yōm</i> in Genesis One could not have been intended by the Hebrew author to mean a literal twenty-four-hour day’ (Archer 1994). There are many alternative ideas about the meaning of the days of creation precisely because the Hebrew is not definitive” (169) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archer 1994, 199 (169)
Age of Universe	<p>“about 14 billion years” (31)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The vast majority of evangelical scholars have asserted that the biblical record does not give any information about the age of the earth or of the universe. For instance, C. I. Scofield wrote, ‘Scripture gives no data for determining how long ago the universe was created’ (Scofield 1967, 1). A primary reason for this opacity is that the context of Genesis 1 does not require the six days of creation to be six consecutive 24-hour days.... (Archer 1994, 199)” (28) • “Although Holy Scripture does not answer any questions about when God created the heavens and the earth, the record of nature gives an unambiguous and consistent answer that the universe is nearly 14 billion years old and the earth is about 4.5 billion years old. We are told that ‘the heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands’ (Ps. 19:1) and that ‘since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse’ (Rom. 1:20). Thus we can expect the record of nature to give an accurate representation of God’s character and the timing of his creative works” (28) • “If there were only one or two methods of dating the age of the earth or the universe, then their age might be ambiguous. However, there are many independent, mutually reinforcing methods for determining ages in the cosmos, solar system, and the earth. When carefully compared, these methods give consistent ages. With so many complementary dating methods the ages determined are completely unequivocal” (28) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “tree ring patterns ... over 12,400 years” (29) o lake varves: “over 60,000 years” (29) o “ice core data ... about 800,000 years” (29) o cave speleothems ... over 200,000 years” (29) o “radiometric dating ... [up to] 4.6 billion years” (30) o “astronomical measurements ... about 14 billion years” (30) o “nucleocosmochronology ... 12 to 16 billion years” (31) o “cosmic microwave background radiation ... about 13.82 billions years” (31) o “star cluster and white dwarf dates ... between 11 and 15 billion years” (31) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ps. 19:1 • Romans 1:20 • Archer 1949, 199 • Scofield 1967, 1 (28)

Walton 2001, 2009			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יוֹם, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יוֹם	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "the daylight hours" 2. "a twenty-four-hour day" 3. "special days (e.g., day of his death)" 4. "a plural use that can refer to a few days or even a year. [Footnote:] Adapted from HALOT, 2:399–400.]" 5. "the definite article can be added to <i>yom</i> to make it mean 'today'" 6. "a preposition can be tacked on the front and a demonstrative pronoun associated with it to say 'in that day' or simply 'when'" (2001, 81) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "<i>yom</i> sometimes refers to an extended period of time, [but] that usage is limited to certain expressions and collocations" (2001, 81) • "The aspects of the semantic range [of יוֹם] connected to idiomatic phrases cannot be extended to nonidiomatic occurrences" (1996, 167) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HALOT 2001, 2:399–400 (2001, 81)
יוֹם In Genesis 1	"twenty-four-hour day" (2001, 81)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The original Israelite audience would have taken the word [<i>yom</i> ('day') in the creation account in Genesis] to refer to twenty-four-hour days" (2001, 154) • "The [semantic range] categories [of <i>yom</i>] cannot be merged carelessly... One cannot pull the word <i>yom</i> out of [the] setting [of category 6] and still retain the meaning it has in that setting.... Though it is true that <i>yom</i> sometimes refers to an extended period of time, ... its meaning cannot be so glibly transferred to Genesis 1. We cannot be content to ask, 'Can the word bear the meaning I would like it to have?' We must instead try to determine what the author and audience would have understood from the usage in the context. With this latter issue before us, it is extremely difficult to conclude that anything other than a twenty-four-hour day was intended" (2001, 81). 	n/a
Age of Universe	ambiguous (2009, 95)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "God's creation of matter may not be confined to the seven days, nor is it the principle subject of Genesis 1" (2001, 156) • "If the seven days refer to the seven days of cosmic temple inauguration, days that concern origins of functions not material, then the seven days and Genesis 1 as a whole have nothing to contribute to the discussion of the age of the earth. This is not a conclusion designed to accommodate science—it was drawn from an analysis and interpretation of the biblical text of Genesis in its ancient environment. The point is <i>not</i> that the biblical text therefore supports an old earth, but simply that there is no biblical position on the age of the earth" (2009, 95) 	n/a

Williams 1988			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. period of "light" 2. "24-hour periods ... light and darkness together" 3. "all the days [of creation] together" 4. "a period of time, however short or long ... even ages" (108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[In Genesis 2:4, the word 'day'] refers to all the [creation] days together" (108) • "[In] Numbers 3:1 ... 'the day that the LORD spake with Moses' ... lasted forty calendar days and nights!" (108) • "Attention may be called to the New Testament statement that 'with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day' (2 Peter 3:8)" (108) • "Many apocalyptic passages in the Bible ... speak of a coming 'day of the Lord' in which a great number of events will occur. There is little or no suggestion that everything will occur in twenty-four hours" (108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 • Numbers 3:1 • 2 Peter 3:8 • apocalyptic passages (108)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"a period of time, however short or long ... even ages" (108);</p> <p>"Each of these 'days' could have been thousands or multiples of thousand years ...; the exact length is unimportant" (108);</p> <p>"The days of Genesis 1 are best viewed as lengthy periods of time" (109)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The most obvious understanding of the days would be that of six or seven 24-hour periods, in other words, what we know as the 24-hour calendar day. Such a reading is possible but, upon careful scrutiny, rather unlikely" (108) • "The word 'day' ... is used in several different ways in the Genesis 1:1–2:4 passage. First, it refers to the light that was separated from darkness ... (1:5). Second, it refers to light and darkness together ... (also 1:5). Third, it refers to all the days together ... (2:4 ...). This last statement is a summary of the 'generations' (literally, 'begettings'), which seems to refer to all that has preceded over the six days, hence the word 'day' in this case covers the whole process of creation [Archer 1974, 186].... Another relevant Scripture is Numbers 3:1 ... [wherein] that 'day' lasted forty calendar days and nights!" (108) • "That the word 'day' does not refer to a 24-hour calendar day also seems apparent from the account of the sun and moon not being made until the fourth day. How could there be calendar days, which equal solar days, when the sun is not yet present to mark them out?" (108) • "Attention may be called to the New Testament statement ... (2 Peter 3:8)" (108) • "From the evidence above it seems quite likely that 'day' represents a period of time, however short or long, in which God was accomplishing something.... This would fit, for example, many apocalyptic passages in the Bible that speak of a coming 'day of the Lord' in which a great number of events will occur. There is little or no suggestion that everything will occur in twenty-four hours" (108) • "Although God, of course, could accomplish such acts as making all the plants and trees in one calendar day, all the luminaries in the heavens on another, all the fish and birds on another, all the beasts and man on still another, it hardly seems likely, nor even like God, who often works slowly over long periods of time" (108) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (108) • Numbers 3:1 (108) • 2 Peter 3:8 (108) • Archer 1974, 186 (108) • D.A. Young (1982) (109)
Age of Universe	"15 to 20 billion years ago" (105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "It is now generally recognized by physicists and astronomers that we live in an expanding universe with all the galaxies moving farther away from one another at an enormous and ever-increasing speed. By calculating back from this expansion, the evidence points to a definite moment (variously calculated at from 15 to 20 billion years ago) when the universe was packed into a dense mass, almost equal to nothing" (105) • "Geological and biological data say much the same thing [viz., that God brought the process of creation to its climax in man over periods of time, even ages]. It is now generally recognized that prior to man's arrival on the scene there were lengthy periods of time. For example, vegetable life appeared long before animal life, and animal life long before human life" (108) 	n/a

Davis A. Young 1977, 1982			
Issue	Position	Argumentation (for extended semantic range of יום, etc.)	Support
Semantic Range of יום	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "24-hour day" (1977, 83 and <i>passim</i>) 2. "figuratively ... to denote a period of time longer than twenty-four hours" (1977, 83) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In Scripture, the Hebrew word for 'day' (יום) frequently denotes a long period of time rather than an ordinary day" (1982, 58) • "Hodge saw that the word <i>yom</i> does have more than one sense" (1977, 83) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hodge 1871, 1:570–571 (1977, 83)
יום In Genesis 1	<p>"seven successive figurative days of indeterminate duration" (1977, 89);</p> <p>"long periods of indeterminate length" (1982, 160; similarly 161)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Charles Hodge, the great Princeton theologian, ... said that '... if [the ordinary] sense [of <i>yom</i>] brings the Mosaic account into conflict with facts, and another sense avoids such conflict, then it is obligatory on us to adopt that other' [570–571]. ... Hodge saw that the word <i>yom</i> does have more than one sense, and ... it is therefore unnecessary to insist that the ordinary meaning is the only meaning" (1977, 82–83) • "Other theologians with no interest in rescuing science or conceding to it felt that 24-hour days were not necessarily in view. E. J. Young maintained that 'the length of the days is not stated' [104]. He also said that 'if the word "day" is employed figuratively, i.e., to denote a period of time longer than twenty-four hours, so also may the terms "evening" and "morning," inasmuch as they are component elements of the day, be employed figuratively"' (1977, 83) • "There is biblical evidence to indicate that the days of Genesis 1 were long periods of indeterminate length, consistent with the day-age hypothesis" (1982, 160) • "At least once in the creation account itself (Gen. 2:4) the word 'day' refers to the entire period of creation. Further, the word 'day' is used in several different senses in Genesis 1, so that it cannot be dogmatically asserted that the six days must be treated as ordinary days" (1982, 58) • "It was argued in the line of Augustine that at least the first three days cannot be treated as ordinary days inasmuch as the sun, in relation to which Earth's rotation is utilized as a chronometer, was not even yet in existence" (1982, 58) • "The events depicted in the six days are not of such a nature as to have occurred within twenty-four hours. This is particularly the case with respect to day six, which includes the creation of animals, the creation of Adam, the planting of the garden, man's being placed in the garden, his observation and naming of the animals, his deepening loneliness, his deep sleep, and the creation of Eve" (1982, 59) • "The events of many of the six days, as with the vegetation of day three, describe natural growths according to the nature of the created thing, and ... these growths cannot be viewed as taking only one ordinary day [T. Lewis]" (1982, 59) • "The seventh day, the day of God's rest, is still going on and is therefore a long period of time. The fact that it does not say of the seventh day, as it does of the other six, that 'there was evening and there was morning—the seventh day,' was viewed as one clear indication that the seventh day was never terminated. Further, New Testament passages such as Hebrews 4 gave further credence to the continuing existence of God's Sabbath. If the seventh day was a long period of time then it is also clear ... that the preceding six days might also legitimately be treated as long periods of time of indeterminate length" (1982, 59) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis 2:4 (1982, 58) • Hebrews 4 (1982, 59) • Augustine (1982, 58) • Hodge 1871, 1:570–571 (1977, 82–83) • T. Lewis 1855, 127–132, 192–212, 307–314 (1982, 59) • E. J. Young 1964, 104 (1977, 83) • various Day-Age theologians and scientists (1982, 63)
Age of Universe	"billions of years" (1982, 150)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In [Scientific Considerations and the Age of the Earth: Stratigraphy, Sedimentation, and the Flood; Radiometric Dating; The Earth's Magnetic Field; Geochemical Arguments] we sought to demonstrate that the evidence of nature strongly indicates that the Earth is extremely old" (1982, 135) • "In our present situation with the abundant evidence that we have before us there is nothing that would remotely lead us to conclude that the Earth is anything other than extremely old" (1982, 149) • "I am convinced that the antiquity of the Earth suggested by nature is not at variance with what the Bible has to say" (1982, 161) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1982, cc. 6–9 (71–131)