

Reformed Theological Seminary, Virtual Campus

Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Warfield, and Collins on Creation

By: Robert B. Row

For
Dr. Frank James
History of Christianity II
OHT504

April 17, 2004
Charlotte, NC

CONTENTS

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. THE GREAT DEBATE	3
3. AUGUSTINE'S INTERPRETATION	4
4. LUTHER'S INTERPRETATION	5
5. CALVIN'S INTERPRETATION	6
6. WARFIELD'S INTERPRETATION	7
7. COLLIN'S INTERPRETATION.....	9
8. CONCLUSION.....	11
BIBLIOGRAPHY	12

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The creation account in Genesis has been a subject of much debate over the past few years specifically the time frame in which God created this world. There are many interpretations that have been developed but historically the oldest and most commonly accepted interpretation is the Calendar Day Interpretation (God created in six 24-hour days).¹ Other views include the Day Age Interpretation, the Framework Interpretation, Instantaneous Interpretation, and Analogical Interpretation and Theistic Evolution that was deemed as untrue to the scriptures and the *Westminster Confession* by the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church.² There were many of these interpretations that were considered biblically acceptable by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America in 2000.

With continual scientific advancement, our culture is inundated with new theories on the creation of the world. Since the origin of the theory of evolution the world has been indoctrinated to look at the created world with a different pair of glasses. Historically there had been only one set of glasses available in which to interpret the Genesis account of creation. The scriptures alone were the only reliable tools available to historical theologians, the scriptures alone. As of 1859 the glasses of evolution became available for theologians, thru the work of Charles Darwin's, *Origin of Species*.

It is the purpose of this paper to compare the historical perspectives of those with only the one set of glasses available: Augustine, John Calvin, and Martin Luther, with the more contemporary theologians who have two sets of glasses to use such as Princeton's B.B. Warfield and Professor Jack Collins at Covenant Theological Seminary. Collins would disagree with this paper because he indicates that an appeal to historical Christianity on this argument is done with error because the historical scholars did not read the Hebrew texts but only the Greek Old Testament.

Berkoff describes the deep concern that this issue raises, "It was only after the comparatively new sciences of geology and paleontology came forward with their theories of the enormous age of the earth, that theologians began to show an inclination to identify the days of creation with the long geological ages."³ To fairly compare these two pairs of glasses, the first set of glasses being the scriptures and the second set being scientific advances. It will be necessary to discuss both sets of glasses and their influence on each of the theologians mentioned above to determine the differences and similarities among there various interpretations of the creation account. It is important to compare the historical interpretations with the contemporary ones in order for us to arrive at a more accurate picture of the creation account.

The goal of this paper is to render a proper biblical perspective on the Genesis account of the six days of creation by comparing the historical interpretations with the more contemporary ones. In the age of Relativism, we must understand that there is only one interpretation of the six days of

¹ J. Ligon Duncan, *Animadversions on Alex Mitchell's View of the Westminster Assembly and the Days of Creation*, Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation, 31.

² Report of the Creation Study Committee, 2000. 2319.

³ Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 153-154.

creation that is right and we must examine the scriptures to determine which one that is **OR** come to the conclusion that it will remain one of God's mysteries until all is revealed at the consummation of the ages.

Chapter 2

THE GREAT DEBATE

Genesis chapter 1 has been discussed throughout the history of theological debates as far back as Augustine (350-430 AD), to the formulating of the Westminster Confession of Faith (1646), and as recent as the 2000 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America. Covenant Seminary has been the focal point of many concerns over this issue and in his response to an elders request for Covenant Seminary to define what they teach about the six days of creation, President Bryan Chapel said "No one here denies God's creation out of nothing, the historicity of Adam and Eve, the special creation of man, the reality of the Fall. No one here endorses evolution." "All the professors affirm that the first chapter of Genesis can be reasonably interpreted as teaching that God's creative activity occurred in six solar days. Not all of our professors, however, believe that this is the best interpretation." "Men we respect who believed the Bible teaches a 24-hour day in Genesis 1 include such great theologians as Calvin (probably, but Warfield says he was open to other views)." "However, giants in the faith who have taught Genesis was not necessarily (or definitively) limiting God's creating activity to 144 hours include: Augustinethe 19th century defenders of Presbyterian orthodoxy such as Charles Hodge, A.A. Hodge, and B.B. Warfield; and major 20th Century advocates of Biblical inerrancy such as...Jack Collins."⁴ As we see from Chapel's comments the issue is a weighty one that has been a theological debate for ages but the one point that is agreed upon throughout history is the principle of *ex nihilo*, God created out of nothing.

In speaking of the drafting of the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF), Chapel says; "The fact that they did not specifically limit the days to 24 hours in the Confessional statements is taken by most of the notable Confessional commentators and historians to indicate that the divines allowed a degree of latitude on this issue." "What seems most apparent, however, is that the timing of the creation days was not really an issue at the time of the Assembly, and so, clearly definitive statements were not made (and probably were not intended to be made) on this issue."⁵ Chapel supports my introduction of this debate that claimed that the divines did not have the influence the second pair of glasses that the more contemporary evangelicals have. Chapel is correct, the timing of creation days were not an issue but not for the reasons that Chapel believes but because the influence of the second set of glasses (i.e. Evolution) was nonexistent. Therefore, I conclude as Chapel does, that the days were not an issue because they were generally accepted as six ordinary days (24 hour). The editor of the Presbyterian Witness proclaims, "The more I study this issue in light of biblical teaching, the more convinced I am that

⁴ Bryan Chapel, *Covenant Theological Seminary '98-'99 President's Goals and Report*. Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation. 5,6.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

the creation week was just that – six days during which God created all things and the seventh on which He rested from His work. Our doctrinal standards certainly take this position.”⁶ Now that the debate is established, let us proceed to the various theologians and their interpretations of the Genesis creation account.

Chapter 3

AUGUSTINE’S INTERPRETATION

Augustine (354–430 A.D.) said in his work *The City of God*, “What kind of days these were it is extremely difficult, or perhaps impossible for us to conceive...”⁷ Augustine believed in “instantaneous creation.”⁸ This means that all six days of creation were considered to happen instantly. Augustine taught a non-literal view of the six-day creation account. He believed the account was a literary device and not a historical narrative. The creation account according to Augustine did not follow a chronological sequence (i.e. Framework Interpretation) and that the sequence of days denoted not a period of time when things were created but the natural order of things known to the angels. Each day represented a Divine Work of God with no distinct time frame but as works of God within one day (as indicated, according to Augustine, by the 7th day being the end of one day of Divine Work). Augustine’s view of instantaneous creation is treated as six acts of God in a single instantaneous moment and then written by Moses as six days. A lot of what generated much debate in these early theologians was the creation of the sun on the fourth day; because of this they said it was difficult to assess when God actually created time if time is dependent on the phrase “morning and evening” and the presence of light and darkness. Calvin does not appear to have difficulties with the fourth day issue of the sun being created. Augustine did believe in a literal interpretation of Genesis as expressed by the title of one of his works, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis* but he interprets the creation account as follows: God created all things in one day and puts that creation into six repeated days so that man and angels could interpret it properly. With Augustine’s instantaneous creation he never endorses an old earth but asserts a young earth as is apparent in his shortening the time of the creation event to at least one day or maybe an instant.

Augustine’s view was prominent into the Middle Ages and at the time the Westminster Confession was formulated. Luther and the other reformers did not agree with Augustine’s view because it was too allegorical. Calvin argues against Augustine’s view in his commentary on Genesis where he says, “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.”⁹ As a framer of the Confession, Calvin intended to rebut this Framework/Analogical view of creation that is why he included the words “in the space of six days.”¹⁰ It is certainly within God’s power to create all things instantaneously but in order to establish a pattern in which we are to follow (as

⁶ Byron Snapp, *Responses to Covenant Seminary’s Paper on Creation*, 4.

⁷ Augustine, *The City of God*, Book I, ch.6.208.

⁸ Mortin H. Smith, *My Pilgrimage Regarding Creation*, Responses to Covenant Seminary’s Paper on Creation. 19.

⁹ John Calvin, *Genesis*, 78.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

is expressed in Exodus 20:9,10), God created in six days and rested on the seventh. Collins rejects Augustine's view of instantaneous creation.

The 2000 GA Study Committee also states that the Reformers "explicitly rejected" Augustine's allegorical view of the creation account. According to Dr. Morton Smith, the divines were combating this idea of instantaneous creation brought about by Augustine with the phrase "in the space of six days" affirming that creation took place over the space of six days. This is in disagreement with Chapel's assessment of the phrase in the formulation of the Confession as mentioned above (see Great Debate Chapter 2).

Chapter 4

LUTHER'S INTERPRETATION

Luther admits that this is of the most difficult subjects and that apart from knowledge that God created out of nothing; there are not many specifications in the creation account that all theologians would agree upon. Luther believes in the Ordinary Day interpretation. "Moses spoke in a literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read." "We know from Moses that the world was not in existence before 6,000 years ago. Luther's criticism of Collins and Augustine would be: "Nor does it serve any useful purpose to make Moses at the outset so mystical and allegorical. His purpose is to teach us, not about allegorical creatures and an allegorical world but about real creatures and a visible world apprehended by the senses." "He employs the terms 'day and evening' without allegory, just as we customarily do."¹¹

Genesis 1:1 is explained as the preamble to creation in which God later gives shape and form. The absence of the words "He said" in Genesis 1:1 are explained by Luther as Moses intent because if "He said" was included in the first verse there would be no need to repeat it in the following. Simply put to summarize the first verse of the Holy Scriptures, Luther says, "Everything that is, was created by God."¹² Luther attributes verse 1 and 2 to the first day of creation. Luther comments very little on the phrase "evening and morning" but simply attributes it to the normal way in which Jews formulate their days which begin in the evening of each day.

Luther's interpretation of Genesis 2:4-7 is supported by Kelly and many others who point out that Moses has now directed his attention to the state of man and is no longer given over to the details of creation as he was in the first chapter. Again, Luther gives no indication that this is evidence of seasons but agrees with most Christian scientists and scholars that the earth was covered in some sort of steam or dew that rose up to make the earth fruitful. Collins interpretation of this passage is in total discord with Luther's interpretation.

¹¹ Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: Volume 1: Lectures on Genesis 1-5*, 3.

¹² *Ibid.*, 5.

A valid point made by Luther to refute Warfield's theistic tendencies was the distinction that God made in creating the plants and animals in Genesis 1:24. In creating the plants and animals He said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures" with emphasis placed on the word "earth." When God created man his language in Genesis 1:26 was "Let us make man." with emphasis place on the word "us." Martin Luther clearly would not have believed that scripture supported the theory of evolution. It is clear that Martin Luther, according to the GA Study committee, "clearly held to six 24-hour days."¹³

Chapter 5

CALVIN'S INTERPRETATION

We have already spoken of Calvin above in his disagreement with Augustine but now we shift attention to the Reformer himself and what his interpretation was of the creation account. In Calvin's commentary on Genesis 1:5 he gives his interpretation of the days as expressed in the creation account. "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."¹³ There is much debate among theologians over the interpretation of the third day when God creates the sun and stars. There is no doubt that God created light first (Genesis 1:3) and according to Calvin, on the third day the light was placed into a created ball of continual radiant energy called the sun. God gives the light an agent that will now dispense that light. During the day that agent is the sun, at night the agent is the moon and stars. By the order that the Lord ordained, he was bearing witness to his omnipotence by holding the light in his hand, "which he is able to impart to us without the sun and moon."¹⁴

Calvin interprets Genesis 2:4-7 as evidence of the hand of God "who opens and shuts the cataracts of heaven, and that rain and drought are in his hand."¹⁵ Calvin does not believe as Collins does that the seasons had already begun for he admits precisely what the text says that there was yet no rain but that God had watered the earth with a vapor. It is often debated as to whether Calvin actually took a Calendar Day interpretation but it is clearly seen that Calvin does not believe that the language in the creation account is allegorical or figurative in any way. Calvin gives every indication that he takes the account as literal, in the sense of six-24 hour days. Chapel in his response repeatedly implies that a view supporting the 24-hour day view is to go beyond scripture.

The formulation of the WCF and the use of the phrase "in the space of six days" were contributed by Calvin to refute Augustine's view of creation and to show support for his own view, the six 24-hour day view. J. Ligon Duncan comments "the Assembly (referring to the Divines) was generally if not unanimously committed to a literalist view of the six days of creation, and was aware of ancient or contemporary non-literal interpretations of the creation days, and precisely because of those non-literal interpretations chose to employ Calvin's explicitly literalist language ("in the space of six days") in an effort to promote one particular

¹³ John Calvin, *Genesis*, 78.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 111.

view of the manner and time-span of creation as over against other views.”¹⁶ Duncan indicates that there is no evidence of yet that any of the Divines held any other view except a literal six 24-hour day interpretation of Genesis. Collins interprets the WCF “in the space of six days” as follows: “This means that he spread the work of fashioning the world for us over a length of time.”¹⁷

In speaking of man’s tendency to drift off into speculation about God’s creative acts, Calvin again strongly implies his intentions to interpret the creation account literally when he says: “God applied the most suitable remedy when he distributed the creation of the world into successive portions, that he might fix our attention, and compel us, as if he had laid his hand upon us, to pause and to reflect.”¹⁸

The GA study committee says the following regarding its report on the Calendar Day interpretation that Calvin had: “The Calendar Day view appears to be the majority view amongst influential commentators. Certainly, it is the only view held (speaking of the Calendar Day view) by contemporary Reformed theologians that is explicitly articulated in early Christianity.”¹⁹ By the evidence of Calvin’s own commentary on Genesis, his stand against Augustine, and the unilateral agreement by the majority of evangelicals today, it is highly unlikely that Calvin held any other view than a Calendar-Day interpretation.

Chapter 6

WARFIELD’S INTERPRETATION

Kelly in his book *Creation and Change* says the following about B.B. Warfield “Supporters of evolution included not just persons we would think of as religious liberals, but conservative Evangelicals such as Princeton Theological Seminary Professor Benjamin Warfield.”²⁰ According to Kelly, Warfield was a theistic evolutionist. Is this assessment of Warfield accurate? Did he endorse Charles Darwin and his theory of evolution?

According to Warfield, Charles Darwin was considering the clergy until consumed with every thought of the sciences and forgot that his soul lay in a perilous position. In the manuscript of Darwin’s “Journals” he often referred to “creation” and freely spoke of it, but when his “Journals” were proofed and printed 3 years later in 1837 the references to “creation” were omitted. Darwin once said that “science has nothing to do with Christ, except in so far as the habit of scientific research makes a man cautious in admitting evidence” and “the Old Testament was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindus.”²¹ Darwin eventually came to realize that his theories were not cohesive with the Genesis account of creation and determined to dismiss the book of Genesis. It is clear that when Darwin ironed out his theory of evolution he

¹⁶ J. Ligon Duncan, *Animadversions on Alex Mitchell’s View of the Westminster Assembly and the Days of Creation*, Responses to Covenant Seminary’s Paper on Creation, 31-32.

¹⁷ C. John Collins, *Good Faith, Good Science: Sunshine or Moonshine?*, 47.

¹⁸ John Calvin, *Genesis*, 78.

¹⁹ Report of the Creation Study Committee, 2000. 2305.

²⁰ Douglas Kelly, *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1-2.4 in the light of changing scientific paradigms*, 49.

²¹ B.B. Warfield, *Studies in Theology*, 548.

gave up his Christian faith, or as Warfield puts it, “his doctrine of evolution directly expelled his Christian belief.”²² In short, his own sinful pursuit of evolution drew him to the horrific conclusion that Christianity was an unproved delusion.

Warfield held to a Day-Age interpretation of Genesis believing that the days represented in the creation account could have represented long periods of time. Warfield used the genealogies given in the Old Testament to support this view of an old earth assessing that there are generation gaps in the accounts and that Moses was not intending to give the genealogies in a chronological order. Warfield was likely influenced by the persuasive new theory of evolution, which may have driven his interpretation of Genesis.

It is difficult to determine if Warfield was truly a theistic evolutionist or a careful theologian grappling with, but not fully embracing, the evolutionary theory of the natural world. “Distinguishing between what he believed and what he permitted, B.B. Warfield articulated a carefully nuanced understanding of evolution and its implications for science and theology.”²³ His tendency was to be influenced by the evolutionary hypothesis to the point of making it a real possibility to join it with the biblical creation account. It is as if Warfield kept his theological framework of Genesis 1 (of which there is very little documentation) open to the possibility of joining it with evolution, but with the contingency on Darwin’s theory being proven true. “Rather than being a ‘defender’ of Darwinism, Warfield would more properly be described as a cautious critic who carefully distinguished between those elements of evolutionary thought which were amenable to a distinctly Christian interpretation, and those which were anathema to biblical religion.”²⁴

Princeton was a place where America looked for the theologians to examine Darwin’s evolutionary theory. The point may be made, that these theologians were not sure how to handle this new view of the natural world. None of the Princeton theologians (Alexander, C. Hodge, A.A. Hodge, or B.B. Warfield) were willing to change their interpretations of Genesis 1 unless the scientific evidence was compelling. Later in his life Warfield seemed to reconcile his struggle between scripture and evolution by saying, “We dare not adjust our theology to what is as yet a more or less doubtful conjecture.”

It is clear thru his struggle with evolution that Warfield embraced an old earth view and that God may have used evolution to create. This is in disagreement with Luther and Calvin and their Calendar Day interpretation. Unfortunately, Warfield believed that it was possible for man to have evolved from primates. He does this in defense of the missing links in the evolutionary speciation. Again, Warfield does not adopt this theory but says it’s possible only if proof of it is discovered. As of yet there is still not evidence available to support Warfield’s view but there are still evangelicals who wish to embrace His view. Like that of John Stott who says, “my acceptance of Adam and Eve as historical is not incompatible with my belief that several forms of pre-Adamic ‘hominid’ seem to have existed for thousands of years previously....It is conceivable that God created Adam out of one of them.”²⁵ It is difficult to assess where exactly

²² Ibid., 549.

²³ Peter Wallace, “Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield and the Darwinian Controversy.”

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ John R.W. Stott, *Understanding the Bible*, 55.

Warfield stood but later in his life Warfield himself marveled at the idea that evolution had become so widely accepted without one ounce of proof. Warfield did have an old earth, Day-Age Interpretation, of creation, which was probably driven by evolution, but I don't believe he ever fully embraced evolution as an explanation of the Genesis account.

Chapter 7

COLLIN'S INTERPRETATION

Dr. Jack Collins, professor at Covenant Theological Seminary, believes in the "Analogical Days" interpretation that states that the days are sequential but does not hold strictly to the sequence like the ordinary day view. He concludes that the days expressed in the creation account are not to be taken literally but analogically. Collins gives the following evidence for the "Analogical Days" interpretation: 1) the seventh day is not like an ordinary day; 2) the other six days are not strictly limited to 24 hours because they are God's work days; and 3) the best way to get continuity between chapters 1 and 2 of Genesis is if the creation account is "much longer than an ordinary week."²⁶

According to Collins, Genesis 1:1 is the initial creation, with an unknown amount of time between that and the beginning of the first day. Although this gap between the initial creation and the first day is given no determined amount of time, Collins concedes that it could be long or short, that the bible does not tell us. According to Collins this is not an endorsement of the gap theory because the gap theory specifies a great amount of time and a revolt of Satan that made the creation formless and void.

Support for 1): Collins claims that because the 7th day does not have the refrain "and there was evening and there was morning" that the 7th day was never concluded and we are now living in God's Sabbath rest. *Support for 2):* "No doubt the first man was a genius, but we all still expect this to take a fair bit of time. The way the man responds in Genesis 1:23, 'this at last,' confirms our impression of a long wait. All of this supports the view that the creation period is longer than an ordinary week." "We should take the creation week as longer than an ordinary week. The only ways that can be true are if the days aren't ordinary days, or if the days have spaces of time between them."²⁷ Collins does believe that there were consequential days in creation that is supported by the use of "morning and evening" at the end of each day. He also believes that the use of the phrase "in six days" in the Ten Commandments supports the sequence of days (Exodus 20:9). Collins also rejects the ordinary day view because most of its supporters believe it supports a young earth and he believes this to be inconsistent. This shows Collins obvious disagreement with both Luther and Calvin. According to Collins the word "day" is interpreted in its ordinary meaning but should be applied analogically. It appears that Collins interpretation falls somewhere between that of Augustine and Warfield.

²⁶ Collins, *Good Faith, Good Science: Sunshine or Moonshine?*, 63.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 58.

If Genesis 1 were allegorical language how can one use it as a foundation for science? A literal foundation would seem to provide a better foundation than an allegorical one. If we are to take the spoken words of God and make them figurative then where does the literal end and the figurative begin. Again, I believe that by calling the creation account as figurative you also call into question the literal action of God in creation although I don't want to imply that Collins dismisses the creative acts of God as he expresses here: "God says it, and then it happens – it doesn't say how long it took for it to happen, but that doesn't matter: what matters is that God's wishes get carried out."²⁸

Collins concedes that the analogical view does not require him to reject the geological theories but also does not necessarily require an old earth view. Collins also appeals to Genesis 2:5-7 as his foundation for interpreting the six days of creation as longer periods of time. Collins does not restrict his view to any set time frame except to say that days 1 through 5 add up to many years in order to establish the seasons as portrayed in Genesis 2:5-7. Collins's interpretation of Genesis 2:4-25 is that it expands on the sixth day of the first account of creation given in Genesis 1:1-2:3. Douglas Kelly believes that Genesis 2:4 is also the transition verse but that Genesis 2:5-25 is the beginning of Redemptive history focusing on mankind. To Luther, Calvin, and Kelly these verses are not an indication of seasons but a brief account of creation with man as the focal point.

Collins appeals to Charles Hodge to defend his position, "The church has been forced more than once to alter her interpretation of the Bible to accommodate the discoveries of science, but this has been done without doing any violence to the Scriptures or in any degree impairing their authority."²⁹ This seems to be using science to determine the interpretation or at least to accommodate it. I propose that science in many regards supports the scriptures and often times makes the scriptures more vivid to the 21st Century reader. For example, with the scientific advancement of the ultrasound machine one can now glean more from Psalm 139:13 – "For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother's womb." (ESV) This scientific breakthrough has added clarity to the scriptures. The difficulty with Collins proposal by way of the Hodge quote is that the interpretation of scientific data on the issue of age of the earth is not credible. The scientific world involves too many biases when data is interpreted. The whole scientific system is built on the foundation of evolutionary theory and cannot be trusted as a viable means in which to enlighten one to the meaning of the creation account in scripture. One may certainly extrapolate the data from these scientific experiments to come to unbiased conclusions that would be useful. (By unbiased I mean, without the influence of the geologic time scale and the theory of evolution.) There are many Christian organizations that do good scientific research from a biblical perspective (and I might add with very convincing evidence), but because of the stronghold that evolution has on the scientific community, publication of these studies into scientific journals are not accepted because of the conclusions that support creation rather than evolution. One such organization is *Creation Research International* (www.creationresearch.net).

²⁸ Ibid., 45.

²⁹ Ibid., 47.

Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

If modern theologians fear what science may discover that may disprove their interpretation of the creation account, they can rest assured that it will never happen. The entire scientific system (Biology, Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, etc.) is based on the foundation of a lie, the geologic time scale. No matter what science discovers it will never discredit any truly biblical interpretation of the creation account as long as it depends on the geologic time scale to make its conclusions. It is essential to a proper understanding of the Genesis creation account that we not be influenced by the scientific world around us. Collins assesses correctly that the two (Biblical account and the geological account) would be difficult to harmonize because of their different purposes and he believes that harmonizing the two could present real dangers.

The glasses of Luther and Calvin were scripture alone and both of these theologians agreed that the Genesis account was to be taken just as it was read and not figuratively. Warfield was perhaps influenced the greatest by the second set of glasses (Evolution) because he was so closely tied to its birth. Collins claims to be using sound exegetical tools for his interpretation but one can't help but raise an eyebrow at some of the comments that have been mentioned in this paper that seem to indicate that he, like Warfield, is leaving room for science just in case proof comes.

This issue will continue to be debated until the return of Christ, but I firmly believe that the Genesis account is to be taken as it reads and to start reading into it allegorically is to read into it more than is there. Our faith is an historical faith and what our forefathers have learned in the past is invaluable to us. I presume the best way to conclude this topic is to quote Psalm 139:6 – “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high; I cannot attain it.” By ending here I do not want to convey that this subject is not worthy of much study but that we keep the Psalmist's perspective always before us, to keep us humble in such lofty matters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augustine, *The City of God*, (Harvard University Press, London, 1957).
- Berkhof, Louis., *Systematic Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, 1941).
- Calvin, John., *Genesis*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996 reprint).
- Chapel, Bryan., *Covenant Theological Seminary '98-'99 President's Goals and Report. Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation.* vol. 12, no. 2 (The Presbyterian Witness, 1998).
- Collins, C. John., *Good Faith, Good Science: Sunshine or Moonshine?*, (Manuscript, Covenant Theological Seminary, 2002).
- Duncan, J. Ligon., *Animadversions on Alex Mitchell's View of the Westminster Assembly and the Days of Creation*, Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation, vol. 12, no. 2 (The Presbyterian Witness, 1998).
- Kelly, Douglas., *Creation and Change: Genesis 1.1-2.4 in the light of changing scientific paradigms*, (Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 1997).
- Luther, Martin., *Luther's Works: Volume 1: Lectures on Genesis 1-5*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, (St. Louis: Concordia, 1958).
- Report of the Creation Study Committee, General Assembly of PCA, 2000.
Smith, Mortin H., *My Pilgrimage Regarding Creation*, Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation. vol.12, no. 2 (The Presbyterian Witness, 1998)
- Snapp, Byron., Responses to Covenant Seminary's Paper on Creation, vol. 12, no. 2 (The Presbyterian Witness, 1998).
- Stott, John R.W., *Understanding the Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972).
- Wallace, Peter, "Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield and the Darwinian Controversy,"[paper on-line] (Notra Dome University, 1995) available from <http://www.nd.edu/~pwallace/warf.txt>; Internet.
- Warfield, B.B., *Studies in Theology*, (Banner of Truth Trust, 1988).