

only mean a division of the day from the darkness (night) preceding it. So after the start of vs. 5 we have: **n d**.

At the end of vs. 5 we are given, "And there was setting and there was morning". *Morning* (בֹּקֶר) is "originally the breaking through (of) day-light" (Koehler). When the horizon is not obscured, and the sky clear, the light of the day is at full brightness as soon as the light is risen. In this context *boqer* means "daybreak" or the moment the light rises. The word עָרַב means "set" (BDB). The phrase "And there was setting and there was daybreak" can be viewed in two ways. It can be viewed chronologically or it can be viewed retrospectively.

If it is viewed retrospectively, then the order is reversed. It looks back to the setting ending the day, and then it looks further back to the daybreak that separated the light from the darkness.

But if it is chronological, then it refers to the setting ending the day that implicitly brings the return of darkness "night" and then it refers to the daybreak that ends the night.

In both cases the mention of "day one" at the very end of the verse is retrospective. The two points of view may be represented:



The retrospective mention of "day one" after the setting (1) in the first case gives license to take the whole formula retrospectively: 1-2-day→night-2-day-1. On the other hand, the chronological order of first "setting" (1) and then "day break" (2) gives license to regard the matter as in the second case, i.e. 1-2-day→day-1-night-2. It is obvious that the Almighty has avoided the obvious sequence, "daybreak" "day" "setting", in which he might have said "And there was daybreak, one day, and setting", which would have accorded perfectly with the given definition of day in vs. 5.

The reason for this is that Genesis is constantly introducing us to new meanings of the word day. For example in 2:4 it appears to refer to the whole of the six days. In 2:17 and 3:5 it means a thousand years. In 30:33 it merely means "time" in the phrase "in time to come". Furthermore we have God's intentional omission of the formulae when he introduces the seventh day.

The only definition of "day" given in the text is "light" or in the most expansive interpretation, "dawn to dusk" (vs. 5). The out of order formula given and the other definitions of "day" in Genesis invite us to extend the definition to what is called the "calendar day". Case 1 will be setting to setting, and Case 2 will be dawning to dawning. The subsequent recording of the creative acts of God before the day formula in each of the succeeding days reinforces the second case.

However, by omitting it entirely with regard to the seventh day, it is hinted that the case 2 pattern does not apply, and that we should regard the sabbath on the case 1 pattern.

Furthermore, the new moon, created on day four, is first seen after sunset at the end of the 4th day. This indicates that the new moon day is sanctified with the night and day calendar day (case 1). To sanctify means to "set apart" a day. It means that it is treated differently. It is special or unique. While the natural day begins with sunrise, the Sabbaths do not. The new moon is set apart when it is seen after sunset. The 7th year Sabbath is set apart with the dark portion of the year first, and the light portion of the year coming last. So is

the case with the Jubilee Sabbath year. The day of atonement is set apart from the "setting of the ninth day" to the "setting of the 10th day". The feast of unleavened bread is sanctified by ceasing from leaven at sunset at the end of the 14th day.

Nehemiah has the gates of Jerusalem closed before sunset (Neh. 13:19). And Messiah rises from the dead in the third night (Matthew 12:40; Hosea 6:3) on the "Later of the Sabbaths" (John 20:1) "when it was yet dark" "as it began to dawn on the first of the Sabbaths" (Matthew 28:1). It being the Sabbath when he rose before daybreak, it is evident that the Sabbath is reckoned from sunset to sunset.

Finally, we have the mass witness of the Jewish people that the Sabbath is sanctified from sunset to sunset, and likewise the majority of Jewish Christians have always agreed with this.

There are those who attempt to say that the Sabbath is from sunrise to sunset or sunrise to sunrise are squarely refuted by Matthew 28:1, "On the later⁵³ of the Sabbaths, as it began to dawn of the first of the Sabbaths"; This is "while still dark" when the dawn was ascending in the east, but while it was yet night at the tomb. This third night is counted as part of the Sabbath. Likewise, the following day is counted as part of the Sabbath (John 20:19). Likewise, we may always suspect sunrise sabbath observers of harboring anti-Jewish sentiments.

The Date of Creation

In the charts, down the left side of the page, are the years **B.C.** (see page 107, column "A"). The first year is **4140 B.C.** The creation was in the spring of **4140 B.C.**⁵⁴ This makes the world **6175** years old at the next Jubilee in **A.D. 2035**. Some creationists, while affirming that the world was created in six days, wish to allow history to stretch out to **10,000** years (or more) citing possible gaps⁵⁵ in the genealogies or by using the Septuagint. However, the Hebrew Masoretic Text is the best source available.⁵⁶ In addition, an additional **4000** years of world history will not help creationists to fit geological successions into world history.

Every attempt to lengthen the chronology of the bible by citing gaps, the LXX, or by saying such things as Adam begat the "ancestor of Seth when he was 130"⁵⁷ are aiming at defeating the intent of the divinely inspired author of the text to give a chronology from creation. These rationalistic maneuvers effectively claim the chronological facts in the first eleven chapters of Genesis are a meaningless exercise without any purpose. Moreover, such efforts are always the self-

⁵³ Not "end of the Sabbath", nor "evening of the Sabbath", but "later of the Sabbaths" (see Passion Chronology). This is the second Sabbath after the first Sabbath of unleavened bread.

⁵⁴ This date is virtually the same as F.H. Clinton (251.28). See note 245.25.

⁵⁵ There are no *age-linked* genealogies with gaps. See note 245.26.

⁵⁶ See Jones 252.67, pp. 11-20. Jones ably shows that any commitments to the Septuagint or Samaritan texts are based on ignorance of their internal inconsistencies.

⁵⁷ "Genesis 4:25 makes unmistakably clear that Seth was born to Adam and Eve (reference to direct parentage) as a replacement for Abel who had been murdered by Cain" (Jones 252.67, pg. 33). The Scripture says that Enoch was the 7th from Adam (Jude vs. 14). Noah's sons were his immediate sons. And the Methuselah prophecy, "When he dies, it will come" was given only 969 years before the Flood, which further demonstrates the foolishness of "gaps". Only those with an agenda of long ages reject these clear evidences.