

Living Tradition

ORGAN OF THE ROMAN THEOLOGICAL FORUM

NO. 163

MARCH 2013

SOME THOUGHTS REGARDING J. GENE WHITE'S *THE REAL GENESIS CREATION STORY*

by John F. McCarthy

1. J. Gene White's *The Real Genesis Creation Story* (Sunnybrooke Publications, St. Louis, Missouri 63301, A.D. 2010 – <http://www.sunnybrookepub.com>) was brought to my attention a short time ago. In the following essay I shall describe the main impact of the book and give my studied evaluation of the same. (The page numbers in parentheses refer to this book.)

2. Gene White's book is basically aimed at the proponents of the young-Earth interpretation of Genesis 1-2 and the notion that God created the universe in six 24-hour days. He maintains that these scholars "are in irreconcilable conflict with scientific evidence in regard to time" (p. 73). He notes that by about 275 B.C. the Septuagint translators of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek had (falsely) turned young-Earth creation theology into established belief (p. 76). And so, he reasons, our way out of this today lies in realizing that "our understanding of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 has been wrong for more than twenty-two hundred years (page 79). White feels that he has been "misled by conservative Christians" and "hurt by liberals" who did not read correctly what the Bible really says about origins (p. 79).

3. His *exemplar* interpretation sees Gen 1:1-2 as occurring in chronological order with the length of time between them and up to Gen 1:3 as unspecified, while "the six-day Genesis chronicle takes place, and time is rigidly defined in normal, 24-hour, sequential days" (p. 39). Gen 1:1, he says, attributes to God the creation of the heavens and the Earth during an undefined time that could be one day or billions of years. "The exact time, sequence, and method God used to create the heavens and Earth are not revealed in scripture, and man is left to his own resources to fill in the missing information" (p. 148). Gen 1:2 describes the Earth as "vacant and empty" sometime after its creation, when God has not yet created plants and animals. White maintains that scientific evidence (which he calls "general revelation") "indicates that Earth was completely sterile after cooling during a period of several million years from being a red hot molten ball," and he proposes that "special and general revelation combined best describe the absence of life on early Earth sometime after its formation" (p. 34).

4. White claims that the heart of the problem lies in the erroneous translation of seven key verbs in Genesis 1, namely in verses 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, and 24, where traditional interpreters have translated as action verbs, where in fact no action, no creation is stated, but God simply describes what He has already created prior to Gen 1:3 (pp. 56-57). The six-day chronicle contains five major features: a) a mature Earth that has already long existed; b) a world full of light and life; c) five things that he has already created; d) the goodness of his creation; e) his being the sole Creator (p.57).

5. Gene White has focused on an important problem for many Christian readers of the Bible who cannot reconcile the claimed results of empirical science with the history of creation reported in Gen chapters 1 and 2. His 265-page book portrays the results of a great amount of research and tabulation which can be useful for those studying this question. For instance, to illustrate this problem, he lays out a highly researched chapter titled "Evidence of Age," in which he presents a powerful array of data from contemporary empirical science as he carefully and painstakingly goes over an abundant

Editor: Msgr. John F. McCarthy, J.C.D., S.T.D.

Associate Editor: Rev. Brian W. Harrison, O.S., M.A., S.T.D.

Please address all correspondence to: www.rtforum.org e-mail: <jfm@rtforum.org>

Distributed several times a year to interested members.

Not to be republished without permission.

Living Tradition, Oblates of Wisdom, P.O. Box 13230, St. Louis, MO 63157, USA

list of findings regarding the age of the Earth and of the universe. He maintains that “the real issue is compelling scientific evidence that traditional young-Earth creation theology is terribly wrong in regard to time,” because “the heavens, Earth, and its biosphere are much older than 4004 B.C” (p. 111).

6. *Exemplar's* Gen 1:1 reads: “**In the beginning, God created the heavens and the Earth**” (p. 147). This is understood to mean, he says, that in the beginning God created the heavens and the Earth as the fundamental act and that this is not a summary of supposed creative acts performed during the following six-day period (pp. 33). “The heavens” refers then to “everything that ancient man could see when looking upward from the surface of the Earth,” but now to what modern astronomers see up there, while “the Earth” is our planet (p. 148).

7. Furthermore, *Exemplar's* Gen 1:2 says “**And the Earth was vacant and empty of life. And darkness was over the surface of the deep waters. And the Spirit of God hovered over the surface of the waters**” (p. 149). White avers that the translation “without form and void” in the King James Version and in other English translations of the Bible is rightly replaced here by “vacant and empty” as the correct translation (pp. 31 and 150), and that the translation “without form” actually “besmirches the integrity of biblical scholarship and is due to errant theological influence” (p. 121). Besides my noting in passing that the Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, translated into English from the Latin Vulgate of Saint Jerome, has “void and empty” without adding the qualification “of form,” which, as White says, is not in the Hebrew words, and, therefore, which goes beyond the limits of an exact translation, it needs also to be pointed out that Gene White does himself what he condemns in the KJV by adding to his translation the words “*of life*,” which are not in the Hebrew text and which are no more implied than the words “without form.”

8. Again, White offends against his principle of exact translation by adding to the expression “the deep,” the word “*waters*,” drawn from his theological opinion that the inspired text is *not* here referring to “a formless, dark, watery void,” or to “a black, chaotic, fluidic mass,” but to deep waters (p. 122), and is “a clear reference to the depths of the seas and oceans” (p. 142). But the word “waters” is not in the Hebrew text of this second part of the verse.

9. However, in many biblical passages we need to distinguish between the plain and simple meaning of the words and a deeper and more exact meaning hidden beneath. White rejects as a “metaphorical “and not a “literal, straightforward reading” the interpretation (by Henry Morris) of Gen 1:1 as meaning that in the beginning God created “space and raw matter,” and Gen 1:2 as meaning that this raw matter was at first “unformed and uninhabited” (p. 150). Actually, Morris’ interpretation is not metaphorical, but rather the possible uncovering of a subtle and more precise meaning of words that are expressed in this biblical verse and elsewhere in simpler language. White does not consider here the fact that the Hebrew word *eretz* can also mean “ground,” and may be referring to the ground of all material things, which is the simplest and most unformed way in which matter can exist. Only in these days are physicists discovering and creating words for what they have found to be the simplest particles of matter. How would God have clearly expressed this in the time of Moses? Would He have needed to use precise terms (such as quarks, bosons, and Higgs fields) with an added parenthesis explaining that the meaning of these words would not be known to mankind for another three-and-a-half millennia? What is stated majestically in Gen 1:1 is that God began to create the whole gamut of created things from the highest creatures to the lowest, from the empyrean Heaven of the blessed to the smallest and least formed particles of matter. And there is a certain progression in the rest of Gen 1 from lower to higher forms of being.¹

10. *Exemplar's* Gen 1:3 reads: “**And God said, ‘There is light, and light exists’**” (p. 151). White observes that derivatives of the Hebrew verb *hayah* (“to be”) appear in key places in Gen 1:3, 6, and 14. He notes that this verb occurs 53 times in 23 verses in Gen 1-2, and he claims that the King James Version and most other English versions translate some of these verbs in a misleading manner, so as to affirm action where in fact no action is expressed (pp. 135-136). In truth, he says, in Gen 1:3, “God describes the existence of light coming from the Sun, created at some time during the beginning in Genesis 1:1.” He contends that the translation of the verb “to be” in the jussive mood, such as in “let there be light” in the King James Version of Gen 1:3, “is a myth and reflects a rule of biblical Hebrew grammar fabricated to support traditional young-Earth creation theology.” He says that this “jussive/command” form of the verb, as it appears in translations of seven key verses of Gen 1, namely, verses 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, and 24, is a false translation of simple declarative statements in the Hebrew original and has “seriously distorted” the Genesis creation account since the time of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch (pp. 30, 138-139). He argues that “to be” is merely a stative verb, and that “the absence of dynamic verbs” in these seven verses, each following the expression *And God said*, “strongly discredits the notion that God is commanding anything to be created” in these seven verses (pp. 30-31).

¹ Interestingly, Gene White notes (p. 142) that, where Heb 11:3 declares, *By faith we understand that the world was framed by the word of God; that from invisible things visible things might be made*, may refer to the idea in ancient Greek philosophy that all visible objects are made from invisible atoms. I would add that it may also refer to other wider and deeper factors.

11. White claims that these key verbs have been commonly mistranslated since about 275 B.C. He goes on to say that in Genesis 1, verses 3, 6, and 14, the root form *hâyâ* (“to be) is wrongly assigned as a jussive/command form (“be” or “let be” or “let there be”) by the *Old Testament Parsing Guide*, and that the same reference work in 50 occurrences of this form in 49 verses throughout the entire Old Testament classifies it as jussive/command every time (p. 224). He adds that there is no proper wording that distinguishes a so-called jussive form of *hâyâ* from a *qal* perfect form, but is said to be left to the judgment of the reader or translator. And he presents a verse-by-verse study of each of the remaining 46 verses (pp. 225-229) to a conclusion that “none of the 46 verses are commands based on context.” He notes that the jussive form of Hebrew verbs has been defined as “a shortened form of imperfect verbs” (p. 229), and he points out that, since five of the verbs in Gen 1 (verses 9, 11, 14, 20, and 24) are not shortened forms of imperfect verbs, they are not categorized correctly by the *Parsing Guide* and elsewhere as jussive verbs (p. 230).

12. From his systematic study of the words of the Old Testament, Gene White finds that the verb “to be,” of which the verb *hâyâ* is a shortened form, should never in the Old Testament be assigned a jussive state. He claims that the verb *hâyâ*, as it appears in Gen 1:3, 6, and 14, is not correctly translated as a jussive/command or in any of the other 46 verses of the Old Testament where it appears. The context of Gen 1:3, 6, and 14 does not force *hâyâ* to be a jussive/command verb. Even in the King James Version, the verb form *hâyâ* is translated as a stative verb 86% of the time. Therefore, he concludes, “we can view *hâyâ* in Genesis 1: 3, 6, and 14 as a stative, state-of-being verb and classify it as having a Hebrew perfect state” (p. 231). Some further examples of his *exemplar* translation are as follows.

13. *Exemplar’s Gen 1:6 reads: “And God said, ‘There is an expanse in the middle of the water, and it exists to separate between water above from water below’”* (p. 156). (The Douay-Rheims Catholic Version reads: “*And God said: ‘Let there be a firmament made amidst the waters: and let it divide the waters from the waters.’”*) White comments that Gen 1:6 “describes the existence of an expanse (firmament),” whereas common translations mistakenly translate both of these verbs as instances of the “jussive command” (“let there be”). He sees this rather as a “statement by God about Earth’s atmosphere.” He says that, while the word *raqia* is consistently translated as “firmament” in the King James Version, he considers the word “expanse” to be a more descriptive translation (p. 156). In my view, if the Hebrew word *raqia* means essentially “something that hardened as it spread out,” then both of the words “firmament” and “expanse” express part of its meaning: “firmament” expresses the hardening and “expanse” expresses the spreading out.

13. On the level of a hypothetical and more precise sense of the biblical words, the *raqia* could represent the firming-up of the structure of the universe as it spread out through the function of the laws of gravity and inertia created by God, while the “waters” could be the fluids, such as subatomic currents and gases, and later molten matter, in the universe at large as separated and held apart from the gases and molten matter that became the Earth. White claims that the interpretation of Gen 1:1, according to which the “earth” in the expression “the heavens and the earth” represents “space and raw matter” (Henry Morris), leads to the conclusion that “Genesis does not record creation of the Earth as a planet” (p. 155). But in the possible interpretation of Gen 1:6 expressed in this paragraph, I suggest that the forming of the Earth as a planet may be implied in the structural separation of the Earth from the rest of outer space.

14. White sees little value in the day-age interpretation of Genesis 1, which he calls “a brute-force, frontal assault on the clear language of six days described in Genesis 1:3-31” and as being, not so much an “interpretation” as “an outright rejection of the biblical language” (p. 13). For instance, he notes that the day-age reading gives no credible explanation of how the Sun, the Moon, and the stars could have been created on the fourth day, since many stars are older than the Earth, but I would object that the day-age interpretation of Gen 1 does not necessarily say that God created the Sun, the Moon, and the stars on the fourth “day,” as I shall explain below.

15. The Catholic Church has taken a very cautious position regarding this issue. On June 30, 1909, the Pontifical Biblical Commission declared that the word *yom* used in Gen 1 to describe and distinguish the six days “may be taken either in its strict sense as the natural day, or in a less strict sense as signifying a certain space of time.”²

16. White rejects the idea that he sees written in standard translations of Gen 1 of God’s “instantly speaking into existence” things mentioned in verses 6, 14, 20, and 24, and then “needlessly” creating them again in the following respective verses, and he avers that nowhere in the Bible is it specifically stated that God “instantly” created the heavens and the Earth, or that He created them “in six days,” or that He created them “from nothing” (p. 142). But this statement is based upon his unique interpretation of what happened during the six days of Gen 1.

17. *Exemplar’s Gen 1:7 reads: “And God is the one who made the expanse and separated between the waters under the expanse and between the waters over the expanse. And it was so.”* (The Douay-Rheims Version reads: “*And God said: Let there be a firmament made amidst the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.’”*) Regarding his *exemplar* translation, White explains that sometimes “words must be rearranged or added (often debatable)

² *Enchiridion Biblicum 331* – English translation: *Rome and the Study of Scripture* (Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, Indiana, 1964), p. 124.

to improve readability and sentence structure” (p. 147). This is true, but certain rules also need to be observed. In his translation here of Gen 1:7, for example, White’s repetition of the word “between” (the waters) does not conform to correct English idiom, and his inserting within the textual expression “God made an expanse” the words “is the one who,” so as to take God’s direct act of making or creating and relegate it to some distant earlier time is a crass violation of the rules of translation. Not only, but he makes the same unwarranted insertion of these words, “is the one who,” into verses 16, 21, 25, and 27 of the same chapter, so as to conclude that “*Exemplar* creation views Genesis 1:3-31 (the six-day Genesis chronicle) as when God describes His completed work. Nothing is created in these verses” (p. 39).

18. *Exemplar’s* Gen 1:8: reads: “And God called the expanse ‘sky.’ And evening was, and morning was – second day.” (The Douay-Rheims Version reads: “*And God called the firmament Heaven; and the evening and morning were the second day.*”) In White’s view, this verse “is obviously referring to the Earth’s atmosphere” (p. 158). But how obvious is this? White admits that the Hebrew word *shamayim* (“heaven” or “heavens”) can mean either the empyrean Heaven of the blessed, or the cosmic heavens, or the sky of the Earth (p. 123), so how can he say that here this word “obviously” refers to the Earth’s atmosphere?

19. Again, in the plain meaning of the words, the text of Gen 1 is presented in the framework of the seven-day week, but it could also be presenting further meaning to those prepared to understand it. The word “day” commonly refers to a 24-hour period of light and darkness or to the bright part of that period, as in the expression “He worked all day,” but it can also have other related meanings depending on the context. White correctly observes that in the first chapter of Genesis “one cycle of light and darkness establishes the basis for one full day” (p. 40), but he does not consider the possibility that the expression “evening and morning” may actually be the definition of a day in the context of this chapter, which is to say that a “day” in this chapter, where it is qualified by the words “evening and morning,” may be an indefinite period of darkness followed by an indefinite period of light in some sense of these words. This possibility has not been tested to any degree by commentators, and I am not able to present a full development. However, the first day could be a step from total and absolute darkness to the existence of physical light, such as is hypothesized in the theory of the Big Bang. The second day would contain the expansion of physical light in a growing universe distinct from the darkness surrounding it. The third day might represent the creation of plants having the power of photosynthesis in reacting to the presence of sunlight. The fourth day might contain the *positioning* of the Sun, the Moon, and the stars (not their *creation*) as lights in the sky for the use of animals capable of seeing them, as well as for other reasons. The fifth day might record the creation of animals with the power of physical sight to see objects illuminated by physical light. And the sixth day might represent especially the creation of man having the power of intellectual vision. (Of course, the validity of this explanation invites further testing and analysis.)

20. *Exemplar’s* Gen 1:9: reads: “And God said, ‘The waters under the sky wait in one place and the dry ground is seen.’ And it was so.” (The Douay-Rheims Version reads: “*God also said: ‘Let the waters that are under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear.’ And it was so done*”). White avers that the customary translation of *qâvâh* as “let be gathered together” is illegitimate, since the comparison of the use of this verb here with its use elsewhere in the Old Testament strongly supports its correct translation as “wait,” and he prefers “seen” to “appear,” because “appear” suggests the dry ground’s being thrust actively upward out of the water (pp. 158-159). But it seems arbitrary for White to impose an inactive meaning upon these words and many others in the chapter. The whole idea of pure stillness and inertness that White imposes upon the divine work of these six days trivializes the message of this chapter and destroys the motive for which God is said (anthropomorphically) to have *rested* afterwards.

21. *Exemplar’s* Gen 1:14: reads: “And God said, ‘There are luminaries in the expanse of the heavens to distinguish between the day and between the night, and they are for a sign for appointed times and for days and years.’” (The Douay-Rheims Version reads: “*And God said: ‘Let there be lights made in the firmament of heaven, to divide the day and the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years.’*”) White claims that Gen 1:14-15 is just a statement by God about the Sun, the Moon, and the stars, which does not affirm that anything is being created, made, or formed (pp. 163-164). His translation “between the day and between the night” does not conform to standard English expression, and he repeats his denial of the biblical use of a jussive mood of the Hebrew verb “to be.”

22. *Exemplar’s* Gen 1:16: reads: ‘And God is the one who made two great luminaries: the greater luminary to rule the day and the smaller luminary to rule the night and the stars.’ (The Douay-Rheims Version of Gen 1:16 reads: “*And God made two great lights: a greater light to rule the day, and a lesser light to rule the night, and the stars.*”) Note again that White, by inserting the words *is the one who*, alters the tense of the statement and relegates the act of God to a distant past. Instead, this statement may mean that God on the fourth day set, or positioned, them as illuminated signs in the sky (in a Copernican view by setting the speed and angle of the movements of the Earth). The statement of this verse is about luminous signs in the heavens. As visual signs, the Sun is the greatest, the Moon is second, and the stars are the least, even though, substantially, most of the stars are greater than either the Sun or the Moon.

23. *Exemplar's Gen 1:27*: reads: “And God is the one who created man in His image, in God’s image created him, male and female God created them.” Hence, White has translated coupled statements in five verses of Gen 1 as five instances in which God first describes something and then is identified as the one who (had much earlier) made or created them (p. 176), and in verse 27, the insertion of the words “is the one who, is once again an unwarranted tampering with the wording of this text.

24. White maintains that the inspired word of God in the Bible is “the only dependable source of information concerning religious belief and practice,” in this way ruling out the guidance for believers that can come from religious authority, and he declares that “Without the Bible as our sole religious authority, doctrine is bounded only by the limits of human imagination” (p. 70). I believe that the Bible is the basic and inerrant fountainhead of true religious belief, but I hold also to the essential guidance of the teaching authority instilled into the Catholic Church by our Lord Jesus Christ and its importance in guiding the People of God away from the manifold errors concerning the teaching of the Bible that exist around us. White seems to be saying that the Bible is self-explanatory, but, if that is so, then what need is there of his book? His message seems to me to be this: **IT DOESN'T MATTER WHAT THE CHURCH SAYS. IT DOESN'T MATTER WHAT THE POPE SAYS. ALL THAT MATTERS IS WHAT THE SCRIPTURE SAYS. NOW, I WILL TELL YOU WHAT THE SCRIPTURE SAYS.**

25. In a general way, the *exemplar* translation of Gene White distorts the message of the first chapter of Genesis by taking away the work of the first six days of the creation story and thus reducing to nothing the (anthropomorphic) need for God to have “rested” on the seventh day. For God during the six days simply to have seen or looked at the results of his original creation would not be considered work in the general understanding of mankind, and why would he have needed to do this, since God sees all things at all times? Again, why would God have needed six separate 24-hour days to review these things, and when did this week take place? White offers no satisfactory answer to these questions.

26. But Gene White is not the first to offer a non-chronological solution to the problems of the six days of creation that he is dealing with. In the fifth century A.D. **St. Augustine of Hippo**, in his book *On the Literal Sense of Genesis* and in other works, presented a non-chronological interpretation in which he claimed that the six days were not six 24-hour natural days, but rather were six instances of growing supernatural enlightenment by God in the minds of the blessed angels in Heaven regarding what took place during the creation of the world.³ He maintained that the corporeal world was fashioned by God in the presence of angelic knowledge.⁴ Augustine said that this interpretation is literal, not figurative or allegorical.⁵ He said that there are six “days” because there are six successive kinds or levels of created things that the angels were enlightened to understand.⁶

- a. **In Augustine’s view**, the angels had six increases of that light which is called “day” in the six days of Genesis One.⁷ But darkness and light are also taken in their literal meaning, because it is the material works of God that are being spoken of during these six days.⁸
- b. In Gen 1:1: the creation of “heaven” means the creation of the angels⁹, while “earth” in this verse signifies the creation of minimally formed matter,¹⁰ having the capacity of receiving all of the forms of things in the universe to be given shape and form later by God.¹¹
- c. In Gen 1:2 this dark and unformed matter is described as an abyss, a mixture of indistinct elements to be given shape and form by the Lord God.¹²
- d. The six days recount events in the creation of the world, but they are not a succession of 24-hour periods of time, nor are they necessarily in chronological order. Augustine saw the work of these six days as organized in causal, not in temporal order,¹³ and as being also six phases in the contemplation of the blessed angels.¹⁴ Each new “morning” represents the understanding by the angels of the creation of some new category of beings.¹⁵

³ Aurelius Augustinus, *De Genesi ad litteram*, in Migne, Patrologia Latina (PL), vol. 34, IV, 22.

⁴ *De Gen. ad litt.*, ibid.

⁵ *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 28.

⁶ *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 22.

⁷ Aurelius Augustinus, *De civitate Dei*, in PL, vol. 41, XI, 9.

⁸ *De civitate Dei*, XI, 33.

⁹ *De Gen. ad litt.*, I,17; VII, 5.

¹⁰ *De Gen. ad litt.*, II,11.

¹¹ Aurelius Augustinus, *De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber*, in PL, vol. 34, 15.

¹² *Imperfectus libe*, 3-4.

¹³ *De Gen. ad litt.*, V,5.

¹⁴ *De civitate Dei*, XI, 7.

¹⁵ *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 18.

- e. The *evening of the first day* was the natural insight of the angels, while its *morning* was the visual power of their angelic nature to know these things better when elevated to the Beatific Vision of God.¹⁶
- f. *Evening of the second day* refers to the natural knowledge of the firmament by the blessed angels, while *morning* is the elevation of this item of knowledge as they contemplate the eternal reasons for the creation of the firmament.¹⁷ Or, with regard to the thing created, evening of the second day represents the dark and unformed matter created at the first instant of time,¹⁸ and out of which all material things were afterwards made.¹⁹ while *morning* is the angelic understanding of the plan of God in impressing forms upon the unformed matter to become the firmament and all that is in it.²⁰
- g. *On the third day* the two elements, water and earth, were seen by the angels to have received their most notable properties, namely, mobility for water and immobility for earth (two of the four basic elements).²¹ On day three came also knowledge of the realities of the seas and the land, and the nature of plants and trees.
- h. *On the fourth day* came angelic knowledge of the regulation of the world through planets and stars.
- i. *On the fifth day* came angelic knowledge of the swimming and flying creatures.
- j. *And on the sixth day* came angelic knowledge of the higher animals and of man.²²

27. In his *Letter of Genesis*, St. Augustine repeatedly declared that he did not exclude the possibility of a chronological meaning of the six days of creation in Gen 1, and he even invited his readers to seek a better interpretation of the chapter than he had given.²³ A major problem that he had with the chronological interpretation of the six days was the reading that the Sun, the Moon, and the stars were seen to have been created after the creation of plant life on Earth. However, if the divine work of the fourth day is read as the *positioning* by God of these heavenly bodies in the sky as luminous signs and indicators of seasons, days, and years, and *not* as the creation of the substance of these bodies, then Augustine's difficulty is resolved. The creative act would then be, from a Copernican viewpoint, the fixing by God of the speed of the circular and angular movements of the Earth.

28. From a neo-patristic point of view, and under the framework of the four senses of Sacred Scripture, St. Augustine's reading of the six days of creation could well be, not the literal sense of Gen 1, but rather its analogical sense. After all, the analogical sense regards the four last things of death, judgment, Heaven, and Hell, and the knowledge of the blessed angels in the Beatific Vision of God certainly regards their life in Heaven. Augustine speaks elsewhere of an "analogical sense" of Sacred Scripture,²⁴ and, on the basis of the analogy of being, it seems reasonable to suppose that in Gen 1 the natural meaning of light pertains to its literal sense, while the supernatural meaning of light in the elevated perspective of the Beatific Vision pertains to its analogical sense.²⁵ I might add in conclusion that the structure of the seven-day week that frames the days of creation and underlines the need for mankind to arrange its activities accordingly could well pertain also to a tropological sense of the chapter. In addition, then, to the other observations that I have made in this review, the analogical and tropological aspects of the creation story may pertain to a fuller interpretation of the text of Genesis 1, but which do not seem to have been attended to adequately by Gene White in his new reading of the creation story. Almost sixteen centuries in advance, St. Augustine answered the time problem of young-Earth theology better than Gene White does now. If White had not so quickly dismissed the day-age approach to the six days of Genesis and had also reviewed Augustine's thought on the subject before proceeding to his own conclusions, some of the questions that White raises against his view in this book could probably have been avoided.

¹⁶ *De civitate Dei*, XI, 7; *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 22.

¹⁷ *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 22.

¹⁸ *De Gen. ad litt.*, I, 15-16.

¹⁹ *Imperfectus libe*, 3-4., 15; *De Gen. ad litt.*, I, 5.

²⁰ *Imperfectus libe*, 15.

²¹ *De Gen. ad litt.*, I, 5.

²² *De Gen. ad litt.*, V, 5. For a fuller and more detailed discussion of Augustine's interpretation of Gen 1-2, see John F. McCarthy, "The Days of Creation According to St. Augustine," in *Living Tradition* 47 (July 1993).

²³ *De Gen. ad litt.*, IV, 28.

²⁴ *Imperfectus libe*, 2. Cf. Aug., *De utilitate credendi*, III, 5.

²⁵ For a fuller and more detailed discussion of the analogical meaning of Gen 1, see John F. McCarthy, "The Second Say of Creation," in *Living Tradition* 48 (September 1993), pp. 1-4.