

The Gospel Unashamed

"From the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, from the laziness that is content with half-truths, from the arrogance that thinks it knows all truth, O, God of Truth, deliver us."

A Controversial Newsletter "The Printed Voice of Summit Theological Seminary"

~ All articles are written by George L. Faull, Rel. D. unless otherwise stated ~

Vol. 33 No. 2

April 2020

George L. Faull, Editor

Is Genesis Historical?

If one reads the Book of Genesis without pre-conceived ideas, and as if he lived in 1400 B.C., before so-called modern science and dozens of hypotheses, what would he conclude?

- ↳ That God created the heavens and the earth in six literal 24-hour days, with evening and mornings.
- ↳ That the garden of Eden was unique from the rest of the world and had everything that was needed for contentment and peace with God.
- ↳ That the woman was deceived by a sinister personality and that her husband joined her in her sin.
- ↳ That there was a flood that covered the entire world due to the wickedness of man's evil imagination; and only eight persons were saved, and life started over for mankind.
- ↳ That it gives the origins of man and a chronology of the ages of the earlier patriarchs who lived on this earth.
- ↳ That since man sinned, and the fall, the flood, the frustration at Babel, the forefathers were called to be the regenerators of the Savior promised in **Genesis 3:15**.
- ↳ That the history of the four men who are specifically highlighted in

the book stand or fall together since their narrative ties them into one unit.

This would be Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. Remove any of these events or persons and you do not have a complete Mosaic. (Pardon the pun.)

In light of the fact that Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Lot and his wife, Isaac, Melchizedek, Ishmael, Jacob and the twelve sons of Jacob, are specifically mentioned in the Bible, it is groundless to say that the book is not historical.

The fall, Cain's murdering of Abel, the drowning of the old world, the sacrifice of Isaac, Abraham leaving of Ur, his paying tithes to Melchizedek and other such events removes any doubt if they are historical events to the thinking man.

Jesus and the apostles referred to many of these events. If one leaves these out of the historical account, you have a book with no plot.

It shows that man was a sinner who needed a Savior. Then it displays God's Sovereignty in electing men as the vehicles to bring grace to fallen man.

It sets the stage for God's work in the rest of the Bible by promising the nation which would come, the land in which it would occur, and the seed through whom all the peoples of the world would be blessed.

Frankly, no serious student of the Word of God could miss the laying of the plot for the rest of the scenarios of the redemption of man. To remove these is to spoil the very theme of the Gospel.

Paradise was lost; and God's plan for man to regain it requires a man believe the entire book of Genesis. Without Genesis there can be no true theology, there can be no types, there can be no allegories.

To reject **Genesis 1-50** is to put your soul in peril, because if it's true only in part, then one cannot trust the whole.

To reject it is to deny inspiration and revelation of Him who said, "Let there be light, and there was light".

To begin a book that claims to be THE TRUTH with lies, myths, and deception is ludicrous.

For one to pick and choose what he will believe due to alleged new evidence rather than what is obviously meant to be revealed by the author of the book does not appear honest in my book.