

creeping things which *come after* other birds, cattle and creeping things. Verse 20 also says nothing about animals *being similar* to their parents. I mention these things at this point because these two ideas of coming after and being similar to are the ideas most frequently associated with the translation "after its kind."

In this connection, I believe that the King James Version's translation of *min* with the preposition is misleading to English-speaking people today. What can the phrase "after its kind" as it is ordinarily understood mean in this context? What can it mean for Noah to take "fowls after their kind" into the ark with him? What can it mean for Noah to take "cattle after their kind" into the ark? What was Noah to understand by such a command? Did God wish Noah to make certain that he took into the ark only those birds and those cattle which had been begotten in their parents' likeness? Such an interpretation reduces a simple command to meaninglessness!

At this point I must speak frankly. There are many exegetes and theologians who appear to firmly believe that, unless *min* with its preposition is translated in every case by the phrase "after its kind," a potential loophole is opened which could be interpreted as providing aid or support to evolutionists. And such a loophole must not be opened, even at the expense of interpreting Scripture in a faulty, incorrect or meaningless way!

This allegation receives support from the fact that, by translating *min* with its preposition exclusively (with one exception) by the phrase "after its kind," twenty out of thirty uses become meaningless for present-day English, and the remaining ten uses are all in Genesis 1, where we are dealing with Creation! But what does it matter that twenty uses become meaningless; Creationism has been preserved, and Evolutionism has been deprived of a potential weapon! Is not the good accomplished thereby greater than the evil?

To this we must answer with all the earnestness and vigor at our command: Christianity does not need the well-intentioned but exegetically questionable, hermeneutically unsound, theologically indefensible, and ethically reprehensible attempts on the part of some Christians to save other Christians (especially Christian young people) from the faith-destroying theory of Evolutionism. What Christianity needs in this desperate