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The Bible creation story is comprised primarily of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2. Although other minor references to the creation narrative occur in scripture, Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 form the theological and historical basis of the biblical creation account. Within the past two hundred years, the Genesis creation story has increasingly become a major source of controversy within Judeo-Christian belief primarily due to scientific evidence that supports an old Earth and universe.

Some articles, commentaries, and books about the Genesis creation story treat it as just another creation myth. The Bible creation account is equated with other false or fanciful stories found in present-day African, Asian, Native American Indian, South American, and European cultures. From a historical perspective, some equate the Genesis creation narrative to ancient pagan mythology found in Sumerian, Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Canaanite creation stories.

The Genesis creation account, when correctly translated and explained, is truthful and trustworthy. It is a rational, believable story that supports God as creator of the heavens, Earth, and its biosphere. It supports the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. The basis of this viewpoint is a new, conservative, word-for-word translation of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 from the original Hebrew text as given in The Real Genesis Creation Story: A Credible Translation and Explanation at Last—Third Edition by J. Gene White. A corrected translation of Genesis forms the basis for a radically different explanation, internally consistent with scripture and externally consistent with firm scientific evidence regarding time.

Current English translations of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 contain serious errors, with the primary problem being Chapter 1. Key words have been added, poorly translated, or mistranslated in all present-day orthodox English Bible translations. Current translations are tradition bound and theologically driven, rather than by sound translation practices. Linguistic evidence clearly indicates the creation story has been deliberately mistranslated to support traditional young-Earth creation theology, resulting in the current conflict with science regarding extensive time.

Four Main Theological Views of the Genesis Creation Story

The orthodox belief of the church for the past two thousand years has been traditional young-Earth creation theology. According to this belief, the heavens and Earth are relatively young. Using the genealogies given in the Old Testament, Anglican Archbishop James Ussher (1581–1656) calculated a widely accepted creation date of 4004 BC. During six days, God created the heavens, Earth, and all therein.

In the eighteenth century, scientists began to seriously dispute Ussher's creation date as they discovered evidence to the contrary. Geologists came to realize that multilayered rock formations, fossilized remains, uplifted mountains, and severe erosion required extensive time to occur by natural means. As science continued to mature, more objective data became available.
Scientists discovered evidence in starlight, Antarctic ice layers, lake sediment layers, isotope decay in igneous rocks, tree-ring chronologies, and carbon-14 decay in organic matter that strongly support an Earth age beyond 4004 BC and directly conflict with young-Earth creation theology.

Various theological explanations of the Genesis creation story have been developed in an effort to resolve these problems. At present, four leading ideas have emerged for explaining Genesis: (1) traditional young-Earth creation theology, (2) gap theology, (3) day-age theology, and (4) literary interpretations with each having their strengths and weaknesses.

**Traditional Young-Earth Creation Theology**

Traditional young-Earth creation theology is the oldest and most well-known explanation of biblical origins. Young-Earth theology proposes that the heavens, Earth, and its biosphere (all biological life and required environments) were created in six 24-hour days in the recent past around 4,000 BC. *The Genesis Record* by Henry Morris allows extending the creation date back to around 10,000 BC.² *Refuting Compromise* by Jonathan Sarfati, PhD, gives a recent defense of traditional young-Earth creation theology. As Sarfati points out, this was the primary teaching of the church until 1800⁵ and was accepted theology back to the time of Christ. This is not to say that everyone believed exactly the same, but most accepted the basics of traditional young-Earth creation theology.

Some critics promote the notion that young-Earth creation theology is a recent belief developed primarily by Seventh-day Adventist George McCrady Price, theologian John C. Whitcomb, and hydraulic engineer Henry Morris.⁴ Although these men have been influential in the resurgence of young-Earth creation theology, as Sarfati clearly documents, this belief can be traced back to the New Testament period.

Young-Earth creation theology has been the traditional belief of the church for more than two thousand years. This theology is supported by a host of Bible translations and commentaries; however, many scientists, educators, and theologians regard this theology as anti-intellectual because of its conflict with firm scientific evidence of significant time. Rejection of the traditional biblical creation story in Christian academia is quite common.

In a more positive tone, promoters of young-Earth creation theology have shown that Genesis clearly teaches God as creator of the heavens, Earth, and its biosphere. The six days of Genesis 1:3-31, consisting of evening and morning, are literal 24-hour days. God rested from his work on the seventh day. Advocates respect the Bible as truthful and trustworthy, and believe in the inspiration and inerrancy of scripture.

**Strengths:**

1. In orthodox English translations, a first impression reading of Genesis Chapter 1 is that the heavens and Earth were created in six 24-hour days.
2. The Hebrew word translated "day" in Genesis is *yom* (Strong's 03117). When *yom* is used in the context of six consecutive, numbered, numerically increasing days—consisting of evening and morning—they are literal 24-hour days.
3. The Sabbath is codified in the Ten Commandments and defined in Exodus 20:8–11, Exodus 31:12–17, and Deut. 5:12–15 as a day of rest after six days of work. The Genesis creation account is used as an example. The work days are six literal days followed by a day of rest.
4. In orthodox English translations, the Old Testament genealogies of Genesis Chapters 5 and 11 appear to support a recent creation date. Anglican Archbishop James Ussher (1581–1656) calculated a widely accepted creation date of 4004 BC.

5. God is creator of the heavens and Earth. Proponents do not view naturalistic evolution as a significant constructive mechanism.

6. Proponents of young-Earth creation theology steadfastly believe in the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. The Bible is our only religious authority and the clear teaching of scripture must not be compromised.

7. Leading advocates of young-Earth creation theology recognize the importance of the Genesis creation account and its influence on accepting the remainder of the Bible as true. They understand the significance of biblical origins.

Objections:

1. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 are not easily integrated into the rigid six-day time frame of Genesis 1:3–31. These two verses are problematic.

2. The term "heaven" is treated as metaphorical in Genesis 1:1. As explained by Henry Morris, heaven is equivalent to "space." Initially space was empty until the fourth day.

3. The term "earth" is treated as metaphorical in Genesis 1:1–2. As Morris explains, earth does not refer to a physical planet but to the "component matter of the universe" or "basic matter."

4. The term "deep" is treated as metaphorical in Genesis 1:2 and refers to "the basic material elements sustained in a pervasive watery matrix throughout the darkness of space." Morris says, "Elements of matter and molecules of water were present, but not yet energized."

5. The phrase "face (surface) of the waters" is treated as metaphorical in Genesis 1:2 and explained as, "The formless waters, like the formless earth, were essentially a 'presence' rather than a cohesive body."

6. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 are treated as highly metaphorical and not a literal, straightforward reading of the text.

7. Genesis 1:1, 1:2, and 1:3 have little or no chronological significance.

8. Within the six days of Genesis 1:3–31, no specific mention is made of God creating the Earth as a planet.

9. When God speaks in the "command" verses of Genesis 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14–15, 20, and 24, no good explanation is given for the absent dynamic verbs "create, make, form, and build."

10. No good explanation is given for repetitive "creation commands" on the second, fourth, fifth, and sixth days in Genesis 1:6–7, 14–17, 20–21, and 24–25.

11. Creation of the sun on the fourth day is completely out of sequence. Logically, God would have created the Sun on the first day to provide light and a large mass around which our planet could orbit. The creation of a temporary light for the first four days, and then its removal, is complete speculation.

12. The sequence of creating land plants in Genesis 1:9–12 followed by marine life in Genesis 1:20–21 disagrees with scientific evidence for the appearance of life on Earth. Life first appeared in the oceans and then on land.

13. Within the last two hundred years scientists have discovered significant evidence supporting an old age for the heavens, Earth, and its biosphere—much older than a 4004 BC creation date. Evidence of significant time has accumulated to the point it will never be overturned. Ignoring this evidence is not a viable option.
14. Apparent age (the idea that God created things with an appearance of old age, even though they are quite young) cannot legitimately be used to explain away evidence of significant time. This argument makes God a great deceiver and places Bible believers in an indefensible intellectual position.

15. Fossil evidence conclusively proves that animals lived and died before the appearance of mankind on Earth. This contradicts belief that no animal death occurred before the fall of man based on young-Earth interpretations of Genesis 3:14, 17 and Romans 8:19-21.

16. Supporters of this theology do not acknowledge the embellished interpretation or mistranslation of key words in Genesis Chapter 1, Exodus 20:11, Exodus 31:17, Jeremiah 3:17, and Jeremiah 4:23 found in orthodox English Bibles.

17. Advocates of this theology fully support the traditional, embellished interpretation of Genesis 1:3-2:3.

**Gap Theology**

Gap theology was among the first alternate explanations to traditional young-Earth creation theology and was developed to harmonize orthodox translations of the Bible with scientific evidence regarding significant time. Thomas Chalmers (1780–1847), founder of the Free Church of Scotland, brought gap theology into prominence through his preaching. Earth's Earliest Ages (1884) by George H. Pember defends gap theology. The Scofield Reference Bible (1917) promotes this theology in its explanatory notes of Genesis. *Without Form and Void* (1970) by Arthur C. Custance promotes gap theology through an in-depth analysis of the word "was" in Genesis 1:2.

Gap theology proposes that millions of years occurred between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. During this time, dinosaurs and other prehistoric animals lived, hydrocarbon reserves were formed, the fossil record was laid down, sediment layers accumulated, and geologic change occurred. According to Donald G. Barnhouse, the Earth was then ruined by God when Lucifer rebelled. Genesis 1:2 is translated to say, "And the earth became without form and empty." Earth was subsequently reformed and repopulated during six days of creation.

Gap theology is a knee-jerk reaction by theologians who failed to consider the full implications of their idea. To begin with, the translation of Genesis 1:2 is flawed. Secondly, although allowing significant time to occur between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 may be reasonable, gap theology creates a new problem by proposing the complete destruction of Earth's surface and biosphere within the recent geologic past. Scientific evidence does not support the complete destruction and reconstruction of Earth 6,000 years ago.

On a positive note, promoters of gap theology have shown that Genesis 1:1-2 lie outside the rigid six-day time frame of Genesis 1:3-31. The first three verses of Genesis Chapter 1 occur in chronological order and the time between them is not defined in scripture. In general, advocates respect the Bible as truthful and trustworthy, and believe in the inspiration and inerrancy of scripture.

**Strengths:**

2. Genesis 1:1, 1:2, and 1:3 occur in a chronological sequence.
3. Time is undefined between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 and millions of years are allowed to harmonize with scientific evidence in support of significant time.
4. The six days described in Genesis 1:3-31 are literal 24-hour days.
5. God is creator of the heavens and Earth. Proponents do not view naturalistic evolution as a significant constructive mechanism.
6. Advocates of gap theology recognize the importance of harmonizing the Bible with firm scientific evidence in support of significant time. Ignoring this evidence is not an option.

Objections:
1. Gap theology requires the mistranslation of "was" as "became" to indicate change in Genesis 1:2. The Hebrew verb הָיוָה (hawah), a stative, state-of-being verb, is interpreted as a dynamic verb to indicate action.
2. This theology relies on mistranslation of the Hebrew words תֹועֵב and בֹוֻב in Genesis 1:2. These two rhyming words have essentially the same meaning and can be translated "vacant and empty" or "vacant and void" to indicate the complete absence of life on Earth. Proponents of gap theology translate this expression as "without form and empty" or "ruin and desolation."
3. This theology requires the Hebrew verb מָלֵא in Genesis 1:22 and 1:28 to be translated "refill" rather than "fill" to indicate God's desire for the Earth to be repopulated.
4. Creation of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day is completely out of sequence and not satisfactorily explained.
5. Destruction of the Earth to where it was "without form" in Genesis 1:2 followed by the creation of new continents and oceans on the third day in Genesis 1:9 conflicts with science. Scientific evidence does not support the recent formation (i.e., 6,000 years ago) of Earth's continents and oceans.
6. Geology and paleontology do not support an event within the recent past (i.e., 6,000 years ago) that destroyed all life on Earth. Scientific evidence does not support the complete annihilation and then reappearance of animal and plant species within recent history.
7. Supporters of this theology do not acknowledge the embellished interpretation or mistranslation of key words in Genesis Chapter 1, Exodus 20:11, Exodus 31:17, Jeremiah 3:17, and Jeremiah 4:23 found in orthodox English Bibles.
8. Advocates of this theology support the traditional, embellished interpretation of Genesis 1:3–2:3.

Day-age Theology

Day-age theology is a second idea developed to harmonize traditional translations of the Bible with scientific evidence regarding significant time. Prior to 1800, Thomas Burnet, William Whiston, and Hermann Venema separately proposed that the six days of Genesis were long periods of time. The Six Days of Creation (1855) by Professor Tayler Lewis of the Reformed Church of America advocated long ages of time. Creation and the Fall: A Defence and Exposition of the First Three Chapters of Genesis (1856) by Donald MacDonald, a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, advocated long ages for each day. Princeton theologians Charles Hodge, Archibald A. Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield supported a day-age approach. Day-age theology proposes that each day of the Genesis creation account was millions of years long and the days may have overlapped. A Matter of Days (2004) by Hugh Ross discusses day-age theology and its connection with time, natural cause, and evolution. Accepting each day as millions of years relegates significant portions of the Genesis creation story to a metaphorical
explanation. This idea is a brute-force, frontal assault on the clear language of six days described in Genesis 1:3–31. Significant time is forced into the text. Rather than an interpretation, this theology is best viewed as a speculative idea.

In a positive vein, promoters of day-age theology point out that the genealogies in Genesis Chapters 5 and 11 do not require a direct father-to-son relationship and are best viewed as a male-to-descendant relationship. The Genesis genealogies are abbreviated and insignificant patriarchs were left out. This permits moving the appearance of anatomically modern man backward in time beyond 4004 BC. In general, advocates say they believe in the inspiration and inerrancy of scripture.

Strengths:
1. Heaven and Earth in Genesis 1:1–2 are treated as literal. Heaven is comprised of space, stars, galaxies, solar systems, comets, and other objects known to science. Earth refers to our planet with its current size, spherical shape, and mass.  
2. The genealogies in Genesis Chapters 5 and 11 do not require a direct father–to–son relationship and are best viewed as a male–to–descendant relationship. Gaps in the Genesis genealogies permit extending the appearance of anatomically modern man backward in time beyond 4004 BC.  
3. Proponents recognize that animals lived and died on Earth before mankind appeared based on scientific evidence. The Bible does not teach no–animal–death before Adam's sin. According to Genesis 3:14–17, the serpent, Eve, and Adam are the only ones specifically mentioned as being punished (not all animals on Earth). Romans 5:12 and 8:19–22 do not specifically discuss animals and animal death.  
4. Advocates of day–age theology recognize the importance of harmonizing the Bible with firm scientific evidence in support of significant time and the sequencing of past events. Ignoring this evidence is not an option.

Objections:  
1. Day-age theology does not provide a satisfactory explanation for treating the six days described in Genesis 1:3–31 as long epochs of time. Significant time is forced into the text. Harmony with scientific evidence is at the expense of scripture.  
2. The Hebrew word translated "day" in Genesis is yom. When yom is used in the context of six consecutive, numbered, numerically increasing days, consisting of evening and morning, they are literal 24-hour days. Context does not allow yom to be interpreted as millions of years.  
3. Each of the six days in the creation narrative contain evening and morning. The overlap of days is not supported by the biblical text.  
4. Genesis 2:1-3 does not close with the phrase, "And the evening and the morning were the seventh day." Some proponents believe God did not end the seventh day and is currently resting. If the seventh day can be thousands of years long, then the six work days can be millions of years long. This is not a rational conclusion.  
5. Supporters say the Earth was covered by clouds for millions of years during the first three days. The Sun, Moon, and stars were hidden and became visible on the fourth day. This is not a credible explanation.  
6. According to scientific evidence, life appeared first in the oceans and then on land. This disagrees with the creation of trees and plants on the third day (Gen. 1:9-12) followed by
marine life on the fifth day (Gen. 1:20-21). The overlapping of days does not solve this sequence problem.

7. The Sabbath is defined as a day of rest after six days of work. Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 specifically mention the six days of Genesis as an example. No satisfactory explanation is given for these verses.

8. Advocates of this theology do not acknowledge the embellished interpretation or mistranslation of key words in Genesis Chapter 1, Exodus 20:11, Exodus 31:17, Jeremiah 3:17, and Jeremiah 4:23 found in orthodox English Bibles.

9. Proponents of this theology have replaced the traditional, embellished interpretation of Genesis 1:3-2:3 with a private interpretation not supported by the biblical text.

**Literary Interpretations**

The analogical day is a literary interpretation of Genesis developed to eliminate disagreement of the Bible with scientific evidence regarding significant time and the sequencing of past events. Genesis 1 – 4: A Linguistic, Literary and Theological Commentary by Dr. C. John Collins (2006) explains analogical days as "God's workdays, their length is neither specified nor important, and not everything in the account needs to be taken as historically sequential."

Analogue days are quite similar to day-age theology, which proposes the days are millions of years long. As an additional feature, analogue days allow the sequence of days to be rearranged. The highly structured, clear language of six literal, sequential days is dismissed.

On the positive side, Collins' discussion of the Genesis creation account contributes to a better understanding of scripture. Genesis 1:1-2 lie outside the rigid six-day time frame. Genesis 1:1 is a general statement attributing God as creator of the heavens and Earth, while Genesis 1:2 describes the Earth at some point in the distant past. Genesis 1:1-3 occur in chronological order and the time between each verse is not defined. Genesis 2:5 applies to a land that was dry and barren where the garden was to be planted, rather than the entire Earth.

**Strengths:**
1. Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 lie outside the rigid six-day time frame of Genesis 1:3–31.¹¹
2. Genesis 1:1, 1:2, and 1:3 occur in a chronological order.¹²
3. Genesis 1:2 is a description of Earth at some point in the distant past.
4. Genesis 2:5 is interpreted as applying to a land that was dry and barren where the garden was to be planted, rather than the entire Earth.¹³
5. Advocates of this theology recognize the importance of harmonizing the Bible with firm scientific evidence in support of significant time and the sequencing of past events. Ignoring this evidence is not an option.

**Objections:**
1. This theology does not provide a satisfactory explanation for treating the six days described in Genesis 1:3–31 as long epochs of time. Harmony with scientific evidence is at the expense of scripture.
2. When the word is used in the context of six consecutive, numbered, numerically increasing days—consisting of evening and morning—they are literal 24-hour days. Context does not suggest a metaphorical explanation.
3. The credibility of Genesis 1:3–31 as a plausible story of origins is destroyed by allowing the six days to be millions of years and the order of days to be rearranged.
4. Supporters of this theology do not acknowledge the embellished interpretation or mistranslation of key words in Genesis Chapter 1, Exodus 20:11, Exodus 31:17, Jeremiah 3:17, and Jeremiah 4:23 found in orthodox English Bibles.
5. Advocates of this theology have replaced the traditional, embellished interpretation of Genesis 1:3–2:3 with a private interpretation not supported by the biblical text.

The framework view is another well-known literary interpretation of the Genesis creation story. Professor Arie Noordzij of the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands is typically credited as the first person to teach the framework view. *Genesis: A Commentary* (2001) by Bruce Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks explains the framework view from an American perspective. *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (2006) by Meredith G. Kline is another explanation of the framework view. As described by John Collins, the framework view is "a literary framework for us to understand the work of creation, without committing anyone to see the days as either sequential or normal." The framework view treats the Genesis creation account as completely metaphorical. While this approach eliminates any conflict with evidence-based science, acceptance comes at the direct expense of scripture. Such an interpretation leads one to question God's knowledge of origins and his ability to inspire the writing of a credible account.

**Additional Views of Genesis**

In addition to the four theologies mentioned, belief that the Genesis creation story is a compilation of pagan mythology is quite fashionable in some religious circles. Some individuals believe the creation story represents a collection of Sumerian, Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Canaanite stories. Poetical and metaphorical expressions in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah are referenced to support the argument that the Bible is full of incorrect information. Common themes and words in scripture are tenuously connected to pagan mythology and used by critics to attack the Bible creation story as false. This reasoning is similar to taking present-day factual events and then discounting their credibility by connecting common words and themes with those found in fictional works. For example, with this type of logic the account of man's walk on the moon can be accused of being false because of its connection to hundreds of science fiction books, short stories, and movies. This type of fallacious reasoning can be rejected.

All of the above explanations of Genesis have major scriptural and scientific problems, and indicate the chaotic condition of current biblical-based origins belief. Typically, supporters ignore scriptural and/or scientific objections (evidence-based science). All of the above explanations of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 are analogous to driving a square peg into a round hole—the pieces do not fit.

**The Mosaic Preamble**

Present interpretations of Genesis question the very nature of God. If the Bible is true, then why does it appear to conflict with firm scientific evidence in regard to extensive time? As creator, God certainly knows the history of the universe, Earth, and all therein. Surely a wise, eternal, omnipotent God could have inspired Moses to write a creation account capable of
harmonizing with the firm evidence of twenty-first century science in regard to time. Surely God knew that mankind's scientific knowledge would grow to its current state and that such knowledge would conflict with a 4004 BC creation date.

Genesis Chapter 1 (Gen. 1:1-2:3) is best viewed as a Mosaic Preamble. The Mosaic Preamble interpretation is based on an in-depth study of the Hebrew text of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 in the *Biblia Hebraica* (Hebrew Bible). The primary goal of this effort was to create an accurate, credible, and highly literal translation of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2. A secondary goal was to determine if special revelation (God's word, the Bible) and general revelation (God's physical creation) could be harmonized without contradiction in regard to time.

A careful study of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 reveals that several key words have been poorly or illegitimately translated from the original Hebrew text (primarily in Genesis Chapter 1). The translation of some words is unique to Genesis and unsupported by usage elsewhere in the Old Testament—they are obvious embellishments or fabrications. In addition, special rules of grammar have been applied to some words in Genesis Chapter 1.

The Preamble of the United States Constitution is a 52-word paragraph that identifies five objectives of the framers of the constitution prior to its writing. The preamble is an introduction to the highest law of the land—but not the law itself. In a similar manner, Genesis Chapter 1 is a preamble to the Pentateuch that identifies God as a powerful creator—but does not tell how or when he created.

Genesis 1:1-2:3 is best viewed as a preamble to the Pentateuch written by Moses. Genesis 1:1 of the Mosaic Preamble clearly identifies God as creator of the heavens and Earth. Genesis 1:2 of the preamble describes the state of the Earth sometime after its creation as empty of life, covered with water, and enveloped in darkness. In Genesis 1:3-31, God describes various features of the Earth in as he views them in the present (presumably while meeting with Moses on Mt. Sinai). Moses attributes God as the creator and maker of these features. This narrative is structured in a six-day format to support the Sabbath. Genesis 2:1-3 describes God resting on the seventh day. Genesis 2:4 and onward reflects Adam's historical account of events related to the Garden of Eden.

When Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 are properly interpreted, translated, and explained they agree with each other and with the remainder of the Bible. Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 fully complement each other and are not contradictory. God is identified as a powerful creator, maker, former, and builder.

Words in Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 upon which the Mosaic Preamble interpretation is based are about two percent different from traditional translations such as the English Standard Version (a conservative word-for-word translation). The changes are quite subtle, yet permit a radically different explanation of the Genesis Chapter 1 while respecting the clear language of the text. No words, phrases, or verses are treated as metaphorical, mythological, or untrue.

**Conclusion**

The four main theological views of young-Earth creation theology, gap theology, day-age theology, and literary interpretations all have major scriptural and scientific problems. They indicate the chaotic condition of current explanations about Genesis. Fundamentally, all of them are built upon a faulty interpretation and translation of Genesis.

When the Mosaic Preamble of Genesis 1:1-2:3 is understood, it can harmonize with firm scientific evidence regarding time. The six days are real 24-hour days and need not be treated as
metaphorical. On the other hand, scripture allows for an old heavens and Earth. God is an omnipotent, powerful, timeless, ageless creator.
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