

## Genesis: Creation Part 2

Pastor Jim Essian : February 15, 2015

### THE PARADOX CHURCH

*In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters. (Genesis 1:1-2)*

This is the word of the Lord.

So last week we took a flyover of Genesis 1 and we basically looked at Genesis 1 asking the question that Genesis 1 is wanting us to ask it, and that is, “Who created?”

Who created, this creator God, who is he, and who created? That was why Genesis 1 was written. We looked a little bit at what he created, but it is primarily *this is the god who created the heavens and the earth* and that’s what we said, “That in the beginning god created everything out of nothing by his words and He created all things and that this God, if you remember in the first week of Genesis is the triune God of the universe and is a beloved father, and a loving father to a beloved son, with the spirit of love poured out between them. If you didn't know who god was, then let me recap the first week--he is the most satisfied, joyful, happy, perfect, harmonious, being in the universe and out of his love for the sun creation stands forth at his literally his very word.

So that's what we looked at last week, this flyover of this God who created everything right. Galaxies and water, cantaloupes, and the hippy milks I was talking about, and all these all

these wonderful things, he made trees and he created fish and fowl and animals and He then created us. We become the apex of his creation created in his image to reflect his glory, so that when people get around us they get a taste of what God is like. You and I, we embody, and we reflect, and we portray just a shadow of what God is like. There are so many of us and we are all diverse and we all have these different ways of showing a different aspect of God and it's beautiful.

We are meant to fill the earth with His glory as we fill the earth with his image bearers and so we said that all of these things happen in Genesis 1 and that really everything that we enjoy in the life it can be found at its essence in Genesis 1 that everything you like to do is found in Genesis 1. Exploring, creating, and building, cultivating, and organizing, relationships and eating, and sex and babies, and singing, and beauty, and aesthetics, and art, and poetry and everything that you like to participate in, is found at its essence in Genesis 1.

There's a reason why we would participate in all those things, there's a reason why we want to hum or tap our feet to the music or clap as a result, and why we will take the picture of the Texas sky and throw it up on Instagram with #nofilter because it didn't need a filter I guess...

There's a reason why we want to do these things, there's a reason we want to participate, we want to take part in creation and we talked about it--because creation is a boomerang that comes from God and its meant to redound back to God in our praise of Him and so we want to be a part of it because it was meant for us to enjoy to His glory. Beginning so innately in our core essence we understand what Genesis 1 is about, how we want to participate and take part in it.

So creation, it starts in the garden, this is what we said, it starts in the garden, He created us to share in his creation and he basically puts us in the garden, and says *I want you to make the rest of the world look like this, this organization, this beauty, this cultivating, this beautiful garden, you are to make the rest of the world look like this, and you need a lot of help so have lots of babies, fill the earth to my glory that you might share in all of this beauty*, and so we looked more so at the “who of creation”, God, He looks at his creations and it is beautiful, this God enjoys his creation. He invites us to take part in and enjoy it.

Now this week we will talk more about the *how*, Genesis just wasn't primarily written to discuss the *how's*, it wasn't primarily written to debate evolution or to tell us all that we would want to know about how God created.

It gives us something, some hints, there's some things that are clear, there's other things aren't quite as clear. There's some ways in which again to come to some of these theories, in some of these debates looking to the how God created and so were going to talk about them and see what science says. Evolution is that that true? Do we believe that? Can a Christian believe in evolution? What about a literal Adam and Eve? Were they actual real people or is there another way in which God created? Did he use a literal 24-hour day? Did he create a literal 24-hour day?

What are some of the theories about how to read Genesis 1? We are really going to get into some of these debates and some of those theories today. So now I am going to put on my teaching hat, I don't know if you wear teaching hats, I don't know, I just mean I'm going to teach a lot more than I normally would. I don't have a hat on I'm just going to teach a lot and really get into some these theories and some these debates. Before we do I want to clear some things up about God's revealing of himself to us, okay? Because this can help us as we look at

this debate, we said in the first week that God is transcendent and infinite and eternal, and that He would then have to show himself to us for us to know Him.

Okay if He's infinite, were finite, if He's eternal--always has been and always will be--and we had a beginning and if He is transcendent over all times and cultures and peoples and places, He's outside of space time and we are in space time, so because of that, He's going to have to reveal himself to us.

Now Christians believe that He's done that, in two ways He's done that. The general revelation, or what we would say is creation, and is also known through special revelation, that is the Word of God. Because He revealed himself to us in His creation and through His word, now both creation and his Word--the Bible-- we would say are infallible and inerrant.

Creation is infallible and inerrant, it always tells the truth, and the Word of God is inerrant and it's infallible--what isn't inerrant or infallible is our interpretation of creation through science or our interpretation of the scriptures in the Word of God, that's not infallible, okay? But that the Bible and creation are always true we believe as Christians as God spoke in His scriptures that literally it's God's inspired word or reading the Bible is reading God's words but then we learned last week that God also spoke into existence creation. That is the creation we live in, a universe, one universe, all truth speaks with one voice and that's God's voice.

The same God spoke the scriptures that spoke creation into existence, and so a study of the scriptures and the study of creation should show us the same God. The same truth if they do not, if they contradict then we are either getting creation wrong or getting the Bible wrong. It is not that the bible is wrong or creation is wrong, it's just that our interpretation of it is wrong and so we believe that scientists, that atheists, that atheistic--scientists study God's word all the time, all the time atheist--scientists are studying God's word, why? Because He spoke creation

into existence, and science is studying creation so we should never be afraid of science. It has a been a debate since the middle ages of the church, religion and science, there has been this huge debate and for whatever reason, we see some Christians become afraid of science. They were battling science, they would argue against science as if somehow science isn't studying the same Word of God as we do.

That God has revealed himself in creation in the same ways or at least in much of the same ways has revealed himself in scripture, and it actually has been that in the past, science has corrected our interpretation of the Bible. Right, right? Not corrected the Bible, corrected our interpretation of the Bible. Anyone remember that the Earth didn't move and everything revolves around us? That argument stood, until guys like Copernicus shows up, and Galileo shows up and they start to say, *no it seems like the earth moves*. They worked to show us that in the solar system, the planets are in action, and the Earth revolves around the sun.

Well the church was very slow to adopt this, right? Because, there is a certain few texts in the bible that seem to allude to the sun rising and setting. It seemed to allude to the earth being stationary and so they're like *no we can't be earthmovers*. They were non-earthmovers because the Bible says that the sun rises and sets up, of course those were just very poetic words. That was a scripture verse that was talking about our vantage point. We still talk of the sun setting and rising but nobody actually believes that the sun literally sets and rises. Right? Were speaking about it from our vantage point, yes and so there's virtually no theologian now that would say *no* and no other that would say the earth doesn't move, but for everyone, or for a very long time the church was like *no-no-no we can't believe that*, they condemned Galileo as a heretic. All the while it was just their interpretation of the bible that was wrong. That's all. That's all.

His understanding of God's revealing of himself in general revelation, or through creation actually was correct in our interpretation of God and special revelation was actually wrong. So we're corrected. I mean there is nobody who still thinks the earth is stationary, everybody thinks it moves, I'm just saying that if you do, you're most likely wearing Jesus t-shirts and have a shotgun, maybe have some spam stored up in your closet, some end times charts, driving a pickup truck with a confederate flag on it most likely, those are the only non-earthmovers still around, all of us now have adopted science in its correction of our interpretation of the Bible, we should not be afraid of that, not be afraid of that, it's God revealing himself to us.

Now in the case of great theologian Charles Hodge, I want to read to you what he said about this, *it is admitted that theologians are not infallible in the interpretation of scripture, it may therefore happen in the future, as it has in the past, that interpretations of the Bible long confidently received, so we held them for a long time, must be modified or abandoned to bring revelation into harmony with what God teaches in his works or in general revelation, creation, this change of view as to the true meaning the Bible may be a painful trial to the church, does not in the least impair the authority of the scriptures they remain infallible, we are merely convicted of having mistaken their meaning.* Yeah now we also need special revelation, we need the Biblical special revelation; it tells us more than what general revelation can tell us. Creation doesn't tell us all that we need to know about redemption and the work of God, or when He entered history to redeem and save for himself a people that have rebelled Him. The Bible in fact tells us what the Bible is revealing, and what it is for, in 2<sup>nd</sup> Timothy 3:15 it says, *the scriptures are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus*, that's what the Bibles for, that *all scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete and equipped for every good work*, and so the scriptures are to make you wise for salvation, that's the primary force of special revelation, and so Genesis 1:1 is not meant to debate or to offset evolution, or

Darwin, its not meant to argue that. All it's meant to do is to make you wise for salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, that's its primary purpose.

So we believe that the scriptures reveal Jesus to us, what he has done on our behalf, and who he is. Right? Jesus is the hero of the Bible, all-general revelation can do is show us that there is a hero. We look at creation, look at the Texas sky, we look at the complexities of it, and the beauty of it and we stand at the ocean shore and we feel super small and we marvel at God's grandeur and we look at it, we say there must be a hero, there must be a hero but it can't tell us who that hero is. What special revelation is for, the Bible is for telling us who the hero is.

So God reveals himself to us truthfully, perfectly in creation and truthfully and perfectly in the bible. Whenever those things contradict, we should go humbly back to our scientific theory and humbly back to our interpretation of scripture and see if we can get them to sync up. Now when there are things that are super clear in scripture and special revelation, and they still contradict, what is maybe clear in scripture and not as clear in general revelation, we are just going to hold tightly to the scriptures, right? And expect that the science and that general revelation and the study of it will catch up.

We should admit and know that there's going to be some things that science can't do, it can't speak to the miracles, it can't speak to the resurrection, it can't speak to the incarnation of God, where He writes himself into the story. By definition, miracles are acts of God in and through nature that appear to suspend or override the natural, observable patterns of nature. Science can't help us with some things, right? Science can't help us with some things, it's never going to sync up with some of the things in the scriptures, in regards to miracles. So we have to distinguish between what is clear in scripture and what is clear in science from what is not so clear in science, what is not so clear in the scriptures. We need to hold the one tightly and the other loosely, does that make sense?

And so I wanted to start with what is clear for us in regards to some these debated theories, and to move on into the things that are not so clear. So I'm just going to start off super confident, and I know exactly what the Bible is saying, then it won't be so clear, I believe this will end up with *I'm not sure I'm not sure*. It'll be great, so I will start with the question of evolution, right, the debate of evolution, so turn to genesis chapter 1:1, *in the beginning god created the heavens and the earth*. So we said last week, it is very clear that what this means, it is that God created everything out of nothing, the word he used here for create is the word *bara*, for only god can *bara*, only God is the subject of *bara*. Creating in *bara* means typically, that you create out of nothing. Dozens of passages in the rest of the Bible show us that is exactly what it means. That there's other things that God does to make from a form, and to appoint and to build and things like that, that we can do also, we can do those things, and he does those things in Genesis 1, but in genesis 1:1, He *bara-s*, He creates out of nothing.

So the bible would say that God created everything out of nothing, Stephen Hawking however would say in the book *The Grand Design* that the universe created itself from nothing. So the atheist would say that nothing created everything, including time and chance, so that eventually some things would be able to reason that nothing created everything. Okay that's, did you all get that? Right, nothing created everything including time and chance, so that eventually some things could reason that nothing created everything. That's the atheist position, now the Christian position would be that God created everything out of nothing, the Bible very clearly states that God created everything out of nothing and so we would say that the atheistic-evolutionary process view is wrong. That nothing can't create everything, that the impersonal would never create the personal, that what is chaotic, and out of order is never going to create what is perfectly in order. We would say that God created everything out of nothing; we would also say that their position takes as much faith to believe that nothing

created everything, as it is to say that God created everything. Yes, at least as much faith, at least as much faith and so we would reject the idea of atheistic-evolution and that process.

The Psalmist says *the fool says in his heart there is no god*, of course many in our culture now would say that you're a fool if you believe in God, and you should say, *okay that's fine however it takes just as much faith for you to believe what you believe as it takes to believe what I believe*, let's not make this a science against faith or reason against faith debate, you have to take some leaps of faith as well as I do.

So we reject any of that, now, all of us would admit there is microevolution at work. Within the species there are changes, within the species we can see the changes, what about macroevolution? The idea that species change into other species, or that we would come from another species. Now is it possible that God created using the evolution process? This is called theistic-evolution. In that same vein, were Adam and Eve real people? Literal, historic people, actual people, or were they actually figurative of the first man and woman that had evolved and God used the evolutionary process. So let's look at that briefly, now look at verse 21 and 22 of chapter 1, there's very key phrase in a few of these, that will help us, verse 21 So God created the great sea creatures and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarm, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth."

Very specific places for these species to go, jump down to verse 24 *And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds: the livestock, the creatures that move along the ground, and the wild animals, each according to its kind."* And it was so. What's the phrase over and over and over and over *according to its kind*, this is very descriptive and very clear for a piece of literature, Genesis 1, which isn't wanting to or necessarily needing to be

all that clear about some of the *how's*, and this is super clear. Very clear that there is a species that is given the ability, endowed with the ability, to multiply according to its kind.

In verse 22, the fish going to the sea the birds go into the air, very specific realms for them, right? It's not the fish that then mutates out and begins to crawl onto the land and then turns into something else, it is specific functions for the specific species that are meant to multiply according to their kinds, now look at Genesis chapter 2:7. Now we get to Adam, this is chapter 2 verse 7, so now what about Adam, did he evolve? Is that a real person? Genesis chapter 2 verse 7, Then the LORD God formed a man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being.

This is spectacular and this is very-very-very clear that this is a very unique work of creation, right? Whereas God was speaking things into existence and He was calling things into being to appear. Here He got his hands dirty, I love that He gets involved, He is a doer, and gets to work, right? Some of you are at a menial job, and don't like your menial job, or you are involved in manual labor or just doesn't seem very valuable, or you work with your hands all day, I want you to know it is godly, it's good and it's righteous.

That's beautiful, and He gets His hands dirty as he forms out of the dust of the ground, this is very unique and very distinct, separate from His other works of creation. Notice, He breathes life into Adam right? It's one thing to speak creation into existence; it's another, far more intimate way when He breathes to create a creature. To breathe life into a created being, right? This is us, made in His image, meant to be live for His glory, and we get to have a part of Him, and be a part of Him, showing, and revealing what God is like. This is special, this is not evolution, this is a very unique work of creation and you get to the creation of Eve from Adam, is even more supernatural of an event, and so we would say Adam is a literal person, in fact the rest the Bible speaks of Adam and Eve as actual, real people.

Adam is in the Bible's genealogies and was in Jesus's genealogy in the Bible, so in Jesus's family tree the bible is very clear that Adam was an actual real person. The Apostle Paul, he says that it is because of Adam, all of us have been born into sin, because of Jesus, the second Adam we can all be reborn, or born again by faith. That the cost of Adam's sin, is that now we are all in sin, all of us are born just innately and inherently with a heart that's been away from God.

That we don't want to approach God, we don't want to love God we don't want to enter into God's presence, we will participate in what God created, but reject God. When he speaks of Adam's sin, he speaks of those of an actual person. When Paul speaks of marriage, he talked of Adam and Eve as the first marriage, a model of the first marriage and so the rest about them is very-very clear that Adam and Eve were actual, literal people. Now maybe you are convinced, and maybe don't believe that God, out of the dust formed a man, breathed life into one of us, and that there's no actual evidence of it in the Bible. Here's what we do know, we do know that eventually all of us, none of us know the day, but all of us will at one point breathe our last, the air will go out of our lungs, and we will be put into the ground, and turn to dust.

We know that, so perhaps it began a very similar way? So we would not say that God used macroevolution as a process of creation, we would say that Adam is a historic figure created uniquely by God in His image. Now if God can use evolution, How about a 24-hour day, right? Six days, like actual create in that timeframe, that seems a busy week for God. Is there another way to read that, are there other theories that we can hold to? Does the bible even suggest Genesis 1 took place in a week, does it even answer these questions? What is happening here? We will talk about that now, to move less and less clear in these topics, let's see if we can dive into some of these topics.

We will get to into it, and there is still about a dozen theories out there, all we are going to be doing is looking at 3 of them, all about how this went down, here's the first. The first theory is the Day Age Theory; the Day Age view is this theory that holds that in Genesis 1, the days aren't literal 24-hour days, but that each day is a long period of time. Perhaps millions or even billions of years, in each particular day it is a particular age. The Day Age view, actually addresses one of the big debates in Genesis 1 and that's that the use of the word day, is the Hebrew word *Yam*, right like *yam capour*, day of atonement, word day is used in Genesis 1, and the Day Age theorist will say that, the word day or *Yam* is used in a number of different ways, right, like we use the word *day* in a number of different way, and so does the Hebrew language, so the first that the word day appears, it doesn't mean an actual 24 hours, if you look at Genesis 1:5 *God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, the first day.* God called the light day, right?

That's *Yam*, and the darkness he called night, so there day is not referring to a 24-hour period, a literal day, but He is contrasting the day from the night. Right? We would speak in that way as well, and genesis 2:4, *These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens.* Again not using day as a 24 hour day, but in much the same way we would say, "Back in the day, I was younger and in better shape," not bitter, just using that as an example, and illustration, I'm 35 years old...again back in the day, that is not an actual 24 hour day, just saying that there was a time, when I felt younger and I didn't wake up and my back didn't hurt all the time. There are ways in which we can talk about days like that, so they point you then once we get into the actual days, first day where He creates light, the second day He creates the sky, so perhaps day there doesn't mean 24 hours, it means something else, it means a long age.

They then give the older universe some credence, scientist say that the earth is 14 billion years old, and the Earth is about 4.5 billion years old, and there is a lot of evidence to say that,

and so this view allows us to read Genesis 1 and see that there can be an old Earth and universe. And so the Day Age theorists point to that also. The biggest problem with the Day Age view is that whenever a day is preceded by a number, like day 1 and 2, it almost always refers to a literal 24-hour day. Not some sort of figurative day, and so you have a serious problem being that on day 1 when light is created, and then day 4 is when stars and the sun is created, there are some arguments about it but you have to wonder how light was in place and there was no sun, or stars. Of course there are some counter arguments I just can't get into every argument now, I don't live the Day Age view, but it is a view you can hold to.

The second view is probably the most common, and that is the literal 24-hour, 6-day, workweek view, right? That God actually created in 6 real days. Now most people that hold to this hold to a very young earth, like a 10 thousand year old earth or else, this causes a huge problem, there is starlight that you saw last night that is older than 10 thousand years, that is like 10 thousand light years away, so we then would be forced to believe starlight doesn't exist or can't be that old, that's a serious problem. And they would say and they would appeal to this literal reading of Genesis 1 because Moses also wrote in Exodus 20:21 that we should keep the Sabbath because God worked 6 days and rested on the 7<sup>th</sup>.

So the same guy that wrote that God created in 6 days also wrote that because he did you should work for 6 days and not the 7<sup>th</sup>. That is a very good argument, one of the rules in biblical interpretation is "what does the rest of the Bible say?" when something is unclear in the Bible, you look and see what is clear, and you see if it speaks into that. Look at the story of Jonah, come on, dude got swallowed by a fish, 3 days in the fish, fish gets sick, spits up Jonah, and he goes back to Nineveh, they repent, and there's a tree and he goes back to God and that is how the book ends. They say that isn't a real story, that is a myth, but Jesus talks about Jonah, Jesus speaks about Jonah, so we go to something else the Bible says, and we see Jesus speaking about it and talks about it like it is a historical fact. Jonah actually happened, that Jonah actually was

swallowed up by a whale, that he actually was in the belly of the fish for 3 days. Then he came out on the third day and he uses that as an illustration for him being in the belly of the earth for 3 days and then resurrecting on the 3<sup>rd</sup>. So maybe Jonah actually is a real story, maybe it isn't a myth.

Those are important rules for interpreting the Bible, let's see what else the Bible says, and so people that hold to the literal 6 day 24-hour view they look and see what else the Bible speaks of in terms of these days of Moses in Exodus 20, and say "look he seems to think it was a 6-day 24-hour work week, and so we should to." So they have a very strong argument, except when it comes to the scientific evidence for an older earth and an older universe. Some of those that are holding to this literal 24-hour 6-day week view are beginning to try and figure out how the earth could be older and allow them to still hold this view. Okay so what they are beginning to say that God created Adam to be mature and so He also created the earth to be mature, and the universe looks old but it is not actually that old.

That is what many would say because of the evidence against their Young Earth view. This gets a little strange though when you begin to have argument, it is one thing to cut open a tree and see there are 50 rings in the tree and expect it to be 50 years old, but maybe God created it 10 minutes ago. You start getting into all that is out there in regards to the age of the universe, and you begin to question this idea. Gavin Ortlund, he says this *Why would God go to such lengths, for instance, to create so many impact craters on the moons of Jupiter? Why would he give us a false history of annual temperature and irradiation in ice cores, or create so many layers of plankton fossils on the floor of the ocean? It is one thing to create Adam with a 21 year-old body; it is another to fill his mind with 21 years of false memories. If the appearance of age all around us is fundamentally deceptive, can we trust anything we learn from general revelation?*

That is a really good point, if we're seeing starlight that is supposed to be 15 thousand light years away but that actually didn't even exist that seems very deceptive. Why would God go to such great lengths to show us how old the universe is, when it is actually not all that old. That is a difficult argument to make, it is very difficult. There is a lot of debate there, and nuances to these arguments and so on. It is a problem for those that hold to a literal 6-day, and also have an old earth. Now, a couple more things regarding this literal reading of Genesis 1. First of all, just a natural reading of Genesis 1 seems to point to holding this view, if you had never read it, and just picked it up and read it, you'd say what? It seems like the Bible is saying God created the earth in 6 days. We grant that. Usually, not always, but usually a natural reading of scripture is usually the right way to understand it, but not all the time.

A lot of time those who hold to the literal view, they only think it is right to hold to a literal view when they read scripture, and that is not true. When the Bible wants it to be read literally it gives you clues as to it being read literally, when the Bible wants you to read it figuratively it gives you clues to do so. There is nothing lesser in reading a certain text figuratively as opposed to literally. There is nothing bad about that, revelations should be read figuratively and when we don't we get into some weird things where guys don't think the earth moves, and have confederate flags on their trucks right? Kind of crazy end-times guys, they read revelations the wrong way, too literally. We have to be careful and not get too arrogant in our view in regards to holding to reading the Bible literally.

What has to happen is we have to ask ourselves the question, what genre of writing is this particular passage? That is a big question in how we interpret scripture. Literally or figuratively? Which brings me to my next theory, this is my last one, and it is called the framework view. The framework view holds that the same day work week is a literary framework as a way to describe actual real events of God creating in time and space, the 6 days themselves aren't really to be measured or we don't really know how long they were, they just

act as a way of telling a story. Does that make sense; they just act as a way of telling a story. So now we get back to that question, what genre is Genesis 1 written in?

It is unbelievable unique from the rest of the Bible, it is. It is even unique to the rest of Genesis. In fact Genesis 2:4 starts these 10 divine-initiative, division of Genesis that starts with a genealogy, into the rest of Genesis, you're going to see that genealogy and that starts this one divine initiative, there's another genealogy and that will start another divine initiative and that goes on for 10 times in Genesis. But in Genesis 1 you don't have this, it's completely set apart, and when you read Genesis 1, it reads almost like a song doesn't it? Like there's a song to it, like some poetry to it, or some prose to it, but it is not just that, it also reads as actual history. It reads as narrative, it reads as theology, there's really no place to put it, there's no box to put Genesis 1. It is very unique in its writing, and in fact it is beautiful, some of the greatest writing in the universe, when you read it in the Hebrew language. So it is this beautiful language, it is this beautiful piece of writing, that is very unique, and so it is very hard to understand its genre. So the literary framework folk will say, yes it is very unique, its not wanting to necessarily be chronological, its not wanted to be exact, its just wanting to tell you who created and not so much the how of creation. So they talk much about what we talked about last week, so God in the first couple of days is forming the earth and then the back half of the week he begins to fill what He has formed.

So in day 1 you have the light and day 4 you have Him filling in the lights, and day 2 you have the skies, and then he fills it with birds and you have him forming the seas and filling it with fish, so it acts as a literary framework. They look at the 6 day work week, and they say that is analogical to our 6 day work week and of course all views have to hold that the six day work week is analogical to ours, God doesn't work like we work. He doesn't get tired like we get tired, and so there is some room for that interpretation. So the big things about this view, is it points out some problems in the other views and has solutions for them, for instance, in verse 5 and 8,

really wherever it says, 1<sup>st</sup> day, 2<sup>nd</sup> day, 3<sup>rd</sup> day, it points out that in the Hebrew, it doesn't that "the first day," but it says "a first day". That is very important. The Hebrew doesn't say "the first day," but it says "a first day." It doesn't say "the second day," it says "a second day." It is not until day 6 that article changes from "a" to "the". Us to they. Why? Because creation is finishing, it is crescendo-ing into the creation of us, made in God's image. And so it points that out, it is very interesting, as well on day 7 there is no evening and morning. Right on day 1 there is evening and morning, and the same for day 2 through 6. Day 7 there is no evening and morning, why? Well Augustine back in the 4<sup>th</sup> century points out, he says this, "its because day was never finished, God's rest signifies the completion of creation and the conditions for history to proceed. Since mankind may act on the basis of laws that have been permanently established."

So why does day 7 not end with evening and morning? Because we are still in day 7, we are a part of God's rest, that the established laws of the universe have been worked out, and that we are to participate in God's great creation and to enjoy it as God is enjoying it, that we may enter into His rest and to His glory. But of course with sin, that all got broken. Parts of Hebrews will talk about entering in again, entering in again to God's rest, through the life-death-resurrection of Jesus Christ. That salvation is entering into His rest. That final work of salvation when Jesus comes back, is us entering into our Sabbath rest. So those that would hold to a literal framework would say, "we're in day 7." We are a part of God's rest and we've been re-invited back in, through the gospel of Jesus. It is very poetic, a lot of imagery, a lot of figurative work here. So we would say that you can hold to this view and still be Biblical and still be honoring the scriptures and I would just say I tend I to vacillate between this view and the literal 6 day view. Tend to lean more towards the framework view at this point in time, could see myself going, "I don't know" in a year.

So we believe you can hold to either of these three and still be honoring scripture and still be reading the Bible in a way that can be read, and working with great humility in all of it. So these are different views, why? Because we don't quite know, because Genesis 1 is not wanting to tell us the *how* but instead the *who*. So what we do know is that the creator God of the universe is powerful and beautiful and glorious, and happy and He wants to share His work and His glory, and beauty with us, we are the apex of His creation, meant to participate with Him, share with Him in the work of creation, in His joy and unto His glory. That is what we know.

So what should our take-away be then from looking at creation, and some of the ins-and-outs, what should our take-away be? One thing should be this, that Christians are far too often way too arrogant about what they believe and hold to, okay? Way too arrogant, especially when it comes to something that is not as clear in scripture, like what creation theory you hold to, and when you begin to think that it is your view that is the best view and that nobody else should hold to any other view, and that they aren't holding to scripture and they aren't a Christian, and that is an arrogant position and it is kind of foolish. We should be very careful about our arrogance, as Christians when it comes to what we believe and hold to, we should defend the Bible and what it says always. But we shouldn't feel the need to defend the Bible and what it doesn't say or are not sure is saying, we should not do that.

We should never add to the Bible or take away from the Bible, the Bible ends with that warning in Revelation 22, *Do not take any words out of this book, do not add any words to this book*, we should not feel the need to defend the Bible in what it does not say or is not clear in what it is saying, we should hold very loosely and not be arrogant at all about what creation theory we hold and some of the other unclear things in the Bible that Christians tend to debate and it makes us look super foolish. Right? 1 Corinthians 1 Paul doesn't say *Hey boast in creation, boast in your theory of creation*, no he doesn't say that. He says *boast in Jesus*, that we are to

boast in Christ. That we boast in the God who created everything and who then, wrote himself into the story when we rebelled against Him, and wouldn't participate in the order and rhythm in which He created it to be.

He came and redeemed us, and He saved us, and He loved us, and now we can join Him again in the worship of God, we rejoice and we boast in Jesus. That is who we boast in, not what we know. We don't boast in what we know, we boast in who we know, that is what a Christian should do. That is what a Christian does. So we should have great humility about this, Paul would say later in Corinthians and if we boast in anything, we boast in our weaknesses and what we don't know, not in what we know. So one take away is, I am not going to boast in what I think, I am going to boast in Jesus, that what we do when we leave this place and we have these conversations in our city groups and in our homes, and with our friends and with our fellow students and with our co-workers is that we are not going to Bible thump folks on the head with what we believe to be true when we are not even sure what we believe is true.

Even with the things that are clear in the scripture we shouldn't be arrogant about them, why? Because it is not about us, it is about Him, and Him revealing himself to us, we would know nothing if He didn't reveal himself to us, and so we gently and lovingly share and we have these conversations and we point to what is true, and we can point to what is true, and when we are not sure we can just say, "I don't know, all I know is 'He is good, I was blind and now I see, that is what I know, I don't know now He created.'" That should be our posture as we walk away from this, as well, when we look at creation, and especially some of the things we don't know, you consider the wisdom and wonder of God, that should make you worship, right? When you stand at the seashore how small do you feel? Or when you stand before the Grand Canyon, how small do you feel? Those things are meant to make you wonder. When we get into some of the science stuff, and we get into some of the Genesis 1 stuff, we just consider, and marvel at the wisdom of God, and the knowledge of God in creation. It should stir us to worship, the Bible

tells us it should. Psalm 104:24, O LORD, how manifold are your works! In wisdom have you made them all; the earth is full of your creatures. Proverbs 3:19, The LORD by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding he established the heavens; Paul says in Romans 11, *Who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor? Who has ever given to God, that God should repay them? For from him and through him and for him are all things. To him be the glory forever! Amen.*

All of this should make us worship as we consider the wisdom of God in creation. We should wonder at it, we should fear Him even. Right the Proverbs tells us it is *the fear of the Lord* that is the beginning of our wisdom. We should fear God and His wisdom and knowledge to create in the manner in which He has created, all of the complexities, and intricacies, and textures, and varieties, and tastes, and smells, and beauties, and the goodness of all that He has done, our minds should be blown. We should fear Him and rejoice in Him, and worship the wisdom of God in creation. You worship Him because of all this. Consider all this, Genesis 1 and 2 is basically saying that God created all things out of nothing, through His word He then forms us, breathes life into us, we are made in His image, that we might participate and join Him, ruling and reigning over His creation that we might then fill the earth and multiply, that His glory then fills the earth.

So that everybody else can worship God as well, that is basically what Genesis 1 and 2 is saying, that God dwells with man in the garden, walks with man in the garden, we get to go to work with dad in the garden. Then you look at how the bible ends, that whole revelations 21:1, *Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more.* Much like -- *in the beginning God created the Heaven and Earth* --in Genesis 1:1. Then it continues, *I saw the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride beautifully dressed for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, "Look! God's dwelling place is now among the people, and he*

*will dwell with them. They will be his people, and God himself will be with them and be their God. He will wipe every tear from their eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away.*” The Bible ends with a new Heaven and a new earth, God again dwelling with man, there is again peace and joy, and harmony and there is no tears, fear, or sin. Which harkens back unto Genesis 1 and 2 where Adam is walking with God in perfect harmony, perfect shalom, perfect beauty, nothing is wrong yet. Then later in Revelation 22 it will say that we reign with Jesus, we reign with Jesus, did you know that we reign with Jesus? Like Genesis 1 and 2, we subdue the earth and have dominion over it.

That all of God’s purposes in Genesis 1 and 2 are fulfilled in Revelations 21, and 22. If you take sin out of the Bible you have Genesis 1 and 2, and Revelations 21 and 22. IF you take sin out, you don’t have a Bible you have a booklet, right? It is just a booklet, and Genesis 1 and 2 and Revelations 21 and 22 they’re the same thing but you do have sin, you do that sin. You have men and women who do rebel against God, and wont participate in His work of creation. Enjoying Him unto His glory, no we rebelled, we denied and rejected Him; we wanted His stuff and not Him. We chose the gift and not the giver, so consider the wisdom of God to write himself into the story, the wisdom and grace and love of God to give himself to His creation that had rejected Him and chose the rest of His creation instead of Him, consider the wisdom of God in creation, but also in re-creation.

All that He envisioned and purposed in Genesis 1 and 2 is accomplished in Revelations 21 and 22, and all that we are meant to be is redeemed and restored and we experience it and we know it. How good is our God?

So we should not be afraid of science, not be afraid of general revelation, God spoke it. God spoke it. We love special revelation, we love the Bible, because it tells us who the hero is, and His name is Jesus.

