

## Daniel Pech

December 19 at 9:57 PM ·

In Genesis 1, God creates the more basic things first, then He creates the more dependent things. For example, He creates both land and sea (vs. 9-10) before He creates any form of life. And when He first creates life, it is the more basic form of life, flora, upon which the fauna depend. Only then does He create the fauna.

So, in Genesis 1, God creates in the natural logical order that we would naturally expect. Of, course, God is all-powerful. So we can imagine that He could have created in a sequence contrary to the natural hierarchy of dependency. But Genesis 1 shows that He is wise and caring, not just all-powerful.

So the account shows that God is not uptight in His power. This is unlike the violence-based ways of many pagan deities in many pagan creation myths. In many pagan creation myths, the world, and humans, are the result of violence among their deities.

Furthermore, many of these myths involve patently absurd material sources of things. Thus, it would not be out-of-character for these myths if we imagined that one of these myths said that humans are made from the urine of one deity, and the sky from the entrails of another deity.

So it seems clear that, in Genesis 1, God creates in the natural logical order, and from the naturally expected material sources. Of course, He also creates some of the most basic things from nothing, such as space and matter. But, for all other things, He creates in the naturally expect sequence, and from the naturally expected material sources.

So it comes as a surprise that, upon arriving at the Day Four portion of the account, that portion seems to say that God created the Sun, Moon and stars on Day Four (vs. 14-19). This is a surprise in two ways:

One, this is not the naturally expected chronological point at which to create the luminaries. For the naturally expected point is at the beginning: in v. 1 as the narrative opening.

Two, the first thirteen verses, in their own terms, naturally suggests to us that the luminaries are created in v. 1. For, in Nature, there is no reason for the luminaries not to be created in v. 1. In fact, the 'heaven' of v. 1 most naturally is assumed to include the luminaries. That is, this 'heaven' is assumed to be the whole 'family' in their 'house', not just the empty 'house' where they are supposed to 'live'.

Therefore, when we arrive at the Day Four portion (vs. 14-10), it seems we have to \*reinterpret\* the first thirteen verses in view of the fact that this Day Four portion seems to say that the luminaries are created on Day Four, and not, as we had assumed, at the start in v. 1.

In other words, upon arriving at the Day Four portion, it seems we (1) ought to have \*waited\* to interpret the first thirteen verses until we had read the whole account through, and (2), interpreted the first thirteen verses \*retroactively\* in the context of the Day Four portion.

But such a retroactive interpretation is not how to treat a straightforward, plain-language narrative. In fact, to "faithfully" hold that the Inspired, Historical, everyday Literal account teaches that God created the luminaries on Day Four is akin to holding that an authoritatively already-assembled jigsaw puzzle must have some of its pieces \*alternately arranged\* in order to arrive at the full intended picture. But enough of that for now. I want to explain a bit about the fact that God created in six days.

---

An automobile does not require being made in any particular sequence, nor in short order. This is because its engine does not naturally require being run in order for it to be made. By contrast, the main subsystems of the Earth's ecology are not just 'machines'. Rather, they are living organisms. This means each subsystem naturally requires being run in order to be assembled one to another. This is especially the case for the global flora system and the two fauna systems. And they have no natural 'off' mode. So, basically, Genesis 1 shows how Earth's ecology can be known to function as an irreducibly complex system.

---

Now, a bit about the belief, popular among self-avowed Calendar Day creationists, that Genesis 1 includes explicit information on cosmic physics (ex: Morris, 2000:16-18; Humphreys, 1997; DeRemer, Amunrud and Dobberpuhl, 2007; Faulkner, 2016).

The account does not outright affirm our interest in cosmic physics writ secularly non-fine-tuned. But it \*does\* outright affirm our interest in the Earth (vv. 26, 28) and this as a finely tuned ecology. Indeed, what is the fine-tuned \*reality\* of cosmic physics if not an affirmation of (I) water-based life, (II) the Earth's cosmically unique role in the support of that life, and (III) humans' physical and metaphysical cosmological virtue?

Of course God created space, matter, and energy. But, so, what? It takes more words to both spell that out and to identify cosmic divine design per Creation Week than to right away spell out the Creation Week in terms of that Design. So to claim Genesis 1 begins and proceeds by spelling out the 'cosmically' trivial factoids is at once metaphysically shallow and apologetically greedy.

Indeed, as Apostle Paul reminded the Early Church, the mark of paganism, secularism, and atheism is a denial of the universal self-evidence of life-affirming Divine Design (Romans 1:20-23). So it seems Genesis 1 is to be understood purely in terms of that self-evidence of Divine Design in Nature, never contrary to it.

In fact, Paul's own reminder does not otherwise appeal to the Creation account. He never once makes any claim that the Creation account simply is 'authoritative' and 'therefore must be believed'. In other words, he does not even once cite 'what the account says' as either the foundation for faith and wisdom or the measure for defining ungodly unbelief.

The Pharisees worshiped only what the Law 'spelled out'. This is why they misunderstood it even in that regard. To them, it was a complex already-assembled jigsaw puzzle some of the pieces of which about which they loved to think had to be alternately arranged 'in God's favor'. But God is not 'The one uptight pagan deity who happens to be all-powerful'.

Natural Language normally involves a lot of ambiguity. This ambiguity self-evidently is not meant to allow the normal meanings of plainly natural statements to be twisted or missed. Rather, the ambiguity is a byproduct of a set of shared values between author and audience. In other words, it is a byproduct of communicative simplicity, or efficiency. In short, the ambiguity presupposes that the audience (readers or hearers) has the Natural Knowledge of the topic, so that they do not need to be treated as 'complete, senseless, Blank Slate Idiots.'

---

There are four pertinent facts of the ancient Hebrew language. I mention only the two simpler ones here:

One, ancient Hebrew has no pluperfect form of verb, instead relying on the reader's everyday normal good sense of things, as he naturally knows them, to determine the chronological relation of a given statement to another given statement.

Two, that which an ancient Hebrew person would readily perceive of v. 1-3 is that concerning the term 'darkness' in v. 2. Such a term commonly was used to imply or identify dense cloud (ex: Job 3, Job 38:9; and Deuteronomy 4:11).

---

-----A purely space ship way of life-----

As for the set of shared values between Genesis 1 and us readers, there is a way to prove as to what that set of values is. Perhaps the best way is by imagining that we have no natural knowledge of the complex set of things by which we find any of the account at once plain and sensible.

For example, imagine if humanity, from the beginning, has lived bound inside a Star Trek-like space ship stranded far away from any galaxy. This ship has every artificial system required for our biological survival and increase. It even has an automated system for expanding ship to comfortably accept such increase.

And, just like in the Star Trek universe, all those systems would require our work, toil, and expertise for maintenance. In short, we would have to earn our right even to breathe.

So the deepest difference to the Star Trek universe is that we would have no natural knowledge of a watery-planet-based, star-orbiting way of life. Even the ship's ambient thermal systems are separate from its lighting systems, and the latter produces nearly no heat while the former produces none of the kind of light by which we see.

Despite having all the perfectly synthesized food we could ever need, we would know nothing of flora. Therefore, upon our finding Genesis 1, we would say:

'What is all this about water? How can water be more important than atmospheric pressure, the latter of which this strange account does not even mention? It goes on about things it calls "land", "sea" "flora", "birds", "fish", and "land animals". But it does not once point out the universal need for sealed outer bulkheads. It does not once mention the need for the expertise and toil to maintain gravity generators. It surely is a fantasy account, and a weird fantasy at that.'

So a non-terrestrial 'way of life' does not provide for any of our most crucial natural needs. It may keep us biologically alive, but only by deeply contorting our sense of metaphysics and ethics.

---

-----To boil it all down-----

Genesis 1 is not just a 'plain' account of origins in 'Natural Language'. For, plain normal statements in natural language are not a function of logical possibility. More to the point, they are not a function of a generic, proto-pagan conception of God's power and sovereignty.

But the characteristic justification for maintaining that God created the Sun, Moon and stars belatedly, and not as expected, is that God, in foreknowing that many humans would worship the Sun and such, chose to preemptively rebuke this error by creating the luminaries belatedly, and this so as to demote the luminaries as mere creations.

But this justification makes God out to have engaged in a preemptive version of the mutual-adversary-based essence of many pagan creation myths. For, to think that God created Sun, Moon and stars belatedly is to render God as the all-powerful Cosmic Chef who, in order to be sure to rebuke His critics, supposedly poisons the very food He serves to everyone. More incredibly, many somehow love this Chef for supposedly doing this, so they fault those critics for being critical of the poisoned food. Today, those who worship the secularistic kind of notions and 'findings' of 'science' think Genesis 1 is no better than fanciful Fairy Tales told to children at bedtime. But many Christians, in thinking to be actually defending the account from such skepticism, reduce the account to 'a Fairy Tale that God, in His power, chose to make reality.'