

1: Lesson 3: The God Of Creation (Genesis) | www.enganchecubano.com

*The Genesis of God: A Theological Genealogy [Thomas J. J. Altizer] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Thomas Altizer, one of America's premier theologians, searches for a proper understanding of the Christian God.*

But the Indians, who thought that an elevator was just a little room and who were not used to being on top of a high structure without climbing it, had no idea of where they were when they stepped out of the elevator and onto the observation deck. They were interested in the pigeons and pigeon droppings, but they had no interest in the fantastic view. Because of their limited perspective, they could not comprehend the panorama before them. One of the unfortunate results of the predominance of evolutionary thought in our educational system and in our entire culture is that it has hindered even us as Christians from reading Genesis 1 from the viewpoint Moses intended when he wrote it. After further discussion, he comes back to this theme: In our first two studies I sought to deal with some of the scientific matters because they are so predominant in our thinking that we could never approach Genesis as Moses intended without first showing why evolution is so fallacious. The creation account should point us to the Creator who alone is worthy of our worship, enjoyment, and obedience. God is referred to by name 35 times in the opening section of Genesis 1: Clearly He is the great subject; creation is merely His handiwork, here to tell us of Him. As Paul states in Romans 1: As Calvin observes p. For if the mute instruction of the heaven and the earth were sufficient, the teaching of Moses would have been superfluous. Israel had been in captivity for years in Egypt where the sun and a pantheon of other gods were worshiped. The Canaanites worshiped fertility gods, warrior gods, gods who guaranteed healthy crops, gods of the moon and stars. They offered food and, at times, even their own children to their gods to appease them. Against this backdrop of false religions, we see that The creation account refutes many errors of false religion. Moses asserts that God alone created all that is. He just spoke the word according to His inscrutable purposes and called into being all that exists. This is in great contrast to the pagan stories of origins of other ancient peoples. Most of them portray a great struggle between powerful forces, where one god finally wins and creates the earth. But Genesis reveals God as effortlessly creating with a mere command: Since He created the sun, moon, and stars, He is over them and in no way are they to be worshiped. The fact that the stars are created by God and assigned a fixed purpose by Him shows that they do not have any ability to determine human destinies, thus refuting the widespread practice of astrology Calvin, pp. There are three ways, by the way, of dealing with the matter of light being created on day one, but the sun, moon and stars not being created until day four. One approach is to attribute the light of day one to God Himself. In the future heavenly city, there will be no sun, but God Himself will be its light Rev. A variation of this view is that the heavenly bodies were created in verse 1, shone through on day one 1: A third view argues that we must see Genesis 1 as a literary-theological arrangement rather than a strict chronological narrative of how creation happened. This is not to call it a myth, but rather to recognize that often the authors of Scripture do not follow our Western mindset by arranging things in strict chronological order. For example, the table of the nations Gen. But however you explain it, the point stands that the sun, moon, and stars are not to be worshiped; they are the mere servants of the powerful Creator who spoke them into existence and assigned their functions. The creation account refutes a number of other common religious errors. That one God created all that is refutes polytheism, the belief in many gods, and dualism, the view that the good and the evil gods are equal. That He is separate from and over His creation refutes pantheism, the view that the creation is one with God, and the New Age movement, which worships the creation. That He created matter refutes that matter is eternal. That God granted to His creation the ability to be fruitful and multiply refutes the pagan fertility cults Kidner, pp. That a personal God created the world and put man over it refutes nihilism, the view that human life and history have no discernible meaning and that there is no objective ground of truth or of morals. That God made man as male and female who together reflect His image gives dignity and equality to both sexes, while as chapter 2 shows assigning them differing roles. That God appointed man to have dominion over the creation refutes the radical animal rights movement, but also calls us to responsible stewardship of the earth

and all its resources. And, that God created all that is by the word of His power refutes evolution by chance and all of the philosophical baggage that goes with it. Thus all of these errors of false religions that have continued to rear their heads down through the centuries are refuted by this first chapter of Genesis. As we look at what God has made and as science probes even deeper into the mysteries of the distant universe on the one hand, and the mysteries of the atom on the other, it should stagger us with the infinite power, wisdom, intelligence, creativity, and glory of God. When He created the heavens and the earth, He did not hold consultations with anyone because there was no one else! He simply acted in order to bring about His sovereign purpose. If He had chosen to do so, He could have spoken the whole thing into existence in a single sentence. I believe He used the six days of creation to teach us and set a pattern for our existence, that we are to work six days and rest on one each week. That God merely had to speak in order to call into existence what did not exist shows His infinite power and should humble every person and even every nation before Him 2 Pet. From the tiniest insects to the movements of the planets there is overwhelming evidence of an intricate, interdependent plan. One reason I am inclined to take the six days of Genesis literally is that you cannot take out major sections of creation without upsetting the balance of the rest. Yet they argue that this finely balanced system, which shows evident design, came into being through sheer chance over billions of years. Years ago Sir Isaac Newton had an exact replica of our solar system made in miniature. The planets were all geared together by cogs and belts to make them move around the sun in perfect harmony. One day as Newton was studying the model, a friend who did not believe in the biblical account of creation stopped by. Who made it for you? All of these balls and cogs and belts and gears just happened to come together, and wonder of wonders, by chance they began revolving in their set orbits and with perfect timing. For starters, consider your own body! Such order does not come from random chance. Many scholars have pointed out the orderly progression of the days of creation.

2: Genesis flood narrative - Wikipedia

The God of Genesis is not someone whom Christians share with Islam, modern-day non-Messianic Judaism, 1 Hinduism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Unitarians, or any other belief system which rejects the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Rather, unlike those systems, Genesis portrays the God.

As there never was a time when God did not exist, and as activity is an essential part of His being John 5: It was natural with St. John, when placing the same words at the commencement of his Gospel, to carry back our minds to a more absolute conceivable "beginning," when the work of creation had not commenced, and when in the whole universe there was only God. A word plural in form, but joined with a verb singular, except when it refers to the false gods of the heathen, in which case it takes a verb plural. Its root-meaning is strength, power; and the form Elohim is not to be regarded as a pluralis majestatis, but as embodying the effort of early human thought in feeling after the Deity, and in arriving at the conclusion that the Deity was One. Thus, in the name Elohim it included in one Person all the powers, mights, and influences by which the world was first created and is now governed and maintained. In the Vedas, in the hymns recovered for us by the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, whether Accadian or Semitic, and in all other ancient religious poetry, we find these powers ascribed to different beings; in the Bible alone Elohim is one. Christians may also well see in this a foreshadowing of the plurality of persons in the Divine Trinity; but its primary lesson is that, however diverse may seem the working of the powers of nature, the Worker is one and His work one. It is quite possible, therefore, that the word bara, "he created," may originally have signified to hew stone or fell timber; but as a matter of fact it is a rare word, and employed chiefly or entirely in connection with the activity of God. As, moreover, "the heaven and the earth" can only mean the totality of all existent things, the idea of creating them out of nothing is contained in the very form of the sentence. Even in Genesis 1: The heaven and the earth. To the Hebrew this consisted of our one planet and the atmosphere surrounding it, in which he beheld the sun, moon, and stars. But it is one of the more than human qualities of the language of the Holy Scriptures that, while written by men whose knowledge was in accordance with their times, it does not contradict the increased knowledge of later times. Contemporaneous with the creation of the earth was the calling into existence, not merely perhaps of our solar system, but of that sidereal universe of which we form so small a part; but naturally in the Bible our attention is confined to that which chiefly concerns ourselves. Throughout the first account of creation Genesis 1: This word is strictly a plural of Eloah, which is used as the name of God only in poetry, or in late books like those of Nehemiah and Daniel. It is there an Aramaism, God in Syriac being Aloho, in Ohaldee Ellah, and in Arabic Allahu--all of which are merely dialectic varieties of the Hebrew Eloah, and are used constantly in the singular number. In poetry EJoah is sometimes employed with great emphasis, as, for instance, in Psalm The plural thus intensified the idea of the majesty and greatness of God; but besides this, it was the germ of the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Divine unity. In the second narrative Genesis 2: The spelling of the word Jehovah is debatable, as only the consonants J, h, v, h are certain, the vowels being those of the word Adonai Lord substituted for it by the Jews when reading it in the synagogue, the first vowel being a mere apology for a sound, and pronounced a or e, according to the nature of the consonant to which it is attached. The former has the analogy of several other proper names in its favour; the second the authority of Exodus 3: At the end of proper names the form it takes is Yahu, whence also Yah. We ought also to notice that the first consonant is really y; but two or three centuries ago j seems to have had the sound which we give to y now, as is still the case in German. But this is not a matter of mere pronunciation; there is a difference of meaning as well. Yahveh signifies "He who brings into existence;" Yehveh "He who shall be, or shall become;" what Jehovah may signify I do not know. We must further notice that the name is undoubtedly earlier than the time of Moses. At the date of the Exodus the v of the verb had been changed into y. Thus, in Exodus 3: The next fact is that the union of these two names--Jehovah-Elohim--is very unusual. In this short narrative it occurs twenty times, in the rest of the Pentateuch only once Exodus 9: Once, moreover, in Psalm 1: There must, therefore, be some reason why in this narrative this peculiar junction of the two names is so predominant. The usual answer is that in this section

God appears in covenant with man, whereas in Genesis 1: This is true, but insufficient; nor does it explain how Jehovah became the covenant name of God, and Elohim His generic title. Whatever be the right answer, we must expect to find it in the narrative itself. The facts are so remarkable, and the connection of the name Jehovah with this section so intimate, that if Holy Scripture is to command the assent of our reason we must expect to find the explanation of such peculiarities in the section wherein they occur. What, then, do we find? Nature without man was simply good; with man, creation had reached its goal. In this, the succeeding section, man ceases to be very good. Inferior creatures work by instinct, that is, practically by compulsion, and in subjection to rules and forces which control them. Man, as a free agent, attains a higher rank. He is put under law, with the power of obeying or disobeying it. God, who is the infinitely high and self-contained, works also by law, but it comes from within, from the perfectness of His own nature, and not from without, as must be the case with an imperfect being like man, whose duty is to strive after that which is better and more perfect. But as this likeness is a gift conferred upon him, and not inherent, the law must come with the gift, from outside, and not from himself; and it can come only from God. Thus, then, man was necessarily, by the terms of his creation, made subject to law, and without it there could have been no progress upward. But he broke the law, and fell. Was he, then, to remain for ever a fallen being, hiding himself away from his Maker, and with the bonds of duty and love, which erewhile bound him to his Creator, broken irremediably? Scarcely has the breach been made I before One steps in to fill it. The breach had been caused by a subtle foe, who had beguiled our first parents in the simplicity of their innocence; but in the very hour of their condemnation they are promised an avenger, who, after a struggle, shall crush the head of their enemy Genesis 3: Now this name, Y-h-v-h, in its simplest form Yehveh, means "He shall be," or "shall become. Paul tells us of a notable change in the language of the early Christians. Their solemn formula was Maran-atha, "Our Lord is come" 1Corinthians The Deliverer was no longer future, no longer "He who shall become," nor "He who shall be what He shall be. The faint ray of light which dawned in Genesis 3: Distinctly from the words of Eve, so miserably disappointed in their primary application: The hope was at first dim, distant, indistinct, but it was the foundation of all that was to follow. Prophets and psalmists were to tend and foster that hope, and make it clear and definite. But the germ of all their teaching was contained in that mystic four-lettered word, the tetragrammaton, Y-h-v-h. The name may have been popularly called Yahveh, though of this we have no proof; the Jews certainly understood by it Yehveh--"the coming One. The force of this letter prefixed to the root form of a Hebrew verb is to give it a future or indefinite sense; and I can find nothing whatsoever to justify the Assertion that Jehovah--to adopt the ordinary spelling--means "the existent One," and still less to attach to it a causal force, and explain it as signifying "He who calls into being. But in this section, in which the name occurs twenty times in the course of forty-six verses, there is a far deeper truth than Eve supposed. Jehovah Yehveh is simply "the coming One," and Eve probably attached no very definite idea to the words she was led to use. But here He is called Jehovah-Elohim, and the double name teaches us that the coming One, the future deliverer, is God, the very Elohim who at first created man. The unity, therefore, and connection between these two narratives is of the closest kind: Pulpit Commentary Verse 1. The formula, "And God said," with which each day opens, rather points to ver. Its plural form is to be explained neither as a remnant of polytheism Gesenius , nor as indicating a plurality of beings through whom the Deity reveals himself Baumgarten, Lange , nor as a plural of majesty Aben Ezra, Kalisch, Alford , like the royal "we" of earthly potentates, a usage which the best Hebraists affirm to have no existence in the Scriptures Macdonald , nor as a cumulative plural, answering the same purpose as a repetition of the Divine name Hengstenberg, Dreschler, and others ; but either 1 as a pluralis intensitatis, expressive of the fullness of the Divine nature, and the multiplicity of the Divine powers Delitzsch, Murphy, Macdonald ; or, 2 notwithstanding Calvin's dread of Sabellianism, as a pluralis trinitatis, intended to foreshadow the threefold personality of the Godhead Luther, Cocceius, Peter Lombard, Murphy, Candlish, etc. The suggestion of Tayler Lewis, that the term may be a contraction for El-Elohim, the God of all superhuman powers, is inconsistent with neither of the above interpretations That the Divine name should adjust itself without difficulty to all subsequent discoveries of the fullness of the Divine personality and nature is only what we should expect in a God-given revelation. Unless where it refers to the angels Psalm 8: Bara, one of three terms employed in this section, and in Scripture

generally, to describe the Divine activity; the other two being *yatzar*, "formed," and *asah*, "made" - both signifying to construct out of pre-existing materials cf. *Barn* is used exclusively of God. Though not necessarily involved in its significance, the idea of creation *ex nihilo* is acknowledged by the best expositors to be here intended. Its employment in *vers.* In the sense of producing what is new it frequently occurs in Scripture cf. Thus, according to the teaching of this venerable document, the visible universe neither existed from eternity, nor was fashioned out of pre-existing materials, nor proceeded forth as an emanation from the Absolute, but was summoned into being by an express creative *fiat*. The New Testament boldly claims this as a doctrine peculiar to revelation Hebrews Modern science explicitly disavows it as a discovery of reason. The heavens and the earth i. The earth and the heavens always mean the terrestrial globe with its aerial firmament. The earth here alluded to is manifestly not the dry land *ver.* The heavens are the rest of the universe. The Hebrews were aware of other heavens than the "firmament" or gaseous expanse which over-arches the earth. The fundamental idea associated with the term was that of height *shamayim*, literally, "the heights" - Gesenius, Furst. The Saxon thought of "the heaved-up arch. Though not anticipating modern astronomical discovery, he had yet enlarged conceptions of the dimensions of the stellar world Genesis The connection of the present verse with those which follow has been much debated. The proposal of Aben Ezra, adopted by Calvin, to read, "In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was" is grammatically inadmissible. Equally objectionable on the ground of grammar is the suggestion of Bunsen and Ewald, to connect the first verse with the third, and make the second parenthetical; while it is opposed to that simplicity of construction which pervades the chapter. The device of Drs. Buckland and Chalmers, so favorably regarded by some harmonists of Scripture and geology, to read the first verse as a heading to the whole section, is exploded by the fact that no historical narration can begin with "and. It is no exception, the second book of Moses being in reality a continuation of the first. Honest exegesis requires that *ver.* I shall be viewed as descriptive of the first of the series of Divine acts detailed in the chapter, and that *ver.* Matthew Henry Commentary 1: The faith of humble Christians understands this better than the fancy of the most learned men. From what we see of heaven and earth, we learn the power of the great Creator. And let our make and place as men, remind us of our duty as Christians, always to keep heaven in our eye, and the earth under our feet.

3: The Genesis of God

"Michael Whitworth has provided for the reading public a wonderful treatment of the Book of Genesis in his The Epic of www.enganchecubano.com is a scholarly yet simply and insightful treatment of familiar material we all would do well to study again with Michael.

Comparative mythology provides historical and cross-cultural perspectives for Jewish mythology. Both begin with a series of statements of what did not exist at the moment when creation began; the Enuma Elish has a spring in the sea as the point where creation begins, paralleling the spring on the land – Genesis 2 is notable for being a "dry" creation story in Genesis 2: At the same time, and as with Genesis 1, the Jewish version has drastically changed its Babylonian model: Eve, for example, seems to fill the role of a mother goddess when, in Genesis 4: The two share numerous plot-details e. This enraged Ninhursag, and she caused Enki to fall ill. Enki felt pain in his rib, which is a pun in Sumerian, as the word "ti" means both "rib" and "life". The other deities persuaded Ninhursag to relent. It was you that hacked Rahab in pieces, that pierced the Dragon! It was you that dried up the Sea, the waters of the great Deep, that made the abysses of the Sea a road that the redeemed might walk And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. This was made up of three levels, the habitable earth in the middle, the heavens above, an underworld below, all surrounded by a watery "ocean" of chaos as the Babylonian Tiamat. Above it was the firmament , a transparent but solid dome resting on the mountains, allowing men to see the blue of the waters above, with "windows" to allow the rain to enter, and containing the sun, moon and stars. The waters extended below the earth, which rested on pillars sunk in the waters, and in the underworld was Sheol , the abode of the dead. In the Enuma Elish , the "deep" is personified as the goddess Tiamat , the enemy of Marduk ; [42] here it is the formless body of primeval water surrounding the habitable world, later to be released during the Deluge , when "all the fountains of the great deep burst forth" from the waters beneath the earth and from the "windows" of the sky. Only when this is done does God create man and woman and the means to sustain them plants and animals. At the end of the sixth day, when creation is complete, the world is a cosmic temple in which the role of humanity is the worship of God. This parallels Mesopotamian myth the Enuma Elish and also echoes chapter 38 of the Book of Job , where God recalls how the stars, the "sons of God", sang when the corner-stone of creation was laid. And there was evening and there was morning, one day. God creates by spoken command and names the elements of the world as he creates them. In the ancient Near East the act of naming was bound up with the act of creating: And there was evening and there was morning, a second day. God does not create or make trees and plants, but instead commands the earth to produce them. The underlying theological meaning seems to be that God has given the previously barren earth the ability to produce vegetation, and it now does so at his command. God puts "lights" in the firmament to "rule over" the day and the night. According to Victor Hamilton, most scholars agree that the choice of "greater light" and "lesser light", rather than the more explicit "sun" and "moon", is anti-mythological rhetoric intended to contradict widespread contemporary beliefs that the sun and the moon were deities themselves. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day. After this first mention the word always appears as ha-adam, "the man", but as Genesis 1: The meaning of this is unclear: Having the spiritual qualities of God such as intellect, will, etc. Only later, after the Flood, is man given permission to eat flesh. The Priestly author of Genesis appears to look back to an ideal past in which mankind lived at peace both with itself and with the animal kingdom, and which could be re-achieved through a proper sacrificial life in harmony with God. This implies that the materials that existed before the Creation "tohu wa-bohu," "darkness," "tehom" were not "very good. In ancient Near Eastern literature the divine rest is achieved in a temple as a result of having brought order to chaos. Rest is both disengagement, as the work of creation is finished, but also engagement, as the deity is now present in his temple to maintain a secure and ordered cosmos. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto the LORD thy God, in it thou shalt not do any manner of work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore the

LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it. Eden may represent the divine garden on Zion , the mountain of God, which was also Jerusalem; while the real Gihon was a spring outside the city mirroring the spring which waters Eden ; and the imagery of the Garden, with its serpent and cherubs, has been seen as a reflection of the real images of the Solomonic Temple with its copper serpent the nehushtan and guardian cherubs. When God forbids the man to eat from the tree of knowledge he says that if he does so he is "doomed to die": Kenegdo means "alongside, opposite, a counterpart to him", and ezer means active intervention on behalf of the other person. Later, after the story of the Garden is complete, she receives a name: This means "living" in Hebrew, from a root that can also mean "snake".

4: Genesis In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

The message of Genesis is not confusing. The repetitive information throughout the rest of Scripture is consistent. The universe was created by an omnipotent, omniscient, and transcendent Being. The words of Scripture insist that God's work was recent, complete, and "good." Our struggle with.

The Bible succinctly addresses both origins and future events, credibly answering the three greatest questions whence? It marshals the full contingent of rhetorical instruments into a single message: The pathos of the crucifixion account is an event worthy of being the pinnacle of world history, that Omnipotence would submit to death at the hands of his own creation! The resurrection of the founder and the message of salvation by faith apart from human works stand in stark contrast to every other religious system known. But to fully appreciate the weight of the evidence, one must dig deeper than this. There are several lines of reasoning that give testimony to the fact that the Bible is the Word of God. They can be generally grouped into five broad topics, each of which deserves a great deal more attention than is currently given here. The Bible is unique in preparation, circulation, translation, and preservation. The Bible was written over a period of 1, years by a great variety of men who were inspired of God. From the king of Babylon writing in Chaldean to the humble prophet of Samaria; from an educated doctor writing in Greek to the beautiful lyrics composed by a Hebrew shepherd in the field; from a statesman born in ancient Egypt to a fisherman of the Roman era; it is difficult to conceive of a more diverse group! Writing any volume of such length and being in compete harmony would indeed be a wonder, much less dealing with a topic so controversial as religion. No book in the history of the world has been as widely circulated as the scripture. Every year it outsells all of the top best-sellers and it has now been translated into over 1, different languages. The noted French infidel Voltaire was convinced that he could destroy Christianity and the Bible. After Voltaire moved on, the residence was occupied by the Tronchin family. Discoveries of hundreds of copies of the ancient texts from a millennium before Christ reveal the remarkable preservation of the message throughout time. The Bible is also unique in message and influence. So either He was divine, or he was a deceitful impostor, or he was pathetically self-deluded. Great men the world over have sought to plummet the message of the scriptures. From common people with no formal education to the brightest minds in the scientific world, most have found intellectual challenge and many have come to know spiritual fulfillment in the message of this unique book. Not only have many of the locations and traditions that are mentioned in the Bible been confirmed by field workers in the Middle East and researchers that study ancient histories, but specific events cited have often been shown to match in great detail. Associates for Biblical Research has extensively excavated Jericho. While an invading army would typically ram the walls inward upon the debris, the Bible declares that God caused the walls to fall flat so that the Israelites could go straight in. Skeptics once believed that the book of Daniel was in error when it discussed Belshazzar ruling Babylon. The dynasties were revealed on cuneiform tablets excavated from ancient Babylon and Belshazzar did not appear on the list. He could do no more since he was only second himself. Sir William Ramsey is regarded as one of the greatest archaeologists ever to have lived. Skeptical of the authorship and accuracy of the gospels and Acts, Ramsey set out to investigate. Making predictions in the Old Testament era was no light matter. The penalty for failing the test was death. McDowell presents 61 specific prophecies that were clearly fulfilled in Christ. His birthplace, the flight to Egypt, His ancestry, the slaughter of the innocents, His being preceded by a messenger, the ministry starting in Galilee, His teaching with parables, His entry into Jerusalem on a colt, His betrayal by a friend, the 30 pieces of silver, His death upon a tree, the garments parted and lots cast, the gall and vinegar offered, His side pierced but no bones broken, the darkness over the land, and His burial with the rich, and His resurrection. These are not common predictions that have decent odds of happening. No other religion in the world even makes a pretense that its founder is still alive, yet the prophets predicted the resurrection Psalm Many of the Old Testament prophecies like Malachi 3: It was destroyed in A. Indeed, there was a narrow historical window in which the Messiah could come. For it was determined in Genesis That is why they had to appeal to Pilate in John Biblical prophecies with regard to ancient cities is equally remarkable. Skeptics have suggested that a message of

impending doom spoken against an ancient city must come true eventually. Contemplate just a few of them: Among the several specific predictions with regard to ancient Edom are those in Ezekiel This is a daunting series of prophecies, particularly when one considers that Petra, the capital of Edom, was one of the wonders of the ancient world—literally a city carved into a mountain and the Jews were in bondage when the prophecy was made! Yet under the Maccabean era the resurgent Israelites pillaged Edom. In dramatic fulfillment the Edomite empire was finally destroyed right up to the city of Teman. Only Teman, or Maan was left and survives still today. When the capital city of Petra was rediscovered to the chagrin of critics who maintained that the Edomite civilization was mythical , it was found to be a ghost town, inhabited only by eagles, scorpions and other wild creatures. By way of contrast, one can consider the prophecies against Moab and Ammon. Though in Ezekiel Indeed these cities are in existence and thriving today. One is hard-pressed to find superlatives to sufficiently convey the splendor of ancient Babylon. The outer wall was over feet high and wide enough to race 8 chariots abreast! Upon entering one of the one hundred solid brass gates, the visitor would be struck with the majesty of the hanging gardens, massive palaces, exquisite temples, and flowing Euphrates. The prophets foretelling its demise is akin to someone today forecasting the utter desolation of London or New York. But more than that, Isaiah This has indeed come to pass. But interestingly, Jeremiah While the Bedouins avoid the old city of Babylon, archaeological activity has been ongoing since many interesting ruins of the dead city remain. In Ezekiel 26 the prophet details the destruction that will befall Tyre. Let us note the specificity: Nebuchanezzar attempted to subdue proud Tyre but because the inhabitants of this seacoast city all abandoned Tyre proper to escape to the large island fortress off the coast, he never looted its treasury or conquered its royalty. His destruction of the mainland portion of Tyre certainly fulfills verses which apply to him. The dramatic fulfillment of the prophesied judgment was not completed in Nebuchanezzar since the inhabitants outlasted him on their Alcatraz-like island. When Alexander the Great came through to conquer Tyre, the citizens tried the same trick—evacuating for the island fortress. Alexander took a cue from the failure of Nebuchanezzar. He took ALL of the debris from the city of Tyre literally scraping it bare , built a causeway out to the island, and proceeded to demolish it, selling the surviving inhabitants into slavery. Attempts were made to rebuild Tyre and it was again destroyed. The modern city called Tyre was NOT constructed on the ancient mainland site. In fact the ancient plot is largely barren rock somewhere inland from the modern construction , and has quite literally been used by local fishermen to lay out their nets! They all came true in the minutest detail. A most remarkable Old Testament prophecy has been fulfilled in the modern era. In keeping with the warning of Leviticus From the destruction of Jerusalem in A. It would seem highly unlikely that the Jews would remain distinct as a people, having no country and every motivation to intermarry and escape the stigma. Yet this Biblical prophecy has been completely fulfilled in recent history. From a population of only 20, identifiable Palestinian Jews in , the modern reemergence of the Israeli nation has swelled that number to 6 million Jews. No other nation has been similarly reborn. As a prophet Himself, Jesus Christ made numerous predictions. It would seem superfluous that an invading army would go to the trouble of moving all the foundation boulders. But when the Romans burned the Temple during their AD 70 conquest of Jerusalem, all the wealth of gold melted and ran down between the giant stones. Thus all the stones were overturned to get at the gold. Jesus predicted in vs That was a command it would seem impossible for a motley group of followers of an itinerant preacher in the obscure nation to do. How could they go through all the world spreading His teachings and getting people to believe the incredible story of his death and resurrection? Yet they have done just that. Interestingly, even the advent of the modern skeptical era with a worldview based upon uniformitarianism was foretold in the scriptures see II Peter 3: One must always be cautious against using circular reasoning such that scientific theories are enlightened by the scripture and then those theories are used to show that the scriptures are reliable. But quite aside from the evidence for controversial theories like special creation, or the co-existence of men and dinosaurs; there are a number of rather startling statements in the Bible which appear to be far more advanced than the scientific knowledge at the time of writing. Moreover, there has never been an irreconcilable discrepancy between scientific facts or laws and the scriptures. Hippocrates, before the invention of the telescope charted and numbered 1, stars. Kepler later recounted and revised the number. Today scientists agree with Jeremiah. There

are billions just in our galaxy! It is interesting that the Bible makes the number of stars roughly equivalent to the number of grains of sand on the seashore Genesis Carl Sagan also compared these two, leaning towards the number of stars being greater. Amazingly, the latest estimates of the gross number of sand grains are comparable to the modern estimated number of stars in the universe! Note that darkness is in a place but light is in a way. It travels a path.

5: Genesis 1, King James Version (KJV) | The Bible App

The Deity (God) BACK; NEXT ; Figure Analysis. The Big Other. The Guy Upstairs. The Top Dog. The Power That Be. Creator. Judge. Father. Whatever it is that comes to your mind when you think of "God," chances are Genesis will offer you a few surprises.

Documentary hypothesis Building the Ark watercolor circa 1850 by James Tissot The flood is part of what scholars call the Primeval history , the first 11 chapters of Genesis. Flood myth The flood myth originated in Mesopotamia. Seeing that the earth was corrupt and filled with violence, God instructed Noah to build an ark in which he, his sons, and their wives, together with male and female of all living creatures, would be saved from the waters. Noah entered the ark in his six hundredth year, and on the 17th day of the 2nd month of that year "the fountains of the Great Deep burst apart and the floodgates of heaven broke open" and rain fell for forty days and forty nights until the highest mountains were covered 15 cubits, and all life perished except Noah and those with him in the ark. The punishment that overtook them was befitting their crime. As their sensual desires had made them hot, and inflamed them to immoral excesses, so they were chastised by means of heated water. Then Noah built an altar and made a sacrifice, and God made a covenant with Noah that man would be allowed to eat every living thing but not its blood, and that God would never again destroy all life by a flood. Jesus and the apostles additionally taught on the Genesis flood narrative in New Testament writing Matt Some Christian biblical scholars suggest that the flood is a picture of salvation in Christ - the ark was planned by God and there is only one way of salvation through the door of the ark, akin to one way of salvation through Christ [25] [26]. Additionally, some scholars commenting on the teaching of the apostle Peter 1 Peter 3: Christian scholars also highlight that 1 Peter 3: However, Catholic schools almost always teach evolution in science classes. As he was building it, the chieftains passed him and mocked him. The acknowledgement of this follows closely the development of understanding of the natural history and especially the geology and paleontology of the planet. Many attempts have been made to place this time-span to a specific date in history. Flood geology and Scriptural geologist The development of scientific geology had a profound impact on attitudes towards the biblical flood narrative. By bringing into question the biblical chronology , which placed the Creation and the Flood in a history which stretched back no more than a few thousand years, the concept of deep geological time undermined the idea of the historicity of the ark itself. In the English theologian and natural scientist William Buckland interpreted geological phenomena as Reliquiae Diluvianae: Louis Agassiz subsequently explained such deposits as the results of glaciation. The scientific community regards flood geology as pseudoscience because it contradicts a variety of facts in geology, stratigraphy, geophysics, physics, paleontology , biology, anthropology, and archeology. Scientific analysis refutes the key tenets of flood geology, which, as an idea, is in contradiction to scientific consensus. In relation to geological forces, uniformitarianism holds that the shaping of the Earth has occurred by means of mostly slow-acting forces that can be seen in operation today. In general, there is a lack of any evidence for any of the above effects proposed by flood geologists, and scientists do not take their claims of fossil-layering seriously. The obvious answer involved mankind spreading over the continents following the destruction of the Tower of Babel and taking animals along, yet some of the results seemed peculiar. In Sir Thomas Browne wondered why the natives of North America had taken rattlesnakes with them, but not horses: However, biblical scholars of the time, such as Justus Lipsius 1605 and Athanasius Kircher c. 1650. The resulting hypotheses provided an important impetus to the study of the geographical distribution of plants and animals, and indirectly spurred the emergence of biogeography in the 18th century. Natural historians began to draw connections between climates and the animals and plants adapted to them. One influential theory held that the biblical Ararat was striped with varying climatic zones, and as climate changed, the associated animals moved as well, eventually spreading to repopulate the globe. Less than a century later, discoveries of new species made it increasingly difficult to justify a literal interpretation for the Ark story.

6: A Walk Through the Book of Genesis | www.enganchecubano.com

About Genesis Translated as 'origin' from the Greek word, the Book of Genesis tells us how everything began from humanity's history to the world we know today. One could call this the 'problem statement' for humanity, one the rest of the Bible will be answering.

Login Genesis Category: A group of biblical books that have a similar literary genre or main themes and have been placed together as a major section of the Bible. The first five books of the Old Testament that recount the foundation story of the Israelites, their covenant with God, and their role in human history. A unique style of writing that follows recognized literary conventions and language patterns. A story sequence in which characters are placed in a setting and involved in a developing plotline. A narrative that is intentionally placed in an ambiguous historical setting in order to make larger claims about the nature of reality and human purpose. Contents God makes a good world and commissions humans to rule it, and then they give in to evil and ruin everything. Torah Series Part I God makes a good world and installs humans as its rulers. Humanity rebels and ends up ruling the world in a destructive way, leading to violence, death, and the founding of the city of Babylon. He does this by passing down a covenant blessing through Abraham and his family, including Isaac, Jacob, and other individuals, in order to bless all the families of the earth. These descendants will become the foundation for the Nation of Israel and Jesus the Messiah who will bring salvation for all of humanity. He creates humans in His own Image, then rests. Everything He made is good. Garden of Eden God puts Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, depicting a perfect environment and relationship with God, and blesses them to rule the earth and create like He does. The Rebellion God gives humans the ability to choose. A serpent tempts them to disobey God and sin contaminates humanity and creation. God prophesies redemption for humans. The Flood Humans populate and become exceptionally corrupt. Heartbroken, God floods the whole earth. Noah builds an ark and is spared. God reinstates His covenant with Noah. Scattering of Nations People repopulate, create Babylon, and desire a great tower to make themselves famous. God scatters and confuses them with different languages before it is built. Read Scripture Part I.

7: In Defense of the Genesis Flood - Capturing Christianity

Answer: Genesis refers to the sons of God and the daughters of men. There have been several suggestions as to who the sons of God were and why the children they had with daughters of men grew into a race of giants (that is what the word Nephilim seems to indicate).

I especially dislike the introduction that goes like this: It does need an introduction. Derek Kidner says of this book, There can scarcely be another part of Scripture over which so many battles, theological, scientific, historical and literary, have been fought, or so many strong opinions cherished. For this reason, we must devote our attention to some introductory matters. Traditionally, Moses has been held to be the author of Genesis over the centuries. A number of inferential evidences favor this conclusion. Other New Testament writers follow this same approach Acts 3: It is therefore hard not to conclude that Moses wrote all the Pentateuch, in spite of no one air-tight statement to this effect. Critics have not been content with this conclusion, however. Generally the four primary sources are referred to as J, E, D, and P. Several lines of evidence are given to support the Graf-Wellhausen or Documentary hypothesis. First would be the different names which are employed for God. Secondly, we are pointed to different expressions referring to some act, such as that of making a covenant. This leaves the author with no opportunity for stylistic change or for a change in the nuance of a word. One would hate to write under such restrictions today. First, it is based upon the very thin ice of conjecture of scholars who are supposedly better informed than the authors of old; and secondly, it has placed most of the emphasis upon the isolation of fragments and their authors, rather than upon the interpretation of the text itself. Thus, we must agree with the conclusion of Sir Charles Marston: They have made Old Testament study unattractive, they have wasted our time, and they have warped and confused our judgments on outside evidence. It has been assumed that they possessed some sort of prescriptive right and authority superior to the Sacred Text. In the clearer light that Science is casting, these shadows that have dimmed our days of study and devotion are silently stealing away. The first eleven chapters focus upon the ever widening ruin of man, fallen from his created perfection and coming under the judgment of the Creator. The first division of the book, chapters , can be summarized by four major events: The last division of Genesis, chapters , can be remembered by its four main characters: While there are more complicated schemes for the book, this simple outline should assist you to think in terms of the book as a whole. Every incident, every chapter should be understood as it contributes to the argument of the book. The Importance of the Book of Genesis A surveyor must always begin from a point of reference. So, too, history must start at some definite place of beginnings. The Bible is, through and through, a historical revelation. As such, it must have a beginning. The book of Genesis gives us our historical point of reference, from which all subsequent revelation proceeds. Also, we find the foundation of our theology. Sidlow Baxter has written, The other writings of the Bible are inseparably bound up with it inasmuch as it gives us the origin and initial explanation of all that follows. The major themes of Scripture may be compared to great rivers, ever deepening and broadening as they flow; and it is true to say that all these rivers have their rise in the watershed of Genesis. Or, to use an equally appropriate figure, as the massive trunk and wide-spreading branches of the oak are in the acorn, so, by implication and anticipation, all Scripture is in Genesis. Here we have in germ all that is later developed. This doctrine attempts to define the phenomena which occurs in the process of divine revelation. Essentially initial revelation is general while subsequent revelation tends to be more particular and specific. Let me try to illustrate progressive revelation by an examination of the doctrine of redemption. The first promise of redemption is definite but largely undefined in Genesis 3: Literally hundreds of prophecies tell in greater detail, the coming of the Messiah. The striking realization is that Genesis and the Pentateuch contain the broad outlines of virtually every major area of theology. For those of us who tend to lose our sense of perspective between fundamental and incidental truths, a study of Genesis will tend to remind us of those areas of theology which are most fundamental and foundational. Genesis also sheds light on contemporary events. The bitter struggle which is currently going on in the Middle East is explained in the book of Genesis. Abram, who wanted to help God along with His plan, took matters into his own hands. The Arabs of today

claim to have descended from Ishmael. For some this material is simply a Jewish myth, having no more historical validity for modern man than the Epic of Gilgamesh or the stories of Zeus. For others it forms a pre-scientific vision that no one who respects the results of scholarship can accept. Still others find the story symbolic but no more. Some accept the early chapters of Genesis as revelation in regard to an upper-story, religious truth, but allow any sense of truth in regard to history and the cosmos science to be lost. I would like to mention three methods of interpretation which we must avoid. Neo-orthodox theologians are willing to grant that the Bible contains truth, but will not go so far as to accept it as the truth. They suspect that throughout its transmission down through the ages it has become something less than inspired and inerrant. These untrue accretions which have become mixed with biblical truth must be exposed and expunged. This process is referred to as demythologizing Scripture. The great difficulty is that man determines what is truth and what is fiction. Man is no longer under the authority of the Word, but is the authority over the Word. A second method of interpretation is called the allegorical approach. This method is barely one step removed from demythologizing. The application may differ, but the interpretation, never! Closely related to the allegorical method of interpretation is the typological approach. No one questions that the Bible contains types. Some of these types are clearly designated as such in the New Testament Rom 5: Other types can hardly be questioned, while not specifically labeled as such. For example, Joseph seems to be a clear type of Christ. While the meaning of such interpretation may be one that conforms to Scripture or may be taught elsewhere, there is no way to prove or disprove the type. The more spiritual one is the more types he or she seems to find. And who can question them? But in this search for types, the plain and simple interpretation is obscured or overlooked. Let us exercise great caution here. I would like to suggest that we approach the book of Genesis as the book presents itself to us. I believe the first verse makes clear the way we must approach the entire work. The mood is authoritative and declarative. The claim implied by this verse is much like that of our Lord when He presented Himself to men. There is no middle ground, no riding the fence with Jesus. Jesus does not deserve mere courtesy. He demands a crown or a cross. So it is with this verse. We dare not call it good literature. It claims authority and veracity. From this verse one should either read on, expecting a revelation from God in this book, or he should set it aside as mere religious rhetoric. Let us remember that no one witnessed the creation: Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth! Tell Me, if you have understanding, who set its measurements, since you know? Or who stretched the line on it? Or where were its bases sunk? Or who laid its cornerstone, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? There are only two viable options as to where Genesis 1: If it is the former, we should value it only as a work of antiquity, on the same level as other ancient cosmogonies. If the latter, we must come on bended knee, willing to hear and obey it as an authoritative word from God. This view of Genesis as divine revelation, the historical account of our origins, is that of the remainder of the Scriptures. To Him who made the heavens with skill, for His lovingkindness is everlasting; to Him who spread out the earth above the waters, for His lovingkindness is everlasting; to Him who made the great Lights, for His lovingkindness is everlasting; the sun to rule by day, for His lovingkindness is everlasting, the moon and stars to rule by night, for His lovingkindness is everlasting Psalm The One forming light and creating darkness, causing well-being and creating calamity; I am the Lord who does all these. It is I who made the earth, and created man upon it. I stretched out the heavens with My hands, and I ordained all their host. For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve. And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression I Tim 2: Our Approach to the Book of Genesis We will therefore come to the book of Genesis as divine revelation. We shall endeavor to interpret the book literally, in the light of the culture and customs of its day.

8: Are there two different creation accounts in Genesis 1 and 2

The author of Genesis was not intending to show a distinction between the image of God in Adam and the image of Adam's descendants, but rather their similarity. Just as Adam and Eve were made in the image of God, so also, all their descendants also bear the image of God.

This is one of those rare photos that Cameron did not take. It came with the theme. Conversations about science and religion inevitably get around to the Genesis flood. Behind the topic of evolution, the flood depicted in Genesis is probably the most common topic in the science and religion discussion. After all, the evidence for a global flood is, quite frankly, nonexistent. Yet many read Genesis as committing Christians to a global flood. Does Genesis depict a global flood? If so, are Christians committed to either believing in a global flood or believing that the Bible erred? What does it mean to write in defense of the Genesis flood? We will first set the context of the Lost World Series. Then, we will look at the position Longman and Walton take on this issue. Finally, we will briefly summarize other aspects of the book. In the introduction, the underlying concepts of the Lost World series are laid out: Point 5 is especially important here. Walton, in particular, has emphasized the importance of speech act theory for understanding biblical authority. Simply put, there are three acts in speech act theory: A locutionary act is simply the utterance. The illocutionary act is what you are doing with the utterance promising, commanding, and so on. The perlocutionary act is the effect the speaking is hoping to accomplish. There are a number of debates about and within speech act theory, but this overview should be sufficient. With this as the background, we will now look at how they handle the flood. That is why reading the text against the ancient Near Eastern background is so important: This is because the text is written within a certain cognitive environment that culturally conditions the flood tradition and rhetorically shapes global language the description. To put it another way, the human author is not intending to teach that there really was a global flood. Instead, that is part of his culturally conditioned and rhetorically shaped environment. The author may have even believed in a global flood, but that does not entail that he is authoritatively teaching such a view. Here an example might help: Only what the authors teach, their illocutionary acts, are authoritative. This does not entail a denial of biblical inerrancy because inerrancy has traditionally been attached to what the Bible affirms. Under this view, since the author does not intend to affirm and teach a global flood it is assumed, whether there was a global flood or not is immaterial. Thus, to write in defense of the Genesis flood does not mean writing in defense of a global flood. This does not entail that therefore the text has no purpose. Instead, the interpretation of the event is authoritative. Here one might rightfully worry that Longman and Walton are working with a rather limited view of speech act theory. Paul Maxwell points out that speech act theory can be reductive. While I do not see this as a limitation of speech act theory itself, it can be a limitation of its proponents. For instance, Longman and Walton point out that there is no flood story from Egypt. So their argument seems too quick. As stated, this objection is not solid by any means. Nonetheless, it is certainly an issue that must be wrestled with. Where there are variations within the cultures that make up the culture at large, discerning the line between culturally conditioned and taking a stand on a debated issue can be tricky. It seems to me that more work should be devoted to this area. Moving forward, though, Longman and Walton do believe that the author intended to refer to a real event in the real past. Thus, they do affirm that there is some event concerning a flood that is authoritatively taught. The makeup of that flood, however, is not authoritatively taught. A few points are used to weigh in this direction. First, Genesis does use figurative language like metaphor and hyperbole. They start with examples we would all agree on: God opening the eyes of Adam and Eve Gen. The Bible also uses hyperbole to describe historical events. They mention that Joshua seems to indicate that the Israelites conquered all of the land while Joshua 13 highlights all of the land yet to be conquered. With these two points as background, they argue that the flood account also uses hyperbolic language. They argue that a real event was rhetorically shaped with cosmic proportions, in line with other ancient Near Eastern literature. Hyperbole permeates the flood. They also argue that the ark dimensions were hyperbolic. Since there is no boat even close in size from the ancient world, they believe that the readers would have seen the dimensions as hyperbole because of the size and the fact that the

boat would not be seaworthy. The flood itself is also hyperbolic because it is depicted as global. Here Longman and Walton argue that the biblical depiction is of a global flood. The pervasiveness of human sin, God regretting making human beings, the flood as an act of re-creation, the need to take animals, the size of the boat, the descriptions of where the water comes from, and the description of the height of the waters all point to a global flood. Thus, the Bible does depict a global, not a local, flood. They believe that what is authoritative is the illocutionary act of the human author, what the author is intending to teach. The author does intend to teach about a real event in a real past. However, the description of this event is laden with the cultural milieu and rhetorical conventions of the time. Thus, the flood is portrayed as a global flood, but this is in line with the figurative language that we find throughout Genesis and within the flood narrative. Given this, the authoritative teaching is not about the global dimensions of the flood, but about the interpretation of this event. This takes us to a summary of the rest of the book. Interpretation, Science, and the Flood After surveying the other flood traditions and comparing and contrasting the biblical account with them, Longman and Walton move on to talking about how the flood is interpreted. This is important because their goal is constructive, not simply destructive. That is, they are not simply ruling out that we need to believe in a global flood, they also want to talk about what the text does authoritatively teach and mean. Along these lines, they talk about two interpretations. The first is one that is well-known and often taken: They also lay out a second view. This view focuses on the themes of order, nonorder, and disorder. The emphasis falls on divine presence. The overall thrust, then, would be about how God brings order through the covenant after the nonordered water wipes out the disorder caused by human sin. Against this background, Longman and Walton provide another reading for the sons of God narrative in Genesis 6: This is for three reasons. First, genealogies often move forward in time before the narrative then goes back to where the story was. Third, the sons of God see the daughters of men as good, the same language found in Genesis 1 and 3. Thus, the interbreeding of the sons of God and daughters of men is not the cause of the flood. Instead, the sons of God represent a quasi-presence of God that actually increases disorder. Finally, they turn their attention to the tower of Babel. Thus, it is not about ascending up to God, but about constructing sacred space that God uses to come down. Along the way, Longman and Walton discuss many points in the biblical text. The book ends by thinking about the flood. They again emphasize that the flood has a real event behind it, although we might not be able to identify this event and should not be dogmatic in doing so. Therefore, writing in defense of the Genesis flood means we should affirm a real event in the past that must fit certain specifications, but it does not mean we need to be able to definitively identify that event. As an example that would qualify, they mention the Black Sea deluge hypothesis. Their point is not that this hypothesis is correct or the event that stands behind the Genesis flood, it simply serves as the type of event that would qualify. Moshier contributes a chapter arguing that geology does not support a worldwide flood. They further argue that flood stories from around the world do not prove a worldwide flood. Finally, they discuss how science can purify our religion and religion can purify our science. Taking Stock We have seen that Longman and Walton are not denying inerrancy. They believe their view is perfectly consistent with what evangelicals have affirmed about inerrancy. After all, inerrancy is about what the Bible affirms, and they argue that the author is not intending to teach a global flood. Instead, while a global flood is depicted, this is because of the cultural conditioned and rhetorical shaped nature of the author and the text. The author does teach that there was a real flood in the real past, but the depiction of this flood as global is not authoritative. Therefore, the scientific evidence that poses a problem for a global flood does not pose a problem for biblical inerrancy. They go on to see the flood narrative in terms of two different interpretations.

9: Who were the sons of God and daughters of men in Genesis ?

The Genesis creation narrative is the creation myth of both Judaism and Christianity. The narrative is made up of two stories, roughly equivalent to the first two chapters of the Book of Genesis.

Are there two different creation accounts in Genesis 1 and 2? The first five books of the Bible were compiled by the same author, this includes Genesis. What God told Moses he wrote. He did not write anything God did not tell him to write. How did the writer Moses know what happened before man appeared? God revealed the past, as He reveals the future to the prophets. It is always important to pay attention to details of any Scripture, especially the creation account in Genesis 1 and 2. These are not two contradictory accounts of creation. Genesis 1 covers the six days of creation. God pronounced it good at the completion of the sixth day. Genesis 2, from verse 4 onward, is a looking into the details of the events of Day 6, the origin of the human race. These accounts are not contradictory. Genesis two gives us the details missing from Genesis 1. God, who calls the things that are not, as though they were. It is in Genesis 2 that God is called YHWH Elohim, identifying him as the self-existent one creator of both the heavens plural and the earth. The earth becomes the center of His plan and the sun, moon and stars are created in reference to the earth. Then the first words God spoke, "Let there be light"; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. Each of the six days begins the same way: And God said as an introduction, v. The sequence of days began in darkness which is called night. The light that appears before the sun, is not sunlight. This light is not to be confused with the establishment of the sun, moon, and stars. The main objection is that there is light prior to the sun as if God cannot produce another source of light without the sun. This is a unique light that provides light for the first three days until the luminaries of day sun and night moon appear on the fourth day. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made. Instead it is summarizing what is already written in chapter 1 with the completion of God resting Gen. Genesis 2 is not a day by day report in sequence. If so then it would make no sense from this opening statement of its completion. Genesis two is a more detailed explanation of the sixth day; the day that Adam and Eve were made. The detailed recap is stated in Gen. The Hebrew word for day is yom, it refers to a period of time in distinction from yom day with a numeral, which means a twenty-four-hour day 1, day 2 etc. Verse 4 is an introduction to the man and woman in the Garden of Eden that extends to Genesis 4: Or that there were two races of man, the first perished and God started all over. Genesis 2 does not say anything about the creation of the earth, the creation of the sun, moon, and stars, the creation of sea creatures; yet these are not different accounts. Reading the text carefully makes it clear Gen. It starts with a reference to the condition of the earth 2: It appears to contradict Genesis 1: But this is not a contradiction, Genesis 1: Verse 5 onward is specifically describing the Garden of Eden where there are no plants within as yet. God is developing the place where Adam and Eve will live. The context of v. As it states in Gen 2: In Genesis we have what is called the Law of Recurrence. Chapter 2, the 2nd block goes into more detail of the earlier segment. This produces a pattern when put together fits perfectly with both records. In chapter 1 of Genesis, the whole creation is described in sequential order of events but in chapter 2, the author takes portions of chapter one and adds in the details of certain portions he focuses on. After God made the material part of man, He breathed the breath of life into him and he then became a living soul Gen. This portion explains the material part of man originated with the dust of the ground but the life of man comes from God. Man is unique as a living soul. The separation of the immaterial results in the material part of man becoming dead Psalm He then instructs him about what trees to eat from and which to not eat from. Before God makes him a helper on the 6th day he brings all the creatures to Adam to name all the animals and birds V. And whatever Adam called each living creature, that was its name. So Adam gave names to all cattle, to the birds of the air, and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him. It is not saying these animals were made after Adam- as if giving a sequence of events, but only how they were made as it reflects back and builds on the Genesis one account. The animals and man were both created on the

6th day but they were made before man, as it says in Genesis 1: What we see is the woman was in the mind of God, before God made her from Adam. That is an important concept, from the standpoint of typology as we learn in the New Testament of Christ and the church, as well as from the standpoint of humanity and the family unit. God formed Adam out of the dust of the ground Adamah. Eve was made from the rib of Adam also from the dust same material as Adam, just twice removed. Chapter 2 fills in the details. Both man and woman are included -the details of how woman is taken from man and given back to him in marriage is described in chapter 2: And God blessed them, and God said to them three things: What is focused on is man being alone without a mate, this is not giving a sequential order but making an overall statement of how he was given a wife. Another example is -Gen. The tree of life was also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Again adding the details to the first block of Scripture Gen 2: And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat;" but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die. And the rest is history. Articles can be reproduced in portions for ones personal use. Any other use is to have the permission of Let Us Reason Ministries first. We love hearing the testimonies and praise reports. We are here to help those who have questions on Bible doctrine, new teachings and movements. Unfortunately we cannot answer every email. Our time is valuable just as yours is, please keep in mind, we only have time to answer sincere inquiries from those who need help. For those who have another point of view, we will answer emails that want to engage in authentic dialogue, not in arguments. We will use discretion in answering any letters.

Adair on Leadership (Business Action Pocketbooks) Plant Resistance to Viruses Broadcast Engineering and Maintenance Handbook Roger Tappens simply elegant cookbook. Pioneering Feminist Anthropology in Egypt Fighting to win the spiritual battle Political poems, &c. Ludwig Tieck and Dante Human rights of prisoners The court martial of Robert E. Lee Architects Essentials of Cost Management (The Architects Essentials of Professional Practice) Cold Night Beauty Mel Bays Complete Book of Exercises for the Pianist California mechanics lien law handbook Making of champions Engineering circuit analysis solution manual 8th edition Fat a cultural history of obesity The Ultimate Guide to Skinning and Tanning The great serpent in eastern North America George E. Lankford The Venture Brothers Country of Unshielded Boundary .21 The green sicknesse The becoming of becoming : what can philosophy do for organization theory? Martin Brigham. Wanda the Witch and the Magical Maze Table of Participles. Introduction : changing times and generations The biology and molecular genetics of lung cancer Formation of econometrics RELAP5/MOD3.2 post test calculation of the PKL-experiment PKLIII-B4.3 The development of feminist theology in Latin America A Gangin Fits Aye Getting (Lythway Large Print) Gospel of filth Political economy of monopoly Kubr management consulting a guide to the profession Land Law (Lawcards) Piazzolla oblivion oboe piano Linking quality and quantity Father of my heart Object-oriented client/server application development American pragmatism : James J.E Tiles