

Lecture Outline 3: The Historicity of the Pentateuch; Creation

Beginning of Lecture 3

I. Introduction

- A. Faith is not “believing something that you know isn’t true.”
 - 1. You can use your brain.
 - 2. You can do research.
 - 3. You can listen to critics.
- B. *Time* magazine article, “Is the Bible Fact or Fiction?” December 18, 1995
- C. Comprehensive list of archaeological discoveries that have conclusively disproved some part of the Bible:
 - 1. There are none.

II. Abraham

- A. Some scholars say there is no proof; no Ancient Near Eastern text (other than the Bible) refers to Abraham
 - 1. What do they expect? An inscription that says, “*Dear Sarah: I think you’re gorgeous even though you’re 90! Happy Birthday. Hugs and kisses, Abraham?*”
 - 2. The chances of finding anything that Abraham wrote are miniscule.
- B. Haran
 - 1. Abraham went from Ur to Haran in about 2000 B.C.
 - 2. Everyone agrees where Haran was.
 - 3. Could this story have been invented around 1000 BC, as some scholars claim?
 - 4. Haran was a commercial center exactly at the time of Abraham, but from 1800-700 B. C. it was unoccupied.
- C. Ur of the Chaldeans
 - 1. Not all evangelicals agree with Dr. Hugenberger’s explanation (last lecture).
 - a. Kenneth Kitchen says Abram left southern Ur, and Genesis 15 is a case of updating a name.
 - b. Just like Dan, which was originally called Laish
 - 2. Dr. Hugenberger believes Abram came from the northern Ur (in Chaldea) mentioned in inscriptions from Ebla.

III. Names

- A. You can tell just by listening to names like “Capability” and “Hephzibah” what century they come from.
- B. “Abraham” is just the kind of name you’d expect for a man living in the time the Bible says he did. cf. Kitchen, Kenneth A. *The Bible in its World. The Bible and Archaeology Today*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press; and Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- C. “Ishmael,” “Isaac,” “Joseph,” or “Jacob” are Amorite Imperfective names.

1. A study of 6000 names from about 1800 B.C. found that 16% were Amorite Imperfectives
 2. In 1300 B.C. (~ Moses) only 2% of the names were Amorite Imperfectives.
 3. By 1000 B.C., in a study of 5000 names, only 0.25% were Amorite Imperfectives – this is the time when JEP and D were supposedly writing.
 4. In Genesis 16–50, by Dr. Hugenberger's count, there are 24 names of major descendants of Abraham. Of these, 4 are Amorite Imperfective names (16%).
- D. Doing research to find out what kinds of names were used hundreds of years ago to use in your historical novel is a very modern phenomenon.

IV. Camels

- A. Some scholars have claimed that camels were not domesticated until about 1000 B.C., and that the mention of domesticated camels in the Abraham story proves that they were a late invention.
- B. Recent discoveries of texts from Alalakh (18th century B.C.), ancient Babylon, and a Sumerian text from Nippur indicate domestication of camels as early as the third millennium B.C.
- C. Sites in Meggido, Ta'anach, and Jericho, from 2500 B.C. have human bones and camel bones together in cemeteries!

V. Inflation

- A. Prices of goods are a good chronological marker
- B. Akkad (2250 B.C.): a slave cost 10–15 shekels
- C. Ur III: (2100 B.C.): 10 shekels
- D. Old Babylonian (1750 B.C.): 20 shekels
- E. Nuzi, Ugarit (1400 B.C.): 30 shekels
- F. Assyria (750 B.C.): 50–60 shekels
- G. Persia (500 B.C.): 90–120 shekels
- H. Biblical Examples
 1. Joseph (Genesis 37:28)
 - a. ~1750 B.C.
 - b. critics say the story was invented around 1000 B.C.
 - c. was sold for 20 shekels!
 2. Sinai (Exodus 21:32)
 - a. ~1400 B.C.
 - b. critics say the story was invented after 1000 B.C.
 - c. price of a slave was 30 shekels!
 3. Menahem (2 Kings 15:20)
 - a. ~750 B.C.

- b. critics say it was composed around 600 B.C.
- c. price of a slave was 50 shekels!

VI. Clothing Styles

- A. Asiatics depicted in a 19th century B.C. wall painting.
 - 1. Using a donkey as a beast of burden
 - 2. Headbands on the women
 - 3. Men have beards, unlike the Egyptians
 - 4. Men also wear headbands.
- B. Exodus 13:16; Deuteronomy 6:8
 - 1. Tie God's commands "on your foreheads."
 - 2. Like phylacteries of later times
 - 3. Not in order to stand out – all Asiatics wore headbands
 - 4. It's like, "you wear tee-shirts? Have the law of God on your tee-shirt."
 - 5. Adapting culturally accepted forms of dress for the purpose of reminder and instruction
- C. Also, tassels on the edges of their clothing; fits the period in which they were living.

VII. Details about Israel's Worship

- A. Priestly benediction
 - 1. "The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, the Lord lift his countenance upon you and give you his peace."
(see Numbers 6:24–26)
 - 2. Occurs in a P text (6th-century B.C., according to critics)
 - 3. Found on two silver scrolls from 7th century B.C.!
 - 4. Critics counter that the 6th-century writer was incorporating 7th century material!
 - 5. But that means their theory is non-falsifiable!
- B. The feast of trumpets
 - 1. Numbers 29
 - 2. The Israelites are to offer one bull, seven lambs, one goat, a meal offering and a wine libation.
 - 3. Hittite text, ca. 1500 B.C. specifies the same sequence and numbers of offerings!
 - 4. When God gave these instructions, he was speaking to the cultural expectations of the people and giving insight into what he was doing.
- C. The ark of the covenant
 - 1. The ark was a box, supported on two staves, covered with gold within and without.
 - 2. Inside the ark were the tablets of the ten commandments.
 - 3. On top of the ark were two cherubim, wings touching in the center.

4. The ark is viewed as a footstool for God's actual throne, which was on living cherubim (see Ezekiel 10).
5. There was a similar ark in Pharaoh Tutankhamen's tomb!
6. This was from the period right around Moses's time.

D. The Holy of Holies

1. Another discovery in Tut's tomb was a gilded shrine, like the holy of holies.
2. It was a special sanctuary for the deity of the Egyptians.
3. Was God plagiarizing, or not very creative? Why did he borrow these symbols?
4. God had a polemical purpose – the truth is not that, but this.

VIII. Covenantal forms

- A. See earlier discussion (Lecture 2)
- B. The literary form of the Ten Commandments and Deuteronomy is exactly what you'd expect from the time of Moses, and not at all what you'd expect from the time of D.

IX. The Exodus

- A. The exodus is a favorite target for the popular media.
- B. Why do we never read in Egyptian records about having a whole nation of Israelite slaves that wound up defeating the whole Egyptian army and plundering the whole nation?
- C. When Egyptians wrote histories, they exaggerated greatly and never mentioned defeats. It was all a bunch of bologna. You never read bad news.
- D. The Hyskos conquered and ruled Egypt for 200 years (1786–1550 B.C.) and there was no mention of it in Egyptian records until they were kicked out of Egypt!
- E. There is a bas relief showing Ramses II defeating the Hittites at Kadesh (see workbook page 3-5). But in real life, the Egyptians lost that battle!
- F. Student question: is there any proof of the Israelites being held as slaves in Egypt?
 - a. Answer: there are proto-Siniatic inscriptions of Semitic slaves in Egypt.
 - b. Not direct proof, but it establishes plausibility.
- G. Student question: could the "pharaoh that knew not Joseph" be the Hyskos supremacy?
 - a. Answer: Some people think that, but Dr. Hugenberger thinks it's more than we can say.
 - b. The Hyskos supremacy would be a good explanation for that text, but it's too much to say that it is a direct reference.

X. Dibon

- A. General principle: an argument from silence proves nothing.
- B. Numbers 33:45 mentions that Israel went to Dibon on the way to the promised land.
- C. Based on digs at Dibon in 1950, 1952, 1953, 1955, 1965, it is claimed that Dibon was

unoccupied from 1500 to 900 B.C., which by any reading of the evidence covers the Exodus. This is an embarrassing fact, if true.

- D. Topographical lists from Karnak, originating from the reigns of Pharaoh Thutmose III and Rameses II, both mention Dibon as an occupied city.
- E. Thutmose III actually went on an expedition to Palestine, and used the same route that Israel would later use, the same list of places as in Numbers 33!
- F. The absence of evidence is not evidence of absence!

XI. The Conquest of Canaan

- A. It would be nice to have evidence of the historicity of the conquest.
 1. Destruction levels within cities are excellent evidence for when a city was destroyed.
 2. The problem is, Israel was supposed to dispossess the inhabitants of the land, not destroy it.
 3. They would not want to destroy the cities God was giving them to live in.
 4. There are three cities Israel did burn in the conquest, Jericho, Ai, and Hazor.
- B. Jericho
 1. There are four “burn levels” found in the digs at Jericho.
 2. City IV was surrounded by a 15-foot high stone revetment topped by an 8-foot high mud-brick wall.
 3. Kathleen Kenyon, who excavated Jericho in the 1950’s, argued that the mud-brick walls had fallen outward, except for a small section in the northern part of the city.
 4. Every house had evidence of catastrophic destruction, perhaps from an earthquake and fire.
 5. Kenyon dated this destruction at 1550 B.C., over a hundred years before the earliest date for Israel’s arrival.
 6. A 1997 Italian-Palestinian collaboration (so far unpublished) may date the destruction to 1400 B.C., according to Bryant Wood, a recognized archaeologist who has assessed their data.
 7. Within the houses, stone jars were found that still contained grain, indicating the city was not plundered.
 8. Perhaps Rahab lived on the north side of Jericho?
 9. Student question: how do they decide on the dating of this destruction level?
 - a. Answer: jewelry styles like scarab beetles on the rings have been essential to dating Jericho; patterns of pottery are key.
 - b. Until we see the report from the 1997 dig, we won’t know what evidence they are using to date the destruction.

10. Student question: do the biases of archaeologists influence their dating?
 - a. Answer: everybody is biased.
 - b. When reports are published, people can argue back and forth to help establish the facts.
11. Student question: have you ever come across facts that you didn't want to see?
 - a. Answer: you find things that you don't want to see all the time!
 - b. But after a while, you end up trusting the truth and God more than your own senses and reasoning.
 - c. You realize that there's a better answer just down the road if you stick with it.

C. Ai

1. It is hard to place Ai. It was probably a very small place, and there are no signs saying, "Welcome to Ai."
2. J.J. Bimson and David Livingstone identify Ai with Khirbet Nisya, which was destroyed around 1400 B.C., which would be convenient.

D. Hazor

1. There is no doubt about the identification of Hazor; it was a big city, and its site has nothing else around it.
2. Hazor has so many burn levels, you can take your pick.
3. The first burn level can be dated about 1400 B.C.
4. Joshua did not occupy Hazor, he merely cropped off the leadership of the north at the time.
 - a. Israel couldn't populate the whole land at once, so they didn't take the whole land at once.
 - b. They kept the Canaanites around for a while, to keep the land maintained.
5. The second burn level at about 1300 B.C., which most scholars attribute to Pharaoh Seti I.
6. The third burn level dates to about 1220 B.C., which would be about when Deborah won her victory over Jabin, king of Hazor, in Judges 4 and 5.
 - a. Judges does not mention that Hazor was burned at that time, but says that Jabin was decisively defeated.
 - b. After this conquest, Israel occupied Hazor.
 - c. Interestingly, after this burn level, the old temples to Canaanite idols are not rebuilt, and idols, which had been prevalent prior to this level, are now almost never found.
7. At other sites (not so much Hazor) you can tell Israelites may have moved in by the sudden absence of pig bones in the garbage dumps.

E. Hebron

1. Joshua 10:36 mentions an attack on Hebron early in the conquest.
2. Archaeological evidence seems to indicate that Hebron was unoccupied for the whole period of the conquest.
3. But the topographical lists of Rameses II and III mention Hebron as an existing site.
4. The absence of evidence is not evidence of absence!

XII. Stele of Merneptah

- A. Pharaoh in 1220 B.C.
- B. Had this stele carved in his mortuary temple to celebrate his victories.
- C. Among his victories in the Syro-Palestine area is a mention of Israel: "Israel is laid waste, its seed is not."
 1. He is bragging that he wiped Israel off the face of the earth.
 2. This is standard Egyptian exaggeration, but it proves Israel was in the land as a major presence before 1220 B.C.

XIII. Conclusion

- A. If you look at the archaeological discoveries that confirm details in the Old Testament story, it is an impressive list.
 1. David (Tel Dan stela 9th BC; Moabite Stone 9th B.C.)
 2. Omri (Moabite Stone 9th B.C.)
 3. Ahab (Kurkh Monolith of Shalmaneser III 9th B.C.)
 4. Jehoram (Tel Dan stela 9th B.C.)
 5. Ahaziah (Tel Dan stela 9th B.C.)
 6. Jehu (Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III 9th B.C.)
 7. Joash (Tell Al-Rimah stela of Adad-Nirari III 9th B.C.)
 8. Uzziah (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 9. Menahem (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 10. Pekah (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 11. Ahaz (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 12. Hoshea (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 13. Hezekiah (Annals of Tiglath-Pilezer III 8th B.C.)
 14. Manasseh (Prism B of Esarhaddon; Rassam Cylinder of Ashurbanipal 7th B.C.)
 15. Jehoiachin (ration documents of Nebuchadnezzar 6th B.C.)

XIV. Genesis 1:1–3

- A. In the NIV, Genesis 1:1 is translated, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."
 1. It is an independent sentence, a declarative sentence.

2. There are at least three major interpretations of Genesis 1:1, but Dr, Hugenberger will argue for a fourth.

B. Interpretation #1: Summary heading

1. Genesis 1:1 is an opening sentence that introduces what follows.
2. Nehemiah 1:1 is another example of this kind of thing.
3. Question: Does Genesis 1:1 summarize what follows?
 - a. If Genesis 1:1 is a summary heading, then Genesis 1:2 seems to start with preexisting matter!
 - b. It seems to imply that parts of creation were already there when God started his work.
 - c. It seems to summarize more than what is reported.

C. Interpretation #2: The Gap Theory

1. Genesis 1:1 describes an initial, perfect creation.
2. In between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 is a “gap” of an indeterminate time period.
3. During that gap, there is a desecration, a destruction of the earth that results in an earth that is “without form and void.”
4. In the following verses, God recreates the world in six days and rests on the seventh.
5. This view is advocated in the Scofield Reference Bible, and is very popular.
6. This view seems to accommodate modern science well.
 - a. If scientists tell us the earth is 15 billion years old, all of that can be in the gap.
 - b. Dinosaurs could have lived and died in the gap.
7. Why would God destroy everything?
 - a. The argument is that during the gap, Satan fell and God’s judgment on Satan somehow involved the whole world as well.
8. Problem: the text says nothing about any of this. It’s an argument from speculation.
 - a. Genesis 1:1-2 says nothing about the fall of Satan.
 - b. It says nothing about a gap.
 - c. Everywhere else in the Bible that creation is mentioned, there is no hint of a world that used to exist before ours.
 - d. If God by this point is really upset at some part of the creation (even demons) why does he call it all “good”?
 - e. Grammatically, verse 2 does not begin with a *waw* (Hebrew: ׀) which is the way to join consecutive clauses.
 - 1) In Hebrew, most clauses start with a *waw*, which is usually translated “and” if it is translated at all.

- 2) This is the way Hebrew indicates that one thing happens after another.
- 3) Grammatically, it makes no sense for verse 2 to take place after verse 1.

D. Interpretation #3: Incomplete creation

1. Genesis 1:1 describes the creation of the earth in a primordial, incomplete state.
2. How primordial? “Formless and empty” – that primordial.
3. Genesis 1:1 describes the first act of a single creation
4. Genesis 1:2 and following describe God’s acts to shape and refine creation.
5. Problem: Every other Bible passage that refers to creation seems to point to creation as resulting in an earth that is like we see it now, more or less.

E. Interpretation #4: Subordinate clause

1. Most evangelicals who are aware of this interpretation dislike it.
2. Genesis 1:1 is not a sentence, not an independent clause. It is an introductory subordinate clause.
3. Genesis 1:1–3 builds to a crescendo, with an introductory subordinate clause in verse 1, then three temporal clauses in verse 2, and the independent clause finally in verse 3.
4. Translate Genesis 1:1, “In the beginning of God’s creating of the heavens and the earth...”
 - a. The Hebrew starts with the *buh* prefix (Hebrew: בְּ), meaning “in,” which is affixed to *reshith* (Hebrew: רֵאשִׁית), which means “beginning.”
 - b. The vowel (shewa) under the “b” indicates that this word is the beginning of a construct chain, and so should be translated “in beginning of...” There is no “the” in the Hebrew of this verse.
 - c. The Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint (LXX) also lacks a “the”: *en arche* ἐν ἀρχῇ, “in beginning,” as does John 1:1, quoting this passage.
 - d. What follows this first word is definite, so it is appropriate to add “the” in there in an English translation, but it is not there in Hebrew.
5. If this is so, why haven’t many people argued for this translation?
 - a. In beginning Hebrew, students are taught that what follows in a construct chain must be a noun, and what follows here is a verb, “creating.”
 - b. In more advanced Hebrew, you find out that the whole clause that follows can function as a noun. “In the beginning of God’s creating of the earth...”
6. In its defense, all 50 other times this phrase appears in the Bible, it is translated “in the beginning of” and also in the *enuma elish* and other Ancient Near Eastern Texts.
7. Why do evangelicals not like this translation?
 - a. It sounds like it has the same problem as the summary heading view, indicating the preexistence of matter.

- b. When God started creating, there was already an earth that was formless and void.
8. But that's not what "in the beginning of" usually means in the Bible.
- Example: Jeremiah 28:1 "In the fifth month of that same year, the fourth year, early in the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah, the prophet Hananiah son of Azzur..."
 - This isn't talking about the first seconds of the reign of Zedekiah.
 - It is talking about a point in the early part of Zedekiah's reign.
9. The story starts at some point in the span of God's creation, when three conditions were true of the earth:
- The earth was uninhabitable and uninhabited.
 - Hebrew: *tohu wabohu* (תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ)
 - NIV: "formless and empty."
 - Isaiah 45:18, "For this is what the LORD says— he who created the heavens, he is God; he who fashioned and made the earth, he founded it; he did not create it to be empty, but formed it to be inhabited—he says: "I am the LORD, and there is no other."
 - "Empty" means "uninhabited."
 - Hebrew *shamayim* (שָׁמַיִם) means "the sky" or "the invisible world." God created both the visible and the invisible universe.
 - Darkness was over the surface of the deep.
 - This is part of the problem God is about to address.
 - Darkness is inimical to life. Light is important to people, plants, and animals.
 - The deep of the oceans was terrifying in biblical times.
 - Swimming was invented late by the Egyptians, and picked up by the Greeks for their military training.
 - Water was by definition a terrifying element; if you got into it, you were dead.
 - What is God going to do about it?
 - The Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.
 - This is a theophany.
 - A localized appearance of God in some form.
10. With these three conditions, the story begins with the first independent clause.
- "God said, 'Let there be light!'"
 - Do you see the tremendous crescendo?
 - It begins the Bible in the most arresting possible way.

XV. Creation and Science

A. Introduction

1. Even if this topic does not interest you, it will interest some in your congregation, so you need to know how to deal with it, out of love for our neighbor if for no other reason.
2. Some allege that prior to Copernicus, the general assumption was that everything revolved around the earth.
3. But now, they say, we have a more objective view.
4. Carl Sagan and the “Pale Blue Dot”
 - a. In a photograph taken from Voyager I in 1990, 3.7 billion miles away from earth, our planet looked like just a pale blue dot.
 - b. Sagan wrote, “Take a good look at it. Stare at that dot for any length of time. And then try to convince yourself God created the whole universe for one of the ten million or so species of life that inhabit that speck of dust.”
 - c. His agenda was to challenge the notion that the universe is God’s creation, and that people are the apple of God’s eye.

B. There are seven common misunderstandings when considering the Bible and science.

1. Facts don’t speak for themselves, they need to be interpreted.
 - a. But once you accept some fundamental presuppositions, you are suddenly surrounded by all sorts of confirmatory evidence.
 - b. There are some apparent contradictions between the Bible and science that we need to deal with.
2. The Bible doesn’t require a small universe.
 - a. Carl Sagan seems to think that the Bible requires a small universe.
 - b. But David beat him to the punch. Psalm 8:3–4, “When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him?”
3. The Bible doesn’t require a young earth.
 - a. It is possible, but not required.
 - b. Archbishop James Ussher (17th century)
 - 1) Provided a timeline back from Jesus to creation
 - 2) Determined a date for creation of Sunday, October 23rd, 4004 B.C., beginning at sundown on the 22nd.
 - 3) *Note: In the lecture, Dr. Hugenberg attributes a time of 9:00 a.m. to Archbishop Ussher, but this is incorrect, though a common error. September 12, 3929 B.C. at 9:00 a.m. was the time man was created as determined by Dr. John Lightfoot, a*

contemporary of Archbishop Ussher.

- 4) Based dating in part on the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11.
 - 5) Ussher's interpretation is possible but not required by the text.
 - 6) It rests on two mistakes:
 - (a) The genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 are almost certainly selective, not exhaustive.
 - (1) Just like Matthew 1:1
 - (2) Matthew 1:2-17 expands on the selective genealogy of verse 1, but even it is selective.
 - (3) 14 generations between Abraham and David, and between David and Jesus
 - (4) But from other OT genealogies, we know that there are names trimmed in order to get the fourteens.
 - (5) If you see a stereotypical number in a Biblical genealogy (like 3, some multiple of 7, 10, or 12) it is probably selective.
 - (6) Genesis 5 has ten generations from Adam to Ham, and then segmentation.
 - (7) Genesis 11 has ten generations from Shem to Terah, and then segmentation.
 - (8) Luke 3:36 inserts a name into this Genesis 11 genealogy, Cainan, between Arphaxad and Shelah.
 - (9) Selective genealogies were the universal practice in the Ancient Near East.
 - (b) In Hebrew, you can beget your grandchildren and great-grandchildren, not just your children.
 - (1) The Hebrew word meaning "to beget" *yalad* (יָלַד) can also be translated, "became the ancestor of."
 - (2) That is, when Shem was 100 years old, he became the ancestor of Arphaxad (Genesis 11:10), he became the father of the son in whose line Arphaxad would later come.
 - (3) e.g. Deuteronomy 4:25 "After you have begotten children and grandchildren..." (cf. 2 Kings 20:18, Isaiah 39:7, Genesis 46:25)
 - (4) We don't like this in our culture, but that's our problem, not theirs.
 - 7) So, we cannot just add up the numbers in the genealogies and think that we have figured it out.
4. The Bible does not prohibit plant or animal death before the fall.
- a. There might have been a lot of non-human death before the fall.

- b. Soil is the result of decomposed animal and plant material; was there soil before the fall?
- c. Student question: fossil evidence
 - 1) What are we to make of the entire geological column, with dinosaurs and fossils?
 - 2) Cave paintings in Spain and France never depict dinosaurs.
- d. Romans 5:12 says that death entered the world through one man's sin, that death came to all men; Adam's sin introduced death to humanity.
- e. Psalm 104 is an inspired commentary on Genesis 1.
 - 1) Verses 1–2a = Day One
 - 2) Verses 2b–3 = Day Two
 - 3) Verses 5–18 = Day Three
 - 4) Verses 19–23 = Day Four
 - 5) Verses 24–26 = Day Five
 - 6) Verses 27–30 = Day Six
 - 7) Verses 31ff = Day Seven
 - 8) Verses 20–21 talk about the darkness being of benefit to predators, implying there were predators at the time.
 - 9) Verse 21 speaks of the lion roaring for its prey – carrots and apples?
 - 10) The Bible's interpretation of the Bible is that there were carnivores from Creation on.
- f. When the Lord God makes garments of skin for Adam and Eve (Genesis 3:21), the death of the animal is not even mentioned. It is unremarkable.
- g. Genesis 4:4 talks about Abel's sacrifice from his flock. Where did he get the idea that it's okay to kill animals?
- h. Ruling over and subduing (Genesis 1:28) entails the right to take animal life.
 - 1) The term "subduing" elsewhere in the Bible is used for the dispossession of Canaan, where the Canaanites lost their lives.
 - 2) Adam is charged with guarding the garden (Hebrew *shamar* – שָׁמַר – Genesis 2:15). The threat in verse 17, "...you will surely die" implies an awareness of the meaning of the term.
- i. There is no indication that animals ate of the tree of life.
- j. It is a mistake to read eschatology into protology.
 - 1) Isaiah 11:7 and passages like it imply that carnivores will no longer be carnivores in the peaceable kingdom.
 - 2) Even if that's the correct interpretation of the eschaton, that doesn't mean it's how things originally were.

- 3) There will be no marrying in the kingdom, but of course there was in the garden.
- 4) The final state is more than just a return to the original state.
- k. Genesis and vegetarianism.
 - 1) Genesis 1:29 is a selective report of what God said to Adam and Eve.
 - 2) It is intended to set up the command not to eat of the forbidden tree.
 - 3) It tells us nothing about what Adam and Eve could or could not do with regard to eating animals.
 - 4) Genesis 9:3 is often interpreted as implying antediluvian vegetarianism.
 - 5) It changes the temporary restriction Noah was under in the ark.
5. Genesis 1 does not offer an exhaustive explanation of the origin of the universe.
 - a. The doctrine of concurrence is important for Christians to be aware of.
 - b. Example: the weather
 - 1) Psalm 135:7 tells us that God sends the rain (cf. Jeremiah 14:22)
 - 2) This does not mean that clouds have nothing to do with it.
 - 3) When Elijah prayed for rain (1 Kings 18:42–46) he sends his servant to look for a cloud.
 - 4) Job 36:27–28 shows an awareness of the water cycle.
 - 5) God sends rain, but he uses the processes of evaporation, condensation, and rain. This is called concurrence.
 - c. Example: Reproduction
 - 1) Psalm 139:13 tells us that God knit each of us together in our mother's womb.
 - 2) But most of the time gestation, embryology and the rest all play a part.
 - d. This takes nothing away from God.
 - e. If Genesis 2 can indicate that the creation of man involved pre-existing matter and sequence without contradicting Genesis 1, why can't the rest of the creation story do the same?
 - f. The nature of a miracle requires an implied past.
 - 1) When Jesus changed the water into wine (John 2:1–10), did the wine have bits of grape seeds and skins in it?
 - 2) If so, was God trying to deceive people?
 - 3) No, the nature of a miracle requires an implied past
 - 4) So, when God brought Eve to Adam, she was a fully grown woman (including a belly button!).

End of Lecture 3