

Creation or Creation, Ruin, and Restoration

“In the beginning God created the heaven [‘the heavens’] and the earth.

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God said, Let there be light: and there was light” (Gen. 1:1-3).

“But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

For in six days the Lord made [Heb., *asah*, ‘to make,’ ‘form,’ ‘fashion’ (cf. Gen. 1:31)] heaven and earth [‘the heavens and the earth’], the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Ex. 20:10, 11).

Exodus 20:11 is used today by the Creation Science group, among others, as a proof text that the six days in Gen. 1 are days of “creation,” not days of “restoration,” calling attention to the plural use of “heavens” in this verse as referring to more than just this earth and its associated heaven (*i.e.*, seeing this plural usage of “heaven” as a reference to the entire universe).

But, in the light of the section of Scripture referenced in Ex. 20:11 (Gen. 1, 2) would this type understanding of the verse be correct?

And, since a plural use of “heaven” is somewhat at the heart of the issue, it might help to have some understanding of dual and plural usages of words in the Hebrew text.

Thus, let’s deal with this first.

The Hebrew text, unlike English, has a dual form, signifying “two” when used. And, since the Hebrew text uses a dual form, does the plural use of a word in the Hebrew text signify “three or more”?

Some try to understand the Hebrew plural in the preceding manner, stating, for example, that *Elohim* (plural use of *El*, “God”) in Gen. 1:1 shows that God is a trinity — three or more, which in this case, comparing Scripture with Scripture, would be three and no more.

However, trying to prove the trinity through the use of *Elohim* in Gen. 1:1 would be a misuse of the Hebrew text. Though Hebrew does have both dual and plural forms, these forms are not used as some would imagine.

Dual is used mainly for things such as pairs — two hands, two feet, two eyes, etc. Plural is used outside of this type usage, referring not to three or more but to two or more (e.g., the plural, not dual, is used in a verse such as Gen. 19:1 — “two angels”).

Even in Gen. 1:1, “heavens” (pl. in Heb. text) would be used in a dual sense — the heavens associated with the earth and the universe at large, excluding the third heaven where God dwells.

But the use of “heavens” in Ex. 20:11, though used in the same dual sense as in Gen. 1:1, could only be understood in a different respect. This verse, referencing Gen. 1, 2, takes you into the six-day restoration of the heavens and the earth following the creation and ruin. The statement in Ex. 20:11 does *NOT* reference events in Gen. 1:1 but events in Gen. 1:2b ff.

But, what about the use of “heavens?” At least two heavens are referenced in Ex. 20:11, as in Gen. 1:1.

Well, there are two heavens within our solar system (the atmospheric and outer space), with both being affected by the removal of light following Satan’s fall (Gen. 1:2a), and with both being affected again by the restoration of light preceding man’s creation (Gen. 1:2b, 3).

(Note that the same limitation on the use of “heavens” is probably referenced in II Peter 3:10-13. It would seemingly make little to no sense for God to destroy an entire uncorrupted universe at this time, then replace it, particularly since angelic rulers can evidently be found ruling over provinces throughout the universe [Job. 1, 2].)

Also, note the same type usage in the Greek text through the offer of “the kingdom of the heavens” in Matthew’s gospel (expression used thirty-two times in this gospel, with “heaven” always plural), which

has to do with a rule from the heavens over the earth — *presently under Satan and his angels, to one day be under Christ and His co-heirs.*

And this rule has *NOTHING to do with anything outside of this earth and our solar system.* Man moving beyond this earth out into the universe, in this respect, *has to do SOLELY with the ages beyond.*

If the Creation Science people, and others, understood the restoration in Gen. 1:2b ff correctly, they would not have a problem with it. They couldn't. The problem is that they don't understand it correctly. They attempt to make it something that it isn't, something which anyone could only have a problem with.

To show how those in the Creation Science group think, I'll reference a past experience, with comments.

In the late '70s I was quite well acquainted with John Morris (son of Henry Morris, an early pioneer in modern day Creation Science [John headed the Creation Science group at one time in later years; I don't know about today]). John, at that time, was working on his Ph.D. in geology at the University of Oklahoma in Norman. And we lived in Norman at the time.

One day I asked John why his group objected to a creation, ruin, and restoration of the earth over six days. He responded, "Because there is no evidence in geology that this ever happened." He also referenced Ex. 20:11, attempting, through this verse, to support "creation" rather than "restoration" in Gen. 1.

Exodus 20:11 has already been dealt with; but note his reference to "no evidence in geology."

And he was correct. *There is NONE! There could be NO evidence in geology, for God restored the earth. And ANY evidence from geology could ONLY portend an incomplete, imperfect restoration.*

If God had restored the earth in a manner where evidences could be found in geology today, then God not only restored the earth in an imperfect manner but also with the vestiges of sin remaining. And, as a result, man would have been created from that tainted by sin, with any following action by Satan unnecessary.

Man, created from a ground of this nature would have already been in a fallen condition at the time of his creation (Gen. 1, 2). And there would have been *NO need for the temptation account in Gen. 3. NOR could Rom. 5:12 be true relative to man. NOR could*

man even be redeemed.

With such a scenario surrounding the restoration of the earth and man's creation, the entrance of sin relative to man could only date back to a time preceding man's creation, to Satan's fall.

Thus, *God could ONLY have restored the earth completely, leaving NO vestiges of anything having to do with Satan's sin.*

And a restored earth of this nature, which could have been *the ONLY type restoration possible*, would, for all practical purposes, be *EXACTLY the same as a 6,000-year old newly created earth* (a young earth which the Creation Science people, improperly understanding the opening chapter of Genesis, contend for).

And that's why I say, if these people would get straightened out on how God restored the earth, they wouldn't be so quick to condemn what Scripture plainly teaches. In fact, they likely would be very accepting of the matter.

In their present understanding and resulting actions though the creation scientists form a rather strange group. Here is a group that is in existence to provide an apology for Scripture, from science, particularly on the opening chapters of Genesis; and they begin this apology by denying that which Scripture plainly teaches in the first thirty-four verses of Genesis.

Note that an erroneous teaching of this nature is not something which should be taken lightly, with possibly the thought in mind that it doesn't really matter.

This type erroneous teaching, at the outset of Scripture, *destroys the original foundation upon which the whole of subsequent Scripture rests* — man's creation, his ruin, his restoration over six days (6,000 years) for a purpose to be realized on the seventh day (the earth's coming 1,000-year Sabbath).

In short, such a teaching, at the outset, *destroys the original foundation upon which all teaching regarding Man's salvation — past, present, and future — rests.*

Important or not? You can be the judge!

(As well, the teaching held by some that Gen. 1:1 has to do with "restoration," not with "creation" [not with an absolute beginning] is little better. Note that such a teaching also destroys God's original foundational structure set forth at the beginning.)