

Do we believe, as the book of Genesis states, that God created the cosmos in six days and on the seventh day rested? Are we more likely to say that the cosmos was created in what might be called “the big bang”? If so, why do we almost exclusively use the past tense of the verb to create, “created,” when making such a statement? Is that how we put it? Do we say that the universe was created by the big bang? If so, might we be guilty of relegating the creation to the past? Is the creation, via the big bang or any other theory we might have, an unchanging, fixed point, a magnetic north on a compass rose, confined to peer-reviewed scientific journals and history books? Why have we done this?

When we think about the creation of the cosmos, do we include ourselves as part of that creation? Why not? How do we think of ourselves? Might we think of ourselves and others; as individuals, as societies, as congregations whose “creations” are essentially relegated to the past? Have you heard of the comedic gravestone epitaph, “Died at 30, buried at 70?” Could that be us? Does that sound more like a fatalistic, predetermined, predestined theology that one might associate with the Middle Ages? A theology sometimes associated as having an uncaring, omnipotent, omniscient God who creates us as these fixed entities? A God who pulls all the strings?

So, could it be that although we reject the story of the Genesis God that created the cosmos in six days and rested on the seventh, we still conceive and live our lives according to a concept of God that is the Genesis God? Even though we may not be “believers,” are we fixed to a concept of God, as the Genesis God, who is omnipotent and omniscient? Why might we do this? Why do we hold on to a conceptual idea of God whose story we’ve rejected? Have we allowed others, Biblical literalists, fundamentalists to own the concept of what God is, what God does, what God knows, what God feels? Can we possibly think of God more expansively or in a way that might be more useful to us? What does it mean if we can’t? If we are fixed in our idea of what God is, what God does, what God knows, what God feels, are we, in a sense, also guilty of fundamentalism?

Can you accept or imagine that creation is not relegated to the past, and that we ourselves, and that you yourself, along with all plants, animals, all of nature, all that is; are part of an ongoing creation?

If we all, and everything, are part of an ongoing creation, part of the crew on a metaphorical sailing vessel sailing on a metaphorical sea into, not simply unchartered waters, but newly created, eternally begotten waters, what, if anything, might be at the helm? Might it be nobody, nothing? Might it be something, made in our image or perhaps not, something we could call

God? Could we also call it love? What is that? Could we say that God is the natural laws of the cosmos? Just what and why is gravity anyway?

Just what is the nature of this sea? Just what is the nature of reality? It is tables and chairs, books and binders, pens and pencils, printers and computers, etc.? Is the nature of reality stuff? A thousand years from now, what will be the nature of the computer screen that you're looking at right now? Might the true nature of reality be something other than stuff? Might stuff merely be the consequent, resultant, impermanent form begotten from a deeper nature of reality?

Might becoming and unbecoming (perhaps the same thing), rather than stuff, be a better, more accurate, explanation of the nature of reality? Might being in process, becoming and unbecoming, rather than being itself, be a better, more accurate explanation of what goes on here, there and everywhere?

Essentially, might reality be more verb than noun? Is the chorus you heard this morning at daybreak outside your bedroom window birds, or perhaps birding? Is it the towhee or is it toheeing? Might we, too, be more verb than noun? What is age?

Could the captain of our metaphorical ship be called God, or perhaps, more accurately, Godding? If it's not working for you, could you think expansively enough to maybe stop carrying the omnipotent, omniscient being God you've been taught by those who claim ownership of God? Could God be conceived as the never ending "moral arc of the universe bending toward justice" of which Unitarian minister Theodore Parker speaks? A moral arc that is constantly being bent, accelerating towards a center of justice, of beloved community, and taking us with it? A moral arc that is itself not fixed, but changing, in process, just like the rest of us, all things, all nature, all reality?

If worship means praising what is worthy, can we conceive of a God worthy of worship? What conception of God could be more worthy? An omnipotent, omniscient God we worship out of fear that very omnipotence and omniscience; or perhaps God as an evolving partner, along with us as evolving beings sailing on an ever-changing arc of creation towards a more moral universe?

Is this merely an intellectual mind game I'm presenting to you this morning? An intellectual Sunday morning drive in the country? Does it matter how we think about reality? Are our actions, what we do, how we behave, affected by how we think about, perceive reality? Might what we do, how we behave and how we think be different if we saw the cosmos, ourselves included, not as stuff, beings; but as beings in process? As verbs, as always becoming and unbecoming?

Might the true nature of reality be questions where the answers themselves are always in process, becoming and unbecoming, changing through time?