

As George Matheson has written:

Who are the "all" here spoken of? They are the living creatures of the whole earth. What! you say, the creatures of the animal world! can *these* be said to be in possession of God's Spirit? I can understand very well how *man* should be thus privileged. I can understand why a being of such nobleness as the human soul should lay claim to a distinctive pre-eminence. But is it not a bold thing to say that the human soul is in contact with the beast of the field? Is it not a degradation of my nature to affirm that the same Spirit who created me created also the tenants of the deep? No, my brother; if you shall find in God's Spirit the missing link between yourself and the animal world you will reach a Darwinism where there is nothing to degrade. You are not come from them, but you and they together are the offspring of God. Would you have preferred to have had no such link between you? It is your forgetfulness of the link that has made you cruel to the creatures below. You do not oppress your brother man, because you know him to be your brother; but you think the beast of the field has no contact with the sympathy of your soul. It *has* a contact, an irrefragable, indestructible contact. You are bound together by one Spirit of creation; you sit at one communion table of nature; you are members of one body of natural life. The glory of being united to thy Father is that in Him thou shalt be united to everything. Thou shalt be allied not only to the highest but to the lowest, thou shalt be able not only to go up but to go down. Thou shalt have the power that the Lord had—the power to empty thyself to the lowermost, to the uttermost. Thou shalt feel that thou owest all things thy sympathy when thou hast recognized this relationship through the same divine Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the notion of a natural kinship between man and the lower orders, so widespread among primitive peoples, was, after all, but a universal intuition of an eternal truth.

## 5. The Spirit of God in the Creation of Man

In Gen. 1:26, we read the following:

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Certainly the plural pronouns here—"Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"—indicates a Divine inter-communion; the bringing into existence of the being who was designed to be lord tenant of the whole natural creation; the final achievement of the initial phase of the Creative Process, and the crowning glory of the Divine handiwork, merited just such a sublime con-

1. *Voices of the Spirit*, 50-51.

*silum* of the three Persons of the Godhead. At this *counsiltium* it was decreed that this noblest of all creatures, man, should be created in the "image" of God. Hence we read, in verse 27, that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." In what does this "image" consist? Surely it does not consist in anything physical, for the simple reason that our God is a Spirit, hence "without body or parts." What, then, is the meaning of "image," as used in this passage? Obviously, it can mean only one thing, namely, that man in his essential being is spirit (person), even as God is a Spirit (Person); hence man, *as a person*, is the image, likeness, reflection, of God. As God thinks, feels (loves) and wills, so man is capable, in his own creaturely way of course, of thinking, feeling, and willing. If this be anthropomorphism, then make the most of it! Our God is not the colorless, feelingless construct of cold human pantheistic intellectualism, but the great Heart of Love who meets the needs of human experience.

In a word, *this last forward step in the Creation marked the beginning of the Era of Personality.*

"God created man in his own image." It seems to me that this text is fully clarified in the second chapter of *Genesis*, which is but an amplification of the content of the first chapter, but with special reference to the origin, constitution and first state of man. Here we read, Gen. 2:7, that "*Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*" This is one of the most brilliant gems in the entire history of Scripture truth. Here we have depicted in two terse, meaningful sentences: (1) the constitution of a body of "the dust of the ground," and then (2) the infusing of that lifeless body with the vital principle, the "breath" or "spirit" of life. Had the Creator stopped with the mere forming of a body, that would have been comparable to the building of a house with no one to live in it. Hence, in a graphic portrayal, God the Creator is represented as stooping over, so to speak, placing His lips and nostrils upon the lips and nostrils of the lifeless thing lying on the ground, and expelling into it an infinitesimal bit of His own being. And immediately the hitherto lifeless form became a body-spirit unity, a *living soul*. Anthropomorphic as this picture may be, as indeed it had to be, because of the inadequacy of human language, neither science nor philosophy has ever conceived anything comparable to it in simplicity and in far-reaching import. It means

simply, in a word, that in every human being there is a spark of the Infinite and of His powers, that every essential human self (spirit) is a reflection of the Being of God. Of course the Breath of Life here is a metaphor of the operation of the Spirit of God, of the procession of the Spirit from the Being of God.

[This truth is evident from a comparison with Ezek. 37:7-10]: So I prophesied as I was commanded: and as I prophesied, there was a great noise, and, behold, an earthquake; and the bones came together, bone to its bone. And I beheld, and lo, there were sinews upon them, and flesh came up, and skin covered them above; but there was no breath in them. Then he said unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind [breath], Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army. [That is, in response to the decree of the Word, the Breath of God—a metaphor of the Spirit of God—issued forth from God and re-animated those lifeless forms which Ezekiel saw in his vision. The Breath of God signifies, in Scripture, an operation of the Spirit of God.]

“Yahweh Elohim formed the man of the dust of the ground.” The word *adamah* (“ground”) here seems to signify the *fertile soil*, the *nutritious earth*, which provides food for man and for those animals which are useful to man. Cf. Gen. 2:9—“Yahweh Elohim caused to spring up from the *adamah* every green tree,” etc. Gen. 2:19—“Yahweh Elohim formed from the *adamah* every beast of the field, and every flying thing of the heaven,” etc. It is of the utmost significance, I think, that the verb used in Gen. 2:7 (translated “formed”—“Yahweh Elohim *formed* the man of the dust of the ground”) is the verb used also in Gen. 2:19 to describe God’s forming of animals and birds, which according to the first chapter of *Genesis* vv. 20, 24) were produced by the earth and by the waters respectively. The significance here lies especially in the fact that the text of Gen. 2:7, as in the case of the other texts cited, does not necessarily exclude God’s use of *secondary causes* in the forming of man’s body. “Our conclusion,” writes Messenger

is that there is nothing in Genesis 2:7 which, when rightly understood, *disproves* the theory of the origin of man’s body by way of organic evolution. Of course it is equally true that there is nothing in Scripture which *proves* it. Intermediate stages are neither mentioned, nor expressly excluded. The same applies to the activities of secondary causes.<sup>1</sup>

1. Ernest C. Messenger, *Evolution and Theology: The Problem of Man’s Origin*, 116.

Obviously the text of Genesis 2:7, reduced to its simplest terms, teaches us that the Divine Will saw fit to constitute the material or corporeal part of man, of *matter*, that is to say, of the chemical elements. This fact, moreover, is fully substantiated by human experience; when the life principle departs from the body, in the phenomenon of death, the body simply resolves itself (decomposes) into the elements of which it was originally constituted. There has never been any question in my mind that man's body, like that of the lower animals, was *created* mortal; hence, following his fall into sin, he was expelled from Eden "lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever" (Gen. 3:22); that is to say, in order that the law of mortality to which he had been made subject by creation might operate properly and thus bring about the execution of the penalty attached to sin. Gen. 3:19—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto to the ground; for out of it was thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

But Yahweh Elohim, we are told, having formed man of the dust of the ground, then "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." At this point an important question arises. It is this: Can we believe, in the light of this statement, that in the act here described God utilized a corporeal (let us say, animal) form which had the power inherently to *begin to think as man thinks*, and that all this text implies is that the Breath of God awakened this latent but *resident* power, and transformed the creature into *homo sapiens*? *I think not*. As a matter of fact, I have not yet been convinced that any concrete evidence exists to substantiate the view that thinking man emerged from an animal ancestor by purely naturalistic evolution, that is, by some sort of an elicited development of resident powers, and resident powers only. True it is that of anthropology and biology textbooks are full of conjectures to this effect, but they are little more than conjectures. I fail to see how the theory of the organic evolution of man's higher thought powers from an animal ancestry can ever be harmonized with this description of man's creation, as given in Gen. 2:7: "Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." The second part of this text teaches us unequivocally that the life principle in man derived originally, *by the inbreathing of the Divine Spirit*, from the very Life of God, Himself. This remains true, moreover, even though that

first Divine inbreathing may have been into some higher animal form. That is to say, the life principle in man is essentially spiritual (rather than biological) in nature; the breath of life in man subsumes the vital principle (previously implanted in the lower orders) *plus* the rational moral principle; it is by the latter than man is specified as man. In a word, God made the corporeal form before Him to live—or at least to live a higher kind of life, on a higher level of being than that of the brute—by imparting to it, by causing to be breathed into it, His own mode of life; and thus the creature, man, *homo sapiens*, became the image or likeness of his Creator. At this stage in the Creative Process the last and highest (as far as the physical Creation is concerned) increment of power came into the Process from the very Being of God. The result was the natural man. And thus the Era of Personality was ushered in, the highest order of being in the whole natural Creation.

Finally, we are told that the body-spirit unity thus effected is to be designated a "living soul." Into the *formed dust*, the corporeal form, God infused something, not of any antecedent matter, but immediately of His own essence. This entrance of the Divine Breath was the entrance of personal life into the human corporeal form, as a result of which the man became a living soul.

As George Matheson has written so eloquently:

Every man ought to be proud of a good ancestry—of an ancestry whose commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost. characteristic was goodness. The value lies not in the origin, but in the heredity. The qualities of my ancestors would be nothing if they did not tend to be transmitted; it is the present and not the past that gives them weight. Our life is always the breath of the spirit which has made us; the traits of the fathers re-appear in the children. On one side we have all a splendid ancestry. On the side of our Mother Nature we have much to bear; we are children of the flesh, and the flesh is weak. But we have also an origin from our *Father*, and our Father is a Spirit. We have an ancestry which goes back beyond Nature, beyond maternity, beyond the flesh. We have a pedigree which is older than the mountains, older than the stars, older than the universe. We are come from a good stock; we are branches of a high family tree; we are scions of a noble house, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Nature is the parent of our flesh, but the Divine is the Father of our spirits; the Spirit of God has made us, and the breath of the almighty has given us life.<sup>1</sup>

This Divine inbreathing was, of course, an operation of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God and the Breath of God are one and the same, the former expression being proper whereas the latter is only metaphorical.

## THE SPIRIT AND THE COSMOS

[Cf. Isa. 38:16, from "the writing of Hezekiah"]: O Lord, by these things men live; And wholly therein is the life of my spirit. [Job 32:8]: There is a spirit in man, And the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding. [Job 33:4]: The Spirit of God hath made me, And the breath of the Almighty giveth me life. [Job 27:3]: For my life is yet whole in me, And the spirit of God is in my nostrils. [Psa. 139:14]: I will give thanks unto thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

Hence, in virtue of this original Divine inbreathing, every man is essentially spirit, a spirit, and God is said to be the Father of spirits.

[Num. 16:22]: And they fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, etc. [Num. 27:16]: Let Jehovah, the God of the spirits of all flesh, etc. [Heb. 12:9]. Furthermore, we had the fathers of our flesh to chasten us, and we gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? [Eccl. 12:7]: And the dust returneth to the earth as it was and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it. [Cf. Luke 23:46]: And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, Father, into thy hands I

In the words of the Psalmist:

When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visited him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God, And crownest him with glory and honor. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands [Psa. 8:3-6].

The new increment of power implanted in the first human corporeal form, that is to say, superposed, in all likelihood, upon the basic physiochemical and physiological processes which he shared in common with the lower orders of life, included all the capacities and potencies of personality. This means of course that the man was endued with a moral nature by means of which he had kinship with his Creator. By means of his intelligence he had the ability to discern the Mind and Will of God. As Guyot puts it: "The animal is still under the law of nature, that is, of instinct or necessity, while man, possessed of a knowledge of God, is under the law of liberty, and thus becomes a responsible, or in other words, a moral being."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the first man was more than just a conscious being—he was a *self-conscious* being. That he was an affectionate being, too, is demonstrated by the account of the stirring of his social instincts: he was sorrowful that he had no mate, no counterpart (Gen. 2:18-20); hence, as an affectionate being, he was capable of loving God and his fellows. And finally, he was a *self-determining* being, capable of choosing God's way in preference to his own

1. *Op. cit.*, 42-43.

way or his own way in preference to God's way. This latter choice he made, and fell into sin (Gen. 3:6-8). All these qualities, subsumed under the term "spirit," resulted from an immediate operation of the Spirit of God, metaphorically described as an outbreathing from the Deity and an inbreathing into the lifeless corporeal form.

Moreover, in the restoration of these abilities to man, which takes place in the process known as *regeneration*, it is plainly asserted that the Spirit is the author of them.

[Eph. 4:20-24]: But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus: that ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man, that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit; and that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth. [Col. 3:9-10]: Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him. [John 3:5]: Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. [Titus 3:5]: according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Savior. [Gal. 5:16]: But I say, Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. [Gal. 5:22-25]: But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control; against such there is no law. And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof. If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk. [2 Cor. 3:2-3]: Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men; being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of flesh. Etc., etc.

Thereby, that is, by the process of regeneration (followed, of course, by sanctification) the Spirit restores His own work, and Adam may be said to have had the Spirit throughout his period of innocence. In all men, from first to last, all truth, goodness and righteousness are the fruit of the Spirit of God. For ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord: walk as children of light (for the fruit of the light is in all goodness and righteousness and truth) [Eph. 5:8-9].

\* \* \* \*

Just a few statements by way of recapitulation at this point, with respect to the "harmonizing" of the Biblical cosmogony

1. Arnold Guyot, *Creation*, 124.

## THE SPIRIT AND THE COSMOS

with the hypothesis of organic evolution now so generally in vogue in scientific circles:

In the first place, I have tried to show that there is no irreconcilable conflict between the *Genesis* account of the Creation and the progressive development hypothesis, in their broad outlines. I have tried to make it clear that in general the former, by simply affirming the fundamental religious truth that what God commanded to be done, *was done*, and *was good*, at each successive stage of the Creation, without describing specifically *how it was done*, allows for an interpretation in terms of "evolution" as the latter is generally believed and taught today. That there was a progressive development in Creation, that the process was spread over six cosmogonic days, which were periods of indeterminate length, and that the progression was from inanimate matter to plant life, to animal life, and finally to rational human life, in the order named—all this seems to be implied in the *Genesis* narrative. All this is explicit as well in the evolution hypothesis. Nor is there anything in the *Genesis* narrative to militate against the view that evolution may have taken place, as envisioned by the organic hypothesis, on each of the different levels of being which constitute the Cosmos, and in particular on the plant and animal levels. Indeed the evolution hypothesis, strictly speaking, embraces only what is designated "organic evolution," that is, the evolution of "natural" life in its various "kingdoms," genera, and species. From the fact that the idea of "create" or "creation"—a word, as we have seen, which is used in the *Genesis* cosmogony to describe the introduction of an element, a new increment of power, which cannot be explained by what had gone before—appears only three times in the narrative (vv. 1, 21, and 27), it would seem that we are justified in assuming that intermediate acts were in a sense evolutionary, that is, the readjustment of material already present to form new combinations, the word used to describe such acts, being, not "create," but "make." All this means that on the plant and animal levels at least, development may have taken place by some such process, even according to the Biblical account. As far as the human order of being is concerned, if evolution has taken place or is taking place therein, it must be regarded as having assumed a psychological rather than biological character, as indeed Du Noüy contends in his recent work entitled *Human Destiny*. It would seem that man's future development must be primarily in the moral and spirit-



ual realms, and that it must depend to a large extent upon his own thinking and his own efforts, in virtue of his endowment with the priceless gift of freedom. That he has freedom to "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling," freedom to attain his own ultimate natural and proper end, if he chooses so to do, no person endowed with plain common sense would even attempt to deny.

In the second place, I must re-assert at this point that there is no evidence in the *Genesis* cosmogony, nor even in the evolution hypothesis as commonly presented, to support the notion of a purely naturalistic development—*i.e.*, by means of *resident* forces—from the inanimate to the animate level, from the plant to the animal, or—despite all assertions to the contrary—from the brute animal to thinking man. It is the main contention of the present treatise that at the beginning of each of these respective stages of Creation, new increments of power may have been infused into the Creative Process by the agency of the Spirit of God, thus marking off the different levels on which the Hierarchy of Total Being is constructed. No theory of evolution by means of resident forces alone has yet successfully bridged the gaps between the rock and the plant, between the plant and the animal, or between the brute animal and rational (and spiritual) man. On the other hand, if these gaps ever should be closed *conclusively*, all that would be proved as a consequence would be that God infused into First Energy all the potentialities of life, consciousness, rationality, and, I might add, holiness. This, of course, is incredible on the face of it. Moreover, if God, by some alchemy inscrutable to us, infused these potentialities into the Creative Process at the beginning, this could mean only that such powers are inherent in the Deity Himself, or, it may be, that they were brought into existence by Him *ex nihilo*. Or, on the other hand, if First Energy (atoms?) alone is to be regarded as possessing these powers inherently from the beginning—as the materialistic scientists would probably like for us to believe—all this would mean is that First Energy must be identified with God, and indeed with a God differing but little from the God of the Bible. No matter how strenuously unbelieving and irreligious thinkers may strive to avoid the use of the word "God," there is no getting away from the fact of God, from the fact, that is, of a First Principle of all things. So, why not call this First Principle

"God," as men have done throughout the ages, and let it go at that.

In the third place, although I have tried to show that the *Genesis* cosmogony is—in its broad outlines—capable of legitimate interpretation in harmony with the evolution hypothesis, also in its broad outlines, this does not necessarily mean that Creation did take place by evolution. There is no imperative requiring anyone to make Bible teaching conform to the scientific thought of any age. As stated repeatedly, the Bible is designed to be a textbook of religion, not of science; and as such it stands on its own merits. One thing is sure, however: Creation must have taken place either (1) *instantaneously* (i.e., first forms of species, archetypes, sprang into being immediately at the Divine Command), or (2) by *emanation* (of first energy and all subsequently added powers, from the Being of God), or (3) by *evolution*, as envisioned by the present-day prevailing theory. Now, as we have seen, instantaneous Creation (i.e., of all first forms immediately, and at one time) is not taught by the *Genesis* cosmogony itself; on the contrary, according to that very cosmogony, the Creation was spread over six successive "days" at least (even according to the ultra-literal theory, over six successive days of twenty-four hours each). Moreover, there is no necessary reason for assuming that *all* living species, that is, all that we know today, came into existence *at one time* in the course of the Creation. It is far more reasonable to regard the majority of those species now existing upon the earth as the natural products of natural variations in other species. Nor again is there any question involved of the Power manifested in Creation: just as great Power must be presupposed to have created a Cosmos by a process of evolution as to have created it instantaneously, and vice versa. Hence, taking all things into consideration, a modified form of progression would seem to be the hypothesis most in conformity with the broad outlines of the Biblical cosmogony. To sum up, then, evolution might possibly have taken place on each of the successively higher levels of being, but certainly not in the transition from one level of being to the next higher level. *Those transitions must have been effectuated by the direct interposition and activity of the Spirit-power of God.* Moreover, no one has any adequate explanation of how one species may have "emerged" from a lower species. The whole theory is based on

nothing but a series of inferences. To say it is a *fact* is certainly "jumping the gun."

As for the question as to whether the successively higher increments of power introduced by the Divine Spirit into the Creative Process—energy, life, consciousness, rationality, and holiness—were, and are, emanations from the Being of God, or absolute creations by the Thought-power of God. I must confess that I fully accept the latter view. Still, it might be argued legitimately, that for all practical purposes we have in this problem a distinction without a difference. I know of no way of resolving the problem. Its solution seems to lie beyond the power of human intelligence.

In the fourth place, as is well known, from a strictly scientific point of view the chief problem in connection with the evolution hypothesis is not that of the *survival* of existing species, but that of the *arrival* of a *new* species. I do not consider that this problem has ever been satisfactorily solved by science. Scientists are not agreed as to the *method* of evolution, whether it occurred by inheritance of acquired characters (Lamarck), or by natural selection (Darwin), or by changes in the germ-plasm (Weismann), or by mutations (De Vries), or by a combination of two or more, or even all, of these various factors. It seems impossible, in the light of present-day knowledge, to account for the *arrival* of a *new* species (from an old or existing one) except on the ground of some change in the chromosomes and genes of the latter's reproductive cells. Any acquired characteristic would have to be transmitted in such a manner, that is, through the genes—would it not?—and in no other way. How then did the acquired characteristic incorporate itself into the genes of the individual acquiring it and thus become transmitted to that individual's offspring? As far as I know, science has no answer for this question, and therefore rejects the theory of the transmission of acquired characters. In fact, science falls back usually on *mutations* to explain the origin of species. That mutations do occur cannot be doubted. But what causes mutations? Cosmic rays? These have been proved experimentally to cause mutations in some cases. Then were those mutations which are called upon to account for the Cosmos and its creatures *purposive* or *chance* occurrences? There can be but one intelligent answer to this question: In view of the *order* in our universe, and in view of the obvious *progression* in the process of physical Creation itself, we can

## THE SPIRIT AND THE COSMOS

only conclude that if cosmic rays caused the mutations which lay back of the evolutionary process, then the activity of such rays must have been directed by a Supreme Intelligence and Will, in order to have taken place in the proper sequence necessary to progression in Creation, and in the proper manner necessary to produce the framework of order manifested by the Cosmos in which we live. But this brings us back once more to Universal Intelligence and Will—in a word, to our God and His Spirit and His Word.

Finally, as Bergson has argued so conclusively, not one of these methods of evolution which have been hypothesized in the past, nor all of them together, can account for the onward and upward surge of the Movement of Life itself. They may serve to account for the *how* of the so-called evolutionary movement, but certainly they do not account for the force which impelled the movement onward and upward constantly, from lower to higher and still higher forms, culminating finally in the human person. Nor can this impetus be accounted for, except on the basis of the operation of the Spirit-power of God.

For the religious man, therefore, the truth remains eternal, and for ever—that “in the beginning” it was God who, by His Spirit, at the decrees of His Word, created “the heavens and the earth and all the host of them.”

On *evolution* and *evolutionism*, see my textbook on *Genesis*, I, 254-259, 472-474, 560-601; II, 313-353, 356-363. Also my book, *The Eternal Spirit*, 539-592).

It would be difficult to express my position on evolutionism more clearly than it is stated in a few terse sentences by a distinguished minister, college professor, radio and television speaker, Dr. Batsell Barrett Baxter, in his excellent text on apologetics, entitled *I Believe Because . . .* (pp 164-165), as follows:

The problem has sometimes been presented to me in this fashion: “Here is a man who believes in the existence of God, the deity of Christ, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the importance of the church. He has become a Christian in the manner prescribed in the New Testament, and he faithfully worships and works according to the directions in the Scriptures; yet he believes that God created the universe and then developed life on the earth by the evolutionary method. He is a faithful Christian and at the same time a theistic evolutionist. Will he be lost because of this view?” To say that such a man would be lost because of his misunderstanding and mistaken ideas about how God produced life on earth would be to speak where one has no real right to speak. Would one be lost for believing that Isaac was the

father of Abraham, rather than the other way round? Would one be lost for believing that Jacob had only ten sons instead of twelve? Would one be lost if he felt that the flood was only a localized phenomenon, covering only a few hundred square miles, rather than the whole earth? Would one be lost for thinking that Bishop Ussher's dates are correct, when they now appear to be somewhat incorrect? In other words, will God determine salvation in terms of what one believes about how or when He created the universe? Will one be lost because of a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of Genesis 1? It is my conviction that we ought to be slow to speak on these matters. From the foregoing pages, it ought to be clear to anyone that I am not an evolutionist, theistic or otherwise. I have not yet seen sufficient evidence to lead me to believe in the evolutionary theory. At the same time, I am not ready to exclude from fellowship sincere Christian brethren who mistakenly (as I believe) think that evolution was God's method. To allow this particular issue to divide the Lord's church would be most unfortunate indeed. It certainly would be most pleasing to Satan, and most displeasing to God.

### Day Seven: Rest

#### 2:1-3

*And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; because that in it he rested from all his work which God had created and made."*

Thus ends what has rightly been called the sublime Hymn of Creation.

1. God *finished* His work, on the seventh day. Does this mean that God, in some fashion, *worked* on the seventh day? To avoid such an interpretation, the Septuagint and certain other ancient versions insert the *sixth* day in the text instead of the seventh. Others have translated it, "had finished." Still others take the passage to mean that God *declared* His creative work finished. The Creation evidently was completed, as it had already been pronounced very good. Could it be that on the seventh day God fitted up Eden to serve as man's temporary abode in his first state of innocence and placed him in it?

2. God *rested from His work*. (1) But we are told that Jehovah "fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. 40:28). Does God ceased from His labor of creating, or as Skinner puts it, viously an anthropomorphic expression indicating simply that God need to rest because of fatigue? Surely not. This is ob-desisted from His creative activity. (Since the Creation was

finished and pronounced very good, what more was there to do?) Murphy's suggestion is that God's rest arises from the joy of achievement rather than from the relief of fatigue. Moreover, even though God "rested" from His works of physical creation, He certainly did not rest from works of benevolence (redemption). (2) Heaven is eternal rest, that is, rest from any kind of physical or corporeal activity (surely, however, a principal aspect of the activity of Heaven will be growth in *spiritual knowledge*). God came out of His timelessness to create the heavens and the earth, in six successive epochs; this Creation having been completed, and Eden prepared for man's first state, God returned back into the timelessness of pure Spiritual Being. Hence the Father's "rest" continues, and therefore *we have no formula, as at the end of each of the first six days, that there was evening and there was morning, a seventh day*. All preceding periods had begun and ended; not so the seventh—it is still going on. This is evidently what Jesus meant (John 5:17) in answering the Jews who were criticizing Him for healing on their week-day Sabbath. "My Father worketh even until now, and I work," said Jesus. That is to say, "You Pharisees criticize me for doing a work of *benevolence* on your little twenty-four-hour Sabbath—but why? My Father's Sabbath has been going on throughout all these intervening centuries from the time He ceased from the creating of the world, yet through all this time He has been doing works of benevolence continuously. Why, then, should you literal-minded hypocrites find fault with me for doing a work of benevolence on your little week-day Sabbath?"

3. *Pro-lepsis: Resting and Hallowing.* (1) Note that to *bless* is to wish something for that which is blessed (someone has said, "infinite multiplication" of the something wished); and to *hallow* is to remove that which is hallowed, out of its secular relations and to devote it to God. (2) This is obviously a *pro-lepsis*: and who was in a better position to understand this than Moses under whom the observance of the week-day Sabbath was established? Now a *pro-lepsis* is a connecting together, by the writer of the narrative, of two widely separated events in point of years, in an explanatory way, so that it appears as if they might have happened at one and the same time. Remember that Moses is writing this narrative long after the

1. George Gamow, *The Creation of the Universe, Intro.*, xii.

Creation. *This means that God rested on the seventh epochal (aeonic) day after finishing His Creation (of the physical universe). But He did not sanctify the seventh solar day of the week as the Jewish Sabbath until many centuries later, to be specific, when the Hebrew people under Moses were in the Wilderness of Sin, previous to their arrival at Sinai.* In the sixteenth chapter of Exodus we have the account of the institution of the Jewish Sabbath. Moses, however, in giving us the Creation Narrative, connects the *resting* on the seventh aeonic day (after Creation) and the *sanctification* of the seventh solar day in the Wilderness of Sin, in such an explanatory way that it appears that the two events happened following the Creation, and at the same time, when in reality they were separated by many centuries. He does this, evidently, for the purpose of teaching the Jewish people *why it was that Yahweh selected the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth, as a day of rest for them, but especially as a memorial of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage* (Deut. 5:15). (3) Another example of pro-lepsis occurs in Gen. 3:20—"And the man called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." ("Eve" means "Living" or "Life.") When Adam named her Eve, as far as we know, she was not the mother of anyone; but she was the mother of the entire human race when the Mosaic Cosmogony was written. Hence, Moses appended the explanatory clause, "because she was the mother of all living," to show why Adam, with prophetic insight, named her Eve. (4) Pro-lepsis occurs in the New Testament, as in Matt. 10:2-4, in the enumeration of the twelve apostles. Matthew, in giving their names, concludes with the statement, "and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him." The clause, "who also betrayed him," is merely explanatory on Matthew's part, to make clear the identity of Judas. Yet the calling of Judas to the apostleship and the betrayal of Jesus by Judas were events separated in time by some three years, although it might seem, from the wording of this passage from Matthew's account, that they occurred at one and the same time. There can be little or no doubt that in Gen. 2:1-3, we have another pro-lepsis: only on this basis can the passage be harmonized with the teaching of the Bible as a whole.

(5) A. Campbell takes the position that the Sabbath was observed from the Creation.<sup>1</sup> However, there is no evidence whatever to support this view. There is not the slightest sug-

gestion of an observance of the Sabbath prior to the time of Moses: the term does not even occur in the book of Genesis. There are intimations of a division of time into cycles of seven days (weeks) here and there in Genesis (e.g., Gen. 8:10-12, 29:16-30, 50:10), but there is no necessary connection between these and the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath; moreover, there is not even an intimation of Sabbath observance associated with them. (6) It is crystal clear that the first observance of the week-day Sabbath occurred in the wilderness of Sin, as related in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. It is inconceivable that the Procession under Moses would have been on the march from Elim to the wilderness of Sin, as we are told expressly that it was, on the first day of the eight-day period described here, for this would also have been a Sabbath had the institution been in effect at that time. The Law of the Sabbath forbade the people to do any work whatever, even to kindle a fire or to leave their habitations on that holy day (Exo. 16:29, 31:14-15, 35:2-3; Num. 15:32-36); hence, marching on the that first day into the wilderness of Sin would have been a flagrant violation of the Sabbath Law. Now, as the story is given, throughout the six days that followed the first day of marching, the people, at God's command, gathered manna ("bread from heaven") each day, and, again at God's command, they gathered a double portion on the sixth day. Why so? Because the day that followed—the last day of this eight-day period—was the first observance of the Jewish Sabbath. The Scripture makes these facts too clear for misconception (Exo. 16:21-30). Not too long after this, the Procession reached Sinai, and there the positive law of the Sabbath was incorporated into the Decalogue (Exo. 20:8-11). (7) The Sabbath was a provision of the Mosaic Law, given to one people only, a people living in a part of the world where it could be properly observed (e.g., without the kindling of a fire, Exo. 35:2-3, Num. 15:32-36) without working a hardship on them (cf. the words of Jesus, Mark 2:27-28). The wording of Exo. 20:8, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," does not necessarily imply a previous observance; "remember" means, evidently, "keep in memory," or "do not forget" the Sabbath day, thus having reference primarily to their *future* observance of the day. If it be contended that the word "remember" here has reference to *past* observance, I answer simply that the Hebrew people had already



observed the Sabbath at least a few times, from the occasion of its institution in the Wilderness of Sin (Exo. 16). The language of this sixteenth chapter makes it too obvious for question that what is described here was the first observance of the seventh day of the week as the Jewish Sabbath.

(8) Finally, the Sabbath was an integral part of the Decalogue, and the Decalogue was the heart of the Mosaic Covenant. In Deut. 5:4-22, we find Moses repeating the Ten Commandments, including the command to keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. In verses 1-3 of the same chapter, we find him stating expressly that God had not made this Covenant with their fathers (the Patriarchs), but with the generation that had been present at Horeb (another name for Sinai), and with their descendants to whom he, Moses, was speaking on that occasion (just before his own death and burial). (Cf. Gal. 3:19. Here the Apostle tells us that the Law (Torah) was added, that is, codified, because of the growing sinfulness of the people under no restraint but that of tradition and conscience). Moses then goes on to tell the people, no doubt to *remind* them (vv. 12-15), that the seventh-day Sabbath was set apart by Divine ordinance to be observed by the Children of Israel as a *memorial of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage*. (Cf. Neh. 9:13-14). It necessarily follows that the observance must have been inaugurated *after* that deliverance had taken place, that is, after the Exodus. All these Scriptures account for the fact that we find no mention of the Jewish Sabbath in Genesis, that is, throughout the Patriarchal Dispensation. What, then, was the purpose of the inspired writer (Moses, cf. Matt. 19:7-8; Luke 16:19-31, 24:27, 44; John 1:17, etc.) in correlating the observance of the week-day Sabbath by the Jewish nation with the "day" of God's rest from His creative activity? The answer is obvious: it is to explain why the *seventh* day was selected to be memorialized instead of any one of the other six days. We have in Genesis *the reason why the particular day of the week was chosen*: we have in Deuteronomy *what the day was chosen for*, that is, what it was Divinely intended to memorialize. (There is no need whatever for assuming two contradictory accounts here, nor even for assuming two different accounts.) In a word, the Genesis narrative is to inform us that the seventh day of each ordinary week was sanctified as a memorial for the Jewish nation because that was the great *aeonic* day on which God rested from His creative activity "in the beginning." Thus it may be con-

tended legitimately that *the extent of the time involved* in these two instances is not any necessary part of the exegetical parallel.

(9) The seventh-day Sabbath was a sign between Yahweh and one people only, the Children of Israel (Exo. 31:12-17). It was divinely appointed a memorial of their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt (Deut. 5:12-15), and as such never had any significance whatever for a Gentile. Moreover, it was to cease with the abrogation of the Old Covenant and the ratification of the New by the death of Christ on the Cross (Hos. 2:11, John 1:17, Col. 2:13-17, 2 Cor. 3:3-15, Gal. 3:23-27; Heb. 8:6-13, 9:23-28, 10:8, 14; 1 Pet. 2:24). In our Dispensation, the observance of the seventh day would, of course, as stated above, have no meaning, especially for Gentiles. Hence, in the New Testament writings, whereas Jesus, the Apostles, and the early evangelists often went into the synagogues on the Sabbath (the seventh day) to preach the Gospel to the Jews wont to be assembled there, all Christian assemblies, however, were held on the first day of the week, the day on which the Lord was raised from the dead (Mark 8:31, 16:9, 21:42; Acts 4:10-12, 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1-2), which came to be known as the Lord's Day (Rev. 1:10). There is no particular connection between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day. There is, however, a kind of analogy: that is, as the Sabbath was ordained a memorial of the deliverance of ancient or fleshly Israel from the bondage of Egypt (Deut. 5:15), and as Egypt is, in Scripture, a type of a state of sin, so the Lord's Day is a memorial of the deliverance of spiritual Israel (Gal. 3:29) from the bondage of sin and death, through the resurrection of Christ.

(10) Note allusions to the six "days" of Creation in other parts of the Bible, especially Exo. 20:11 and Exo. 31:15-17. Do these passages require us to accept the "days" of the Genesis Cosmogony as days of twenty-four hours each? On this point Tayler Lewis (Lange, CDHCG, 135-136) writes with great clarity, as follows: "The most clear and direct allusion is found in the Fourth Commandment, Exo. 20:11, 'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth.' This language is held to be conclusive evidence of the latter having been ordinary days. They are of the same kind, it is said, or they would not have been put in such immediate connection. There could not be such a sudden change or rise in the meaning. This looks plausible, but a careful study

shows that there is something more than first strikes us. It might be replied that there is no difference of radical idea—which is essentially preserved, and without any metaphor in both uses—but a vast difference in the scale. There is, however, a more definite answer furnished specially by the text itself, and suggested immediately by the objectors' own method of reasoning. God's days of working, it is said, must be the same with man's days of working, because they are mentioned in such close connection. Then God's work and man's work must also be the same, or on the same grade for a similar reason. What a difference there must have been between God's work be to thee a sabbath (a rest), for the Lord thy God *rested* on the seventh day' — words of the same general import, but the less solemn or more human term here applied to Deity. The Hebrew word is the same for both: 'In six days shalt thou labor and *do* all thy *work*; for in six days the Lord *made* (*wrought*) heaven and earth.' Is there no transition here to a higher idea? And so of the *resting*: 'The seventh day shall and man's work—above all, between God's ineffable repose and the rest demanded for human weariness. Must we not carry the same difference in to the *times*, and make a similar ineffable distinction between the divine working-days and the human working-days—the God-divided days, as Augustine calls them, and 'the sun-divided days,' afterwards appointed to us for '*signs*, and for seasons, and for days, and for years' of our lower chronology? Such a pointing to a higher scale is also represented in the septennial sabbath, and in the great jubilee period of seven times seven. They expand upwards and outwards like a series of concentric circles, but the greatest of them is still a sign of something greater; and how would they all collapse, and lose their sublime import, if we regard their antitype as less than themselves, or, in fact, no greater than their least! The other analogy, instead of being forced, has in it the highest reason. It is the true and effective order of contemplation. The lower, or earthly, day is made a memorial of the higher. We are called to *remember* by it. In six (human) days do all thy work; for in six (divine) days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . It is the manner of the Scriptures thus to make times and things on earth representatives, or under-types, of things in the heavens, *hypodeigmata ton en tois ouranois* (Heb. 9:23). Viewed from

## THE SPIRIT AND THE COSMOS

such a standpoint these parallelisms in the language of the Fourth Commandment suggest of *themselves* a vast difference between the divine and the human days, even if it were the only argument the Bible furnished for that purpose. As the *work to the work*, as the *rest to the rest*, so are the *times to the times*."

(11) Thomas Whitelaw comments in similar vein:

The duration of the seventh day of necessity determines the length of the other six. Without anticipating the exposition of ch. 2:1-4, it may be said that God's sabbatic rest is understood by the best interpreters of Scripture to have continued from creation's close until the present hour; so that consistency demands the previous six days to be considered as not of short, but of indefinite, duration. The language of the fourth commandment, when interpreted in accordance with the present theory, confirms the probability of its truth. If the six days in Exod. 20:11 are simply natural days, then the seventh day, in which God is represented as having rested from his creative labours, must likewise be a natural or solar day; and if so, it is proper to observe what follows. It follows (1) that the events recorded in the first five verses of Genesis must be compressed into a single day of twenty-four hours, so that no gap will remain into which the short-day advocates may thrust the geologic ages, which is for them an imperative necessity; (2) that the world is only 144 hours older than man, which is contrary to both science and revelation; (3) that the statement is incorrect that God finished all his work at the close of the sixth day; and (4) that the fossiliferous remains which have been discovered in the earth's crust have either been deposited there since man's creation, or were created there at the first, both of which suppositions are untenable. But now, if on the contrary, the language signifies that God laboured in the fashioning of his cosmos through six successive periods of indefinite duration (*olamim*, aeons), and entered on the seventh day into a correspondingly long period of sabbatic rest, we can hold the opposite of every one of these conclusions, and find a convincing argument besides for the observance of the sabbath in the beautiful analogy which subsists between God's great work of *olamim* and man's little work of sun-measured days."<sup>1</sup> [Perhaps I should emphasize the fact here that the *Pulpit Commentary*, although first published about the turn of the century and recently re-issued, is still one of the sanest, most comprehensive, and most scholarly of all Biblical Commentaries. Perhaps the most erudite of all such sets is the *Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical Commentary*, co-edited by Dr. John Peter Lange and Dr. Philip Schaff, first published in 1868; the volume on Genesis, by J. P. Lange, is translated from the German, with essays and annotations by Dr. Tayler Lewis. The general content of these Commentaries has been affected very little by recent scientific discoveries and hypotheses. I should say that this is a mark of their true greatness, their reliability.]

(12) Some additional evidence concerning the "days" of the Creation is in order here, if for no other reason than to demonstrate the general ambiguity with which the Hebrew *yom*

1. Whitelaw, *op. cit.*, 12, 13.

is used in the Old Testament. For example, Gen. 1:5 (here "Day" refers to *daylight*); Gen. 2:4 (here *yom* takes in the whole Creative Week); Gen. 2:17 (here the word indicates an indefinite period); Gen. 35:3—"the day of my distress"; Eccl. 7:14—"the day of prosperity," "the day of adversity"; Psa. 95:8—"the day of temptation in the wilderness" (Did not this "day" last forty years?) (Deut. 9:1—here "day" means in a short time; Psa. 2:7—here we have an eternal day, a day in God's Eternal Purpose), etc. Note also in the New Testament the Greek equivalent, *hemera*, John 8:56—"my day" here takes in Christ's incarnate ministry and probably His entire reign as Acting Sovereign of the universe (Acts 2:36, Phil. 2:9-11); Heb. 3:15—in this text "to-day" takes in the "present season of grace," that is, the entire Gospel Dispensation. Thus it will be seen that by the same word *yom*, and its Greek equivalent *hemera*, the Scriptures recognize an *artificial* day (Gen. 1:5), an *eternal* day (Psa. 2:7), a *civil* day (Lev. 23:32), a *millennial* day (2 Pet. 3:8), a *judgement* day (Acts 17:31), a *solar* day (Exo. 16:4-5, Rom. 14:5), a *day-period* (Gen. 2:4, John 8:56, Heb. 3:8, Rom. 13:12), etc. Certainly, the sheer elasticity with which these Hebrew and Greek words are used for our word, "day," throughout the Bible forbids the dogmatic assumption of a single fixed meaning!

It is worthy of note here that Gleason L. Archer, Jr., whose fidelity to the Scriptures can hardly be questioned, in his *outstanding* book, published recently, after rejecting the concepts of a *twenty-four-hour* day and a *revelational* (special prophetic visional) day, presents the view which I have adopted here, namely, that in the Genesis Cosmogony each of the seven Creative Days must have been a period of indefinite duration (that is, as man measures time). He writes:

According to this view the term *yom* does not necessarily signify a literal twenty-four-hour day, but is simply equivalent to 'stage.' It has often been asserted that *yom* could not bear this meaning, but could only have implied a literal day to the Hebrew mind according to Hebrew usage. Nevertheless, on the basis of internal evidence, it is the writer's conviction that *yom* in Genesis 1 could not have been intended by the Hebrew author to mean a literal twenty-four-hour day.<sup>1</sup>

I fail to see how any other interpretation can be validated on the basis of the content of the Genesis Cosmogony as a whole.

4. *The Mosaic Epic of Creation* is especially meaningful

1. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, 176-177.

in one respect: in v. 31 it sets *the sublime optimistic motif* of the entire Bible. This verse reads: "God saw everything he had made, and behold, it was very good." What a burst of exultation and benediction to be called forth from the inmost being of Elohim at His contemplation of His own handiwork in its entirety! What order, what beauty, what glory there was, to elicit such Divine exultation! Yet—does not this verse strike the note of optimism that pervades the Bible from beginning to end? Does it not impress the truth upon us that God's work can never be destroyed, indeed can never be ultimately marred, much less ruined (Acts 3:21); that Good will never be overcome by Evil, but will in fact overcome Evil, in the consummation of the Divine Plan of the Ages? This crescendo of moral victory reaches its height in the New Testament. Even in the midst of the Great Tribulation which man will bring upon himself at the end of the present Dispensation, the spread of evil in all its forms—greed, lust, violence, war, utter preoccupation with earthly things—when the saints see these iniquities becoming world-wide, Jesus Himself tells us, they shall lift up their eyes and "see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24:29-30, 16:17-18; Mark 13:19-26; Luke 21:20-28). Never is there the slightest intimation anywhere in Scripture of the possibility of Satan's triumph over the Creation of God! On the contrary, it is expressly affirmed again and again that Satan and his rebel host (of both angels and men) are doomed; that their proper habitation is the pit of the abyss, that is, segregation in Hell, the penitentiary of the moral universe (Matt. 25:41, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6), and that to this ultimate destiny they are bound to be consigned by the Sovereign Will that decrees and executes Absolute Justice. (Matt. 25:31-46; John 5:28-29; Heb. 2:14-15; Phil. 2:5-11; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Rom. 2:2-11; Acts 17:30-31; Rev. 20:11-15).

5. *The Correspondence with Present-day Science* of the main features of the Genesis account of the Creation is little short of amazing. (1) On the basis of the *panoramic* interpretation of the Genesis Cosmogony, the one which we have adopted here, largely on the ground that it does not require any far-fetched applications of the various parts, that is to say, any unjustified "stretching" of the meaning of the Scripture text, the whole Creation Narrative, in its essential features, parallels

the fundamental theories of the physical sciences of our day. On the basis of this *panoramic* view, there is no need to postulate any post-cataclysmic reconstruction theory (based on the notion of a "gap" between verses 1 and 2) to provide a way of escape from the difficulties of modern geology. Certainly the stretch of time between the first brooding of the Spirit over the primeval deep and the Divine *consilium* in which it was decreed that man should be created in God's image, was eminently sufficient to allow for the developments claimed by such sciences as astronomy, physics, paleontology, archeology, anthropology, etc., and, as we shall see later, for those aspects of the biological and physiological sciences which truly can be designated *scientific*. Besides, the notion of the building of a new cosmos on the ruins of a former one, without even a suggestion, in the Scripture text, of any natural or moral reason for such wholesale changes, makes the *reconstruction* theory a purely arbitrary one on man's part. (2) Again, the oft-heard *cyclical* theory of cosmic history is usually, either in its origin or in its adoption, a case in which the wish is father to the thought on the part of atheistically and agnostically motivated scientists who would attempt to avoid the problem of Creation by zealously affirming what they choose to designate the "eternity of matter." (In passing, it should be noted that the correlation of the word "eternal" (which most certainly signifies *timelessness*) with the nature of what man calls "matter" is *per se* an obvious contradiction.) Evidently, even though the theory of cycles of catastrophes and reconstructions might reasonably allow for the view that, as Hoyle puts it, "matter is infinitely old" (a view which he himself rejects), any such cyclical theory deprives cosmic being and history of any meaning whatsoever, and certainly ignores the fact of the Intelligence and Will which, on the basis of the theory of cycles, necessarily establishes and sustains the successive periods of cosmic order that are supposed to emerge from respective prior cataclysms. (Let us not forget that *cosmos is order*.) As a matter of fact, these cyclical theories have little or nothing to support them, apart from the human imagination which conjures them up.

(3) Again, the Genesis account of the Creation is in strict accord with the nuclear physics of our time in presenting radiant energy (light), of some kind, as the first and ultimate form of "physical" energy. This, as stated heretofore, is a commonplace of present-day physical science.

(4) Especially, however, is the *Order* of the Creation as presented in the Genesis Narrative in the closest harmony with present-day scientific thinking, and indeed with the facts of human experience. And the amazing thing about this correspondence is that it is true, despite the fact that the Mosaic Cosmogony can certainly be proved to have had its origin in pre-scientific times, that is, before the sciences, as we think of them, had begun to be developed. In the Genesis Narrative the word "good," as we have noted heretofore, signified the order that prevailed as a result of the ordinations of the Word and the broodings of the Spirit; hence, at the end of the Creative Process God is said to have looked out on the whole and pronounced it "very good," that is to say, the order was perfect, *perfection signifying wholeness*. Obviously, energy, especially the different kinds of radiant energy (light), were necessarily the first "physical" existents; hence, we are told that these were created on Day One. This was the necessary "physical" beginning of the cosmos, insofar as human experience and science can determine. (The Primal Energy is, of course, the Divine Intelligence and Will.) Again, the creation of both light and atmosphere necessarily preceded the appearance of all forms of life: without light and atmosphere plants could not perform the mysterious process of photosynthesis, the process by which solar energy is captured, so to speak, and converted into stored food energy for beast and man. Without photosynthesis no form of animal life, the human body included, could exist. A. Cressy Morrison writes:

All vegetable life is dependent upon the almost infinitesimal quantity of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which, so to speak, it breathes. To express this complicated photosynthetic chemical reaction in the simplest possible way, the leaves of the trees are lungs and they have the power when in the sunlight to separate this obstinate carbon dioxide into carbon and oxygen. In other words, the oxygen is given off and the carbon retained and combined with the hydrogen of the water brought up by the plant from its roots. By magical chemistry, out of these elements nature makes sugar, cellulose, and numerous other chemicals, fruits and flowers. The plant feeds itself and produces enough more to feed every animal on earth. At the same time, the plant releases the oxygen we breathe and without which life would end in five minutes. Let us, then, pay our humble respects to the plant . . . Animals give off carbon dioxide and plants give off oxygen . . . It has recently been discovered that carbon dioxide in small quantities is also essential to most animal life, just as plants use some oxygen. Hydrogen must be included, although we do not breathe it. Without hydrogen water would not exist, and the water content of animal and vegetable matter is surprisingly great and absolutely essential. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon dioxide, and carbon, singly and in their various relations to each other,



## THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS WORD AND WORKS

are the principal biological elements. They are the very basis on which life rests. There is, however, not one chance in millions that they should all be at one time on one planet in the proper proportions of life. Science has no explanations to offer for the facts, and to say it is accidental is to defy mathematics.<sup>1</sup>

And, finally, in this connection, without the subhuman orders to provide for man the means of food, shelter, clothing, medicines, etc., he simply could not exist in his present natural state. (Moreover, according to the Divine Plan, *man's natural state as a person created in God's image is the necessary pre-condition to growth in holiness which is the very essence of the Spiritual Life, just as the Spiritual Life is the necessary preparation for the Life Everlasting* (1 Cor. 15:44-49, Rom. 8:18-25, Matt. 5:8, Heb. 12:14, 2 Pet. 3:18).

To summarize: the general order of the Creation as set forth in Genesis was, briefly, as follows: energy, light, atmosphere, lands and seas, plants, water and air animals (and it is a commonplace of biology today that animal life had its beginning in the water), land animals, and finally man and woman. This, as we have noted, was an order determined by the very nature of things as they are known by present-day science; hence, it presupposes a directing Intelligence and ordering Will. (Surely order, anywhere, or of any kind, presupposes an orderer.) Again, this universal order consisted in the harmony (hence, *unity*) of all natural non-living and living processes. Every created class of things was fulfilling the function, and attaining the end, for which the Creator-God had brought it into existence; in a word, there was perfect harmony and unity of all the component parts of the whole natural Creation. This universal order prevailed, of course, until sin entered the world. Sin is transgression of the law of God; it is *lawlessness* (1 John 3:4) and this is *disorder*.

*It is of the utmost importance to emphasize here the fact that the order in which the various parts, non-living and living, of the natural Creation are said to have been brought into existence, in the account given us in the first chapter of Genesis, is precisely that which is claimed by modern science. Yet the Genesis Cosmogony was written, as we all know, long before men knew anything about radiant energy, atomic processes, cellular processes, plant photosynthesis, psychosomatic entities,*

1. *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 26, 27.

*etc., or their sequential inter-relationships. This is a fact, I contend, which can be accounted for only on the ground of the special Divine inspiration of the Mosaic Cosmogony.*

I consider it a privilege to present here the following conclusive paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Unger:

In the first two chapters of Genesis in an account unique in all ancient literature, the Pentateuch catalogues the creation of the heavens and earth, and all plant, animal and human life. Other nations have their creation stories. But these are important only by sheer contrast in accentuating the sublimity and grandeur of the inspired record. Purged of the gross polytheistic perversions of the numerous non-inspired creation legends by virtue of its advanced monotheistic point of view, only the Genesis account arrives at the great First Cause in that incomparably magnificent opening word: 'In the beginning God created . . .' (Genesis 1:1). Lifting the reader with one stroke out of the morass and confusion of the polytheistic accounts, in which primitive peoples in their naive efforts to explain the origin of the universe attributed each different phenomenon to a separate cause in the form of a deity, the Pentateuch conducts us at once to that which was totally beyond the grasp of the natural mind, the concept of the universe as a whole as the creative act of one God. By inspiration the author of the Pentateuch has the secret which the polytheistic writers of ancient Mesopotamia blindly groped after, the unifying principle of the universe. In an age grossly ignorant of causation, Genesis stands out all the more resplendently as a divine revelation. The discovery of secondary causes and the explanation of the *how* of creation in its on-going operation is the achievement of science. How cause produces effect, how order and symmetry prevail, how physical phenomena and organic life are interdependent—these and similar questions science has answered. But science can go only so far. The elements of the universe, matter, force, order, it must take for granted. Revelation alone can answer the *why* of creation. The Bible alone discloses that the universe exists *because God made it* and brought it into being for a definite purpose. The account of the origin of the cosmos in Genesis, moreover, is not only incomparably superior in every respect to ancient cosmogonies and creation accounts, but what is all the more amazing in the light of the utterly unscientific age in which it was produced, is its scientific precision even when judged by the standards of our modern scientific age. Commenting on the account of creation which we find in Chapter I of Genesis, W. F. Albright calls the 'sequence of creative phases' which it outlines as 'so rational that modern science cannot improve on it, given the same language and the same range of ideas in which to state its conclusions. In fact, modern scientific cosmogonies show such a disconcerting tendency to be short-lived that it may be seriously doubted whether science has yet caught up with the Biblical story.'<sup>1</sup>

(This excerpt from Albright occurs in the article, "The Old Testament and Archeology," in the *Old Testament Commentary*, H. C. Alleman and E. E. Flack (Philadelphia, 1948), p. 135).

1. Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*, 184-186.