

PART SIX: THE FIRST FOUR "DAYS" OF  
THE COSMIC WEEK OF BEGINNINGS

Gen. 1:2-1:19

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The verb *bara*, translated "create," writes Skinner (ICC,15) is used exclusively in Scripture of Divine activity, "a restriction to which perhaps no parallel can be found in other languages"; expresses the idea of *novelty*, *extraordinariness*; expresses the idea of *effortless* production ("such as befits the Almighty") "by word or volition" (as another puts it, the verb emphasizes "the unconditioned Creatorship of God"; cf. Psa. 33:6,9; Psa 148:1-6; Rom 4:17). With this introduction which, apparently, is a caption to the Cosmogony that follows, or, it may be, a designation of the activity by which the first form of undifferentiated energy-matter was called into being by the Divine Will and Word, the writer proceeds to the description of the successive steps by which this first form of energy-matter was arranged into an organized cosmos.

Day One: Energy-Matter, Motion, Light  
(1:2-5)

*"And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."*

1. The writer singles out the earth for special emphasis. This is consistent, of course, in that it points up the fact immediately that the entire Cosmogony is to be written from the viewpoint of an inhabitant of earth. However, as Lange points out (CDHCG,163), the description given here of the genesis of the earth may well serve, by way of analogy, for the generation of the universe.

2. The earth "was waste and void." (1) This description takes us back to the first stages in the Creative Process subsequent to the first putting forth of energy from the being of God; the Spirit, literally, *was brooding*;

that is, the process was actually going on when the account opens; as yet the primal energy (was it psychical or physical?) had not transmuted itself into gross matter (which present-day physicists describe as "frozen" or "congealed" energy). There was only *formlessness* and *voidness*: literally, the earth was *formless* and *empty*. Again quoting Lange (CDHCG,163): "It is through the conception of voidness, nothingness, that *Thohu* and *Bohu* are connected . . . The *desert* is *waste*, that is, a confused mass without order; the *waste* is *desert*, that is, *void*, without distinction of object. The first word denotes rather the lack of form, the second the lack of content, in the earliest condition of the earth. It might therefore be translated form-less, matter-less."

(2) There are some who hold that the phrase *thohu cabohu* supports the notion of a previous overthrow, a cosmic upheaval. For corroboration they refer us especially to Isa. 34:11, where the same terms are rendered, respectively, "confusion" and "emptiness" (cf. also Jer. 4:23). Whitelaw (PCG,41) rejects this view: the phrase, he contends, does not suggest the ruin of a previous cosmos, because Elohim never intended anything to be thus formless and empty, hence utterly *functionless* (that is, not "good" for anything); rather, He created the earth to be inhabited, and to be inhabited by man as the crown of Creation. Obviously, the Genesis Cosmogony gives us the clear picture of an *organized* cosmos, the ultimate end for which the Divine activity was first set in operation. Our God is purposeful: He sees (plans) the end from the beginning (Isa. 46:9-11).

(3) I suggest that "form" (in "formless") here does not connote shape or configuration essentially, but, rather, the ancient concept of "form" as the principle of specification, that is, of the identity of particulars in any given class. For example, one who looks at a mustard seed and a poppy seed can hardly distinguish between them. But

one thing is sure: one cannot plant a poppy seed and get a mustard plant, for the obvious reason that all poppies have the form of "poppy-ness," whereas all mustard plants have the form of "mustard-ness." Or, just as a mind or soul "informs" the human body, so man is specified (set apart as a species) by his thought processes. Hence, we have in this verse of Genesis a picture of the earth when it had not yet assumed the form of a planet, but was still only a "part" of a huge, shapeless, objectless, motionless, and tenantless mass of "world stuff" (the hydrogen fog of Hoyle? or Gamow's ylem? or Whipple's "dust cloud"?), perhaps little more than a potential field of elemental forces, out of which the earth and all other planets and suns, and perhaps all other universes, were eventually to emerge as a result of the "brooding" of the *Ruach Elohim*. It was that state in which all electronic, gaseous, liquid, and solid elements were commingled (present only potentially), but as yet lacking any trace of differentiation. Moreover, this primal world-stuff was "shrouded in the thick folds of Cimmerian gloom, giving not the slightest promise of that fair world of light, order, and life into which it was about to be transformed."

3. "*And darkness was upon the face of the deep.*" (1) Is this a reflection of the Babylonian cosmology in which the earth was thought of as resting upon a subterranean ocean? Such a view is based, of course, on the presupposition that the Babylonian traditions of the Creation and the Deluge were the originals from which the Biblical accounts were derived—a view which ignores altogether the possibility of Divine revelation as the source of the Genesis Cosmogony (or the account of Noah's Flood). In opposition to this *derivation-theory*, it will be noted that the preceding affirmation (in v.2) that the earth was formless and empty, indicates clearly that as yet the earth *as such* did not even exist, that in fact the whole heavens and earth were as yet unformed, at this stage of the Cre-

ative activity. It is granted, of course, that the "deep" is a term used frequently in the Hebrew Scriptures to designate the sea (cf. Psa. 42:7, Job 38:30, Isa. 44:27). But again there is no evidence that a sea or ocean existed at this point in the Creation. The writer is not picturing here the ultimate state of the cosmos; rather, he is describing its state prior even to the beginning of its arrangement into a cosmos, prior to the genesis of physical force, motion, and ultimately gross matter, through the continuous activity of the Spirit of God. In view of these considerations, I suggest that the "deep," in this particular connection, could well refer to the "deep" of *limitless Space*. (This could be the import of the term as used in Gen. 8:2 also.) Under this view, then, we have here a picture of limitless Space filled with, and shrouded in, thick darkness, with the "world-stuff" beginning to emerge at God's command, through the Spirit's activity of stirring, energizing, that is, actualizing forms of energy which had not before that moment operated, and which were capable of transmutation into the kinds of matter known to us today. (It is impossible for the human mind to conceive of the transition from Eternity to Time (which necessarily involved the beginnings of what we call the "physical" aspects of the Plan of the Ages) as having occurred in any other way. Basically, to be sure, this transition must always remain a mystery to human intelligence because it embodies the ineffable, and must, in the final analysis, be largely a matter of faith.) In its first state, of course, the very first "world-stuff" was motionless and objectless (that is, wholly undifferentiated); as a matter of fact, had there been anything at this point desirable to be seen, there was no light by which to see it, for thick darkness "was upon the face of the deep." This interpretation is supported by the language of the very next sentence, "*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,*" the term "waters" suggesting an even more advanced stage in the Creative

Process, probably the stage at which matter had begun to assume, incipiently at least, a gaseous ("atmospheric waters"), or perhaps even the beginning of a fluidic, state.

(2) It is significant, I think, that the tradition of such a primordial Chaos, the chief characteristics of which were *formlessness*, *emptiness*, and *darkness*, was widespread among ancient peoples. The Greek word, *Chaos*, for instance, meant primarily, empty, *immeasurable space*, and only secondarily, *the rude, unformed mass* of something out of which the universe was created. Thus Hesiod, the Greek poet of the 8th century B.C., wrote as follows; "Verily at the first Chaos came to be, but next wide-bosomed Earth, the ever-sure foundation of all the deathless ones who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus, and dim Tartarus in the depth of the wide-pathed Earth, and Eros (Love), fairest among the deathless gods, who unnerves the limbs and overcomes the mind and wise counsels of all gods and all men within them. From Chaos came forth Erebus and black Night; but of Night were born Aether and Day, whom she conceived and bare from union in love with Erebus. And Earth first bare starry Heaven, equal to herself, to cover her on every side, and to be an ever-sure abiding-place for the blessed gods" ("Theogony," HHH, LCL). Of course, these are all personifications, but their import is obvious. Chaos (Space), says Hesiod, was first of all; of him was born Erebus (Darkness) and black Night; and by the union of Darkness and black Night came Aether (the upper air) and Day. And Plato, some four centuries after Hesiod, writing in an imaginative vein, in his well-known "likely story" (*mythos*) of the *Timaeus*, described the Creation of the cosmos, by the *Demiourgos* (Master Craftsman), out of the Receptacle of Becoming (Space) according to the patterns supplied by the Eternal Forms or Ideas that go to make up the World of Being. Plato seems to imply that these Eternal Forms (principles of specificity, e.g., the "cow-ness" of a

cow, "horse-ness" of a horse, etc.) exist in the Divine Reason, although I have never been able to find any passages in which he affirmed this explicitly. The Receptacle, he describes as having no qualities of its own; it is not, according to the Platonic picture, that *out of which* things of our World of Becoming are made, but that *in which* the qualities that make up this "physical" or "corporeal" world (in the form of the Opposites which are said to be continuously passing, the one into the other and back again, cyclically) appear as in a mirror (See F. M. Cornford, PC). Lange, on Gen. 1:2 (CDHCG, 163): "Chaos denotes the void space (as in a similar manner the old Northern Ginnungagap, gaping of yawnings, the gaping abyss, which also implies present existing material), and in the next place the rude unorganized mass of the world-material." (Incidentally, one principle that must always be kept in mind in the study of the Old Testament is that *mythological (and traditional) distortions of ancient beliefs and practices all point necessarily to a genuine original.*) Certainly it is worth noting well, in this connection, that one of the concepts which has gained widespread credence among physicists of our own time is that Space may have been the very first "stuff" of which the physical universe had its beginning. For example, Mr. Walter Russell, one-time President of the Society of Arts and Sciences, was quoted in the metropolitan press several years ago, as follows: "The question arises, Is there any line of demarcation between a spiritual and a physical universe? And have we been calling the invisible universe spiritual just because we could not see it? We have begun to see something tangible and inspiring beyond place, mass and dimension. There must be a limitless source of static energy somewhere back of all this dynamic expression." With reference to the ultimate particles or forces of which matter is composed, continued Mr. Russell. which seem to constitute light, and which carry energy, scientists find

them all acting suspiciously like some of the processes of human thought. He added: "Tomorrow physics will undoubtedly divorce energy from matter and give it to space . . . What we call the spiritual universe may prove to be the static source in space of electric energy. If Einstein's prophecy is fulfilled it would cause a far greater upheaval in science than Copernicus caused in the concept of Ptolemy. Basic conclusions of today would be either reversed or discarded entirely, for if energy belongs to space as the new cosmogony suggests, light would belong to space, as Jesus inferred. When energy is found to belong to space, light will be understood to be an emergence from space, and God will be found to be what Jesus said He was—Light. As we study Jesus' teaching from the point of view of science, we become convinced that He understood light, energy, motion, and space, and knew what filled space. Jesus taught that life is eternal, that there is no death. Science may prove this to be literally true, and that the body, like all other material phenomena, merely registers the intensity of the thinking of a Supreme Intelligence. If science proves this, it will give meaning to the words of Sir James Jeans that 'matter may eventually be proved to be pure thought.'" (Recall Pascal's vivid line: "The eternal silence of infinite space is terrifying." Cf. Psa. 139:7-10.) We might well ask: Can any real line of demarcation be drawn between psychical (mental, spiritual) light (illumination) and physical light (illumination)? (See again the comments by Fred Hoyle on "continuous creation," as quoted on preceding pages.) (Of course, *we must always avoid dogmatizing in our attempts to correctly apprehend the sublime truths that are incorporated in the Genesis Cosmogony.*)

(3) The Bible teaches throughout that our physical cosmos is an embodiment of Divine Thought as expressed by the Divine Word (Logos), and as actualized by the Divine Spirit. The Will of God is the constitution of the

totality of being, both visible and invisible (Psa. 148:1-6, 33:6,9; Heb. 11:3). These are fundamental truths to which the physical science of our time is gradually groping its way back, despite its tendency to cling tenaciously to pantheistic assumptions.

(4) As in the physical realm, so it is in the spiritual. M. Henry (CWB, 2): "This chaos represents the state of an unregenerate graceless soul: *there* is disorder, confusion, and every evil work; it is empty of all good, for it is without God; it is dark till almighty grace effects a blessed change." (This change is wrought, of course, through our hearing, accepting, and obeying the Gospel of Christ.)

4. "*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*" (1) Literally, the Spirit of God (*Ruach Elohim*) was brooding. Not a "wind" of God, for the obvious reason that the air did not exist at this particular stage in the development of the cosmos. Skinner (ICCG,17-18): "Not, as has sometimes been supposed, a *wind* sent from God to dry up the waters, but the divine Spirit, figured as a bird brooding over its nest, and perhaps symbolizing an immanent principle of life and order in the as yet undeveloped chaos." "In accordance with Biblical usage generally," writes Whitelaw (PCG,4), this term, Spirit of God, "must be regarded as a designation, not simply of 'the divine power, which, like the wind and the breath cannot be perceived, (Gesenius), but of the Holy Spirit, who is uniformly represented as the source or formative cause of all life and order in the world, whether physical, intellectual, or spiritual . . . As it were, the mention of the *Ruach Elohim* is the first out-blossoming of the latent fulness of the Divine personality, the initial movement in that sublime revelation of the nature of the Godhead, which, advancing slowly, and at the best but indistinctly, throughout Old Testament times, culminated in the clear and ample disclosures of the gospel." (Cf. Job 26:13, 27:3, 33:4, 32:8; Psa. 33:6, 104:29-30; Acts 17:25).



(2) "The Spirit of God *was brooding*." The Hebrew word used here has a double meaning. In the first place, it conveys the idea of a stirring, a fluttering, as of an eagle stirring up her nest and teaching her young to fly. (The word has this import also in the Song of Moses, Deut. 32:11.) Thus the entrance of the Spirit into the primordial Chaos — formless, objectless, immeasurable Space — was signaled by a stirring therein, an energizing, a *setting in motion*. In the second place, the word *merachepheth* (from *rachaph*, to be tremulous, as with love) signifies a *brooding*, an incubation. The complete picture is that of a mother-bird brooding over her nest, hatching her eggs, and nurturing her young. In Milton's stately elegiac verse, the Spirit

". . . from the first

Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread,

Dove-like, sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,

And mad'st it pregnant . . .

Rotherham (EB, 3,n.): "The beautiful word *brooding*, an exact rendering of the Hebrew, is most suggestive, since it vividly describes the cherishing of incipient life, as a preparation for its outburst. The participial form of such a word clearly denotes a process, more or less lengthened, rather than an instantaneous act." John Owen, (HSGP, 56): "The word 'moved' (*merachepheth*) signifies a gentle motion, like that of a dove over its nest, to communicate vital heat to its eggs, or to cherish its young. Without him, all was a dead sea, a rude unformed chaos, a confused heap covered with darkness; but by the moving of the Spirit of God upon it, he communicated a quickening prolific virtue . . . This is a better account of the origin of all things than is given us by any of the philosophers, ancient or modern." Moreover, does not this verb suggest clearly that the Creation was an act or outpouring of Divine Love as well as of Divine Power—of Divine Love seeking perhaps the fellowship of kindred holy spirits,

that is, the spirits of the redeemed of mankind? And may we not reasonably conclude that this activity of the cherishing Spirit was the origin of the myth of Eros, and of the mythological world-egg, whether regarded as Persian or Greek?

"The breath of man," writes Lange (CDHCG, 164), "the wind of the earth, and the spirit, especially the spirit of God, are symbolical analogies. The breath is the life-unity, the life-motion of the physical creature, the wind is the unity and life-motion of the earth, the spirit is the unity and life-motion of the life proper to which it belongs; the spirit of God is the unity and life-motion of the creative divine activity. It is not a wind of God to which the language here primarily relates . . . From this place onward, and throughout the whole Scripture, the spirit of God is the single formative principle evermore presenting itself with personal attributes in all the divine creative constitutions, whether of the earth, of nature, of the theocracy, of the Tabernacle, of the church, of the new life, or of the new man. The Grecian analogue is that of Eros (or Love) in its reciprocal action with the Chaos, and to this purpose have the later Targums explained it: *the spirit of love*." M. Dods (EBG): "This, then, is the first lesson of the Bible: that at the root and origin of all this vast material universe, before whose laws we are crushed as the moth, there abides a living, conscious Spirit, who wills and knows and fashions all things." (Cf. John 4:24; Psa. 104:29-30; Job 26:13, 27:3, 33:4; Acts 17:25; Gen. 2:7, Psa. 33:6—"the breath of his mouth"; Exo. 31:1-11, 35:30-35; Num. 11:16-17; Deut. 34:9; 2 Sam. 23:12; 1 Chron. 28:11-12; John 14:26, 16:7-14, 20:22-23; Acts 1:1-5, 2:1-4; Eph. 2:19-22; John 3:1-7; Rom. 5:5; Acts 2:38; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Rom. 8:11.) Robinson (CEHS, p.5): "The Bible is the Book of the Spirit. On its first page there is painted the impressive picture of chaos, when darkness was upon the face of the deep; but the

Spirit of God was brooding, like a mother-bird, upon the face of the waters. From the last page there rings out the evangelical challenge of the Church to the world, 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come.' Between them there is the story of a divine evolution, which is from God's side, revelation, and from man's side, discovery."

(3) *As the first brooding of the Spirit over the primordial "deep" was the beginning of the actualization of the physical creation, so the overshadowing of the Virgin by the same Holy Spirit, effecting the conception, hence the incarnation, of God's Only Begotten Son, was the beginning of the actualization of the spiritual creation, the Regeneration (1 Cor. 15:45-49). The divine creation of the physical nature of Mary's Son, the incarnate Logos, constituted His body the perfect offering as the Atonement (Covering) for the "sin of the world" (John 1:29), and also constituted it a body over which death had no power. Thus it will be seen that the Incarnation by the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection are all necessary to the framework of Christianity; not one of these doctrines can be rejected without vitiating the entire Christian System. It would be well for the unitarians and the cultists to keep this in mind. (I am reminded here of the man who said he had flirted with Unitarianism for a long time, but simply could not bring himself to address his prayers, "To whom it may concern.") (Luke 1:35; John 1:14; Luke 24:45-49; Acts 2:30-33, 4:10-12; Rom. 8:11; Heb. 4:14-15, 7:26-28, 9:23-28; 1 Pet. 2:21-25, 3:21-22; Rev. 1:17-18).*

(4) Note here also the correlations of various Scriptures which identify the Spirit of God of the Old Testament with the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord, of the New Testament. Correlate Luke 4:18-19, Isa. 61:1-2, Acts 10:38; Matt. 22:43, Psa. 110:1; Acts 4:25, Psa. 2:1-2; Acts 1:16, Psa. 69:25, 109:8; Heb. 3:7-11, Psa. 95:7-11; all these with 1 Sam. 16:13, 2 Sam. 23:2;

## THE FIRST FOUR DAYS

1:2

Acts 2:17-21, 2:4, 2:32-33; Acts 28:25-28, Isa. 6:9-10; Isa. 61:1-3, Luke 4:18-19; John 3:34, Matt. 12:28; Luke 11:20; Exo. 8:19, 31:18, 32:16, 34:1, 34:27-28; Deut. 9:10, Psa. 8:3 (the "finger of God" in Scripture is a metaphor of God's Spirit-power): 2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:1-11. Note where identifications occur in the same passage: Acts 16:6-7; Acts 5:3,9; 2 Cor. 3:17-18; Rom. 8:9. The Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit (Neh. 9:20, Matt. 28:19, Acts 2:38, John 1:33), the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord—all these are terms designating "the one and the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:11, Heb. 9:14). (Cf. also Isa. 63:10-11; Isa. 11:2, 42:1, 48:16, 61:1; Matt. 3:16, John 1:32, etc.)

(5) The transmutation of psychical energy into physical energy and action occurs all the time in man: it occurs when any human being "makes up his mind" to walk, run, climb, jump, sit down, lie down, or to use his mind or body in any way. There is no more mysterious power in our human experience than this power of thought and will to direct the activity of mind (as in cases of voluntary recollection) and that of the body (a notable example being that of the pitcher who throws the baseball *if* and *when* and *where* he "makes up his mind" to throw it.) Yet this is so commonplace in our lives that we never give any thought to the unfathomable mystery involved. May we not reasonably conclude, then, that in the possession of such powers man but reflects the spark of the Infinite which was breathed into him originally by the Spirit of God (Gen. 2:7, 1:26,27)? And if psychical energy in man is capable of self-transmutation into physical energy, who can gainsay the fact that psychical energy in God (who is Spirit, John 4:24) is capable of an absolute creation of physical energy? We hold, therefore, that primal energy is Pure Thought, the activity of pure Spirit. (We recall that Aristotle defined God as Pure-Thought-Thinking-Itself.) This primal energy is the source of every

other form of energy in the cosmos. Spirit-power, Will-power, Thought-power, Word-power (which is Thought-power willed and expressed) in God are one and the same in activities and in effects. Our cosmos is the product of Universal Intelligence and Will, the construct of Pure Thought. This is precisely what the Bible teaches—that God the absolute Spirit, by the instrumentality of His Word and the agency of His Spirit, is the eternal (un-originated) First Cause of all things that exist. Moreover, the Creation itself was essentially that act of Pure Thought which embraces the entire Space-Time Process (Continuum) in a single Idea; hence, with God it is always the eternal NOW (Exo. 3:14). As Augustine writes, referring to the Creator (Conf., 262, 260): “Thy years are one day; and Thy day is not daily, but To-day, seeing Thy To-day gives not place unto to-morrow, for neither doth it replace yesterday. Thy To-day is Eternity; therefore didst Thou beget the Co-eternal, to whom thou hast said, *This day have I begotten Thee*” (Psa. 2:7. This divine begetting referred to in the Psalm was in the Eternal Purpose of God: it became concretely actualized in the Incarnate Logos.) Again: “In the Eternal nothing passeth, but the whole is present.”

(6) The beginning of the brooding of the Spirit over the thick darkness of “the deep” marked the first transmutation from the psychical to the physical. The introduction of physical energy was the creation of motion: the natural transitions followed, from motion to heat, to light, etc. It is important to note, however, the distinction between *energy*, which is primary, and the propagation and application of *energy* in terms of *force*, which is secondary. It is obvious, moreover, that the application of energy in terms of force presupposes a *directing Will*. Without the guiding Intelligence and Will to direct the expenditure of energy along definite and well-prescribed lines, and for specific and respective ends depending on the kinds of

energy put forth, the result would surely be disorder and catastrophe. It seems evident that all natural law, which is but descriptive of the operations of natural forces (in terms of specific formulas), is of necessity predicated upon the guiding Intelligence and Will which is superior to that which it directs and governs: speaking by way of analogy, law, of whatever kind, presupposes a lawgiver. Science, in its use of the word "law" which it borrowed from jurisprudence, wittingly or unwittingly, pays tribute to the cosmic Lawgiver. The guiding Intelligence and Will which directs the expenditure of energy in terms of force presupposes, in turn, the Divine Personality. It is unreasonable to presuppose an *impersonal* energy, or source of energy, as the First Cause. *This definition of force as applied and directed energy is fundamental to any proper understanding of the cosmic processes. Moreover, wherever there is divine Will, there is divine Personality; and wherever there is divine Intelligence and Will, there is the Eternal Spirit. In a word, apart from the Eternal Spirit there is no rational explanation either of energy or of force; however, with the acceptance of the activity of the Eternal Spirit, no other explanation is needed, either of energy or of force, or of the Creation and Preservation of the Cosmos.* Where the Eternal Spirit is, there is law, light, life, love, order, peace. (Cf. again John 4:24, Heb. 9:14.) Where the Spirit is not, there is license, darkness, death, hate, disorder, strife: in short, evil in every diabolical form. Or, as someone else has put it: "It is indeed significant that the two characteristics of the primordial Chaos which occur in all the ancient traditions are those of *emptiness* and *darkness*. That is to say, *where God is not, there is always emptiness, darkness, non-being. Where God is, there is, by way of vivid contrast, life, light, being. And the ontological difference between non-being and being consists in the activity of the Divine Spirit.*" We shall now follow the account, as given in the remaining

verses of the Genesis Cosmogony, of the progressive development, step by step ("day" by "day"), of the primal undifferentiated world-energy, *under the continuous brooding of the Spirit of God*, into the organized cosmos that is the object of man's scientific quest throughout the ages:

"And God said, *Let there be light: and there was light.*"

1. Literally; "And God said, Light, Be! and light was." According to Scripture, God as Father *plans*, God as the Word (Logos) *executes* (decrees), and God as the Spirit *actualizes* that which is decreed (Psa. 148:6; Isa. 45:22-23, 46:9-11; Eph. 3:9-12). In the first verse of Genesis, Elohim, the Absolute, the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9), is introduced to us as the originating First Cause; in verse 2 the Spirit of God is introduced to us as the actualizing First Cause; in verse 3, the Word of God is introduced to us as the executive First Cause, of the initial phase of the Creative Process. From this point on, throughout the entire Cosmogony; the formula, "And God said," introduces the account of each successive advance in the physical (natural) Creation. That is to say, whatever God willed and *decreed* at the beginning of each "day," was done (actualized) on that "day," in that particular stage of the total Process. Just *how* it was done seems to have been a matter of little or no concern to the inspired writer, or, therefore, to the Spirit who inspired him to write; the purpose was to emphasize only the religious fact of the Creation, namely, that it was God who did the creating, through the executive agency of the Logos and the realizing agency of the Spirit. The problem of the *how* of the Process was left for human science to spell out slowly and laboriously throughout the centuries. Hence, under the energizing activity of the Spirit, the Word, we are told, the Logos, interposed His executive authority, ten times in succession, in the form of Divine ordinances or decrees, to give intelligent direction and order to the Process as a whole.

We must not forget that our God—the living and true God—“declares the end from the beginning” (Isa. 46:10). The end result was the *organized* cosmos, the cosmic order which makes human science possible. As a matter of fact, it is this order which makes human life possible; man simply could not live in an unpredictable world.

2. From this verse onward we must not forget that we are thinking in terms of the writer's point of view, that is, in terms of earth, and of the solar system of which the earth is a planet, in short, of the viewpoint of a person on earth. Of course, the development described here, apparently, of what occurred in the formation and development of our solar system, may be regarded as paralleling what was occurring in other celestial systems (galaxies, or “island universes”).

3. How long a time elapsed between the first stirring of the Spirit of God in the primeval “deep,” and the issuance of the first Divine decree, “Let there be light,” we do not know and obviously cannot know. Both the Bible and science indicate, however, that the stretch of time was very, very long: the various heating and cooling processes hypothesized by science, and the activity of “brooding” attributed in Scripture to the Divine Spirit, all imply an indefinitely long period.

4. *The Logos.* (1) In the Old Testament, we meet God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God: in the full light of the New Testament revelation, these become Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2). Why was not this triune personality of the God of the Bible clearly revealed to God's ancient people, the children of Israel? We cannot say definitely. It is obvious, of course, that God did not fully reveal Himself in Old Testament times. Perhaps if He had disclosed His triune personality to the Hebrew people, they would have drifted into tritheism, that is, into the worship of three Gods instead of the one living and true God. Hence, under the



Old Covenant, it is the *uniqueness* of God which was given special emphasis, in the oft-repeated creed, Deut. 6:4, "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah," that is, the *only* Jehovah (Yahweh). (Deut. 4:35,39; Isa. 45:18, 46:9; Acts 17:23-29.) It seems that the revelation of the tri-unity of God was withheld from the Israelites of old, lest they drift into polytheism and idolatry, the besetting sins of the ancient pagan world. However, although the doctrine is not fully disclosed in the Old Testament writings, there are many clear intimations of it, as we shall see later.

(2) We are especially concerned here with the significance of the name *Logos* as it occurs and its meaning is fully revealed in the Bible as a whole: Let us not forget the principle of interpretation which is followed throughout this textbook, namely, that any Bible doctrine must be studied and interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Bible as a whole, in order that its full meaning may be brought to light. Hence, with reference to the *Logos*, we find that Scripture unequivocally, from beginning to end, identifies the One whom we know historically as Jesus of Nazareth, and whom we confess as the Christ, the Son of the living God, as the true Biblical *Logos*. In proof of this statement, note the following catenae of Scripture passages: (a) Those which affirm generally His pre-existence, His co-eternity with the Father, and His pre-existence, moreover, as a personal Being (Phil. 2:5-7; Heb. 2:14; John 1:18, John 10:17-18; John 17:5, 17:24; Col. 1:17; John 8:58; Rev. 1:17-18, 21:6; Isa. 9:6; Mic. 5:2; John 6:38, 6:62, 7:33-34; Gal. 4:4); (b) those which present Him as the executive Agent of the Creation and Preservation of the world (Col. 1:16-17; 1 Cor. 8:6; John 1:1-3; Heb. 1:3, 1:10); (c) those which declare either explicitly or implicitly, His deity (John 8:58, here He assumes for Himself the "great and incommunicable" Divine Name, Exo. 3:14), John 1:18; Rev. 1:17-18, 21:6; John 1:1-3 ("and the *Logos* was God"), John 20:28 (here

Jesus accepts forms of address due to Deity alone); Matt. 1:23 ("God with us"); John 10:30, Rom. 9:5, Col. 2:19, 1 Tim. 3:16, Heb. 1:3, 1 John 1:2); (d) those Old Testament passages which intimate pre-incarnate appearances of the eternal Logos. These include *the passages referring to the activity of the "Angel of Yahweh"* (Gen. 3:2-4, 16:7,9,13; Gen. 18:1,2,13,17,20,23; Gen. 22:11-19, 31:11-13, 32:30; Exo. 3:2-4, 14:19 (here the Angel's presence is indicated by the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire, symbols, respectively, of the Spirit and the Word, who go together, Isa. 59:21); Exo. 13:21-22 (cf. 1 Cor. 10:1-4, Heb. 11:26-27), Judg. 13:20-22, Josh. 5:13-15, Dan. 3:25,28, Mic. 5:2); *those passages in which Wisdom is represented as existing eternally with God, though distinct from Him* (Job 28:20-23, Prov. 8:1-6, 7:21 (cf. 1 Cor. 1:22-24, 1:30); Jer. 10:10-12); *those passages in which the Word, as distinguished from God, is presented as the executor of God's will from eternity* (Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:5-6, 119:89, 147:15-18, 107:20; Heb. 11:3, 2 Pet. 3:5).

As Epiphanius, one of the Church Fathers, wrote, in substance: the Divine unity was first proclaimed by Moses (Deut. 6:4); the Divine duality, that is, the distinction between the Father and the Son, Messiah, by the prophets (Isa. 9:6, 11:1-2; Mic. 5:2); but the Divine tripersonality was first clearly shown forth in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2).

The term *Logos* was in rather common use at the time of our Lord's ministry in the flesh. Hence, John wrote his Prologue (1:1-18) to set forth the true doctrine of the *Logos*, in Latin *Verbum*, in English, *Word*. The *Logos*, he declared, is not the Platonic World Soul, not the Gnostic inferior intermediary between God and the world, not just the Philonian Divine Thought (Word) or its manifestation in the world (Wisdom), not the Stoic World Fire, *but the Person who became flesh and dwelt among us as Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God.* (1 Tim.

2:5, Matt. 16:16). Lebreton (HDT, I, 187): "The Messianic belief is as foreign as belief in the Incarnation to the Philonian theory of the Logos, and is equally characteristic of Christianity. As the Messiah, prepared for by the whole past of Israel, awaited and predicted by the prophets, came upon earth to inaugurate the Kingdom of God and redeem the elect, and due, later on, to return to judge the whole world, Jesus fills the whole of history. The Philonian Logos is foreign to history; he may be the object of the speculation of philosophers, he has no contact with the life of men." Again (*ibid*, 414): "Human speculation flattered itself in vain that it could sound the depths of the life of God, its proud efforts resulted in nothing but barren and deceptive dreams; it is in the humility of the Incarnation that the mystery of God has been revealed: for the Jews a scandal, a folly to the Greeks, the strength and wisdom of God for the elect."

A. Campbell has written on the doctrine of the Logos (John 1:1-3), in the *Christian Baptist*, May 7, 1927, as follows: "The names Jesus, Christ, or Messiah, Only Begotten Son, Son of God, etc., belong to the Founder of the Christian religion, and to none else. They express not a relation existing before the Christian era, but relations which commenced at that time . . . To understand the relation betwixt the Savior and His Father, which existed before time, and that relation which began in time, is impossible on either of these [*i.e.*, the Arian or Calvinistic] theories. There was no Jesus, no Messiah, no Christ, no Son of God, no Only Begotten, before the reign of Augustus. The relation that was before the Christian era was not that of a son and father, terms which always imply disparity; but it was that expressed by John in the sentence under consideration. The relation was that of God and the 'Word of God.' This phraseology unfolds a relation quite different from that of a father and a son—a relation perfectly intimate, equal and glorious. This

naturally leads me to the first sentence of John. And here I must state a few *postulata*. 1. No relation amongst human beings can perfectly exhibit the relation which the Savior held to the God and Father of all, anterior to His birth. The reason is: that relation is not homogenial, or of the same kind with relations originating from creation. All relations we know anything of, are created, such as that of father and son." (Note: where there is father and son, the father must of necessity *antedate* the son.) "Now I object as much to a created relation as I do to a creature in reference to the original relation of God and the Word of God. *This relation is an uncreated and unoriginated relation.* 2. When in the fulness of time, it became necessary in the wisdom of God to exhibit a Savior, it became expedient to give some view of the original and eternal dignity of this wonderful visitant of the human race. And as this view must be given in human language, inadequate as it was, the whole vocabulary of human speech must be examined for suitable terms. 3. Of the terms expressive of relations, the most suitable must be, and most unquestionably was, selected. And as the relation was spiritual and not carnal, such terms only were eligible which had respect to mental and spiritual relations. Of this sort there is but one in all the archives of human knowledge, and that is the one selected. 4. The Holy Spirit selected the name, WORD, and therefore we may safely assert that this is the best, if not the only term, in the whole vocabulary of human speech at all adapted to express that relation which existed 'in the beginning,' or before time, between our Savior and His God." What are the implications of this name? At this point I paraphrase Mr. Campbell's answer to this question thus: (1) A *word* is commonly defined as the sign or symbol of an idea. It is the idea expressed in written or spoken form. (When I speak of a chair, for instance, there immediately flashes into your mind an image of the thing of which I have the same image in my

own mind; and the image represents an *idea*. The word is therefore the sign or symbol of the idea.) (2) the human intellect *thinks, i.e.*, it formulates and relates ideas by means of words, and the result is *language*. Men cannot express their ideas without words of some sort. (3) It follows that the word, and the idea which it represents, must have their origin at the same time, and are therefore of like antiquity—or, as we say, co-etaneous. And though the word may not be the same in different languages, the same idea is expressed. (4) The idea and the word are distinct, of course; that is, they are *two*. (5) Yet the relationship between the two is the most *intimate* of which we have any knowledge, and is a relationship of the *mind* or *spirit*. An idea cannot exist without a word, nor a word without an idea. (6) To be acquainted with the word is to be acquainted with the idea, for the idea is in the word, and the word stands for the idea.

We continue Mr. Campbell's exegesis verbatim from this point, as follows: "Now let it be most attentively observed and remembered that these remarks are solely intended to exhibit the relation which exists between a word and an idea, and that this relation is of a mental nature, and more akin to the spiritual system than any relation created, of which we know anything. It is a relation of the most sublime order; and no doubt the reason why the name, Word, is adopted by the Apostle in this sentence, was because of its superior ability to represent to us the divine relation existing between God and the Savior prior to His becoming the Son of God. By putting together the above remarks on the term Word, we have a full view of what John intended to communicate: (1) As a word is an exact image of an idea, so is 'The Word' an exact image of the invisible God. (2) As a word cannot exist without an idea, nor an idea without a word, so God was never without 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' without God. Or, as a word is of equal age, or co-etaneous with its idea, so 'The Word'

and God are co-eternal. (3) And as an idea did not create its word, nor a word its idea, so God did not create 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' God. Such a view does the language used by John suggest. And to this do all the Scriptures agree. For 'The Word' was made flesh, and in consequence of becoming *incarnate*, He is styled the Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father. As from eternity God was manifest in and by 'The Word,' so now God is manifest in the flesh. As God was always with 'The Word,' so when 'The Word' becomes flesh, He is Immanuel, God with us. As God was never manifest but by 'The Word,' so the heavens and the earth and all things were created by 'The Word.' And as 'The Word' ever was the effulgence or representation of the invisible God, so He will ever be known and adored as 'The Word of God.' So much for the divine and eternal relation between the Savior and God. You will easily perceive that I carry these views no farther than to explain the nature of that relationship uncreated and unoriginated, which the inspired language inculcates."

Mr. Campbell concludes as follows: "These views place us on a lofty eminence whence we look down upon the Calvinistic ideas of 'eternal filiation,' 'eternal generation,' 'eternal Son,' as midway between us and Arianism. From this sublime and lofty eminence we see the Socinian movement upon a hillock, the Arian upon a hill, and the Calvinist upon a mountain; all of which lose their disproportion to each other because of the immense height above them to which this view elevates us. The first sentence of John, I paraphrase thus: 'From eternity was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was, I say, from eternity with God. By Him all things were made, and He became flesh and dwelt among us. He is become a child born and a son of man. As such He is called Immanuel, Jesus, Messiah, Son of God, Only Begotten of the Father.'"

Again, in the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1846, pp. 634-636, Mr. Campbell wrote the following on the same subject, the Person of Christ, the Savior: "Our attention is first called to his person. Right conceptions of his person are, indeed, essential to right conceptions of His office. Our guide to both are the oracles of God. What, then, say the Holy Scriptures? They represent the person called Jesus the Messiah as having been born of a Virgin in the reign of Herod the Great, and in the thirtieth year of Caesar Augustus. But while they thus represent his nativity as having been at that particular time, they also intimate that his birth was only an *incarnation* of one who previously existed, whose 'goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.' . . . Jesus is the name of an *incarnation*, but it is not the name of that which became incarnate. It was not Jesus, but *the Word* that was made flesh. The person called THE WORD 'became flesh and dwelt among us.' . . . Evident, then, it is that Jesus of Nazareth had in some other nature a pre-existence. His human existence commenced at a fixed date, and in a certain place; but in some other nature, and in some other place, he pre-existed. What that nature was, and where that abode, must be learned from that Spirit which 'searches all things—even the deep things of God.'" Finally, "We have, then, GOD, the WORD of God, and the SPIRIT of God; and these three are not three Gods, but one God—denominated in the remedial system as the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, relations of a truly mysterious and sublime character. We can, indeed, apprehend, though we may not comprehend them. They are intelligible, though not comprehensible." (I consider Mr. Campbell's explanation of the doctrine of the Logos the clearest I have been able to find anywhere. Hence I have taken sufficient space here to reproduce it in its entirety.)

*Logos* has a twofold meaning in the Greek: (1) reason

or intelligence, as it exists inwardly in the mind, and (2) reason or intelligence as it is expressed outwardly in speech; hence, an account, a tale, a study, a revelation. Both of these meanings are implicit in the use of this word as the eternal name of our Savior. Jesus is inwardly the Word of God in the sense that He exists from everlasting to everlasting in the "bosom" of the Father (John 1:18), and, as nothing is as close to a person as his own thought, so there is no one as close to the Father as His Only Begotten Son. Jesus is the Logos outwardly in that He reveals to us "the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" both in life and in teaching (Rom. 12:1-2; John 14:9-12, 16:13-15). He was with God before the world was called into being, before even time began; He is with God now, seated at God's right hand, the Acting Sovereign of the universe and the Absolute Monarch of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 28:18; Acts 2:36; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 1:20-23; Col. 1:13-20; Phil. 2:5-11; Heb. 1:1-4; 1 Pet. 3:20-22; Rev. 1:17-18). He is God in the sense that He is one Person of the Divine Tri-unity, of which He is the executive Agency (John 1:1-3). *The manger of Bethlehem was not the place of Christ's beginning*: on the contrary, He is the Logos personally and timelessly, the Logos unbegun and unending; His goings forth have been from everlasting (Mic. 5:2; John 17:5,24; John 8:58; 1 Tim. 3:16). What really happened at Bethlehem was that the pre-existent Logos took upon Himself a new order of being: in the Apostle's language, the Logos "became flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:14). Jesus Christ, the Son of God, left eternal glory (John 3:16, 17:5; Gal. 4:4) and took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:14-18; Phil. 2:5-11), to purchase redemption for sinful man (John 1:29; 1 Cor. 6:19-20; Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Heb. 9:12; Rev. 5:9-10). That is to say, the non-material passed over into the material. This happens every day when man causes his own thoughts to transmute



themselves into corporeal activities of many different kinds. Conversely, man transmutes the material into the non-material (or at most, the quasi-material) in the application of the ultimate forms of energy and the relations existing among these, which are apprehensible only in terms of mathematical formulas. Those who discount or reject the Virgin Birth are called upon to "explain away" the doctrine of the Savior's pre-existence, one of the explicit and most prominent doctrines of the Bible.

To summarize: Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, is known to us *historically* as Jesus (Jesus of Nazareth); His *eternal* name, however, is Logos, Word; his *temporal* name (that which existed only in God's Eternal Purpose until it was given actuality in our world, at Bethlehem, in the reign of Caesar Augustus) is Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father (Psa. 2:7; Col. 1:13-18; Luke 1:30-35; John 1:14); His official title is Messiah, Christos, Christ, meaning "The Anointed One." These names are all meaningful, and must not be wrested out of their respective Scriptural contexts.

5. "*Let there be light: and there was light.*" (1) Note well the manner in which these decrees were expressed, the formula which occurs throughout the whole Cosmogony: "Let there be," etc., etc. (vv. 3,6,9,14,20,24). Does not this intimate that the Divine Will was operating through the media of what we speak of as secondary causes, that is, "the laws of nature"? Note the significant change in v. 26: it is no longer, "let there be," it is now "let us," that is, Elohim communicating within His own being, a Divine *Consilium* of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit.

(2) *What kind of light* is indicated here? Do we have here the idea of light without a sun? Simpson (IBG, 469): "Light was therefore created before even the sun—one of the features of the story which renders impossible all attempts to bring it into line with modern scientific knowl-

edge." This statement is dogmatic, to say the least. Of course, this is to be expected of exegetes who find the source-material of these Scriptures in various aspects of the Babylonian myths. True it is, that in the early pagan accounts of Creation, we find a sun-god, that is, a *personification* of the sun, presented as creator; and that we also find in these accounts the antithesis of darkness and light portrayed under the guise of a deadly conflict between this sun-god and some kind of a chaos-monster. But the idea of light as the first *created* being is not to be found in any of these pagan traditions (which, by way of contrast with the Hebrew account, are myths in the proper sense of that term). It is agreed, of course, that it was not the intention of the writer of Genesis to give us a scientific account of the Creation (indeed the entire book was written in pre-scientific times). It was his intention, rather, to give us the religious (spiritual) truth about the origin and development of the Creative Process. But who has any legitimate ground or right to assume that the Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of Truth (John 15:26), could not have put this account in language that would be found to be in accord with human science as the latter advanced in its understanding of the mysteries of the physical world? Indeed the broad general terms in which this narrative is communicated to man has made it adaptable even throughout the changes which have occurred from time to time in scientific theory.

(3) What kind of light was this first light, as decreed in v.3? In opposition to the dogmatism of the mythologizing interpreters, it should be noted that among physicists of our time it is a commonplace that the primal form of energy—the ultimate, the irreducible—to be called into being was some form of *radiant* energy. But there are many kinds of radiant energy, in addition to those few reflected by a surface and then refracted by the retina of the human eye to give man his sense of colors, those

embraced within the limits of the *visible* spectrum. There are many other forms of radiant energy operating both above and below these limits, such as radio waves, for example. Cosmic rays which bombard us constantly from outer space are perhaps the most mysterious of all these primal forms of energy. Or, again, was this first light some form of molecular light?—light resulting, let us say, from heat produced by the motion induced (by the Divine Energy) into the now gradually shaping cosmic mass, which by this time was probably molten? There is no certain answer to these questions, of course. We know, however, that luminosity is the result of incandescence. Any solid body can be rendered luminous (incandescent) by being heated to some 800 degrees Fahrenheit. Any liquid that can absorb as great a quantity of heat likewise emits light. To be incandescent is to be white, glowing, or luminous with intense heat. Strong (ST, 395): “The beginning of activity in matter would manifest itself by the production of light, since light is the resultant of molecular activity. This corresponds to the statement in verse 3. As the result of condensation, the nebula becomes luminous, and this process from darkness to light is described as follows: ‘there was evening and there was morning, one day.’ Here we have a day without a sun—a feature in the narrative quite consistent with two facts of science: first, that the nebula would naturally be self-luminous, and, secondly, that the earth proper, which reached its present form before the sun, would, when it was first thrown off, itself be a self-luminous and molten mass. The day was therefore continuous—day without night.” Someone has rightly remarked that men called Moses a fool for putting light previous to the sun, and Laplace a scientist for doing the same thing.

(4) In a famous essay, *On Light (De Luce)*, Robert Grosseteste, made the first Chancellor of Oxford in 1221, apparently anticipated some of the concepts of present-day

physics, in his treatment of *lux* (light in its source) and *lumen* (reflected or radiated light). His theory came to be known as the "light metaphysics," and was elaborated by two of his contemporaries, Roger Bacon and the Italian mystic, Bonaventura. According to this theory, along with the Creation *ex nihilo* of unformed matter, God brought into existence the first form, *lux spiritualis*. This *lux*, conceived as an extraordinarily rarefied form of corporeal light, something, in fact, that approximated *spirit*, originated space; and as the form of corporeity in primordial matter, was the primary source and cause of all created things. As McKeon writes (SMP, I, 261): "The characteristic of all light is to engender itself perpetually, and diffuse itself spherically about a point in an instantaneous manner. Originally, the luminous form and matter were equally unextended, but the first form created by God in the first matter, multiplies itself infinitely, and spreads equally in all directions, distending thus the matter to which it is united and constituting thus the mass of the universe." Moreover, according to this theory, just as light is the power by which the purest Spirit produces the corporeal world, so too it is the instrument by which the soul comes in contact with the body and the things of sense; hence, viewed in this aspect, the *lux* becomes *lumen*. Commenting on Grosseteste's theory, Miss Sharp has this to say (FPOTC, 23): "It appears that Grosseteste experienced the same difficulties as modern physicists. The functions he assigns to light . . . show that he regards it as an energy; but his desire to speak of it as resembling body is strikingly like the present-day application of such terms as 'wave lengths' and 'rays' to the ether, which in itself is admitted to be imperceptible to the senses and is thought of only as the subject of activity or as that which is conserved throughout change. As a principle of unity in the universe, this light is comparable to the modern ether, which fills all space from the most

distant star to the interspaces of the atom. Again, Grosse-teste's theory is not unlike the modern hypothesis of the convertibility of matter and energy. Lastly, we find something resembling the modern ethereal attributes of electricity, magnetism, and chemical activities, in his view of *lux* as the source of all movement and life and as the basis of sound." (Modern physics, to be sure, has abandoned the notion of ether; however, this does not affect the foregoing argument, as space itself seems to have taken over the role once assigned to the ether.) Two other pertinent facts should be pointed out in this connection: first, that Grosseteste's theory of *lux* and its creative function is strikingly parallel to the tendency of present-day physicists to regard *radiant energy* as the ultimate irreducible of matter; and second, that this "light metaphysics" is strikingly adaptable to the Biblical doctrine of the ultimate glorification of the bodies of the redeemed (Dan. 12:3; Rom. 8:11,30; 1 Cor. 15:35-49; Acts 9:1-9; 2 Cor. 5:1-5, etc.) and it was used by its advocates, by Bonaventura especially, to elaborate that doctrine.

(5) That the light decreed in the third verse of Genesis was *not* the light of our sun seems obvious. Solar light did not penetrate the vapors which enveloped the earth until the fourth "day." Moreover, it seems that our entire solar system was in process of being formed, but only *in process* of being formed at this stage of the Creation: as part of an organized cosmos, it did not yet exist *as a solar system*. Lange (CDHCG,165): "The light denotes all that is simply illuminating in its efficacy, all the luminous element; the darkness denotes all that is untransparent, dark and shadow-casting; both together denote the polarity of the created world as it exists between the light-formations and the night-formations, the constitution of the day and night." However, whatever may have been the nature of the light described in this meaningful passage, the religious truth remains the same,

namely, that the entrance of the Divine Word always brings light, whether that entrance be into the impenetrable darkness of the primordial Chaos or into the dark recesses of the human soul. Where the Spirit of God operates through the Word, the darkness flees before the light; so in the Creation, there was at first darkness, non-being, but when the Spirit began to energize there was light and being. On Day One, then, occurred the beginning of matter-in-motion in the primal forms of energy and light.

*“And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.”*

1. *The light was called “good.”* In Scripture anything is called *good* that is doing what the Creator designed it to do in the total scheme of things. Hence we may rightly say that the Creation was the field in which God’s perfections were manifested. Note also that only the light is called good, not the darkness, nor even the co-existence of light and darkness.

2. *“God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night.”*

(1) Because God is all-powerful, all that He creates is good for some purpose or end. Did God Himself bring the darkness into existence? Whatever the darkness implies here, whether it be an absolute void or a motionless, objectless, amorphous “world-stuff,” man does not have and cannot even claim to have the certain answer to this question. It may well be that the darkness existed by God’s sufferance; hence, whatever may be implied by the term, this darkness when reduced to order by Divine decree, became a good: the whole Creation was later Divinely pronounced *good*, and after the creation of man, *very good* (vv. 25, 31). Thus has God always been bringing forth being out of non-being, perfection out of im-

perfection. (2) Titus Burckhardt writes ("Cosmology and Modern Science," in *Tomorrow*, Vol. 12, No. 3): "Modern science will never reach that matter which is at the basis of this world. But between the qualitatively differentiated world and the undifferentiated matter there lies something like an intermediate zone: this is chaos. The sinister dangers attendant on atomic fission are but a pointer indicating the frontier of chaos and of dissolution." (3) By thus separating the darkness and the light, as specific—yet relational—forms, God imposed order on the darkness and gave meanings to both darkness and light; meanings both physical and spiritual. (4) At the same time that He gave meaning to both darkness and light, as Lord of both, He gave them their appropriate names, Night and Day, respectively, and thus set in motion the ordered alternation of night and day generally.

3. "*And there was evening and there was morning, one day.*" (Literally, "Day One.") (1) Simpson (IBG, 471); rejects the aeonic-day theory. While this view, he says, "might have made the account of creation less irreconcilable with modern science, it would have involved a lessening of God's greatness, one sign of which was His power to do so much in one day." Is not this a begging of the question? How is God's greatness lessened by the view that this first day was one of indefinite length? Did it not take the same measure of power to actualize the Creation regardless of the length of time that God may have taken to do it? (2) We certainly do not take the position here that God could *not* have created the cosmos in six days of twenty-four hours each: God can do whatever He may will to do that is consistent with His Being and Character. M. Henry (CWB, 2): "The Creator could have made his work perfect at first, but by this gradual proceeding he would show what is, ordinarily, the method of his providence and grace." (Cf. 2 Pet. 3:8). Whitelaw (PCG, 12): "Of course the length of Day One practically

determines the length of all six. If it was a solar day, then they must be considered such. But as the present sidereal arrangements for the measurement of time were not then established, it is clearly gratuitous to proceed on the assumption that it was." M. Henry again (*ibid.*, 2): "This was not only the first day of the world, but the first day of the week. I observe it to the honour of that day, because the new world began on the first day of the week likewise, in the resurrection of Christ, as the light of the world, early in the morning. In him the dayspring from on high visited the world." (Luke 1:78, Matt. 28:1, Mark 16:1-2, Luke 24:1, John 20:1-10, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2, Rev. 1:10). (3) How long was the darkness that preceded the light of this Day One? This question could be answered only if we knew precisely what the darkness was. This, however, we do not know. That the darkness was of indefinite duration seems obvious from the reading of the text. It has been asserted that this sequence of darkness and light, night and day, evening and morning, was determined by the Hebrew custom of reckoning time from sunset to sunset. Is it not more reasonable to think that, on the contrary, the Hebrew custom was derived from the Hebrew Cosmogony as handed down from the remote past in the Torah?

Day Two: The Atmosphere  
(1:6-8)

*"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day."*

1. These verses precipitate us into the very core of the problems incidental to the origin of the celestial (astronomical) universe. They mark the end of cosmo-



logical reference and point to the beginnings, respectively, of the geological and the biological. As heretofore stated, the content of this section of the text has reference primarily, it seems, to our solar system, as explained from the viewpoint of a terrestrial inhabitant. However, it can be just as readily applied to the various units (galaxies, stellar systems, supernovae, etc) of the entire cosmos. We shall now examine these verses rather carefully because of the importance of the subject-matter involved.

2. *Progressive Revelation.* Many eminent authorities have held that the Genesis Cosmogony as a whole is a record of the Creation couched in the language of the commonality and presented from the viewpoint of ordinary human experience and common sense: in a word, in conformity with what is designated the "law of accommodation." We find this law exemplified in the instances of poetic imagery and anthropomorphism occurring throughout the Old Testament, and especially the book of Genesis. Because of the limitations of human vocabulary, its inadequacy as a vehicle for the communication of Divine thought, the most God could do for man was to supply him with an anthropomorphic image of Himself (John 1:18), that is, until He could supply the real, and far more adequate image, in the person of His Only Begotten Son (John 14:6-11). Hence, it follows that revelations given to the infancy of the race were necessarily more anthropomorphic, and stated in simpler terms, than those made in subsequent ages as men advanced in their ability to understand the significance of what was being revealed. God's revelation to men of Himself and His Eternal Purpose was a progressive revelation, and the record of that revelation and its meaning for us was set down, from age to age, by men who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21), precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little, etc. (Isa. 28:10,13; cf. Mark 4:28). Failure to recognize this aspect of the Divine method

leads to absurd distortions of Scripture teaching in the form of half-truths which are often more deceptive than complete error.

3. *The Law of Accommodation.* This is clearly stated by Marcus Dods (EBG, 4-5) as follows: "Accepting this chapter [the first chapter of Genesis] then as it stands, and believing that only by looking at the Bible as it actually is can we hope to understand God's method of revealing Himself, we at once perceive that ignorance of some departments of truth does not disqualify a man for knowing and imparting truth about God. In order to be a medium of revelation a man does not need to be in advance of his age in secular learning. Intimate communion with God, a spirit trained to discern spiritual things, a perfect understanding of and zeal for God's purpose, these are qualities quite independent of a knowledge of the discoveries of science . . . Had the writer of this book (Genesis) mingled with his teaching regarding God an explicit and exact account of how this world came into existence—had he spoken in millions of years instead of speaking of days—in all probability he would have been discredited, and what he had to say about God would have been rejected along with his premature science. But speaking from the point of view of his contemporaries, and accepting the current ideas regarding the formation of the world, he attached to these the views regarding God's connection with the world which are most necessary to be believed. . . . Here then instead of anything to discompose us or to excite unbelief, we recognize one great law or principle on which God proceeds in making Himself known to man. This has been called the Law of Accommodation. It is the law which requires that the condition and capacity of those to whom the revelation is made must be considered. If you wish to instruct a child, you must speak in language that a child can understand." Strong (ST, 393-394) writes that what he calls

the pictorial-summary view of the Genesis Cosmogony "holds that the account is a rough sketch of the history of creation, true in all its essential features, but presented in a graphic form suited to the common mind and to earlier as well as later ages. While conveying to primitive man as accurate an idea of God's work as man was able to comprehend, the revelation was yet given in pregnant language, so that it could expand to all the ascertained results of subsequent physical research. This general correspondence of the narrative with the teachings of science, and its power to adapt itself to every advance in human knowledge, differences it from every other cosmogony current among men." There is a world of truth in these statements. What was necessary in the primitive world to save men from groveling in polytheism and idolatry was the knowledge that there is a living and true God; that He is one, not many; that He is just, holy, and good; that He made the world and all that therein is (Acts 17:24-28); that the crowning achievement of His handiwork was the creation of man in His own image, to be lord tenant of earth. All these truths are expressly set forth in Genesis. The scientific account of the Creation has been written by the finger of God upon the crust of the earth and in the natures of living species; the religious account was incorporated by inspiration of the Spirit of God in the graphic panoramic affirmations of the Genesis Cosmogony.

4. *The "Mythologizing" of the Radical Critics.* The radical critics have developed fantastic pseudo-Biblical cosmologies by reference to alleged Babylonian mythological source-material. In so doing they have created a cosmological "mythology" of their own. Perhaps the radical critics' point of view is best expressed by Harry Emerson Fosdick (MUB, 46-47) as follows: "In the Scriptures the flat earth is founded on an underlying sea; it is stationary; the heavens are like an upturned bowl or

canopy above it; the circumference of this vault rests on pillars; the sun, moon, and stars move within this firmament of special purpose to illumine man; there is a sea above the sky, 'the waters which were above the heavens,' and through the 'windows of heaven' the rain comes down; within the earth is Sheol, where dwell the shadowy dead; this whole cosmic system is suspended over vacancy; and it was all made in six days with a morning and an evening, a short and measurable time before. This is the world view of the Bible." An examination of the Scriptures cited as the basis on which this cosmic view was formulated shows that they are not necessarily subject to the interpretation put upon them by these critics; that in fact protagonists of this view fail to distinguish between poetic imagery and propositional truth. (The Scriptures cited are the following: Psa. 136:6, 24:1-2; Gen. 7:11; Job 37:18; Gen. 1:6-8; Isa. 40:22; Job 26:11; Psa. 104:3; Gen. 1:7; Psa. 148:4; Isa. 14:9-11; Psa. 93:1, 104:5; Psa. 104:2; Gen. 1:14-18; Psa. 78:23; Gen. 7:11; Job 26:7.)

Many authorities, including distinguished Semitic scholars have taken these "mythologizers" to task for "imposing on the Bible a stilted, artificial cosmology that is nowhere clearly and systematically taught in Scripture." A striking example of the far-fetched inferences of these critics is found in the alleged association of the Hebrew word *tehom*, "the deep," with the Babylonian *Tiamat*, "the she-dragon of chaos." However, this connection, if it actually existed, simply proves the Hebrew account to have been the original, because the natural object, *tehom*, surely preceded the mythological personification of it. (Cf. Psa. 136:6, 24:2.) For a thoroughgoing and conclusive treatment of this important phase of our subject, for which we have not available space here, the student is advised to read Bernard Ramm (CVSS, 96-102), who concludes as follows: "The best we can do is to (i) indicate the freedom of the Bible from mythological polytheistic or

grotesque cosmologies, (ii) note the general hostility of the Bible to cosmologies which are antitheistic, and (iii) clearly present the *theocentric* view of the Bible towards Nature." (I call attention here to the thesis of the excellent book by Yehezkel Kaufmann, recently published, *The Religion of Israel*. This distinguished Jewish scholar writes, obviously, with but one end in view, namely, to establish the fact that Hebrew monotheism was definitely *not* an evolution from surrounding pagan mythologies and traditions, but was in fact a complete *revolution* against such systems.) The Fosdick interpretation, as quoted above, is a reading into the first few chapters of Genesis a mass of conjecture that simply cannot be validated without unjustifiable distortion of fact.

*Similarities between the Babylonian Cosmogony and the Hebrew Narrative of the Creation:* (1) Both know of a time when the earth as such did not exist. (2) In Genesis, light dispels darkness, and order follows chaos. In the Babylonian record, Marduk, a sun-god (like the Sanscrit *Dyaus pitar*, the Greek *Zeus patér*, the Latin *Iu piter*, meaning "father of light") overthrows the she-dragon of darkness, Tiamat. (3) In Genesis, the dry land appears after a time, in obedience to Divine decree. In the Babylonian tablets, Marduk creates the earth out of one part of the corpse of the slain Tiamat. (4) In Genesis, the sun, moon, and stars are set in the heavens, again by the decree of Elohim. In the Babylonian record, Marduk creates them to serve as mansions for the gods. (5) In Genesis, God brings into existence the lower species, again by the operation of His ordinances. In the Babylonian record, the assembly of the gods creates them. (6) In Genesis, God creates mankind. In the Babylonian record, Marduk fashions the first man out of the blood of the slain Kingu who had been Tiamat's consort. Finegan (LAP, 53): "The sequence of events in the creation also is the same in the two stories, in that the following happenings take

place in the same order: the creation of the firmament, the creation of dry land, the creation of the luminaries, and the creation of man. Both accounts begin with the watery chaos and end with the gods or the Lord at rest." (Incidentally, in the Genesis account, there is no reason for assuming that the creation of the celestial luminaries took place on the fourth "day," as we shall see later.)

*The Contrasts between the Babylonian Cosmogony and the Hebrew Account of Creation.* These unlikenesses are tremendous. (1) Genesis reveals God as the Creator of all things. The Babylonian record brings in a number of deities. (2) Genesis pictures an original darkness, abyss, deep, etc. The Babylonian account personifies them, and the earth, the sky, the sea, and the heavenly bodies as well. (3) Genesis reveals a God without a female counterpart; in fact the Hebrews had no word in their language to express the idea of a goddess. The Babylonian records give to almost every great deity a female counterpart: indeed this was a feature of all pagan polytheisms. (4) Genesis is purely spiritual in character. The Babylonian account is shot through with base passions, jealousies, hates, plots, wars, and like evils. (5) Genesis is purely monotheistic, whereas the Babylonian record is grossly polytheistic. The gods of all the ancient polytheisms were anthropomorphic *personifications* of natural forces (in particular, of the sun-father and the earth-mother). The God of Hebrew and Christian monotheism is pure personality.

*Did the writer of Genesis borrow his account from Babylonian sources?*<sup>9</sup> Although this view prevails today in certain academic circles, it is, to a great extent, absurd and unwarranted. A comparison of the religious teaching of the two accounts should be sufficient to settle this question in the mind of anyone not blinded by preconceived opinion. Clay (LOTB, 73); "Upon the differences of the two stories we need not dwell. The crude polytheistic

grotesqueness of the Babylonian, with its doctrine of emanation or evolution from chaos to order, which makes the gods emerge from this chaos, or brings the firmaments out of a carcass, put it altogether in another class; and it is in no respect to be compared with the dignified and sublime conception of the beginning of things, with God as the supreme Creator, who called all things into existence." The theory frequently advanced that the prophets of Israel took these Babylonian traditions and "purified them by the subtraction of their grosser elements," for the purpose of making them "the vehicle for teaching the impressive truths of God's personality, unity, and relationship to Israel" (H. L. Willett), is, in McGarvey's language (BC, 389) "about as sensible as to say that the parable of the prodigal son was derived from *Peck's Bad Boy*, or from Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer*."

Did the Babylonian account (known as *Enuma Elish*, from its two opening words, meaning "when on high") have its origin from Genesis? This is improbable, but not at all impossible. Or, are the few likenesses between them due to a common Semitic inheritance, each handing on from age to age records concerning the early history of the race? Granting that this hypothesis be acceptable, how are we to account for the fact that the Genesis narrative remained pure, the least uncolored by the extravagances of all these ancient traditions? The history of the Hebrew people began with Abraham. How did Abraham or his immediate successors come into possession of such an idealistic religious account of the Creation? How can we account for the pure conceptions embodied in the Genesis account on any other basis than that of supernatural origin and oversight. Granting that the account was a revelation from an early age, what prevented it from becoming steeped in mythological accretions as did the creation stories of all other ancient peoples?

I am not willing to admit that the Mosaic narrative is

an embodiment of traditions, when it has all the earmarks of a special divine revelation. This is true regardless of the time in which it may have originated. Why omit all consideration of the Spirit of God in dealing with this problem? Does not special revelation include special inspiration, and vice versa? Why could not the Holy Spirit have revealed these truths to some ancient patriarch who gave them down through his descendants to Moses? Why could not the Holy Spirit have embodied them in a revelation directly to Moses himself? Or—if the critics would insist that it be so—to an inspired writer in the ages following Moses? Our claim here is *that Divine inspiration is the only basis on which anyone can account for the pure conceptions of the Genesis Cosmogony. These simply cannot be explained away as figments of the human imagination.* Orr (ISBE, V, 3107): “No stronger proof could be afforded of the truth and sublimity of the Biblical account of the origin of things than is given by the comparison of the narrative of creation in Gen. 1–2:4, with the mythological cosmogonies and theogonies found in other religions.” Ramm (CVSS, 102): “It is typical of radical critics to play up the similarity of anything Biblical with the Babylonian, and to omit the profound differences or gloss over them. When the Biblical account is set side by side with any other cosmology its purity, its chasteness, its uniqueness, its theocentricity are immediately apparent.” Again (*ibid.*, 102, n.43): “Conservative Christianity explains Babylonian and Biblical parallels by the theory of *cognateness* (not of dependence, nor of purification.)”

5. *The Firmament. The Waters under the Firmament, and the Waters above the Firmament.* (1) The word *rakia*, translated “firmament,” means literally, “stretched out,” hence “expanse,” and by necessary inference, alludes to the atmosphere. Obviously, this is the space above the earth, in general what we call the sky, the habitat of the winds and clouds, and the space in which the celestial



bodies of our solar system move in their courses. Hence, v.5 "God called the firmament Heaven." Not the heavens of the entire cosmos, referred to in v.1, but the *celestial* heaven which is in close proximity to the earth, "the heaven of the earth-world" (Delitzsch). (2) Does this passage refer to a separation of the "heavenly waters," described as held back by a "solid arched firmament" to which the heavenly bodies were attached, from the "watery abyss" below, on which the flat earth was supposed to rest—the customary explanation built on the theory of a borrowing from Babylonian cosmology? Not necessarily. It has been stated above that the customarily accepted theory of an adaptation of Babylonian source material to the Hebrew account, is built on the failure of the critics to recognize the poetic imagery of the Hebrew Scriptures and to differentiate this imagery from astronomical fact.

(3) We accept the interpretation here that is presented by Arnold Guyot, in his excellent little book, *Creation*; though published as far back as 1884, like many other works of earlier vintage, it gives us a far more sensible understanding of the Genesis Cosmogony than those appearing on the market since the turn of the century, a period in which textual criticism in all areas has been characterized by sheer conjectural extravagances. The word translated "waters," Guyot tells us, being the best afforded by the Hebrew language to express the idea of fluidity (nebulousness), is used here to designate the primordial cosmic material, the amorphous world-stuff, the molten mass (now heated to intense degrees by the energizing of Divine Power) of the undifferentiated sun, planets, satellites, etc., of our solar system. (Psalm 148 seems to have this same meaning, where we read of the "waters that are above the heavens" (v.4)—waters which are distinguished from the "deeps" below (v.7) and the "vapor" above (v.8). Hence, the separation of the earth

from the parent mass, and the development of it into an independent sphere, answers, according to Guyot, to the dividing of "the waters which were under the firmament" from "the waters which were above the firmament." That is to say, "the waters which were under the firmament" (the detached earth in its most primitive state as such) became divided from "the waters which were above the firmament" (the parent molten mass, which apparently became a sun) by the intervening *expanse*. Moreover, after having become detached from the parent mass, naturally the earth began to cool at its surface, as it whirled through space; and as this process of cooling continued, the gases were thrown off which formed the *atmosphere*. And no doubt the entire earth-mass became enshrouded in dense vapors at this stage, these vapors thus obscuring for a time the light of the parent sun from which the planet had been detached. Guyot writes (Cr, 66-67): "One fact admitted by all is the work of separation, of individualization, which must have preceded the present combination of the heavenly bodies, and this is indicated as the special work of the second cosmogonic day . . . thus we follow the gradual concentration from a gaseous state to a compact and well-defined body . . . We see how a family of planets has been detached from a vast central body which holds them in bondage in their orbits by the power of its mass." That is to say, the entire process by which the earth was detached and developed as a separate planet could well have been duplicated in the detachment and separate development of all the celestial bodies from their respective central suns. This all occurred on Day Two. Thus under the impulsion of the "brooding" of the Spirit of God, the cosmos began to march into being. And so "there was evening and there was morning, a second day."

(4) Note the remarkable correspondence between the foregoing interpretation of Gen. 1:6-8 and current scien-

tific hypotheses of the origin of our solar system. In general, these are two, namely, the *monoparental* and the *biparental* hypotheses. According to the former, as envisioned especially in the nebular hypothesis of Laplace (1749-1827), the huge primordial mass of nebulous matter, revolving in space with sufficient velocity and gradually condensing from an intensely high degree of heat, may have eventually, by throwing off successive rings of nebulae, set the stage for the development of all the celestial bodies, moving in their respective orbits, which make up our planetary system. The biparental hypothesis, on the other hand, first suggested by the French naturalist Buffon (1707-1788), pictures the formation of our planetary system as the result of a violent collision between the sun (which in more recent terms is thought of as having become a nova or supernova in the far distant past) and some other celestial body, which he called a "comet," by which he apparently meant, however, another star of comparable size. Although some of the fragments caused by this collision must have been lost forever in interstellar space, others, Buffon thought, held in check by the gravitational pull of the central mass (sun), were forced to continue revolving around it in the form of separate planets. This biparental hypothesis has been modified in recent years by the Chamberlin-Moulton theory in which the notion of direct physical collision has been abandoned for the tidal wave theory, namely, that the planets were first formed when a giant tidal wave of nebulous matter was raised on the surface of the sun by the gravitational attraction of an intruding star which passed by the sun at a distance of several solar diameters. This tidal wave theory has been further elaborated by Sir James Jeans. The theory has also been implemented by the planetesimal hypothesis, that these separate planetary masses subsequently grew by accretion of smaller compact masses of nebulae (each surrounding a nucleus) called planetesimals. This tidal

action hypothesis has been chosen, instead of that of direct collision, we are told, on the ground that the close passing of two great stars is much more probable than a direct collision. However, it is interesting to note that the British geophysicist, Jeffreys, has suggested recently that the hypothetical stellar encounter must have been much closer than was assumed in the tidal theory, that in fact the passing star must literally have "brushed" the surface of the sun, in order to tear away masses of solar matter. If this view should be the right one, we are back to the original form of Buffon's hypothesis. Note the following pertinent comments from Gamow (BE, 29): "We must conclude that the solid crust of the Earth must have been formed from previously molten material about two million years ago. Thus we can picture the Earth two billion years ago as a completely molten spheroid, surrounded by a thick atmosphere of air, water-vapors, and probably other volatile substances." The Genesis Cosmogony thus speaks for itself in the many features in which it is in harmony with current scientific thinking about the origin of our planetary system.

Day Three: Lands and Seas, Plant Life  
(1:9-13)

*And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, herbs yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, after their kind: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a third day."*

1. Need it be pointed out here that there had to be

light, and there had to be an atmosphere, before there could be any vegetation upon the earth. Moreover, the earth itself had to be put in order to receive and to nourish this vegetation from the time of its first appearance. Hence we have here, in all likelihood, a description of the steps necessary to this end: the partial condensation of the vapors enveloping the earth's surface, at this stage in the Creative Process, together with the cooling of the earth's crust, resulted, of course, in the outlining of continents and oceans. Hence, at this point something entirely new—a new increment of power—entered into the progressive development of the Creation. This something new was the appearance of the first forms of life, those of the plant world. This marked the crossing of the "great divide" between the world of physiochemical energy and the world of living things.

2. Just as there had to be light, and there had to be an atmosphere, so there had to be plant life before there could be any form of animal life. Plant cells differ from animal cells in the fact that they alone contain the pigment chlorophyll, which is responsible for the green color of plants and which is best known for its mysterious action in photosynthesis, the amazingly subtle and complex process by which plants convert the energy of the sun's rays into stored food energy that is necessary to the existence of all living things. Scientists have not yet been able to break this process down, to learn exactly how it works. It is a scientific fact, however, that with the creation of plant chlorophyll, photosynthesis commenced and the plant kingdom began to flourish, "sucking in sunlight and dumping out oxygen." E. V. Miller (WLP, 117): "With few exceptions all life on this planet owes its existence to the fact that green plants are able to store up the energy of the sun." Light is known to be the sole source of energy for this process of photosynthesis. Other necessary factors are water, carbon dioxide, oxygen, and

temperature of varying degrees. (In oceanic life, the microscopic organisms known as plankton carry on photosynthesis, like their relatives on the land, and so supply fish and other marine animals with food.) Thus the Genesis Cosmogony is again found to be in accord with present-day biological science.

3. On Day Three the Creative Process moved upward from the astronomical beginnings to the geological and biological phases. As we have already noted, on Day Two, the earth, when it became detached from the parent sun, began to cool. It would seem that as it cooled, the solid portions gathered at the center, with the liquids resting upon them, and the gases forming the outer envelope. As this cooling of the earth's crust continued, the elements were thrown off which comprise our atmosphere, and the entire mass became surrounded by dense vapors. This expanse (atmosphere) separated the earth below, not only from the parent sun, but probably from the other planets as well, all of which were in process of being formed in the same way. Science could hardly improve on the brevity and comprehensiveness of this description. Then on Day Three, the partial condensation of the enveloping vapors, and the continued cooling of the earth's crust, brought about the genesis of lands and seas, and so paved the way for the appearance of vegetation. Everest (DD, 150): "The earth shrank upon itself as it cooled, continents and mountains were lifted up, ocean beds were depressed, and the waters flowed together. Evaporation began, the wind-wafted clouds passed over the lands, the rains fell, the rivers dashed down the slopes, and another great wheel began to revolve and flash in the presence of the Master Mechanist."

4. "Let the earth bring forth," etc. (1) Various commentators hold that the classification of flora here is *threefold*—grass, herbs, and trees. Skinner (ICCG, 24), thinks it is *twofold*, based on two different methods of

reproduction, the one kind (grass, verdure, herbage, terms designating "all plants in the earliest stages of their growth") producing seed merely, the other producing fruit that contains the seed. (2) "And it was so." This oft-repeated formula is simply an affirmation that whatever the Creator "spake,"—that is, willed, ordained, ordered—was done, that whatever He "commanded," "stood fast" (Psa. 33:9). (3) Note the threefold description of the "trees" here: their *specific nature*, "fruit-bearing"; their *peculiar characteristic*, seed enclosed in fruit; and their *external appearance*, rising above the ground. (4) "After their kind." Surely this means, not that God made every kind of plant, tree, or seed, outwardly and directly; it means, rather, that He instituted the causation, in the form of seminal power, from which each individual of a kind or class (genus, species, etc.) proceeds to grow and to reproduce its kind. Since it is the *form* which is embodied in the seed, it is the form (the principle of specification, e.g., the "oakness" of an oak tree, or that which makes it an oak tree and not some other kind of tree) which determines the structure, and not the structure which determines the form. Hence an oak tree is an oak tree and cannot be a birch tree, any more than a poppy seed can be planted and a mustard tree be produced from its germinal seed. This principle of "each after its own kind" is one which prevails today as always, and no doubt will continue to do so, among all living things. If this were not true, taxonomy—the classification of animals and plants on the basis of their natural relationships—would be impossible, as indeed would be all the biological sciences. Note that the Genesis account makes it clear that the causative power is in the seed, a causative power which requires light, soil, atmosphere, moisture, etc., to actualize it. Note also the clear implication of secondary causation (as described in the form of "laws of nature") in the repeated formula, "Let the earth put forth grass," etc., "Let the

THE FIRST FOUR DAYS 1:14-19

waters swarm with swarms of living creatures," "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind," etc. In a word, God provides the seminal power, but His power operates at the direction of His eternal decrees (Psa. 148:5-6). (5) "And God saw that it was good." This formula (one might say, refrain), appearing at the end of each section of the Creation narrative, affirms that whatever God commanded, was done; and that the Divine purpose for which it was done was being realized. It was all *good* in the sense that each thing produced was doing what the Divine Will ordained it should do in the total structure of being.

Day Four: Chronology  
(1:14-19)

*"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day."*

1. Evidently we have here the account of the genesis of chronology, the measurement of time. On this day the sun, moon and stars were bidden to give light for the earth, and were appointed as timepieces, for signs, seasons, days and years.

2. This does not necessarily mean that the heavenly bodies were brought into existence at this time. It is our conviction that the various systems of suns and planets and satellites had all been passing through the same formative processes as that which had brought into existence our



own planetary system. Milligan (SR, 29): "There is nothing in the text that implies that they were just then *created*. They had doubtless existed in some state, as had the earth, from the beginning. But on the fourth day the clouds were most likely dispersed, and the atmosphere became perfectly transparent, and these luminaries then became visible from the earth; and hence this was the most suitable time that could have been selected *for making them our chronometers.*"

3. This section obviously refers to the appearance of sun, moon and stars *in the firmament*, in such a way as to be plainly discernible to the naked eye of an observer upon the earth. During this entire period, the atmosphere was gradually being purified. Plants continued to grow in this humid environment, although the source of the rapidly increasing light was probably not apparent for some time; however, plant growth itself, by absorption, assisted in the complete dissipation of the enveloping vapors, so that the heavenly bodies finally appeared in full view in the firmament.

4. Note that the Divine decree was not, Let the luminaries be brought into existence; it was, rather, Let the sun, moon and stars *give light upon the earth*. This was necessary in order for them to be appointed as our time-pieces. Note our word "appointed"—not created. This means that these celestial luminaries which had been in process of creation from the beginning were now divinely appointed as the instruments for man's use in measuring signs (the zodiac?) and seasons, and days and years; just as the rainbow which had existed from the beginning in the relationship between the sun's rays and the rainfall, was in Noah's day divinely appointed to be the sign of His covenant that He would never again destroy man with the waters of a flood (Gen. 9:8-17); and just as the unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine, which had existed from the beginning, were appointed by our Lord to be

the appropriate emblems of His offering of His body and His blood on the Cross of Calvary for the redemption of mankind (1 Cor. 11:23-33).

In order to adapt to his present environment, man has need of the sequence of day and night, of seedtime and harvest, of the times and the seasons. For practical ends, he must have norms for the measurement of space and time. However, mathematical time must be distinguished from real time. Whereas the former is measured, the latter is experienced: it is the very intensity of life, as *e.g.*, the soldier who will say, on coming out of battle, "I feel as though I have lived a lifetime in the last few hours." This experience of the intensity of living affords one at least a faint glimmer of the meaning of eternity as *timelessness*.

#### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

##### The Primordial Darkness a Metaphor of the Unconverted Soul

The thick darkness of the first "day" of the Creation is a fit metaphor of the darkness of the unconverted soul. In the beginning the world was (1) *without order*. It was in a state of formlessness and emptiness. So the unconverted soul lives in a state of spiritual formlessness and emptiness, a condition which requires a special Divine arranging in order to bring harmony and beauty out of this formlessness (1 Cor. 2:14). (2) *Without light*. In the beginning there was thick darkness everywhere. So the unconverted soul walks in darkness (Eph. 4:17-19) devoid of that true spiritual light which came down from heaven to illumine the emptiness of men's hearts (John 1:4-9, 2 Cor. 4:4-6). One may be alive to culture, to education, to science, to social problems, to political issues, but unless one is born again, born of water and the Spirit, *he is spiritually dead* (John 3:1-6). (3) *Without life*. There were no indications of life in the great deep until the Holy Spirit began to brood "upon the face of the waters." So, until the human soul yields itself to the

quickenings impulse of the Holy Spirit, it is dead in its own trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1, Rom. 3:23). Persistence in such a course leads ultimately to eternal separation from God and from the glory of his might (2 Thess. 1:7-10, Rev. 20:14). (4) *Yet not beyond the limits of Divine grace.* As the Holy Spirit brooded over primeval darkness, so He broods today over unconverted souls, longing for the proclamation of the Word to introduce light, life, order, and beauty; by wholeheartedly responding to the Divine Word; all who thus hear and obey the Gospel are made "partakers of the divine nature" (Rom. 10:8-10, 10:17; 2 Pet. 1:4).

Darkness was upon the face of the deep until God said, "Let there be light." A beautiful symbol of the appearance of the true Light who lighteth the world. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not" (John 1:4-5, 14:5). When Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, the world of men was enshrouded in spiritual darkness (Rom. 1:18-32). Judaism had become hopelessly encrusted with sheer formalism and traditionalism. So-called "natural" religion had failed. Current philosophies did not assuage the pessimism in men's souls. Stoicism, Hedonism, Libertinism, Epicureanism, Cynicism, and the other isms, had served their day and been found wanting. The whole world was under condemnation, lost, in danger of perishing (John 3:16-17). "Then cometh Jesus"—the world's hope, the Light and Life of mankind, and the *only* Light and Life of mankind.

#### Light as a Metaphor of the Gospel

1. Light and the Gospel are analogous, as regards (1) their *source*, God; (2) their *nature*, which is, in each case, to shine, to illumine, to dispel darkness; (3) their *effect*. Light simply shines: it does not have to be advertised. What would you think of a man who would put a sign on a lighthouse, reading "This is a lighthouse"? What

would humanity do without light? What would the world be without the Gospel?

2. God's gift of light resembles His gift of the Gospel, in that (1) both are *pure*, (2) both are *free*, (3) both are *universal*, (4) both are *gentle*, (5) both are *pervasive*, (6) both are *indispensable*, (7) both are *transcendent*, (8) both are *satisfying*.

3. It is the will of God: (1) that all men shall have the light of salvation. God despises both physical and moral darkness. To dissipate moral darkness, He sent His Son, His Spirit, His Church, His ministers, etc. (2) That His Church shall be the light of the world (Matt. 5:14-16, 2 Cor. 3:2-3). God does not expect the world to be spiritually enlightened by literary, philosophical, cultural, or social service societies; nor by clubs, lodges, or secular schools; nor by the "social gospel," eugenics, fraternalism, or any other human instrumentality in itself. God expects the world to be spiritually enlightened by His Church, and *only* by His Church, which is the "habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22). As Christ was the Incarnation of the Father, so the Church is the Incarnation of the Son (Eph. 1:23). There is no substitute for the Church of the living God. (3) That the whole world—all peoples—shall be illumined by the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ. The twofold mission of the Church is that of preserving the Truth of God and proclaiming it unto all the nations (Isa. 11:9, 60:19; Heb. 2:14; 1 Tim. 3:15; Matt. 28:18-20, 24:14).

Have you the light of Divine grace in your heart? Can you truly sing,

"Once I was blind, but now I see—

The light of the world is Jesus"?

Is your soul so flooded with Gospel light that you can peacefully "wait for the morning" (Psa. 130:6)? Are you letting your light shine before men? Are you truly a living epistle of Christ?

“In the beginning, God”  
 “God created”—“God said”—“God saw”—“God called”—  
 “God made”—“God set”—“God blessed”—always there is  
 God. God—the explanation of all things; without Him,  
 there is no ultimate explanation of anything.

Joseph Parker (PBG): ‘I claim no finality; I scorn no  
 other man’s thinking; I had a universe given me to account  
 for. One man told me that it was to be accounted for by  
 chance, and I *felt*—that he was a fool. I had human life  
 given me to account for, in all zones and climes, in all  
 ages and seas and lands. I studied it. One man told me it  
 was to be accounted for by the law of averages, and I  
 felt that he was a fool. I had the Bible to account for.  
 I read it straight through, and I was told by one man that  
 it happened to come together just as it is, that there is no  
 purpose in it, no organic spiritual genius and unity, and  
 that it was a gathering up of fragments that have no mu-  
 tual relation; and as I read the thing, as it got into me  
 and made my blood tingle, I felt that he, too, was a fool.  
 Then I came to this revelation, “In the beginning, God”—  
 God, not a name only, but a character, a spirit, a life, a  
 reality: God is light, God is love, God is Savior, God  
 blessed forevermore, King of kings and Lord of lords, and  
 I *felt* that the answer was grand enough to be true!’

#### The Word-Power of God

Man’s besetting sin has ever been that of rejecting the  
 Word of God. But search the Bible from cover to cover,  
 and you will find that nothing so displeases God as lack  
 of confidence in, and disrespect for, His Word. For ex-  
 ample, Saul and the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15).

There are those who speak of “the mere Word” as if  
 it were of no importance. But words are always important,  
 because they communicate ideas. Words are the media  
 of intelligent intercourse among persons. So the Word of  
 God is the revelation of the Mind and Will of God. God’s  
 Spirit-Power, Will-Power, Word-Power, are equally all-

powerful. (Cf. Luke 1:37; Matt. 24:35, 12:36-37, 7:24-27; Mark 8:38.) This Power is the sovereign Power in the cosmos, as evidenced by the following facts: 1. *The worlds (ages) were framed by the word of God* (Heb. 11:3). The formula, "And God said," occurs ten consecutive times in the first chapter of Genesis, and in each case that which God ordained came to pass. John 1:1-3, 1:14; Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6; Col. 1:15-17. The Logos was the executive Agent of the Godhead in the Creation of the universe. 2. *The cosmos is sustained in its processes by the same Word-Power.* This is the Power that maintains the order which human science discovers and describes both in the physical and in the moral realm. Heb. 1:1-3, 2 Pet. 3:7. 3. *Biblical miracles were performed by the use of the same Word-Power.* The rod of Moses was an emblem of this Power. But Moses failed to sanctify God's Word in the sight of the Israelites by smiting the rock instead of speaking to it, as God had commanded (Num. 20:7-13). Note Joshua's command addressed to the sun and the moon (Josh. 10:12). 4. *This Word, Logos, became incarnate in the person of Jesus of Jesus of Nazareth.* John 17:5,24; John 8:58, 1:1-3, 1:14; Col. 1:15-17. Jesus was the Logos inwardly in that He is from all eternity in the bosom of the Father (John 1:18). He is the Logos outwardly in that He is the complete revelation of God to man (John 14:9-12, 16:13-15). The Babe in the Bethlehem manger was God's Power clothed in flesh and blood. 5. *Jesus wrought mighty works (miracles) by the same Word-Power.* Acts 2:22; Matt. 14:19, 8:26-27, 8:3; John 4:50; Matt. 8:32, Mark 1:25; Luke 7:14, John 11:43. Matt. 8:8—"only say the word, and my servant shall be healed." Jesus gave no treatments, absent or present; He had only to speak the Word and the miracle was wrought. 6. *When Jesus returned to the Father, this Word-Power was dispatched to the Apostles at Pentecost through the agency of the Holy Spirit.* Luke 24:49; John 14:16-17, 14:26; John

15:26-27, 16:7-15, 20:22-23; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4. Note the effect of the preached Word on the multitude (Acts 2:37). 7. *The Word-Power of God, since the first proclamation on the Day of Pentecost, is embodied in the Gospel.* Psal. 19:7—it converts the soul. Isa. 2:3, Mic. 4:2—this Word to go forth from Jerusalem. Acts 2:4—this it did on the first Pentecost after the Resurrection. Luke 24:47—the Gospel to be proclaimed first at Jerusalem. Rom. 1:16—the Gospel, not just a power, nor one of the powers, but the Power of God unto salvation to all who accept and obey it. 8. *By the same Word Power, the Apostles performed miracles.* Acts 3:6, 9:34, 9:40, 13:8-12. 9. *The Word, written or spoken, makes believers.* Acts 2:14-37, 8:5-12, 8:30-35, 9:6, 22:10, 11:14, 10:34-43, 16:14-15, 16:32, 18:8; Heb. 4:12; 1 Thess. 2:13; Rom. 10:8-11, 10:17. *Conclusion:* Division in Christendom arises from two causes, namely, refusal to accept and obey the laws of God, and the making of laws by men where God has not made any. The Word is irresistible by material things: when it is spoken, nature obeys. Man alone has the power to resist the Word (Rom. 13:1-2) and the power to neglect it (Heb. 2:1-4). Note the ultimate destiny of all who ignore, neglect, or resist the Word (2 Thess. 1:8, 1 Pet. 4:17). Let us obey the Gospel of Christ (Heb. 5:9) and so enjoy the fulfillment of the precious and exceeding great promises of God (2 Pet. 1:4, Heb. 5:9, Acts 2:38, Rom. 6:23).

#### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SIX

1. What is the import of the word *bara* in the first chapter of Genesis?
2. What was done on Day One of the Creation?
3. State the probable meaning of the phrase, "formless and empty," as descriptive of the original state of the earth.
4. What is suggested by the first syllable, "form," in the word "formless," as used in v.2?

## THE FIRST FOUR DAYS

5. What is the probable meaning of the term, "the deep"?
6. What is the meaning of the word *chaos* in Greek?
7. How does the picture of the primeval "chaos" suggest the state of the unregenerate soul?
8. What does the word "brooding" suggest, as descriptive of the work of the Spirit of God in the Creation?
9. Point out the correlation between the Spirit's "brooding" at the beginning of the physical Creation and His "brooding" at the beginning of the spiritual Creation.
10. List some of the Scriptures which identify the Spirit of God of the Old Testament with the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of Christ, of the New Testament.
11. Cite some examples from everyday life of the transmutation of psychical energy into physical energy.
12. What light does this throw on the origin of the first form of physical energy?
13. What is presupposed in the application of energy in terms of force?
14. What probably was the kind of "light" indicated in the third verse of Genesis?
15. What reasons have we for concluding that this was not solar light?
16. With what formula is the description of each epoch of Creation introduced in the Genesis narrative?
17. In the light of the entire Bible what is the significance of this formula?
18. Point out some of the Scriptures which identify Jesus of Nazareth as the Eternal Logos.
19. What is the twofold meaning of the term *Logos* in Greek, and how does Jesus fulfill this twofold aspect?
20. State the historical, eternal, and temporal names of our Savior. What is His official title and what is its import?
21. What is the significance of the repeated formula, "Let there be," etc.?
22. What reasons have we for thinking that the first form



## GENESIS

- of light was an elementary kind of radiant energy rather than solar energy?
23. What does the word "good" imply, as God is represented as using it, in the Genesis account?
  24. What was done on Day Two of the Creation?
  25. Explain what is meant by the "law of accommodation."
  26. List the contrasts between the Babylonian and the Mosaic Cosmogonies.
  27. Why do we reject the theory that the Genesis account was borrowed from Babylonian sources?
  28. What are the grounds on which we accept the Genesis account as divinely inspired?
  29. What does the word "firmament" mean, as used in vv. 6 and 7?
  30. What is probably meant here by the separation of "the waters which were under the firmament" from "the waters which were above the firmament"?
  31. State the monoparental and biparental hypotheses of the origin of the earth.
  32. What is the import of the word "Heaven" as used in v.8?
  33. What was done on Day Three of the Creation?
  34. By what processes were lands and seas probably differentiated?
  35. Explain what is meant by secondary causation.
  36. What do we mean by saying that God probably operated through secondary causes throughout most of the Creation? By what formula is this method indicated?
  37. What is the import of the phrase "each after its kind"?
  38. What was done on Day Four of the Creation?
  39. Why do we reject the view that sun, moon and stars were created at this stage?
  40. Correlate Gen. 1:17 with Gen. 9:8-17 and with 1 Cor. 11:23-33.
  41. State some of the aspects in which the primordial

- darkness was a metaphor of the unconverted soul.
42. State the aspects in which light is a metaphor of the Gospel.
  43. What do we learn from the first chapter of Genesis concerning the Word-Power of God?
  44. Where is this Word-Power to be found today?

PART SEVEN: THE LAST THREE "DAYS" OF  
THE COSMIC WEEK OF BEGINNINGS

Gen. 1:20-31

The heart of the Genesis Cosmogony is that all things have been brought into existence by the Supreme Creative Will, acting either directly (primary causation) or through the agency of forces and materials of His own creation (secondary causation). "God created," "God said," "God called," "God saw," "God made," "God blessed," etc. The name of God, Elohim, occurs forty-six times in the first two chapters of Genesis. The facts that God wills it means that He is Absolute Sovereign over what He has created; that He rules, determines, and brings to their pre-determined ends all the ages (Isa. 44:6); that He is sovereign over all aspects of the cosmos, including life, man, society, peoples, and even the destinies of individuals and nations (Acts 17:24-28, Jer. 18:5-10). God *before* all, God *back* of all, God *over* all: God's creative Word is the Efficient Cause of the existence, and continuance in existence, of all things. God Himself is without beginning or end, the First and the Last, the Alpha and the Omega, the Self-existent Living One.

Every process of the cosmos is divinely willed; every good end is divinely designed and ordained. Hence the living and true God is personal—an Other to all other persons. He is the sovereign God, transcending the cosmos and independent of it. He is the personal, sovereign, rational and moral Divine Being. He is "over all, and through