

- 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

all, and in all" (Eph. 4:6). There is not the slightest room here for pantheism or deism. This is *theism* in its most exalted form. Deut. 6:4—"Yahweh our God is one Yahweh," that is, the *only* Yahweh ("I AM," Exo. 3:14). "I am God, and there is none like me" (Isa. 46:9). "I am the first, and I am the last: and besides me there is no God" (Isa. 44:6; Rev. 1:8, 1:17-18). This is *monotheism* of the highest order.

The sublime facts to which the Genesis account of the Creation points directly is that the Eternal God, who is Spirit (John 4:24), is the God of creation, of revelation, of conscience, of judgment, of redemption, of the ultimate restoration of all things (Acts 3:21).

When Elohim began the Creation, He made things, one might well say, "in the rough." He created "the heavens and the earth"—the ancient Hebrew way of saying the entire cosmos. The Spirit of God "moved" in the darkness of the great deep, preparing it for all that was to follow. One basic truth of the entire Genesis account is that in the six great "days" of creative activity, this activity pointed unfailingly to the crown of the Divine handiwork, man; in them all things necessary to human existence were marvelously wrought. How long it was from the first stirring in the primordial deep until God said, "Let us make man in our image," we do not know. We can readily see, however, that the account allows for the vast ages, and the processes taking shape throughout, as envisioned by present-day geological science.

Perhaps it should be added here, parenthetically, that the geological theory of *uniformitarianism*, namely, that early geological processes were the same as those now empirically discernible (or, as Hutton put it, that the present is the key to the past, and that, if given sufficient vastness of time, the processes now at work could have produced all the geological features of our planet) simply could not apply, in any great detail, to the first beginnings

of the lands and seas that go to make up our earth. It seems obvious that the elements had to be brought into existence in their proper interrelationships in order to effect planetary beginnings and to establish the more advanced planetary processes and changes.

As we have noted, Day One of the Hebrew Cosmogony witnessed the first manifestations of energy, of matter-in-motion, and the creation of light. On Day Two the firmament was brought into being, giving us such necessities of human existence, as the surface waters, the intervening atmosphere, and the sky above with its clouds. On Day Three, earth and water, apparently one conglomerate mass up to this point, became separated, so that the earth took its proper form, with continents and seas being formed, and with vegetation beginning to clothe the hitherto bare land. On Day Four it seems that the vapors enveloping the newly formed planet were gradually dissipated, so that sun, moon and stars became visible, to be divinely appointed as standards for human measurement of time. Cornfeld (AtD,5): Thus God "made the world's time, which is the framework of history, for He is the Lord of history."

Throughout the rest of the Genesis Cosmogony, the writer, while noting that there are divinely graded "kinds" of living beings, puts supreme emphasis on the moral and spiritual character of the cosmos, and its dependence upon its Creator ("God saw that it was good," vv. 4,10,12,18,21, etc.) and especially upon the "towering significance of man" as a moral agent and the lord tenant of the whole Creation.

It seems significant indeed that in verse 21, we find the Hebrew verb *bara* used the second time (cf. v.1) in the account of the Creation. We have noted heretofore that this verb denotes a real *primary* beginning: it means that something *new*, some new increment of power, is being introduced into the creative process. Hence, we find in

the section we now take up (vv.20-23) the account of the advance from the *unconscious* being of the plant to the *conscious* being of the animal, the awareness that comes from sense-perception and locomotion, the powers that *specify* the entire animal creation. Because of this fact, I have chosen to make this the breaking point between the two sections of the Creation narrative.

Day Five: the Water and Air Species

(1:20-23)

“And God said, Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature that moveth, wherewith the waters swarmed, after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind: and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth. And there was evening and there was morning, a fifth day.”

1. We have here the account of the beginnings of animal life, in the aquatic and aerial species. Did animal life appear first in the water? Evidently so, as air-breathing animals could hardly have lived until the atmosphere had been purified. Water animals must have preceded all other kinds in the Creation. It is a commonplace, of course, of present-day biology that animal life began in the water, and that flying reptiles which lived in the water and required but little oxygen, were probably the precursors of birds.

2. V.20—“let the waters swarm,” etc. That is to say, the seas were to be filled with creatures adapted to marine life, each species capable of reproducing its own kind prolifically. Note also Gen. 2:19—Does this mean that the bodies of marine animals are of a different texture than those of birds and beasts? Whatever it means, it is made

clear that the *life principle* was inherent in every individual of every "kind" (species) of both water and air creatures. These are here differentiated from all previous creations, and from vegetation in particular, by their possession of this vital spark. But—does not this contradict the fact that plants are also living organisms? It does not. It simply bears out the well-known fact that the life processes of animal cells are different from those of plant cells (as stated heretofore, the latter are specifically characterized by their possession of chlorophyll and by their unique activity of photosynthesis). Whitelaw (PCG, 25): "It may be impossible by the most microscopic analysis to differentiate the protoplasmic cell of vegetable matter from that of animal organisms, and plants may appear to be possessed of functions that resemble those of animals, yet the two are generically different—vegetable protoplasm never weaving animal texture, and plant fibre never issuing from the loom of animal protoplasm. That which constitutes an animal is the possession of respiratory organs, to which, doubtless, there is a reference in the term *nephesh*, from *naphash*, to breathe." Lange (CDHCG, 171): "The creation of marine animals begins first. It is not only because they are the most imperfect creatures, but because the water is a more quickening and a more primitive conditioning of life than the earth. The like holds true of the air."

3. V.21—"And God created . . . every living creature that moveth" (A.S.V.) "The moving creature that hath life" (A.V.) R.S.V.—"every living creature that moves," from *ramas*, meaning "move," "creep," etc.—the term *remes* being especially descriptive of creeping animals, either on land, or in water (Gen. 9:2, 7:14; Psa. 69:34). Does this mean that insects also came into existence at this stage? Or are these to be included among the "creeping things" named in v.24? We cannot be certain about this. One fact, however, is obvious, namely, that the appearance

of the power of locomotion is emphasized here as the significant characteristic of the life process at this stage. Human experience proves that animal life is specified (distinguished from plant life) by the power of sensitivity (sensations are the sources of consciousness) and locomotion. (See *infra*, Aristotle's Hierarchy of Being.) Lange (CDHCG, 172): "It suits well the fifth day, or the number five, that the symbols of mightiest life-motion, the fishes and the birds, are created on this day. The animals of lesser physical motion, but of more intensive individual sensation, come after them."

4. V.22. In the case of plants, their reproductive powers are included in their creation. Here, however, the first living animal forms are endowed with the right of self-propagation by a separate act—a Divine benediction. In Scripture, as in nature, fish are assigned to water, birds to the heaven (sky, air), and beasts to the earth. In a later verse, we shall see that man's lord tenancy over all these forms, indeed over the whole earth, is ordained by the Creator.

Day Six: Land Animals, Man, Naming
of the Animal Tribes, Woman

(1:24-31)

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind: and it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind: and God saw that it was good."

1. Here we have the account of the creation of the land animals, whose bodies are part of the earth's substance (elements): this could not be said of fishes which are related in a special sense to the water. Some hold that the classification here includes insects for the first time. *E.g.*, Skinner (ICCG, 29): "The classification of animals is

threefold: wild animals, roughly, *carnivora*; domesticated animals, roughly, *herbivora*; reptiles, including perhaps creeping insects and very small quadrupeds."

2. *The River of Life.* (1) The stretch of time involved in the Divine activity of the first four "days" of the Creation allows, of course, for the developments claimed by the astronomical and geological sciences. (A word of caution here: Recent attempts to apply the evolution yardstick, which was at first simply and only a hypothesis of the *origin of species*, to the origin of the celestial and terrestrial non-living worlds, are, to say the least, based on the questionable *a priori* supposition that such a norm is valid in these areas.) Nevertheless, it can now be maintained legitimately that no conflict need arise between Genesis and geology, in the light of present-day knowledge in these realms. (2) We have now reached the stage in which the Creative Activity, as set forth in the Genesis narrative, is represented as advancing from non-living to living forms. Here, of course, the tremendous mysteries of the Life Process—many of them apparently impenetrable by human intelligence—press upon us for solution, from the points of view of both Scripture and science. The life that any person enjoys was not created in him; rather, it flowed into him from his parents, and their life flowed into them from their parents, and so on and on and on, back, obviously, to a Source of all life, which in the nature of the case had to be a Living Source. First Life could not have been a human creation, for, if we are to accept the views of the evolutionists, both plant and animal life existed prior to man's appearance on the scene. How fitting, then, such metaphors as the Stream of Life, the River of Life, etc.! How irrefutable the truth set forth in Scripture that all life is a Divine gift—the very Breath of the living and true God (Gen. 2:7)! Rev. 22:1—"the river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." However life may

have originated on earth—or on any other planet, for that matter—it is essentially the Breath of God. And the Breath of God is Scripturally a metaphor of the power of the Spirit of God. (3) What is life? What is it in the structure of the living cell that sets it apart from the non-living molecule or atom? All that can be said now, in answer to this question, is simply that *no one knows*. Living things are differentiated from the non-living by such powers as metabolism, growth (not by accretion from without, but by processes operating from within), reproduction, waste and repair, sensitivity, adaptability, movement, “dynamic equilibrium” (“ability to maintain a balance in the flow of matter and energy within the organism’s system”), etc.

3. *The Mystery of the Life Movement.* (1) What is there in the living cell to “vitalize” it, to differentiate it from mere quanta of energy? No one knows. The secret resides in the cell protoplasm, a semifluid, jellylike substance, which, up to the present time, has resisted all human efforts to analyze it. The most that has been learned thus far is that “life requires a large number of highly specific proteins with different shapes, sizes, and patterns.” These protein molecules and “sub-molecules”—each containing a large number of atoms—are invariably present in protoplasm (so we are told). I take the position that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that man may some day, once he has succeeded in “breaking down” protoplasm, synthesize a living cell in the laboratory. This event, however, should it occur, would leave unsolved the problem as to how the first living cell came into existence, because this was a development which necessarily occurred before man was created. Moreover, such a synthesis would only push the fundamental problem a notch farther back. The basic problem would need to be re-stated as follows: How did the ingredients thus synthesized by man, come to be endowed with the potencies essential to the

production of the spark of life? One thing is sure—man himself did not endow these ingredients with vital force: this force must have been present potentially in the ingredients themselves or in their inter-relationships. Thus it becomes clear that the eventual synthesis of a living cell in the scientific laboratory would leave the problem of Creation, or of the Source and nature of Creative Force still unsolved. (2) Every human individual starts life as a single cell, the ovum which was produced by the ovary of the mother and fertilized by the spermatozoon of the father. Immediately following this fertilization (conception), the basic cellular processes set in, namely, those of *cell segmentation* (continuous division and multiplication), *cell differentiation* (change of structure), and *cell specialization* (the assumption of function which accompanies differentiation), so that by the time the child is ready to be born it has its full complement of different tissues. At the end of thirty hours after conception, we are told, the one cell has “pulled apart” to make two cells; at fifty hours, the two split to make four; at sixty hours, the four become eight, etc., until, by the process of “geometrical progression,” at the end of the third day of life there are thirty-two cells. This is the start toward the vast number of cells which go to make up the body of the newborn babe. Dr. George W. Corner, embryologist at the Rockefeller Institute, has written (as quoted by Dr. Shettles, *Today's Health*, March, 1957, published by the A.M.A.): “The fertilization of an egg by a sperm cell is one of the greatest wonders of nature. If it were a rare event, or if it occurred only in some distant land, our museums and universities would organize expeditions to witness it, and newcomers would record its outcome with enthusiasm.” But as it is, like the shining of the sun, we simply take it for granted, without giving a thought to the mystery of it. Call it protoplasmic ir-

ritability, or what not, there is a vital force which is inherent in the life processes of the living cells—and this is why we call them *living* cells.

(3) Manifold are the mysteries of the life processes. For instance, can anyone explain how it is that, by means of a specific number of submicroscopic “blobs” of “living matter” called chromosomes, 23 in the human male and 23 in the female (through the activity of the hypothetical genes inherent in these chromosomes, though the genes are not apprehensible to the naked eye, nor even to the naked eye implemented by the most powerful microscope), the two parental—and several ancestral—natures are fused in the offspring; or how it comes about that through these quasi-material chromosomes and genes, not only are physique and physiology, but even temperament (emotional tone and intensity) and intelligence potential, handed down to the child? (There is no amount of learning that can transform a moron into a genius.) Or, can anyone explain the upward surge of the life movement into the more and more complex forms of living being? Can anyone explain the venerable Will to Live, the determination to resist extinction, that seems to characterize all living creatures (or, as put in the form of the oft-heard cliché, “Self-preservation is the first law of nature”)? What is this tremendous life force that can drive the roots of a tree through a sewer or through the foundation of a house? To my way of thinking the mysteries of the life processes are far more inscrutable than the powers that are wrapped up in the atom.

4. *The Problem of the Origin of Life* has not yet been solved by any *naturalistic* hypothesis. (1) As a matter of fact, only two hypotheses of a strictly *naturalistic* character have ever been suggested, namely, the view that life was brought to this earth, possibly by a falling meteorite, from some other planet, and the view that is generally known as the theory of spontaneous generation. Obvious-

ly, the former view explains absolutely nothing; nothing, that is, with respect to the *origin* of life: it simply transfers the problem to another planet or star. The latter view, however, the theory of spontaneous generation (abiogenesis), deserves some attention at this point. (2) In ancient and medieval times the theory of abiogenesis was held generally, and without question, by scientists (such as they were in those early ages), philosophers, and theologians alike, including even several of the Church Fathers. Nor was this view held to be antiscritptural: as Aquinas put it (ST, I, q.91, art.2): "What can be done by created power, need not be produced immediately by God." Men frequently noted that worms, insects, flies, mice, frogs, etc., seemed to come out of the earth, out of dung, out of putrid meat and water exposed to the air; hence the consensus was that under proper conditions of moisture and warmth, the earth could generate living forms. It was even believed that the mud of the Nile River begat swarms of mice. The English naturalist, Ross, announced pompously: "To question that beetles and wasps were generated in cow dung is to question reason, sense, and experience" (quoted by De Kruif, MH, 26). It remained for the restless Italian experimenter Spallanzani (1729-1799), building on first foundations already laid by the Dutch lens grinder, Leeuwenhoek, and another Italian iconoclast, Redi, finally to come to the conclusion, and to proudly announce, that "microbes must have parents." All the thanks he got for his epoch-making discovery was the prejudice, leading to ostracism, of his colleagues. We all know, however, that Spallanzani's view was fully confirmed by the great Pasteur (1822-1895) in the next century. No concrete evidence has yet been found that would disprove this view that all life comes from antecedent life, that only living things can reproduce living things. (3) Twentieth-century biologists are content to stop with the claim that such an event as the generation

of the spark of life by non-living matter might have occurred under certain conditions. For example, G. G. Simpson (ME,13): "How did life arise? Again, the honest answer is that we do not know but that we have some good clues . . . Current studies suggest that it would be no miracle, nor even a great statistical improbability, if living molecules appeared spontaneously under special conditions of surface waters rich in the carbon compounds that are the food and substance of life. And the occurrence of such waters at early stages of the planet's evolution is more probable than not. This is not to say that the origin of life was by chance or by supernatural intervention, but that it was in accordance with the grand, eternal physical laws of the universe. It need not have been miraculous, except as the existence of the physical universe may be considered a miracle." Also Julian Huxley (EA, 19-21): "The work of Pasteur and his successors has made it clear that life is not now being spontaneously generated . . . There are only three possible alternatives as regards the origin of living substance on this earth. Either it was supernaturally created; or it was brought to the earth from some other place in the universe, in the interior of a meteorite; or it was produced naturally out of less complicated substances . . . The third alternative, that living substance evolved out of nonliving, is the only hypothesis consistent with scientific continuity. The fact that spontaneous generation does not occur now is not evidence that it did not do so at some earlier stage in the development of this planet, when conditions in the cosmic test tube were extremely different. Above all, bacteria were not then present, ready to break down any complex substances as soon as formed . . . It must be confessed, however, that the actual process is still conjectural; all we know is that living substance must have developed soon after the first rocks of the geological series were laid down, and that this was somewhere about two thousand million years ago.

We can be reasonably sure that a relatively simply nucleoprotein marked a crucial stage in the process, and that the earliest truly living things were nothing so elaborate as cells, but more in the nature of naked genes." All this, of course, is still guesswork; indeed a hypothesis has been correctly defined as a "fairly good guess." (4) It is interesting to note here that the well-known "Church Father," Augustine, who lived from A.D. 354 to 430, points up the fact (GL, V,4,143) that Gen. 1:11-12 teaches that the *earth* itself, not *seeds in the earth*, was given the power to produce plants (the first form of life). He writes: "For he does not say, 'Let the seeds in the earth germinate the pasture grass and the fruitful tree,' but he says, 'Let the *earth* germinate the pasture grass sowing its seed.'" Augustine also theorized that living things which inhabit the earth were created potentially in the form of "hidden seeds" ("seminal reasons"); that in due time, and in the proper sequence, these "hidden seeds" were actualized pursuant to the proclamations of the successive Divine decrees. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) held that this actualization (in his thinking, apparently, something of the character of an evolution), was the *modus operandi* by which the Creator effectuated the origins of the first forms of life. As stated above, with respect to the spontaneous generation theory one fact is obvious, namely, that if the spark of life was actually generated by the sudden orientation of certain forces within a protein molecule, the potencies had to be inherent in that molecule before they could be actualized. This means simply that the problem of the origin of life is pushed back another step: it becomes the problem of how non-living matter acquired these potencies in the first place, and of the Efficient Causality by which they were actualized: in short, the necessary Creative Power, in whatever form localized, had to operate to bring about Creation.

5. *Aristotle's Hierarchy of Being.* This is a doctrine, stated in his *De Anima* ("On the Soul") which becomes very helpful at this point in our study. According to Aristotle, the totality of being is a hierarchy (*i.e.*, organized on different levels, in an ascending order of complexity); that is to say, our world is a terraced world, so to speak, and not a continuum (without a single break from the lowest to the highest of forms). Aristotle based this hierarchical arrangement of all organisms on what he called the differentiating "powers of the soul" (*psyche*) possessed by those individual existents at each level, those of each higher order, subsuming in themselves the powers of those below them in the scale, and possessing an additional differentiating or *specifying* power of their own. At the lowest level, of course, are the processes of the inanimate creation (according to Aristotle, of matter-in-motion), what today we call the physiochemical basis of all created things. At the next level, according to Aristotle, is the plant creation (what he designates the *vegetative psyche*), which has the same physiochemical basis, *plus* the vegetative or nutritive powers (what are known today as the cellular processes). At the third level is the animal order (*animal psyche*), which has both the physiochemical and vegetative powers, *plus* the powers of sensitivity and locomotion. At the highest level stands man, the rational creation (*rational psyche*), who has the same physiochemical basis insofar as his body is concerned, who also shares the vegetative powers with the plant and animal orders, and the powers of sensitivity and locomotion with the animal creation alone, but who has in addition the power of reason (the thought processes and their ramifications). Over all, said Aristotle, is the Prime Mover, the First Cause, God, whom he defines as Pure Self-Thinking Thought (cf. Exo. 3:14, John 4:24).

God—Pure Thought Thinking Itself

Rational psyche	p-c processes	nutritive (cellular) processes	sensitivity locomotion	reason
Animal psyche	p-c processes	nutritive (cellular) processes	sensitivity locomotion	
Vegetative psyche	p-c processes	nutritive (cellular) processes		

The inanimate level: in Aristotelian terms, matter-in-motion; in modern scientific terms, the physiochemical processes.

It should be noted that this diagram points up the major problems posed by the evolution hypothesis, namely, the bridging of the gaps from the non-living to the living, from the plant to the animal, and especially from the animal to man.

It is interesting to contrast with Aristotle's "hierarchy" of being, the notion of the totality of being as a continuum, as embodied in the famous doctrine (developed in early modern times) of the Great Chain of Being. According to this view, because our world is the handiwork of a perfect Being, it must be "the best of all possible worlds"; hence, again reasoning *a priori*, all possible beings must be actualized, all possible places filled, therein: that is, there must be an unbroken continuity—a progressive gradation—of organisms from the very lowest living being up to the very highest, God Himself. (See A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, Harvard University Press.) As stated clearly by Alexander Pope, *An Essay on Man*:

Of systems possible if 'tis confest

That wisdom infinite must form the best,
then it follows that—

. . . all must full or not coherent be,
And all that rises, rise in due degree.

The resultant picture is as follows:

Vast chain of being! which from God began,
 Natures aethereal, human, angel, man,
 Beast, bird, fish, insect, what no eye can see,
 No glass can reach; from Infinite to thee,
 From thee to nothing.—On superior pow'rs
 Were we to press, inferior might on ours;
 Or in the full creation leave a void,
 Where, one step broken, the great scale's destroy'd;
 For Nature's chain whatever link you strike,
 Tenth, or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike.

It is evident that the Great Chain of Being theory, although originally arrived at through *a priori* reasoning, is the one that is most in harmony with the evolution hypothesis, provided the former could be established by empirical evidence. I am reminded here of Haeckel's *Tree of Life*, a book in which the author supplied all the "missing links" he considered necessary to the evolution of species, and supplied them out of his imagination. The book is looked upon today as a kind of freak product of overzealousness, in an age when the favorite academic indulgence was that of singing paeans to Darwin.

Biblical teaching completes the Aristotelian picture with its doctrine of angels (from the Greek *angelos*, "messenger") who are represented as occupying an intermediate position between God and man (Psa. 8). Angels are pictured in the Bible as celestial (ethereal) beings, higher than man in intelligence and power, whose function is to serve as emissaries of God in the execution of His Plans for His Creation (Heb. 1:14, 2 Pet. 2:11).

Perhaps it should be mentioned here that the French scientist, Cuvier (1769-1832), held the view that the first pair, male and female, of each "kind" was a direct Divine creation. The modern philosopher, Lotze, and others, have advanced the view that special increments of power were thrust into the Creative Process, at intervals, by direct

Divine action, thus marking off the transitions from inanimate energy to life, from life to consciousness, and from consciousness to self-consciousness (as in man). As stated above, these are the unbridged gaps in all naturalistic theories of the origin of species.

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

1. Note the change of formula in v. 26. It is no longer, “Let there be a firmament,” “Let the waters under the heavens be gathered in one place,” “Let the earth put forth grass,” “Let there be lights in the firmament,” “Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures,” “Let the earth bring forth living creatures,” etc. It is now, at the beginning of this final epoch, “Let us make man in our image,” etc. Obviously something of transcendent importance is about to occur: the climactic terminus of the whole Creative week is about to be attained, the noblest product of the Divine handiwork is about to be unveiled.

2. *What, then, does the “us” signify?* (1) Does it mean that God is taking counsel with the angels (Philo)? Hardly, for the simple reason that man is not the image of an angel, that is, possessing an ethereal body: man’s body is of the earth, earthy (1 Cor. 15:47); to become spiritual (ethereal) the bodies of the saints must await the putting on of immortality (2 Cor. 5:1-10; 1 Cor. 15:35-57; Phil. 3:20-21; Rom. 2:5-7, 8:11, 8:22-23). Moreover, God’s angels always appear in Scripture as servants, never as counselors (Heb. 1:14). (2) Does it mean that God was taking counsel with the earth (Maimonides)? Hardly. It is difficult to see how the earth could enter into a Divine *consilium* that involved the deliberation and decision that

is indicated in the phrase, "Let us," etc. (3) Is this an occurrence, then, of what is commonly designated "the plural of majesty"—that is, the use of "we" by an Oriental potentate, in his royal edicts, to connote his power, majesty, glory, and all the attributes which may be inherent in him, in the eyes of his subjects? Skinner (ICCG,30) objects that this usage is absent from Hebrew theology. (4) Is this a "remnant," a "hang-over," of polytheism? Evidently *not*. Such a view is completely out of accord with the strict Hebrew monotheism. (5) The "us" evidently connotes the involvement of all the powers of the Godhead in the creation of man. By correlating this verse (1:26) with Gen. 3:22, 11:7, and Isa. 6:8 (note the three-fold "holy, holy, holy" in v. 3 of this chapter), it becomes evident that all these Scriptures designate a *consilium* among persons; in short, in the light of Scripture teaching as a whole, they are intimations of the triune personality of God. In the Old Testament we have 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). (This is in accord, too, with the use of the plural form *Elohim* as the Name used for God in this chapter: see Part V this text, *supra*.) (The credo of Deut. 6:4 evidently has no numerical significance: it means simply, and positively, that the Yahweh of the Bible is *one* Yahweh in the sense of being the *only* Yahweh: cf. Isa. 45:18, 46:8-11; 1 Tim. 2:5, Acts 17:23-31).

3. V. 27—"And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Note the verb, *created*, from the Hebrew *bara*, the third and last time it is used in the Genesis Cosmogony. In the process of the physical creation the "brooding" of the Spirit did not cease with the bringing into existence of such first physical phenomena as energy, motion, light, atmosphere, lands and seas: in short, the factors that constitute the physiochemical world. This "brooding" or actualizing was continuous

throughout the whole Creative Week (indeed it is continuous throughout the entire Time Process). Moreover, as a result of the Word's executive agency, and of the Spirit's realizing agency, new increments of power came into the Creative process, at successive stages of development. As emphasized heretofore, this is clearly indicated by the three successive appearances of the verb *bara* in the Genesis Narrative. In the Hebrew, *yatsar* means to "form" or to "fashion," and *asah* means to "make." Both of these verbs designate a forming, fashioning, or arranging out of, or with the use of, pre-existing materials. The verb *bara*, however, in the some forty-eight instances in which it occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures, invariably conveys the idea of a *creation absolute*, that is, without the use of pre-existing materials; and in every instance in which it appears, whatever its object may be, it has God for its subject. *Bara* is used first in Gen. 1:1—now, granting that this affirmation is simply a general introductory statement, which it appears to be, it clearly points to the fact that the first step in the Creative Process—perhaps the engendering of the first form of physical energy—was a *creation absolute*. Again, *bara* is used in v. 21, obviously to indicate the step upward (or forward) from the *unconscious* to the *conscious* order of being: in this passage the beginning of animal life—in the language of the ancients, "animal psyche" or "animal soul,"—is described. Finally, *bara* occurs a third and last time in v. 27: here it designates the step upward from the *conscious* to the *self-conscious* (personal) order of being: in the language of the ancients, from "animal soul" to "rational soul." Thus it is clear that the inspired writer intends for us to understand that a *creation absolute* took place at (at least) three successive steps upward in the actualization of the natural creation, producing for human science the seemingly impenetrable mysteries of physical energy, conscious life, and self-

conscious life. It seems evident, moreover, that a *creation absolute* must have taken place also in the step forward from the nonliving order to the first living being; this, from the point of view of biological science, would have been the first form of plant life, although the author of the Genesis Cosmogony does not explicitly so indicate. (It is a commonplace in present-day biology that the line between plant and animal is so thinly drawn—as in certain algae, fungi, etc.—as to be indiscernible.) Certainly unless spontaneous generation can be established as a fact of nature, the conclusion would seem to be unavoidable that the plant cell was the first living form to be created. The mystery of life—the mystery that resides in the protoplasm of the cell—has not yet been penetrated by human science, and unless it can be determined that inanimate matter can *per se* produce life, we must continue to think that life force (*elan vital*) is something added to, or superposed upon, the basic physiochemical processes. We must conclude, therefore, that as a result of the “brooding” of the Divine Spirit, new increments of power came into the Creative Process, at successive stages, to produce the first forms, respectively, of physical energy, the unconscious life of the plant, the conscious life of the animal, and the self-conscious life of man. These are phenomena which mark off the various levels in the total Hierarchy of Being. These levels, moreover, are characterized by differences, not just of degree, but of rank. And the use of the verb *bara* in the Genesis Cosmogony indicates clearly, with the single exception noted (and the exception would, of course, be eliminated, should it be proved that plant cell and animal cell were cotemporaneous in origin) the beginning of each of these successively higher orders. It is also most significant that the words *bara* and *asah* (“created and made”) are used in Gen. 2:3, by way of recapitulation, evidently to mark the distinction between

absolute beginnings and subsequent "natural" developments or arrangements of that which had previously been originated.

4. *The Breath of Life.* According to Scripture, the brooding of the Spirit (metaphorically described as the Breath of Life, the Breath of God, etc.) is responsible for every form of life in the universe—natural, spiritual, and eternal. And so at the Creation this brooding of the Spirit actualized every form of natural life there is—the unconscious life of the plant, the conscious life of the animal and the self-conscious life of man. (Acts 17:24-25; Gen. 1:21, 7:21-23; Eccl. 3:21; Job 34:14-15; Psa. 104:27-30.) Commenting on v. 27 of Psa. 104, George Matheson writes (VS, 50,51): "Who are the 'all' here spoken of? They are the living creatures of the whole earth. What! you say, the creatures of the animal world! Can these be said to be in possession of God's Spirit? I can understand very well how *man* should be thus privileged. I can understand why a being of such nobleness as the human soul should lay claim to a distinctive pre-eminence. But is it not a bold thing to say that the human soul is in contact with the beast of the field? Is it not a degradation of my nature to affirm that the same Spirit which created me created also the tenants of the deep? No, my brother; if you shall find in God's Spirit the missing link between yourself and the animal world you will reach a Darwinism where there is nothing to degrade. You are not come from them, but you and they together are the offspring of God. Would you have preferred to have had no such link between you? It is your forgetfulness of that link that has made you cruel to the creatures below. You do not oppress your brother man, because you know him to be your brother; but you think the beast of the field has no contact with the sympathy of your soul. It *has* a contact, an irrefragable, indestructible contact. You are bound together by one Spirit of creation; you sit at one communion table of na-

ture; you are members of one body of natural life. The glory of being united to thy Father is that in Him thou shalt be united to everything. Thou shalt be allied not only to the highest but to the lowest; thou shalt be able not only to go up but to go down. Thou shalt have the power that the Lord had—the power to empty thyself to the lowermost, to the uttermost. Thou shalt feel that thou owest all things thy sympathy when thou hast recognized this relationship through the same divine Spirit.” Perhaps the feeling of a natural kinship between man and the lower orders, so widespread among primitive peoples, was, after all, but a universal intuition of an eternal truth. (See a further elaboration of this concept in our study of Gen. 2:7 *infra*.)

5. *Man as the Image of God.* (1) V. 26—“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” Up to this time God has simply uttered the creative edict, and what He commanded was done; now it seems that He stays His hand, so to speak, for a Divine *consilium* before He goes on with the final phase of His creative work. The reason is obvious: He is now to bring into existence man, the highest (in inherent powers and faculties) and the noblest (in moral potential) product of His handiwork; man, for whose use and benefit everything else has already been brought into being. Elliott (MG,36): “Man was initiated by a solemn announcement rather than by a command. The lower animals were made each after their kind, but man was made after the *image of God*. Appointed as head of all other creation (1:26), man was the pearl, the crown of creation.” As for everything below man, God pronounced it all *good* (v. 25); following man’s creation, however, and his appointment as lord tenant of the earth, Elohim looked out upon His total handiwork and pronounced it *very good* (v. 41); that is, every created species was fulfilling its nature by doing that which it was designed to do in the over-all plan of God. “The cosmology of the Bible is

geocosmic in its practical point of view." (2.) It should be noted here that the *image of God* in man persisted: that is, neither Fall nor Flood destroyed it (Gen. 5:1,3; Gen. 9:6). Elliott (MG, 37): "This is a basic trait which God has stamped upon all mankind. Man may ignore this character, act on the animal level, and, thus in a sense, be 'inhuman' in the nature of failing to evaluate and use the possibilities which God has graciously given; but he does not *lose* these possibilities. As long as there is life, there is the opportunity through forgiveness of having dominion and fellowship with God."

(2) A great deal of unprofitable speculation has been engendered about the use of the two terms here, "image" and "likeness." Tayler Lewis, for example (Lange, CDHC, 173), following the Maimonidean tradition, that the "us" of v. 26 probably indicates communication between the Creator and the already created earth (or subhuman nature as a whole), suggests that the phrases, "in *our* image, after our likeness," could mean that man should be like unto both the divine and the earthy, "that is, in the composition of his body a likeness of the earth (or nature) from which he was taken, and in his spirit like to the higher order of being in that it is incorporeal and immortal." He adds: "If we depart at all from the patristic view of an allusion to a plurality of Idea in the Deity, the next best is that of Maimonides. In fact, if we regard *nature* as the expression of the divine Word from which it derives its power and life, the opinion of the Jewish Doctor approaches the patristic, or the Christian, as near as it could from the Jewish standpoint." (Cf. Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:47, John 3:31.) (I have stated, in a foregoing paragraph, the common objections to this Maimonidean interpretation of v. 26.) The general tendency today is against making any significant distinctions between the two words, "image" and "likeness."

(3) That "image" or "likeness" here is not to be interpreted as any form of *corporeal* likeness of man to God, is evident from the tenor of Biblical teaching as a whole. In Scripture, for example, God is unequivocally described as Spirit (John 4:24, the words of Jesus; cf. Acts 17:27-28); that is, as one of the earlier creeds puts it, "without body or parts, but having understanding and free will." Again, the Second Commandment of the Decalogue expressly forbids the making or use of any graven image, or likeness of anything, as an object or means of worship (Exo. 20:4-6); in view of this explicit prohibition in the Mosaic Code, it is most unlikely that the terms "image" or "likeness" of Gen. 1:26 were intended to convey any notion of corporeality in God. As a matter of fact, the Bible is replete with polemics against any form of image-worship (idolatry). Cf. Deut. 5:8, Psa. 106:20; Isa. 40:18-23, 44:9-20; Acts 17:29, Rom. 1:22-23; Isa. 6:1 (Isa. 6:1—note Isaiah's silence here as to God's appearance). Of course God is often spoken of, especially in the Old Testament, in anthropomorphic or metaphorical language; hence, passages, in which He is pictured as thinking, feeling, or willing, as men are wont to think and feel and act (Gen. 6:6, 3:8; Exo. 32:10-11, 32:14), and passages in which bodily organs are ascribed to Him, such as hands, arms, eyes, fingers, ears, mouth, lips, etc. (Gen. 3:8, 11:5; Exo. 8:19, 15:16, 31:18; Num. 11:18, 11:23, 12:8; Deut. 8:3; Exo. 33:20-23; Psa. 94:9, 17:4, 17:15, 33:6, 119:73; Isa. 1:15, 50:2, 60:13; Prov. 2:6; Job 40:9; Zech. 14:4). All such passages exemplify only the inadequacy of human language to communicate Divine revelation, and the use of the Law of Accommodation to overcome—not too effectively, of course—this linguistic barrier.

(4) The consensus among Bible students is that the image of God attributed to man in the Creation Narrative consists in the latter's essential spirituality as an intelligent and free agent, in his moral integrity, and in the dominion

over all subhuman orders divinely entrusted to him. That this image of God is still that which specifies man *as man* and constitutes him to be wondrously superior to all lower orders, even after the Fall and the Flood, is clearly indicated by such passages as Gen. 5:1-3 and Gen. 9:6. In Gen. 9:6, the fact of this image of God in man makes murder (the killing of a human being of one's own individual authority and with malice aforethought) punishable by taking the life of the murderer: in Biblical teaching, rational life (personality) is man's greatest good, primarily because he has been created in God's image. Even Aristotle remarks that the power of reason is the spark of the Divine in man. Chesterton has commented pointedly that "man is either the image of God or a disease of the dust." (Cf. Gen. 2:7; Job 27:3, 32:8; Psa. 139:14, 8:3-6; Eccl. 12:7, Heb. 12:9, etc.) In a word, this image of God in man is the basis of the emphasis on *the dignity and worth of the person* which runs throughout all Biblical teaching. *This conviction of the dignity and worth of the person is the basis of all moral action and of the science of moral action which goes under the name of ethics.* Although from the earth, that is, the physiochemical elements, comes man's physical tabernacle, from God comes that essential spirit—the core, so to speak, of the person and personality—which is incorporeal and hence timeless (2 Cor. 4:18, 5:1-10; 1 Cor. 15:35-58).

(5) Perhaps the meaning of the image of God in man is best summarized in the word *personal*. That is to say, as God is a Person (Exo. 3:14), so man is a person, though unquestionably in a vastly inferior sense. Some Bible students have tried to clarify this difference by asserting that God is "super-personal." To my way of thinking, however, the "super" in this connection is meaningless, because no one knows or can know in this present life all that is connoted by the prefix. In saying that man is personal in some sense as God is personal, we are surely on

Scriptural ground. It is significant that although the Old Testament forbids our thinking of God in the likeness of *material things*, it does not forbid our thinking of Him in the likeness of our *inner selves*. My conviction is that the term "personal" expresses the core of the meaning of the phrase, "the image of God," even more precisely than the term "moral." True it is that man, by virtue of his possession of understanding and power of choice, is a moral being *potentially*, and hence responsible for his deeds. However, our Lord alone is the *very* image of God in human flesh (Heb. 1:3, John 1:14), that is, God's image both personally and morally—morally in the sense of actualized potentiality: though "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). His devotion to the Father's will was complete devotion; hence, He was "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners" (Heb. 7:26, Matt. 3:15, Luke 2:49; John 4:34, 5:30, 5:36, 6:38, 17:4).

(6) Some commentators have held that the "image" of God indicated here is that of dominion; that is, man's Divine endowment with dominion over the whole creation is a reflection, so to speak, of God's absolute sovereignty. But, is it not more reasonable to conclude that man's stewardship, his lord tenancy of the universe, follows from his endowments, rather than vice versa? Skinner (ICCG, 32): "This view cannot be held without an almost inconceivable weakening of the figure, and is inconsistent with the sequel, where the rule over creatures is, by a separate benediction, conferred on man, already made in the image of God. The truth is that the image marks the distinction between man and the animals, and so qualifies him for dominion: the latter is the consequence, not the essence, of the divine image." (Cf. Psalms 8:3-9.)

(7) Again, neither, "image" nor "likeness" should be taken to signify that man is divine. He is *human*, separated from God, not by degree, but by rank: he belongs to the

natural world, whereas God transcends the natural, as Creator transcends His Creation. Only through redemption and sanctification (growth in holiness or wholeness) does man become a "partaker of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4, Heb. 12:14, Matt 5:8). Elliott (MG, 36): "Thus, the words do not imply that man is divine. He is copied after a divine one, patterned after a divine one with some of his attributes: he has functions which are like God's. Thus, God showed Himself to be the *prototype* and the *original* of man. This implies, not that man is just like God, but that man is something on the order of God."

(8) It may be accepted, I think, that "image" here signifies not only personality, hence possible fellowship with God, but representation as well. Again Elliott (MG, 37): "Images in the Orient were to represent someone. Thus, man is the 'representative' of God over creation. Actually the image idea has something to say about man's stewardship. Dependence is also involved: man is dependent upon the one for whom he is representative. Since dependent man has been delegated a task of responsibility with a share of authority over creation, he is in turn a responsible being."

(9) However, we repeat the conviction here, for the sake of emphasis, that man is God's image primarily in the personal sense of the term. Cf. Exo. 3:14—Only a person can say meaningfully, "I am," that is, only a person uses *personal* pronouns. Moreover, let us never forget that the fundamental property of the person is individuality, that is, *otherness*: every person, God included, is *unique*, every person is an *other* to every other person. Hence the saint's ultimate Union with God is not absorption into the Cosmos, into Brahma, Tao, Unity, the One, or what has been designated "the ocean of undifferentiated energy" (that is, the loss of individuality); it is, on the contrary, according to Scripture teaching, a state of unhindered access to, and fellowship with, the personal living (theistic) God (1 John

1:3-4, 1 Cor. 13:9-12, Rev. 21:1-8). Again, we take note of the supreme excellence of the Christian faith as compared with Oriental, and indeed *all other*, systems or cults that may be abroad in the world under the name of "religion."

(10) A final constructive word from T. Lewis (Lange, CDHCG, 174) is in order here: "The image of God the distinguishing type of man: Hold fast to this in all its spirituality as the mirror of the eternal ideas, and we need not fear naturalism. Many in the church are shivering with alarm at the theories, which are constantly coming from the scientific world, about the origin of species, and the production of man, or rather the physical that may have become man, through the lower types. The quieting remedy is a higher psychology, such as the fair interpretation of the Bible warrants, when it tells us that the *primus homo* became such through the inspiration (the inbreathing) and the image of God lifting him out of nature, and making him and all his descendants a peculiar species, by the possession of the image of the supernatural."

(11) "*Male and female created he them.*" (1) Note the threefold parallelism here of the parts of this verse (27), built around the verb "created." This surely indicates a crescendo of jubilation as the writer contemplates the crowning work of Elohim's creative Word and Spirit—the creatures, both male and female, created in His own image. (2) Note that "male" and "female" as used here are generic, that is, designating the two great divisions, according to sex, of the entire human race. As yet they are not proper names, as, for example, in Gen. 3:20 and Gen. 5:3. Note that God "called their name Adam," that is, Man, "in the day when they were created" (Gen. 5:1-2): that is, the generic name was originally ascribed in common to both man and woman. (3) The content of this verse 27 surely indicates that we have here a kind of panoramic view of the climactic events of this great "day,"

and thus we have confirmation of the essentially panoramic (pictorial-summary, cinemascope) character of the entire Hebrew Cosmogony. On the view (which will be presented later) that in chapter 2 we have in greater detail, and with special reference to man, the account of the happenings on this sixth "day," we may summarize these happenings as follows: the creation of man, the naming of the animal tribes, and the creation of woman. The Garden of Eden narrative seems also to be associated with the events of this day. We are justified in reaching these conclusions, I think, in spite of the chronological indefiniteness of the sequence of the Divine works throughout the entire Creative Epoch. Time seems never to have been a matter of any great concern to the Spirit of God in His revelation of God's Eternal Purpose as embodied in the Bible.

"And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for food: and to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the heavens, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for food; and it was so. And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day."

1. Note the twofold Divine blessing, not to him, but to *them* (that is, all mankind): the blessing of the power to reproduce their kind, which they were to have in common with the lower orders (v. 22); also the blessing—and responsibility—of dominion over all subhuman orders of being. Are we justified in assuming that man and woman

in their original innocence had the power of reproducing their kind by the power of *thought* alone? It is a point worth considering, although, of course, we have no certain answer.

2. Note also the twofold Divine ordination: to multiply and replenish (populate) the earth, and to subdue it. (1) God ordered them to disperse and to occupy the whole earth. But what did they actually do? They disobeyed God: they concentrated in the land of Shinar and undertook to build a tower to heaven (Gen. 11:1-9). There is no evidence anywhere that God looks with favor on concentration of population, for the obvious reason that it invariably issues in vice, crime, sin, divorce, mental illness, disease, strife, and every kind of evil. (2) God also vested them with dominion over the whole earth, with lord tenancy over the whole of nature. This dominion includes the authority to control and utilize nature, nonliving as well as living, for his own good and the good of his fellows. (If man has the right to life, he has the right to the means of sustaining it, and the means are provided only by the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms.) After all, what is science but the story of man's fulfilment, whether wittingly or unwittingly on his part, of this Divine injunction to take possession of the earth and subdue it? (3) *There are three categories of truth:* (a) that which is concealed from man, largely because it lies beyond the power of the human intelligence to apprehend it (the mysteries of nature, such as energy, life, consciousness, perception, self-consciousness, etc., are as inscrutable as the mysteries of grace, such as the triune God, the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ, the incarnation, the atonement, resurrection, immortality, etc.); (b) that which has been embodied in the structure of the cosmos for man to spell out slowly, through the centuries, in the form of his science; and (c) that which has been revealed in Scripture for man's redemption, sanctification,

and immortalization: 2 Pet. 1:13—"all things that pertain unto life and godliness" (cf. Deut. 29:29). (John 8:31-32, 14:6, 18:37-38, 17:17).

3. *The Glory and Dignity of Man* is clearly indicated by many affirmations of the Genesis Cosmogony. Milligan (SR, 36): "God's favor to man is further manifested in the fact, that for his special benefit the whole earth, with all its rich treasures of mineral, vegetable, and animal wealth, was provided. For him, all the matter of the Earth was created in the beginning. For him, all the gold, and silver, and copper, and iron, and granite, and marble, and coal, and salt, and other precious minerals and fossils, were treasured up, during the many ages that intervened between the epoch of Creation and the beginning of the Historic Period. For him, the light and the atmosphere were produced. For him, the world was clothed with grass, and fruits, and flowers. For him, the Sun rose and set in the firmament, and the stars performed their apparent daily and yearly revolutions. For him, the sea and the land were filled with living creatures, and the air was made vocal with the sweet voices of birds. All these things were provided for the good and happiness of man; and then he himself was created to enjoy them. And thus it happened that what was first in design was really last in execution."

The fact of the Glory and Dignity of Man is the crowning revelation of the first chapter of Genesis. Man's nobility, in the Plan of God, is evidenced as follows: 1. *By the time of his appearance in the Creation.* He came into existence after all inferior kinds had been created: he was the last and fairest of the Divine works. 2. *By the solemn circumstances of his making.* With respect to other phases of the creative activity, there was a simple expression of the Divine Will, such as, "Let there be light," "Let the waters bring forth," etc. But the creation of man necessitated a Divine *consilium* in which the three Persons

of the Godhead were heard to decree among themselves, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The creation of man was a subject of special consideration and was attended with Divine solicitude and delight. 3. *By the dignity of his nature.* Created in the image of God, endowed with the essential elements of personality, he is the highest and noblest of all creatures of earth. (Gen. 1:27, 2:7; Job 32:8, 33:4; Psalms 8:3-8, 139:14). 4. *By the circumstances of his early environment.* Eden, with its delights, was especially fitted up for his occupancy, signifying his early state of innocence, happiness, exemption from physical death, and unhindered access to God (Gen. 2:8-17). It seems that God, foreseeing his fall into sin, prepared the earth at large, with all its vast resources, for his habitation in his fallen state. 5. *By the extent of his dominion* (Gen. 1:28-31), which is universal. Everything on earth was placed under his lord tenancy, and the Divine command was unequivocal, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." The Scripture makes it crystal clear that man was crown of the Creation for whose sake all else was called into being. Man, in his primitive state was *natural*; through rebellion against God, he fell from a natural into an *unnatural* state (sin is unnatural); by grace, through faith, he may attain to a *preternatural* state. Man, at present, is fallen, in spiritual ruin, in danger of perishing, and without hope in this world or in the world to come, unless he accepts the Lord Jesus Christ as His Redeemer and prepares for ultimate Union with God by growing in the Spiritual Life in this present world. (Rom. 3:23-25, John 3:16-18, Eph. 2:8, 1 John 5:11-12). Let us seek the restoration of the Divine image in our souls, for without holiness no one can hope to see (experience) the Lord (Heb. 12:14).

Marcus Dods (EB-G): "Man is dear to God because he is like Him. Vast and glorious as it is, the sun cannot think God's thoughts, can fulfil but cannot intelligently sympa-

thize with God's purpose. Man, alone among God's works, can enter into and approve of God's purpose in the world, and can intelligently fulfil it. Without man the whole material universe would have been dark and unintelligent, mechanical and apparently without any sufficient purpose. Matter, however fearfully and wonderfully wrought, is but the platform and the material in which spirit, intelligence, and will may fulfil themselves and find development. Man is incommensurable with the rest of the universe. He is of a different kind and by his moral nature is more akin to God than to His works."

4. The doctrine pointedly emphasized in Scripture that the cosmos with its myriad forms of life was brought into existence for man's use and benefit (Gen. 1:28-30, 9:1-3) is looked upon as absurd by self-appointed "positivists," "naturalists," "humanists," pessimists, and all their kind: the very idea, they say, is consummate egotism on man's part. In one breath they tell us that man is utterly insignificant, just a speck on a speck of the totality of being; in the next breath, they will contend that man's capacity for knowledge is infinite, thus vesting him potentially with omniscience. (Man's capacity for knowledge is indefinite, but not infinite.) Among these skeptics and agnostics, consistency is never regarded as a jewel. If the lower orders, nonliving and living, were not brought into existence for man's benefit, (a) for what conceivable end could they have been created?—the only alternative view would be that of the utter purposelessness of all being; (b) how does it happen that man is the only created being capable of inquiring into the meaning of the cosmos and of his own life in it? and (c) how does it happen that man is vested with a well-nigh insatiable spirit of wonder (curiosity?) which drives him into an unabating quest for the understanding and control of his environment?

5. One might well ask at this point, *Why a Creation at all?* Or, for those who would deny Creation, why the

existence of the totality of being that obviously does exist? Of course, man has no certain answer to this question, nor is the certain answer to be found anywhere that I know of (cf. Job 11:7, Isa. 55:8-9, Heb. 11:6). I firmly believe, however, that God's activity in whatever realm, whether that of the physical Creation or that of the spiritual Creation, the Regeneration (Matt. 19:28; John 1:3, 3:3-6; Tit. 3:5), is the outpouring of His love. And, we might ask, even though human intelligence cannot fathom the mystery, How could God's love be as fully revealed in any area of being as in a world of lost sinners? (Cf. John 3:16-17, Acts 3:21; Eph. 3:8-12; Rom. 8:21, 8:38-39; 1 John 4:7-21). It strikes me that man's weakness is his utter incapacity to fathom the super-abundance of the Divine Love which is lavished unstintedly upon the creatures which He created in His own image. May we not be justified in believing also that it is this unfathomable, ineffable Divine Love which caused the Creator to shower upon mankind the glories of the physical as well as those of the spiritual Creation. Intrinsically, God's end in Creation is the well-being (happiness) of His moral creatures; extrinsically, His primary end is His own glory. Nor is this doctrine of the love of God incompatible with that of the final punishment of the neglectful, disobedient and wicked (Matt. 25:46, John 5:28-29, Rom. 2:4-11, 2 Thess. 2:7-10, Rev. 20:11-15). We must remember that God did not prepare Hell for mankind, but for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41); the lost who go there will do so because their individual consciences will send them to their proper place (Acts 1:25, Rev. 6:16-17).

6. *Vv.* 29-30. There is a difference of opinion as to whether these verses indicate that only vegetable diet was permitted for man's sustenance. One view is that we cannot dogmatically affirm that man's dominion over the animals did not involve his using them for food; indeed the fact of animal sacrifice (first noted in ch. 4) probably indi-

cates that the worshipers ate the flesh of the victim: this seems to have been an aspect of sacrifice wherever practiced. On the other hand, it is contended by many that Gen. 9:3 clearly teaches that the use of animals for food was not authorized prior to Noah's time. We do have indicated here, however, a fundamental scientific fact, namely, that plants with their chlorophyll, because of the mysterious work of photosynthesis which they perform, are absolutely necessary food for all animal life (including human beings).

7. V. 31—*Everything was very good.* (Cf. Psa. 104:24, 119:68.) The meaning of "good" as used in these first few chapters of Genesis is uniformly the same: the good is that which is suitable to a nature, that which adds a perfection or removes an imperfection. The nature of any class of things is determined by their *function*. Note Gen. 2:18—"it is not good that the man should be alone." That is to say, *alone* the man could never have actualized the functions for which he had been created, namely the reproduction of his kind and their stewardship over the whole of the Creation; without a helper meet for his needs, his appearance on the scene would have been utterly purposeless and useless. Hence, anything to be *good* must be *good for something*; that is, for the function it was created to perform. Therefore, when Elohim looked out over His Creation and pronounced it all good, this meant that all created species were actualizing the functions for which they had been created, in relation to the totality of being: the consequence was, of course, harmony, order, peace. Note also that heretofore God simply pronounced His handiwork good (vv. 10, 12, 18, 21, 25), but now, in contemplation of the finished Creation, God pronounces it all *very good*. The reason for the special emphasis is obvious: man, the crown of Creation, has now made his appearance on the scene and been appointed lord tenant of the universe. (The various existents of the subhuman

world (both the nonliving and the living) are incapable of dysfunctions that would distort their natures; man alone, endowed as he is with the power of choice to endow him with the power to love, has succeeded in "messing up" practically everything that God has created; without this power of choice, however, man simply would not be man—he would be only a robot or an automaton.) *God never makes anything but good.* Nature was perfect (complete) as it came from His hand. There was nothing to mar this perfection until sin (moral evil) entered Eden, bringing in its wake disease, suffering, and death (physical evil).

Day Seven: Rest

2:1-3

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

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

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

2. *God rested from His work.* (1) But we are told that Jehovah "fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. 40:28). Does God need to rest because of fatigue? Surely not. This

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

3. *Pro-lepsis: Resting and Hallowing*. (1) Note that to *bless* is to wish something for that which is blessed (someone has said, "infinite multiplication" of the something

wished); and to *hallow* is to remove that which is hallowed, out of its secular relations and to devote it to God. (2) This is obviously a *pro-lepsis*: and who was in a better position to understand this than Moses under whom the observance of the week-day Sabbath was established? Now a *pro-lepsis* is a connecting together, by the writer of the narrative, of two widely separated events in point of years, in an explanatory way, so that it appears as if they might have happened at one and the same time. Remember that Moses is writing this narrative long after the Creation. *This means that God rested on the seventh epochal (aeonic) day, after finishing His Creation (of the physical universe). But He did not sanctify the seventh solar day of the week as the Jewish Sabbath until many centuries later, to be specific, when the Hebrew people under Moses were in the Wilderness of Sin, previous to their arrival at Sinai.* In the sixteenth chapter of Exodus we have the account of the institution of the Jewish Sabbath. Moses, however, in giving us the Creation Narrative, connects the *resting* on the seventh aeonic day (after Creation) and the *sanctification* of the seventh solar day in the Wilderness of Sin, in such an explanatory way that it appears that the two events happened following the Creation, and at the same time, when in reality they were separated by many centuries. He does this, evidently, for the purpose of teaching the Jewish people *why it was that Yahweh selected the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth day, as a day of rest for them, but especially as a memorial of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage* (Deut. 5:15). (3) Another example of *pro-lepsis* occurs in Gen. 3:20—“And the man called his wife’s name Eve, because she was the mother of all living.” (“Eve” means “Living” or “Life.”) When Adam named her Eve, as far as we know, she was not the mother of anyone; but she was the mother of the entire human race when the Mosaic Cosmogony was written. Hence,

Moses appended the explanatory clause, "because she was the mother of all living," to show why Adam, with prophetic insight, named her Eve. (4) Pro-lepsis occurs in the New Testament, as in Matt. 10:2-4, in the enumeration of the twelve apostles. Matthew, in giving their names, concludes with the statement, "and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him." The clause, "who also betrayed him," is merely explanatory on Matthew's part, to make clear the identity of Judas. Yet the calling of Judas to the Apostleship and the betrayal of Jesus by Judas were events separated in time by some three years, although it might seem, from the wording of this passage from Matthew's account, that they occurred at one and the same time. There can be little or no doubt that in Gen. 2:1-3, we have another pro-lepsis: only on this basis can the passage be harmonized with the teaching of the Bible as a whole.

(5) A. Campbell (CS, 139), takes the position that the Sabbath was observed from the Creation. However, there is no evidence whatever to support this view. There is not the slightest suggestion of an observance of the Sabbath prior to the time of Moses: the term does not even occur in the book of Genesis. There are intimations of a division of time into cycles of seven days (weeks) here and there in Genesis (*e.g.*, Gen. 8:10-12, 29:16-30, 50:10), but there is no necessary connection between these and the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath; moreover, there is not even an intimation of Sabbath observance associated with them. (6) It is crystal clear that the first observance of the week-day Sabbath occurred in the wilderness of Sin, as related in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. It is inconceivable that the Procession under Moses would have been on the march from Elim to the wilderness of Sin, as we are told expressly that it was, on the first day of the eight-day period described here, for this would also have been a Sabbath had the institution been in effect at that time. The Law

of the Sabbath forbade the people to do any work whatever, even to kindle a fire or to leave their habitations on that holy day (Exo. 16:29, 31:14-15, 35:2-3; Num. 15:32-36); hence, marching on that first day into the wilderness of Sin would have been a flagrant violation of the Sabbath Law. Now, as the story is given, throughout the six days that followed the first day of marching, the people, at God's command, gathered manna ("bread from heaven") each day, and, again at God's command, they gathered a double portion on the sixth day. Why so? Because the day that followed—the last day of this eight-day period—was the first observance of the Jewish Sabbath. The Scripture makes these facts too clear for misconception (Exo. 16:21-30). Not too long after this, the Procession reached Sinai, and there the positive law of the Sabbath was incorporated into the Decalogue (Exo. 20:8-11). (7) The Sabbath was a provision of the Mosaic Law, given to one people only, a people living in a part of the world where it could be properly observed (*e.g.*, without the kindling of a fire, Exo. 35:2-3, Num. 15:32-36) without working a hardship on them (cf. the words of Jesus, Mark 2:27-28). The wording of Exo. 20:8, "*Remember* the sabbath day to keep it holy," does not necessarily imply a previous observance; "remember" means, evidently, "keep in memory," or "do not forget" the Sabbath day, thus having reference primarily to their *future* observance of the day. If it be contended that the word "remember" here has reference to *past* observance, I answer simply that the Hebrew people had already observed the Sabbath at least a few times, from the occasion of its institution in the Wilderness of Sin (Exo. 16). The language of this sixteenth chapter makes it too obvious for question that what is described here was the first observance of the seventh day of the week as the Jewish Sabbath.

(8) Finally, the Sabbath was an integral part of the Decalogue, and the Decalogue was the heart of the Mosaic

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

as a memorial for the Jewish nation because that was the great *aeonic* day on which God rested from His creative activity "in the beginning." Thus it may be contended legitimately that *the extent of the time involved* in these two instances is not any necessary part of the exegetical parallel.

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

(10) Note allusions to the six "days" of Creation in other parts of the Bible, especially Exo. 20:11 and Exo. 31:15-17. Do these passages require us to accept the "days" of the Genesis Cosmogony as days of twenty-four hours each? On this point Tayler Lewis (Lange, CDHCG, 135-136) writes with great clarity, as follows: "The most clear and direct allusion is found in the Fourth Commandment, Exo. 20:11, 'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth.' This language is held to be conclusive evidence of the latter having been ordinary days. They are of the same kind, it is said, or they would not have been put in such immediate connection. There could not be such a sudden change or rise in the meaning. This looks plausible, but a careful study shows that there is something more than first strikes us. It might be replied that there is no difference of radical idea—which is essentially preserved, and without any metaphor in both uses—but a vast difference in the scale. There is, however, a more definite answer furnished specially by the text itself, and suggested immediately by the objectors' own method of reasoning. God's days of working, it is said, must be the same with man's days of working, because they are mentioned in such close connection. Then God's work and man's work must also be the same, or on the same grade for a similar reason. The Hebrew word is the same for both: 'In six days shalt thou labor and *do* all thy *work*; for in six days the Lord *made* (*wrought*) heaven and earth.' Is there no transition here to a higher idea? And so of the *resting*: 'The seventh day shall be to thee a sabbath (a rest), for the Lord thy God *rested* on the seventh day'—words of the same general import, but the less solemn or more human term here applied to Deity. What a difference there must have been between God's work and man's work—above all, between God's ineffable repose and the rest demanded for human weariness. Must we not carry the same differ-

ence into the *times*, and make a similar ineffable distinction between the divine working-days and the human working-days—the God-divided days, as Augustine calls them, and ‘the sun-divided days,’ afterwards appointed to us for ‘*signs*, and for seasons, and for days, and for years’ of our lower chronology? Such a pointing to a higher scale is also represented in the septennial sabbath, and in the great jubilee period of seven times seven. They expand upwards and outwards like a series of concentric circles, but the greatest of them is still a sign of something greater; and how would they all collapse, and lose their sublime import, if we regard their antitype as less than themselves; or, in fact, no greater than their least! The other analogy, instead of being forced, has in it the highest reason. It is the true and effective order of contemplation. The lower, or earthly, day is made a memorial of the higher. We are called to *remember* by it. In six (human) days do all thy work; for in six (divine) days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . It is the manner of the Scriptures thus to make times and things on earth representatives, or under-types, of things in the heavens, *hypodeigmata ton en tois ouranois* (Heb. 9:23). Viewed from such a standpoint these parallelisms in the language of the Fourth Commandment suggest of *themselves* a vast difference between the divine and the human days, even if it were the only argument the Bible furnished for that purpose. As the *work* to the *work*, as the *rest* to the *rest*, so are the *times* to the *times*.”

(11) Thomas Whitelaw (PCG, 12,13) comments in similar vein: “The duration of the seventh day of necessity determines the length of the other six. Without anticipating the exposition of ch. 2:1-4, it may be said that God’s sabbatic rest is understood by the best interpreters of Scripture to have continued from creation’s close until the present hour; so that consistency demands the previous six days to be considered as not of short, but of indefinite, duration. The language of the fourth commandment, when

interpreted in accordance with the present theory, confirms the probability of its truth. If the six days in Exod. 20:11 are simply natural days, then the seventh day, in which God is represented as having rested from his creative labours, must likewise be a natural or solar day; and if so, it is proper to observe what follows. It follows (1) that the events recorded in the first five verses of Genesis must be compressed into a single day of twenty-four hours, so that no gap will remain into which the short-day advocates may thrust the geologic ages, which is for them an imperative necessity; (2) that the world is only 144 hours older than man, which is contrary to both science and revelation; (3) that the statement is incorrect that God finished all his work at the close of the sixth day; and (4) that the fossiliferous remains which have been discovered in the earth's crust have either been deposited there since man's creation, or were created there at the first, both of which suppositions are untenable. But now, if, on the contrary, the language signifies that God laboured in the fashioning of his cosmos through six successive periods of indefinite duration (olamim, aeons), and entered on the seventh day into a correspondingly long period of sabbatic rest, we can hold the opposite of every one of these conclusions, and find a convincing argument besides for the observance of the sabbath in the beautiful analogy which subsists between God's great work of *olamim* and man's little work of sun-measured days." (Perhaps I should emphasize the fact here that the *Pulpit Commentary*, although first published about the turn of the century and recently re-issued, is still one of the sanest, most comprehensive, and most scholarly of all Biblical Commentaries. Perhaps the most erudite of all such sets is the *Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical Commentary*, co-edited by Dr. John Peter Lange and Dr. Philip Schaff, first published in 1868; the volume on Genesis, by J. P. Lange, is translated from the German, with

essays and annotations by Dr. Tayler Lewis. The general content of these Commentaries has been affected very little by recent scientific discoveries and hypotheses. I should say that this is a mark of their true greatness, their reliability.)

(12) Some additional evidence concerning the "days" of the Creation is in order here, if for no other reason, to demonstrate the general ambiguity with which the Hebrew *yom* is used in the Old Testament. For example, Gen. 1:5 (here "Day" refers to *daylight*); Gen. 2:4 (here *yom* takes in the whole Creative Week); Gen. 2:17 (here the word indicates an indefinite period); Gen. 35:3—"the day of my distress"; Eccl. 7:14—"the day of prosperity," "the day of adversity"; Psa. 95:8—"the day of temptation in the wilderness" (Did not this "day" last forty years?); Deut. 9:1—here "day" means in a short time; Psa. 2:7—here we have an eternal day, a day in God's Eternal Purpose), etc. Note also in the New Testament the Greek equivalent, *hemera*, John 8:56—"my day" here takes in Christ's incarnate ministry and probably His entire reign as Acting Sovereign of the universe (Acts 2:36, Phil. 2:9-11); Heb. 3:15—in this text "to-day" takes in the "present season of grace," that is, the entire Gospel Dispensation. Thus it will be seen that by the same word *yom*, and its Greek equivalent *hemera*, the Scriptures recognize an *artificial* day (Gen. 1:5), an *eternal* day (Psa. 2:7), a *civil* day (Lev. 23:32), a *millennial* day (2 Pet. 3:8), a *judgement* day (Acts 17:31), a *solar* day (Exo. 16:4-5, Rom. 14:5), a *day-period* (Gen. 2:4, John 8:56, Heb. 3:8, Rom. 13:12), etc. Certainly, the sheer elasticity with which these Hebrew and Greek words are used for our word, "day," throughout the Bible forbids the dogmatic assumption of a single fixed meaning!

It is worthy of note here that Gleason L. Archer, Jr., whose fidelity to the Scriptures can hardly be questioned, in his *outstanding* book, published recently, *A Survey of*

Old Testament Introduction, after rejecting the concepts of a *twenty-four-hour* day and of a *revelational* (special prophetic visional) day, presents the view which I have adopted here, namely, that in the Genesis Cosmogony each of the seven Creative Days must have been a period of indefinite duration (that is, as man measures time). He writes (pp. 176-177): "According to this view the term *yom* does not necessarily signify a literal twenty-four-hour day, but is simply equivalent to "stage." It has often been asserted that *yom* could not bear this meaning, but could only have implied a literal day to the Hebrew mind according to Hebrew usage. Nevertheless, on the basis of internal evidence, it is the writer's conviction that *yom* in Genesis 1 could not have been intended by the Hebrew author to mean a literal twenty-four-hour day." I fail to see how any other interpretation can be validated on the basis of the content of the Genesis Cosmogony as a whole.

4. *The Mosaic Hymn of Creation* is especially meaningful in one respect: in v. 31 it sets *the sublime optimistic motif* of the entire Bible. This verse reads: "God saw everything he had made, and behold, it was very good." What a burst of exultation and benediction to be called forth from the inmost being of Elohim at His contemplation of His own handiwork in its entirety! What order, what beauty, what glory there was, to elicit such Divine exultation! Yet—does not this verse strike the note of optimism that pervades the Bible from beginning to end? Does it not impress the truth upon us that God's work can never be destroyed, indeed can never be ultimately marred, much less ruined (Acts 3:21); that Good will never be overcome by Evil, but will in fact overcome Evil, in the consummation of the Divine Plan of the Ages? This crescendo of moral victory reaches its height in the New Testament. Even in the midst of the Great Tribulation which man will bring upon himself at the end of the present Dispensation, the spread of evil in all its forms—

greed, lust, violence, war, utter preoccupation with earthly things—when the saints see these iniquities becoming world-wide, Jesus Himself tells us, they shall lift up their eyes and “see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory” (Matt. 24:29-30, 16:17-18; Mark 13:19-26; Luke 21:20-28). Never is there the slightest intimation anywhere in Scripture of the possibility of Satan’s triumph over the Creation of God! On the contrary, it is expressly affirmed again and again that Satan and his rebel host (of both angels and men) are doomed; that their proper habitation is the pit of the abyss, that is, segregation in Hell, the penitentiary of the moral universe (Matt. 25:41, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6), and that to this ultimate destiny they are bound to be consigned by the Sovereign Will that decrees and executes Absolute Justice. (Matt. 25:31-46; John 5:28-29; Heb. 2:14-15; Phil. 2:5-11; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Rom. 2:2-11; Acts 17:30-31; Rev. 20:11-15).

5. *The Correspondence with Present-day Science* of the main features of the Genesis account of the Creation is little short of amazing. (1) On the basis of the *panoramic* interpretation of the Genesis Cosmogony, the one which we have adopted here, largely on the ground that it does not require any far-fetched applications of the various parts, that is to say, any unjustified “stretching” of the meaning of the Scripture text, the whole Creation Narrative, in its essential features, parallels the fundamental theories of the physical sciences of our day. On the basis of this *panoramic* view, there is no need to postulate any post-cataclysmic reconstruction theory (based on the notion of a “gap” between verses 1 and 2) to provide a way of escape from the difficulties of modern geology. Certainly the stretch of time between the first brooding of the Spirit over the primeval deep and the Divine *consilium* in which it was decreed that man should be created in God’s image, was eminently sufficient to

allow for the developments claimed by such sciences as astronomy, physics, paleontology, archeology, anthropology, etc., and, as we shall see later, for those aspects of the biological and physiological sciences which truly can be designated *scientific*. Besides, the notion of the building of a new cosmos on the ruins of a former one, without even a suggestion, in the Scripture text, of any natural or moral reason for such wholesale changes, makes the *reconstruction* theory a purely arbitrary one on man's part. (2) Again, the oft-heard *cyclical* theory of cosmic history is usually, either in its origin or in its adoption, a case in which the wish is father to the thought on the part of atheistically and agnostically motivated scientists who would attempt to avoid the problem of Creation by zealously affirming what they choose to designate the "eternity of matter." (In passing, it should be noted that the correlation of the word "eternal" (which most certainly signifies *timelessness*) with the nature of what man calls "matter" is *per se* an obvious contradiction.) Evidently, even though the theory of cycles of catastrophes and reconstructions might reasonably allow for the view that, as Hoyle puts it, "matter is infinitely old" (a view which he himself rejects), any such cyclical theory deprives cosmic being and history of any meaning whatsoever, and certainly ignores the fact of the Intelligence and Will which, on the basis of the theory of cycles, necessarily establishes and sustains the successive periods of cosmic order that are supposed to emerge from respective prior cataclysms. (Let us not forget that *cosmos* is *order*.) As a matter of fact, these cyclical theories have little or nothing to support them, apart from the human imagination which conjures them up.

(3) Again, the Genesis account of the Creation is in strict accord with the nuclear physics of our time in presenting radiant energy (light), of some kind, as the first

and ultimate form of "physical" energy. This, as stated heretofore, is a commonplace of present-day physical science.

(4) Especially, however, is the *Order* of the Creation as presented in the Genesis Narrative in the closest harmony with present-day scientific thinking, and indeed with the facts of human experience. And the amazing thing about this correspondence is that it is true, despite the fact that the Mosaic Cosmogony can certainly be proved to have had its origin in pre-scientific times, that is, before the sciences, as we think of them, had begun to be developed. In the Genesis Narrative the word "good," as we have noted heretofore, signified the order that prevailed as a result of the ordinations of the Word and the broodings of the Spirit; hence, at the end of the Creative Process God is said to have looked out on the whole and pronounced it "very good," that is to say, the order was perfect, *perfection signifying wholeness*. Obviously, energy, especially the different kinds of radiant energy (light), were necessarily the first "physical" existents; hence, we are told that these were created on Day One. This was the necessary "physical" beginning of the cosmos, insofar as human experience and science can determine. (The Primal Energy is, of course, the Divine Intelligence and Will.) Again, the creation of both light and atmosphere necessarily preceded the appearance of all forms of life: without light and atmosphere plants could not perform the mysterious process of photosynthesis, the process by which solar energy is captured, so to speak, and converted into stored food energy for beast and man. Without photosynthesis no form of animal life, the human body included, could exist. Morrison (MDNSA, 26-27): "All vegetable life is dependent upon the almost infinitesimal quantity of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which, so to speak, it breathes. To express this complicated

photosynthetic chemical reaction in the simplest possible way, the leaves of the trees are lungs and they have the power when in the sunlight to separate this obstinate carbon dioxide into carbon and oxygen. In other words, the oxygen is given off and the carbon retained and combined with the hydrogen of the water brought up by the plant from its roots. By magical chemistry, out of these elements nature makes sugar, cellulose, and numerous other chemicals, fruits and flowers. The plant feeds itself and produces enough more to feed every animal on earth. At the same time, the plant releases the oxygen we breathe and without which life would end in five minutes. Let us, then, pay our humble respects to the plant . . . Animals give off carbon dioxide and plants give off oxygen . . . It has recently been discovered that carbon dioxide in small quantities is also essential to most animal life, just as plants use some oxygen. Hydrogen must be included, although we do not breathe it. Without hydrogen water would not exist, and the water content of animal and vegetable matter is surprisingly great and absolutely essential. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon dioxide, and carbon, singly and in their various relations to each other, are the principal biological elements. They are the very basis on which life rests. There is, however, not one chance in millions that they should all be at one time on one planet in the proper proportions for life. Science has no explanations to offer for the facts, and to say it is accidental is to defy mathematics."

And, finally, in this connection, without the subhuman orders to provide for man the means of food, shelter, clothing, medicines, etc., he simply could not exist in his present natural state. (Moreover, according to the Divine Plan, *man's natural state as a person created in God's image is the necessary pre-condition to growth in holiness which is the very essence of the Spiritual Life, just as the*

Spiritual Life is the necessary preparation for the Life Everlasting (1 Cor. 15:44-49, Rom. 8:18-25, Matt. 5:8. Heb. 12:14, 2 Pet. 3:18).

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

It is of the utmost importance to emphasize here the fact that the order in which the various parts, non-living and living, of the natural Creation are said to have been brought into existence, in the account given us in the first chapter of Genesis, is precisely that which is claimed by modern science. Yet the Genesis Cosmogony was written, as we all know, long before men knew anything about radiant energy, atomic processes, cellular processes, plant photosynthesis, psychosomatic entities, etc., or their sequential inter-relationships. This is a fact, I contend, which can be accounted for only on the ground of the special Divine inspiration of the Mosaic Cosmogony.

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

184-186): "In the first two chapters of Genesis in an account unique in all ancient literature, the Pentateuch catalogues the creation of the heavens and earth, and all plant, animal and human life. Other nations have their creation stories. But these are important only by sheer contrast in accentuating the sublimity and grandeur of the inspired record. Purged of the gross polytheistic perversions of the numerous non-inspired creation legends by virtue of its advanced monotheistic point of view, only the Genesis account arrives at the great First Cause in that incomparably magnificent opening word: 'In the beginning God created . . .' (Genesis 1:1). Lifting the reader with one stroke out of the morass and confusion of the polytheistic accounts, in which primitive peoples in their naive efforts to explain the origin of the universe attributed each different phenomenon to a separate cause in the form of a deity, the Pentateuch conducts us at once to that which was totally beyond the grasp of the natural mind, the concept of the universe as a whole as the creative act of one God. By inspiration the author of the Pentateuch has the secret which the polytheistic writers of ancient Mesopotamia blindly groped after, the unifying principle of the universe. In an age grossly ignorant of causation, Genesis stands out all the more resplendently as a divine revelation. The discovery of secondary causes and the explanation of the *how* of creation in its ongoing operation is the achievement of science. How cause produces effect, how order and symmetry prevail, how physical phenomena and organic life are interdependent—these and similar questions science has answered. But science can go only so far. The elements of the universe, matter, force, order, it must take for granted. Revelation alone can answer the *why* of creation. The Bible alone discloses that the universe exists *because God made it* and brought it into being for a definite purpose. The account of the origin of the cosmos in Genesis,

moreover, is not only incomparably superior in every respect to ancient cosmogonies and creation accounts, but what is all the more amazing in the light of the utterly unscientific age in which it was produced, is its scientific precision even when judged by the standards of our modern scientific age. Commenting on the account of creation which we find in Chapter I of Genesis, W. F. Albright calls the 'sequence of creative phases' which it outlines as 'so rational that modern science cannot improve on it, given the same language and the same range of ideas in which to state its conclusions. In fact, modern scientific cosmogonies show such a disconcerting tendency to be short-lived that it may be seriously doubted whether science has yet caught up with the Biblical story.' (This excerpt from Albright occurs in the article, "The Old Testament and Archeology," in the *Old Testament Commentary*, H. C. Alleman and E. E. Flack (Philadelphia, 1948), p.135).

6. *Unscriptural Notions of God and Creation.* (1) *Atheism*, means literally, "no god." The term is applied generally to any theory that the universe is the product of blind "chance," of "fortuitous concourses of atoms," etc. (2) *Agnosticism*, which means literally, "without knowledge." As Robert G. Ingersoll once put it: "I do not say that there is no God—I simply say that I do not know. I do not say that there is no future life—I simply say that I do not know." It has been rightly said that an agnostic is a man who *wants to be* an atheist. It is so much easier to profess agnosticism than to defend atheism. (3) *Pantheism*, meaning literally, "all is God." Pantheism identifies God with the world, nature, the universe, etc. Objections: Pantheism is self-contradictory in that it tries to attribute infinity to God, yet shuts Him up within a finite process; moreover, it contradicts our intuitions as intelligent creatures that we are not particles of God, but unique self-conscious entities; and finally, it makes God include within

Himself all evil as well as good, or takes the only possible alternative of regarding evil as "illusion." *But an illusion cannot be an illusion of nothing.* Pantheism denies God's transcendence. (4) *Deism*, the view that there is a God, that He created the world and set it going, and then withdrew from all further intercourse with it, much as a man winds a clock and then expects it to run forever of its own accord. Objections: (a) Deism came into existence in the age in which Newton's concept of the rigidity of "the laws of nature" dominated all science. As someone has put it, "Having brought God into the picture to account for these 'laws of nature,' it then bowed Him out with thanks for His provisional services." (b) To accept deism is to reject special providence, prayer, miracle, redemption, inspiration, revelation, resurrection, immortality, etc., in short, the entire Plan of Redemption that is revealed in the Bible. (c) The concept of an infinite God who would create and then take no further interest in His Creation simply makes no appeal to man's spiritual consciousness. Such a concept of God has nothing to offer in the way of meeting human aspiration and human need. Such a God is not, cannot be, a God of Love. Deism denies the *immanence* of God. (5) *Materialism*, the theory that all phenomena of human experience are traceable ultimately to *matter in motion*. Objections: (a) Our only means of knowing matter is through the instrumentality of mind; hence, in knowing matter, mind proves itself to be of a higher order than the matter which it knows. (b) The attributes (powers) of mind are of a higher rank than the attributes of matter. Perception, consciousness, self-consciousness, meaning, the sense of values, and the like, simply cannot be explained on the ground of any powers inherent in matter. (c) Mind, rather than matter, proves itself to be the eternal and independent principle. It must continue to be so regarded until it can be scientifically demonstrated that mind is to be identified with the activity

of brain cells. But all attempts to explain the psychical from the physical are failures: *psychology cannot be reduced to sheer physiology*. (d) Matter was never known to generate *per se* thought, feeling, or will. The sensible man *knows* intuitively that he is essentially *spirit*, although in this present life tabernacled in a body. (e) We must accept the eternity of spirit or find ourselves without any explanation of the noblest phenomena of our own being, viz., consciousness, personal intelligence, intuitive ideas, freedom of choice, moral progress, our beliefs in God and immortality, etc. Man simply refuses to believe what the materialist tries to tell him—namely, that he is of no higher order of being than the brute. (f) Modern research in the area of the phenomena of the subconscious supports conclusively the spiritualistic interpretation of man, that is, the conviction that the person is essentially imperishable soul or spirit which the ultimate dissolution of the body cannot affect. (6) *Dualism*, the theory of *two* eternal self-existent principles, namely, Mind and Matter, or God and Energy-Matter. Objections: (a) It is unphilosophical to assume the existence of two unoriginated and unending principles, when one self-existent First Cause is sufficient to account for the facts. (b) Those who hold this view usually admit that matter is an unconscious, hence imperfect, substance, and therefore subordinate to the Divine Will; obviously, this is equivalent to admission of the priority of God as Eternal Spirit, Mind, etc. (c) If matter is inferior to mind it belongs in the realm of secondary causation. But this leaves us where the doctrine of Creation begins. This doctrine does not attempt to dispense with the First Cause; it ascribes adequate Efficient Causality of all things to God. (d) Creation without the use of pre-existing matter is in harmony with what we know of thought-power, and is, therefore, more reasonable than the notion of the “eternity of matter.” (Cf. recent research

in the phenomena of extrasensory preception and psychokinesis. See Vol. I, pp. 93-98, of my *Survey Course in Christian Doctrine*.)

(7) *Emanationism*, the theory according to which the universe is the product of successive emanations from the being of God (variously designated Unity, The One, The Monad, etc.). This view is untenable because it denies the infinity and transcendence of God, because it makes the Deity include within Himself all evil as well as Good, and because it leads logically to pantheism, hence is subject to the same objections that are valid against pantheism. (8) *Naturalism*. Atheists and agnostics of our day prefer to be known as "naturalists." However, because of the ambiguity of the word "nature," so-called "naturalism"—whatever form it may take—is little more than denial of the supernatural, the superhuman, etc., especially what is known in Bible teaching as a *miracle*.

(9) *Humanism* is another favorite facade behind which modern-day atheists and agnostics hide. (a) Humanism may be what is roughly described as "humanitarianism"; for example, the "humanism" of the late Clarence Darrow. This type of humanism is rooted in extreme pessimism. In essence it is personal commitment to the task of ameliorating for our fellows the tragedy of living in this "present evil world": to victims of this insatiable pessimism, the idea of a future life is not even entertained, nor is such a life even considered desirable. (b) Again, "humanism" may, and often does, take the form of the deification of man; subjectively, it is a chest-thumping philosophy, well exemplified in the poetry of Walt Whitman, William Henley, *et al.* (c) True humanism, however, is the humanism of the Bible, the humanism based on the two Great Commandments (Matt. 22:34-40, 5:1-12, 25:31-46; Gal. 5:22-25). This is the humanism that flows spontaneously out of the heart that is filled with love for God and for one's fellow-men. In our world, selfish and sinful as man

GENESIS

may be, there is still altruism as well as self-seeking, co-operation as well as conflict. (See Pico della Mirandola's famous *Oratiōn on the Dignity of Man.*)

(10) *Polytheism* is the name given to belief in many gods. Practically all the nations of antiquity invested every natural object with its protecting god or goddess, nymph or naiad. These polytheistic deities were, generally speaking, *personifications* of the forces of nature, and in particular of the "Sun-Father" and the "Earth-Mother." (11) *Monotheism* is the name given to belief in *one* God only. Biblical monotheism is properly designated a self-revelation of the living and true God. The greatest spiritual struggle that the ancient Children of Israel faced continually was that of retaining the monotheistic self-revelation of Yahweh-Elohim, communicated to them, through the mediatorship of Moses, instead of drifting into the idolatrous polytheism of the tribes by which they were surrounded on all sides. (12) *Henotheism* is belief in one god, accompanied, however, by recognition of the existence of other deities. (13) What is known as *monotheism* (belief in one God) in religion is that which is known as *monism* (belief in one First Principle) in philosophy. *Ethical monism* is the designation which has been used at times to signify, from the viewpoint of philosophical terminology, the essence of Biblical religious theory and practice.

7. *Theism* (from the Greek *theos* ("god"): Latin equivalent, *deus*). The theistic God is the God of the Bible. Theism is the doctrine of the *living* God, the I AM (HE WHO IS), the Creator, Preserver, and Sovereign of the universe, both natural and moral (Exo. 3:14, Psa. 42:2, Hos. 1:10, Deut. 6:4, Mark 12:29, Matt. 16:16, Acts 14:15, Rom. 9:26, 1 Thess. 1:9, Heb. 10:31). The God of the Bible is not personification—He is pure *Personality* (Exo. 3:14). The God of the Bible is Pure Actuality; in Him all potentially is actualized; hence He is the *living*

THE LAST THREE DAYS

and true God. He is Wholeness, that is, Absolute Holiness. For the theist, God is transcendent in His being and immanent in His power. Thompson (MPR, 253): "It is in theism that the concept of God comes alive, that rational thought can echo something of what religion finds God to be. It is in theism that the ultimates of existence and value are more than mere abstractions. It is in theism that religious thought can, for the first time, advance beyond myth and symbol and make rational contact with the objects of religion. No philosophical theism, however, can do justice to the objects of faith. It is true only so far as it can go, and it cannot go far. Yet it can go far enough to underwrite faith's affirmation that Goodness and Truth are one Being." (Job 11:7, Heb. 11:6).

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

The Fool's Decision

Psa. 14:1—"The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Note the phrase, "in his heart," that is, that which is primarily emotional in man. One simply cannot logically *think* his way into atheism: the fact is that there must be a First Cause or First Principle who is *sui generis* (self-existent), that is, without beginning or end (Rev. 1:17-18); the only possible alternative would be that at some time, somewhere, and somehow, nothing created something. This, of course, would be absurd: as the ancients put it, *ex nihilo, nihil fit*. This Power which we call First Cause or First Principle in philosophy, we think of as God in Christian faith and practice. Atheism, therefore, is not a product of intelligence; it is, rather, the result of an emotional imbalance of some kind. I am convinced that the majority of atheists are professed atheists primarily because *they want to be known as atheists*. A perverted will is more often the source of unbelief and irreligiousness than ignorance or any other cause. (We are reminded of the Russian astronaut who said that he looked throughout

GENESIS

the stratosphere, throughout the stretches of celestial space, but he failed to see any God anywhere. What stupidity! The living and true God is Spirit, not to be apprehended by the physical eye (John 4:24). But of course it is practically certain that this astronaut had never looked into the Bible—the fact that accounts for his stupidity!) Essentially we are what our thoughts make us to be.

We call attention here to three commonplace evidences of God in the world which are incidental to everyday experience, so much so in fact that, like the shining of the sun, we are prone to overlook their eternal significance. These are as follows:

1. *Life*. With the coming of every spring, as the poet has put it so exquisitely,

Whether we look or whether we listen,
We hear life murmur or see it glisten;
Every clod feels a stir of might,
An instinct within that reaches and towers,
And, groping blindly above it for light,
Climbs to a soul in grass and flowers.

(1) This profound mystery called life—so elementary, so pervasive, so wonderful—what is it? The only answer is—silence. This Stream of Life flows out from Someone, Somewhere, Somehow: it rises through the *vegetable* psyche and through the *animal* psyche, reaching its height in the *rational* psyche—in self-conscious personality (man). (2) We are born, not made; we were born of our parents, our parents were born of their parents, and so on and on and on. The first human parents were obviously the handiwork of previous Life. Life is generated, not created. The “red River of Life” (physical life is in the blood, Lev. 17:11) has been flowing out from Somewhere, Someone, for ever and ever. This Someone is the *living* God (Matt. 22:32, 16:16; Acts 14:15; 1 Thess. 1:9; 1 Tim. 4:10; Heb. 10:31) who breathed into the lifeless creature whom He had

THE LAST THREE DAYS

formed of the "dust of the ground" the Breath of Life (Gen. 2:7); hence, man is said to be the image of God (Gen. 1:27). (Note that the Source of this River of Life is the I AM, HE WHO IS, the Living One (Exo. 3:14; Rev. 22:1, 1:17-18) whose very essence is *to be*: in our God of the Bible existence and essence are one.) (3) Life—in whatever form, physical, spiritual, eternal—is *the gift of God* (Acts 17:24-25; John 1:4-5, 3:16, 11:25-26; Rom. 6:23; 1 John 5:11-12). If there is no God, no eternally Living One (Rev. 1:17-18), there is no explanation of life. Science still stands mute before the mysteries of being. What is energy: What is life? What is consciousness? What is self-consciousness? Man simply does not know: he can only imagine and speculate. As Tennyson has written—

Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but *if* I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.

2. *Law.* (1) Our world is a world of order; otherwise, there could never be a science, because science is man's effort to discover and to describe the order he finds in the various realms of being. (2) We hear so much about the "laws of nature." But what are they? They are descriptions of the processes which take place in nature—nothing more, nothing less. These laws may tell us *how* things act in their various interrelationships, but they do not tell us *why* they act as they do. (Two atoms of hydrogen, for example, unite with one atom of oxygen to form a molecule of water: this is *how* the process takes place. But *why* does it do so, in just these proportions? Science cannot answer this question. Faith alone can answer it—because the answer is God, the Will of God.)

GENESIS

(3) Every effect in nature has its cause. M. M. Davis (HTBS, 15): "A caravan was crossing the desert. An early riser reported that a camel had been walking about the tent during the night. He was asked how he knew it; and he pointed to the tracks in the sand, saying that nothing but a camel made such tracks. And when we look about us, we see the tracks of Jehovah. We see them in the hills and mountains, in the valleys and plains, in the rivers and oceans, in the flowers and trees, in the birds and fishes, in the sun, moon, and stars, in the covenant of the day and night, in the coming and going of the seasons, and, most of all, in man himself. With all his splendid achievements—and they are splendid—man has not been able to make things like these." (4) It is just as true today as it ever was that *design presupposes a designer*. Titus, (LIP, 436), writing from the viewpoint of an evolutionist, in stating the teleological argument, has this to say: "Take, for example, the long process of development leading to the human brain and mind of man. The process has produced minds which begin to understand the world, and it has produced thought and understanding. This is unintelligible unless the course of evolution is directed." (5) The most famous *argument from design* for the existence of God is that of William Paley, in Chapters I-VI of Paley's *Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity*, a book first published in 1802. The argument is as sound as it ever was: nothing has ever been discovered that would negate it. "In crossing a heath," writes Paley, "suppose I pitched my foot against a *stone*, and were asked how the stone came to be there; I might possibly answer, that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there forever: nor would it perhaps be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a *watch* upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place: I should hardly think of the

THE LAST THREE DAYS

answer which I had before given, that, for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there. Yet why should not this answer serve for the watch as well as for the stone? Why is it not as admissible in the second case, as in the first? For this reason, and for no other, viz., that when we come to inspect the watch, we perceive (what we could not discover in the stone) that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose, *e.g.*, that they are so formed and adjusted as to produce motion, and that motion so regulated as to point out the hour of the day; that if the different parts had been differently shaped from what they are, or of a different size from what they are, or placed after any other manner, or in any other order, than that in which they are placed, either no motion at all would have been carried on in the machine, or none which would have answered the use that is now served by it . . . This mechanism being observed (it requires indeed an examination of the instrument, and perhaps some previous knowledge of the subject, to perceive and to understand it; but being once, as we have said, observed and understood), the inference, we think, is inevitable; that the watch must have had a maker; that there must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose for which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction and designed its use." (I have reproduced here only a small fraction of Paley's complete argument. I urge every Bible student to secure a copy of Paley's book and read the argument as a whole: it is thoroughgoing, completely logical, and in my humble opinion, incontrovertible, that is, by any person with an unbiased attitude.) The application is obvious: The Cosmos, Universe, World, etc., like a great watch, is so replete with evidence of order and design, that the presupposition of a Supreme

GENESIS

Architect or Designer is unavoidable. (6) As thought presupposes a thinker, as adaptation presupposes a being to adapt, as behavior presupposes a being to do the behaving, as love presupposes a lover, so *law presupposes a lawgiver*. Scientists, in their use of the term *law*, pay tribute, whether wittingly or unwittingly, to the Supreme Lawgiver. (It should be remembered that science borrowed this term from jurisprudence, not jurisprudence from science.) (7) Where there is law, there is the lawgiver. This is true in the natural world: the Will of God, expressed through the Word, and actualized by the Spirit, created the cosmos, and sustains it in its various processes. But will belongs to the person and personality; hence, the orderly natural processes which men describe in terms of laws are but the methods by which the Divine Person expends His energy. Science admits the fact of law; to be consistent, it must admit the fact of the Lawgiver whose Will is the constitution of the cosmos.

Back of the loaf is the snowy flour,

And back of the flour the mill;

And back of the mill is the wheat and the shower,

And the sun, and the Father's will.

(—Maltbie B. Babcock)

(8) Not only in the vast reaches of outer space, nor in the complexities of the submicroscopic atom, are we brought face to face with the Primary Intelligence and Will, but in the moral realm as well. The distinction between good and bad, right and wrong, rests eternally in the Will of our God, the God who is Absolute Justice (Psa. 89:14, 85:10). All moral norms emanate from God, either implanted in man by creation or communicated to him by revelation (Rom. 7:7). (9) The same is true in the spiritual realm. The law of Moses was God's Will

THE LAST THREE DAYS

for the Jewish Dispensation (John 1:17). The Gospel—the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1-4)—is God's power unto salvation to all obedient believers throughout the present Dispensation (Rom. 1:16-17, 2:12-16). Why so? Because it is the Will of God with respect to human redemption. God wills that all men shall believe, repent, confess Christ, be baptized into Christ, and continue steadfastly thereafter in the Spiritual Life (Acts 16:31, 2:38; Rom. 10:9-10; Gal. 3:27; Acts 2:42; Gal. 5:22-25), and He promises eternal redemption on these terms and conditions (Heb. 9:11-12). If the Bible does not have its source in the *Will* and *Love* of God, it is a miserable hoax. If it is not all that it claims to be, it is the greatest imposture ever perpetrated on humanity.

3. *Love*. (1) This master passion which has inspired innumerable hymns, songs, poems, works of art, and deeds of sacrificial service, is an ever-present energy flowing out from Someone, Somewhere, even as life and law. Those who concern themselves so much with the problem of evil and its origin, need give attention also to the fact of good and its source: for Love is the Highest Good, the Summum Bonum. (2) What is love? It is not sensuality. It is attraction to an object combined with the desire for oneness with that object. The nobility of the love is determined by the nobility of its object. (3) As the essential principle of life is growth, and of law is authority, so the essential principle of love is *sacrifice*. He who loves much will give much. One will inevitably espouse the interests of the object of one's love: for example, the mutual love of sweethearts, the love of parents for their children, the love of a patriot for his country, the love of the man of true piety for his God. So when our God looked out upon the world and saw His moral creatures in danger of perishing forever, He incarnated Himself as their Savior (1 John 4:8, John 3:16, Matt. 1:23; Heb. 2:14-18, 4:14-16). Love is

GENESIS

the greatest force on this earth—it is far mightier than the sword. It will be the sole motivating force in Heaven: there faith will become knowledge, hope will attain fruition, but love will be all in all, imperishable, and sovereign (1 Cor. 13:13).

The night has a thousand eyes,
And the day but one;
Let the light of the bright world dies
With the dying sun.

The mind has a thousand eyes,
And the heart but one;
Yet the light of a whole life dies
When love is done.

(—Francis W. Bourdillon).

Strange, yet powerful, echoes of God—life, law, and love—forces of Heaven, universal in scope, without beginning or end. Man is here today and gone tomorrow, but life, law, and love are for ever. Life presupposes a personal God, law a sovereign God, and love a compassionate God. Only a fool says in his heart, There is *no* God. Practical atheism is, of course, far more common than theoretical atheism. The practical atheist takes no account of God in his life; he lives as if there were no God; he is altogether heedless of the outcome of his ways, of the inevitability of inflexible Justice.

Are you a practical atheist? Then you are foolish. Are you a theoretical atheist? Then you, too, are foolish. Atheism is foolishness, the essence of which is stupidity. The denial of God is the most stupid decision a person can make, because it not only consigns him to the complete loss of God as his eternal destiny, but it also enslaves him to a warped and twisted outlook on his life and its meaning in this present world. Turn ye, turn ye, before it is everlastingly too late (Jas. 4:8).

THE LAST THREE DAYS

The Living God

Acts 17:22-31, John 4:24. Who—or what—is God? What does the word signify? Who—or what—is its true referent?

Let us approach this question, first, negatively:

1. God is *not* just an *idea* in the human mind. (There are those who insist that instead of God having created man in His image, man has in fact created God in his imagination.) To this we object that any group of men capable of fabricating by sheer imagination a God of Justice, Love and Grace such as the God of the Bible, or of a Revealer of God such as Jesus of Nazareth claimed to be, would themselves have to be gods. If Jesus had not lived at all, the writers of the Gospels would have been as great as He by virtue of their ability to imagine such a Personage and to put on His lips such a Teaching as that revealed in their biographies of Him. Jesus Himself declared expressly: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:9). It is the contention of this writer that the conclusive proof of the existence of God is to be found—but only by honest and good hearts, of course (Luke 8:15, Matt. 13:14-15, Isa. 6:9-10, Acts 28:25-28)—in the life and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ (John 17:1-5, Heb. 1:1-4). If Jesus was not all that He claimed to be, then He was the rankest imposter who ever appeared in the world.

2. God is *not* just a "*projection of the father-image*," as the Freudians would have us believe: religion, they say, is essentially *belief based on wish*, that is, wish-fulfilment. In reply to this rather subtle deception, it will be noted (1) that it tends to lead to a gross idolatry of Man, (2) that Freud exemplified his own wish-fulfilment notion by his bitterness and dogmatism about religion, that is, his extremism exemplifies his own inner desire, not just to explain religion, but to "explain it away"; (3) that his writings show that he had not the faintest conception of

GENESIS

what genuine religious experience is, and little or no understanding of the essential unity and spirituality of the content of the Bible (a characteristic of many so-called "learned" men); (4) that his basic thesis is flatly contradicted by the fact that religious conviction has led innumerable believers to suffer persecution and even martyrdom for their faith ("wish-fulfilment" and vicarious sacrifice cannot be reconciled); (5) and finally, the Freudian, and indeed all atheistic arguments, simply ignore the fact of the Mystery of Being, the explanation of which man's history shows to have been always his most universal and profound concern. The various arguments for the existence of God are hardly affected by the Freudian hypothesis.

3. God is *not* a material *object* or *idol*, not a *likeness* of anything in the heavens above or on the earth below. In the ancient Greek temple the statue of the god or goddess occupied the main room known as the *cella*, e.g., the statue of Athena Parthenos (Athena the Virgin) in the *cella* of the Parthenon on the Athenian Acropolis. To devotees of pagan temple worship, the statue *was*, literally, the god or goddess. Idolatry is expressly forbidden throughout Scripture (Exo. 20:4-6, 1 John 5:21, 1 Cor. 10:14, 1 Thess. 1:9). (Are not artistic representations of Jesus, in sculpture, statuary, portraiture, etc., under the ban of this same Divine prohibition of idolatry in any form, and hence evidences of human profanity?)

4. God is *not nature* nor is He anything in nature. Some wag has facetiously suggested that the pantheist (who identifies God with nature) could well perform his daily devotion each morning simply by kissing his pillow before arising to the duties of the day. God is not nature—He is the Author of nature. (Gen. 1:1, Acts 17:24, Col. 1:16-17, Heb. 1:1-4.) God is not anything in nature: hence He is not to be worshiped as sun, moon, stars, earth, or any

THE LAST THREE DAYS

created thing. The religious experience reaches far beyond the esthetic, that is to say, from nature itself to the God of nature, from the created to the Creator.

5. God is *not* a *personification* of anything whatsoever. The old pagan deities were all personifications of natural forces (such as Zeus, of the sun, or Athena, of wisdom), but the living and true God is not personification in any sense—He is *pure personality* (Exo. 3:14).

6. God is *not* an *impersonal energy*, influence, or “principle.” He is not of the order of electricity, the atomic process, the life process, and the like. He is not just an impersonal “principle,” such as Mind, for example. God has mind, to be sure, but we only create confusion when we say that God and Mind are identical. Nor is God some abstract impersonal influence. Of course, God is good; but God is not to be identified with the abstract moral influence, Good. God is love, too; but this does not mean that God and Love are one and the same: it means that our God is the God of Love (John 3:16, 1 John 4:7-21). In the sense, of course, that He is the Creator-God, He may properly be designated philosophically the First Principle (from *principium*, “source,” “origin,” from *princeps*, the first in line when a Roman military company (*centuria*, “century”) “numbered off.”) This does not mean, however, that God is an impersonal abstraction of some kind. Principle is the first thing in nature, law the second, and matter, as we know it, is third.

Approaching the subject, then, affirmatively, who is God?

It will be noted that Jesus used two designations for God, (1) Spirit (John 4:24), and Heavenly Father (Matt. 6:26, 6:9; John 17:11). The former gives us insight into the nature or type of being of God; the latter designates God's special relationship with His Covenant children. By these two terms Jesus has given us a clearer insight into the meaning of the word, “God,” than can be

GENESIS

gotten from all the sophisticated names coined by the philosophers. By these two designations Jesus has made God intelligible, that is, congenial to man.

1. God is *Spirit*. God is the one and only infinitely perfect Spirit, the Creator and Ruler of all things, and the Author of all good. This is to say that God as to nature is personal, having understanding, affection, and free will, but not having a body. (Rom. 11:34, John 3:16, Luke 22:42, Isa. 46:10, Eph. 3:11). Where there is spirit, there is personality, uniqueness, otherness, vitality, and sociality. Therefore, our God who is a Spirit is a personal God, a living God, a loving God. In the sense that God is personal, we too are personal: we have been created in His "image" (Gen. 1:26,27). Strong (ST, 250): "God is not only spirit, but He is pure spirit. He is not only not matter, but He has no necessary connection with matter." Again: "When God is spoken of as appearing to the patriarchs and walking with them, the passages are to be explained as referring to God's temporary manifestations of Himself in human form—manifestations which prefigured the final tabernacling of the Son of God in human flesh."

2. God is *Heavenly Father*. A distinction is essential here: In a universal sense God as Creator is the Father of all spirits (Heb. 12:9; cf. Gen. 2:7). It is as Redeemer, however, that God is to His Covenant-elect, their Heavenly Father. There is no evidence in Scripture that the natural, the unregenerate, person, the one who has never accepted the terms of Covenant relationship, has any right to address God by this special relational Name. (1 Cor. 2:14; Eph. 2:1-10; Rom. 8:14-17; John 14:6, 14:13-14; 2 Cor. 6:18) (Note especially Luke 15:3-7, 11-32. What we have here is not the Narrative of the Prodigal Son, as it is commonly designated; what we have here in fact is the Narrative of the Forgiving Father. There is no portrayal of God which compares with this in all the literature of man.)

THE LAST THREE DAYS

To summarize (according to Knudson, RTOT, 65): God is "no blind force in nature, no vague spiritual presence, no abstract principle, but a living personal being, who distinguishes himself from the world which he has made, freely communicates himself to his children, and by his sovereign will guides the course of nature and history."

What should we learn from these truths about God? We should learn (1) that our God is always yearning for us to draw near to Him (Jas. 4:8); (2) that true worship is the communion of the human spirit with the Divine Spirit, according to the means and appointments of the Word of truth (John 4:24, 8:31-32, 17:17); (3) that our chief end in life is to love and serve God here, that we may enjoy unending fellowship with Him hereafter (Rom. 6:23, 1 John 1:1-4, Matt. 25:34).

The Living Word

Heb. 4:12-13, 1 Sam. 15:22. Nothing is so displeasing to God as disregard for His Word. Yet the world is full of persons today—many of them church-members—who talk ignorantly and glibly about what they call "the mere Word." (There are no "meres" in the Divine vocabulary.) The Word has been from all eternity, from before the foundation of the world and the creation of man. To trifle with the Word is to commit heinous sin (Matt. 24:35, Mark 8:38, 1 Thess. 2:13).

Note the following matters of profound importance:

1. Practically all the confusion (sectism) in Christendom is directly traceable to man's presumption: that is, caused by his adding to, subtracting from, or substituting for, the Word.

2. Exaltation of feelings, experience, the "inner consciousness," etc., as authority in religious faith and practice, over the plain teaching of the Word, is *mysticism*.

GENESIS

For eighteen centuries the Church has been loaded down with all forms of mysticism, every one of which effectively nullifies the power of the Word.

3. Exaltation of *institution* above the plain teaching of the Word results in literalism, legalism, and especially in *traditionalism*. Traditionalism exalts ecclesiasticism, hierarchism, and church dogma and decree, above the authority of the Scriptures, whereas the Bible is our all-sufficient Book of Discipline, fully adequate to "furnish the man of God completely unto every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). If a creed contains more than the Bible, it contains too much; if it contains less than the Bible, it does not contain enough; if it contains the same as the Bible, it is unnecessary, because we have the Bible. Let us endeavor, therefore, to speak where Scripture speaks, and to keep silent where Scripture is silent.

4. The Word of God cannot be resisted by material things: when God speaks, all nature obeys (John 1:1, Heb. 1:3, 2 Pet. 3:5, Psa. 33:9). The only power on earth that can *resist* or *neglect* God's Word is man's free will (John 5:40, Rom. 13:1-2, Heb. 2:1-4, and the man who does either nullifies God's power to redeem him. Cf. Rom. 1:16—note the qualifying phrase, "to every one that believeth.")

5. There will be just two classes in the Day of Judgment: those who *have done*, and those who *have not done*, what is commanded in the Word (Matt. 7:24-27, Heb. 5:9). The supreme question is not, What must I *feel* to be saved? but is always, What must I *do* to be saved (Acts 2:38, 16:30, 22:10). Men must *do* something to be saved: they must do what God requires them to do to enter into Covenant relationship with Him. They must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 16:31); they must repent, turn from sin (Acts 2:38, 17:30, Luke 13:3); they must confess Christ (Matt. 10:32-33, Rom. 10:8-10); they must be buried with Christ in baptism and raised to walk

THE LAST THREE DAYS

in newness of life (Acts 2:38, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 6:3-5); they must continue steadfastly in the essentials of Christian faith and worship (Acts 2:42, 2 Pet. 1:5-11); they must bring forth in their lives the works of faith and the fruit of the Spirit (2 Pet. 3:18, Jas. 2:14-26, Gal. 5:22-25). Note especially, in closing, the solemn warnings in Heb. 4:12-13, and in 1 Sam. 15:22.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SEVEN

1. What is said, in this text, to be the "heart" of the Genesis Cosmogony?
2. Distinguish between *primary* and *secondary* causes.
3. Cite Scriptures which teach *theism* and *monotheism* in their purest forms.
4. What is the theory of *uniformitarianism*? Why is this theory not applicable to the creation of lands and seas?
5. Review what happened on Days One, Two, Three, and Four of the Creative Week.
6. What was created on Day Five?
7. What advance in the Creation is indicated in vv. 20-23?
8. According to Genesis in what environment did animal life begin? What does biology teach about this?
9. On what ground does Lange account for the beginning of animal life in the water and in the air?
10. What are the two characteristics in particular which distinguish animal life from plant life?
11. List the principal events of Day Six of the Creation.
12. Explain the import of the metaphor, "River of Life."
13. Explain what is meant by the "mystery" of the Life Movement.
14. Name and define the cellular processes.
15. List Skinner's threefold classification of animals.

GENESIS

16. What are the two naturalistic theories of the Origin of Life?
17. Explain what is meant by *abiogenesis*. How did the Church Fathers regard this theory? What is the status of the theory today?
18. State Augustine's theory of "seminal reasons" ("seminal causes").
19. Explain what is meant by the Will to Live.
20. State clearly Aristotle's theory of the Hierarchy of Being.
21. What particular still unsolved problems are pointed up by Aristotle's theory?
22. What was the Great Chain of Being theory? In what great poem is it set forth?
23. What change in the formula of the Divine decree occurs in v. 26? What does this change emphasize?
24. State the theories of Creation suggested by Cuvier and Lotze.
25. What theories have been suggested as explanations of the "us" in v. 26?
26. What is the only explanation of the "us" which harmonizes with the teaching of the Bible as a whole?
27. What is the special significance of the *credo* of Deut. 6:4?
28. By what Names is the tripersonality of God indicated in the Old Testament? What is the full revelation of these Names as given in the New Testament?
29. What is the significance of the use of the verb *bara* in v. 27?
30. What is the meaning of the term, "creation absolute"?
31. What are the phenomena which mark off the successive levels in the Totality of Being?
32. What is the significance of the metaphor, "the Breath of Life"?

THE LAST THREE DAYS

33. What is the special import of God's "very good" in v. 31?
34. Why cannot the terms "image" and "likeness" of God refer to *corporeal* likeness?
35. What is, in all likelihood, the specific import of the phrase, "image of God," as descriptive of man?
36. In what special sense was Jesus the "very image" of God?
37. Does the phrase "image of God" indicate that man is in some sense *deity*?
38. In what sense is man the "representation" of God in the Creation?
39. What special significance has "personality" with reference to God?
40. What is the significance of the distinction between the Oriental doctrine of *absorption*, and the Biblical doctrine of *fellowship*, as the destiny of the person? Which of these is the doctrine of personal immortality?
41. What is the import of the terms "male" and "female" as used in v. 27?
42. What was the twofold Divine blessing pronounced upon mankind at the beginning (v. 28)?
43. What evidence have we that God does not look with favor on concentration of population?
44. What is meant by the statement that God vested man with *lord tenancy* over the whole of nature?
45. How is this lord tenancy connected with man's stewardship?
46. What are the three "categories" of truth?
47. On what ground do we assert that human science is the fulfilment of God's command that man should "multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it"?
48. By what five fundamental truths does the Genesis Cosmogony affirm the glory and dignity of the person?

GENESIS

49. What reasons do we have for asserting that all sub-human orders were created for man's use and benefit?
50. What general objections to this view are urged by skeptics?
51. Would you not agree that if our conviction is not true (that the world was created for man's use and benefit), the only alternative view would have to be that all existence is meaningless? Explain your answer.
52. Restate the argument presented herein, in answer to the question, Why a Creation at all?
53. Explain the significance of the teaching of Jesus in Matt. 25:41.
54. Would you say that Gen. 1:29-30 indicates that God originally intended only a vegetable diet for man?
55. What conclusion do you reach by comparing these verses with Gen. 9:3?
56. What is the meaning of "good" as used in these verses?
57. What is the special significance of God's "very good" in v. 31?
58. State the various explanations of the Scripture which tells us that God "finished his work" on Day Seven.
59. In what sense, evidently, did God "rest" on Day Seven?
60. What is the probable significance of the absence of the customary formula (used in preceding verses to indicate the termination of each Day's activity) from the story of Day Seven?
61. How do the words of Jesus in John 5:17 throw light on this problem of God's rest?
62. What is a prolepsis? Cite Scripture examples of prolepsis.
63. Show how Gen. 2:2-3 is obviously a case of prolepsis.
64. What is the reason given for God's hallowing of the seventh day of the week instead of some other day?
65. What special event was the Jewish Sabbath appointed to memorialize (according to Deut. 5:15)?

THE LAST THREE DAYS

66. Where in the Pentateuch do we find the account of the first observance of the Jewish Sabbath?
67. Explain the significance of the sequence of events of the eight-day period described in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus.
68. Why, evidently, do we find no record of the observance of the Sabbath in the book of Genesis?
69. Why does the Sabbath have no significance for Christians?
70. What day do Christians observe and why? What is it called in Scripture?
71. What analogies exist between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day?
72. Summarize the arguments for the general interpretation that Day Seven of the Creative Week is one of indefinite duration.
73. Show how Tayler Lewis correlates the language of the Fourth Commandment with this interpretation.
74. Show how Whitelaw effects the same correlation. Cf. Rotherham's view (as given earlier in this text) and that of Archer (as stated directly above).
75. List other evidences of the ambiguous use of the Hebrew *yom* throughout the Old Testament.
76. Show how Gen. 1:31 sets the optimistic motif which runs throughout the entire Bible.
77. List the correspondences between the Hebrew Cosmogony and present-day science.
78. Explain how this correspondence is especially true of the order of Creation as given in Genesis and as held by the most recent science.
79. What bearing do these facts have on the doctrine of the special Divine inspiration of the Genesis Narrative of the Creation?

GENESIS

80. Show how the Order of the Creation as given in Genesis harmonizes also with the facts of human experience.
81. Restate our objections to the reconstruction and cyclical theories, respectively, of the cosmos as applied to the Genesis Cosmogony.
82. Explain what is meant by plant photosynthesis and why the process is of such great importance.
83. Review the general Order of the Creation, Day by Day, as set forth in Genesis 1.
84. What is the special significance of this Order? To what does it necessarily point?
85. Explain the difference between theoretical *atheism* and *agnosticism*. Is there any practical difference between the two views?
86. What is *pantheism*, and what are the main objections to it?
87. Define *deism*, and state the objections to it.
88. Define *materialism* and state the objections to it.
89. Define *dualism* and state the objections to it.
90. Explain what is meant by *emanationism*. State the objections to it.
91. What, in a general sense, is *naturalism*?
92. Distinguish between "humanitarian" humanism, "egoistic" humanism, and Biblical humanism.
93. Define *polytheism*. What was its most fundamental characteristic?
94. Define *monotheism*. How is it related to *monism*?
95. Define *henotheism*.
96. State the fundamental characteristics of theism. What are the chief attributes of the Biblical theistic God?