

PART EIGHT: THE BEGINNING
OF "HOMO SAPIENS"

Gen. 2:4-7

1. *Diagrammatic Review* of Gen. 1:1—2:3

Day

Day

1. Energy,

4. Chronology,

Matter-in Motion,

or Measurement

Light

CREATION—

of Time

THE

5. Water and

2. Atmosphere

Air Species

BEGINNINGS

6. Land Animals,

3. Lands and Seas

Man,

Naming of Animal

Plant Life

Species,

Woman

GENESIS

2. *Antiquity of the Pentateuch.* There are three outstanding marks of *uniqueness* in the Pentateuch (Torah) which certainly support the conclusion that it is more ancient, by centuries, than the rest of the Old Testament canon. (1) The name of Jerusalem is not found in the Pentateuch. This is inconceivable on the supposition that it was compiled after the Davidic reign or during the period of Captivity. (Cf. Josh. 10:5,23; Josh. 15:8 (note the significance of the parenthesis here); 2 Sam. 5:5-10; cf. Gen. 14:18). (2) The Divine title, "Lord of hosts" ("Jehovah of hosts"), occurring in 1 Sam. 1:3 for the first time, is absent from the Pentateuch. Yet it is a title common to the other books of the Old Testament. (3) There is no mention whatever in the Pentateuch of the ministry of sacred song. This would be a strange omission if any part of the fivefold volume had been written in post-exilic times, when sacred song was the pre-eminent part of the Hebrew ritual. As a matter of fact psalmody seems to have been a form of ritual worship which had its beginning in the Davidic reign.

3. *The Internal Unity of Genesis* is striking evidence that the book was ultimately the product of one hand. The thread of thought, the motif—namely, the Messianic development—is unbroken throughout. Beginning with the Creation and the Fall of man, the promise that the Seed of the woman should "bruise" the Serpent's head, the institution of sacrifice as the beginning of religion, the spread of sin and death as a consequence of the intermarriage of the pious Sethites with the irreligious Cainites, the Deluge, the subsequent dispersion, the Call of Abraham to become the progenitor of the people of the Old Covenant, the lives of the patriarchs—in fact, everything points forward (1) *primarily*, in point of time, to the organization of the Jewish Theocracy and the ratification of the Old Covenant at Sinai with Abraham's fleshly seed; and (2) *secondarily*, again in point of time, to the death and

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

resurrection of Christ, and the establishment of the New Covenant at Jerusalem, with Abraham's spiritual seed (Gal. 3:16, 3:23-29; John 1:17; Col. 2:13-15; Heb. 9:11-12, 9:23-28, 8:1-13, 9:11-22). It is inconceivable that such a unity of theme could have been achieved at the hands of numerous uninspired men or as a consequence of frequent editorial revision. In support, therefore, of the traditional Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, I should like to insert here two excerpts from scholars whose conclusions deserve full consideration, as follows: (1) William Henry Green (UBG, Preface, v): "All tradition, from whatever source it is derived, whether inspired or uninspired, unanimously affirms that the first five books of the Bible were written by one man and that man was Moses. There is no counter-testimony in any quarter. From the predominant character of their contents these books are commonly called the Law. All the statutes contained in them are expressly declared to have been written by Moses or to have been given by the Lord to Moses. And if the entire law is his, the history, which is plainly preparatory for, or subsidiary to, the law, must be his likewise." (2) W. H. Bates, writing in *The Bible Champion*, issue of July, 1920: Genesis "treats of matters which took place ages before Moses was born. The account which it gives of many events, is circumstantial, descending even to details of conversations and descriptions of personal attitudes and incidents which none could be cognizant of but the parties concerned. The very latest event mentioned in it had occurred, at the shortest estimate, more than half a century before Moses was born, and the rest of its human history covered a period extending to more than a thousand years of a prior antiquity, the earlier parts of it standing in relation to Moses as the times of Homer, Hesiod, and Thales stand to ours. As evidence connects Moses with all the books of the Pentateuch, the conclusion to which we are brought is that

GENESIS

Genesis was *compiled* by him. The proper statement for us to make is this: *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are of Mosaic authorship, while Genesis is of Mosaic editorship*, he having compiled it from pre-existing books: and so all has Mosaic authority. It should be noted, however, that later editorial hands may have supplied a slight touch here and there—possibly put upon the margin of manuscripts as explanatory comments—which subsequent copyists have incorporated into the body of the work.” (The student should be cautioned here that books and articles defending the Mosaic authorship of the Torah, which were written soon after the turn of the century, are frequently more reliable in their content than works on the same general subject written in recent years. It should be noted also that Green, by the term “counter-testimony,” referred, of course, to external evidence, of which there is very little to confirm the JEDP theory: that theory is based almost exclusively on alleged *internal* evidences of composite authorship.)

I see no reason for denying that Moses may have used traditions, or even documents (rolls), which had been handed down from earlier generations, in establishing the framework of the book of Genesis. (Note here the testimony of Jesus Himself to the Torah and its Mosaic origin: Matt. 19:3-9; Mark 10:3-4; Luke 16:29, 20:37, 24:27, 24:44; John 1:17, 3:14, 5:45-46, 7:19-23, etc.) Certainly, of all the Hebrew leaders of great antiquity, Moses was the one man most thoroughly equipped, both by education and by personal faith, for preserving in writing for future generations the early history of mankind, the history of the beginnings of the Hebrew nation, and the eternal principles of the Moral Law.

The internal unity of Genesis is too obvious to be questioned. This is true, regardless of any theory of authorship that might have been put forward. Genesis 1:1—2:3 gives us a sketch, in broad outlines, of the arrangement of the

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

universe at large, with particular emphasis, of course, on the earth and its manifold forms of life, all designed to serve as man's permanent abode. Gen. 2:4-25 is a brief sketch, graphic in its simplicity of detail, of the fitting up of Eden as the temporary home of this first human family prior to their first violation of the moral law and the consequent birth of conscience in them. With this introduction, the narrative launches, very properly, into the account of man's expulsion from the Garden (his loss of innocence), and his subsequent history in the two diverging lines of piety (the Sethites) and irreligion (the Cainites). Whitelaw (PCG, 39-40): "The internecine struggle between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, which the fratricidal act of Cain inaugurated (ch. 4), is the legitimate and necessary outcome of the sin and grace revealed in Eden (ch. 3), while the melancholy story of the temptation and the fall presupposes the paradisaical innocence of the first pair (ch. 2). Thus homogeneous in itself, it likewise *connects with the preceding section through ch. 2*, which as a monograph on man, supplies a more detailed account of his creation than is given in the narrative of the six days' work, and, by depicting man's settlement in Eden as a place of trial, prepares the way for the subsequent recital of his seduction and sin, and of his consequent expulsion from the garden." All this, in turn, prepares the reader for the account of the cause and consequences of the Deluge (the revelation of Divine Judgment that inevitably overtakes human arrogance, licentiousness, and violence), and then for the account of the election of the fleshly seed of Abraham to the Divine tasks of preserving the knowledge of the living and true God in the world, and of preparing the way for the advent of the Messiah, the note on which it terminates in certain aspects of the death-bed prophetic utterances of Israel (ch. 49). The one motif of this progressive revelation throughout is redemption in Christ Jesus. And so the

GENESIS

book of Genesis as a whole becomes linked inseparably to the content of the Bible as a whole, and Paradise Lost of Genesis becomes Paradise Regained of the book of Revelation.

4. *Relation of Genesis 2 to Genesis 1: the Separate Document Theory.* On the ground of certain obvious, yet readily explainable characteristics which distinguish Genesis 2:4-25 from the preceding chapter 1, recent destructive criticism has alleged diversity of authorship. We have already conceded that the hypothesis, frequently advanced, that Moses, in writing the book, may have made use of pre-existing traditions and documents ("books," "rolls") is neither incredible nor impossible. But the peculiarities of different parts do not justify the reckless abandon with which the book has been "analyzed" and separated into different hypothetical original "codes" by the advocates of the so-called Analytical or Documentary Theory. The authorship, subject-matter, and even the existence of these alleged "Codes" are largely matters of conjecture.

The question before us at this point is the following: Is Gen. 2:4-25, which we are now studying, a section from another original document (to be specific, from the alleged J (Jahvist) Code, so called because of its general use of the Name *Yahweh* ("Jehovah") for Deity, as distinguished from the E (Elohist) Code, so called because of its general use of the Name *Elohim* for the Deity, as in Gen. 1:1-2:3)? Or, is the content of Gen. 2:4-25 designed to be an explanatory amplification of the content of Gen. 1:1-2:3, the Hebrew Cosmogony, with both originating from, or at least woven together by, the same author, none other than Moses the great lawgiver? The advocates of the separate-document (analytical) theory argue that Gen. 2 could not have been written by the author of the Cosmogony which precedes it, for the following reasons:

(1) *That it is a second and superfluous account of the*

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

Creation. This is an unwarranted assumption. The business of taking two different parts of any narrative, relating to matters which are distinct and *having different themes*, and wresting them from their intended meaning into *two alleged variant accounts of the same thing*, is a vicious critical method. The first chapter of Genesis treats of the Creation in its broad outlines, in a panoramic fashion as we have noted previously, and as reaching its climax in man's appearance on the earth; the second chapter, however, treats of man *specifically*, as the object of God's gracious providence, in the preparation of Eden for his habitation in his original state of innocence, and in the institution of marriage by means of which domestic society had its beginning and human history began its march down the corridors of time.

(2) *That there are discrepancies between the two sections.* (The student should keep in mind that we are considering here *only* the relation between the first two chapters of Genesis, nothing more.) Of course, on the supposition that Gen. 2:4-25 is a separate account of the Creation, there are apparent discrepancies. But, that Gen. 2:4-25 is a separate account of the Creation is precisely the thing these critics have set out to prove: and every rule of logic is violated when the thing to be proved is used as the pre-supposition from which one must take off, in order to arrive at the proof. (This is the fallacy of "begging the question," *petitio principii*.) However, on the hypothesis that Gen. 2 is a recapitulation, with specific details as to the nature of man, his primitive moral state, and the circumstances of his primitive environment, there are no discrepancies of any note. The creation of the universe, the heavens, the earth, the sea, and the kinds of creatures they include, is roughly *sketched* in chapter 1, but is *taken for granted* in chapter 2. The latter provides details which were unavoidably passed over in the former, such as the dual nature of man, his original innocence,

GENESIS

the preparation of Eden as his first habitation, the creation of woman, and the institution of marriage. From this point of view, there are no dissonances between the two chapters: rather, the second is complementary to the first.

(3). *That the style and diction of the two sections are different.* Well—why not? Their respective themes demand differences in terminology. All such differences arise not only from the personality and habits of the author, but also from the character of the subjects treated. It has been argued that ch. 1 is “systematic,” “chronological,” “scientific”; that it abounds in “stereotyped phrases”; that “it moves in a solemn and impressive monotone”; that its author “restricts himself to the great facts without entering in an explanatory way into particular details”; and that he uses “a ceremonious, solemn, formal style of writing,” including many expressions that savor of remote antiquity; that chapter 2, on the other hand, is topical in its order of presentation, “free and flowing” in diction; that its author writes with a delicacy, pathos, and evenness of style that is entirely wanting in chapter 1. *Does not diversity of themes readily account for these contrasts?* Green (UBG, pp. 7-41): “Ch. 1 is monumental, conducted on a scale of vastness and magnificence, and its characters are massive and unyielding as if carved in granite. Chs. 2 and 3 deal with plastic forms of quiet beauty, the charms of paradise, the fateful experiences of Adam and Eve. In the onward progress of creation all is conducted by the words of Omnipotence, to which the result precisely corresponds . . . There is no call for such a style in a simple narrative-like ch. 2, where it would be utterly out of place and stilted in the extreme . . . It is said that ch. 1 proceeds from the lower to the higher, ending with man; while, on the contrary, ch. 2 begins with the highest, viz., with man, and proceeds to the lower forms of life. But as ch. 2 continues the history begun in ch. 1, it naturally starts where ch. 1 ends, that is to say, with the creation of man,

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

especially as the whole object of this chapter is to depict his primitive condition." In a word, then, ch. 1, being an epitome of the Creation as a whole, is *epical* in character; ch. 2, being an account of early man's first kind of environment, is essentially *pastoral* in character.

I cite here the statements of the well-known German "critical analyst," Kalisch (as quoted in PCG, 39-40), *in re* the alleged "irreconcilable differences" between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2—what he calls "the two cosmogonies"—as excellent examples of the recklessness with which the early destructive critics and the more recent "demythologizers" conjure up "discrepancies" which actually do not exist at all. I shall quote Kalisch's statements and call attention to the obvious fallacies involved in them, as follows: (1) "In the first cosmogony vegetation is immediately produced by the will of God; in the second its existence is made dependent on rain and mists and the agricultural labours" (K). But—Gen. 1:11-12 does not require us to believe that vegetation was first produced *immediately* by the will of God. Indeed the word "immediately" is an arbitrary assumption. As a matter of fact, the very Divine decree, "Let the earth bring forth" grass, herbs, trees, etc., indicates clearly that God was proposing to operate by means of secondary causes ("laws of nature") at whatsoever time or times these various means (seeds, rain, mists, agricultural labor) should be brought into existence. (In all these Divine Decrees, the specific means and methods of actualization are not revealed, in Gen. 1.) No particular chronology is indicated. Hence, Gen. 2:4-7 simply amplifies the Gen. 1:11-12 account, by giving more detailed information as to the origin and operations of these necessary means. (2) "In the first the earth emerges from the waters, and is, therefore, saturated with moisture; in the second it appears dry, sterile, and sandy" (K). But—granting that the earth did "emerge from the waters" (1:9-10)—and we have noted heretofore

GENESIS

the ambiguity of the term "waters," as used in these verses—what in all likelihood was its surface condition? It must have been a veritable terrestrial mud-flat. Then certainly the cooling of the earth's crust set in, bringing about solidification, and at the same time helping to establish the proper atmospheric conditions for the ultimate appearance of vegetation. All that is indicated in Gen. 2:5-6 is that, at this point in the Creation, the atmospheric conditions necessary to plant life had not yet been fully actualized and the customary agricultural operations had not yet been instituted because, as yet, there was no man to engage in such activities. We could also assume here, reasonably I think, that a distinction is intimated between wild plant life and domesticated plant life, that which is produced by human agricultural methods. (3) "In the first, man and his wife are created together; in the second, the wife is formed later, and from a part of man" (K). But—the notion that Gen. 1:26-28 teaches that the first man and his wife were "created together" is again a sheer, and genuinely absurd, assumption. The chronology and methodology of their origin is not even under consideration in this Scripture; as a matter of fact, the terms "male" and "female," as used here, have only *generic*, not particular (individual), significance. Hence, the details of the origin and nature of our first parents are supplied in ch. 2. (4) "In the former, man bears the image of God, and is made ruler of the whole earth; in the latter, his earth-formed body is only animated by the breath of life, and he is placed in Eden to cultivate and guard it" (K). But—the "image of God" of Gen. 1:26-27 is precisely the endowment which resulted from the *inbreathing* of God of Gen. 2:7, the Divine act by which the corporeal tabernacle was ensouled, that is, endowed with the essential elements of personality. Eden is an added detail to describe the man's primordial state of unhindered access to his Creator, prior to his violation of the moral law. Nor is there any statement

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

in Gen. 2 that would in any way affect the lord tenancy of the earth with which he was divinely invested according to Gen. 1:26-30. (5) "In the former, the birds and beasts are created before man; in the latter, man before birds and beasts" (K). But Gen. 2:19-20 does not necessarily involve any time-sequence: it is not the time, but simply the fact, of the creation of the higher air and land animals which the writer records here. Many eminent authorities render this passage, "And God brought to the man the beasts which he had formed," etc. Moreover, there is no warrant for supposing this to be the account of a second creation of animals, exclusively within, and of a kind adapted to, the Edenic environment, as some have suggested. Thus the student cannot but recognize the fact that these arguments presented by Kalisch (and other destructive critics) to show that we are dealing here with "two cosmogonies" characterized by "irreconcilable differences," simply do not hold water. In fact, the alleged "discrepancies" disappear altogether under the view that the content of ch. 2 is intended to be an amplification of the broad outlines of ch. 1, a view that may well be declared self-evident on close examination. As a matter of fact, ch. 2 cannot really be designated a "cosmogony" at all, that is, in any true sense of that term.

5. *Relation of Genesis 2 to Genesis 1: the Complementary Theory.* This is the view that Gen. 2:4-25 fills in the important details which are necessarily omitted from Gen. 1:1-2:3, because of the over-all structure, design, and elevated tone of the first section. The following chart will serve to illustrate, I think, the complementary relationship of these two sections:

Gen. 1:1-2:3 is a broad general account of the creation of energy-matter, and its subsequent arrangement	Gen. 2:4-25 is a kind of recapitulation, giving important details with special reference to the origin and
--	--

GENESIS

into a cosmos, with special emphasis on the origin of the earth and its relation to the celestial bodies. The section concludes with the account of the origin of living species, attaining perfection in man.

"Because that in it he rested from all his work which God had created and made" (2:3)—a statement concluding the general panoramic Hymn of Creation.

"In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth" (1:1). In this section the Name used for Deity is *Elohim*, the Name that designates Him in His absoluteness (transcendence) of being and power. *Elohim*

nature of our first parents, their primitive habitation, and the beginnings of society in general, in the forms especially of liberty, law, language, and marriage. This section is not in any sense contradictory of the first—rather, it is *complementary*.

"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created" (2:4): a statement introducing specifically the history of man, first in his primitive habitation, and then in the world at large. Here we have the first use of the word *toledoth* ("generations"), the word used to introduce each of the ten sections of the book, and never used to describe antecedents, but always to introduce *consequents*.

"In the day that Yahweh Elohim made earth and heaven" (2:4). In this section the Name *Yahweh* ("Jehovah") is used, the Name which reveals the Deity in His works of benevolence, in His providential

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

designates the Creator-God (Isa. 57:15).

On the third day of Creation, according to this section, the physical features of the earth appeared: the condensation of vapors could well have resulted in the outlining of continents and oceans. "And God called the dry land *Earth*" (1:10). This condensation resulted in rainfall, thus preparing the way for vegetation.

In the first section we read that man was created "in the image" of God, both "male and female" (1:27).

activities toward His creatures, especially man. *Yahweh* designates the Redeemer-God.

"In the day that *Jehovah God made earth and heaven*" (2:4). Note again the ambiguity of the word "day." This statement takes us back to the second and third "days" of Gen. 1, to the time before there was either rainfall or vegetation. V. 6 describes the beginning of rainfall (the "mists" here surely indicate the condensation of vapors which resulted in rain, as suggested in 1:9-10, because rain necessarily preceded the origin of terrestrial plant life). Thus the writer, in this section, takes us back into the record of the Creation, in order to prepare us for the more detailed account of the origin, nature, and primitive history of mankind.

In the second section, we are told *how* man was created, and of what he consists by nature; also how woman was created and what her divinely ordained

GENESIS

relation is to man (2:7, 21-25).

In the first account, we are told that man was created, but we are given no information as to his primeval environment.

In the first section we are told, without any amplification, that the water and air species were created on the fifth day, and land animals on the sixth day (1:20-25).

RECAPITULATION: In Gen. 1:1-2:3, we have the account, in broad outline only, of the origin of the cosmos, and especially of the earth and its atmospheric and planetary surroundings, and the main kinds of living creatures,—all this leading up to the creation of man in the “image” of God.

The second section supplies this information with its account of the Edenic garden. V. 9 may have reference to vegetation in Eden, rather than to vegetation generally.

In this section, v. 19, literally rendered, reads: “And God brought to the man” the birds and beasts which He “had formed out of the ground,” etc. This gives us some added information as to the living matter of which these forms of life were constituted, and tells us how they received their names (2:18-20).

RECAPITULATION: In Gen. 2:4-25 we have the account of the beginning of society and its essential institutions, viz., liberty, law, language, and marriage. Thus it will be seen that this section is not really a “cosmogony”; that it is, rather a complementary—or, one might say, supplementary—account with an entirely different structure, content, and emphasis.

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

6. *The Problem of the Two Divine Names.* As we have noted above, there are two Names given to the Deity in the first two chapters of Genesis, that is, in the original text. The Name used in the first section (1:1—2:3) is, without exception, the Name *Elohim*, which is translated "God" throughout the Old Testament. However, beginning with ch. 2:4, the Name *Yahweh* begins to occur (occasionally in connection with *Elohim*, but not generally so). This Name, which derives from the so-called Tetragrammaton, the four Hebrew letters without vowel points, *YHWH*, literally transliterated *Yahweh* (but imperfectly as "Jehovah," as in the A.S.V.), but translated "Lord" in the Authorized Version and in the Revised Standard Version, has, from as far back as the third century B.C., been regarded by the Jewish people as too sacred to be uttered: hence, in reading, they have generally substituted the word *Adonai* ("my Lord") for the divinely revealed "great and incommunicable Name" of Exo. 3:14. This distinction of Names in the first two chapters of Genesis is one of the principal arguments offered by the critics in support of their theory of two original documents or "codes." A careful study of the use of these two Names throughout the Old Testament as a whole will disclose the fact that in many instances they are used interchangeably either in a single Scripture or even in a part of a Scripture verse. Conservative scholars generally take the position that the distinction of these two Names derives not from two different original accounts or documents, but from their meaning as representing the two primary phases of the Divine Activity, namely, those of creation and redemption; hence, that *Elohim* designates the Creator-God, *Yahweh* the Redeemer-God.

The problem of an adequate Name for our God has always been a most difficult one, because of the limitations of human vocabulary. Rotherham (E.B., 26): "Does not 'name' in the Bible very widely imply revelation?"

GENESIS

Men's names are throughout the Scriptures fraught with significance, enshrining historical incidents, biographical reminiscences, and so forth; and why should the Name of the Ever-Blessed be an exception to this rule? Does not the Almighty Himself employ this Name of His as though it had in it some self-evident force and fitness to reveal His nature and unfold His ways? His Name is continually adduced by Himself as His reason for what He does and what He commands: 'For I am Yahweh.' (Exo. 3:14; Isa. 42:8, 43:3, 45:5, 46:9-11; Psa. 46:10; Heb. 11:6). Some have said that the meaning of The Name is not clear, that perhaps it has been kept so by Divine design. With this notion I cannot agree. Exo. 3:14—in this passage, says Rotherham (EB, 26), "I am that I am" expresses the sense, 'I will become whatsoever I please' . . . and we know He pleases to become to His people only what is wisest and best. Thus viewed, the formula becomes a most gracious promise; the Divine capacity of adaptation to any circumstances, any difficulties, any necessities, that may arise, becomes a veritable bank of faith to such as love God and keep His commandments." The frequently heard claim that "Yahweh" is simply the name of the tribal deity of ancient Israel is absurd, on the face of it: the very meaning of the Name invalidates such a notion. Again I quote Rotherham (EB, 24): "Men are saying today that 'Y' was a mere tribal name, and are suggesting that 'Y' Himself was but a tribal deity. As against this, only let The Name be boldly and uniformly printed, and the humblest Sunday-school teacher will be able to show the groundlessness of the assertion." It is inconceivable that the leaders of the ancient Hebrew people, surrounded on all sides as they were by tribes all practicing the grossest polytheistic systems, could have conjured up this Name—signifying pure personality, spirituality, holiness, etc.—out of their unaided human imagination. We simply cannot with reason regard "Yahweh" as a mere Hebrew

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

name for Deity; we can indeed regard it only as a Divine self-revelation, as The Name by which the living and true God has really made Himself known to His people by His acts of Divine Goodness, especially those embraced in the unfolding of His Divine Plan for the redemption of His creatures who were, at the beginning, created in His image, after His likeness. (John 3:16-18, Gal. 1:3-4, Tit. 2:13-14, Heb. 12:2).

The so-called "analytical" dissection of Scripture passages, and even of parts of such passages, to bolster theories of alleged discrepancies, is a vicious form of textual criticism. The same is true of the reckless discriminatory treatment, at the hands of the same critics, of the alleged alternation of the Divine Names, *Elohim* and *Yahweh*, and the hypothetical theories therefor. T. Lewis has stated this aspect of the case, especially with reference to the Divine Names, clearly (Lange, CDHCG, 107-108), using as an example the suggestion that the Name *Elohim* has regard to the "universalistic" aspect, and the Name *Yahweh* to the "theocratic" aspect, of God's being and activity. Lewis has written: "Admitting the distinction, we may still doubt whether it has not been carried, on both sides, to an unwarranted extent." He goes on to show how the critics of both schools violate their own oft-asserted *a priori* contention that the Bible must be treated like all other books. The "universalistic view," he says "is already curing itself by its ultra-rationalistic extravagance. It reduced the Old Scriptures not only to fragments, but to fragments of fragments in most ill-assorted and jumbled confusion. Its supporters find themselves at last in direct opposition to their favorite maxim that the Bible must be interpreted as though written like other books. For surely no other book was ever so composed or so compiled. In the same portion, presenting every appearance of narrative unity, they find the strangest juxtapositions of passages from different authors, and

GENESIS

written at different times, according as the one name or the other is found in it. There are the most sudden transitions even in small paragraphs having not only a logical but a grammatical connection. One verse, and even one clause of a verse, is written by the Elohist, and another immediately following by the Jehovist, with nothing besides this difference of names to mark any difference in purpose or in authorship. Calling it a compilation will not help the absurdity, for no other compilation was ever made in this way. To make the confusion worse, there is brought in, occasionally, a third or fourth writer, an editor, or reviewer, and all this without any of those actual proofs or tests which are applied to other ancient writings, and in the use of which this 'higher criticism,' as it calls itself, is so much inclined to vaunt."

The "theocratic" hypothesis, Lewis goes on to state, "is more sober, but some of the places presented by them as evidence of such intended distinction will not stand the test of examination. What first called attention to this point was the difference between the first and second chapters of Genesis. In the first, Elohim is used throughout; in the second, there seems to be a sudden transition to the name Jehovah-Elohim, which is maintained for some distance. This is striking; but even here the matter has been overstated. In the first chapter, we are told, the name Elohim occurs thirty times, without a single interruption; but it should be borne in mind that it is each time so exactly in the same connection, that they may all be regarded as but a repetition of that one with which the account commences. We should have been surprised at any variation. In this view they hardly amount to more than one example, or one use of the name, carried through by the repetition of the conjunctive particle. Thus regarded, the transition in the second passage is not so very striking. It is not well to say that anything in the composition of the scriptures is accidental or capricious, yet, as

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

far as 'the Bible is written like other books,' we may suppose a great variety of causes that led to it as well as the one assigned. It might have been for the sake of an euphonic variety, or to avoid a seeming tautology. It might have been some subjective feeling which the writer would have found it difficult to explain, and that, whether there was one writer or two. Again, it might have been that the single name suggested itself in the first as more simple and sublime standing alone, and, in this way, more universalistic, as it is styled; whilst in the second general resume the thought of the national name comes in, and the writer, whether the same or another, takes a holy pride in saying that it was the national God, our God, our Jehovah-Elohim, that did all this, and not some great *causa causarum*, or power separate from him. There might be a feeling of nearness in respect to the one name that led to its use under such circumstances." This critique speaks so eloquently for its own "reasonableness" that it fully serves our purpose here, namely, to demonstrate the artificiality, and indeed, the superficiality, of the mass of conjecture which has been built up in theological circles in the name of "consensus of scholarship" with respect to the unity of Genesis and the bearing thereupon of the alternating use of the two Divine Names.

"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that Jehovah God made earth and heaven. And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up; for Jehovah God had not caused it to rain upon the earth; and there was not a man to till the ground; but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground."

7. Reversion to Gen. 1:6-13. (1) V.4—"generations," literally "begettings." This, as we have noted, is the key word by which Genesis divides naturally into sections. Cf. Gen. 5:1, 6:9, 10:1; 11:10,27; 25:12,19; 36:1, 37:2.

GENESIS

Note that in all these passages—those in which this key word (*toledoth*) occurs—the reference is not to *antecedents*, but to *consequents*, i.e., not to ancestors, but to posterity. We see no reason for making an exception of the use of the word here (2:4): hence, “the generations of the heavens and of the earth” undoubtedly refers to the historical developments that followed the cosmic Creation itself (Gen. 1:1–2:3); and the added statement, “in the day that Yahweh Elohim made earth and heaven,” must take us back to what was taking place on the second and third “days” of the Creation Week—the “days” on which the atmospheric firmament and the earth with its lands and seas made their appearance (Gen. 1:6-13). All this was preparatory, of course, to the account of the beginnings of human society in its essential aspects such as those of liberty, law, language, and marriage. (2) Again, the *yom* (“day”) of v.4 designates an indefinite period of time (cf. Num. 3:1, Eccl. 7:14, Psa. 95:8, John 8:56, Rom. 13:12, Heb. 3:15), apparently commensurate with that of the second and third stages of Mosaic Cosmogony (1:6-13). (There are those, of course, who hold that the “day” of v.4 designated the whole Creation Week, that of the preceding Cosmogony: 1:1–2:3). (3) Moreover, this surely is evidence that v. 4 does not belong to the account which precedes it (regardless of the meaning of the word “day”), but is the statement that is designed to introduce that which follows, throughout the rest of ch. 2. Does the phrase, “earth and heaven,” then, suggest the psychosomatic structure of the human being, whose body is from the physical world but whose spirit (interior life) was originally inbreathed by direct Divine action (1 Cor. 15:45-47; Job 33:4, Eccl. 12:7, Acts 17:25, Heb. 12:9)? Green (UBG, 11-12): “This title, *the generations of the heavens and of the earth*, must announce, as the subject of the section which it serves to introduce, not an account of the way in which the heavens and the earth were them-

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

selves brought into being, but an account of *the offspring of the heavens and the earth*; in other words, of man, who is the child of both worlds, his body formed of the dust of the earth, his soul of heavenly origin, inbreathed by God Himself. And so the section proceeds regularly. First, Gen. 1:1, 'in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' the title announcing that the theme of the first chapter is the Creation. Then 2:4, 'the generations of the heavens and of the earth,' announcing that the theme of that which follows is the offspring of heaven and earth, or, the history of Adam and his family. Then 5:1, 'the generations of Adam,' in which his descendants are traced to Noah and his sons. Then 6:9, 'the generations of Noah,' or the history of Noah's family, and so on to the end of the book."

(4) Having sketched graphically the theological facts regarding the Creation generally, the writer now turns his attention to man, the creature for whose use and benefit everything else has been called into being. *This entire section (2:4-4:26) is a history of Adam and his family, their original innocence, their temptation and fall, their subsequent careers in two diverging lines, and the establishment of true religion through them.* In ch. 1, man is considered only as a part of the general scheme of things; in ch. 2, he is considered exclusively, in his primitive environment and innocence, as the handiwork of God and the object of His providential acts. In ch. 1, the scene is the whole world and all it contains; in ch. 2, it is limited to Eden, which was fitted up for the habitation of the first human family during their probationary state. (5) It should be noted also that the order of statements in ch. 2 is not *chronological*, but that of *association of ideas*. Green (UBG, 24-25): "V. 7, man is formed; v. 8, the garden is planted and man put in it; v. 9, trees are made to spring up there; v. 15, man is taken and put in it. We cannot suppose the writer's meaning to be that man was made

GENESIS

before there was any place to put him, and that he was kept in suspense until the garden was planted; that he was then put there before the trees that were to supply him with food had sprung up; and that after the trees were in readiness he was put there a second time. It is easy to deduce the most preposterous conclusions from a writer's words by imputing to them a sense he never intended. In order to pave the way for an account of the primitive paradise, he had spoken of the earth as originally destitute of any plants on which man might subsist, the existence of such plants being conditioned on that of man himself. This naturally leads him to speak, first, of the formation of man (v. 7); then of the garden in which he was put (v. 8). A more particular description of the garden is then given (vv. 9-14), and the narrative is again resumed by repeating that man was placed there (v. 15). As there was plainly no intention to note the strict chronological succession of events, it cannot in fairness be inferred from the order of the narrative that man was made prior to the trees and plants of Eden, much less that he preceded those of the world at large, of which nothing is here said."

(6) Vv. 2:5-6. The clause, "in the day that Yahweh Elohim made earth and heaven," points back to what had occurred in the second and third stages of the Creation, namely, the origin of the atmospheric firmament (expanse, "heaven," sky), and the origin subsequently of the earth (as it became detached from surrounding nebulae and so assumed its form as a planet) and its physical features (lands and seas): that is, to the time when as yet there was neither vegetation nor rainfall nor a man "to till the ground." In a word, the dry land having become separated from the waters (seas), and an atmosphere having been thrown around the planet, as a result of the cooling of the earth's crust vaporous substances ("mists") began to ascend into the skies and to return to the earth in the form of rain. All this, of course—light, atmosphere, lands, seas,

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

rainfall—necessarily preceded the first beginnings of plant life: precisely in the same order as depicted in the Cosmogony of Genesis 1. The stage was now set for the appearance of the crown of the Creation, man himself, and for the various developments revealed in subsequent chapters: (1) man's Edenic state (2:4-25), (2) his subsequent temptation and fall (3:1-24), (3) the story of Cain and Abel (4:1-16), (4) the degeneracy of the Cainites (4:16-24), and (5) the birth of Seth (4:25-26) to carry on the Messianic genealogy.

(7) We are not surprised, therefore, to find the totality of the Divine Being and His attributes designated by the dualistic Name, *Yahweh Elohim*, in this section. Once the documentary unity of the Elohistic and Yahwistic sections is entertained, this complete Name becomes a declaration that the Redeemer-God of Adam and his posterity is one with Elohim the God of the whole cosmos. This dualistic Name occurs twenty times in chs. 2 and 3 (the account of man's paradisaical state), but only once thereafter in the entire Torah (Exo. 9:30). It must be kept in mind that Elohim is a plural form. Strong (ST, 319): "God's purpose in securing this pluralization may have been more far-reaching and intelligent than man's. The Holy Spirit who presided over the development of revelation may well have directed the use of the plural in general, and even the adoption of the plural name Elohim in particular, with a view to the future unfolding of the truth with regard to the Trinity." E. S. Brightman, a later advocate of the Analytical Theory concedes the following (SOH, 22): "It follows that the use of the divine names is by no means an infallible, or the chief, criterion for separation of the sources. Steuernagel says that there is no compulsion for a Jahvistic writer always to use the name 'Jehovah.' Eichrodt rightly calls dependence on this criterion the 'baby-shoes' of criticism, that need to be taken off." Nor is there any reason why Moses should not have used both Names

GENESIS

as he saw fit, because it was to him specifically that the revelation of the *Tetragrammaton* was made (Exo. 3:13-15, 6:2-3) in its fulness of meaning; hence Moses was pre-eminently qualified to use the Names as he saw fit, and to combine them in describing the absolute beginnings of God's creative and redemptive activity, as in the section before us. This fact argues in favor of the Mosaic authorship of Genesis.

"And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

8. *Man a Psychosomatic Being.* This is one of the most important and meaningful statements in all literature. (1) Yahweh Elohim formed the man (that is, the corporeal or "physical" man) of "the dust of the ground." If this passage were put in modern terms, the phrase, "dust of the ground," would probably be rendered, "the physical elements" (those which go to make up all that is designated "matter"), hence the elements into which the body is resolved at death. (2) The verb used here, *yatsar*, translated "formed," is used in the Old Testament of a potter molding clay (Isa. 29:16, Jer. 18:4); used also of "spirit" in Zech. 12:1. (3) Having thus formed "the earthly house of our tabernacle" (2 Cor. 5:1), the Creator then "breathed" into *it* "the breath of life," and the *it* became a *he*. In this graphic anthropomorphic picture, the Creator is represented as stooping over and placing his mouth and nostrils upon the opened mouth and nostrils of the lifeless corporeal form (as in ordinary resuscitation) and expelling into it "the breath of life." To be sure, this phrase means that God caused the inanimate form to "come alive," but in man's case it designates infinitely more than mere *vitality* (as we know from immediate personal experience). (Cf. Gen. 7:22—here "the breath of the spirit of life" is said to be characteristic of animal forms, but there is no implication that God *breathed* this vitality into them: cf.

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

Acts 17:25). Indeed there is no intimation anywhere in Scripture that *God breathed His breath into any other creature than man*: this is most significant. What, then, is implied by it, in man's case? Surely, whatever more is implied by it, it cannot be less than the truth that God expelled into the corporeal form, not only vitality, but also the potentiality of the thought processes which specify man as man, thus constituting him to be a *person*. This surely gives us a clue to the meaning of the phrase, "the image of God," as used of the human being in Gen. 1. Of course, this does not mean that God endowed man with the potentiality of *deity*, but with the potentiality only of *divinity*. (Note well, not with actual divinity, but only with the potentiality of it, which can be actualized only by the Spiritual Life.) These two words, "deity" and "divinity" are *not* synonymous, and to use them as such is an egregious error. Deity and humanity are differences of rank or kind, not of degree: man is human and there is no process whatever by which a human being can be transmuted into a deity. To be sure, in speaking of God, we use the phrase, "the divine Being," but only by way of contrast with the human being. Hence, in Scripture, the righteous person, by leading the Spiritual Life (Gal. 5:22-25), by growing in the grace and knowledge of Christ (2 Pet. 3:18), by living the life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3), is said to become a "partaker of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4), and therefore fitted for "the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12). In a word, man can become godlike (1 Tim. 4:7), but he does not have the potentiality ever of becoming God, or of acquiring the attributes of God.

(4) "Man became a living soul." Note that the R.S.V. renders it "living being," and that the A.V. and the A.S.V. render the same word, as used in v. 19, "living creature." The verse obviously emphasizes the fact that man *is* a living being (soul), not that he *has* living being (soul).

GENESIS

Nephesh is the product of the fusion of the *basar* (flesh) and the *ruach* (spirit). (*Ruach* may be rendered either "spirit" or "wind": however, common sense born of human experience can recognize the absurdity of interpreting this passage as indicating that man is body animated by *wind*: the notion is ridiculous.) Man is distinguished from the brute by the sublimely sententious fact that God *breathed*: this means that man is like God, because he has the breath of God in him. His corporeal part shares the corporeal life of the lower animals, but his spiritual powers constitute him to share the privileges and responsibilities of a good world and the capabilities of spiritual growth and ultimate union with God. In short, v. 7 declares that God created man a *complete* being. I see no reason for reading mystical, esoteric, or magical connotations into this Scripture; in its simplest terms, it means that God constituted him a body-mind or body-spirit unity—a *person*.

(5) We have here, then, one of the most remarkable anthropomorphic passages in literature, and its most amazing feature is its complete agreement with the most recent science, in which the psychosomatic (organismic) interpretation of the human being prevails, in biology, physiology, medicine, psychology and psychiatry. (Psychosomatic medicine is a commonplace in our day: it is universally recognized that the interior life is affected by the exterior, and that the exterior is even more poignantly affected by the interior.) Gen. 2:7 means simply that man is a mind-body or *spirit-body* unity, not essentially dualistic in structure, but with the "physical" and the "spiritual" (personal, mental) elements interwoven in a complexity that defies analysis. (This means also that while mind and body thus interact, neither can mind become entirely body, nor body entirely mind. Even in the next life, according to Bible teaching, the saint will continue to be a spirit-body unity, the *natural* (*psychikos*, "soulish") body having been transmuted into the *spiritual* (*pneumatikos*) body, the change

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

described in Scripture as the putting on of immortality (1 Cor. 15:35-57, Rom. 2:6-8, 2 Cor. 5:1-10). Christianity is unique in the emphasis it places on the redemption of the bodies of the saints; cf. Rom. 8:18-25).

(6) *The Breath of Life*. Keil and Delitzsch (BCOTP, 79): "The dust of the earth is merely the earthly substratum, which was formed by the breath of life from God into an animated, living, self-existent being. When it is said, 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,' it is evident that this description gives prominence to the peculiar sign of life, viz., breathing; since it is obvious, that what God breathed into man could not be the air which man breathes: for it is not that which breathes, but simply that which is breathed. Consequently, breathing into the nostril can only mean that God, through His own breath, produced and combined with the bodily form that principle of life, which was *the origin of all human life*, and which constantly manifests its existence in the breath inhaled and exhaled through the nose." (Italics mine—C. C.)

(7) This inbreathing by the Eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14) determined individual *human nature* to be what it is *specifically*, namely, essentially spirit indwelling an earthly body, and hence incapable of annihilation. (Man is specified, *i.e.*, set apart as a species by his thought processes.) This Divine inbreathing also determined (by endowing the creature with the power of choice) individual *human destiny*, either (for the righteous only) ultimate eternal union with God (Life Everlasting: 1 Cor. 13:9-12, Heb. 12:23, 1 John 3:2, Rev. 14:13), or (for the neglectful, rebellious, disobedient) ultimate eternal separation from God (eternal death: 2 Thess. 1:7-10, Acts 17:30-31, Rom. 2:4-9; Rev. 6:15-17, 20:11-15, 21:1-8, 22:10-15), in the place prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 5:29-30, 25:41). (The last end of the wicked is not annihilation, but segregation in the penitentiary of the moral universe, Gehenna or Hell). (8) Reduced to its basic significance,

GENESIS

Gen. 2:7 emphasizes the fact that man is a fusion of body (earthly elements) and spirit (divinely inbreathed by the Creator Himself): an earthly house of this tabernacle (2 Cor. 5:1-8), vitalized by spirit, thus communicated to it by the Breath of God. Where there is spirit, in the full sense of the term, there is *vitality, personality, sociality*, and ultimately, but only as the product of the Spiritual Life, wholeness or *holiness*.

(9) *Nephesh* in this text, therefore, denotes the *complete* living human being, that is, in his present state. Man's body consists of the earthly elements; it is formed from *adamah*; in a wider sense, formed *out of* the earth (Gen. 18:27, Psa. 103:14); hence, at death the body goes back to the earthly elements from which it was originally constituted (the elements which it shares with the whole animal creation). (Gen. 3:19, 23; Job 10:9, 34:15; Psa. 146:4). But the spirit—the interior being, in a very literal sense, the imperishable ego, self, person—is from God, and hence, at the death of the body, it goes back to the God who gave it (Eccl. 12:7; Gen. 7:22; Job 32:8, 33:4; Psa. 18:15, 104:29-30; Prov. 20:27; Isa. 42:5; Acts 17:25), for His final judgment and disposition of it (John 5:28-29; Matt. 12:41-42, 25:31-46; Acts 17:30-31; Rom. 2:4-9; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 20:11-15). According to this remarkable Scripture (Gen. 2:7), man is so constructed in this present life, as to be neither entirely “corporeal” nor entirely “mental,” but a complex fusion of the powers of both body and mind into a wondrous whole (Psa. 139:14).

9. *Body, Soul, Spirit*. (1) What, then, are the essential elements (parts, or separate categories of powers) of human nature? There are two theories: what is known as the *dichotomous* theory, that man is made up of *body* and *spirit*; and what is called the *trichotomous* theory, that he is somehow constituted of *body, soul, and spirit*. (Matt. 10:28, 27:50; Luke 23:46, John 19:30; Job 27:3, 32:8, 33:4; Eph. 4:23; 1 Cor. 5:3, 3 John 2, and esp. Eccl. 12:7,

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 4:12). This problem (of the proper correlation of these three terms, as used in the Bible) is, in many respects, difficult; hence, in attempting to determine the correct explanation, one should not be dogmatic. The problem is complicated especially by Scriptures in which "soul" and "spirit" seem to be used interchangeably. (Cf. Gen. 41:8 and Psa. 42:6; John 12:27 and 13:21; Matt. 20:28 (*psyche*, "life") and 27:50.) (2) It seems obvious, however, that Gen. 2:7 supports the dichotomous view. Certainly it teaches that man is a living soul or living being, constituted of a body of earthly elements and a Divinely inbreathed spirit. Common sense confirms the fact that the Divine inbreathing described here was an inbreathing, not merely of the *vital* principle, but of the *rational* as well; not only of the *life* processes, but of the *thought* processes also, with all their potentialities: the subsequent activity of the man so constituted (naming of the animal tribes, acceptance of the woman as his counterpart, and, sad to say, his disobedience to God's law) proves him to have been truly *homo sapiens*. Man does not just live—he *knows* that he lives.

(3) The phrase, "living soul," as used here does mean "living being," but a living being composed of body and spirit, and thus endowed with the elements of personality: hence, man is said to have been created "in the image of God." Note the following pertinent quotations assembled by Strong (ST, 486): "Soul is spirit as modified by union with the body" (Hovey). "By soul we mean only one thing, *i.e.*, incarnate spirit, a spirit with a body. Thus we never speak of the souls of angels. They are pure spirits, having no bodies." (Hodge). (Cf. Heb. 1:14—nevertheless, angels are represented in Scripture as manifesting themselves in some kind of external texture, something that makes them perceptible by man.) "We think of the spirit as soul, only when in the body, so that we cannot speak of an immortality of the soul, in the proper sense, without bodily life"

GENESIS

(Schleiermacher). "That the soul begins to exist as a vital force, does not require that it should always exist as such a force in connection with a material body. Should it require another such body, it may have the power to create it for itself, as it has formed the one it first inhabited; or it may have already formed it, and may hold it ready for occupation as soon as it sloughs off the one which connects it with the earth" (Porter, *Human Intellect*, p.39). It should be noted here especially that in Scripture there is said to be a *natural* (*psychikos*, "soul-ish") body, and, for the redeemed, a *spiritual* (*pneumatikos*) body (1 Cor. 15:44-49, 2 Cor. 5:1-10, Phil. 3:20-21, Rom. 2:7, 8:11). Strong himself writes (ST, 486): "The doctrine of the spiritual body is therefore the complement to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul." Aristotelian-Thomistic teaching is that soul *informs* body, or, vice versa, that body is *informed* by soul ("inform" meaning "to give form to," that is, to put a thing in its proper class); hence, that the two are inseparable, because body *needs* soul, and soul *needs* body, for mutually complementary ends. The same thing may be said of *spirit*, as used in Scripture: it seems always to be represented as being associated with, or identical with, a rarefied form of "matter." (It will be recalled that the old Greek philosopher, Demokritos, taught that nothing exists ultimately but atoms and the void; soul atoms, however, said he, are no doubt of a finer texture of matter than the gross atoms of the body.) Knudson (RTOT, 229): "That *ruach* did not denote a third element in human nature, distinct from *nephesh*, is evident from the fact that it is often used synonymously with *nephesh* as a designation both of the principle of vitality and the resultant psychological life." (Cf. Gen. 6:17, 45:27; Judg. 15:19; 1 Sam. 30:12; Ezek. 37:5; Psa. 104:29; Isa. 26:9, 19:14; Exo. 28:3; Psa. 51:12, Judg. 8:3; Prov. 16:19.) All this boils down to the fact that, with reference to man, *neither soul nor spirit, in Biblical teaching, is bodilessness:*

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

the notion of “disembodied spirits” is a distinctive feature of Oriental mysticisms. According to Scripture teaching, God alone is Pure Spirit (John 4:24); that is, “without body or parts, but having understanding and free will.” (There are two Scriptures, of course, which seem to favor the trichotomous theory, though on closer scrutiny—it seems to me—are not necessarily to be taken as doing so. These are 1 Thess. 5:23 and Heb. 4:12. Concerning 1 Thess. 5:23, Frame writes (ICC-Th, 209-210): The Apostle “prays first in general that God may consecrate them [the Thessalonian Christians] through and through, and then specifically that he may keep their spirit, the divine element, and the soul and body, the human element, intact as an undivided whole, so that they may be blameless when the Lord comes.” A. T. Robertson writes (WPNT, 38-39): “*Your spirit and soul and body . . . not necessarily trichotomy as opposed to dichotomy as elsewhere in Paul’s Epistles. Both believers and unbelievers have an inner man (soul, *psyche*; mind, *nous*; heart, *kardia*) . . . and the outer man (*soma*). But the believer has the Holy Spirit of God, the renewed spirit of man (1 Cor. 2:11, Rom. 8:9-11).*” (Cf. Tit. 3:5). This author goes on to say that the apostolic prayer here is “for the consecration of both body and soul (cf. 1 Cor. 6). The adjective *holokleron* . . . means complete in all its parts.” Strong holds (ST, 485) that this text is not intended to be “a scientific enumeration of the constituent parts of human nature, but a comprehensive sketch of that nature in its chief relations.” P. J. Gloag (PC-Th, 106) adheres to the trichotomous view. He writes: “The ‘spirit’ is the highest part of man, that which assimilates him to God, renders him capable of religion, and susceptible of being acted upon by the Spirit of God. The ‘soul’ is the inferior part of his mental nature, the seat of the passions and desires, of the natural propensities. The ‘body’ is the corporeal frame. Such a threefold distinction of human nature was not unknown

among the Stoics and Platonists. There are also traces of it in the Old Testament, the spirit, or breath of God, being distinguished from the soul." With reference to Heb. 4:12, the use of *psyche* and *pneuma* is certainly not too clear. The idea presented here is that of the probing, penetrating, adjudicating activity of the *logos*: *logos* is pictured as the all-seeing Eye of God which pierces the human being to its deepest depths: to "the subtlest relations of human personality, the very border-line between the *psyche* and the *pneuma*—all this is open to the *logos*" (James Moffatt, ICC-H, 56). As Barmby writes (PC-H, 110): the *logos* is "a living power . . . more keenly cutting than any sword; cutting so as to *penetrate* through and through—the whole inner being of man, to its inmost depths; then, in doing so, discerning and opening to judgment all the secrets of consciousness." Or, according to Delitzsch, as quoted by Barmby (PC-H, 111): "In fallen man his *pneuma* which proceeded from God and carries in itself the Divine image, has become, 'as it were, extinguished'; 'through the operation of grace man calls to mind his own true nature, though shattered by sin'; 'the heavenly nature of man reappears when Christ is formed in him'; and thus the Word of God 'marks out and separates' the *pneuma* in him from the *psyche* in which it had been 'as it were, extinguished.'" (Cf. Gal. 4:19, Col. 1:27).

To summarize: I find the tendency in general among commentators to look upon the psyche (soul) as the seat of the present animal ("natural") life, and the spirit as the seat of the higher faculties and powers, in man. It is my personal conviction, however, that soul, in whatever state it may exist and continue to exist, stands for a body-spirit unity (or mind-body unity), to be explicit, a psychosomatic unity. However, regardless of the interpretation of the distinction between soul and spirit that one may accept, the fact remains that each is represented in Scripture as associated in the concrete, that is, in human life itself, with

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

an outer or bodily texture of some kind. And it is this very fact which nullifies the claims of materialism and brings to light the really profound uniqueness and significance of the Christian doctrine of immortality. Hence, this is the fact in which we are here primarily interested.

(4) Permit me to state parenthetically that it has been my conviction for some time that certain findings in the area of the phenomena of the Subconscious in man throw considerable light on this problem of the distinction, if such a distinction really exists, between the *soul* and the *spirit* in the human being. Men who have engaged in research in this particular field uniformly describe the human "interior man" (2 Cor. 4:16, Rom. 7:22, Eph. 3:16) as a house, so to speak, with two rooms in it: a front room which faces the external world and through which impressions from that world make their entrance by way of the physical senses; and a back room in which the impressions which have entered by way of the front room find a permanent abiding-place. This front room is commonly designated the objective (conscious, supraliminal) part of the self, or simply the "objective mind"; this back room, the subjective (subconscious, subliminal) part of the self, or simply the "subjective mind." It is to this room that we refer when we speak of the Subconscious in man. The *objective* takes cognizance of the external world; its media of knowledge are the physical senses; it is an adaptation to man's physical needs, his guide in adapting to his present terrestrial environment. (The fact is often overlooked that man's physical senses serve only to adapt him to his present earthly milieu; they really shut out—or at most only give him clues to—the world that lies beyond sense-perception, the *real* world (2 Cor. 4:16-18). Suppose, for example, that a man had a visual mechanism like the lens of a high-powered microscope, so that every time he looks into a glass of water, he sees all the little "bugs" floating around in it; or, suppose he had a kind of x-ray

GENESIS

eye that would enable him to be little more, apparently, than a skeleton (to which sundry internal and external accoutrements are necessarily attached) meeting other like skeletons, etc., in ordinary social intercourse—who would want to experience such a kind of life as this, even if such a life were possible, which, to be sure, it would not be? Or, suppose that man had an auditory mechanism constructed in the manner, let us say, of a radio receiving set attuned to all the vibrations that are coming into his ear; and impinging on his auditory nerve, from the outer air, from water; or from other sources—such an uproar would surely drive him crazy in short order. As a matter of fact, I am profoundly thankful that I do not have the sense of smell which my little dog has: it would make life unlivable to any man. Hence, we can readily see that the function of the physical senses is to enable the person to adjust to his present terrestrial environment: they cannot open to his view the glories of the world that lies beyond that of time and sense. Incidentally, Plato named this world of sense, the world of becoming, and the world beyond sense-perception, the world of being; Kant called the former, the phenomenal world, and the latter, the noumenal world.) The “objective mind” of man is needed, therefore, in order that he may take cognizance of his needs and responsibilities in relation to the external world in which he now lives. *Its highest function is that of reason*, which is in fact reflection upon what he has apprehended by sense-perception. The “subjective mind”—the Subconscious—on the other hand, takes cognizance of its environment independently of physical sense; it apprehends by pure thought and intuition; it is the storehouse of memory; it is the seat of perfect perception of the fixed laws of nature; it performs its highest functions when the objective processes are in abeyance (that is, in natural or induced sleep—the latter is hypnosis); *it is especially amenable to suggestion*. This “subliminal” (below-the-

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

threshold-of-consciousness) part of the "inward man" seems to be unlimited by objective concepts of distance, space, and time (one can go back into childhood, or travel throughout the cosmos, in a dream): it functions effectively outside the space-time dimension. It has all the appearance of a distinct entity (being), with independent powers and functions, having a psychical (or metapsychical) order of its own, and being capable of functioning independently of the corporeal body. *It is, in a real sense, the very core of the human being. It seems to be, in its ultimate aspect, the ontological self, the essential and imperishable being of the human individual. I suggest, therefore, that the objective powers of the human psyche are rightly to be correlated with what we call "mind" (or "soul"?) in man, and that the subjective powers may rightly be correlated with what we call "spirit" in him.* Therefore, it is certainly well within the bounds of probability that all that I have suggested here to be included under the word "spirit" may be specifically what God breathed into man when He created him. (See further *infra*, in the few paragraphs on the phenomena of the Subconscious.) Again, let me remind the student that all this does not mean that either "mind" (or "soul") or "spirit" exists independently of some form of bodily texture, either in this present world or in the world to come.

10. *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, only intimated in the Old Testament (Job 14:14, 19:25-27; Gen. 5:24, Heb. 11:5; 2 Ki. 2:10-11; Heb. 11:9-10, 13-16, 17-19), is fully revealed in the New. (1) As stated heretofore, according to Biblical teaching, there is a *natural* body (this we know also from personal experience), and there is also a *spiritual* body, that is, a body gradually formed by the sanctification of the human spirit by the indwelling Spirit of God (Rom. 5:5, 8:11, 14:17; 1 Cor. 15:44-49; 2 Cor. 5:1-8; 1 Cor. 6:19, 3:16-17; Heb. 12:14). The spirits of the redeemed, although separated from their natural

GENESIS

("soul-ish") bodies at death, will be clothed in their spiritual bodies in the next life (Phil. 3:20-21). (Certainly present-day science has nothing to say against this teaching. Modern nuclear physics has proved that matter may take such attenuated forms (even the atom is found to be, not a "particle," but a "field" of inconceivably powerful forms of energy) as to be practically non-physical, or at the most only metaphysical.) Incidentally, to try to determine whether this transmutation takes place immediately at death, or, following an "intermediate state," at the general Resurrection (Matt. 11:21-24, 12:38-42), is, of course unjustified, presumptuous, and futile: it is vainly trying to interpose man's measurements of time into the realm of God's timelessness: and all such matters are best left to the disposition of the Sovereign of the universe, who, we can be sure, "doeth all things well." (2) This final transmutation of the saint's natural body into his spiritual body is what is designated in the New Testament as the putting on of immortality (Rom. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:53-54); that is to say, in Scripture, immortality is a doctrine that has reference exclusively to the destiny of the *body* (Rom. 8:20-23). Immortality, moreover, is not something that all men have, or will have, regardless of the kind of life each may lead; on the contrary, immortality—the redemption of the body—is a reward of loving obedience to the Gospel requirements (Acts 2:38, Matt. 28:18-20, Acts 8:35-39, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 10:9-10) and of the faithful pursuit of the Spiritual Life (Rom. 2:7, 14:17; Heb. 12:24; Gal. 5:16-25; 2 Pet. 1:5-11, 3:18; Rev. 2:10, 3:5, 19:8). Strictly speaking, the word "eternal" means *without beginning or end*, whereas "immortal" means *having a beginning but no ending*. We must always distinguish, therefore, between *survival* and *immortality*: the two words are not synonymous. The spirit of man is eternal—it will live forever in one of two states, namely, in a state of reconciliation with God (Heaven) or in a state of separation from

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

God (Hell). (Cf. Matt. 25:46—here Jesus teaches explicitly that Hell is equally eternal with Heaven: this text clearly refutes theories of ultimate annihilation of the wicked, of the possibility of post-mortem repentance, or of possible salvation by proxy (Ezek. 18:19-20, Luke 16:19-31, Rom. 14:10, 2 Cor. 5:10, Rev. 20:11-15, etc.), and the like: notions characteristic of the cultists. The matter of importance to us, at this point, is that in Scripture teaching, there is no promise of spiritual bodies (immortality) to the lost, nor is there any information given us about the *kind* of bodies in which they will be tabernacled after the *Judgment*. However, Jesus certainly makes it clear, in Matt. 10:28, that they will take with them into the infernal abode some kind of body. And “to destroy,” as the term is used here, does not mean annihilation—it means eternal punishment in Gehenna (the real hell). (Note how frequently Jesus used the name Gehenna in His teaching: Matt. 5:22,29,30; 18:9; 23:15,33; cf. Heb. 10:31, Jas. 3:6.)

(3) 1 Cor. 15:44-49. Here the Apostle is setting forth in some detail the doctrine of the ultimate redemption of the bodies of the saints. Throughout this entire chapter, his subject is the *body*, especially the resurrection of the body, and that only. The sainted dead, he tells us, will come into possession of their spiritual bodies, when Jesus comes again, by *resurrection*; and those Christians who may be living on earth at the time will take on their spiritual bodies by *transfiguration* (vv. 50-55). Again, John the Beloved, we are told, saw “underneath the altar the *souls* of them that had been slain for the word of God,” etc. (Rev. 6:9); that is, evidently he saw the immortalized spirits of the redeemed—“the spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:23)—those whose redemption had been made complete by their putting on of their spiritual bodies (immortality), and hence were once again body-spirit unities or living souls. The first Adam, the Apostle

GENESIS

tells us, was a *living soul*—he was so created. The last Adam, he goes on to say, *became a life-giving spirit* (v. 45). Christ, the Second Adam (Rom. 5:12-19) has power, as the Crown of humanity, to give to His elect their new spiritual bodies: hence, He is said to have “abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel” (2 Tim. 1:10; John 10:14-18, 11:25-26). (Robertson (WPNT, IV, 195) comments on 1 Cor. 15:39 as follows: “Paul takes up animal life to show the great variety there is, as in the plant world. Even if evolution should prove to be true, Paul’s argument remains valid. Variety exists along with kinship. Progress is shown in the different kingdoms, progress that even argues for a spiritual body after the body of flesh is lost.”). To be sure, our Lord, while in the flesh, had a human spirit (Luke 23:46, John 19:30), but His human spirit was so possessed by the Holy Spirit that the terms “Spirit of Christ,” “Spirit of Jesus,” and “Holy Spirit,” are used interchangeably (John 3:31-36, Acts 16:6-8, 1 Pet. 1:10-12). Hence the Spirit of Jesus became truly a *life-giving Spirit* (Rom. 8:11); after three days, His Spirit returned to earth and gave life to His body which had been interred in Joseph’s tomb (Psa. 16:8-10; Acts 2:24-32; Rom. 8:11; Phil. 3:20-21; 1 John 3:2). This spiritual body, though exhibiting the same individuality, was different in texture from His former earthly body: it was of such a texture that he could manifest Himself at will regardless of physical barriers of any kind (Matt. 28:16-20; Mark 16:12-13, 16:19; Luke 24:13-15, 36-43, 50-51; John 20:11-18, 19-31; Acts 1:1-5, 9-11; 1 Cor. 15:1-8). His earthly body was constituted of flesh and blood. But “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 15:50); hence, His resurrection body was one of “flesh and bones” (John 20:24-29, Luke 24:39-40): evidently the blood, the seat of animal life, was gone. (Luke 24:39—Note how, in this Scripture, the risen Christ sought to impress upon His Apostles that He

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

was not a phantasm, not just a ghost.) Subsequently, at His Ascension to the Father, His body underwent a final change, known in Scripture as *glorification* (Dan. 12:3; John 7:39, 17:5; 1 Cor. 15:40-41; Rom. 2:7, Heb. 2:10): it was in His glorified body that He temporarily manifested Himself on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. 17:1-6, 2 Pet. 1:16-18); and it was in this body, the radiance of which was "above the brightness" of the noonday sun (Acts 9:1-9, 22:5-11, 26:12-18), that He appeared to Saul of Tarsus on the Damascus road, temporarily blinding the persecutor, but qualifying him for the apostleship (1 Cor. 15:8, 9:1; Acts 1:8, 2:33, 10:39-41, 26:16-18; 1 John 1:1). And Paul the Apostle informs us that it is God's Eternal Purpose that His elect—those whom, through the Gospel (Rom. 1:16), He calls, justifies, and glorifies (Acts 2:39, 2 Thess. 2:14, Rom. 10:16-17, 1 Cor. 4:15, 1 Pet. 5:10) are foreordained ultimately to be conformed to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:28-30); that is, redeemed in body and spirit, and hence—*again as living souls* (Rev. 6:9, Heb. 12:23)—clothed in glory and honor and immortality (incorruptible bodies, Rom. 2:7). Hence, note well 1 Tim. 6:14-16: it is the Lord Jesus Christ about whom the Apostle is writing here: He alone, it could truly be affirmed, as the firstborn from the dead (Col. 1:18, Acts 26:23), "hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable," seated at the right hand of God the Father Almighty (Acts 2:29-36, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Eph. 1:17-23, Phil. 2:9-11, 1 Pet. 3:21-22). There is no doctrine of "disembodied spirits" or "eternal bodilessness" in Biblical teaching. As to his essential nature, the living being (soul) known as man (generically) is a *body-spirit* (psychosomatic) unity, in whatever state he may exist, either in this world or in the world to come. It irks me beyond measure to find the statement in books and printed articles (written by men who ought to know better, and indeed would know better had they ever subjected themselves to the discipline of

GENESIS

metaphysics) that "human nature is changing." Again let me say that man *as to nature* is a body-spirit or body-mind unity, set apart as a species by his thought processes: should he cease to be such, *he would no longer be man*. A change of nature would be a *substantial* change, that is, a change from one kind of being to another kind. There is no evidence anywhere that man is undergoing any such change: should he do so, the human race would finally cease to exist. Changes in the form of corporeal maturation, or in the form of the addition of increments of knowledge to personality, etc., do take place constantly—but these are not changes of human nature; that is, and, as far as we know, always will be a body-spirit unity. To summarize in the words of Gareth L. Reese, in *The Sentinel* (organ of the Central Christian College of the Bible, Moberly, Missouri), issue of February, 1965: "By means of the Gospel, men have had disclosed to them the life of the future world, and the incorruptibility (*aphtharsis*) of body and soul. Paul has pointed out that the wicked survive death, and have wrath, indignation, tribulation and anguish awaiting them. He also taught that one of the things included in the redemptive act of Christ was the redemption of the body. Christ died for the body as well as for the soul. This is why he can speak of the uncorruptible body which awaits the redeemed at the second coming of Christ." (2 Tim. 1:10, Rom. 2:4-10, 1 Cor. 15, 1 Thess. 4:13-18). (A word of caution here: It will be noted that I have been using the phrases, "mind-body unity," and "spirit-body unity," as if they were synonymous. This, as pointed out previously, is not necessarily the case. It could well be that the former designates the *conscious*, the latter the *subconscious*, powers and activities of the interior man. Be that as it may, my contention is that either phrase designates what is called in Gen. 2:7 a *living soul*.)

(4) The duality of human nature is not only a fact psychosomatically, but a fact morally and spiritually as

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

well. (Perhaps I should make it clear at this point that in writing of the *duality* of human nature, I do not mean a duality of *being* (or essence); I mean, rather, a duality of operational activities, that is, of mental (or personal) as distinguished from corporeal processes.) Note, in this connection Rom. 7:14-24, 8:1-9; Gal. 5:16-25, etc. It should be understood that the term "flesh" as used in these Scriptures is the Pauline designation for the "natural" or "unregenerate" man (1 Cor. 2:14; cf. John 3:1-8, Tit. 3:4-7), one who, no matter how obvious his respectability, "morality," self-righteousness, etc., has not the Spirit (Jude 19, Rom. 8:9), and is therefore spiritually dead (Eph. 2:1, Col. 2:13). Evil, in Scripture, is not attributed to matter *as such*, nor to the body *as such*, nor to the right use of the body, but to the wrong use of it. Sin, according to New Testament teaching, has its fountainhead, not in the flesh (considered as body), but in "the mind of the flesh," the "carnal mind." (Cf. Matt. 15:18-20, Mark 7:20-23). This idea may be illustrated clearly by the Freudian doctrine of the *libido*, namely, that it—the libido—is the psychic energy by which the physiological sex drive is represented in the mind. Hence, one who thinks constantly of sex indulgence (lasciviousness, Gal. 5:19) is bound to have an over-developed libido. We are pretty generally what our thoughts make us to be: cf. Phil. 4:8-9; Rom. 1:21, 1:28-32). That is to say, it is the misuse of the body by the "carnal mind" that is the primary source of moral evil (sin). (No sin is ever committed that is not the choice of self above God, of *my* way of doing things over God's way of doing things.)

Perhaps it should be noted here that the rigid dualism of body and soul (*soma* and *psyche*) is not a Biblical teaching. It is a feature—an outstanding feature—of Oriental mysticisms and of Platonic philosophy. In the Socratic-Platonic system, the body is explicitly declared to be "the tomb of the soul," and true knowledge of the essences of

GENESIS

things, becomes possible only when the soul (after numerous re-incarnations) is finally liberated from the body, its corporeal prison. This, let me repeat for emphasis, is not Biblical teaching. Although in Scripture there is recognition of a duality of operational activities within human nature—of corporeal processes and mental (or personal) processes, of viscerogenic drives and psychogenic drives, etc.—there is no such notion of duality or dualism of human nature as essence or being, as that espoused by Oriental mysticism, Pythagoreanism, and Platonism.

11. *Christian Teaching about the Human Body.* I think we fail to recognize the high value that is placed on the human body in Biblical, and especially in New Testament, teaching. (1) In Scripture, for example, there is no such notion presented as that which characterizes some pagan, and even some so-called Christian sects (cultists)—the doctrine that to purify the soul one must punish the body: hence, fanatical forms of monasticism, long periods of “penance,” extreme periods of fasting, such practices as scarification, flagellation (whipping the body), and the like. (Look up the story of the Penitentes who have flourished unto this day in northern New Mexico.) The tendency of mysticism has always been to downgrade, and actually degrade, the human body. Plotinus (A.D. 205-270), for example, the founder of Neoplatonism, is said to have been ashamed he had a body, and would never name his parents nor remember his birthday. (2) In New Testament teaching, the body of the saint, the truly converted person, is said to become at conversion the temple of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38; Rom. 5:5, 8:11; 1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:19-20; 2 Cor. 1:21-22; Gal. 3:2; Eph. 1:13-14, 2:19-22; Eph. 4:30; Rev. 7, etc.). (3) In the New Testament, the human organism, which of course includes the body, is presented as a metaphor of the Body of Christ, the Church (Eph. 1:22-23, 4:12, 5:22; Col. 1:18, 24; Col. 2:19; 1 Cor. 12:27). (4) In the New Testament, we find

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

many exhortations to temperance, cleanness, and chastity, which have primary reference to the body (Rom. 1:26-27, 12:1; Matt. 5:27-31; 1 Cor. 5:9-11, 6:9-10, 6:13, 9:27; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:5; 1 Thess. 4:3-8; 1 Tim. 1:9-10, 6:9-10; Tit. 2:12; Heb. 13:4; 1 Pet. 1:15, 2:11; Jas. 3:1-6; Rev. 21:8, 22:15). (4) In Scripture, as we have pointed out several times, human redemption includes the redemption of the whole psychosomatic unity—the living being known as man—the last phase of which is the redemption of the body, which is designated the putting on of immortality (Rom. 2:7). Progression in human redemption is from the Kingdom of Nature, through the Kingdom of Grace, into the Kingdom of Glory. Christianity is the only religious system in which emphasis is placed on the importance of the human body, its care, and its proper functions. *This is just another form of the uniqueness of the Christian faith.*

12. *How Man Differs from the Brute.* As far as we can ascertain from the observation of animal behavior, the differences between the operational powers of the brute and man are vast, and may be summarized as follows: (1) The brute, through the media of his physical senses, is *conscious*, that is, aware of the events of his physical environment. But man is *self-conscious*: he distinguishes between the *me* and the *not-me*. I am aware, not only of the manuscript page on which I am typing these words, but also of the fact that *I* am doing the typing. Hence, man, being a *person* created in God's image (Exo. 3:14), uses *personal* pronouns. If a brute could ever say, meaningfully to itself, "I am," it would no longer be *just* an animal. (2) The brute has *percepts* deriving originally from sensations. Man, however, has *concepts* as well as percepts, and concepts derive from his thought processes. By means of concepts, man is able to transcend the space-time continuum which he now inhabits. (3) The brute gives no evidence of having the power of reasoning (from *this* to

that). Certainly no man would be so foolish as to try to teach his old dog the principles of calculus, either differential or integral. But man is capable of both inductive (from experience to ideas) and deductive (from idea to idea) reasoning. Hence, it is man alone who has developed the sciences of pure mathematics and pure (symbolic) logic. (4) The brute forms no judgments; that is, gives no evidence of mental ability to unite two percepts by affirmation or to separate them by denial (*e.g.*, The rose *is* red, or, The rose *is not* red). But man is constantly forming and communicating judgments. A judgment in epistemology becomes a proposition in logic and a sentence in grammar; hence, man has developed all these branches of knowledge. (5) The brute, having no ideas to express in propositional language, is confined to the language of gestures, dances, cries, etc. But man has ideas—very complex ideas at times—and can communicate them in the form of propositional language. (6) The brute is *determined* in its acts by its physiological impulses. But man is *self-determined*. In every human act, three sets of factors are involved, namely, those of heredity, those of environment, and those of the personal reaction. Self-determination in man is the power of the self, the I, to determine its own acts (make its own decisions, choices, etc.). Freedom is the power to act or not to act, or to act in one way instead of another, in any given situation. (7) The brute seems to have little or no freedom from *instinct* (which has been called the “Great Sphinx of nature”). Think how restricted, how utterly uninteresting, life would be for man if he were confined solely to grooves of instinctive behavior? But man has intelligence which empowers him to vary his responses, even to delay them; and by means of intellect, he can make progress through trial-and-error. (8) The brute seems to have no power of contrary choice, But man has this power. Everyone knows from experience that in his various acts, he *could have* chosen

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

to act differently. Common sense tells him that he is not indeterminable, nor completely determinable, but actually self-determinable, in the last analysis. Freedom, negatively defined, is immunity from necessity. (9) The brute gives no evidence of having moral or spiritual propensities. But man has never been found so depraved as to be completely without them. (10) Hence, the brute, although manifesting responses which seem to indicate affection, pleasure, guilt, shame, remorse, and the like, certainly does not have *conscience* in any true sense of the term. Conscience is the voice of practical reason; only where there is reason, can there be conscience. Man alone possesses conscience in the strict sense of the term. When one does what one has been brought up to believe to be right, conscience approves; when one does that which one has been brought up to believe to be wrong, conscience chides. Conscience is what it is educated to be, and man alone is capable of such education. Because of this lack of ability to make moral distinctions, the brute is not considered responsible before the law—the brute is not regarded as a moral creature with moral responsibility. We do not haul our animals into court and charge them with crimes; such a procedure would be ludicrous. Nor does anyone in his right mind ever try to teach his old horse, dog, cat, or any other kind of pet, the Ten Commandments, or the multiplication tables, or the alphabet. (11) Man is distinguished from the brute especially *in the tremendous range of his moral potential*. As Aristotle has stated the case so realistically (*Politics*, I, 2, 1253a, Jowett trans.): “Man, when perfected, is the best of animals, but, when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all; since armed injustice is the more dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony.” Indeed, man

is capable of more heinous acts of lust, cruelty, violence, and viciousness of all kinds, than any brute; and even more destructive in their consequences are his sins of pride, ambition, greed, overweening arrogance, and the like—"sins of the spirit"—of which the brute can hardly be considered capable at all. It has been rightly said that man's range of moral potential is such that he can either walk up in the Milky Way or wallow in the gutter, depending of course on his own individual attitude toward life and its meaning. (12) The distinction between the brute and the child *is a distinction of kind (nature) and not of degree.* Just as a poppy seed cannot produce a mustard plant, so the brute does not have the potentialities of a human being. The child has the essential elements of human nature potentially from conception and birth: the brute never has them at any time in its life. Undoubtedly the human race—*homo sapiens*—had its beginning in an original pair, the male and the female, from whom all their progeny have inherited by ordinary generation the body-spirit unity by which human nature is specified. (It is generally held by scientists, I think, that there has been only one alleged case of biological evolution terminating in *homo sapiens*. All theories of alleged "centers of human origin" are built on sheer conjecture. But should these theories be validated later, the fact still remains that "homo sapiens"—the name adopted by scientists for man as we know him—had his origin in the union of the male and the female. No provision exists in nature, that anyone knows of, for homosexual procreation.) The first man was created a living soul by the free act of God in endowing him with the Breath of Life; the child—every child of Adam's progeny—is a living soul through the media of secondary causes (parental procreation). The child who matures in this terrestrial environment will have a personality actualized largely through the interaction of the factors of heredity and those of environment (plus, as we have said, the per-

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

sonal reactions). Who knows, then, but that the child who dies in infancy will acquire a personality constituted of the factors which go to make up his celestial (heavenly) environment? For, as Jesus states expressly, "to such belongeth the kingdom of God" (Luke 18:15-17, Matt. 19:13-15, Mark 10:13-16, Matt. 18:1-6). We must remember that our Lord, by His death on the Cross, atoned for the innocent and the irresponsible *unconditionally* (John 1:29, Rom. 3:20, 5:18-19). (13) Absolute beginnings are certainly *supernatural* or at least *superhuman*; but entities so begun are perpetuated by the operation of natural forces (secondary causes). This does not mean that the essential elements of personality must depend on physical conditions for their own actualization and development, *as if they were properties of matter*. To be sure, a healthy body is distinctly an asset to a spiritually healthy mentality; still and all, we know that great intelligence and spirituality may develop in weak physical frames. There is no limit to the potential development of the "inward man" in holiness, until his perfection is attained in the putting on of immortality. (Matt. 5:8, 5:48; Rom. 14:17; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 3:12; Heb. 12:14, 12:23; 1 Pet. 5:10; 2 Pet. 3:18). To suppose that any such potentialities characterize the brute would be the height of absurdity.

13. *Man is Specified as Man by His Thought Processes.* (1) By "specified" is meant here, *set apart* (i.e., from the lower animals) *as a distinct species*. Man is specified by his power of *reason*: this includes the thought processes of which he is capable. Science supports this reasoning by its designation of man as *homo sapiens*, from the Latin *homo*, "a human being," "a man," and *sapiens*, "sensible," "knowing," "wise," etc. (2) Man can be defined *specifically* only in the light of those operational concepts which have peculiar reference to him as man. (By "operational" is meant a judgment, based on shared experience, not of what an entity appears to be, but of how it acts.) The

GENESIS

operational concepts relating to man may be divided roughly into three classes as determined by the "levels of organization" or "dimensions" in his being: namely, those which are specific of him, characteristic of man only—the psychical, metapsychical, and psychological concepts; those which he shares with all living beings—the biological and physiological concepts; and those of physics, chemistry, and mechanics, those which he shares with the inanimate creation—the physiochemical concepts. An incalculable amount of error has crept into scientific thinking as a consequence of the unwarranted mingling of the concepts peculiar to one dimension of the human being with those specific of another. So writes the late Dr. Alexis Carrel (MU, 32-34): he goes on to say: "It is nothing but word play to explain a psychological phenomenon in terms of cell physiology or of quantum mechanics. However, the mechanistic physiologists of the nineteenth century, and their disciples who still linger with us, have committed such an error in endeavoring to reduce man entirely to physical chemistry. This unjustified generalization of the results of sound experience is due to over-specialization. Concepts should not be misused. They must be kept in their place in the hierarchy of the sciences." (3) All the attempts which have been made in recent years to reduce man to a kind of "glorified brute" have ended—as all such attempts are bound to do—in complete failure, for the obvious reason that man is *more than* a brute. Even the most ardent evolutionist admits—at least implicitly—that man has evolved *beyond* the brute stage; that is to say, that he is animal *plus*, and it is the plus that makes him man. Man is specifically mind, spirit, etc., that is, that part of the organism which *is* man actually, is essentially non-corporeal. Or, as one writer has put it: "Spatial predicates do not apply to minds or ideas." The very fact that man has advanced beyond the mere animal stage (as the evolutionists would put it) means that he is obligated by his

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

very nature to use his reason to control his appetites and passions and to direct his will. (4) Any adequate study of human abilities must involve the problem of "the meaning of meaning." A sensation is an event in the nervous system, But the consciousness (awareness) of this sensation is something else. Obviously, it is not the sensation itself, but an experience caused by the sensation. The sensation is event A, the consciousness of it is event B. And no one knows, no one can even begin to explain, what consciousness really is. We do know, however, that consciousness brings into play certain word-symbols, such as "joy," "pain," "sorrow," "disgust," "remorse," etc., to identify the particular sensation or affect. But the use of word-symbols obtrudes the whole problem of meaning into the picture: to what do these word-symbols refer? Sensation is physiological, to be sure. But experience convinces us that consciousness does not belong in that category, and that meaning cannot be reduced to physiology at all. Sensation occurs in the body, *but meaning is a phenomenon of the thought process. There is no correlate in the brain for meaning in thought. Hence the utter folly of trying to reduce psychology to sheer physiology.*

14. *The Power of Abstract Thought* specifies man as man. (1) "Abstract" is from *abs*, "from," and *trahere*, "to draw," hence, "to draw from." Cognition, or knowing, for example, is a process of abstraction. The first step in cognition is the sense-perception of an object, such as a chair, book, etc. The second step is that of image-ing or *imagination*, the process by which the mind abstracts and stores away the *image* of the thing perceived. (When a student leaves the classroom, he does not take with him "in his head" or in his mind the actual chair in which he has been sitting; he takes only the image of the chair.) The third and final step in cognition occurs when the mind abstracts from both the sense-perceived thing and the image thereof, a process which is known as *conceptualization*. The con-

GENESIS

cept (universal, form) is essentially an act of thought, a determination of the essence of the thing once perceived, that is, the aggregate of properties which puts the thing (apprehended as the object) in its particular class of things. It is by conceptualizing that man is able to transcend the space-time dimension in which he is confined corporeally. *E.g.*, the word "horse," as such, as a combination of letters, is only a symbol. But every symbol has its referent; every figure is a figure of *something*. Hence, the referent of the word-symbol "horse" may be an actual horse now being perceived by physical vision, *i.e.*, the *percept* (particular). Or its referent may be the totality of the properties which go to make up the essence of every horse that ever did or ever will exist, *i.e.*, the *concept* (universal). This means that man is capable of thinking in terms of past, present, and future: it means that he is capable of compiling a dictionary in which concepts are stereotyped in the form of definitions. (2) Man's power of abstract thinking has enabled him to construct *language* by means of which he communicates ideas. Anthropologists generally agree, I think, that man's inherent ability to construct language is the one factor which, above all others, has enabled him to drive forward throughout the ages to his present level of being and culture. As Gillin writes (WMIA, 451): "By far the most ubiquitous type of symbol systems used by human beings is spoken language." Again, "The ability to speak articulate language is, apparently, a feature in which the human species is unique." Susanne Langer writes (PNK, 83): "Language is, without doubt, the most momentous and at the same time the most mysterious product of the human mind. Between the clearest animal call or love or warning or anger, and a man's least, trivial *word*, there lies a whole day of Creation." Sapir (Lang., 8-10) writes: "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

system of voluntarily produced symbols." He then goes on to state that language is not exclusively a psychophysical construct: the so-called "organs of speech" (lungs, larynx, palate, nose, tongue, and lips) he says "are no more to be thought of as primary organs of speech than are the fingers to be considered as essentially organs of piano-playing or the knee as the organ of prayer." In a word, these are organs of speech if and when the person (the mind or will) chooses to use them as such. Sapir concludes: "Hence, we have no recourse but to accept language as a fully formed functional system within man's psychic or 'spiritual' constitution. We cannot define it as an entity in psychophysical terms alone, however much the psychophysical basis is essential to its functioning." Language is not only the medium by which conceptual thought is developed; it is also the means of making such thought communicable. Culture follows communication, and is enhanced by progress in facility of communication. Language, says Sapir, is universal, and perhaps the oldest of human inventions. (3) Again, man's development of the sciences of pure mathematics is perhaps the most obvious example of his power of thinking in abstract symbols. The anthropological theory that man first learned to count (in terms of tens, of course) by using his fingers and thumbs as "counters," would seem to be a reasonable explanation. Indeed, "counters" are used in the classroom today to make young children acquainted with the number series. We can be sure, however, that "counters" (marbles, pebbles, blocks, etc.) were never used anywhere or under any circumstances to multiply 999,999 by 999,999. Pure mathematics in its more complex aspects must have been the product of human *thought* in its most abstract form. Mathematics is, of course, like verbal speech, one of the sciences of communication. The same is basically true of music: as everyone knows, music has its foundation in mathematical relationships—a fact which the Greek

GENESIS

philosopher-mystic, Pythagoras, discovered in the long, long ago. Man has what might be called indefinite (though not infinite) power to think and live in mathematical, and hence metaphysical, terms. (4) The meaning of meaning is in itself an abstraction. Meaning is an essential feature of consciousness, over and above, and of a nature different from, the sensory content. A word that is read to a person comes into that person's consciousness as sound *and meaning*. A wild beast perceives a *sound* in the human voice; a trained animal discovers a kind of *meaning* (perhaps a command, or a summons to food and drink); but a human being alone discerns therein a *thought*. There is no alchemy of wishful thinking by which a mental process can be reduced to a cellular process exclusively: no matter how the two processes are correlated, they are *not identical*. Any theory that consciousness has no real efficacy or significance, or that mind, as a projection of a biological process, can be described simply in terms of stimulus and response is utterly inadequate to account for the more refined abstract phenomena of man's psychical and metapsychical dimensions. (5) Dr. Ernst Cassirer, in his excellent little book, *An Essay on Man*, develops the thesis that man is to be defined, not in terms of a metaphysical substance of some kind, nor in terms of an empirically discerned biological set of instincts, but in terms of his specific tendency to think and live by means of symbols. It is this power and tendency to "symbolify," Cassirer holds, which has produced the facets of his culture, namely, language, art, myth, and ritual. Even much of his history is written in terms of symbols—records and documents surviving from past ages. And symbolizing, no matter what form it may take, is essentially abstraction.

15. *The Power of Creative Imagination* also specifies man as man. Creative imagination is thinking in terms of the possible and the ideal: it lies at the root of practically all of man's achievements. It is popularly regarded, of

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

course, as confined to the realm of art, as finding its outlet primarily in artistic productions. This it surely does: as Chesterton has put it, "Art is the signature of man." But we must not overlook the fact that man's creative imagination is equally as responsible for his science as for his art. The scientist, in his laboratory, envisions what might be, under such-and-such conditions; he proceeds to set up the conditions; then he performs the experiment and thus demonstrates whether his theory is true or false. Thus it is—by the trial-and-error method—that science has attained the level of achievement which it exhibits in our day. Man's creative imagination is the root of all his technology; scarcely an invention (tool) is known which did not exist in theory before it existed in fact. Then, too, man has always been subject to the lure of the *ideal*: think of the "utopian" books which have been written, embodying man's efforts to envision and portray the ideal society: Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Campanella's *City of the Sun*, Butler's *Erewhon*, etc. Think of the achievements of such creative geniuses as Pythagoras, Archimedes, Paracelsus, Da Vinci, the Curies, Pasteur, the Mayos, Einstein, etc.! There is little doubt that man's creative imagination has its fountainhead in the powers of the Subconscious.

16. *A Sense of Values* also specifies man as man. (1) Because he is a rational and moral being, he has ever demonstrated his propensity to *evaluate*: hence, to coin such words as "truth," "honor," "beauty," "justice," "goodness," and the like—terms which have no meaning whatsoever for a lower animal. There are many who hold that this sense of values is innate: Aristotle, for example, had this to say (*Politics*, I, 2, 1253a, Jowett trans.): "It is a characteristic of man that he alone has any sense of good and evil, of just and unjust, and the like, and the association of living beings who have this sense makes a family

GENESIS

and a state." Scholastic philosophers likewise have consistently maintained that the sense of right and wrong, of good and bad, is inherent in all men, whatever their condition in life or level of culture: that no people ever existed lacking this elementary sense of moral discrimination. This they designate the Ethical Fact. (2) It must be acknowledged that this sense of values has inspired man's development of the science of jurisprudence. Jurisprudence has its basis in morality; that is, in human relations, relations among moral beings (persons). As ethics, the science of moral action, has been developed little by little throughout the centuries, so jurisprudence, the science of law, has been developed little by little along with ethics. Jurisprudence is the product of man's reason, formulated for the purpose of preserving those relations and acts which he has found necessary to his well-being, and preventing those which he has found to be destructive of individual character and social order. (3) Law is either *customary* (handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation) or *statutory* (permanently embodied in some stereotyped form). Originally, law was promulgated in the form of tradition; later, when writing came into use, by carving on wood, stone, metal, clay tablets, etc. (e.g., the Roman Law of the Twelve Tables; the two tables of stone of the Mosaic Code; the Code of Hammurabi in Babylon, about 1800 B.C., engraved on a pillar of black diorite, and now in the Louvre, Paris; the Code of Solon in Athens, carved on wooden rollers or prisms, set up in the court of the archon *basileus*, so that they could be turned and read by the people, etc.). In the later historic period, law was inscribed on parchment or papyrus; today, it exists in printed form, in the statute books of civilized peoples. *Law is the product of human thought: anyone with an ounce of "gumption" knows that neither ethics nor jurisprudence exists among brutes.*

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

17. *The Power of Laughter* also specifies man as man. This is a fact which cannot be over-emphasized. But what is laughter? We do not know. Books and parts of books have been written on the subject, without shedding much light on the source or nature of this remarkable human phenomenon. Genuine humor is, of course, the ability to laugh at the follies and foibles of mankind, especially one's own, without becoming bitter: it is to recognize man's frailties but to go on loving him in spite of them. Genuine humorists are rare in the history of world literature (such as Chaucer, Sterne, Jane Austen, Will Rogers): too many have vitiated humor by resort to bitterness, cynicism, cruel satire, and the like (e.g., Jonathan Swift and Mark Twain). The sense of humor is a priceless possession, and one which we Americans cannot lose without losing our heritage. Richard Armour, writing in *The Saturday Evening Post*, of December 12, 1953, has presented the case eloquently. "An American fighter pilot," he writes, "shot down behind the North Korean lines, imprisoned for two and a half years, starved until he weighed barely 100 pounds, and beaten time and again to the edge of unconsciousness, made three extremely revealing statements when he got home. The first: 'I never saw any evidence of a sense of humor on the part of the Chinese and North Korean Communists.' The second: 'One thing that made it possible for us to stick it out was our seeing the funny side of things.' The third: 'How about the fellows who couldn't laugh? They're dead.'" This writer goes on to show that dictators are necessarily humorless men. For them to fail to be deadly serious would be to vitiate the impression of their self-exploited indispensability which they must keep uppermost in the minds of their dupes. For them to permit themselves to be "laughed at" would result in their downfall. "The sourpuss," says Mr. Armour, "is as much a trade-mark of Communism as the hammer and sickle." He concludes: "Dictators fear

GENESIS

laughter and know that people who keep their wit as well as their wits about them—as the Dutch did under the Nazis, and the Poles now do under the Communists—are hard to subjugate. A sense of humor may be the secret weapon of the democracies. Laughter is healthy, wholesome and civilizing. Laughing at our sometimes desperate circumstances helps keep us sane. Laughter at our sometimes overproud, sometimes overpetty, selves helps keep us down to—and up to—human size. After all, the ability to laugh is one of the distinctions between man and the animals. It may also be one of the distinctions between free people and slaves." *It is a recognized fact that a well-developed sense of humor is one of the unfailing ear-marks of a mature person.* A popular novelist makes one of his characters remark about a certain young woman: "When once she learns to laugh at herself, she will begin to grow up." The sense of humor, and the power of laughter which goes with it, seem to be lost only when men cease to be genuinely human and become fanatics crazed by the assumption of their own self-righteousness and indispensability.

18. *The Phenomena of the Subconscious* uniquely specify man as man. (1) There is no more generally accepted fact in present-day psychology than that of the unbroken continuity of the psychic processes on the subliminal level. The total content of the psyche is at any given time far more vast than the content of consciousness at the particular time. (2) Intimations of the powers of the inner self which have been opened to view by psychic research are found in two of the most common facts of human experience, namely, *the subconscious association of ideas and the subconscious maturing of thought*, as illustrated in the sudden appearing in a dream or in a dreamlike moment of waking, of the solution of a problem which has been vexing the mind in the hours of objective awareness and reasoning. (3) Review, at this point, the

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

distinctions between the objective and subjective, the conscious and subconscious, aspects of the psyche ("the inward man") as interpreted by present-day research, as presented *supra* in the section entitled, "Body, Soul, and Spirit." In this connection, the student must also keep in mind the fact that the Subconscious of psychic phenomena, which is completely psychical in content, is not to be confused with the Unconscious of Freudianism, which is psychophysiological. (Review also the "stream-of-consciousness" psychology of William James.) (4) *Hypnosis* is practiced extensively today, in different fields—in dentistry, sometimes in surgery, in childbirth, etc. *Autohypnosis* occurs in trances characteristic of orgiastic "religious" cults. *Catalepsy* is a state of deep hypnosis in which the patient is rendered insensible to fleshly pain. Compare hibernation in animals, for example, with suspended animation in human beings. (5) Phenomena of the Subconscious which indicate the human spirit's transcendence of the space-time dimension are *telepathy* (communication of thought and feeling from one person to another, regardless of distance involved, without the mediation of the physical senses), *clairvoyance* (the power to see physical objects or events apart from the media of the physical senses), and *prescience* (foreknowledge of events in time). These are the phenomena included under the well-known term, extra-sensory perception, ESP. These phenomena are under study in various colleges and universities in our day, notably by Dr. J. B. Rhine and his colleagues of the Department of Parapsychology at Duke University. (See Rhine's books, *The Reach of the Mind*, *The New World of the Mind*, etc.) Certainly such phenomena as *telepathy* and *clairvoyance* support the Biblical doctrines of inspiration and revelation: if human spirit can communicate with human spirit without the use of physical media, surely the Divine Spirit can in like manner communicate God's truth to selected human spirits (Acts

GENESIS

2:4, 1 Cor. 2:10-13, Matt. 16:16-17, John 16:13-14, Matt. 10:19-20). The phenomena of *prescience*, of course, support the claim of prophetic insight and prophetic transcendence of time that is characteristic of Biblical religion. (6) Phenomena of the Subconscious which point up the human spirit's apparently unlimited power of knowing, are *perfect memory* and *perfect perception of the fixed mathematical laws of nature*. Thus the *perfect memory* of the Subconscious provides a scientific basis for the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. Who knows but that perfect memory, by which the self preserves the records of its own deeds, both good and evil, may prove to be "the worm that never dies," and conscience (that is, unforgiven, guilty conscience) "the fire that is never quenched" (Luke 16:19-31, Mark 9:43-48, Rev. 20:11-15). Again, the *perfect perception*, by the Subconscious, of the *fixed laws of nature*, supports the view that Life Everlasting will not be a matter of stretched-out time, but essentially illumination or fulness of knowledge, that is, intuitive apprehension of eternal Truth, Beauty, and Goodness: in a word, eternal life will be wholeness or holiness—the union of the human mind with the Mind of God in knowledge, and of the human will with the Will of God in love. This will be the Summum Bonum, the Beatific Vision (1 Cor. 13:12, 1 John 3:1-3). (In the life we now live on earth this phenomenon of *perfect perception* manifests itself in mathematical prodigies, musical prodigies (perfect pitch), photographic memory, idiot-savants, and the various aspects and fruits of what we call *creative imagination*.) (7) Phenomena of the Subconscious which support the view that spirit (mind) is pre-eminent over body are those which are exhibited in cases of *suggestion* and *auto-suggestion*. These phenomena remind us that all men are endowed by the Creator with psychic powers designed to be of great value to them in maintaining physical and mental health, if they will but utilize these

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

powers as they should. (Cf. Prov. 23:7, Phil. 4:8). This fundamental fact is the basis of what is known and practiced in our day as *psychosomatic medicine*. (See the great work by H. Bernheim, *Suggestive Therapeutics*, recently re-published by the London Book Company, 30-41 Fiftieth Street, Woodside, New York.) (8) Phenomena such as those of *psychokinesis*, levitation, automatic writing, the projection of ectoplasms and phantasms, and the like, seem to indicate that the thought energy of the Subconscious has the power to transmute itself into what we call "physical" energy and thus to produce "physical" phenomena. Psychokinesis (or telekinesis) is that kind of phenomenon in which ponderable objects are said to be influenced, and even moved, by thought energy alone. Dr. Rhine and his colleagues have long been experimenting in this field and claim to have obtained positive results. In *automatic writing*, the Subconscious is said to assume control of the nerves and muscles of the arm and hand and to propel the pencil. *Levitation* is not, as often defined, the *illusion* that a heavy body is suspended in the air without visible support: it is alleged by students of psychic phenomena to be the real thing, produced by subconscious thought power. *Ectoplasm* is defined by Hamlin Garland as an elementary substance that is given off by the human body, at the command of the Subconscious, in varying degrees. He conceives it to be ideoplastic, that is, capable of being moulded, by the subjective thought power either of the psychic or of the sitter, in various shapes. To quote the distinguished physicist, Dr. Millikan: "To admit telekinesis and the formation of ectoplasmic phantasms is not to destroy the smallest fragment of science—it is but to admit new data, to recognize that here are unknown energies. Materialization does not contradict one established fact: it merely adds new facts" (quoted by Garland, FYPR, 379,380). Phantasms are described as thought projections of the Subconscious, that is,

GENESIS

ethereal reconstructions of matter by the power of thought. They may be called "embodied thoughts," we are told, even as man may rightly be called the embodied thought of God. Truly, then, *thoughts are things*. (It should be made clear at this point that these phenomena are not to be identified with aspects of what is known in Scripture as necromancy, such as, for example, alleged communication between the dead and the living. All forms of necromancy, conjuration, sorcery, occultism, etc., are strictly condemned in both the Old and New Testaments: (cf. Exo. 22:18, Lev. 19:26,31; Lev. 20:6, Deut. 18:10-12; Gal. 5:20, Rev. 21:8, 22:15, etc.). (9) All such phenomena as psychokinesis, levitation, ectoplasms, phantasms, etc., serve to support the view of the primacy of thought (spirit) in the totality of being. In the possession and use of these powers of thought energy, thought projection, and thought materialization, man, it is contended, reveals the spark of the Infinite that is in him, and thus himself gives evidence of having been created *in God's image*. For, is not the cosmos itself, according to Biblical teaching, a construct of the Divine Will, a projection of the Divine Spirit, an embodiment of the Divine Thought as expressed by the Divine Word (Gen. 1; Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6; Heb. 11:3)? Biblical teaching is simply that the Will of God, as expressed by His Word, and actualized by His Spirit, is the Constitution (that which constitutes) of our universe, both physical and moral.

(10) To summarize: It will thus be seen that the phenomena of the Subconscious prove that "mind" is continuously active—it never sleeps, not even when the body is at rest. They also go to prove the independence, transcendence, and imperishability of the essential human person, the human spirit, and therefore support the spiritualistic (as against the materialistic) view of man's origin, nature, and destiny. They confirm the fact of the primacy of spirit in man, and, on the basis of the Principle

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

of Sufficient Reason (that whatever *begins* to exist must have an adequate cause) they support our conviction of the priority and sovereignty of the Divine Spirit in whose image man was created (John 4:24; Job 32:8, 33:4; Heb. 12:9). (For those who wish to pursue the study of the Subconscious further, the following books are recommended, in addition to those already mentioned as works by Dr. Rhine: F. W. H. Myers, *The Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, 2 vols., Longmans, Green and Company, New York; Hereward Carrington, *The Story of Psychic Science*, published by Ives Washburn, New York; Dr. Alexis Carrel, *Man the Unknown*, published by Harpers, New York; Hamlin Garland, *Forty Years of Psychic Research*, Macmillan, New York. Also *The Law of Psychic Phenomena*, by Dr. T. J. Hudson, the 32nd edition of which was published in 1909. Some of these works are now out of print, but copies are usually available at second-hand bookstores. For out-of-print books, write the London Book Company, Woodside, New York, or Basil Blackwell, Broad Street, Oxford, England.)

19. *The Mind-Body Problem*. That thought processes do take place continuously in man, no matter how they are to be accounted for, can hardly be a matter of controversy: such processes are facts of every person's experience. This, of course, accentuates the old *mind-body problem*, which is no nearer solution today than it ever was. (1) Generally speaking, it appears to be an empirical fact that mental life, as man experiences it in his present state, is correlated with brain activity: if certain parts of the brain are damaged or removed, certain aspects of conscious life cease to occur. To say, however, that either consciousness or thought is *connected with* the activity of brain cells in some inscrutable manner is a far cry from affirming that either consciousness or thought is exclusively brain activity. *Correlation is not identity*. We have already noted the distinctions between sensation, on the one hand,

GENESIS

and consciousness and meaning, on the other. We repeat here that there is no correlate between cellular activity in the brain and meaning in thought. The idea that such a connection exists, is inconceivable. Moreover, the fact that brain activity is in some way connected with mental activity in no way militates against the Biblical doctrines of survival and immortality. (This matter is fully treated *infra*, in the section on "The Assumptions of Scientism.")

(2) We often hear statements such as the following: "Thoughts are nothing but electro-chemical impulses through neural pathways in the brain." "Colors are nothing but different wave-lengths of radiant energy." "Pain is nothing but a certain kind of excitation of the nerve-endings." "Sounds are nothing but movements in a vibrating medium which make their impact on the human ear." "Man is nothing but a biological being." The foregoing statements (cliches) are examples of the (now recognized in logic) fallacy of *over-simplification*, sometimes called the "nothing-but" fallacy or the "reductive" fallacy. They are unjustifiable identifications of mental events with physical or physiological events. The human being is not so simply constructed. (3) Present-day philosophy does not regard the mind-body problem, as being any nearer solution than it has been in the past. Plato, as we have noted, was a complete dualist. For him, the soul (or mind) was an eternally pre-existent entity, which is incarcerated for the time being in an alien corporeal prison-house, from which it may be liberated ultimately, after successive re-incarnations, only by the death of the body. Plato's great pupil, Aristotle, taught that the soul exists as the animating principle of the living body in this world, that body and soul co-exist in an inseparable organic unity, that indeed the soul cannot exist independently of the body which it informs and actualizes. Augustine modified the teaching of Platonism on this subject by affirming that man is both body and soul and must be

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

redeemed (perfected) as "a thing of both flesh and spirit." Aquinas, strictly a disciple of Aristotle, interpreted the latter as teaching that the soul might possibly exist apart from the body, but can exist in a fully perfected state only when united to body, either in this natural life or in its resurrected state. Descartes, the first of the modern philosophers, also modified Platonic dualism, by defining man (that is, mind) as "finite thinking substance," thus restricting the term "soul" to include only the human thought processes. We have already noted that Biblical teaching throughout presents the human being as a body-spirit (or body-mind) unity (Psa. 84:2), and expressly affirms that salvation occurs ultimately, that is, as perfected or complete, in the clothing of the redeemed in their spiritual (or ethereal) bodies. This body-spirit or body-mind doctrine is in complete harmony with the psychosomatic (or *organismic*) approach of modern science, especially the science of medicine. ("Organismic" in philosophy designates a structure "with parts so integrated that their relation to one another is governed by their relation to the whole."). Again I affirm that this organismic interpretation of the human being is in complete accord with the Christian doctrine of immortality. (4) However, psychologists who adopt the organismic approach to the study of the human being, even when this approach is applied to the study of human *behavior* exclusively, find themselves compelled to adopt dualistic concepts in describing human motivation: hence, they distinguish between what they call "viscerogenic" (*i.e.*, biological or physiological) drives, and what they call "psychogenic" (*i.e.*, originating in more refined—and essentially personal—factors, such as ideals, interests, values, tastes, inclinations, sentiments, traits, attitudes, etc.) drives. I suggest that it would be conducive to clarity of understanding to use the simpler terms, "physical" and "mental" (or "psychical"), respectively.

GENESIS

(5) One proposed solution of the mind-body problem is that which is designated *epiphenomenalism*, a term coined by T. H. Huxley. This is the view that "mind" is just the name we give to certain phenomena which merely *accompany* certain kinds of processes and changes in the nervous system; so-called mental states are a kind of aura, so to speak, which hover about the brain processes without having any substantive existence themselves or any special function; in a word, mind is "nothing but" a "natural" brain function. Consciousness arises in some kind of transformation of neural energy, but is not itself a distinct form of being of any kind. Whatever movement takes place is a one-way process: from body toward what is called "mind," never from mind toward body. Now there is indeed a possibility that there is a correlation between the forces of the electro-magnetic field and the life and thought processes. This, however, does not necessarily mean that when the physical body dies, the mind, self, or person dies with it. As we shall note later, contrary to the assumptions of the materialists, this theory can be seen readily to harmonize with the Biblical doctrine of immortality. (6) A few clarifying words are in order here about the much-exploited Conditioned Reflex, and along with it, Watsonian *behaviorism*. The Conditioned Reflex (the "dog-and-drool" psychology), the most rudimentary form of learning, is essentially a physiological act. This—the "conditioned reflex"—is a term which has been given widespread currency in recent years (with but little justification) as a result of the experiments reported by the Russian biologist, Pavlov (died in 1936). Pavlov performed his experiment on dogs. Having first made sure that the visual perception of food (stimulus A) would elicit a flow of saliva (for which he contrived a measuring apparatus) and that the sound of a gong (stimulus B) would not, Pavlov then presented gong and food together, either in immediate succession or with some temporal overlap, for a number of times,

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

and found that the presentation of the sound of the gong (stimulus B) alone would then cause salivation. A similar technique has been used many times with human subjects and it has been found that responses can be "conditioned" in the same way. This is especially true of infants; as a matter of fact, reflexive conditioning is perhaps the most elementary form of learning. It is certainly the *modus operandi* of animal training. It is now known, however, that a conditioned reflex, although established by many repetitions of both the original and conditioning stimuli, is soon lost. Moreover, it should be noted that whatever may be the stimulus that produces it (*i.e.*, whether the original or the conditioning stimulus), the *response* is not altered by the conditioning. This means that conditioning is simply the extension of the range of stimuli that will elicit the same response: hence it is at most only a theory of *afferent* ("bearing inward") learning. And by no stretch of the imagination can this type of conditioning rightly be regarded as accounting for more than just a small fraction of the learning process. It is obvious that the process of learning as a whole involves not only an extension of the range of effective stimuli (*afferent* learning), but also conscious alteration of response to the same stimulus (*efferent*—"bearing outward"—learning). This alteration of response, moreover, must come from within the individual and involves personal choice: *indeed man is distinguished from the brute by his power of varying his responses, and even of delaying his response, to the same stimulus (e.g., eating a steak to satisfy an immediate demand of the appetite, or refraining from eating the steak for the sake of health)*. Variability of possible responses to any given stimulus necessitates personal choice. The mature individual does not respond to the same stimulus in the same manner as he responded as a child or as a youth; his responses are more refined, that is, more precise, perhaps more effectively adaptive. Of course, if conditioning is

GENESIS

extended to include all forms of learning, as is done generally today in classes in psychology and in education, then, to avoid the fallacy of a circular argument, distinction must be made between *reflexive* conditioning and *ideational* conditioning of human responses. The conditioning of human acts by the introduction and association of ideas takes place at a much higher level than the conditioning which produces the essentially physiological conditioned reflex (such as that of Pavlov's experiment). Alteration of response at this higher level brings into play the conscious and voluntary activity of the person. Finally, it is doubtful that conditioning as a theory of learning (and hence of motivation) is any improvement upon its predecessor, the venerable doctrine of *association*. In Pavlov's experiment, for example, did the dog salivate merely because of the sounding of the gong or because of its continued association of that sound in its own "memory" with the reception of food? Surely common sense supports the latter view. Conditioning, therefore, of the type of Pavlov's experiment, although probably accounting for the rudimentary beginnings of the learning process, in infants and young children, falls far short of accounting for the more mature phase of that process which begins with accountability and extends throughout the rest of life. As a matter of fact, the Conditioned Reflex explains very little, insofar as human learning is concerned. (7) In the nineteen-twenties and following, one Professor John B. Watson, came forth with a theory in which he repudiated the traditional concept of thinking, describing it as sub-vocal speech—talking, that is, under one's breath. This caused Dr. Will Durant to quip that Dr. Watson "had made up his larynx that he did not have a mind." Watson's book, *Behaviorism*, sold into hundreds of thousands of copies. His theory, however, has gone the way of Dianetics, Hadacol, "Kilroy was here," and other passing fads. It has ever been a matter of amazement to me that any intelligent

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

person could find it possible to "swallow" such a shallow concept. Today the theory receives passing mention only in textbooks on the history of psychology.

(8) The commonsense view of the mind-body relationship is known as *interactionism*. According to this view, mind and body continuously interact, each upon the other: the relation is that of a two-way process, that of mind upon body, and at the same time that of body on mind. This is the view that is implicit in the practice of psychosomatic medicine. That interaction of this kind does take place is the testimony of everyday experience, although it must be admitted that the *mode* of this interaction seems to be unfathomable. The student, for example, does not leave the room after class until he "makes up his mind" to propel his feet toward the door. The pitcher in a baseball game throws the ball if and when and how he "makes up his mind" (wills) to use his arm to throw it. I am reminded here of what Dr. Rudolph Otto has written (IH, 214): "For a manifestation of the influence exerted by the psychical upon the physical, we need in fact go no farther than the power of our will to move our body—the power, that is, of a spiritual cause to bring about a mechanical effect. This assuredly is an absolutely insoluble riddle, and it is only the fact that we have grown so used to it that prevents it from seeming a 'miracle' to us." I commend the following summarization by the late C. E. M. Joad (GP, 498): "Common sense holds that a human being is not exclusively a body. He has a body, but he is, it would normally be said, more than his body; and he is more, in virtue of the existence of an immaterial principle which, whether it be called mind, soul, consciousness or personality, constitutes the reality of his being. This immaterial principle, most people hold, is in some way associated with the body—it is frequently said to reside in it—and animates and controls it. It is on some such lines as these that the plain man would, I think, be inclined to describe the

GENESIS

make-up of the human being. He would describe the human organism, that is to say, as a duality. In the view of the present writer this commonsense account, which discerns in a human being the presence of two radically different principles, the one material and the other immaterial, is nearer to the truth than any other of the alternatives in the field." (This is in exact accord with the teaching of Gen. 2:7, that man is a creature of both earth and heaven.) Psychologists tacitly admit the impossibility of a naturalistic resolution of the mind-body problem: this they do simply by ignoring it and giving their attention almost exclusively to the study of human behavior.

20. "*Homo sapiens*" (Gen. 2:7). (1) This is the term we use here, because it is the term used by present-day science to designate man as we know him and as he has proved himself to be by his works, in both prehistoric and historic times. The term means literally, "wise man," that is, man who is capable of reason, who is specified by his thought processes. Dictionary definitions of the term are the following: "Man, regarded as a biological species"; and, "the single surviving species of the genus *Homo*, and of the primate family, *Hominidae*, to which it belongs." It will be noted that the first of these definitions involves something of a paradox: as we have surely proved, man is not a strictly biological species—he is *more than* biological—he is *psychobiological*, a body-mind or body-spirit unity (body-mind, if only the *conscious* part of his psyche is being considered, but body-spirit, if the phenomena of the *Subconscious* in him are being considered.) (It is a favorite trick of the self-styled "naturalists" to incorporate all human powers, psychical and metapsychical included, into what they think of as a biological totality, when as a matter of fact they are begging the question every time they arbitrarily extend the "biological" into the area of these higher phenomena characteristic of man. *Petitio principii* is a common fallacy to which scientists are prone,

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

especially those who have never grounded their thinking in the discipline of metaphysics.) (2) Gen. 2:7 is one of the most meaningful and far-reaching statements in literature. However, its import can certainly be obscured by "extremist" interpretations. Dr. James H. Jauncey writes so clearly on this point (SRG, 56), affirming that "evolution or any other theory" of the origin of man "cannot make God superfluous," as evidenced by the fact that Darwin himself in his *Origin of Species* (ch. 15, last paragraph) concedes that "in the beginning the Creator gave life to one of a few primary forms." Jauncey continues as follows: "On the other hand, it is equally important for the student of the Bible to avoid reading into Scripture what it does not say. It is easy to assume that when the Bible says that God created man from the dust of the earth, it means that He made some kind of mud and out of this formed a man in the same way that a kindergarten child forms an image of man out of clay. But the Bible does not say this. It gives no indication of the process God used. If it should prove that this process was not instantaneous, this would not be surprising with a Creator who takes years to make an oak out of an acorn. He could make a mature man in a fraction of a second, but in fact He takes some twenty years and a very complicated and intricate process to do so. This does not mean that God could not have created the first man instantaneously. Indeed, He may well have done so, but it does mean that we cannot assume what the Bible does not in fact say." All this boils down to the single fact that the whole problem is not one of Divine *power*, but of the Divine *method*. Dr. A. H. Strong (ST, 465-476), on the other hand, goes "all out" for the doctrine of Creation (including that of man) by evolution. He writes as follows: "The Scriptures, on the one hand, negative the idea that man is the mere product of unreasoning natural forces. They refer his existence to a cause different from mere nature, namely, the creative act of

God But, on the other hand, the Scriptures do not disclose the method of man's creation. Whether man's physical system is or is not derived, by natural descent, from the lower animals, the record of creation does not inform us. As the command, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures' (Gen. 1:24) does not exclude the idea of mediate creation, through natural generation, so the forming of man 'of the dust of the ground' (Gen. 2:7) does not in itself determine whether the creation of man's body was mediate or immediate Evolution does not make the idea of a Creator superfluous, because evolution is only the method of God. It is perfectly consistent with a Scriptural doctrine of Creation that man should emerge at the proper time, governed by different laws from the brute creation, yet growing out of the brute, just as the foundation of a house built of stone is perfectly consistent with the wooden structure built upon it. All depends upon the plan. An atheistic and undesigning evolution cannot include man without excluding what Christianity regards as essential to man. But a theistic evolution can recognize the whole process of man's creation as equally the work of nature and the work of God While we concede, then, that man has a brute ancestry, we make two claims by way of qualification and explanation: first, that the laws of organic development which have been followed in man's origin are only the methods of God and proofs of His creatorship; secondly, that man, when he appears upon the scene, is no longer brute, but a self-conscious and self-determining being, made in the image of the Creator and capable of free moral decision between good and evil."

(3) The present writer takes the position here that Gen. 2:7 is surely an anthropomorphic revelation of Divine truth unparalleled in literature. The fact stands out clearly that the inspired writer intends, by this one great affirmation, that man shall know the truth concerning his origin

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

and his nature, from which his destiny as an individual (person) is to be determined. He intends all men to know that each has within him—breathed into him by the Creator Himself—the potentiality of becoming a sharer of divinity (2 Pet. 1:4); that his very life is a Divine gift which is to be given back to God in loving obedience and service (Rom. 12:1, Matt. 22:35-40); that he is constituted a person *by creation*, with all the rights and duties that attach to persons *simply and solely because they have been created persons*. This is the only doctrine of man that makes sense or that can give hope to his life in this present world. There is more truth and meaning for man in this one Scripture, Gen. 2:7, than is to be found in all the tomes written by man himself (no matter how “scholarly”), all the products of human speculation the majority of which confuse more than they clarify. (This subject is treated more fully in Part Ten *infra*.)

FOR MEDITATION, SERMONIZING, AND SPECIAL STUDY

What Is Man?

Psa. 8:4. It seems that the eighth Psalm was written under the spell of the nighttime. The inspired psalmist, contemplating the heavenly bodies in their courses, the stars in all their glory, and the moon in her reflected brightness, with “sweet reasonableness” associates himself with the cosmos he inhabits, and begins to realize both his weakness and his strength. No science is more calculated to inspire with lofty emotion than that of astronomy. It is not possible for any honest and intelligent person to look out upon the vastness of heaven’s canopy—set with a multitude of starry worlds—without finding his thoughts turning to the contemplation and adoration of the One who made all this to be (Psa. 19:1-6, 33:6,9; 104:1-6, 148:5-6; Isa. 40:18-26, etc.). From contemplation of the Creator and His wonderful natural works, our minds

GENESIS

descend, like the psalmist's, to meditation on the creature; and, in humility, we exclaim: "What is man, that thou art mindful of *him*?"

Throughout his history, man has written many things, both good and bad, about man. Alexander Pope, in his *Essay on Man*, wrote as follows:

Know then thyself, presume not God to scan,
The proper study of mankind is man.
Placed on this isthmus of a middle state,
A being darkly wise and rudely great:
With too much knowledge for the skeptic side,
With too much weakness for the stoic's pride,
He hangs between; in doubt to act, or rest;
In doubt to deem himself a god, or beast;
In doubt his mind or body to prefer;
Born but to die, and reasoning but to err;
Alike in ignorance, his reason such,
Whether he thinks too little or too much:
Chaos of thought and passion, all confused;
Still by himself abused, or disabused;
Created half to rise, and half to fall;
Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all;
Sole judge of truth, in endless error hurled:
The glory, jest, and riddle of the world."

Shakespeare, however, wrote of *Homo sapiens* in more extravagant terms (*Hamlet*, II, ii, 315-320): "What a piece of work is man; How noble in reason! How infinite in faculties! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals . . ." Jonathan Swift, the English satirist, at the opposite pole of thought, once exclaimed: "I hate and detest the animal called man." And someone has dubbed man "the joker in the deck of nature." It was Aristotle, how-

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

ever, who, in an excerpt quoted *supra*, struck a saner, more felicitous note, emphasizing the amazing range of man's moral potentialities. "What is man?" is a question that must be approached from different points of view. What is man—

1. As to his *nature*? (1) He is the image of God (Gen. 1:27), obviously in a *personal* sense (Exo. 3:14). (2) Operationally, he is *dualistic* as to his powers. As an organism, he is made up of the elements that make up all matter (as to his body), the whole vitalized (as to his spirit) by Divine inbreathing (Psa. 139:14, Job 33:4). He is a body-spirit unity, "a living soul" (Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:45).

2. As to his *place in creation*? (1) He has been made "a little lower than God" (A.S.V.), "than the angels" (A.V.). (Psa. 8:4-9, Heb. 2:5-9). (2) He is lord tenant of earth, God's steward over all lower orders and things (Gen. 1:28, 9:1-7). This dominion he holds by virtue of his intelligence and will; and his science is but the fulfilment, historically, of the Divine injunction to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it. Dutt (JCHE, 12): "And in this man reveals the divine within him. How else can we explain God's creative acts? Why the universe, the earth, and man? Why did not God retain them as an *idea* simply, reposing in His mind? Earth was not needed either for throne or footstool, and man himself supplies nothing essential to the nature of God. But there is a side of the divine nature which can be satisfied only in the expenditure of creative energy. It expressed itself primarily in the formation of matter; secondly, in intelligence; and, lastly, in redemption. These are worthy of the mind of God, and in them we believe He takes profound delight." (Acts 14:15, Rev. 4:11).

3. As to his *responsibility*? (1) He is a *moral* being, a citizen of moral government. Morality, in its strictest sense, is "conformity to the rule of right," and this rule is pre-

GENESIS

scribed by the Creator, the Sovereign of the cosmos (Rom. 7:7). (2) Endowed with the power of choice by virtue of which he is a moral being, he has always been *under law*. The first law was *positive*, and hence designed to *prove* his moral character, both to himself and to his posterity (Gen. 2:16-17). Throughout the early centuries, the moral law was handed down by word of mouth through the patriarchs, until the Mosaic Code was added "because of the transgressions" of the people (Gal. 3:19, Rom. 5:12-14). But the Mosaic Law was to be binding only until "the seed should come" and "nail it to his cross" (Gal. 3:19, 3:22-24; Col. 2:13-15; John 1:17; Matt. 5:17-18; 2 Cor. 3:1-16; Heb. 10:1-4, 8:6,13, etc. Jesus, the "Seed" of the woman, abrogated the Mosaic Law and instituted "the perfect law of liberty," *i.e.*, the Gospel (Jas. 1:25, 2:8; Rom. 8:3, 10:4, 8:2). (This does not mean, of course, that Christians are exempt from obedience to the moral law—not by any means! When a man makes two wills, he may take certain provisions of the first and incorporate them into the second, and they become binding, not because they were in the first will, but because they are re-enacted in the second. In like manner, the provisions of the moral law have been re-enacted in the Last Will and Testament of our Lord (Eph. 4:6; Acts 17:24, 14:15; 1 John 5:21; Matt. 5:34; Jas. 5:12; Eph. 6:1, 6:4; 1 John 3:15; Rom. 13:1-10; 1 Cor. 6:9-10, 6:18; Rom. 1:26-27; 2 Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 5:3-5; Col. 3:5; 1 Tim. 1:9-10; Rev. 21:8, 22:15; Eph. 4:28; Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:25; Eph. 5:3; Luke 12:15; 1 Cor. 5:11, etc.). The sole exception is, of course, the law of the Sabbath: this is not re-enacted in the New Testament; all Christian assemblies, under the guidance of the Apostles, were held on the first day of the week, the Lord's Day (John 16:13, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2, Rev. 1:10). The Lord's Day is a memorial of the Resurrection of Christ: Mark 16:9). (3) Man is under *the Divine*

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

Law as revealed in Scripture, in particular, under that which is revealed in the New Testament. Divine law was communicated orally through the patriarchs in the early ages of the world; then codified for the Hebrew People, through Moses, when they were elected to preserve the knowledge of the living God (monotheism). But the Old Covenant contained only the types and shadows of the perfect law to be revealed through Christ and His Apostles. Christ was the Word of God incarnate, and His Will, as revealed in the New Testament, is the all-sufficient Book of discipline for His elect, the church (John 16:7-15, 20:22-23; Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 1:1-8; Eph. 1:20-23; 2 Tim. 3:16-17). A. J. Gordon (MS, 169): "Scripture is literature indwelt by the Spirit of God. The absence of the Holy Ghost from any writing constitutes the impassable gulf between it and the Scripture." (4) He has *the ability to comprehend and obey the law of God*, the Divine Word (Psa. 19:7, 119:89; 1 Thess. 2:13). He can know his duty, reflect, compare, judge, and act; hence it is evident that his present state is *probationary*. (5) He is, therefore, a *responsible* creature. Endowed with the power of choice, and put under a law that has been revealed, and having the ability to apprehend and obey that law, he is responsible to the Government of Heaven for his thoughts and deeds (1 John 5:2-3, Psa. 119:143; 1 Sam. 15:22-23, Matt. 7:21-27; Rev. 20:11-15, 22:12-15). Law would not be law without a penalty for its violation: hence, the law of God embraces the most awful punishment of which the human mind can conceive, namely, eternal separation from God and from the glory of His might (2 Thess. 1:7-10, Matt. 25:45-46, Rev. 20:11-15).

4. As to his *destiny*? (1) He has a *physical* body which returns to the dust, that is, to the physical elements of which it is composed (Gen. 3:19, Job 10:9; Psa. 103:13-16; Eccl. 12:7). (2) He is essentially *imperishable spirit*,

GENESIS

Divinely inbreathed; as such he will live forever, either in a state of union with God or in a state of separation from God (Acts 7:59; Luke 23:46; Heb. 12:9; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 4:12; 1 Cor. 15:45-48; Eph. 2:19-22; Col. 1:20; 2 Cor. 5:1-10, 5:17-19; Rom. 2:12-16, 5:1-5, 8:10-11, 2:5-9; Rev. 20:11-14). (3) His destiny will be Heaven or Hell. Heaven is the fellowship of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, of the good angels, and of "the spirits of just men made perfect," that is, the elect of all Dispensations, clothed in glory and honor and incorruption (Heb. 12:22-24). Hell is the "abode" of Satan and his rebel host, and of the lost souls of earth (Psa. 9:17; Matt. 8:12, 10:28; Mark 9:47-48; Luke 16:19-31; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6; Rev. 20:11-14). (4) Every man's destiny is determined by his acceptance or rejection, as the case may be, of the Mediatorship of the Lord Jesus. A complete surrender to, and walk with, our Christ leads to Heaven; neglect or refusal to confess Christ and to live according to His revealed will, leads to Hell (Matt. 7:13-14, 7:24-27; John 14:1-9, 14:15, 15:10-14; 2 Cor. 5:17-21, 10:5; Phil. 2:12-13; Rom. 2:5-11, 12:1-2; Heb. 5:9; John 5:28-29). The Spiritual Life is the life that "is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:1-4).

The three great problems of philosophy, said Immanuel Kant, are God, freedom, and immortality. From the human point of view, these are the problems of the origin, nature, and destiny of the person. There are just three problems that are of primary importance to all mankind; these are, What am I? Whence came I? and, Whither am I bound? No other matters are of any significance in comparison with these! How incalculably important then that we should live in obedience to the Word of God, in the commitment of faith, and in the assurance of hope (Heb. 6:17-20)—and so live *for eternity* (1 John 5:4)! The Way itself has been made plain (Isa. 35:5-10): walk ye in it!

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

On the Tripersonality of God

Refer back to the "us" in Gen. 1:26.

Deut. 6:4—"Jehovah our God is *one* Jehovah." This truth is repeatedly emphasized throughout the entire Bible. However, the "one" here has reference especially to the *uniqueness* of God: Our Yahweh is the *only* Yahweh (Isa. 44:6-8, 45:5-7, 45:18, 45:20-25; 1 Tim. 2:5, Eph. 4:6; Rom. 10:12, 3:30; 1 Cor. 8:4, Acts 17:24-28).

In this unity, however, there is embraced a triple personality, as evident from the following Scriptures: (1) the use of the plural form Elohim for the Deity (Gen. 1:1, Psa. 8:5); (2) intimations of Divine intercommunion (Gen. 1:26, 3:22, 11:7; Isa. 6:8); (3) the baptismal formula (Matt. 28:19); (4) the statements of Jesus in John 14:23,26; (5) the apostolic benediction (2 Cor. 13:14); (6) the introduction to Peter's First Epistle (1 Pet. 1:2).

The doctrine of the tripersonality of God may be summarized as follows:

1. In the Bible there are Three who are recognized as God: (1) the Father (Psa. 2:7, John 6:27, 1 Pet. 1:2, etc.); (2) the Son (John 1:1,18; John 20:28 (note that Jesus accepts Thomas's confession here without protest), Rom. 9:5, 1 John 5:20, Tit. 2:13); (3) the Spirit (Acts 5:3-4, 1 Cor. 3:16-17, Heb. 9:14, John 4:24).

2. These three are so presented that we are compelled to think of them as distinct persons, as evident: (1) from passages in which the Father and the Son are distinguished from each other (Psa. 2:7; John 1:14, 3:16; Gal. 4:4); (2) from passages in which the Father and the Son are spoken of as distinct from the Spirit (John 15:26, 14:26, 14:16-17; Matt. 28:19; Gal. 4:6; 2 Cor. 13:14); (3) from passages asserting or implying the personality of the Holy Spirit, as in Acts 5:9, 7:51, 15:28; John 14:16; 1 Cor. 2:10-11; Rom. 8:26; Eph. 4:30; 1 Thess. 5:19; Isa. 63:10. Note passages that depict the Spirit as manifesting powers of

GENESIS

which only persons are capable (John 14:16, 14:26, 15:26, 16:7-8, 16:13-14; Luke 12:12; Matt. 4:1; Acts 9:21; 1 Cor. 2:9-10; 1 Tim. 4:11; Gen. 6:3); as having those faculties which only persons have (Luke 11:13; Psa. 51:11; Neh. 9:20; Rom. 8:26-27; Rom. 15:30; Acts 16:6-7; 1 Cor. 2:11, 12:11); as suffering slights that can be experienced only by persons (Isa. 63:10; Matt. 12:31-32; Mark 3:29; Acts 5:3-4, 7:51; Eph. 4:30; Heb. 10:29; 1 Thess. 5:19); as associated with other persons, both Divine and human (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2; Acts 15:28, 16:6-7, 8:29, 10:19, etc.).

3. These distinctions of personality are immanent and eternal, as evident (1) from passages asserting the pre-existence of Christ, the Son (John 1:1, 8:58, 10:30, 17:5, 17:24; Phil. 2:5-6); (2) from passages asserting or implying intercourse between Father and Son previous to the Creation of the world (John 17:5, 17:24, 1:18; Gal. 4:4; Heb. 12:2); (3) from passages asserting that the Son was the executive Agent in the Creation of the world (John 1:3, 1 Cor. 8:6, Col. 1:16-17; Heb. 1:2-10); (4) from passages which assert the eternity of the Spirit (Gen. 1:2, Psa. 33:6, Heb. 9:14, Psa. 139:7, 1 Cor. 2:10-11).

4. This tripersonality is *not* to be construed as *tritheism*: cf. John 4:24. In other words, there are not three Gods—there is only one God. God is Three in One, however; that is, a triple personality embraced in the unity of the Divine Essence. Whereas three persons among men have the *same kind of essence*, the three Persons of God have the *same essence*. The Father is not God as such, for God is not only Father, but also Son and Holy Spirit; the Son is not God as such, for God is not only the Son, but also Father and Spirit; the Holy Spirit is not God as such, for God is not only the Spirit, but also Father and Son. This tripersonality of God was not revealed in Old Testament times, perhaps lest the Children of Israel should be tempted to drift into tritheism (the worship of three

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

Gods), under the influence of the practices of their polytheistic pagan neighbors. Hence, in the Old Testament we have God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God, but in the full light of the New Testament (Christian) revelation, these become known as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, respectively.

5. The immanence of these three Divine Persons in one another is set forth in the following Scriptures: John 3:34, 10:30, 14:10-11, 16:14-15, 17:20-23; Eph. 4:6, 2 Cor. 3:17, 1 Tim. 3:16, Heb. 1:3.

6. While we can draw no lines separating the Persons of the Godhead, they are presented in Scripture as capable of dissociation one from another at the same time: (1) In John 14:16-17, the Son, one Person, prays to the Father, another Person, to send the Spirit, the third Person, upon the Apostles to guide them into all the truth: cf. John 16:7-10, etc.; (2) the Father is distinguished from the Son as the Sender from the One sent, also as the Begetter from the One Begotten (John 1:14, 3:16-17, 1:18; 1 John 4:9); (3) the Son is pictured as praying to the Father (John 11:41-42, Matt. 26:36-46) (cf. also the 17th chapter of John); (4) the Spirit is distinguished from both the Father and the Son, and is said to have been sent by both (John 14:16-17, 14:26, 15:26, 16:7; Gal. 4:4-7); (5) at the baptism of Jesus, when the Son was standing on the bank of the Jordan after coming up out of the water, the Father was speaking from Heaven, and the Spirit was descending through the air in "a bodily form, as a dove" (Matt. 3:16-17, Mark 1:10-11, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-33).

7. This doctrine of the tripersonality of God is, of course, inscrutable. (Incidentally, it should be noted that the term, "Trinity," is not to be found in Scripture.) Imperfect analogies may be cited, however, as follows: (1) the mystical union of man and woman in marriage (Matt. 19:5-6, Eph. 5:28-32); (2) the inter-relationships between

GENESIS

Christ, the Head, and the members of His spiritual Body, the Church (Eph. 1:22-23; Rom. 12:4-5; 1 Cor. 12:12; Eph. 4:1-16; 5:22-23); (3) the metaphor of the vine and the branches (John 15:4-5); the teaching of Jesus here is that the life of the Vine (Christ) diffuses itself in the life of every branch (individual disciple, saint, etc.), and hence that the life of each saint, vitalized as it is by the indwelling Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38, Rom. 5:5, 1 Cor. 6:19), is manifested in the life of all who make up the Body; (4) the complex psychosomatic unity, the human being: on the corporeal side, man is built up successively of cells, tissues, organs and systems; on the personal side, of reflexes, habits, traits, dispositions, etc., and all these are organically fused (integrated) in the incomparably complex being known as *homo sapiens*; (5) in the various cases of dual, or even multiple, personality that have been reported from time to time. Interesting experiments have disclosed from two to five apparently distinct, yet conflicting, personalities within a single corporeal frame. One of the most notable examples is the classic case of Sally Beauchamp, as reported by Dr. Morton Prince, in his well-known book, *The Dissociation of a Personality*. Hence, if dual or triple personality is possible in man, why should it be thought incredible in the Deity?

8. Nowhere is this unity of tripersonality in God brought out so forcefully as in the Great Commission, that is, in the *baptismal formula* authorized by our Lord Himself: "baptizing them," said He, that is, baptizing those who have been made disciples, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Baptism is the only ordinance in the entire Bible that is to be administered in the *name*—that is, by the *authority*—of the triune God: it must therefore be a most sacred, spiritual, heart act, cf. Rom. 6:17). Does this mean that the believer is to be immersed three *times*? No, because the singular is used, *name*, not *names*: there are not three authorities in

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

the Godhead, not three sovereignties: there is but one Sovereignty—that of the Godhead as a whole. Hence, *one immersion* brings the penitent believer into the *name* of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit at one and the same time, simply because the Father, Son, and Spirit are *one* God. So-called trine immersion, therefore, is unscriptural; it would be valid only if there were three Gods, if tripersonality were actually tritheism. But there is one, and only one God, and one immersion brings the believer into Covenant relationship with Him. (Cf. especially Eph. 4:4-6).

This doctrine of the triune personality of our God is, to be sure, mysterious, inscrutable, beyond comprehension by the finite mind. Yet it is necessary to any possibility of divine revelation and human redemption. 1. *It is essential to a correct understanding of God's relationships with man.* The God who loves must make common cause with the object of His love. It has been rightly said that "love is an impossible exercise in a solitary being." We need not only a God who is eternal and sovereign (Elohim), but a God as well (Yahweh) who "so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:16). 2. *It is essential to a proper self-revelation of God.* If there are not Three Persons, then there is no Son who can adequately reveal the Father (John 14:8). Herein lies the emptiness of Unitarianism and all such "liberal" colorless cults: they have no perfect revelation of God. And if there is no Holy Spirit, then self-communication of the Divine Being to the human being is impossible (Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 2:6-15). 3. *It is essential to the Scheme of Redemption.* If God is one, solitary and alone, then there can be no mediation, no atonement, no intercession, no redemption. The gulf between God and man is not one of degree, but one of kind: it is infinite. Only One who is God can bridge that gulf and effect a reconciliation.

GENESIS

Without a Redeemer, redemption and reconciliation are meaningless terms, and religion is a human invention and sheer presumption. 4. *It is essential to all true worship of God.* Worship, says Jesus, is the communion of the human spirit with the Divine Spirit, on the terms and conditions as revealed by the Spirit in the Word (John 4:24). Therefore, without both Spirit and Word there can be no true worship (cf. Rom. 8:26-27). 5. *It is essential to any adequate Christology.* Rejection of this doctrine of the tri-personality of God suffices to explain the utter inadequacy of all Unitarian and so-called "modernistic" views of Jesus. If Jesus was just a man, and not the Word who became flesh and dwelt among us, not the God-Man, Immanuel (Matt. 1:23), then He cannot be the Savior of anyone or anything. If He was just a teacher, a "divinely illumined" philosopher and ethical teacher, and no more, then His teaching, like all philosophy, is just another guess at the riddle of the universe, and the world is back where it was two thousand years ago, floundering in the muck and mire of pagan superstition. 6. *It is essential to any perfect pattern of human life and conduct.* We believe that Jesus was truly "God with us" (Matt. 1:23, John 14:8). Therefore His teaching and His practice are perfect patterns for us to follow. Without the Son to reveal and to live the perfect life, the life that God would live and would have us live, then we are without an Exemplar: we have no Way, no Truth, no Life. In fact, every fundamental doctrine of the Christian Faith—Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, Sanctification, Immortalization—is rooted deeply in the fact of the tripersonality of God.

Moreover, to speak of so-called pagan "trinities" in the same breath with the triune God of the Bible is to manifest either gross ignorance or a mind blinded by prejudice and a perverted will. In the first place, what are commonly called "trinities" in heathen mythologies are not trinities at all, but triads: that is, not *three in one*, but *three sepa-*

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

rate ones for whom no unity of essence or function was ever claimed. In the second place, these so-called "trinities" are, in most cases, vague and unidentifiable; they are invariably surrounded by other gods regarded as equally powerful. In the Vedas, there were Dyaus, Indra, and Agni. In Brahmanism, there were—and still are—Brahma ("Creator"), Vishnu ("Preserver"), and Siva ("Destroyer"). These, among the oldest of the deities of "natural religion," more nearly approximate a "trinity" than any similar groups; yet in either case the three constituted a triad rather than a triunity; moreover, they were thought of as ethical antagonists, in most instances. In Egyptian mythology, there were Osiris, Isis his consort, and Horus their son. But there were many other great gods in Egypt, in addition to these three, depending at times on the particular priestly caste which enjoyed dynastic power. Nor is there any well defined triad in Greek mythology. Was it Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades? Or Zeus, Hera and Athene? Or Zeus, Hera, and Apollo? Instead of a triad, the ancient Greeks generally referred to their *twelve* great gods. The same is generally true of the Romans, who took over these twelve great Greek gods and gave them Latin names. The Romans had gods for everything: the making of gods, as Augustine has pointed out so eloquently in his *City of God*, was the chief business of the superstitious Roman people. According to a witticism of Petronius (*Satiricon*, 17,5): "Indeed, our land is so full of divine presences that it is easier to meet a god than a man."

Then, in addition to all this, the gods of the heathen mythologies were crude, grossly anthropomorphic, and downright immoral. Every god had his female consort, and as many mistresses, including even ordinary women, as his passions might impel him to appropriate. (Read, for example, the *Ion* of Euripides.) Zeus was perhaps the most assiduous philanderer of the lot: he stopped at noth-

GENESIS

ing, including incest (Hera, his consort, was also his sister), rape, and treachery. There is absolutely nothing of this character in the Biblical presentation of the tri-personality of the God of the Bible. It is entirely void of such gross anthropomorphism. The inter-relationships among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are exclusively incorporeal, ethical, and spiritual. In fact the only relations sustained by the three persons of the Biblical Godhead, of a semiterrestrial character, are those sustained with man spiritually and for man's redemption. These relations are signified by the two terms, the "begetting" of the Son, and the "proceeding forth" of the Spirit. The term "begetting," in reference to the Son, describes an event—the Incarnation—which took place *in time*, and through the instrumentality of the Virgin Mary. Prior to His Incarnation, His Name was Logos, Verbum, Word (John 1:1-3). By the miracle of the Incarnation—the "overshadowing of the Holy Spirit"—He became the Only Begotten Son of God (Luke 1:26-38), the Mystery of Godliness (1 Tim. 3:16). The same is true of the "procession" of the Spirit: that, too, is an event which, whenever it occurs, occurs *in time* (time being, of course, co-etaneous with the Creative Process, including both Creation and Redemption), and for specific Divine ends, as, for example, the coming of the Spirit upon holy men of old, upon the great prophets, and especially upon the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost (2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12; Acts 2:1-4, 7:51-53). To speak of the inter-relations among the Three Persons of the Biblical God in corporeal, or even in anthropomorphic, terms, is a gross perversion of the truth. And by no stretch of the imagination can any resemblance be found between the various triads of heathen myth and legend and the tripersonality of the living and true God. For our God is a Spirit, and "they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4:24).

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

On the Divine Names in Genesis

For the benefit of students who might want to delve more deeply into this fascinating problem, I am summarizing here the catenae of the Elohist passages, the Yahwistic (Jahvistic) passages, and finally the mixed passages (those in which both Names occur), as given by Tayler Lewis in Lange's Genesis (CDHCG, 106-107). In my opinion, this is information that needs to be preserved; and since not too many of our young ministers will find this great work (now long out of print) available, except perhaps those who may have access to the libraries of the older theological seminaries, I feel justified in taking sufficient space to present it here, in somewhat abridged form, of course, as follows:

1. *The Elohist Sections*, frequently designated "universalistic" or "cosmogenetic" (those in which the Name Elohim predominates or is used exclusively): (1) Chs. 1:1-2:3. The Hebrew Cosmogony. (2) Ch. 5. The Sethite Line (v. 29, a glance at the judgments of Yahweh, the exception). (3) Ch. 6:9-22. The *toledoth* of Noah. (4) Ch. 7:10-24. Beginning of the Flood. Elohim orders Noah and his progeny, along with pairs of all flesh, into the ark; Yahweh, however, as the God of the Redemptive Plan shuts him in (v. 16). (5) Ch. 8:1-19. The emergence from the ark. (6) Ch. 9:1-17. The Divine blessing on Noah and the new race. The rainbow covenant. (7) Ch. 17:9-27. The ordinance of circumcision. Ch. 19:29-38. The story of Lot and his daughters. (8) Ch. 21:1-21. Ishmael's expulsion. Yahweh, only in v. 1. (9) Ch. 21:22-24. Abraham's covenant with Abimelech (but Yahweh in v. 33). (10) Ch. 25:1-18. Abraham's death. (But in v. 11, it is Elohim who blesses Isaac). (11) Chs. 27:46-28:9. The wanderings of Jacob. Esau's marriage. (However, note El Shaddai ("God Almighty") in 28:3, and Elohim in 28:4). (12) Ch. 30. Story of Rachel (but see also mixed

GENESIS

sections *infra*). (13) Ch. 31. Jacob's departure from Laban. (But Yahweh in vv. 3, 49.) (14) Ch. 33. Jacob's return. (15) Ch. 35. Elohim throughout, except in v. 11, El Shaddai. (16) Chs. 41-50. Story of Joseph in Egypt. (Yahweh only in 49:18). (17) Exo., chs. 1 and 2. Israel's oppression in Egypt.

2. *The Yahwistic (Jehovistic or Jahvistic) Sections* (those in which the Name Yahweh predominates or is used exclusively, and which are frequently designated "theocratic"): (1) Chs. 2:4-3:24) Man in Eden, and expelled from Eden. (2) Ch. 4. Story of Cain and Abel. Yet Eve thanks Elohim for Seth, v. 25, and calling on the Name of Yahweh is said to have become common practice among the pious Sethites, v. 26. (3) Ch. 6:1-8. Yahweh repudiates the antediluvian race, but preserves mankind through Noah. (4) Ch. 7:1-9. Noah's deliverance on the basis of his righteousness. (5) Ch. 8:20-22. Noah's thank-offering and Yahweh's resolution to have mercy on mankind. (6) Chs. 10-11:31. The genealogical table. Yahweh mentioned only twice, with reference to Nimrod (10:9), and with reference to the confusion of tongues at Babel (11:5,6,8,9). (7) Chs. 12:1-17:8. Abram's call (12:1-8). Protection of Sarah in Egypt (12:10-20). Abraham's settlement in Bethel, and his separation from Lot (ch. 13). The deliverance of Lot (ch. 14). (Abraham praises Yahweh as *El Elyon* (v. 22): cf. Exo. 6:3.) Yahweh's covenant with Abraham (ch. 15). Sarah and Hagar, with reference to the child of the Promise (ch. 16). Yahweh as El Shaddai, "God Almighty" (ch. 17:1; cf. again Exo. 6:3). (8) Chs. 18-19:28. The appearance of Yahweh to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. Yahweh's judgment on Sodom. (9) Ch. 24. Isaac's marriage. (10) Ch. 25:19-26. The twins, Jacob and Esau. (11) Ch. 26:2, 12, 24, 25. "Theocratic" testimonies and promises. (12) Ch. 29:31-35. Yahweh takes Leah into His favor. (13) Ch. 30:25-43.

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

New treaty between Jacob and Laban. (14) Ch. 38. Yahweh punishes the sons of Judah. (15) Ch. 39. Yahweh with Joseph in Egypt.

3. *The mixed sections.* (1) Ch. 9:18-27. Vv. 26-27: "Blessed be *Yahweh*, the *Elohim* of Shem . . . May *Elohim* enlarge Japheth." (2) Ch. 14. Melchizedek a priest of El Elyon, and blesses Abraham in this name. But Abraham speaks in the Name of *Yahweh* El Elyon. (3) Ch. 20. *Elohim* punishes Abimelech. The latter addresses Him as *Adonai*. (4) Ch. 20:1-19. Abraham (v. 11) speaks of the fear of *Elohim*. He prays to *Elohim* for Abimelech's house (v. 17), for *Yahweh* had closed up the mothers' wombs of the house of Abimelech (v. 18). (5) Ch. 27. The words of Isaac as reported by Rebekah: the blessing before *Yahweh* (v. 7). Jacob: "*Yahweh*, thy *Elohim*" (v. 20). Vv. 27 and 28 remarkable: Jacob already blessed by *Yahweh*, but Isaac gives him the blessing of *Elohim*. (6) Ch. 28:10-22. The angels of God. V. 13—I am *Yahweh*, the *Elohim* of Abraham and the *Elohim* of Isaac (v. 13). Jacob (vv. 16-17): *Yahweh* is in this place . . . This is none other than the house of *Elohim*. Cf. also vv. 20-22. (7) Chs. 29:31-30:24. *Yahweh* takes Leah into favor (29:31-35); yet the blessing of fruitfulness is the concern of *Elohim* (30:2). *Elohim* favors Leah with the births of the fifth and sixth sons (30:18,20). Rachel thanks *Elohim* for the birth of Joseph, "taking away her reproach" (30:23), but she named him Joseph, "saying, *Yahweh* add to me another son" (v. 24); cf. also v. 27, the words of Laban. (8) Ch. 32. Jacob: The "*Elohim* of my father Abraham, and the *Elohim* of my father Isaac, *Yahweh*," etc. (32:9). "Thou hast wrestled with *Elohim* and with men" (32:28). "I have seen *Elohim* face to face" (v. 30). (9) Ch. 39. *Yahweh* is with Joseph in Egypt (39:2). Joseph says to Potiphar's wife: How can I commit this great sin against *Elohim*? (v. 9). *Yahweh* is with Joseph in prison (v. 21).

GENESIS

4. Other Names for the Deity which occur in Genesis are the following: (1) *El*, "Mighty One" (Gen. 14:18,19,20,22; 16:13; 17:1; 21:33; 28:3; 31:13; 35:1,3,11; 43:14; 46:3; 48:3; 49:25). (*Elohim*, "God," "gods," occurs repeatedly throughout the Torah and the entire Old Testament.) (2) *El Shaddai*, "God Almighty" (Gen. 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3, 49:25; cf. Exo. 6:3). (3) *El Elyon*, "The Highest," "The Most High" (Gen. 14:18,19,20). (4) *El Roi*, "God of seeing" (Gen. 16:13; cf. Gen. 32:30, "Peniel," meaning "the face of God"). Obviously, these are Names especially of attributes of God, they frequently overlap in meaning, and they are all to be distinguished from "the great and incommunicable Name," YHWH (Exo. 3:14), which is the Name of the very *essence* (being, nature, etc.) of the living and true God. His name is HE WHO IS.

5. For a thoroughgoing discussion of "the great and incommunicable Name," YHWH, the Tetragrammaton, the student is referred to Rotherham (EB, 22-29), from which the following excerpt is presented as sufficient for present purposes. Rotherham writes (EB, 22-23) as follows (concerning the "suppression" of The Name): "The *Tetragrammaton*, or name of four letters (in allusion to the four letters YHWH), is a technical term frequently employed by scholars, and will here, for a little, serve a useful purpose. Besides employing this term, we can reverently speak of 'The Name,' or can set down the first letter only, 'Y,' in the same way as critics are wont to use the Hebrew letter *yod* as the initial of the Divine Name intended . . . It is willingly admitted that the suppression has not been absolute; at least so far as Hebrew and English are concerned. The Name, in its four essential letters, was reverently transcribed by the Hebrew copyist, and therefore was necessarily placed before the eye of the Hebrew reader. The latter, however, was instructed *not to pronounce it*, but to utter instead a less

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

sacred name—Adonay or Elohim. In this way The Name was not suffered to reach the ear of the listener. To that degree it was suppressed. The Septuagint, or ancient Greek version, made the concealment complete by regularly substituting *Kurios*; as the Vulgate, in like manner, employed *Dominus*; both *Kurios* and *Dominus* having at the same time their own proper service to render as correctly answering to the Hebrew *Adonay*, confessedly meaning 'Lord.' The English Versions do nearly the same thing, in rendering The Name as LORD, and occasionally GOD; these terms also having their own rightful office to fill as fitly representing the Hebrew titles *Adonay* and *Elohim* and *El*. So that the *Tetragrammaton* is nearly hidden in our public English versions. Not quite. To those who can note the difference between 'LORD' and 'Lord' and between 'GOD' and 'God,' and can remember that the former (printed with *small capitals*) *do* while the latter *do not* stand for The Name—to such an intimation of the difference is conveyed. But although the *reader* who looks carefully at his book can *see* the distinction, yet the mere *hearer* remains completely in the dark respecting it, inasmuch as there is no difference whatever in sound between 'LORD' and 'Lord' or 'GOD' and 'god.' It hence follows that in nearly all the occurrences of The Name (some 7,000 throughout the Old Testament) the especial Name of God is absolutely withheld from all who simply hear the Bible read. 'Nearly all,' for there are about half a dozen instances in the A.V., and a few more in the R.V., in which this concealment does not take place. In other words there are these very few places in which the *Tetragrammaton* appears as 'Jehovah,' and although it may be asked, 'What are they among so many?' still their presence has an argumentative value. If it was wrong to unveil the *Tetragrammaton* at all, then why do it in these instances? If, on the other hand, it was right to let it be seen in these cases, then why not in all? With the exceptions explained,

GENESIS

however, it remains true to say, that in our public versions the one especial Name of God is suppressed, wholly concealed from the listening ear, almost as completely hidden from the hastening or uncritical eye." Rotherham goes on to state that, although the motive for the suppression, namely, "to safeguard the Divine Majesty in the minds of men," is respected, the suppression itself must be regarded as a mistake, on the following grounds: (1) that it was an "unwarrantable liberty"; (2) that it has led to serious evil in the form of the notion that 'Y' was a mere tribal name, and that 'Y' Himself was but a local deity. "Solid advantage," concludes this author (EB, 24), "may be counted upon as certain to follow the restoration" of The Name. "Even if the meaning of The Name should not disclose itself, the word itself would gradually gather about it the fitting associations—and that would be a gain; and godly readers would be put on quest—and that would be a further gain; and if the true significance of the *Tetragrammaton* should be brought to light, there would be a trained constituency to whom appeal could be made—and that would be a yet greater gain." To the objection that Jesus followed the Septuagint version as it stood (in which The Name is concealed under the common title *Kurios*, "Lord"), notably in citing Psa. 110:1 (cf. Matt. 22:41-45), Rotherham answers that "Jesus had to plead His Messiahship at the bar of the Scriptures as then current, and any criticism by Him of the nation's Sacred Documents might have placed a needless obstacle in the people's path," and adds: "We thus conclude that the objection may and should be set aside as inconclusive, and so fall back on the reasons given why the Divine Name should be suffered uniformly to appear."

Rotherham insists that the rendering of The Name as "Jehovah" should be abandoned because it is "too heavily burdened with merited critical condemnation." This pronouncement, he tells us, was unknown prior to the year

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

1520, when it was introduced by one Galatinus. It was formed by combining “the sacred *Tetragrammaton* and the vowels in the Hebrew word for Lord, substituted by the Jews for JHVH, because they shrank from pronouncing The Name.” As another authority has put it: “To give the name JHVH the vowels for the word for Lord (Hebrew, *Adonai*) and pronounce it *Jehovah* is about as hybrid a combination as it would be to spell the name *Germany* with the vowels in the name *Portugal*—viz., *Gormuna*.” “From this we may gather, writes Rotherham (EB, 25), “that the Jewish scribes are not responsible for the ‘hybrid’ combination.” (The use of *Jehovah* is, unfortunately, a defect of the American Standard Version. The Revised Standard Version returns to the Authorized Version’s word “Lord”—in small capitals.) The form *Yahweh*, Rotherham concludes, is for all practical purposes the best.

6. *Conclusion*: It strikes me that to formulate any satisfactory hypothesis to account for the interchangeable use of these various names (or titles) for our God, in the book of Genesis, would be a fruitless task. It seems, rather, that no such arbitrarily conceived hypothesis is needed. In fact the writer apparently does not follow any sustained particular pattern of differentiation. This apparently indiscriminatory use of these various names (or titles) is precisely the fact that makes the Documentary Hypothesis little more than a hodge-podge of conjecture, one in which unknown and unknowable “redactors” have been arbitrarily conjured up by the destructive critics to give the Hypothesis any semblance of reasonableness.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART EIGHT

1. Diagram from memory the content of Gen. 1:1–2:3.
2. Explain what is meant by the term *Homo sapiens*, as used by scientists.

GENESIS

3. State the three marks of the uniqueness of the Pentateuch as cited in this section.
4. Summarize the evidence of the internal unity of the book of Genesis.
5. What do we mean by saying that the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch is based exclusively on alleged *internal* evidence?
6. What is the "separate document" theory of the relation of Genesis 2 to Genesis 1?
7. What are the claims advanced to support this theory?
8. State the chief objections to these various claims.
9. Is there any justifiable reason for assuming that we have in Genesis 2 a "second cosmogony"? Explain your answer.
10. What is the "complementary theory" of the relation of Genesis 2 to Genesis 1?
11. List the added details of the account of the Creation that are given in Genesis 2.
12. What is the over-all theme of Genesis 1? Of Genesis 2?
13. How does the diversity of theme affect the literary style of each chapter?
14. What is meant by the "problem of the two divine Names"?
15. Explain what each of these Names means when translated.
16. What is meant by the Tetragrammaton?
17. Explain how the Name "Yahweh" substantiates the doctrine of the Divine inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures.
18. What other names are given to the Deity in Genesis and what does each mean?
19. From the various passages in which the word "generations" occurs in Genesis, what must we conclude that it points to? To what, then, does it point in Genesis 2:4?

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

20. To what stage of the Creation does the inspired writer return in introducing his account of man's primitive state?
21. To what does "day" refer, as used in 2:4?
22. On what "day" of the Creation did the first rainfall occur?
23. Does chapter 2 describe vegetation in the world at large, or only that of the Garden of Eden?
24. Does this chapter have anything to tell us as regards the priority of man or plants?
25. What is the import of the combination of the two divine Names in 2:5,7?
26. Explain what the words *psychosomatic* and *organismic* mean?
27. Explain how Genesis 2:7 harmonizes with the present-day scientific view of man as a *psychosomatic* unity.
28. Explain how this text also harmonizes with the *organismic* approach to the study of man characteristic of present-day psychology.
29. What profound truth is suggested by the phrase, "a living soul"?
30. How do the words *deity* and *divinity* differ in meaning?
31. Does deity differ from humanity in degree or in kind? Explain.
32. Are we to conclude that God's inbreathing endowed man with the attributes of deity? Explain.
33. Explain what is meant by the statement that God's inbreathing endowed man with the potentiality of becoming a partaker of the divine nature.
34. How does this potentiality become actualized?
35. What was determined, by God's inbreathing, to be the nature and destiny of the human being?
36. Distinguish between the *dichotomous* and *trichotomous* theories of man.

GENESIS

37. What do we mean by saying that man is a creature of both earth and heaven?
38. List the attributes that are characteristic of *spirit*, as the term is used in the Bible.
39. What is the Biblical teaching concerning the relation between body and spirit (or mind) in man?
40. Does any one of these terms—mind, soul, or spirit—indicate bodilessness in Scripture?
41. To what systems of human origin does the concept of “disembodied spirits” belong?
42. Explain the Scripture teaching about the *natural* body and the *spiritual* body.
43. In the light of present-day study of the powers of the Subconscious, what might well be the distinction between mind and spirit in man? Hence, how might *body-mind* unity differ from *body-spirit* unity, and how might the *soul* be related to either or both of these unities?
44. Explain how the doctrine of man as a body-mind or body-spirit unity is in harmony with the Christian doctrine of immortality.
45. State the Christian doctrine of immortality.
46. Distinguish between survival and immortality.
47. How does the word “eternal” probably differ in meaning from the word “immortal”?
48. List the evidences of the high value which Christian teaching gives to the human body.
49. What does the Bible teach regarding the ultimate destiny of the bodies of the redeemed? Of those of the lost?
50. What changes took place in the body of Jesus after His resurrection?
51. What is meant by the Apostle’s statement that Jesus became “a life-giving spirit”?

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

52. Explain 1 Cor. 15:45.
53. Explain Rom. 8:28-30 in relation to God's Eternal Purpose for His elect.
54. What seems to be the Pauline distinction between "flesh" and "spirit"?
55. What Pauline phrase apparently corresponds to the Freudian concept of the libido?
56. In what systems of human origin do we find the doctrine of a rigid dualism of soul and body?
57. Summarize New Testament teaching about the human body, and show what is unique in it.
58. Distinguish between man's powers of *perception* and *conception*.
59. What is especially significant about his power of *conceptualization*?
60. List the powers which distinguish man from the brute.
61. Explain how man's power of abstract thinking specifies him as man.
62. What is meant by *abstraction* in relation to the process of cognition?
63. List the facets of human culture which originate in man's tendency to "symbolify."
64. Explain the significance of language in specifying man as man.
65. How does *sensation* in man differ from *consciousness*, and from *meaning*.
66. What is the full import of these distinctions?
67. Explain what is meant by the phrase, "the meaning of meaning."
68. Elaborate the statement that it is impossible to reduce psychology to sheer physiology.
69. Explain how man's power of creative imagination specifies him as man.

GENESIS

70. Explain how man's sense of values specifies him as man.
71. What are the two sciences which originate in man's application of his sense of values to everyday living?
72. Explain how man's sense of humor and his power of laughter specify him as man.
73. List and explain the phenomena of the Subconscious which specify man as man.
74. Explain what is meant by *extrasensory perception* and by *psychokinesis*, and show how these phenomena support the Biblical revelation of human nature and destiny.
75. What is the over-all significance of the phenomena of the Subconscious?
76. What is meant by the phrase, "man's range of moral potential"?
77. Explain what is meant by the mind-body problem.
78. Show how psychologists are compelled to adopt dualistic terms in attempting to explain human motivation and behavior.
79. Explain what is meant by the "nothing but" fallacy.
80. State the theory of epiphenomenalism, and show why it is not necessarily a materialistic theory.
81. Explain the Conditioned Reflex and show how it is deficient as a theory of learning.
82. Distinguish between *reflexive* and *ideational* conditioning.
83. Show how "educationism" really "begs the question" in trying to explain all learning in terms of the Conditioned Reflex.
84. State the theory of interactionism and point out the difficulty involved in it.
85. Give some examples from everyday life of the power of the psychical to direct the physical in man.

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

86. Explain the statement that the problem of Creation is not one of the Divine power, but of the Divine method, employed.
87. Show how this statement is related to the exegesis of Gen. 2:7.
88. Summarize the excerpt from Dr. Jauncey's book dealing with the exegesis of Gen. 2:7.
89. Summarize the excerpt from Dr. Strong's book dealing with Gen. 2:7.
90. What is the view presented in this textbook of the exegesis of Gen. 2:7?

PART NINE: THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY

(Gen. 2:8-25)

"And Jehovah God planted a garden eastward, in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made Jehovah God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became four heads. The name of the first is Pishon: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Cush. And the name of the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth in front of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates. And Jehovah God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it" (vv. 8-15).

1. *The Garden.* (Cf. Isa. 51:3; Ezek. 28:13, 31:8-9, 36:35; Joel 2:3). (1) God planted it "eastward," that is, to the east of the Land of Promise (Canaan), and from the point of view of the writer. Is it significant that there