

## 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

is no mention here of anything to the west? (2) *In Eden*: a name derived probably from the Sumerian "edin," meaning a "plain" or a "steppe" (Cornfeld, AtD, 13), and translated into the Greek, in the Septuagint, as *paradeisos*, a name meaning "orchard" or "garden" (probably a "garden of fruit trees"). *Paradeisos* is transliterated into English as Paradise. The location of this Garden is not precisely determinable. Only two theories have been advanced: the one puts it at the head of the Persian Gulf; the other, in Armenia, the region east of Asia Minor, the area around Mt. Ararat and Lake Van. (3) *Did Eden exist at all geographically?* I see no reason for assuming that it could not have so existed: indeed actual geography is indicated by specific mention of the two rivers whose names have been historically established, namely, the Tigris and the Euphrates. This would mean that the Garden was somewhere in Mesopotamia (from *mēso*, "middle," and *pota-mos*, "river"; hence, "in the middle of" or "between" the Tigris and the Euphrates). (The Euphrates has never had any other historical name, but the Hiddekel of the Genesis account was called the Tigra by the Persians and the Tigris by the Greeks: cf. Dan. 10:4, also the testimony of Strabo, Pliny, et al). However, it is not possible to identify the other two rivers, the Pishon and the Gihon, because it is not possible to identify, with any degree of certainty, the districts, Havilah and Cush, respectively, which these two rivers are said to have "compassed" (probably "skirted"). The best bet is that Havilah referred to an area somewhere in the Arabian peninsula, probably what is today called Yemen (Gen. 25:18, 10:7, 10:29; 1 Sam. 15:7; also Gen. 16:7, 20:1; Exo. 15:22). Cush may have represented the *Kas* of the Egyptian monuments, since Cush is pretty generally thought to be the Hebrew name for modern Nubia, the name which by extension became Ethiopia, the name—apparently a misnomer—used by the Greeks (cf. R.V. Gen. 2:13; also Num. 12:1, Exo.

## THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

2:21, Gen. 10:6-8, 1 Chron. 1:8-10, Isa. 11:11; 2 Ki. 19:9, 2 Chron. 12:3, 14:9); in this case, the Gihon could have been the Nile. (Some authorities think that Cush represented the country, in Elam, taken over by the Kassi of the Babylonian inscriptions, about 1600 B.C.). It could be, of course, that the main river (apparently a subterranean sea) which "went out of Eden to water the garden" was the Persian Gulf itself, and the four heads emanating from it may have been identified, in ancient Hebrew thought, as the Nile, the Euphrates, the Tigris (which at one time flowed directly into the Gulf), and the Indus Rivers (the four great rivers of what the noted Egyptologist, James H. Breasted, has named the Fertile Crescent; see sketch map 2). Some hold that the four rivers may have been the Phasis, the Araxes, the Euphrates and the Tigris. Murphy thinks the Pishon may have been the River Halys, which flows into the Black Sea, and in the bend of which was the ancient capital of the Hittite Empire, Boghazkoi (or Hattusas). Finally, it could well be that subsequent geological changes have destroyed the site of Eden altogether. (Incidentally, little is to be accomplished by speculating about some of the geographical names that appear in the Pentateuch; hence, we do not intend to devote much time or space here to what can be but little more than conjecture.) Moreover, it is this writer's opinion that the significance of Eden geographically is of secondary consequence to the spiritual meaning which the story of Eden has for the inward man, the spiritual meaning which may well be communicated to us by the Spirit of God symbolically or metaphorically in the very terms which reappear in the Revelation, the last book of the New Testament (cf. Rev. 22:1-5; also 2:7, 22:14). (4) Geographical significance is indicated, however, in the fact that the Biblical account of Eden does harmonize with scientific conclusions about the origin of mankind. Advocates of the evolution hypothesis are

trying in our time to establish a theory of "centers" of human origin. This theory, however, is wholly conjectural, built on the assumption that certain archeological finds, in widely separated places of earth (skeletal parts, such as bones, teeth, etc.) are to be described as "humanoidal" and could point to separate developments of lower animal forms into humankind. But biologists for the most part agree, I think, on the basis of the evolution hypothesis, that there has been but one biological development flowering in man as we know him (*homo sapiens*). Both the prehistoric and historic evidence now available agree with Scripture in putting the cradle of the human race in Southwest Asia, whence it dispersed *westward* via the Mediterranean Sea and the Danube Valley, and *southwestward* by way of the Nile and its tributaries; and *eastward* into what is now known as India and China, and finally by way of the Aleutians and Bering Strait into the Americas. Ethnologists are generally agreed that the American aborigines came from Mongoloid ancestry in Eastern Asia: the Eskimo is definitely Mongoloid.

(5) We must never overlook the profound import—in the form of symbol and metaphor—of the various aspects of this exquisitely-told account of man's original state. Surely the Garden itself does by symbol and metaphor point back to an original innocence and unhindered fellowship of man with God. The Eden story teaches us (a) that God's purpose for man was that the latter should dwell in close communion with his Creator, and (b) that God had actually constituted him for, and ordained him to, happiness as his natural and proper intrinsic end in life. As a matter of fact, personal experience must convince us that man's natural impulses uniformly indicate that he has been ordained to happiness or well-being; that the normal human being does not set out deliberately to make himself ultimately and permanently miserable. Man's failures occur in his misguided efforts to find happiness in *apparent* goods

(those which satisfy some appetite in isolation) instead of *real* goods (those which benefit the whole man by adding perfections or removing imperfections). In a word, man's depravity is expressed in his rebellious determination to find true happiness without God: this no man ever did or ever will do. The tragic fact is that he allowed his moral discernment to become vitiated by a wrong choice at the very outset of his existence (cf. Matt. 6:33). This Divine purpose is at the very heart of the Eden narrative: in his Edenic state, man had unhindered access to God: this fellowship he would still have, had he not forfeited the right to it by defying the Will and transgressing the law of God. *But even the more tragic fact is that the story of the Garden—of man's losing his oneness with his Creator—is repeated in the life of every human being who reaches the age of moral discernment* (Rom. 3:23). (It is interesting to note here that Breasted puts forward the idea that in the story of Adam and Eve we have the account of the birth of conscience in man, of his "emergence" from the Age of Power into the Age of Character, from the age of his struggle with nature into that of his struggle with himself; this struggle with himself Breasted designates "an unfinished historical process" (DC, 386). This is an interesting view, one with which, I should say, the account in Gen. 3:6-13 is in harmony.)

(6) Indeed, I raise the question here: *Could not much of the account of the Garden of Eden be deliberately symbolical?* The heart of the teaching here is that the river which originated somewhere in the subterranean deep, and "flowed out of Eden to water the garden" (2:10) is symbolical (metaphorical) of the River of Life itself, the River which flows out timelessly from one source only, "the throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev. 22:1); for let it be never forgotten that our God, the God of the Bible, is the *living* God (Matt. 16:16, Acts 14:15, John 11:25-26, 1 Thess. 1:9; Heb. 3:12, 9:14, 10:31, 12:22; Rev. 1:17-18),

the Source and Preserver of every form of life—natural, spiritual, and eternal. This River of Life, with its Tree of Life, as the source and sustainer of life perpetually, plays a tremendous role in Biblical thought (Psa. 46:4, Ezek. 47:1-12) and again in the consummation of the Biblical drama (that is, the actualization of the Eternal Purpose of God: cf. Rev. 2:7, 7:17, 22:1-2, 22:14-17, 22:19; Prov. 3:18). (This Garden of the Lord God became throughout the Scriptures the highest ideal of earthly excellence: cf. Isa. 51:3; Ezek. 28:13, 31:9; Joel 2:3.) It is profoundly meaningful that this River and this Tree first appearing in the story of Paradise Lost should reappear in the story of Paradise Regained. We must not overlook the fact that the Apocalypse was “signified” to John the Beloved (Rev. 1:1); this means that it is couched in prophetic symbolism throughout. Why, then, should not these terms which have symbolic meaning in Revelation be recognized as having the same import when first used in the book of Genesis? (We shall consider this matter again *infra*, in our study of the Trees of the primeval Garden.)

2. *Man in the Garden.* (1) God *created* (*bara*) the Man in His own image (Gen. 1:27); that is, He *formed* (specified) him a body-spirit unity, a “living soul” or “living being”—a *complete* person (Gen. 2:7); *blessed* him (Gen. 1:28), conferred on him dominion over the whole earth (Gen. 1:28, Psa. 8); planted a “garden of delight” for his first occupancy (Gen. 2:8); and then *put him* into the Garden “to dress and to keep it” (Gen. 2:15). (2) V. 9—It seems evident that this statement refers exclusively to vegetation *within* the Garden, and not outside it. There is no implication in this verse that man preceded plant life in the over-all Creation. We are nowhere informed that the luxuriant vegetation of the Garden was brought into existence at the same time as the vegetation that spread generally over the earth’s surface. Eden, with its trees and flowers, was a special act of Providence. It seems equally

obvious that the world at large was prepared for man's occupancy after his probationary state was terminated by his transgression of Divine law. (3) God blessed the first human pair, the Man and the Woman (Gen. 1:28). It should be noted that throughout the Scriptures God's blessing is never a mere wish on His part, but always contains "the means of self-fulfilment, if only properly applied" by man. *God never proposes to do for man what man can do for himself.* (4) God put the Man in the Garden: obviously another anthropomorphism: that is, God did not pick him up bodily and put him down in the Garden; rather, He exerted some kind of influence on the inward man, on the man's spirit; the Man went where he was ordained to go, in consequence of a suggestion to his subconsciousness, some secret impulsion, or even an openly stated command of the Creator (cf. Acts 8:26, 10:19, 13:4, 16:6-7).

(5) Two Divine injunctions directed the course of the Man's life in the Garden: In the first place, he was "to dress and to keep it" (v. 15); in the second place, he was to refrain from eating the fruit of a particular tree, known as "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." (6) The first of these commands signified that the Man was to till the soil of the Garden, to cultivate its vegetation (trees, plants, and flowers), and to protect this vegetation from the depredations of weeds and of wild beasts. Even the plants, flowers and trees of this bower of delight stood in need of human tending, lacking which they would surely have degenerated. (Does not nature, if left to her own resources, tend to degenerate, both in quantity and in quality? Plant tomatoes this year, and cultivate them, and you will have a good crop; but just let the seed drop into the ground and come up in what is called "volunteer" fashion next year, and you will have an inferior crop.) Nor were animals so domesticated that the Man did not need to protect (fence?) the Garden against their depredations.

Do we have here an ominous hint of the greater Adversary who, even then, was "going to and fro in the earth and walking up and down in it" (Job 1:7, 1 Pet. 5:8)? (7) Work never was, never will be, a curse to man. Skinner (ICCG, 66): "The ideal existence for man is not idle enjoyment, but easy and pleasant work, 'the highest aspiration of the Eastern peasant' being to keep a garden." Note Gen. 3:17—even here, in the statement of the penalty, it is not work that is declared to be a curse; rather, it is expressly stated that the curse (the penalty of sin) would proceed from the ground. That is, work in itself was not a part of the penalty; rather, the frustrations pursuant to honest labor, which would characterize man's life outside Eden, on the earth at large, would be the penalty. Cornfeld (AtD, 15): "The curse is actually in the niggardliness of the soil or the fruitlessness of man's labor." Hester (HHH, 67-68): "God provided work for man before the Temptation and the Fall, because it is indispensable to life and is essential to the happiness of man. It is not a curse but a blessing. Without work people could not live and without it man would be miserable and useless. All really happy and useful people have learned the thrill and the satisfaction of achievement by hard work." Francisco (IOT, 23): "Labor antedates the Fall; after the Fall, labor becomes toil." (Who would ever want to live the life of a grasshopper floating down stream? It is as true today as it ever was that an idle brain is the devil's workshop. It is inconceivable that Heaven should be a life void of all activity: life *is* activity. Man's drive for *security* is fraught with frustrations; security never was, never will be, fully realized in this life. It may well be that God could have created a being incapable of vice and crime and sin—but surely such a creature would not be a man.)

(8) Gardens and God are always close to each other. The very idea of a garden—a properly tended garden—suggests *beauty*: and does not our God love beauty? (Even

the great Southwest "desert" is a thing of beauty and a joy forever to anyone who can appreciate its wondrously varied and unique plant and animal life.) A garden also suggests *life* and *growth*, for where there is life, there must be growth: the living thing that does not grow will stagnate and die. A garden also suggests the possibility of weeds, and hence the necessity of being tended by man, lest the weeds take over and smother the flowers and the fruits. In like manner, the Spiritual Life must be properly tended: the fruit of the Spirit must be protected against the encroachment of weeds, the wheat from the destructive activity of the tares (Matt. 13:24-30, Gal. 5:16:25). What an idyllic setting we find portrayed in this story of the Garden of Delight, Paradise! What more vivid symbolism of man's unbroken fellowship with God could the Holy Spirit have given us! What more meaningful picture could He have vouchsafed us to accentuate the terrible import of the account which follows—the account of the awful tragedy of man's deliberate wrecking of that fellowship!

3. *The Tree of Life.* (1) Is this term to be taken literally? That is, was this an actually existing tree? Certainly it could have been a real tree, bearing real fruit, the properties of which were specifically designed to renew physical youth and vigor. There is nothing incredible in such an interpretation. If God provides food to renew man's physical strength, as we know that He does (hence, Matt. 6:11), why should it be thought incredible that He should have prepared a special kind of food to renew and preserve man's physical youth? According to this view, the means provided for this purpose was the fruit of the Tree of Life; and Adam, though *mortal* by creation, had this means of counteracting his mortality. Thus had he maintained his innocence, and by unswerving obedience to God's Will had grown into holiness, we may suppose that his body could have been transfigured and translated to Heaven without the intervention of physical death (its

dissolution, or resolution into its physical elements). Moreover, when he did transgress the law of God, it became imperative that he should be expelled from the Garden, and that "the way of the tree of life" should be guarded, in order that in his state of rebelliousness, he might not gain access to its fruit and so renew his youth; that is to say, in order that the inherent laws of mortality might work out their course in his physical constitution (cf. Gen. 3:22-24, 5:5). It seems that in view of the possibility (or shall we say, likelihood?) of his making the fateful choice of transgression above obedience (1 John 3:4), Divine Wisdom had made ready the whole earth for his occupancy and lord tenancy, as the stage on which His Plan of Redemption, embodying His Eternal Purpose, should be executed (Isa. 46:8-11, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Eph. 3:8-13, John 17:1-6; Eph. 1:4, Heb. 4:3, 1 Pet. 1:19-20, Rev. 13:8, 17:8). As Monser has written (TMB, 39-41): As the Scheme of Redemption began gradually to unfold, "then began this wondrous series of types . . . which opens with the Tree of Life. Like the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil it takes its name from the service it renders, but unlike that Tree, the very nature and quality of its fruit are productive of the immortal life. To Adam and Eve in their virgin innocence the use of its fruit would be natural since they were thus, conditionally, mortal beings, becoming mortal because of sin. Yet, as we reckon things, the design of the fruit seems peculiar. Other trees, and their fruits, might contribute to man's daily support. This was to preserve an undecaying vigor to one so supported. The inheritance of life was in it. It did not lose its valuable property when man sinned, but man lost his right to partake of it, being turned aside by the flaming sword of the cherubim, while the Tree was put under constant guard. To doubt or deny this is not only to challenge Holy Writ, but also to deny angel-life, and the frequent record of angelic presence found throughout the Scriptures."

(2) Certainly, however, this Tree of Life has symbolic significance for all mankind: obviously it was designed to be a *symbol of unhindered access to God*. (See discussion of symbols in Part Two.) Symbols are of such a nature as to be addressed to man's physical senses or to his mental images originally derived by way of sense-perception. Symbols are, as a rule, existent in some way in the physical realm; and Biblical symbols are "for the purpose of presenting more clearly to the understanding the spiritual and abstract qualities of things, by means of outward signs and pictures addressed to the senses" (Milligan, SR, 72). Hence, it was to be expected, because of the inadequacy of human language for the communication of Divine Thought, that the Remedial System should be "one gorgeous array of picture-lessons" (Monser). But it is in a *metaphorical* sense especially that this Tree of Life, whether it actually existed or not, has the most profound significance for man. The metaphor is a special kind of symbol—an abridged form of comparison compressed into a single word or phrase. Hence we may rightly hold that the Tree of Life, the symbol of unbroken fellowship with God, is also the symbol—in the form of a metaphor—of the mediatorship of the Logos (1 Tim. 2:5, John 1:14, Heb. 12:24, Gen. 28:12, John 1:51). Thus the Tree of Life takes its place along with other Scripture metaphors of the various aspects of the redemptive work of Christ, such metaphors as the Bread of Life (John 6:32-35), the Water of Life (John 4:13-14, 7:37-38; Rev. 7:17), the True Vine (John 15:1-6), the Door to the Sheepfold (John 10:7-16), the Smitten Rock (Exo. 17:6, Isa. 53:4-6, 1 Cor. 10:3), etc. This metaphorical import is clearly indicated in the references to the Tree of Life which appear again in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 2:7, 22:2,19). In these passages it becomes evident that the Tree of Life is Christ Himself, the Great Physician, whose redemptive ministry is literally and specifically "for the healing of the nations"

(Rev. 22:2; cf. John 1:29, Isa. 54:4-5). After all, this is the meaning of the Tree of Life which has profound significance for God's elect. As is the case invariably, the references in the Old Testament to this subject—as indeed to any subject of note—can be fully understood only in the light of the New Testament Scriptures relating to the same subject.

(3) Finally, it should be noted here that a "tree of life" appears frequently in the literature of the ancients. In the non-Biblical accounts, however, it was pictured as existing in some place inaccessible to man. But the Tree of Life in Genesis is said to have been "in the midst of the Garden" (v. 9) into which Yahweh Elohim put the Man. This undoubtedly indicates that God intended for the Man to enjoy the blessing symbolized by this Tree, the blessing of unhindered fellowship with Himself, the kind of fellowship which the Man broke by his act of disobedience, the act which brought sin to the earth, and, as a consequence, separation from God. This separation, in turn, brought into operation true religion, the religion that is essentially redemption and reconciliation, the binding anew of man to God (from *religo*; *religare*, "to bind back" or "again": cf. 2 Cor. 5:18-21).

(4) A most important principle must be stated in this connection (one to which we shall be harking back frequently as we continue our study of Genesis) as follows: *Concepts that are widespread, woven into the traditions of peoples everywhere, no matter how degenerate they may have become as a result of popular diffusion, point back unmistakably to genuine originals.* No counterfeit ever existed that did not presuppose a genuine. Hence, the purity of the accounts in Genesis of such events as the Tree of Life, man's Golden Age of innocence, his Temptation and Fall, the role of Satan in these events, the institution of Sacrifice, Noah's Flood, etc., we have every right to contend that we have the true original or ancestral

forms, in a word, the facts which became corrupted in theory and practice by popular diffusion from their original locus—the cradle of civilization. From the very beginning, human tradition and speculation have brought about the corruption of Divinely revealed truth.

Note Pfeiffer's summary here (BG, 20): "Among the many trees which grew in the garden, verse 9 specifies two as of particular significance: the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The tree of life was designed to confirm man in the possession of physical life, and to render death an impossibility. Because of man's sin, it never came to be used. Man was expelled from the garden, after his sin, 'lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever'" (3:22-23).

*"And Jehovah God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (vv. 16-17).*

4. *The Beginnings of Liberty and Law.* Note that God first went to great pains to impress upon the Man the scope of the liberty which he was to enjoy: he would be free (note, "freely eat") to partake of the fruit of every tree of the Garden, with just one exception. Of the fruit of one particular tree he was not to partake: this was "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." This reminds us forcefully of the fact that *genuine human liberty is enjoyed only within the circumference of obedience to the law; that outside that circumference liberty becomes prostituted into license.* (Cf. Matt. 7:24-27; John 14:15, 15:10,14; 1 Cor. 6:19-20; Gal. 5:1; Heb. 5:9; Jas. 1:25, 2:8; 1 John 3:4). Multitudes sell themselves to the Devil either in pursuit of unrestrained "personal liberty," or in the pursuit of illicit knowledge. Man, from the beginning of his existence, has ever engaged in the futile business of trying to play God.

5. *The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* (1) "The knowledge of good and evil" may signify (a) the power of moral judgment; hence the partaking of it marked the beginning of man's *actual experience of sin* and the consequent birth of conscience; or (b) the *maturity* that man acquires through personal experience of sin and its consequences (cf. for the meaning of *maturity* in Scripture, Num. 1:3,20,22; Num. 14:29-30; Num. 26:2, 32:11; 1 Chron. 27:23; Lev. 27:3, etc.); or (c) the awakening of the physical sex drive in man resulting in physical coition (the view that has always been rather widespread—but if true, Does this mean that the Male and the Female prior to their partaking of this forbidden fruit had the power to reproduce their kind exclusively by *thought*?); or (d) perhaps all these views taken together, or (e) the entire gamut of possible knowledge (omniscience).

(2) The argument is often heard that this Tree was so named because until man ate of its fruit he could have no adequate understanding of sin and its consequences. It is said that "incapacity to know good and evil may be a characteristic of unconscious childhood and unreflecting youth, or of debilitated age, but it is not conceivable of one who was created in God's image, invested with moral dominion, and himself constituted the subject of moral government." The reply usually given to this argument is that Adam and Eve, prior to their first transgression of the Divine law (1 John 3:4) were not totally incapable of knowing good and evil, but, rather, were without the experience of sin in their lives. Experience, it is said, "is a dear school, but, nevertheless, it is the only one in which we can learn anything perfectly" (cf. John 7:17, Rom. 12:2). Strong (ST, 583): "Adam should have learned to know evil as God knows it—as a thing possible, hateful, and forever rejected. He actually learned to know evil as Satan knows it—by making it actual and a matter of bitter experience." The fact is that the choice required of the

Man (and the Woman) was the choice between self and God, between one's own way of doing things and God's way of doing things. It is the choice which every human being makes, one which he cannot avoid, as he goes through this life. The first human pair chose self, and sin entered the world; selfishness is at the root of every sin that man commits; the essential principle of sin is selfishness. Hence, God has sought to achieve through redemption and immortalization what might have been brought about by spiritual growth and transfiguration. "Knowledge of good and evil is the power to distinguish between good and evil, not in act only, but in consequence as well. This faculty is necessary in order that man may reach moral maturity."

(3) Did this particular Tree, then, have a real existence; that is, did it exist in the manner that a tree is known to exist in the forest? Those who so contend base their conviction largely on the contention that the condition of the heart is invariably made known by the *outward* act. "By their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:15-20). On the eating or not eating of the fruit of this Tree were suspended the issues of life and death. Hence the relationship between this first human pair and their Creator was not changed until the former manifested their selfish choice in the overt act of disobedience to God. Not that there was harm in the particular thing which was eaten; rather, *the harm came about in the partaking of anything which had been expressly forbidden by the Divine Will*. A father may command his son to bring him a book and to put it on the piano, when to lay it upon the library table would be just as satisfactory (it would seem)—that is, if the father had not specifically ordered that it be placed on the piano. The father's command would be sufficient for an obedient child—he would put the book in the place where his father has told him to put it. Thus, the father's command would become a proof of the child's love and obedience. So it

was with the Father's command issued to Adam and Eve: their defiance of it was evidence of their lack of faith, trust and love; and this defiance was consummated in the overt act which was itself proof of their rebellious hearts. Moreover, as it was in the case of the man's Fall, so it is in respect to his Restoration: Conversion is not complete until man demonstrates his faith and repentance and his voluntary choice of Christ as his personal Redeemer, Priest and King, in the external act of Christian baptism. Faith changes the heart, repentance the life, and baptism the relationship (Gal. 3:27). Baptism is an overt witnessing to the facts of the Gospel, the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and is also the overt act whereby the penitent believer commits himself to Christ in such a way that the whole world can see this commitment, testify to it, and be influenced by the example of it.

(4) Speculation as to what kind of fruit this Tree produced naturally would be foolish and unprofitable, granting, of course, that the Tree and its fruit were existent as objects in the external world. There would be no reason to suppose that, in any case, any injurious properties were inherent in it. "The death that was to follow on the transgression was to spring from the *eating*, and not from the *fruit*; from the sinful act, and not from the creature, which in itself was good" (Whitelaw). "Why," sneeringly asks the skeptic, "suspend the destiny of the world on so trivial a circumstance as the eating of an apple?" Milligan (SR, 37-40) states the case substantially as follows: Such a question arises from total ignorance of the subject. A few observations will suffice: (1) It was exceedingly important, in the very beginning, that the first creatures of the human race know themselves, and know whether or not their hearts were strictly loyal to God. (2) No better proof of their loyalty or disloyalty could have been made than that which, according to Moses, God appointed for this

purpose. (3) It was of such simplicity that they easily understood it; hence violation of this first precept had to arise from a spirit of pure disloyalty. It was a *positive* law, and positive law requires a thing to be done simply and solely because the Divine Lawgiver demands it. Those very acts which irreverent men have styled "mere outward acts," "mere external performances," have been means used by the Lord to prove the faith—or lack of it—on the part of His creatures. (4) Hence, it follows "that this positive precept, originally given to man as a test of his loyalty; was in no sense the *cause* of his disloyalty; it was simply the occasion and *proof* of it. The *spirit* of disloyalty cherished in the heart will as certainly lead to a man's condemnation and final ruin as will the open and overt transgressions of any law, whether it be moral or positive." (The student should note here that there is no mention of an "apple" in the Genesis account: here, mention is made only of the "fruit" of this particular Tree (3:6), without any specification of the particular *kind* of "fruit." The notion of an apple was brought into the story by John Milton, in *Paradise Lost*. Was this idea of an apple borrowed from the Greek tradition of the Golden Apples which Ge (Earth) gave to Hera at her marriage with Zeus? According to the legend, these apples were guarded by the Hesperides in their specially prepared gardens near the river Oceanus in the extreme West, perhaps near the Atlas Mountains of North Africa between the Mediterranean Sea and the Sahara Desert?). Cf. Pfeiffer (BG, 20): "Man was blessed by God in the beautiful Garden of Eden, but man had one responsibility: obedience to the express command of God. God chose a tree as the means whereby Adam could be tested. We need not assume any magic quality in the tree. It was the act of disobedience which would mar man's fellowship with God." Kraft (GBBD, 47): "Just one simple prohibition in an environ-

ment otherwise apparently completely safe and free—but therein was the fatal opportunity of choice: to obey or not to obey.”

6. “*The Knowledge of Good and Evil.*” (1) The present writer must admit his agreement with Biblical students who hold that “the knowledge of good and evil,” in the text before us, is a phrase which signifies complete knowledge (“total wisdom”—as someone has put it); in a word, omniscience. Strictly speaking, “good” and “evil” are terms that have reference to more than moral acts, to a great deal more than knowledge of the physical sex life; as a matter of fact, they have reference to the *constructiveness* or *destructiveness* of all human motivation and action. Moral or ethical knowledge embraces the fundamental facets of every other branch of human knowledge, and cannot be isolated from human activity in general. (Cf. 2 Sam. 14:17, Isa. 7:15-16.) Certainly mature knowledge includes knowledge of the ways and means of reproducing the human species. But this is only a part—and indeed a rather small part—of the totality of human knowledge. It seems to me that the fundamental truth embodied in this prohibition (v. 17) was that man was never to leave God out of his life; nor in overweening pride and ambition aspire to illicit knowledge, the kind of knowledge and wisdom (wisdom is the right use of knowledge) which God alone possesses and which God alone knows how to use for the benefit of all His creatures. Dr. J. B. Conant, in his little book entitled, *Modern Science and Modern Man*, advances the thesis that the prime fallacy of which man has been guilty for the last one hundred years or more is that of thinking himself capable of attaining unlimited knowledge. This, says Dr. Conant, is to claim omniscience, and omniscience man does not have; to be sure, his capacity for knowledge is indefinite, but it is not infinite. This, Conant points out, is the great moral and spiritual truth which is taught us in the Book of Job (cf. Job 11:7, also

chs. 38-41). Elliott (MG, 45-46): "Basically, the sin involved is pride, trying to be *as* God. Man too often feigns or desires omniscience, thus putting himself at the center of the stage rather than God. God wanted man to have life (the tree of life), but it was to be obtained only as God granted the experiences (tree of knowledge) validating life" (cf. John 10:10).

(2) Again I raise the question: Was this particular Tree a real tree, bearing real fruit of some kind? Or is the account of this Tree one that is clothed entirely in symbol or metaphor? I do not deny that it could have been an actual tree bearing real fruit: far be it from me to impose limitations on the Wisdom and Power of God: hence I have presented in the excerpts quoted above the views of writers who propose the literal interpretation. The problem involved here is this: Was the outward act, in the case of our first parents, that of eating some kind of real fruit of some kind of real tree, or is the account of the eating of the fruit of the Tree in question symbolic of some other overt act of disobedience to God. I do not question the fact that an overt or outward act of defiance of God's Will was involved. Let me repeat, however, that this is not the point at issue. That point is the problem of the character of this act: Was it a partaking of literal fruit of some kind, or was this story of man's eating the forbidden "fruit" designed to describe metaphorically any unspecified human act of human disobedience to God. Such disobedience, of course, whatever form it may take, is sin (1 John 3:4). In short, whether a literal tree is indicated in this story or not, a human act of rebellion against God, the Sovereign of the universe, is clearly indicated; and this is the essential import, for all mankind, of the story of this Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, and of the tragic role which it played in the moral and spiritual history of the race.

7. *The Assured Penalty*: "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Shook (GB, 62): "The clause of the prohibition, 'Thou shalt surely die,' evidently refers to physical death and means no more than 'thou shalt become dieable.'" Literally rendered, this clause is, "dying, thou shalt die." Adam Clarke paraphrases it: "From that moment thou shalt become mortal, and shall continue in a dying state till thou die." (It is a known biological fact in our time that the human being begins to die from the moment he is born.) "Thou shalt be mortal" (the Greek of Symmachus); "Thou shalt be subject to death" (The Targum of Jonathan). (But there is no evidence that Adam had ever been in any sense immortal; rather, the context of this whole story indicates that he was created mortal.) The death indicated here is obviously twofold: (a) the resolution of the body into its physical elements, or physical death (Gen. 3:19, 5:5; Heb. 9:27-28, Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:22-23), and (b) the separation of the "inward man" from God, the Source of all life (Acts 17:24-28; Luke 15:24,32; Eph. 2:1-3; Col. 2:13). "By the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil man forfeited his liberty to eat of the tree of life" (Dummelow). C. H. M., (NBG, 31-32): "In the midst of the fair scene of creation, the Lord God set up a testimony, and this testimony was also a test for the creature. It spoke of *death* in the midst of *life*. 'In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' . . . Adam's life was suspended upon his strict obedience. The link which connected him with the Lord God was obedience, based on implicit confidence in the One who had set him in his position of dignity—confidence in His truth—confidence in His love . . . I would here suggest to my reader the remarkable contrast between the testimony set up in Eden and that which is set up now. Then, when all around was *life*, God spoke of *death*; now, on the contrary, when all around is death, God speaks of

life: then, the word was, 'in the day thou eatest, thou shalt die.' Now, the word is, 'believe and live.'" (Cf. John 14:6, 11:25-26, 17:3, etc.).

"And Jehovah God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him. And out of the ground Jehovah God formed every beast of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And the man gave names to all the cattle, and to the birds of the heavens, and to every beast of the field; but for man there was not found a help meet for him" (vv. 18-20).

8. *The Beginning of Language.* (1) *The Man*, from *adamah*, "red" ("red earth"); according to Rotherham (EB, 34), probably akin to *adhamah*, "ground" (Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:47), hence, "Adam." This name "indicates here collective humanity according to its origin in the first human pair, or in the one man in general, who was certainly the universal primitive man and the individual Adam in one person" (Lange, CDHCG, 192). Note also that God is said to have "formed out of the ground every living thing of the field" (v. 19); that Adam is said to have given names "to all the tame-beasts, and to the birds of the heavens, and to all the wild beasts of the field" (v. 20), according to the Rotherham translation. (Cf. "cattle," for tame-beasts, Gen. 1:24). Cornfeld (AtD, 14): "In a profound way the story portrays the character of human existence, its interdependence with God, with the soil, with woman, and with animal life." (Note that the operation of the penalty of sin was to proceed from the ground: Gen. 3:17-19). (2) *What the Man Did.* It must be kept in mind that we are dealing here with events that occurred on the sixth "day" of the Creation. There is no reason for assuming that all this happened after God had "finished his work which he had made" (Gen. 2:1-2). Hence, on this sixth

“day,” in addition to what God did, the Man is said to have named the birds and the beasts as they gathered in his presence, and then, after falling into a deep sleep during which the woman was created, and then brought to him at his awakening, to have recognized and accepted her as his counterpart: and so the institution of marriage was established. (No reference is made in the Genesis Cosmogony to brute females, but we infer, from the Divine ordination (1:22) to be fruitful and multiply, that the brute females had been created along with the brute males.)

(3) *The Meaning of “Good.”* This is a very ambiguous word as it is bandied about by thoughtless purveyors of clichés. For the real meaning of the word, however, we must go to the Bible. We read that following His work of Creation, God looked out upon it and pronounced it all “very good” (1:31). That is to say, all created things were doing what the Creator had designed them to do in relation to the totality of being. In order that anything be “good” it must be good *for something*: that is, good for what by its very nature it is constituted to do. Hence, when, on the sixth “day,” God looked out upon what had been done, he discovered there was a great lack—essential needs to be provided for—in relation to the Man, the crown of His whole Creation. Hence the pronouncement, “It is not good that the man should be alone.” Now that which is a *good* for any created being must be something that perfects its nature, something that fulfils its potentialities as a creature. So it was with the Man. Obviously, it was not good for the Man to be alone, because, lacking a proper counterpart, a creature answering to his needs, his own potentialities could never have been actualized in himself nor handed down to his posterity: in a word, the whole human race would have perished with him, would have died “a-borning.” There were four reasons especially why the creation of the Woman was necessary: (a) the

Man needed the Woman in order to reproduce their kind; (b) the Man, himself a social being by nature, needed the society of his own kind (Robinson Crusoe, it will be recalled, found no happiness in the association of brutes only); (c) the Woman was needed that she might become a type of the Bride of the Redeemer; and (d) the Woman was indispensable, for the profound reason that the entire Plan of Redemption was wrapped up, so to speak, in the *Seed of a Woman* (Gen. 3:15). (Skinner (ICCG, 47): "Of the revolting idea that man lived for a time in sexual intercourse with the beasts, there is not a trace.") Hence, Yahweh Elohim caused the beasts and the birds to assemble in the Man's presence, perhaps to pass in a grand review before him, and the latter, obviously exercising the gift of speech, gave names to them. This act was a striking attestation of the Man's intelligence: it seems that each name selected by him met with Divine approval. Moreover, this "grand review" must have stirred within him a profound sense of disappointment, even frustration, in the fact that no creature appeared before him who was adapted to his own particular needs. The latent social instinct in his bosom, the craving for companionship of his own kind, was aroused. To satisfy these needs, God created the Woman and brought her unto the Man. (Note that the Man's naming of the animal species was *prima facie* evidence of his ability and his right to hold dominion over them.)

(4) *The Beginning of Language*. It is certainly of far-reaching import that the means of communication among persons—that is, meaningful spoken language—should have been originated in preparation for the beginning of human society in the first conjugal union. It seems that the animal species were brought before the man "to see what he would call them": to make him aware of the fact that he could recognize in none of them the counterpart which he himself needed. His "spontaneous ejaculations" proved

sufficient for the origin of human speech, but failed to satisfy his aroused sense of need of companionship of his own kind. All this boils down to the obvious conclusion, namely, that the Man gave expression to these names as a result of Divine inspiration. This brings us to the consideration of one of the most significant facts of human history, namely, that *as yet, even down to our own time, no satisfactory purely naturalistic theory of the origin of language has ever been formulated by man. The origin of language—of propositional, syntactical speech—is still enshrouded in mystery.*

In the course of the history of human science, two—and only two of any consequence—naturalistic theories of the origin of language have been advanced: these are designated the *interjectional* and the *onomatopoetic* (or onomatopoeic) theories. According to the interjectional theory, speech-sound-units were originally of *subjective* origin, that is, they derived from “emotive utterances.” But surely our experience of language proves beyond any possibility of doubt that words which are expressive of emotion (interjections) are negligible in relation to any linguistic system as a whole; in a word, they are the least important and least used of all speech elements. Sapir (*Lang.*, 4-5): “. . . under the stress of emotion we do involuntarily give utterance to sounds that the hearer interprets as indicative of the emotion itself. But there is all the difference in the world between such involuntary expression of feeling and the normal type of communication of ideas that is speech. The former kind of utterance is indeed instinctive, but it is non-symbolic . . . Moreover, such instinctive cries hardly constitute communication in any strict sense . . . The mistake must not be made of identifying our conventional interjections (our oh! and ah! and sh!) with the instinctive cries themselves. These interjections are merely conventional fixations of the natural sounds. They differ widely in various languages in accordance with the specific

phonetic genius of each of these . . . There is no tangible evidence, historical or otherwise, tending to show that the mass of speech elements and speech processes has evolved out of the interjections." According to the *onomatopoetic* theory, human language had an objective source; that is, it had its origin in the imitation of sounds in nature. This theory has little to recommend it, for two reasons especially: in the first place, there is no possible way of ascertaining what the first form of human speech was; hence no possible way of comparing the first phonemes (units of speech-sound) with the sounds in nature from which they are supposed to have been derived; and in the second place, sound-imitative phonemes of words that make up fully developed languages which are propositional and relational in their thought content, are obviously so rare as to be of little consequence. Again Sapir (*Lang.*, 7): "What applies to the interjections applies with even greater force to the sound-imitative words. Such words as 'whip-poorwill,' 'to mew,' 'to caw' are in no sense natural sounds that man has instinctively or automatically reproduced. They are just as truly creations of the human mind, flights of human fancy, as anything else in language. They do not directly grow out of nature, they are suggested by it and play with it. Hence the onomatopoetic theory of the origin of speech, the theory that would explain all speech as a gradual evolution from sounds of an imitative character, really brings us no nearer to the instinctive level than is language as we know it today." Again (p. 8): "However much we may be disposed on general principles to assign a fundamental importance in the languages of primitive peoples to the imitation of natural sounds, the actual fact of the matter is that these languages show no particular preference for imitative words." I repeat, therefore, *that there is no naturalistic theory of the origin of human language that will stand the test of critical scrutiny. The les-*

son which Gen. 2:19-20 conveys is that language is of Divine origin, by communication from the Spirit of God to the God-breathed human spirit.

“And Jehovah God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib, which Jehovah God had taken from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And the man said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed” (vv. 21-25).

9. *The Beginning of Human Society.* (1) *Society is defined* as a permanent moral union of two or more persons, for the attainment of common ends (goods) through their co-operative activity. Man is by nature a social being: he lives with others, works with others, is benefited by others, and himself benefits others, universally and inevitably. These are facts of history and of ordinary observation and experience. “Man is by nature a political animal,” wrote Aristotle; that is, a social being, a dweller in a *polis* (city-state). Temporal society is of two kinds, namely, *domestic* society (from *domus*, “household”) which consists of the conjugal and the parental-filial relationships, and *civil* society—that of the state, of persons living under the direction of a ruling regime. The Church, of course, does not belong in the category of temporal societies—it is, rather, a supernatural spiritual society.

(2) *Adam’s “deep sleep.”* As a result of the “grand review” of the animal species, the facts became evident that no fresh creation “from the ground” could be a fit companion for Adam: that this companion (counterpart) must be taken from his own body. Hence, God is said to have caused a “deep sleep” to fall upon him. What was the

character of this "deep sleep"? Skinner suggests (ICCG, 68): "a hypnotic trance induced by supernatural agency," the purpose being "to produce anesthesia, with perhaps the additional idea that the divine working cannot take place under human supervision." "While Adam knows no sin, God will take care he shall feel no pain" (M. Henry). (Note the typical import of this account: see *infra*, "Adam as a Type of Christ").

(3) *The Creation of the Woman.* (a) While Adam was in this "deep sleep," God, we are told, removed one of his ribs—this rib He is said (literally) to have "builided into" the Woman. The place in man's body from which this part was taken is most significant: as M. Henry puts it (CWB, 7): "Not out of his head to rule over him, nor out of his feet to be trampled on by him, but out of his side to be equal with him, under his arm to be protected, and near his heart to be beloved." (Cf. the term "rib" with the oft-repeated popular phrase, "bosom companion"). (b) Were the sexes separated or isolated from a common hermaphroditic ancestor or ancestry? Obviously, this crude notion that the first human being was *androgynous* (from *andros*, "man," or "husband," and *gynaiikos*, "woman" or "wife") and later became separated into male and female, has not one iota of support in the Genesis account. (For a facetious presentation of the tale of the androgynous man, see the account proposed by the Greek comedy writer, Aristophanes, in Plato's *Symposium*).

(c) Do we not have here another example of the fundamental truth that in God's Cosmic Plan, in both the physical and spiritual phases of it, *life springs out of real or apparent death*? In this instance, out of the "deep sleep" of the Man emerged the life of the creature answering to his needs. (Cf. Matt. 10:39, 16:25; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24; John 3:16; 1 Cor. 15:35-49). (d) V. 21, "rib," literally something *bent* or *inclined*. Those who scoff at this "old rib story"—and their name is Legion—miss the point of the

whole account, both its *naturalistic* import (the Woman's nearness to, and oneness with, the Man in marriage), and its *positivistic* significance (*i.e.*, its typical reference, for which see *infra*, "Eve as a Type of the Church"). Skinner (ICCG, 68): the story doubtless suggests a "deeper significance," that is, 'the moral and social relation of the sexes to each other, the dependence of woman upon man, her close relationship to him, and the foundation existing in nature for . . . the feelings with which each should naturally regard the other.'" (The quote here is from Driver). (e) Why does not the male man lack one rib today? Because it was only Adam's individual skeleton that was affected by the removal of one of his ribs. Moreover, the Lamarckian theory of "the inheritance of acquired characteristics" is rejected by the science of our day (except, perhaps, in Russia, where the Russian biologist, Lysenko, has been lauded for re-affirming it). It must be understood, too, that this particular act—the removal of a rib from Adam's frame—was not of the character of a naturally acquired modification; Scripture makes it clear that it was a special Divine act performed only once, and that at the fountainhead of the race. (f) I suppose that no story in the Old Testament has been viciously attacked and ridiculed as extensively as this "old rib story." In this instance especially, the thought expressed in one verse of a great religious poem is surely confirmed. That line is: "Blind unbelief is bound to err." To be sure, unbelief is bound to err, *because it is blind*, because it is the product of a closed mind.

(g) It should be noted that, having created the Woman, God Himself "brought her unto the man." This means that our Heavenly Father performed the first marriage Himself. It means infinitely more: it means that He would have all men to know that marriage is a Divinely ordained institution. It means, too, that marriage is the oldest institution known to humankind: it was established prior to worship,

sacrifice, religion, and all human government. Its antiquity and universality are paralleled only by human language.

(h) That domestic society in its various aspects is an ordination of the laws of nature and of nature's God is evident from the following facts: from the definition of the word "natural" as that for which there is in man's make-up a genuine ability or capacity, a genuine inclination, and a genuine need; from the constitution of human nature itself (no man can realize his potentialities living in isolation from his kind); from the natural division of the human race into the two sexes, male and female, and from the union of the two as nature's *modus operandi* for procreating and preserving the race; from the natural physiological and psychological powers of both male and female to enter into the conjugal union; from the natural inclination of both sexes to enter into this union; from the wondrous complementary character of the two sexes *per se*; from the genuine need of both male and female, as physiologically constituted, for the conjugal relation (as the natural and moral outlet for the sex "drive"); and especially for the genuine need of human children for the protection, care and love of parents. There is no kind of offspring that is as helpless, and as helpless for as long a time, as the human infant. Animal offspring mature in a few weeks or months at the most; the human child needs from eighteen to twenty-one years to mature physically, and many more years to mature mentally and spiritually. Maturation, in the case of the person and personality, is a lifelong process: it is never complete, in all its aspects, in the life on earth. Thus it is seen to be evident beyond all possibility of doubt that the conjugal union must be the origin and basis of all human society, and the home the origin and basis of all political and social order.

(i) "Bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh," said Adam, on receiving the Woman unto himself. Whitelaw (PCG, 52): "The language is expressive at once of woman's

derivation from man (1 Cor. 11:8,12) and likeness to man. The first of these implies her subordination or subjection to man, or man's headship over woman (1 Cor. 11:3), which Adam immediately proceeds to assert by assigning to her a name; the second is embodied in the name which she receives." (I see no reason to think that this dominion or headship needed to be exercised prior to the entrance of sin, and the disorder caused by sin, into our world. Cf. Gen. 3:16). It seems to me that the most fundamental fact expressed here in Adam's statement, is that of the *oneness* of the male and female in marriage. Note the "now" here ("This is *now*," etc.): that is, in our state of matrimony: obviously, the words could not apply to the male and female generally, that is, outside of marriage. Hence, the breaking of this oneness, by such acts as fornication, adultery, homosexuality, or any of the numerous forms of sex perversion (unnatural uses of the sex power and privilege) is *sin*. Pfeiffer (BG, 21): "Life is realized in its fullest dimensions when man and woman dwell together in that unity which God purposed and established."

(j) "She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man." Rotherham (EB, 35): "Heb., *ishshah*, 'female-man,' from *ish*, 'man' or 'husband.'" Her generic name is *Woman*; her personal name, bestowed on her later, like the first, by Adam, was *Eve* (Gen. 3:20).

10. *The Sanctity of Marriage.* (1) V. 24—Were these words spoken by Adam, or by the inspired author of the Torah? By the first husband, or by the historian? (Cf. the words of Jesus, Matt. 19:1-9, Mark 10:2-12). In either case, they must be understood as the Divine declaration of *the law of marriage*; as affirming, once for all, the Divine ordination of the conjugal union and the sanctity of its function, especially in the procreation and education of the race. (2) The *basis* of marriage is, according to this Scripture (v. 24; cf. Matt. 19:5-6, Mark 10:7-8, 1 Cor.

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

6:16, Eph. 5:31) the conjugal union actualized by the first pair at their creation; its *nature*, a forsaking (by the woman as well as the man) of parents, especially in the matter of habitation, and, relatively, in respect of affection, and the man's cleaving unto his wife, in the joining together of the two in both body and soul; its *result*, their becoming "into" one flesh. "This language points to a unity of persons and not simply to a conjunction of bodies, or a community of interests, or even a reciprocity of affections. Malachi (2:15) and Christ (Matt. 19:5) explain this verse as teaching the indissoluble character of marriage and condemning the practice of polygamy" (White-law, PCG, 52). (3) Having looked over all the animal pairs and found no fulfilment for his potentialities nor satisfaction for his need, Adam did find all this in the Woman. This was part of God's blessing in Creation. The perpetuation of this blessing was to be assured through monogamy (2:24). It seems that polygamy was permitted at different times in the Old Testament Dispensations (Acts 17:30). But the most fruitful state—the right state—is for each man to cleave unto his wife and unto her only. Jesus so states the case in Matt. 19:4-6 and in Mark 10:6-9). (4) It should be noted that New Testament teaching, in completing these accounts of the institution of the conjugal union (Gen. 1:27, 2:23-24) *does not put any emphasis on the strength of sex; rather, it places the emphasis on the sanctity and inviolability of marriage* (cf. again Matt. 19:4-6, also 1 Cor. 6:16), as the symbol of the mystery of Christ's relationship with His Church (Eph. 5:28-33). (However, it should be noted here that the teaching of Jesus does allow divorce and remarriage (the phrase, "except for fornication," applies with equal force to what follows it, "shall marry another," as to what precedes it, "whosoever shall put away his wife"): cf. Matt. 5:31-32, 19:3-9). We also learn, from Paul in 1 Cor. 7:10-16, that in cases of desertion in which the deserting

party is an unbeliever, the marriage covenant may be regarded as permanently dissolved. I know of no other Scriptural ground to justify remarriage after divorce.)

(5) Some will say that the existence of sex in human life was a natural thing and a blessing. Mankind, we are told, was created "male and female" (Gen. 1:27; 5:2), and the Divine blessing was bestowed upon them with the command (1:29) to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (that is, populate it). Someone has said that this "reads almost like a wedding benediction." All this is true, no doubt. It is true that sex in human life was, and is, a natural thing, that is, if rightly used; the sin comes in the misuse and abuse of it. It is a power, however, which has been perverted and degraded by man into some of the most iniquitous of human acts. We are living in an age when unholy emphasis on the so-called "sex drive" (libido) is universal and threatens to undermine the very foundations of American home life. Sex is included with hunger and thirst as the basic organic drives; to be sure, we know that a man cannot live very long without food and drink; but who ever heard of a man dying of sex frustration? Freudianism, at the hands of its over-zealous disciples, has become a kind of "sophisticated pornography" that is spread abroad in the college and university classroom under the specious cover of "academic freedom." Dr. Will Durant has said that *the inhibition (discipline) of sex is the first principle of civilization*. This is true: it is the first step out of the jungle and the barnyard. History proves that a nation's morale is dependent on its morality; and that its morality is determined largely by its sex morality, that is, upon its home life which is rooted by nature in the sex life of parents.

(6) A prominent contributor to a well-known periodical writes of the "mythology" that has grown up around the subject of sex, as follows: the myth that sex is natural and therefore automatically self-adjusting and self-fulfilling

("all the techniques in the world cannot fill the emptiness which grows between two people who no longer have anything important to say to each other," therefore no ground exists for blaming the estrangement on some lack in the physical relationship in marriage); the myth that "there is a right man for a right woman"; the myth that sex can be treated casually ("I-can-take-it-and-leave-it-when-I-am-ready" point of view); the myth that "sex is something I have to have or I will be sick" (the argument often used by the male to win the acquiescence of the female: many a young woman has been lured into illegitimacy by the specious plea of "love" or "need," when she has done nothing but contribute to the vanity of the "male animal" by adding to his "conquests"), etc. This writer goes on to say (having misplaced the original of this excerpt, I cannot give proper credit) that the sexual crisis in our time is "the sign of that chaos which afflicts men and women whose capacity to love has been lost or taken from them." Parental instruction concerning the pitfalls which young people face in our present-day complex and lawless society must be given them in early childhood. No safeguards exist any longer but the moral standards set by our home life and training.

(7) *The primary ends of marriage are procreative and unitive.* By *procreative* we mean, of course, that marriage is essentially for the procreation and training of offspring and the consequent reproduction and preservation of the human species. Generation without proper training would, in most cases, contribute to the increasing momentum of lawlessness. Some of the silliest cults of our time are the cults of so-called "self-expression." The natural order demands that children not just be born and then be tossed out to grow up willy-nilly, like Topsy. Lack of discipline in infancy and childhood is one of the main sources of juvenile delinquency. We train our dogs and our horses: why, then, do we allow our children to grow up without

any discipline whatever? Someone has rightly said that it is far better for a child to learn respect for proper authority in the high-chair than to grow up and have to learn it, when it is too late, in the electric chair. But marriage is also *unitive* in character. Mutual love and helpfulness contribute continuously to the personality development of the married couple. The man has a home; the wife has security; both have affection (that mutual love which is the union of spirits as well as of bodies); the result is the most tender, intimate, and sacred covenant relationship, with the sole exception of the covenant of grace, into which human hearts can enter. The physical union is an important factor in true marriage, of course: it is characteristically unitive in its enhancement of the intimacy of the conjugal relation. But it is not the most important factor. There must be a union of spirits, as well as of bodies, to make a marriage permanent. It is true, however, that sexual coition, sanctified by Christian love, is the most poignant bliss that human beings can experience short of the Beatific Vision (Union with God) itself. Nor is there any relationship into which human hearts can enter that is as fruitful, as productive of well-being and of genuine happiness as the relationship of a long and happy marriage. Fortunate indeed is the man and woman who can contract and maintain such an ever increasingly fruitful relationship as they grow old together. There is nothing that can compare with it in human experience. Small wonder, then, that the Apostle writes of it as a kind of prototype of the spiritual relationship between Christ and His elect, the Church! (Eph. 5:22-33, 4:10-16; Rom. 6:3-7; 1 Cor. 6:19-20; Acts 20:28; 2 Cor. 11:2, etc.).

(8) V. 25—*naked, but not ashamed*. Keil (KD, BCOTP, 91): "Their bodies were sanctified by the spirit which animated them. Shame entered first with sin, which destroyed the normal relation of the spirit to the body,

exciting tendencies and lusts which warred against the soul, and turning the sacred ordinance of God into sensual impulses and the lusts of the flesh." Delitzsch (quoted by Whitelaw, PCG, 52, and by Lange, 210): "They were naked, yet they were not so. Their bodies were the clothing of their internal glory, and their internal glory was the clothing of their nakedness." Lange (CDHCG, 210): "Nakedness is here the expression of perfect innocence, which, in its ingenuousness, elevates the body into the spiritual personality as ruled by it, whilst, on the contrary, the feeling of shame enters with the consciousness of the opposition between spirit and sensual corporeity, whilst shame itself comes in with the presentiment and the actual feeling of guilt." I find no clear evidence, or even intimation, to support the view that Adam and Eve were united in physical coition prior to the admission of sin into their lives. It seems to me that the meaning of the names given to their sons, Cain and Abel, respectively "a spear" (was not Cain's murderous act truly a spear driven into the heart of Mother Eve?) and "a breath" or "a vapor" (what Abel's short existence truly was) refute such a view. Surely these names could not have applied to circumstances of the Edenic state of innocence! I must therefore agree with those who hold that a part—but only a part—of the knowledge acquired by eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge was the awareness and the experience of the physical sex union. Not that this union was wrong, or a sin, in itself, but that in consequence of man's rebelliousness it was bound to become a prolific source of the most vicious and depraved of human acts (cf. Rom. 1:26-32).

11. "*Paradise, O Paradise!*" From the beginning of his existence, man has always dreamed of such a blissful state of being as that portrayed in the Genesis story of the Garden of Delight. This is reflected in the numerous visions of an ideal earthly state as represented by the

*utopias* (from the Greek negative prefix, *ou*, "no," and noun, *topos*, "place"; hence, "no place") which have appeared in practically every period of human literature. The completely secularistic and hedonistic note is struck by our old friend, Omar, in the *Rubaiyat*. For "Paradise enow" writes Omar, give me—

"A Book of Verses underneath the bough;  
A Jug of Wine, a Loaf of Bread and Thou  
Beside me singing in the Wilderness."

The French artist, Paul Gauguin, describes such an earthly paradise as "a life filled brimful with happiness and radiant like the sun, in perfect simplicity, seeking refreshment at the nearest brook as, I imagine, the first man and woman did in paradise."

In all ages, the vision of a spiritual celestial Paradise seems also to have stirred the hope that "springs eternal in the human breast." In this category, we have the Sumerian Garden of the gods, the Greek Gardens of the Hesperides, the Homeric Elysian Fields ("Islands of the Blessed"), the Hindu Uttarakuru, the Norse Asgard, the Teutonic Valhalla, the Aztec Garden of Huitzilopochtli, the Celestial Oasis of the Moslems, the Happy Hunting Grounds of the American Indians, and many others. (See "The Quest for Paradise," in medical magazine, MD, June, 1965). (See also the four successive races of men as envisioned by the 7th century B.C. Greek poet, Hesiod, in his *Works and Days*, namely, the golden race, the silver race, the race of demigods, and the last, the iron race, described as vicious, corrupt, and filling the earth with violence: cf. Gen. 6:5,11,12). Truly, where there is no vision, where the music and the dream of life is lost, there the people cast off restraint: cf. Prov. 29:18).

Is it not reasonable to hold that the universality of this dream, even in its most degraded (materialistic) forms, presupposes such a state of being, spiritual and eternal, such a fulfilment for those who have prepared themselves

in this world to appreciate it, by living the Spiritual Life, the life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3), awaiting them at some time, somewhere beyond the blue, in the City of God, New Jerusalem, the antitype, of which the type is the Edenic Garden of the book of Genesis. In a word, that we have in the Genesis narrative and its fulfilment in Revelation, the truth respecting the eternal Paradise or Heaven, the future home of the redeemed sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty (Heb. 11:10, 12:22; Gal. 4:12, 2 Cor. 6:18; Isa. 65:17-19, 66:22-23; 2 Pet. 3:8-13; Rev. 2:7, 21:1-7, 22:1-5). (For interesting reading, in this connection, the following are suggested: "The Myth of Er," in the last book of Plato's *Republic*, the concluding chapters of Bunyan's great allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and Book 18 of Augustine's classic work, *The City of God*).

12. *Summary of the Circumstances of Man's Original State* (cf. Eccl. 7:29): It was a state (1) of personal life, of self-consciousness and self-determination; (2) of untried innocence (*holiness* differs from innocence in the fact that it is not passivity, but is the product of continuous moral *activity* in obedience to the Divine Will); (3) of exemption from physical death (as death is in the world, because sin is in the world, and because sin had not yet been committed, the penalty of death had not yet been pronounced upon the race); (4) of special Divine providence; (5) of unhindered access to God; (6) of dominion over all the lower orders; (6) of liberty within the circumference of the moral law and its requirements; (7) of intimate companionship with a helper answering to the man's needs. Generally speaking, it would seem that this Edenic existence was a *probationary* state. Milligan (SR, 50): "The whole earth, was created, and from the beginning arranged with special reference to the wants of man. But to make a world free from all decay, suffering, and death—that is, such a world as would have been adapted to the constitution, wants, and condition of man had he

never fallen, when at the same time God foresaw that he would sin and become mortal—to do so would have been very inconsistent with Infinite Wisdom and Infinite Benevolence. Even erring man would not act so unwisely. And hence we find that the world in general was from the beginning constituted and arranged with reference to man as he *is*, and not man as he *was*, in Eden. Paradise was a mere *temporary* abode for him, during the few days of his primeval innocence.” On the basis of this view, it is the conviction of the present writer that God’s Plan of Redemption is an integral part of His whole Cosmic Plan of Creation, and that Creation will not be complete until the righteous stand in the Judgment, clothed in glory and honor and immortality, redeemed in spirit and soul and body.

#### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

##### Adam as a Type of Christ

(Review concerning types and antitypes in Part Two.)

Rom. 5:14, 1 Cor. 15:45. Note the points of resemblance, as follows:

1. Both came by Divine agency: the First Adam, by Divine inbreathing (Gen. 2:7); the Second Adam, by Divine “overshadowing” of the womb of the Virgin (Gen. 3:15; Luke 1:26-37; Matt. 1:18-25; John 1:1-14; Gal. 4:4; 1 Tim. 3:16).

2. Both said to be the image of God: the First, the *personal* image (Gen. 1:26-27, 5:1, 9:6; 1 Cor. 11:7); the Second, the *very* image (*i.e.*, both *personal* and *moral*: Heb. 1:3; John 10:30, 14:6-11; Col. 2:9; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Cor. 1:30; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 3:5; Heb. 4:15, 7:26-27). The fundamental revelation of the Old Testament is that God created man in His own image (Gen. 1:27); that of the New Testament is that God took upon Himself the likeness of the creature, man (John 1:14, Heb. 2:14-15, Phil. 2:5-8).

3. Both were tempted by the Devil: the First, in a Garden where all the environmental factors supported him, and yet he yielded (Gen. 3:1-7); the Second, in a "wilderness" where the environmental factors all favored the Tempter, but, by reliance on the Word of God, and in the strength of perfect manhood, He resisted the temptation (Matt. 4:1-11, Heb. 4:15). Sin lies not in the temptation, but in the yielding to it (Cf. Matt. 26:36-46).

4. Both were to subdue the earth: the First Adam, in a physical sense (Gen. 1:28—"Adam," in its generic sense, takes in all mankind, and human science is but the fulfillment of this Divine injunction); the Second Adam, in a spiritual sense (Matt. 28:18; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Phil. 2:9-11; Col. 1:13-20; Eph. 1:20-23). The Lord Jesus holds spiritual sovereignty over the whole of created being: He is Lord of the cosmos and the Absolute Monarch of the Kingdom of Heaven (Acts 2:36, Rev. 1:17-18).

5. The First Adam was the "first-born" and head of the physical creation (Gen. 1:26-27). Christ, the Second Adam, is the firstborn from the dead and the Head of the spiritual creation (the Regeneration: Eph. 5:23, 1:22; John 3:1-8; Tit. 3:5; Matt. 19:28; Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15,18; Heb. 12:23, etc.).

Here the analogies end. The contrasts, on the other hand, are equally significant: (1) Rom. 5:17-19, 1 Cor. 15:21-23: Whatever was lost by the disobedience of the First Adam is now regained by the obedience of the Second (John 1:29): regained, for the innocent and irresponsible, *unconditionally* (Luke 18:16; Matt. 18:3-6, 19:14), but, for the accountable, *conditionally*, that is, on the terms of admission into the New Covenant (Acts 16:31, 2:38; Matt. 10:32-33; Luke 13:3; Rom. 10:9-10; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3-11). (Children who grow up to be adults responsible for their acts will experience personality development as a result of the impact of the factors of this terrestrial environment. This is a psychological fact.

Does not this prove that babies who die in infancy, before reaching accountable age, will experience personality development through the impact of the factors of the celestial (heavenly) environment into which they will immediately enter? In either case, Christian redemption is the redemption of the whole being, in "spirit and soul and body" (1 Thess. 5:23). (2) We belong to Adam by *generation* (Acts 17:24-28, Heb. 12:9, Mal. 2:10). We belong to Christ by *regeneration* (John 3:1-8, Tit. 3:5, Matt. 19:28; 2 Cor. 5:17; Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:24, etc.). (3) The First Adam was created *a living soul* (Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:45). The Second Adam, by bringing "life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10) became "a life-giving spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45; John 5:21, 6:57, 11:25-26; Rom. 8:2, 11). (4) We are all the posterity of the First Adam by ordinary or natural procreation, and we look to Eve as "the mother of all living" (Gen. 3:20). But the time came when God had to set aside *all flesh*: the sad fact is that "all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). The whole world is concluded under sin, put under Divine condemnation (John 3:16-18), that all might return to God by one Way: that Way is Christ (John 14:6, 2 Cor. 5:17-20). Fleshly birth no longer avails anything: "Ye must be born again" (John 3:3-8). By the new birth we become "partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4), and so belong to Christ (1 Cor. 5:11, 6:20, 7:23; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Acts 20:28). (5) Hence, true brotherhood is *in Christ* and in Him only. (Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal. 3:27-28). We hear so much today about "the universal brotherhood of man," but the prevailing conception expressed in this phrase is that of a social, rather than a spiritual, brotherhood. A study of the Scriptures reveals the fact clearly that God no longer places any particular value on fleshly brotherhood of any kind. Men can no longer come to God on the basis of anything within themselves: they must come through Christ. Hence the utter folly of

trying to substitute fraternalism, social service, eugenics, civic reform, or any other human device, for the church of the living God. Spiritual brotherhood in Christ is the noblest relationship known in Heaven or on earth: it is an eternal relationship. While our "false prophets of the dawn" are vainly trying to substitute civic righteousness, social service, respectability, and the like, for "the things that abide," every Gospel preacher needs to be at his post preaching "repentance and remission of sins" in the name of Christ (Luke 24:47, Acts 2:38). Good citizenship is not the basis of membership in the Body of Christ: a new birth *is*, however (Matt. 12:50).

#### Eve as a Type of the Church

1. Adam was in need of a helper meet for his needs. It was not *good* that he should be alone: that is, alone he could not actualize his potentialities nor fulfil God's design in creating him, that of procreating the human race (his kind). Eve was, therefore, provided to meet this need. (Note v. 18—not a "helpmeet," but a helper meet for (answering to) the man's need,—his *counterpart*.) In like manner, when our Lord returned to the Father, having accomplished the work the Father had given Him to do (John 17:4-5), it became necessary for a helper to be provided answering to His need: for this purpose the Church was brought into existence (John 1:29, 1 Cor. 3:9, 2 Cor. 11:2-3, Eph. 5:22-32, Rom. 7:4, etc.). It was necessary that a sanctuary be provided in this temporal world for the habitation of God in the Spirit (Eph. 2:22): this sanctuary is the Church (Rom. 5:5, Acts 2:38, 1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19; Gal. 3:2, 5:22-25): no other institution on earth is, or can be, this sanctuary. It was necessary also that provision be made to actualize Christ's redemptive work: the Church was established to meet this need. The mission of the Church is twofold, and *only* twofold, namely, to preserve the truth of God, and to proclaim that truth

unto the uttermost parts of the earth (Matt. 16:16-20, 28:18-20; Acts 1:8). No institution but the Church is divinely commissioned to proclaim the Gospel to all the nations (Matt. 24:14). Hence, the Church is described in Scripture as the *pillar and ground of the truth*, not only of its preservation, but also of its worldwide proclamation. (1 Tim. 3:15; John 8:31-32, 16:7-15, 17:17; Rom. 1:16, 1 Tim. 3:4; 2 Tim. 1:13, 2:2, 3:16-17).

2. As Eve was the bride of Adam, so the Church is the Bride of the Redeemer. The Church is described in the New Testament under such striking metaphors as (1) the Body of Christ, a metaphor suggesting a fellowship of parts, a living organism (Rom. 12:4-5; Eph. 1:22-23, 2:16, 4:4, 12,25; 1 Cor. 12:12-31). (2) the Temple of God, a metaphor suggesting, stability, solidarity, permanence (Eph. 2:19-22, 2 Thess. 2:4, 1 Cor. 3:16, 2 Cor. 6:16), (3) the Household of God, a metaphor suggesting spiritual familial affinity (Gal. 6:10, Eph. 2:19, 3:15; Heb. 3:6; 1 Pet. 2:5, 4:17), and (4) the Bride of Christ, a metaphor suggesting constancy and purity (John 3:29; Rev. 19:6-9, 21:2, 21:9, 22:17).

3. While Adam was in a "deep sleep," God removed the material out of which He made, (literally, which He "buildded into") the Woman (Gen. 2:22). In like manner, while Jesus slept the "deep sleep" of death, on the Cross, one of the soldiers thrust a spear into His side, "and straightway there came out blood and water" (John 19:34), the materials out of which God has constructed the Church. We are cleansed, purged of the guilt of sin, through the efficacy of Christ's blood (the Atonement which He provided by giving His life for us). (Cf. John 1:29; Lev. 17:11, Heb. 9:22, 1 John 1:7, 1 Cor. 10:16, Heb. 9:14, Matt. 26:28, 1 Cor. 11:25, Eph. 1:7, Col. 1:20; 1 Pet. 1:18-19, 2:21-24; Rev. 1:4). And the place—the only place—Divinely appointed for the repentant believer to meet the efficacy of this cleansing blood is the grave of

water (Christian baptism). (Cf. Matt. 28:18-20, Tit. 3:5, John 3:5, Acts 2:38, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 6:3-7, 1 Pet. 3:20-21, etc.).

4. As Eve was a partaker of the corporeal nature of Adam (Gen. 2:23), so the Church is a partaker of the spiritual nature of Christ (2 Pet. 1:4, Eph. 2:10).

5. Adam was divinely appointed to rule over his wife (Gen. 3:16). This Divine ordination, it will be noted, followed their fall into sin. Authority is necessary to any form of society, even domestic society (that of the household), because of the selfish and rebellious impulses in the human heart (Rom. 3:23). Hence, when sin entered, and thus introduced disorder into their lives, God saw fit to vest the authority in the man as the head of the household; and human experience testifies that this was a wise provision. This sovereignty must be exercised, however, as a sovereignty of love (Eph. 5:23, 24). In like manner, Christ is the sole head over all things to the Church (Eph. 1:22-23, Col. 1:18). Matt. 28:18—here "all" means *all*—or nothing, Eph. 4:4—"one Lord," not one in Heaven and another on earth. Acts 2:36—"both Lord and Christ," that is, Acting Sovereign of the universe and the Absolute Monarch of the Kingdom of Heaven. (Phil. 2:9-11, 1 Cor. 15:24-28). Christ delegated His authority to the Apostles as the executors of His Last Will and Testament (Matt. 17:5; John 16:7-15, 20:21-23, Luke 24:44-49, Acts 1:1-8). There is not one iota of Scripture evidence that the Apostles ever delegated their authority to any man or group of men. Rather, apostolic authority is incorporated in the Word, as communicated by the Spirit (1 Cor. 1:10-15, 1 Thess. 2:13), that is, in the New Testament Scriptures (Acts 2:42). The Church is a theocracy, with each local congregation functioning under the direction of elders and deacons (Acts 11:30, 14:23, 15:4, 16:4, 20:17-36; 1 Tim. 3:1-13, Tit. 1:5-9, Eph. 4:11, etc.). Denominationalism is the product of the substitution of human theology and

human authority for the authority of Christ and His Word. The grand theme of all Christian preaching should be the Lordship of Christ. But is it? How often does one hear this message sounded out from the modern pulpit?

6. Adam name his wife (Gen. 3:20): her generic name was Woman; her personal name, Eve. Likewise, Christ named His elect, the Church. Cf. Isa. 65:15, 56:5, 62:2; Acts 11:26, 15:15-18; Rev. 22:4. Matt. 16:18—"my church." Rom. 16:16—"the churches of Christ." This could be just as correctly translated "Christian churches"; the adjectival form "Christian" is just as correct as the genitive of possession, "of Christ." Both names mean "belonging to Christ" (Acts 20:28, 1 Cor. 6:20, Gal. 3:27-29). In the New Testament, individual Christians are named "disciples," "believers," "saints," "brethren," "priests," etc. But these are all common names: to elevate any one of them to a proper name is to make it a distinguishing, hence *denominational*, designation. The same is true of all such human names as those of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Campbell, etc. (1 Cor. 1:10-17, 3:1-7). The name of Christ is the *only* name (authority) in which salvation is granted to men (Acts 4:11-12; cf. Phil. 2:9-11; Acts 2:38, 26:28; 2 Pet. 4:16; Col. 3:17).

7. Adam had only *one* wife. In like manner, Christ has only one Bride, one Body, one Temple, one Household, etc. John 10:16—they (Jew and Gentile) "shall become one flock, one shepherd." Matt. 16:18—"my church," not "churches." Eph. 4:4—"There is one body." For this spiritual Body to have more than one Head, or for this Head to have more than one Body, would be an unexplainable monstrosity. Yet this is the picture presented today by the denominationalism and hierarchism of Christendom, and the price that has been paid for this state of affairs is, as John R. Mott once put it, an unbelieving world. Denominationalism is a fungus growth on the Body of Christ, having its source in human (theological) specula-

tion and presumption. It is anti-Scriptural, and it is an open violation of the Will of Christ as expressed in His sublime intercessory prayer (John 17:20-21). There is no salvation in any denomination *per se*, simply because all denominationalism is of human authority and hence extraneous to the Body of Christ. Salvation is possible only *in Christ*, and to be in Christ is to be in His Body (Gal. 3:27, Acts 4:11-12, Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:10, 4:24).

8. As Eve was the mother of all who live upon the earth naturally (physically), so the Church is the mother of all who live spiritually (Gen. 3:20, Acts 17:25-26, John 3:3-5, Gal. 4:26). To the union of Adam and Eve sons and daughters were born in the flesh (Gen. 5:1-5); to the union of Christ and His Church sons and daughters are born into the Heavenly Family (John 3:7, 1 Pet. 1:23, Rom. 8:14, Eph. 3:14-15, Heb. 8:8-12).

As the material creation would have been incomplete, even non-existent, without Eve, so the spiritual creation (the regeneration) would be non-existent without the Church. Hence, the Eternal Purpose of God looked forward to the Woman as the counterpart of the Man, and to the Church as the counterpart of Christ, her Head (Eph. 1:4-5, Rom. 8:28-30). Man was first brought into existence, then Woman was viewed in him, and taken out of him. In like manner, Christ was lifted up, then the Church was viewed in Him, and taken out of Him (John 3:14-15, 12:32). There was no other creature so near to Adam as was his bride, and there is no people so near to Christ as His Bride, the Church; hence the Church is said to be "the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:23, 4:15-16).

C. H. M. (NBS, 15-17): "When we look at the type before us, we may form some idea of the results which ought to follow from the understanding of the Church's position and relationship. What affection did not Eve owe

to Adam! What nearness she enjoyed! What intimacy of communion! What full participation in all his thoughts! In all his dignity, and in all his glory, she was entirely one. He did not rule *over*, but *with* her. He was lord of the whole creation, and she was one with him . . . All this will find its full antitype in the ages to come. Then shall the True Man—the Lord from heaven—take His seat on the throne, and, in companionship with His bride—the Church—rule over a restored creation. This Church is quickened out of the grave of Christ, is part 'of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones.' He the Head and she the Body, making one Man, as we read in the fourth chapter of Ephesians,—‘Till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.’ The Church, being thus part of Christ, will occupy a place in glory quite unique. There was no other creature so near to Adam as Eve, because no other creature was part of himself. So in reference to the Church, she will hold the very nearest place to Christ in His coming glory.” (Note that Adam apparently did rule *with* Eve, not *over* her, prior to their fall into sin, as stated above.)

#### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART NINE

1. What does the name *Paradise* signify?
2. What are the two views of the possible location of Eden?
3. What two rivers, in the Genesis account, seem to locate Eden geographically, and why?
4. In what respect does the Biblical story of Eden accord with scientific thought concerning the origin of mankind?
5. What is the apparent symbolical import of the Garden of Eden?
6. What lesson does this story have for us with respect to all mankind?

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

7. What significance does Breasted find in the story of Eden?
8. Explain the metaphor, the River of Life, as it is further developed in the New Testament.
9. What two Divine commands directed the Man's life in the Garden?
10. What was the Man's work in the Garden?
11. What does this teach us about honest labor? When did this become toil?
12. In what respects are gardens and God in close relationship?
13. How may the Tree of Life be explained as having actual existence and fruit? What function could this fruit have served?
14. What does the Tree of Life symbolize?
15. What is the metaphorical significance of the Tree of Life?
16. In what sense is the Biblical story of the Tree of Life unique in comparison with non-Biblical traditions?
17. What fundamental truth is indicated by the fact of the universality of certain traditions, as, *e.g.*, those of a prehistoric Golden Age, of Sacrifice, of a Flood, etc.?
18. In what verse of Genesis do we have the account of the beginning of liberty and of law?
19. What does this Scripture teach about the relation between liberty and law?
20. State the rather common views of the significance of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.
21. Concerning the theory that this knowledge was, and is, the *maturity* that man acquires through the personal experience of sin and its consequence, does this imply that man "fell upward"?
22. How is *holiness* to be distinguished from *innocence*?
23. Are we to suppose that the Tree of Knowledge had real existence? On the basis of this view, what was

- the intent of the prohibition regarding the fruit of this Tree?
24. Explain what is meant in Scripture by a *positive* law. What is the chief function of positive law?
  25. What kind of choice was involved in the decision to eat of the fruit of this Tree?
  26. What kind of choice is involved in every sin?
  27. What is the view adopted in this text of the nature of "the knowledge of good and evil" indicated by the Genesis account of this Tree?
  28. What is probably the full meaning of the phrase, "good and evil"?
  29. Why do we reject the view that the only "knowledge" indicated in this account was physiological sex "knowledge"?
  30. What would be the symbolic meaning of the "Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil"?
  31. Regardless of whether this Tree was real or only symbolic, or even only metaphorical, what kind of human act was involved in the eating of its fruit?
  32. What was the twofold character of the "death" consequent upon eating of the fruit of this Tree?
  33. How, according to Genesis, did human language originate?
  34. What is the evident meaning of the word "good," as used in Gen. 2:18?
  35. State the two naturalistic theories of the origin of language and point out the inadequacy of each.
  36. How is society to be defined?
  37. What are the two kinds of human society?
  38. What was the significance of Adam's "deep sleep"?
  39. What profound *naturalistic* and *positivistic* truths are to be derived from the account of Woman's creation out of part of Adam's body?
  40. What lessons are to be derived from the identity of

## THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

- the particular part of Adam's body that God used to build into the Woman?
41. What is the significance of the statement that God, after creating the Woman, "brought her unto the man"?
  42. State the grounds on which we regard domestic society as a natural, and therefore divinely ordained, society.
  43. Explain the significance of the phrases, "bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh."
  44. Explain how the entire account of the Creation of the Woman emphasizes the sanctity of marriage.
  45. What error is involved in the notion that the sex drive is in the same class of organic drives as the drives for food and drink?
  46. State and explain the primary ends of marriage.
  47. Explain the relation of physical coition to the unitive aspect of marriage.
  48. Explain how the morale and morality of a people are related to their sex morality.
  49. Show how the inviolability of marriage and the home is related to national morality and stability.
  50. Explain the significance of the statement that Adam and Eve were "naked," but "not ashamed."
  51. List the circumstances of man's original state.
  52. Review the material on Types and Antitypes in Part Two.
  53. List and explain the points of resemblance between Adam and Christ.
  54. List the points of difference between Adam and Christ.
  55. List the points of resemblance between the bride of Adam and the Bride of the Redeemer.
  56. What should these truths teach us regarding the glory and dignity of the Church?
  57. What should these truths teach us about the mission of the Church?