

## PART THIRTEEN:

### THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(Gen. 3:9-24)

#### *Recapitulation*

1. Aldo J. Tos writes interestingly as follows (ABOT, 61): "The account of the Fall is an artistic presentation of the psychology of temptation. If we compare the various steps that were involved in that primeval drama with the moments involved in an individual's personal temptations, we can say with all honesty: 'The author knew what he was talking about.'" Tos then proceeds to designate these "steps" as follows: "1. Temptation makes its appearance" (v. 1); "2. Delay occurs" (vv. 2, 3); "3. The person is fooled" (vv. 4, 5); "4. Desire is aroused" (v. 6a); "5. Sin is committed" (v. 6b); "6. Effects are felt" (v. 7); "7. Remorse is experienced" (vv. 7, 8); "8. Tension results" (vv. 9, 10).

2. As stated heretofore, by *physical evil* is meant disease, suffering, death (of the body), etc. Leibniz, the German philosopher, classified evil in three categories, namely, *moral* evil (sin), *physical* evil (suffering,) and *meta-physical* evil (finitude). Can we reasonably attribute evil to any subhuman creature or event? For example, catastrophes in nature, such as hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, epidemics, and the like: surely these are neither good nor evil in themselves; obviously, they are *per se amoral*. The same is true of plant and brute creatures: their activities can hardly be said to be either moral or immoral: it is clearly evident that they are incapable of moral responsibility, and hence of moral action. To the extent that such factors affect human life adversely, they can be said to bring physical evil on human beings, although they are themselves involved in no guilt in so doing. A great deal of sheer "wumgush" ("mere mental mush") has been parroted in recent years about alleged "cruelties" in nature (including cruelties to animals).

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

Tennyson, for example, wrote (*In Memoriam*) of "Nature, red in tooth and claw with ravine," etc. Man, if he lives up to the ideal of manhood (humanity that is truly *humane*), is certainly obligated to treat animals without cruelty insofar as it is possible for him to do so. Animals, however, do not have rights, for the simple reason they have no capacity for understanding what either right or obligation means; hence we do not haul animals into court and charge them with crimes. They lack the prior deliberation, freedom of action, and voluntariness of action, all of which are necessary to produce the *human act*. Again, animals do not have the capacity for suffering cruelties such as man has: in the brute, memory is short-lived, as a rule, death usually occurs quickly, and real mental anguish apparently is nil. The fact that one species must feed upon another is a part of the order of nature, not a violation of it: in the case of every living thing, individual disease and death have their respective *causes*. Order is nature's first law because it is ordained by the Will of the Eternal Lawgiver. (If anyone doubts this, let him jump off a twenty-story building!) As the nuclear physicist and Nobel prize winner, Arthur Holly Compton, once put it: "A God who can control a universe like this is mighty beyond imagination."

3. It should be re-emphasized here that *the origin of evil* cannot be a matter of human speculation: the facts in the case lie wholly outside the areas of human science and philosophy. It must be evident to any thinking person that because sin could have originated only in disobedience to divine law, God, therefore is the sole source of truth respecting this important problem. (People are prone to speculate about the origin of evil: why do they hardly ever give any thought to the fact of the source and the existence of the good?) The problem of evil is not a matter for human (philosophical) speculation to resolve: it is, rather, *a matter of fact based on revealed truth*. Philoso-

## GENESIS

phers should not scorn the story of man's first disobedience as related in Genesis, for two reasons: first, the account is the only one that is in harmony with universal human experience, and second, because philosophy has nothing whatever to say on this subject that has equivalent reasonableness and reliability.

4. Another fact should be re-emphasized at this point, namely, that the content of the opening chapters of Genesis *in re* creation, temptation and sin, and the beginning of redemption, has a *universality* in relation to human experience that is not to be found in any other source. These chapters are no more Hebrew in coloring than they are Persian, Egyptian, Chaldean, Chinese, German, or American, etc. The notion that the events narrated in these chapters are to be understood as Hebrew "mythology" is not a reasonable one, and cannot be supported by appeal to the relevant evidence.

*"9 And Jehovah God called unto the man, and said unto him, Where art thou? 10 and he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. 11 And he said, who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? 12 And the man said, the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. 13 And Jehovah God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."*

1. "*The Inquest*" (this felicitous subhead is borrowed from Skinner, ICCG, 76).

(1) Note that their eyes were now opened (v. 7), not the *physical* eye, but the eye of *conscience*: not *sight*, but *insight*. They now *knew* they were naked: not that God had told them so—they knew it intuitively; and this knowledge brought with it a sense of guilt and shame,

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

and in true human fashion they tried to cover their shame by running away and hiding themselves. But this attempted concealment only served to make their act, including the shame itself, even more shameful. There is no possibility of recovery from the guilt and consequences of sin by trying to hide it or to hide from its aftermath; the only possible way to recovery is by *catbarsis*: by an "out with it" to God. Nothing short of this will drain the burden of guilt and shame from the sinsick soul (Prov. 28:13). It is far better for a person, when something obtrudes itself that is not right, instead of trying to hide it or change it or even embrace it, to go to his spouse and declare it, or to his neighbor and straighten it out (Matt. 3:6, 18:15-17; Jas. 5:16), or to his God and talk it out with Him. Note God's promise to His saints, 1 John 1:9: the only method by which the Christian can obtain forgiveness daily is by open confession to God in prayer.

(2) Note again the *fatherly motif*. We have here one of the most illuminating instances of anthropomorphism in the Bible (following closely on the equally significant instance of it in Gen. 2:7, the picture of the Divine in-breathing of spirit into the lifeless corporeal form of man, constituting him a psychosomatic unity). Anthropomorphism means *explaining God in terms of human experience*. Albright (FSAC, 265): "It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the anthropomorphic conception of Yahweh was absolutely necessary if the God of Israel was to remain a God of the individual Israelites as well as of the people as a whole. . . . For the average worshiper, it is very essential that his God be a divinity who can sympathize with his human feelings and emotions, a being whom he can love and fear alternately, and to whom he can transfer the holiest emotions connected with memories of father and mother and friend. In other words, it was precisely the anthropomorphism of Yahweh which was essential to the initial success of Israel's religion. . . . All

## GENESIS

the human characteristics of Israel's deity were exalted; they were projected against a cosmic screen and they served to interpret the cosmic process as the expression of God's creative word and eternally free will." (a) Note well God's questions: Adam, where art thou? Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you you should not eat? (This last "added to remove the pretext of ignorance," Calvin). Not that God did not know the truth about these matters: of course He knew. Adam's absence was clear evidence that something had gone awry: the fact is that he was hiding, not in humility, not through modesty, but from a sense of guilt. God knew all this: nothing is ever concealed from Him, (Heb. 4:12). Hence His queries were like those of an earthly father seeking to bring his erring child to a confession that would remove the guilt and shame of wrongdoing, make forgiveness possible, and so lead to the restoration of a fellowship that had been disrupted. The questions were fitted to carry conviction to the man's conscience (cf. Acts 2:37) and effect in him a change of heart. But Adam was already "too far gone" from his Heavenly Father (cf. Heb. 12:9).

(b) The Father must now "seek" the Man who was not there, as he had been previously, when He called. Like every other call of God, the call was only for man's sake, even as the laws of God invariably contemplate and seek, not His own good, but man's good. Lange (CDHCG, 231): "The Good Shepherd seeks and finds the lost sheep; the sinner must seek and find God; the relation must be an ethical covenant relation." Delitzsch: "This word—where art thou?—echoes throughout the whole human world, and in each individual man." Lange adds: "That is, in a symbolical sense, the passage denotes every case of a sinner seeking the divine home." (c) Why did God call to Adam in view of the fact that Eve had been the first to sin? Of course, the Woman here is included in the generic sense of man, *i.e.*, mankind. The call here, how-

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH ever, was directed to the individual man. The reason is clear, namely, that Adam as the head of the household (1 Cor. 11:8-9, Eph. 5:23) was answerable for Eve's act of disobedience, even though he himself had been ensnared by it (2 Cor. 11:3, 1 Tim. 2:13-14): "the ethical arraignment for the complaint against the wife proceeds through Adam" (Lange). As a matter of fact, Adam, the supposed stronger of the two, was probably the more responsible because of this fact.

2. *The Uncovering of Guilt.* (1) Note the man's evasiveness. God's first question did elicit an admission of a sort—cold, unfeeling, reluctant, half-hearted (v. 10); certainly not a full and free confession, that which Yahweh was seeking, which would have merited forgiveness. (2) God's second question elicited only sheer effrontery on Adam's part. His reply was saturated with all the impudence of a rebellious spirit (v. 12). (3) We have here a vivid example of the Freudian "defense mechanism" which goes under the name of *projection*. (Incidentally, the Bible is the world's best textbook on psychology.) Adam did not admit any personal responsibility or guilt—not a bit of it! Said he, *The Woman* you gave me got me into this mess. Somehow I get the feeling that he emphasized the "you" in this impudent reply, as if to say, *You*, God, gave this *Woman* to me; in the final analysis, *You* are the one to bear the brunt of the responsibility in this business! What unmitigated gall! (4) Note that the *Woman* followed the example set by her spouse: she "passed the buck" to the serpent: "the serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." That is, Don't blame me; blame the old snake that seduced me! A forced confession, lacking even a semblance of contrition!

(5) And the tragedy if it all is that from that day to this, the posterity of Adam and Eve—the whole human race—has been walking in their footsteps (Rom. 3:23). Man's favorite vocation throughout the ages has been that

## GENESIS

of "passing the buck." He blames, and keeps on blaming, the Unconscious, the Subconscious, the hormones (in ancient times it was the "humors"), pre-natal impressions (Dianetics), an "unpleasant childhood," or perhaps a "mental block," for his derelictions. There are thousands who pass their responsibility on to some elusive non-entity which they designate Fate, Fortune, Destiny, etc. Other thousands are still blaming Adam: "the old Adam in me." And multiplied thousands in all ages even blame God for their misfortunes: "Why did God take my child from me?" etc. The fact is they bring the greater number of their misfortunes on themselves. But their delusion of *projection* allows them to indulge orgies of self-pity while they put the blame for their misfortunes and frustrations on others. The last thing that man seems willing to do is to march up to the judge, and say to Him, Yes, I did it, with my own little hatchet. Yet this is precisely what a man *must* do if he hopes to drain off the burden of his guilt (cf. the story of the Prodigal Son, Luke 15:17-19). Men will go to any extreme, it seems, to avoid saying, "I have sinned." This is *catharsis*: and this is the necessary first step on the road to reconciliation and restoration to fellowship.

Bowie (IBG, 506): "Oscar Wilde said once, 'I can resist everything except temptation': and underneath the wry humor of that there is sober fact. Many people act as though no one could reasonably be supposed to resist temptation, But stop the sentence in the middle. The woman tempted me, and. . . . And what? There is the crux of human character. Temptation is an element in every human life and comes to everybody. But it is always possible to end the sentence in another way. This and that tempted me, but I was not persuaded. That is the sort of answer made by souls who are not paper to be scorched by fire but iron to be purified and hardened by it. The fact that evil is possible is no alibi for choosing it." Again

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH (*ibid.*, 507): "We know as well as Adam that alibis will not work. The God we must meet at the end of the day will not be put off by references to other people's sins or by complaints about the universe. When He speaks it will not be in terms of they, or it, but you."

(6) The forbidden fruit turned sour, as it always does when one puts inordinate desire above the right and good. When illicit indulgence of *physical appetite* takes over, the result is certain to be moral corruption and physical decay (Gal. 6:7-8, Rom. 8:6-8). When inordinate desire and quest for *illicit knowledge* takes over, the product is bound to be a spirit seared by false pride and facing the inevitable doom of incarceration in Hell with the Devil and his ilk. Hell will be populated with people who have traveled this egoistic way: the sure way to insensibility to God and all Good (Rom. 2:4-11, 2 Thess. 1:7-10). This writer learned long ago from personal observation and experience that this consuming thirst for illicit knowledge is a thousand times deadlier to the human spirit than perhaps any other form of motivation. (Cf. the Seven Deadly Sins: pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, envy, sloth—all personified in Spenser's great poem, *The Faerie Queene*. Note that pride stands at the head of the list: and what form of pride can be more destructive morally than pride of intellect?) See JB (17, n.) concerning the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil: "This knowledge is a privilege which God reserves to himself, and which man, by sinning, is to lay hands on, 3:5, 22. Hence it does not mean omniscience, which fallen man does not possess; nor is it moral discrimination, for unfallen man already had it and God could not refuse it to a rational being. It is the power of deciding for himself what is good and what is evil and of acting accordingly, a claim to complete moral independence by which man refuses to recognize his status as a created being. The first sin was an attack on God's sovereignty, a sin of pride. This rebellion is described in



## GENESIS

concrete terms as the transgression of an express command of God for which the text uses the image of a forbidden fruit." These comments are especially helpful: they point up the fact that man's first sin was—in essence—but a repetition of Satan's pre-mundane rebellion. We are reminded here of the words of Berdyaev, the Russian philosopher: "When man broke away from the spiritual moorings of his life, he tore himself from the depths and went to the surface, and he has become more and more superficial. When man lost the spiritual center of being he lost his own at the same time." Man is *not* the principle of his own origin, nature, or destiny.

*"14 And Jehovah God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: 15 and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. 16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy pain and thy conception; in pain thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. 17 And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; 18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field; 19 in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it thou wast taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."*

1. *The Threefold Penalty: That Pronounced on the Serpent (Serpentkind)*. Whitelaw (PCG, 65): "The

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

cursing of the irrational creature should occasion no more difficulty than the cursing of the earth (v. 17), or of the fig tree (Matt. 11:21). Creatures can be cursed or blessed only in accordance with their natures. The reptile, therefore, being neither a moral nor responsible creature, could not be cursed in the sense of being made susceptible of misery. But it might be cursed in the sense of being deteriorated in its nature, and, as it were, consigned to a lower position in the scale of being." The use of such phrases as "all cattle" and "every beast of the field" (v. 14) proves the reality of the curse upon the literal serpent. Was this a "flying serpent" (cf. Isa. 27:1)? Or, was it a creature temporarily endowed with the power to stand upright? Some have thought so. Some have held that this creature underwent some kind of transformation of its external form; others, that the language of the curse here signified that henceforth the creature was "to be thrust back into its proper rank," "recalled from its insolent motions to its accustomed mode of going" (Calvin). "Upon thy belly shalt thou go and dust shalt thou eat"—it was doomed henceforth to wind about on its belly, and so its food would be mingled with the dust of the earth. "Dust shalt thou eat" describes a condition of shame and contempt: to "eat the dust" or to "bite the dust" is a phrase which even today expresses humiliation and degradation.

(2) V. 15. Here we have a twofold oracle: (a) a direct prognosis of the natural enmity that should exist henceforth between mankind and the serpentkind: generally speaking, when a man sees a snake, he feels an impulse, spontaneously it would seem, to crush it beneath his heel; (b) a prophetic reference to the spiritual warfare which has been waged from that day to this between the Old Serpent, the Devil, and the Seed of the Woman. This oracle could well have pointed forward to the age-long conflict (-i-) between the Devil and the whole human

## GENESIS

race (John 14:30, 2 Cor. 4:4), (-ii-) between the Devil and the Old Covenant people, the fleshly seed of Abraham (Job. chs. 1, 2; 1 Chron. 21:1; Zech. 3:1-5), (-iii-) between the Devil and the New Covenant elect, the *ekklesia* ("called out"), the spiritual seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:27-29, Eph. 3:8-11, Jas. 4:7, 1 Pet. 5:8-9). On the principle so frequently emphasized in the present textbook, namely, that any Scripture, to be understood fully, must be harmonized with Bible teaching as a whole, undoubtedly this oracle referred in its primary sense to Messiah, Christ, the Seed of Woman in a special and universal sense. Rotherham tells us (EB, 36, n.) that most of the ancient translators rendered the original word here, not as "bruise" but as "crush." He writes: "The same word is used here in the two clauses. 'Most of the ancient translators render it by crushing'—Kalisch." Cf. Rom. 16:20, where the Greek word *syntribo*, meaning to "shatter," "crush," is used. In *The Jerusalem Bible*, it is given thus: "I will make you enemies of each other, you and the woman, your offspring and her offspring. It will crush your head, and you will strike its heel." The JB adds (19, fn.) an interesting comment: "It is the first glimmer of salvation, the *proto-evangelium*. The Greek version has a masculine pronoun ('he,' not 'it' will crush . . .), thus ascribing the victory not to the woman's descendants in general but to one of her sons in particular: the words of the Greek version thus express the Messianic interpretation held by many of the Fathers. The Latin version has a feminine pronoun ('she' will crush . . .), and since in the Messianic interpretation of our text, the Messiah and his mother appear together, the pronoun has been taken to refer to Mary; this application has become current in the Church" (that is, the Roman Catholic Church). In view of the fact that Redemption is the essence of God's Eternal Purpose, and since this Redemption is actualized, on the Divine side, by Messiah's death and burial and resurrection, and since,

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

furthermore, Jesus of Nazareth is the only Person who ever appeared in the world of whom it is specifically (and authentically) testified (by inspiration of the Spirit) that incarnately He was made the Seed of Woman exclusively, for the specific purpose of making possible, through His own death and burial and resurrection (I Cor. 15:1-4), this Redemption, for all men who accept the terms, it surely follows that the sublime oracle in Genesis must be understood as referring especially to Jesus as God's Only Begotten, Messiah, Christ, Redeemer of mankind (Cf. Gal. 3:16, 4:4-5; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38; John 1:1-14, 1:29, 3:16, 17:4-5; Col. 1:12-23, 2:9; 1 Pet. 1:18-21; Rev. 12:7-12, 19:11-16, 20:1-3, etc. Refer back to Part XI *supra.*) (c) Skinner (ICCG, 81) suggests, in this connection, what he calls "the more reasonable view of Calvin," namely, that the passage (Gen. 3:15) "is a promise of victory over the devil to mankind, united in Christ as its divine Head" (cf. 2 Cor. 5:18-21; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 2:1-10, 3:8-12, etc.).

(d) Incidentally, controversy as to whether the Hebrew *almab* and the Greek *parthenos* should be translated "young woman," "maiden," or "virgin" (cf. the Parthenon, the Temple of Athena Parthenos, Athena the Virgin, on the Athenian Acropolis) is purely academic. The language of Matthew and Luke with reference to the conception and birth of Jesus is too clear and positive to justify any such controversy (Matt. 1:18, 24; Luke 1:34, 35). Besides, translation as "young woman" or "maiden" does not in any wise exclude the fact of virginity. Cf. also Paul, in Gal. 4:4. It is frequently parroted about that Paul never taught the Virgin Birth. But Paul certainly emphasized our Lord's pre-existence (Col. 1:13-17, 2:9). And it must be recalled, in this connection, that Luke was Paul's traveling companion throughout the latter's ministry (2 Tim. 4:11), and it is Luke, the "beloved physician" (Col. 4:14) who gives us clearly and positively the facts

## GENESIS

of this mysterious case. If the Apostle did not accept the Virgin Birth why on earth did he not set Luke right about the matter? (Luke certainly means to tell us, 1:35, that it was the Holy Spirit of God who created the physical nature of Jesus in the womb of the Virgin.)

(3) Thus it will be seen that in the oracle of Gen. 3:15 we have *the first intimation of Redemption*. This is the one optimistic note in the context of gloom, decay, and death. In this spiritual conflict of the ages (often designated "The Great Controversy"), the Old Serpent's seed will *strike* or bruise Messiah's *heel* (Matt. 23:33, John 8:44, 1 John 3:10), signifying a mean, insidious, vicious, yet generally unsuccessful, warfare (the heel is not a particularly important part of the anatomy); whereas the Seed of the Woman shall ultimately *crush* the Old Serpent's *head* (the ruling part of the person and personality), signifying the ultimate complete victory of Christ over all evil (Rom. 16:20, 1 Cor. 15:25-26, Phil. 2:9-11, Matt. 25:31-46, Rom. 2:4-11, 2 Thess. 1:7-10, 2 Pet. 3:1-13, etc.).

(4) The Bible is the most realistic book in the world: it deals with man just as he is: it never deceives him. It tells him bluntly that he is in sin, in a lost condition, and in danger of perishing in Hell; at the same time, it offers the Remedy (John 1:29, 1 John 1:7), and the means of applying it (1 Cor. 1:21; Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 15:1-4; Acts 2:38; Rom. 2:8, 10:9-10; 1 Pet. 4:17). In character delineation, not for one moment does it turn aside to hide the sins and vices of the men and women who, so to speak, walk across its pages. On the contrary, it faithfully depicts their vices as well as their virtues, whether reprobates or saints. *The Bible pictures life just as men live it and have lived it throughout the ages: it is pre-eminently the Book of life*. At the same time, it is, from beginning to end, *unfailingly optimistic*. Not even the breath of an intimation that evil might possibly triumph in the end,

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH occurs in it; rather, it is expressly declared, again and again, that the ultimate victory of God and the Good is certain. (Isa. 46:8-10; 1 John 5:4; Matt. 24:29-31, 16:27-28; John 5:28-29, 16:33, 11:25-26; Rom. 8:37-39; Phil. 2:9-11; 1 Cor. 15:20-28, 50-58; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; Rev. 7:14, 21:1-7, 22:1-5). In striking contrast to Oriental cults, which are uniformly pessimistic, viewing life as illusion (*maja*) and salvation only as escape from it, the Bible is always optimistic, presenting life as a divine gift (Gen. 2:7, Rom. 6:23) and man's greatest good, and salvation as the flowering of the Spiritual Life in Christ (Col. 3:3) into timeless fellowship with the living and true God (Exo. 3:14, John 4:24, 1 Cor. 13:9-12, 1 John 3:2, Rev. 14:13). This ultimate victory is implicit in the Genesis oracle. Our God has spoken: His counsel will stand, and He will do that which He pleases, declaring the end from the beginning (Isa. 46:8-11): The Seed of the Woman *shall*, in the Day of the Consummation (Acts 3:20-21), crush the Old Serpent's head. This is the very heart and soul of the Eternal Glad Tidings (Rev. 14:6, Luke 1:10-14, Rom. 1:16, Rev. 20:7-14).

Note well, in this connection, that the Gospel is said to have been in the mind of God from "the beginning," from "before the foundation of the world" (Isa. 46:9-11; Rom. 8:28-30; Eph. 1:3-14, 3:8-12; 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 18-20). Note also the progressive unfolding of this Messianic anticipation. It is rightly said (1) that *from Adam to Abraham* we have the Gospel in God's Eternal Purpose (Gen. 3:14-15; Gal. 4:4; Isa. 7:14; Mic. 5:2; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38; John 1:1-4, 1:18, 17:5; Phil. 2:5-11; Col. 1:3-18; Rev. 13:8, 17:8, 19:11-16, 20:10-15); (2) that *from Abraham to Isaiah* we have the Gospel in *promise* (Gen. 12:3, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14, 49:10; Num. 24:17; Matt. 1:1; John 8:56; Gal. 3:8, 16, 26-29); (3) that *from Isaiah to John the Baptizer* we have the Gospel in *prophecy* (1 Pet. 1:10-12; 2 Pet. 1:21; Acts 3:19-26, 7:51-53; there

## GENESIS

are more than 300 prophetic statements in the Old Testament, covering practically every detail of the life of the anticipated Messiah, all of which were fulfilled in the birth, life, ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, thus identifying Him as that Messiah; indeed it could well be said that the biography of Jesus could be constructed in advance from these predictions; see any Bible Concordance, Dictionary or Encyclopedia for the list of these prophecies and their corresponding fulfillments; see also Lesson 87 of the last Volume (III-IV in one binding) of my *Survey Course in Christian Doctrine*, published by the College Press, Joplin); (4) that *throughout the incarnate ministry of Jesus, the Only Begotten*, we have the Gospel in *preparation* (Heb. 2:3; Matt. 3:2, 12:28, 16:13-20, 24:14, 28:18-20; Mark 1:14-15; Luke 10:1-10; John 20:21-23; Acts 1:1-8); (5) that *beginning with the first Pentecost after the Resurrection* we have the Gospel in *fact*. Obviously, the facts of the Gospel—the death, burial and resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. 15:1-4)—could not have been proclaimed *as facts* until they had actually occurred. This proclamation first took place on the Pentecost following the Resurrection, the great Day of Spiritual Beginning, the birthday of the Church (Acts 2:1-4, 2:14-47, 3:12-26, 11:15).

2. *The Threefold Penalty: That Pronounced upon the Woman (Womankind)*.

(1) It should be noted that whereas the serpentkind (v. 14) and the ground (v. 17) were put under a divine curse, neither the Woman nor the Man were similarly cursed (anathematized), probably in view of the fact that both were to be included in the possibility of redemption that was to be proffered by divine grace for all mankind, and indeed for the entire cosmos (John 1:29, 3:16; Acts 3:18-21, 4:8-12; Rom. 8:18-23; Eph. 3:8-12; Heb. 5:9; 2 Pet. 3:8-13; Rev. 21:1-7, 22:1-5).

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(2) The penalty pronounced upon the woman, and hence on womankind, was twofold: (a) wifely sorrow was to be intensified, particularly in childbirth, and (b) henceforth the woman (wife) was to be subordinated to the man in the conjugal relationship. Apparently the former penalty was to be the natural consequence of the inroads of sin on the human body (cf. Exo. 20:5-6, a statement of the *consequences* of sin, the first statement of the law of heredity in our literature). Sin brought sorrow into the world, and continues to do so: the multiplication of sins results only in the multiplication of sorrows: "both are innumerable evils." Skinner (ICCG, 82): "The pangs of childbirth are proverbial in the OT for the extremity of human anguish." (Cf. Isa. 21:3, 13:8; Jer. 4:31; Mic. 4:9; Psa. 48:6.) Where there is no sin, there is no pain, no grief, no fear. Nor should we overlook the fact that implicit in this penalty is the portent of the many mothers' hearts which have been broken by the neglect, the waywardness, the carelessness, the rebelliousness of sons and daughters: e.g., as in the story of Mother Eve and her son Cain. M. Henry (CWB, 11): "The Woman shall have sorrow, but it shall be in bringing forth children, and the sorrow shall be *forgotten for joy that a child is born*, John 16:21. The sentence was not a curse, to bring her to ruin, but a chastisement, to bring her to repentance" (cf. Heb. 12:4-13). Lange (CDHCG, 238): "Henceforth must the woman purchase the gain of children, with the danger of her life—in a certain degree, with spiritual readiness for death, and the sacrifice of her life for that end."

(3) As for the subordination of the woman to the man in the conjugal relation, I find no evidence that man's rule was intended to be a tyrannous one: as a matter of fact the ideal relation of husband and wife is essentially reciprocal, as already described in Genesis 2:18, 23 (cf. Eph. 5:22, 25). Although woman was created as man's



## GENESIS

counterpart, the helper mate for his needs, hence neither as his superior nor as his inferior, still and all, her position was one of dependence on him. *But when she permitted sin to come into the world, it became necessary for her to be subordinated to her husband in the conjugal relation: two co-equal authorities would hardly be conducive to order and peace in the family.* (Woman's unenviable position in O. T. times is indicated by such passages as Gen. 34:12; Exo. 21:3, 22:16; Deut. 22:23, 24; Deut. 24:1; Hos. 3:1-2, etc. In the New Testament, such passages as Matt. 19:3-9; 1 Cor. 11:2-3, 14:34-35; 1 Tim. 2:9-15, have frequently been misapplied (cf. 1 Cor. 11:4-5). In the last-named texts the Apostle is saying that for women to speak out in the worshipping assembly in such ways as to create disorder, and so bring the criticism of the pagan community upon the church, is disgraceful, and so it was: it should be noted that he uses the word *aischron*, "shame," "disgrace," not the word *hamartia*, "sin." Insofar as the relative standing of male and female *spiritually*, that is, in relation to God, New Testament teaching is clear: male and female are *one in Christ Jesus* (Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17-20, Gal. 3:28, Rev. 22:17). However, it is just as clearly stated in the New Testament as in the Old, that under no circumstances it is permissible for the woman to *usurp dominion* over the man, not even in the church fellowship (Eph. 5:22-33, 1 Tim. 2:12-15): to this extent the language of Gen. 3:16 still holds good, even though public opinion gives woman a much higher social status today than she had in older times. *To sum up: Christianity places woman upon the same level with man as regards the blessings of the Gospel, yet teaches expressly that she is subordinated to man in the marriage relationship, thus putting the stamp of approval on the original penalty pronounced on womankind.*

(4) It should be noted that in the Genesis account of the conjugal relationship of Adam and Eve there is not

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

the slightest intimation of the *matriarchate*, nor of *polyandry* (one wife with two or more husbands at the same time), on Eve's part. Similarly, there is not the slightest intimation of *polygyny* (one husband with two or more wives at the same time) on Adam's part. (Polyandry and polygyny are the two forms of *polygamy*). As a matter of fact, the creation here of a type of relationship between Christ and His Bride, the Church, made it essential that Adam have only one wife, as Christ has but one Bride, one Church, and that the Woman be subordinate to the Man in marriage, as the Church is put under the exclusive authority of Christ, her sole Head (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:45-49; Eph. 1:22-23, 4:4, 4:15, 5:23-24; Col. 1:18, 2:10; Rev. 19:7, 21:2, 21:9, 22:17).

3. *The Threefold Penalty: That Pronounced Upon the Man (all Mankind).*

(1) JB (19, n.): "The punishment is appropriate to the specific functions of each: the woman suffers as mother and wife, the man as bread-earner. To this fall from the original condition there is added death, v. 19, and the loss of intimacy with God, v. 23."

(2) This judgment pronounced upon the Man was fundamentally a declaration to him that the earth at large lay beyond the boundaries of Eden, and that, following his expulsion from Eden, he would be compelled to pass under such a penalty by virtue of being outside the Paradise of his original innocence. That is to say, (1) he would be in a world of thorns, briars, and thistles, etc., constantly reminding him of his fallen state; (2) that he would be in a world of toil (dog-eat-dog competition) where he would have to earn his living in the sweat of his face; and (3) that he would be in a world of death, in which his body would necessarily return to the dust from which it was originally taken (in our day, "dust," of course, is simply the corporeal man, the body, made up of the physical elements). Cf. Gen. 2:7; Eccl. 12:7; Rom.

## GENESIS

5:12, 8:18-23; Heb. 9:27. This threefold penalty would be an ever-present reminder of his fallen state; of the fact that the world (the moral world, *and* the physical) is under the judgment of God, under the curse of sin (Psa. 103:13-14, John 3:16-18, Gal. 3:10-14, 2 Pet. 3:1-7, Rev. 22:3). *No human being in his right mind could deny that this threefold penalty is in full force today, and that it has unfailingly been so throughout the sordid pages of human history from the very beginning.*

(3) Simpson (IB, 7): From now on "man's relationship with nature, like his relationships with God and his fellow men, is in disorder." Hence the vitiation of his power of moral discernment, of his ability "to put first things first" (Matt. 6:33, Col. 3:2, 2 Cor. 4:18), to distinguish properly between the apparent goods and the real goods of life. Moreover, along with the birth of conscience, the problems of rights and duties now arise. (*Right is moral power; might is physical power.* These should never be confused, and certainly should never be identified, either in ethics or in jurisprudence.)

(4) Note that the judgment to come upon man was to come upon him *from the ground*. Man was not cursed, but the ground was cursed: indeed the ground was cursed *for man's sake* (3:17). Adam had work to do in Eden: he had been divinely enjoined "to dress and to keep it," that is, the ground (2:15). After expulsion from the Garden, he was ordered to "till the ground from whence he was taken" (3:23). Cornfeld (AtD, 15): "Many interpreters have assumed that work is a part of the curse for man's sin. The curse is actually in the niggardliness of the soil or the fruitlessness of his labor." Even to fallen mankind, *honest labor is a great blessing*, a positive antidote for worry, self-pity, temptation, vice and crime. "An idle brain is the devil's workshop." Work may be a curse, of course, when it is meaningless, when it is "done under compulsion for ends which the worker hates and against

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH which he inwardly rebels." But it is a great blessing when it proceeds from incentive, from "freedom so that a man feels that the best in himself has a chance to find expression instead of being frustrated by the compulsion that drives him to uncongenial tasks." "In mature people the hidden instinct which turns back with a child's nostalgic longing for irresponsibility and undiscipline still thinks of freedom from work as a kind of paradise" (IB, 111-112). But man could never be happy living the life of a grasshopper floating downstream. I am reminded here of the good deacon who was asked what he would do if, after the Judgment, he should find himself in Hell. "Well," said he, after a moment's reflection, "one thing is sure—I would not sit down and do nothing. At least I'd get busy and try to start a prayer-meeting." Similarly, we can hardly conceive of Heaven as a place of sheer inactivity. Someone has said: "To live is to act; to act is to choose; and to choose is to evaluate." Life, if it is anything at all, is activity. Will Durant has advised us well: "Do some physical work every day. Nature intended thought to be a guide to action, not a substitute for it. Thought unbalanced by action is a disease." In the words of Henry van Dyke:

"This is the gospel of labour,  
ring it, ye bells of the kirk!  
The Lord of Love came down from above,  
to live with the men who work;  
This is the rose that He planted,  
here in the thorn-curst soil:  
Heaven is blest with perfect rest,  
but the blessing of Earth is toil."

(See also Angela Morgan's poems, "Hymn to Labor," and "Work: A Song of Triumph"; from the latter these stirring lines):

## GENESIS

“Work!

Thank God for the swing of it,  
For the hammering, clamoring ring of it!  
Passion of labor daily hurled  
On the mighty anvils of the world!  
Oh what is so fierce as the flame of it,  
And what is so high as the aim of it!  
Thundering on through dearth and doubt,  
Calling the Plan of the Maker out.  
Work, the Titan; work, the friend,  
Shaping the earth to a glorious end;  
Draining the swamps and blasting the hills,  
Doing whatever the spirit wills;  
Rending the continent apart  
To answer the dream of the master heart . . .  
Thank God for the world where none may shirk!  
Thank God for the splendor of work!”

(5) “*Thorns and thistles*,” etc. Lange (CDHCG, 239): As a natural species, “thorns and thistles must have existed before; but it is now the tendency of nature to favor the ignoble forms rather than the noble, the lower rather than the higher, the weed rather than the herb.” Thus is indicated “the sickliness of nature,” “the positive opposition of nature to man” . . . “there comes in a tendency to wildness or degeneracy which transforms the herb into a weed.” Again: “In place of the garden-culture, there is introduced not agriculture simply, but an agriculture which is, at the same time, a strife with existing nature, and in place of the fruit of Paradise, is man now directed to the fruit of the field.” It is a well-known fact that nature, if uncultivated, if left to her own resources, tends to deteriorate rather than to advance; set out tomato plants, for example, this year, and cultivate them, and the fruit is excellent; let the seed from this year’s fruit fall into the ground, however, and produce fruit in “volunteer” fashion, and the product is always inferior. This subhuman de-

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH  
terioration of species in a natural state is pointed directly toward the fact of man's moral deterioration: we all know how easy it is to get down to wallowing in the gutter morally, and how much genuine commitment and perseverance it takes, on the other hand, to climb the "straitened" (narrow, restricted) Way that leads to "life" (Matt. 7:14); that is, to develop morally and spiritually, to enhance the richness of the inner man and his appreciation of the higher values of life, such as faith, hope and love (1 Cor. 13:13).

(6) "*Thou shalt eat the herb of the field.*" JB, 19: "You shall eat wild plants"; RSV, "the plants of the field." Is this statement intended to sharpen the contrast between fallen man's food and the fruit of Paradise Lost? Is it a warning to man that henceforth he would have to eat plants of the kind which had originally been designed to be sustenance for brute animals only (Gen. 1:30)? Does it mean that man was to continue to be a strict vegetarian? (cf. 1:29-30)? Or was it a presage of the fact that all forms of animal life must—and do—depend on plant photosynthesis for their very existence? The thought is intriguing, is it not? *Surely, all truth is present always to the Spirit of God, He who has given us the Bible!*

4. *Death: Man's Last and Most Terrible Enemy* (1 Cor. 15:25-26).

(1) Death is described in Scripture under three general terms, as follows: as a *sleep* (Psa. 13:3; Dan. 12:2; Matt. 9:24; John 11:12-14; 1 Cor. 15:6, 20; 1 Thess. 4:14; obviously, the language of *appearance*: there is no more thoroughly authenticated fact of psychic phenomena today than the fact that the *subconscious in man never sleeps*, that is, in the sense of being completely inactive at any moment: cf. William James's "stream-of-consciousness" psychology); as a *change* (Job 14:14), literally, a "renewal," "relief," "release"; hence, a transition, translation, transfiguration: cf. 1 Cor. 15:50-54, 2 Cor. 5:1-9, 1 Thess. 4:13-17); and

## GENESIS

as a Divine *appointment* (Heb. 9:27-28, cf. Col. 1:5, 2 Tim. 4:8: an appointment that every son and daughter of Adam cannot avoid: cf. Acts 17:30-31; Rom. 2:5-6, 14:10; 2 Cor. 5:10; Matt. 25:31-46; Rev. 20:12).

(2) According to Scripture teaching, "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23); the genealogical tree of evil is, in the order named, Satan, lust, sin, death (Jas. 1:13-15): not only *physical* death, the separation of the spirit from the body and the consequent dissolution of the physical frame (*i.e.*, its resolution into its original physiochemical elements (Gen. 2:16-17, 3:19, 5:5, etc.; John 19:30; Heb. 9:27), but also *spiritual* death, the second death, eternal separation of the human spirit from the living and true God (Deut. 5:26, Psa. 42:2, Matt. 16:16, Acts 14:15, 1 Thess. 1:9, Heb. 12:22, Rev. 7:2), the Source of Life (Gen. 2:7; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 2:11, 20:14, 21:8). Whatever else the word "hell" may signify in Scripture, it does signify the complete loss of God and of all Good (Matt. 5:22, 5:29-30, 10:28, 25:41). Obviously, *death in this twofold sense* is indicated in the penalty enjoined and executed on Adam and his posterity, all humankind.

(3) Gen. 2:17, 3:19. *Universal physical death* is clearly indicated in this penalty: this is evident from the oft-repeated phrase in ch. 5, "and he died." This phase of the penalty was to come upon the earthly part of man (1 Cor. 15:47) from the very ground out of which this part of him—the body—was taken; that is, the part made up of the physiochemical elements, but in archaic language adapted to the infancy of the race, *dust* (Eccl. 12:7; Job 10:9, 34:15; Psa. 103:14). In our time, of course, what Scripture calls "dust" we call "matter," and it is significant that our word "matter" derives from the Latin *materia*, which in turn developed out of the word *mater*, "mother." It is indeed significant that throughout human history the concept of Mother Earth (*Terra Mater*) has played such an important role in man's thinking and living.

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

Gen. 2:7—"Yahweh Elohim formed man of the dust of the ground," etc. That part of him which is physical, corporeal, material, that is to say, his *frame*, is of the earth, earthy; and this is the part which goes back to the dust—the primal elements—whence it came. But Yahweh did not stop with the framing of the physical man: he then breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (an infinitesimal part of His own being): Hence, man is more than dust, more than body—he is a *psychosomatic* unity. Obviously, this is the fundamental truth which Genesis would impress upon us concerning the nature, origin, and destiny of the person. Since the body part came originally from the universal stock of the Stuff of things (the German, *Der Stoff*, is more meaningful than the English word "matter"), it is the part which goes back into this primal Stuff. Hence, Gen. 3:19—"dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

(4) I see no reason for assuming from the Genesis narrative of the Creation that the Man was made by nature immune to physical death. I must disagree with Whitelaw here, who writes (PCG, 46): "Adam, it thus appears, was permitted to partake of the tree of life; not, however, as a means of either conferring or preserving immortality, which was already his by Divine gift, and the only method of conserving which recognised by the narrative was abstaining from the tree of knowledge; but as a symbol and guarantee of that immortality with which he had been endowed, and which would continue to be his so long as he maintained his personal integrity." It is true, of course, that as a consequence of his eating of the Tree of Knowledge, the Man forfeited the privilege of immunity from physical death. However, this does not necessarily mean that he was *created* immortal. (We avoid confusion here by remembering that "incorruption," "immortality," etc., in Scripture have reference to the structure and destiny of the body: cf. Luke 20:34-36;



## GENESIS

Rom. 2:7, 8:11, 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:20-58; 2 Cor. 5:1-9; etc.). On the contrary, it seems evident that Adam was constituted *mortal*—in the human sense of the term—from the beginning, and that he was given the privilege of partaking of the Tree of Life the fruit of which was designed to be the means of counteracting his mortality. It will thus be seen that Adam could have maintained his innocence, and by perfect obedience to the Will of God could have grown into holiness, in which case we may well suppose that even his body would have become transfigured and translated to Heaven (cf. Gen. 5:24, 2 Ki. 2:11), without the intervention of physical death as we know it. Moreover, when he did transgress the law of God, it became imperative that he be expelled from the Garden, and that “the way of the tree of life” be “kept” (guarded, v. 24), so 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 natural course in his physical constitution (cf. Gen. 2:22-24, 5:5). (See my Vol. I, Part IX, pp. 509ff., of the present work). This is indicated by the literal rendering of the penalty as originally pronounced with respect to eating of the Tree of Knowledge (2:17): “in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” or, “dying, thou shalt die.” We have already noted (Vol. I, Part IV) the variations in the meaning of the word “day” in Scripture, and especially in these first few chapters of Genesis: and here the wording indicates a process of some duration, not an instantaneous event. This is in harmony with our knowledge today: science tells us that the human body undergoes complete cellular transformations about every five years; that, as a matter of fact, from the moment of birth the life process sets in which is certain to terminate in death (Psa. 23:4, Heb. 9:27). Nor can this life process, this flux or flow of

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH  
the River of Life, be reversed (Rev. 22:1): it flows in one direction, and in one only.

(5) Skinner (ICCG, 83). "The question whether man would have lived forever if he had not sinned is one to which the narrative furnishes no answer." Cf. v. 22—in this passage the "live forever" has reference to the Man's living forever in a state of alienation from God. Simpson writes (IBG, 512-513): "There is no suggestion here that man would have lived forever had he not eaten of the forbidden fruit. Rather, the implication is that man would have regarded death not as the last fearful frustration but as his natural end. The fear of death is a consequence of the disorder in man's relationships, as a result of which they are no longer characterized by mutuality but by domination." He goes on to say that man tries to build up relationships with others and on others to try to fill the need for security which he experiences. "From the fear of death, however, he cannot escape. For in the depth of his soul he knows that the structure of relationships which he has created to protect himself is fundamentally without substance. In the end it will crumble and he will be compelled to face the fact that he had always tried to deny—that he is man and not God. Man's disordered relationships and his fear of death are inextricably bound up together, the consequence of his alienation from God." *As a matter of fact, the very essence of the stories of Adam and Eve, of Cain's murder of his brother Abel, and of the Tower of Babel, etc., is the fact of man's repeated attempts to play God. This has been man's chief occupation throughout his entire history, and he is still at it. (Cf. Captain Ahab in Melville's Moby Dick).*

(6) Death, however, in Scripture has a far more tragic meaning than that which is signified by the resolution of the corporeal part of man into its original elements. In its deepest sense it is the separation of the soul from

## GENESIS

God, the Source of all life (Exo. 3:14, Gen. 2:7, John 11:25-26, Acts 17:25). This kind of death, *spiritual* (as distinguished from *physical*) death is clearly indicated in the penalty pronounced on humankind at the beginning. Throughout Scripture death is regarded only *secondarily* as the cessation of animal life, but primarily as the privation of life in the sense of favor with God and consequent happiness. *It is the turning from confidence in God to confidence in the creature.* It is the schism that occurs between Creator and creature that is caused by the latter's disobedience, *i.e.*, by *sin*. The only remedy for this kind of death is reconciliation in Christ (John 1:29, 2 Cor. 5:17-21), and reconciliation is the essence of true religion. Lacking this reconciliation, as a result of rebelliousness, neglect, wilful ignorance, etc., this kind of death, *spiritual* death, becomes in the end *eternal* death: this is the *second death*, eternal separation "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (Cf. 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Prov. 14:12; Dan. 12:2; Matt. 7:13, 8:22, 10:28, 23:33, 25:30, 41; Mark 9:44; John 5:29, 6:53; Rom. 1:32, 2:8, 5:15, 6:13, 6:23, 8:6, 9:22; Eph. 2:1, 4:18; Col. 2:13; 1 Tim. 5:6; Heb. 6:1, 9:14; 1 John 3:14; Jas 4:12; 2 Pet. 2:17; Rev. 2:11, 19:20, 20:6, 20:14, 21:8). Note Psa. 23:4—"the valley of the shadow of death." That is, physical death, the dissolution of the corporeal frame, is not *real* death; rather, it is but the "shadow" of eternal and real death, the complete separation from God and all Good, in Hell, the penitentiary of the moral universe (Isa. 9:2, Matt. 4:16, Luke 1:79, Matt. 25:41).

R. Milligan (SR, 52-61) summarizes this phase of the subject most convincingly. He writes as follows (referring to the language of Gen. 2:17): "The words *life* and *death* are both representatives of very profound and mysterious realities. Hence, it is not a matter of surprise that men of a visionary and speculative turn and habit

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH of mind should have formed some very strange and absurd notions and theories concerning them. Some, for example, suppose that life is equivalent to mere existence, and that death is equivalent to annihilation. But this is absurd 1. Because there is existence where there is no life. Minerals exist, but they have no life. 2. Because there is also death where there is no evidence of annihilation, as in the case of trees, flowers, etc. Indeed, there is no satisfactory evidence that any substance is ever annihilated, whether material or immaterial. It is evident, therefore, that life is not mere existence, and that death is not annihilation. But it is easier to say what they are not than to define what they are. Some of the necessary *conditions* of life, however, are very obvious. . . . Be it observed, then, that one of the essential conditions of life is *union*, and that one of the essential conditions of death is *separation*. There is no life in atoms, and there can be no death without a separation from some living substance. . . . To give life, then, to any substance it must be *properly united to some living and life-imparting agent*. And to work death in any substance it must be *separated from said agent by the destruction of its organization or otherwise*. Thus, for example, the carbon of the atmosphere is vivified by being united to living vegetables and animals, and by being separated from these life-imparting agents it again loses its vitality. The number of living and life-giving agents is, of course, very great. God has made every vegetable and every animal a depository of life. But, nevertheless, he is himself the only original, unwasting, and ever-enduring fountain of life. See Psa. 36:9, John 5:26, 1 Tim. 6:16. And hence it follows that *union with God in some way and by some means is essential to all life, and that separation from him is always death*. Acts 16:25. . . . Whether inanimate objects are united to God in more than one way may be a question. But that man's union with his Maker is supported by various chains or systems of

## GENESIS

instrumentalities, seems very certain. Through one system of means, for example, is supported his mere existence (Heb. 1:3). Through another his animal life is continued, with an immense train of physical enjoyments; and through still another is maintained his higher spiritual life—his union, communion, and fellowship with God, as the ever-enduring and only satisfying portion of his soul. Psa. 73:25, 26. And hence it follows that there are also different kinds of death, and that a man may be alive in one sense and dead in another. See Matt. 8:22, John 5:24, Eph. 2:1-7, 1 Tim. 5:6, 1 John 5:12." Milligan goes on to say that animal or physical death, the separation of spirit and body, was obviously not the only death implicit in the language of Gen. 2:17. He concludes: "But that *spiritual death*, or a separation of the soul from God, is the chief and fundamental element of this penalty, is evident from several considerations: 1. *In no other sense did Adam and Eve die on the same day that they sinned.* But in a spiritual sense they certainly did die at the very time indicated (Gen. 3:8). They then, by a common law of our nature, became enemies to God by their own wicked works (Col. 1:21). 2. *Spiritual death seems, a priori, to be the root of all evils; the prolific source of all our calamities and misfortunes.* Reunion with God implies every blessing, and separation from Him implies the loss of everything. Hence we find that this kind of life and death is always spoken of in the Bible as that which is chief and paramount (Matt. 10:28, John 11:26). 3. *This is further evident from the fact that the first and chief object of the Gospel is to unite man to God spiritually. . . .* 4. *It seems that by eating of the fruit of the Tree of Life, Adam might have escaped physical or animal death (Gen. 3:22)."* (From this last statement we must dissent. The language of v. 22 clearly indicates that it was by partaking of the fruit of the Tree of Life the Man was to renew and perpetuate his youth physically; that his banishment from

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

the Garden was to prevent his doing this and so counter-acting forever the laws of mortality inherent in his constitution, to the end that natural or physical death should occur in due course in the world outside Eden.)

From all these considerations it follows naturally that, just as the Bible teaches, *the Second Death will consist, not in the separation of the human spirit from the body, but in the eternal separation of the unforgiven (unreconciled to God in Christ, 2 Cor. 5:17-21) "living soul" (Gen. 2:7) "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might" (2 Thess. 1:7-10). Cf. Matt. 25:41, 46; Rev. 2:11, 20:6, 20:14, 21:4).*

From a correlation of the teaching in the second and third chapters of Genesis concerning various aspects of the Fall, *it seems clear that both physical and spiritual death, both as described above, have descended on all mankind as a consequence of sin (Rom. 3:23). Death, whatever form it may take is in the world because sin is in the world. Rom. 6:23—"the wages of sin is death." Jas. 1:13-15, the genealogy of evil is Satan, lust, sin, death, in the order named. (Rom. 5:12, 7:14; 1 Cor. 15:21-26, 50-57; Heb. 9:27-28).*

The Son of God was manifested "to take away sin," to "destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:5, 8; Matt. 1:21; John 1:29; Heb. 2:14-15; 1 Cor. 15:3, 15:20-28; 2 Cor. 5:1-5). Redemption in Christ Jesus is *complete* redemption, that is, redemption in spirit and soul and body (I Thess. 5:23), redemption both from the *guilt* of sin (Ezek. 18:19-20), and from the *consequences* of sin (Exo. 20:5-6, Rom. 8:23). (Note the Biblical emphasis on the universality of death: Eccl. 3:2, 12:7; Gen. 3:19; Rom. 3:23, 6:23, 5:12-13, 8:23; John 8:44; Heb. 2:14-15, 9:27; Jas. 1:13-15, etc.).

*"20 And the man called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. 21 And Jehovah God made for Adam and for his wife coats of*

## GENESIS

*skins, and clothed them. 22 And Jehovah God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: 23 therefore Jehovah God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. 24 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."*

5 *The Immediacy of the Penalty* embraced the following:

(1) *The setting in of the process of mortality* inherent in the constitution of man from the beginning (*i.e.*, by creation).

(2) *The birth of conscience*, with the sense of separation from God (schism) and the feelings of guilt and shame which accompanied it.

(3) *Immediate expulsion from Eden.* (a) Holiness cannot fellowship with iniquity: God has no concord with Mammon (Luke 16:13—perhaps "gain" personified) or with Belial (2 Cor. 6:15—evidently another name for Satan). (b) This banishment was necessary also, in order that, as stated above, man might not renew and perpetuate his youth, in his fallen condition, by partaking of the Tree of Life at will and so counteracting the operation of the mortal process inherent in him by creation; in a word, that physical death might take place in due course as an essential phase of the punishment for sin. (The same reasoning applies whether eating of the Tree of Knowledge was a real act of eating some kind of real fruit, or whether the eating of the forbidden fruit is to be taken as symbolic of some—any—particular act of disobedience to God. In either case, sin—man's own sin—had come between him and God. It is too obvious to be questioned that we have here a picture of what happens in every life

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

when the age of discretion (and consequently of responsibility) is attained.) (c) Schonfield (BWR, 171): "The Sacred Tree representing life renewing itself is one of the most ancient religious symbols found all over the world." (Could this be a preview, so to speak, of the necessary role of plant photosynthesis to all forms of animal life?) Schonfeld again: "But here there is a direct reference to a prophecy of Paradise Regained found in a book written perhaps 200 years earlier, where it is said of the Messiah:

He shall open the Gates of Paradise,  
And remove the threatening sword against Adam.  
He shall grant to the Saints to eat  
from the Tree of Life,  
And the Spirit of Holiness shall be open then.

—*Testament of Levi*, xviii."

(d) Maimonides summarizes as follows (GP, 16: "Our text suggests that Adam, as he altered his intention and directed his thoughts to the acquisition of what he was forbidden, was banished from Paradise: this was his punishment; it was measure for measure. At first he had the privilege of tasting pleasure and happiness, and of enjoying repose and security; but as his appetites grew stronger, and he followed his desires and impulses . . . and partook of the food he was forbidden to taste, he was deprived of everything, was doomed to subsist on the meanest kind of food, such as he had never tasted before, and this even only after exertion and labor, as it is said, 'Thorns and thistles shall grow up for thee' (Gen. 3:18), 'By the sweat of thy brow,' etc., and in explanation of this the text continues, 'And the Lord God drove him from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground whence he was taken.' He was now with respect to food and many other requirements brought to the level of the lower animals; comp. 'Thou shalt eat the grass of the field' (Gen. 3:18). Reflecting on his condition, the Psalmist says, 'Adam unable



## GENESIS

to dwell in dignity, was brought to the level of the dumb beast' (Ps. 49:12)."

(e) Note especially the devices which Yahweh used "to keep the way of the tree of life." (-i-) *Cherubim* were stationed at the east of the Garden. Archaeology indicates that these were symbolic winged creatures. Figures of winged creatures of various kinds were rather common throughout the ancient pagan world, such as winged lions, bulls, sphinxes, or combinations of a lion's body and a human face, etc. (Cf. Ezekiel's four composite "living creatures" seen by him by the River Chebar, ch. 10). In Hebrew thought, however, the word "cherub" seems to have indicated an angel of high rank (*e.g.*, Lucifer—"Day-star"—who became Satan: cf. Isa. 14:12-15): hence, *cherubim* (plural) apparently were figures symbolic of angels and their ministrations (Heb. 1:14). They are uniformly represented as occupying exalted positions, and as functioning to guard, to veil, or to denote attributes of, the Deity. They have been explained as "symbolic creatures specially prepared to serve as emblems of creature-life in its most perfect form," that is, perhaps, as symbolizing the good angels. They were caused to dwell—someone has said—"at the gate of Eden to intimate that only when perfected and purified could human nature return to Paradise." (-ii-) Note also "the flame of a sword" (flaming sword) "which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Is it not obvious, by comparison with Rev. 22:2, that the Tree of Life, however literally it is to be defined, is essentially a symbol of the Word, the Logos, both personal (as the Messiah Himself), and as impersonal (in the form of His Last Will and Testament: cf. John 1:1-14, Heb. 11:3, Psa. 33:6, 9), the Mediator, the connecting link that alone binds fallen man back to God and so prepares and qualifies him for final Union with God, Life Everlasting? (Cf. John 3:13-15, 3:36, 1:51; Gen. 28:12; 1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24; 2 Cor. 5:18-21). Is not

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

the Flaming Sword to be recognized as the symbol of the Logos, which is the Sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17); "the Word of God which is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword," etc. (Heb. 4:12)? (-lii-) As "keeping" the Way of the Tree of Life, these instrumentalities testified to the fact that God was still keeping watch, not alone over the Tree of Life, but also over the guilty pair who had been banished from their Edenic environment into the world at large, and indeed over their progeny from that day to the present. "The Way of the Tree of Life" was closed for many centuries, until, in fact, Jesus came announcing, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (John 5:40, 11:25-26, 14:6).

(4) "*Mother Eve.*" Her generic name was *Woman* (Gen. 2:23); her personal name, *Eve*, i.e., "living," "life." This is obviously a *prolepsis*: there is no indication that she was the mother of anyone at the time Adam named her. (See *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 541-546). Note that this is the first use of the word "mother" in Scripture.)

(5) "*Coats of Skins.*" Thus we have the divine law established at the beginning, that "apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission" (of sins, Heb. 9:22). As fallen creatures, *death* stood between God and man; hence it became necessary to offer, at once, a substitute *life*. But the life is in the blood (Lev. 17:11); therefore blood had to be shed. In all likelihood this was the beginning of animal sacrifice, although we have no specific mention of this institution until in the next chapter, in the story of Cain and Abel. Thus it was that, at the very beginning, God sought to impress upon the Man and the Woman the fact of their fallen state by removing from them the garments of leaves (3:7) which they themselves had woven to cover their physical nudity, and clothing them in skins which He prepared for them through the shedding of blood, symbolically to cover their spiritual nakedness.

## GENESIS

(6) The expulsion from the Garden actualized the immediacy of the threefold penalty: permanent aspects of it were executed in the world at large through the operation of physical and moral law. The great Milton has given us a vivid portrayal of the feelings of our Mother Eve as she cast the last, long lingering look on the groves of Paradise Lost:

“O unexpected stroke, worse than of death!  
Must I thus leave thee, Paradise! thus leave  
Thee, native soil, these happy walks and shades,  
Fit haunts for gods! where I had hoped to spend  
Quiet, though sad, the respite of that day,  
Which must be mortal to us both! O flowers  
That never will in other climate grow,  
My early visitation, and my last  
At ev’n, which I bred up with tender hand,  
From your first opening buds, and gave you names,  
Who now will rear you to the sun, or rank  
Your tribes, and water from the ambrosial fount?”

6. “*The Lost Chance of Immortality.*” This is a phrase common to Biblical exegetes of a certain persuasion who would identify immortality with *survival* only, either because they are ignorant of, or refuse to accept, the Scripture doctrine as fully revealed in the New Testament, namely, that immortality (a) is *not* mere survival (b) but the phenomenon of the redemption (ultimate transmutation and glorification) of the body, and (c) one of the rewards of obedience to the Gospel, and hence promised only to those who live and die *in the Lord* (Ps. 116:15; Rev. 14:13; John 11:25-26; Rom. 2:7, 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:35-58; 2 Cor. 5:1-9; Phil. 2:5-11; 1 Thess. 4:13-17). This is always what happens to those who neglect or reject New Testament teaching, who fail to consider the teaching of the Bible *as a whole*, on any given subject. The members of this “school” would have it that human immortality

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

was in some sense a threat to the sovereignty of God; thus they insist on accepting and perpetuating the Devil's own lie to Mother Eve, that she, by partaking of the forbidden fruit, would be "as God, knowing good and evil." For example, Cornfeld writes (AtD, 17) with reference to Gen. 3:22-24: "This then is the legendary reason why mankind does not live forever in Eden and must toil over the face of the earth. Original man was expelled from Eden because the divinity saw him as a dangerous rival, trying to rise halfway to divinity. The element of disobedience in the text is only circumstantial. It is not the main consideration in the story. Man, indeed, does not die, as threatened. Instead God is threatened with man's immortality. This would make man quite divine, which would be contrary to the order of nature and the cosmos. So God placed the 'Cherubim' to bar the approaches to the Tree of Life. After this man can appreciate his true condition: that the good earth is the place where his life will be played out. He understands that he can never dream of immortality. But he will return to the ground in death, for from the ground he was made." (This last statement is contradicted by such Old Testament passages as Gen. 2:7; Ps. 23:4; Job 14:14-15, 34:14; Eccl. 12:7; cf. also Luke 23:46, Acts 7:59). This writer goes on to discuss what he calls "the lost chance of immortality in the myths of antiquity," citing as examples the Babylonian tales of Adapa and Gilgamesh (*ibid*, pp. 19-21). However, this interpretation of the Genesis account is completely negated by the teaching of the Bible *as a whole*. The fallacies implicit in it are the following:

(1) The ambiguous use of the term *immortality*. The Greek original is *athanasia*, which means literally *deathlessness* (1 Cor. 15:53-54, 1 Tim. 6:16). (The kindred Greek term is *aphtharsia*, usually rendered "incorruption" or "incorruptibility" (Rom. 2:17; 1 Cor. 15:42, 50, 53, 54; 2 Tim. 1:10). Apparently *aphtharsia* and *athanasia*

## GENESIS

are used interchangeably in the apostolic writings.) In English, "deathlessness" and "immortality" have become equally ambiguous terms, and this ambiguity seems to pervade all human literature on the subject. Obviously, however, that which is truly *mortal* is truly *corruptible* (i.e., subject to change and decay), and this is a quality which can be predicated only of *corporeality*; hence we must conclude that the part of man which is corruptible and mortal, and which can by Divine power (Rom. 8:11) be made incorruptible and immortal, if we are to speak precisely, is the *body*. But, according to Scripture, *man is more than body* (Gen. 2:7; Eccl. 12:7; Job 27:3, 32:8; Matt. 26:41; Luke 23:46; John 19:30; Acts 7:59; 1 Cor. 2:11): he is body vitalized by *spirit*, the Breath of God. Hence *immortality must be distinguished from mere survival; in Scripture the term has reference exclusively to the destiny of the body*. (See my *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 439-444). On this general subject, three views have been advanced in the past, as follows: (a) the ancient Egyptian view, that the physical body would be revived and united with the soul following the judgment of Osiris; hence, mummification, also burial of food, flowers, ornaments, and even a few slaves, with the corpses of the nobility: the *hoi polloi*, to be sure, were not considered of sufficient worth to rate such attentions; (b) the Oriental notion of survival in some kind of bodilessness, as absorbed into what has been called the ocean of undifferentiated primal energy; and (c) the Biblical doctrine, that the physical bodies of the saints (the righteous, the justified, the redeemed) shall ultimately be transmuted into spiritual (ethereal) bodies adapted to their needs in the heavenly world (Rom. 8:18-24, Phil. 3:20-21, 1 Cor. 15:35-57, 2 Cor. 5:1-10). The Bible gives us no information as to the destiny of the bodies of those who shall suffer eternal separation "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might": 2 Thess. 1:7-10).

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(2) A misconception of the constituent elements of human nature *per se*, as it came from the handiwork of the Creator. As stated several times heretofore, and repeated here for emphasis, according to Gen. 2:7, man, naturally, is a spirit-body (in scientific terms, a *psychosomatic*) unity. He is imperishable spirit, tabernacled in a corporeal frame (2 Cor. 5:1-10). Following the Judgment, the saints will continue to be imperishable spirits, but clothed in celestial (spiritual, ethereal), rather than in terrestrial, bodies. As such they will still be "living souls" (Gen. 2:7, 46:27; Acts 2:41, 27:37; Rev. 6:9, 20:4). In Scripture this transmutation process (metamorphosis) is designated variously as "glorification" (Dan. 12:3; John 7:39; Matt. 17:1-2; Acts 9:3-4, 22:6-8, 26:12-15; Rom. 8:29-30; 2 Cor. 3:18; 1 Cor. 15:45-49), as "glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life" (Rom. 2:7), as the "putting on of immortality" (1 Cor. 15:54). From these considerations it follows that the statements quoted above are erroneous in that they deal with the human being as the product solely of *earthly* or physical elements (cf. 1 Cor. 15:47), and disregard completely the fact of the imperishability of the interior (or real) man (2 Cor. 4:11-18). Note the last sentence: Man "will return to the ground in death, for from the ground he was made": this is materialism pure and simple!

(3) Failure to take adequate account of the Divine Attributes, namely, (a) *Absolute Justice* (Ps. 85:10, Isa. 9:7) which demanded sanctions appropriate to the sustention of the majesty of the Divine Law which man had violated, and so to vindicate the Divine Will by which the Law was established; (b) *Absolute Goodness*, which would have been impugned had God chosen to create man in His own image and then leave him hopelessly lost in a world of sin, suffering, and death, and thus doomed to live on a level but little higher than that of the brute (cf. Psa. 8:1-9, Rom. 2:4); and (c) *Divine Love* (grace, com-

## GENESIS

passion, mercy) which was poured out in such a sacrificial manifestation as to prove to all intelligent creatures (both angels and men) God's desire and hope to bring the rebel back—of his own volition—into reconciliation and fellowship impaired by sin (2 Cor. 5:17-21, John 17:3, 1 John 1:3-4, 2 Pet. 3:9). To this end God gave His Only Begotten as the Supreme Sacrifice, gave Him freely for us all (Rom. 8:32, John 1:29, 1 Pet. 2:21-25, Heb. 12:2). "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world" (*i.e.*, mankind). Why not? Because the world (mankind) was, and is, under Divine judgment. Hence, God sent the Son into the world, "that the world should be saved through him" (John 3:16-21).

(4) Rejection of the New Testament fulfilment of the Old Testament preparation, hence of the entire Remedial System. The excerpt quoted above ignores the Plan of Redemption as if it had never existed in the Mind of God (Eph. 3:1-12, 2:1-10). Divine Justice could not, in the very nature of the case, tolerate rebellion in either angels or men, for that would be putting a value (premium) on sin; nor could Divine Love suffer the man, rebel though he was, and is, to be lost, to perish in Hell forever, without making the Supreme Effort to win him back. Hence, God did for man what man could not do for himself: He provided the necessary Atonement (Covering) for sin and vindictory sanction for sustaining the majesty of the Divine Law (cf. Psa. 94:1, 1 Thess. 4:6, Heb. 10:30, Rom. 12:19—in these various passages it is *vindication*, not vengeance (*i.e.*, revenge) that is signified: true law never seeks revenge), the Divine Act which was at the same time a demonstration of His ineffable love for the one whom He had created in His own image (Rom. 8:35-39), the demonstration designed to overcome the rebellion in man's heart, and thus make it possible for God to be "just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:26). And the Logos Himself, "for the joy that was set

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

before him"—the sheer joy of redeeming lost souls who would be persuaded to enter into covenant relationship with Him—took upon Himself "flesh and blood" (Heb. 3:14-15), "endured the cross, despising shame" (Heb. 12:2), "and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Phil. 2:5-11). Finally, the Holy Spirit Himself, throughout the present Dispensation, condescends to enter and to indwell every obedient soul committed to the Mind and Will of Christ (John 7:37-39; Rom. 5:5, 8:27; Acts 2:38; 1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:19-20; Gal. 3:2) as the seal of his participation in the duties and privileges of the New Covenant (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13, 4:30) and the earnest of his attaining the inheritance of all the saints in light (Col. 1:12), the "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled . . . reserved in heaven" for them (1 Pet. 1:4). These numerous Scriptures clearly reveal the fallacy of associating the Genesis account of the Fall with Babylonian folklore from which the sublime doctrines of grace, faith, redemption, and the Spiritual Life, are conspicuously absent. To avoid this fallacy, however, one must correlate the Mosaic account with the teaching of the Bible as a whole. To fail to do this invariably results in the distortion of the truth. The plain truth is, in the light of Scripture in its entirety, that *man has not lost "the chance of immortality" at all. Moreover, if human immortality is a threat of any kind whatsoever to the sovereignty of God, why, then, did God in His Eternal Purpose make provision for it as a natural reward of the Spiritual Life* (Col. 3:4, Rom. 14:17)? For example, in Rom. 8:29-30, we are told explicitly that all those whom God foreknows, calls, justifies, and glorifies (in His Eternal Purpose: there is no past, present, or future, with God; only the eternal *now*), these He foreordains to be conformed to the image of His Son (again, in His Eternal Purpose). That is to say, it was only through the Son's Divine Begetting (Luke



## GENESIS

1:35), Supreme Sacrifice, and Resurrection (as the first-born from the dead) that life and immortality have been brought to light through the Gospel (Rom. 8:11, 8:29; 2 Tim. 1:10; 1 Tim. 1:17, 6:16; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; Col. 1:18; Heb. 12:23); that all of God's elect shall in the finality of the Cosmic Process attain "glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life" (Rom. 2:7).

All the evidence available, either from Scripture teaching or from human experience, seems to make it obvious that *man was mortal from the beginning, that is, created mortal; and that as long as he had free access to the Tree of Life, he had the means of counteracting his mortality.* But what was this Tree of Life? Was it an actually existing tree, bearing real fruit, of a kind such as we now apprehend by sense-perception, fruit 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 (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 at hand always to counteract his mortality. Thus had he maintained his innocence, and by unswerving obedience to the Will of God had grown into holiness, we may suppose that his body would have been transfigured and translated to Heaven without the intervention of physical death (its 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; in a word, that the inherent laws of mortality might work out their course in his physical constitution (Gen. 3:22-24,

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

5:5). It seems that in view of the possibility of his making the fateful choice of transgression above obedience (1 John 3:4), Divine Wisdom had already prepared the whole earth for his occupancy and lord tenancy, as the stage on which His Plan for Redemption, His Eternal Purpose, should be executed (Isa. 46:8-11; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 3:8-13, 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 1 Pet. 1:19-20; Rev. 13:8, 17:8). From this general point of view, it is contended by various Bible scholars *that the entire posterity of Adam—all mankind—must suffer physical death because they are so unfortunate as to be born outside the Garden and hence without access to the fruit of this Tree to counteract their mortality.* (This position is well presented by Brents, GPS, Ch. 5).

Account must be taken, of course, of the obvious symbolism of the elements of the Genesis narrative of the Fall. However, this symbolism is not necessarily weakened by the literal interpretation: in the Bible, real objects are often used as symbols and metaphors of profound spiritual truths (e.g., in the parables of Jesus). As stated heretofore, the correlation of Gen. 2:9, 17 and 3:22-24 with Rev. 2:7 and 22:2 indicates clearly that the Tree of Life is to be understood as a symbol of the Logos, man's connecting link with the Source of Life (Gen. 2:7; John 1:51, 10:10, 11:25-26, 14:6; 1 John 5:12). Similarly, the Tree of Knowledge evidently is to be taken as a symbol of knowledge *per se*, that is, knowledge that comes from the actual experience of sin. (Cf. also the discussion of the Cherubim and the Flaming Sword *supra*.) Moreover, there is a "fall" in every life: this is the old, old story of what happens to every human being on reaching the age of reasoning (discretion or accountability): conscience is born in the passing from innocence to moral responsibility (Rom. 3:23, 5:12). Any human act that is motivated by inordinate physical lust, devotion to the purely sensual, or desire for illicit knowledge—the temptations that beset

## GENESIS

Mother Eve—is a “fall” in the Biblical sense of the term. The plain truth is—it seems to me—that Scripture gives us no clear information as to what might have been man’s ultimate end had he not chosen to enter upon a course of rebellion against God.

Occasionally one encounters the statement that man was created *perfect*. Now *perfection* is *completeness* or *wholeness* (from *per* and *facere*, “to make thoroughly,” “to finish,” “to make complete”). It seems evident that man as he came from the creative Hand of God was perfect in a *personal* sense, and in a personal sense only, that is, in being vested with the powers of thought, feeling and volition. But can it be said that he was *morally* perfect? Or, to be more explicit, can it be said rightly that he was created *holily*? It seems more reasonable to hold that he was created *innocent*, and holiness is definitely not innocence; rather, it is a moral and spiritual condition of the inner man that is achieved by obedience to the Word; it is the product, not of human passivity, but of human activity. Again, can holiness be imposed upon a person from some outside source? I think not. It is, rather, the fruit of a life of voluntary commitment to God, in our Dispensation the life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3, 2 Cor. 7:1, Rom. 12:1-2, 2 Pet. 3:18); in a word, the Spiritual Life which blossoms into the Life Everlasting.

### 7. *The Three States of Man*

Can it be said, then, that man fell “downward”—or did he actually fall “upward”?

Alexander Campbell has left some interesting comments on this problem (LP, 115, 116) as follows: “Adam and Eve were in a state of nature when created by God. They were primarily in a state of nature, which is always proper. They could not reasonably aspire to rise above it, in any relation. If man were in a state of nature, he would be absolutely perfect. We are aware that natural theology

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(as some have it) speaks of man as now in a state of nature. But this is an unfortunate error. Man is in a preternatural, or unnatural, state. Adam and Eve only of all the family of men were ever in a natural state—in other words, in the condition in which they were created by God. God made the natural state of man; sin and its consequences, the preternatural or unnatural; and the drama of redemption, the supernatural. Adam and Eve, before the fall, were natural; after the fall, unnatural. Men have no power to return to a state of nature, but by grace they can rise to a supernatural state. These are the definitions of the true science of man, which it is important to remember.”

From the point of view suggested by Mr. Campbell, it would seem that the Fall was, in a sense, benevolent in character—hence, a fall “upward.” It would seem, surely, that a state of holiness is to be preferred above one of innocence, a supernatural state above a purely natural state. It is apparent, moreover, that God predestined man to be free, that is, to be endowed by creation with the power of choice. Still and all, insofar as man in the present world is considered, according to Mr. Campbell’s view, there was a fall “downward,” from what he designates the “natural” to what he calls the “preternatural” or “unnatural.” Have we a paradox here that cannot be resolved?

Perhaps we should conclude that the fall was both “downward” and “upward.” The fall itself was downward, into a state of rebellion against God. But God’s Love has transformed it (transcended it and its consequences) into a possibility of what might best be called “upwardness” (John 1:29, 3:16). The upward pull is no work of man: it is solely the efflux of Divine Grace (Eph. 2:1-10). What man did to himself pushed him downward; but what God does for him is remedial, to lift him upward, upward through the Spiritual Life here

## GENESIS

into the fulness of union with God in the hereafter, and hence the recovery of "the lost chance of immortality." For Adam and his posterity, God has chosen to override evil by providing the potentiality of ultimate and complete good (redemption in spirit and soul and body) for all men who conform to the necessary prerequisites of conversion (Acts 2:38, Rom. 10:9-10, Gal. 3:27) and the essentials of the Spiritual Life (Gal. 5:22-25), and who thus make it possible for Him to be just and at the same time the justifier of those who manifest the obedience of faith in Christ Jesus (Rom. 3:26, Gal. 3:2, Jas. 2:20-26). (Cf. also 1 Thess. 5:23; Matt. 5:48; John 17:23; Heb. 12:14, 23). From these truths it is obvious, surely, that no possibility exists of man's lifting himself up to glory and honor and incorruption simply by tugging at his own bootstraps. There is no promise of Divine overruling of evil for those who persist in neglect and disobedience and wickedness throughout this life. For them there remains only "a certain fearful expectation of judgment" (Rom. 2:8-9, Heb. 10:27, 2 Thess. 1:7-10).

It must be conceded, of course, that the concept of a fall "upward," so to speak, from a condition of innocence to one of the potentiality of holiness is more in accord with evolutionism than the traditional concept of a fall "downward." But here, as usual, when we reach the depths of the mysteries of God, we are confronted with the inadequacy of human language to provide precise word-symbols for the concepts involved. In the use of such terms as "natural," "unnatural," "preternatural," "supernatural," and the like, in their inter-relationships of meaning, we find ourselves bogged down in semantics: and the road of sheer semanticism usually leads to a dead end. The question arises: Could not our first parents have continued in their unvitiated natural state by maintaining unbroken obedience to God and so have attained holiness without the necessity of a pilgrimage through this world

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH of sin, suffering, senescence, and death, and would this ultimate state have been any less "supernatural" than the holiness ultimately to be attained through the fall and the recovery (redemption)? And to what extent is the redemption of the body, the putting on of immortality, involved in all this? This reasoning in turn might lead us to the unanswerable "dead end" insofar as human reason and experience are concerned: Why was man clothed in a physical, instead of an ethereal body (like that of angels?) in the first place? We cannot avoid the conclusion, it seems to me, that Creation and Redemption are the two grand divisions of the Plan of the Universe. Redemption, therefore, presupposes something, some change of interior state, which can only be rightly designated a "fall." Moreover, *the concept of a fall "downward" is indubitably implicit in the fact of the birth of conscience, and the interior state itself can hardly be properly designated anything other than a state of depravity.*

8. "Predestined To Be Free"

(1) This felicitous phrase I have borrowed from a sermon by my good friend, Dr. James F. Jauncey. Man was predestined, and therefore created, to be free, that is, to have the power of choice; and obviously spiritual growth and maturity are attainable only by personal choice, choice of the Way of Christ and of personal commitment to it; in a word, choice of the Spiritual Life (John 14:6; Matt. 7:13-14; Acts 18:28, 19:23). This means that Adam and Eve were endowed at creation with the power of choice. What, then, was to prevent their continuing in unbroken fellowship with God? *Nothing, absolutely nothing, but their own wills.* (Recall Trueblood's pertinent remark (PR, 251): "Evil is the price we pay for moral freedom.") The first sin was the terminus of the human choice to rebel against God, to put self above God, even though the choice was elicited under the pressure of Satanic temptation. As stated previously, there is no

## GENESIS

hope for the Devil and his angels: they sinned of their own free volition, uninfluenced from without; hence they are *totally depraved*, held in the everlasting bonds of this depravity unto the Judgment of the Great Day (Jude 6, 2 Pet. 2:4, Acts 17:30-31). But there was hope for our first parents, because they were in great measure seduced by outside agency; hence, for them and their kind God could consistently temper justice with mercy (Rom. 8:1-4). The fact remains, however, that no necessity was imposed upon Adam and Eve to sin against God: their choice of the wrong way was their own choice, but they could have chosen otherwise. Their wills were not burglarized by the Almighty. The same is true of the all (human-kind) "who have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). *Man was predestined to be free, not to be enslaved to sin.*

(2) But—does man actually have this power of choice? Fatalistic, necessitarian, deterministic, "mechanistic" cults have flourished in all ages, the common denominator of which is the view that he is under the compulsion of forces over which he has no control; in a word, that free will is an illusion. If this be true, obviously there can be no such thing as morality, as democracy, or even as scientific inquiry, in the full sense of these terms. Perhaps we should try to define freedom. What does it mean to man to have the power of choice? This writer defines freedom as the *power* (not necessarily the *right*) which a human being—a person—has (a) to act or not to act, or (b) to act in one way instead of another, given the circumstances, in the form of motives, for such action. As Roberts writes (PC, 6): "The practical problems with which life confronts every one of us are questions as to which of two or more . . . attractive possibilities we shall choose. Where there is no choice, there is no problem. If there ever is really only one thing to be done, there is no uncertainty. We do it. If we hesitate at all, it is because we suspect

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

there may be another possibility. When we review and appraise action, our own or others', it never occurs to us to praise or blame actions which could not have been other than they were. Whatever is truly necessary is neither good nor bad, neither right nor wrong." As R. A. MacIver puts it (STC, 520): "To live is to act, and to act is to choose, and to choose is to evaluate." Perhaps a simple illustration will suffice here: To what extent is a man "in charge of himself" when he is falling from a twenty-story building? Obviously, he is not in charge of himself at all; rather, he is helpless in the throes of that mysterious physical compulsion known as gravity. On the other hand, to what extent is the same man "in charge of himself" in solving a complex mathematical problem? Evidently this is a mental process in which he is in charge of himself throughout. Freedom means that, in some measure, the person is in charge of himself when he acts. To be sure, freedom is necessarily limited by the circumference of a person's acquaintanceship. A Hottentot, or any other person, who has never heard of ice, could hardly choose to go skating. One could not be expected to choose anything of which he is entirely ignorant.

(3) *Freedom is not "motiveless action,"* that is, the ability to deliberate or choose without motives. If the will were free in this sense, we should never exhort a person to do this or that: we should realize that such exhortations would accomplish nothing. We do not exhort the winds to blow in this or that direction: we realize that the winds are not influenced by motives. But because the will is free, we do urge and exhort, and by exhortation we present to it motives. Freedom of will means, not that the will is *undetermined*, nor that it is *fully determined* by some power other than itself, but that it is *self-determined*.

(4) *Freedom of will, negatively defined, is immunity from necessity.* Natural physical law is indeed stamped on the lower nature of man and governs all those movements



## GENESIS

of man which are not ordinarily subject to his volitional activity (e.g., metabolism, respiration, digestion, assimilation, circulation of the blood, etc.). Nevertheless, man is physically free in his will; at the same time, however, he is morally bound: that is, bound by the moral law which determines his relationships and their corresponding rights and duties. Free will, then, is immunity from necessity within the framework in which choice can be made: immunity from necessity (a) of choosing *this* instead of *that* object or end, and (b) of making any choice at all. Any normal person realizes, even when deciding on a *wrong* course of conduct, that he is capable of choosing the *right* course: in a word, that his choice is not necessitated. This is just common sense.

(5) *A free act is a self-determined act.* An act of will which is necessitated in the will by forces of the inner nature, or one which is forced upon it by violence from without (if that were possible: one might be compelled to give to a burglar the combination of a safe, but he would not do it willingly) is plainly not under the control of the "I"; therefore, such an act is not a human act. Such acts as those of a madman, or those done in sleep, are not *human* acts, because in such cases the will is not free. Freedom to act in one way implies prior power of the will (person) to have acted in another, even in the opposite, way.

(6) *Freedom attaches only to a person.* Negley writes (OK, 85): "I suggest that Liberty is the concept most appropriate to Person. As a value principle, Liberty means, briefly, the guarantee to individuals of as much freedom of thought and action as is consistent with the exercise of an equal freedom by other men." Liberty is personal freedom exercised in relation to other persons. In political thinking, liberty signifies generally the absence of external restraint. Complete absence of external restraint would, of course, be anarchy.

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(7) *Necessitarianism* is the doctrine that all effects follow invariably their prior causes, and especially that the human will does not have any freedom of choice. (The doctrine that the human will is free (especially, to the extent of a person's knowledge) is known as *voluntarism*). Necessitarianism takes one of two forms: (a) that in which man is supposed to be under the rigid control of a pre-determining will, which is known in secular terms as *fatalism* (whatever may be signified by such terms as "fate" or "fortune"), and which is known in theological circles as *predestinarianism* (absolute control of all events by the Deity); and (b) and that which supposes that all effects are invariably determined by their respective antecedent *impersonal* causes, the view which is generally designated *determinism*. Determinism is simply the denial of freedom of *initiatory* action in man. The determinists tell us that in order to freedom of will, man must have the power to do what he chooses to do, and in the doing much be free from all external or internal constraints. They ask: Are all these conditions ever met at one and the same moment? Their own answer is, No. They tell us that if one could know all the factors involved in the personality development of any human being, it would be possible to predict his "decision" in any given situation which apparently demands his making a choice. Of course, the feeling that one has made such a decision becomes in deterministic lingo an "illusion." (Notice should be taken especially of the "if" involved in this supposition. *It is evident that no one can ever know all the factors involved in the development of anyone's personality from moment to moment, from hour to hour, etc.* Such an analysis is utterly impossible; hence the whole theory rests on imponderables and not on available facts. Moreover, every human being is an *individual*. That is to say, no two persons are ever duplicated; every person is unique in that he is different from—an *other* to—every other person.

## GENESIS

There is no possible way by which *my* experiences, memories, emotions, thoughts, and decisions can become *your* experiences, memories, emotions, thoughts and decisions. As Emerson has said: "Nature never rhymes her children or makes two men alike." And as Dr. Allport has written (PPI, 4, 5): "In everyday life, the scientist, like anyone else, deals effectively with his fellow men only by recognizing that their peculiar natures are not adequately represented in his discovery. The single functions which they have in common are deeply overshadowed by the individual use to which they put these functions. The piling of law upon law does not in the slightest degree account for the pattern of individuality which each human being enfolds. The *person* who is a unique and never-repeated phenomenon evades the traditional scientific approach at every step. In fact, the more science advances, the less do its discoveries resemble the individual life with its patent continuities, mobility, and reciprocal penetration of functions." "Each self is simply a unique existence which is perfectly impervious to other selves—impervious in a fashion of which the impenetrability of matter is a faint analogue" (Illingworth, PHD, 30).

(8) Theoretically, determinism is of three kinds: (a) *physical* (that all natural events are reducible ultimately to physiochemical action: thus the human being is defined as "a locus in the movement continuum, constituting a relatively permanent electron-proton aggregate—the atoms, molecules, and tissues of the body—interacting with the electron-proton systems not with the body," etc.—A. P. Weiss, TBHB, pp. 390-392); (b) *biological* (that gene combinations determine all physical, temperamental, and mental characteristics, and hence all human behavior); and (c) *psychological* (that which finds the sources of necessitarianism in unconscious forces and factors, "hidden motives"). Perhaps the most clear-cut presentation of a strict determinism is given us in a book, novelistic in character,

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH entitled *Walden Two*, by the Harvard psychologist, B. F. Skinner (who is currently revered as a kind of demigod in many psychology circles). Joseph Collignon, reviewing the book, in an article in *Saturday Review*, June 27, 1964, summarizes Skinner's thesis as follows: "B. F. Skinner sees, as Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor saw, that the masses are incapable of freedom, and that man must be relieved of guilt if he is to be happy. *Walden Two* eliminates guilt by eliminating sin. Man is an animal that can be conditioned to gratify his desires within the framework of the complexity of social needs. Proper conditioning eliminates the need for choice—if, indeed, choice does exist. 'Choice' becomes an automatic response. If the animal becomes depressed or anxious—by chance, not choice—psychiatrists are available." The holes in this thesis, it seems to me, are the following: Just what is meant by *proper* conditioning? What are to be taken as the *norms* of proper conditioning? Who are to decide what these norms are? Indeed how could any group "decide" anything under this view. It follows, too, that Skinner's "decision" to write the book, including, to be sure, all the thoughts, words, phrases, etc., incorporated in the book—all this must have been the product of chance, not of choice. It is really amazing how silly some Ph.D.'s can become, especially when one is pursuing the exploitation of his own dearly beloved brain-child. (It has been said rightly that the difference between the man who rides a horse and the man who rides a hobby is that the former has sense enough to dismount occasionally to let his horse rest, whereas the man who rides a hobby persists in riding it to death. This is especially true of the intelligentsia and their theoretical hobbies. Professor C. D. Broad once remarked that the theory of determinism is so absurd that only a very learned man could have conjured it up.

(9) Descending from the "ethereal mansions" of abstract speculation to the earthly plane of practical thinking, what

## GENESIS

is the testimony of man's common sense with respect to his own freedom of action? To ask this question is to answer it: *common sense has never yielded to deterministic theories*. Common sense has always held as facts of experience (a) the substantial existence and personal identity of the self, and (b) freedom of will in human conduct. To think, or at least to *act* otherwise would be to manifest incipient insanity and in all probability to run afoul of the civil law. Observation, introspection, and experience in general, all point in the direction of these two facts of human selfhood and self-determination. It is freely admitted, of course, that human action takes place within a framework of hereditary and environmental factors. But the commonsense view is that in addition to these two sets of factors, there is, in every human act, the personal equation: that is, the reaction of the self as a unitary whole, reaction which terminates in the will and in the overt act. I am convinced that I *do choose*, and every sane person has the same conviction. As Illingworth has written (PHD, 35-36): "We ground our belief in freedom on two things—its immediate self-evidence in consciousness and its progressive self-justification in morality—the way in which its moral results approve themselves to the universal reason of mankind; and we are confident that no contrary argument can be constructed without surreptitiously assuming what it attempts to disprove. Lucretius was obliged to allow his atoms the power of swerving. And when Hobbes defines the will as 'the last appetite in deliberation,' he concedes by the latter word what he intends to deny by the former. And so it is with the later necessitarians. Their analysis is more elaborate and possesses the attraction for certain minds of any attempt to explain the primary aspect of a thing ingeniously away. But they have been convicted again and again, either of ignoring the point at issue, or begging in one phase or other, the question to be proved; while their

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

success, if it were possible, would only land them in the old dilemma, that by invalidating consciousness they invalidate all power of reasoning, and with it the value of their own conclusions."

(10) Life and personality are not amendable to mechanistic laws; the stronger motive is stronger because it is in greater accord with the desire and will of the person making the choice (and in too many cases, unfortunately, in greater accord with his desire than with his reason or better judgment). Life and thought surge on and function qualitatively—far above the mere quantitative mechanistic level. Perhaps this is the reason why the conviction of personal freedom is innate and unshakable in man. His ideas, institutions, and laws are all predicated upon it. If any one of the theorists who deny free will were to commit a crime, certainly he would be treated by society—that is, indicted, tried, and maybe convicted and executed—as if he were free to act and therefore responsible for his deeds. His deterministic theory would avail him nothing before the civil law, nor would it avail him anything before the moral law. Imagine a man on trial for murder, pleading his case before the judge in these words: "Your honor, I am innocent. The laws of heredity and environment committed this crime—I did not commit it." I have the feeling that the judge, in response to a plea so asinine, would turn him over to the proper authorities for psychiatric examination and treatment. The fact is, of course, that the man gave the lie to his whole argument the moment he used the "I," the personal pronoun. Anyone making such a defense would become the laughing-stock of the whole community! Those who preach determinism know, while they are preaching it, that it is false; they never treat themselves or their children as mere machines. Let us hear C. D. Broad again (in Muirhead, *Contemporary British Philosophy*, p. 98): "If a man referred to his brother or to his cat as 'an ingenious mech-

## GENESIS

anism,' we should know that he was either a fool or a physiologist. No one in practice treats himself or his fellow men or his pet animals as machines; but scientists who have never made a study of speculative philosophy seem often to think it is their duty to hold up in theory what no one outside a lunatic asylum would accept in practice."

(11) Man knows from immediate experience that he possesses this power of choice. Against determinism is set "the immediate affirmation of consciousness in the moment of deliberate action . . . I find it impossible not to think that I can now choose" (Sidgwick). As William James vigorously contends, our consciousness of freedom and the fact of regret for wrongdoing are the immediate facts of human experience; the world must have moral coherence as well as logical coherence. And Bergson argues with great eloquence that life is basically a flow in which the free spirit of man is constantly emerging as a victor, expressing itself in art, in science, in religion, and in free political institutions. I know, and every person who will be honest with himself knows, that one makes choices between alternatives every day, every hour, even every few minutes. This we *know* from immediate experience, and to deny such knowledge is to manifest wilful ignorance. We may not, and indeed do not, know the extent to which forces of heredity and forces of environment enter into personal motivation and personal choice, but we know that we *do choose*. Freedom is not determinism; it is not indeterminism; it is *self-determinism*. The two essential properties of person and personality are self-consciousness and self-determination; the latter is properly defined as that power by which the self, the I, determines its own acts.

(12) The problem may be stated best, perhaps, as follows: As far as this writer knows, no one questions the fact of the interplay of forces of heredity and forces of

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

environment in the building of personality. The newborn babe is comparable, let us say, to a blank tablet (*tabula rasa*). He has all the potentialities of person and personality, but at first these are latent, waiting to be actualized. Hence as the child matures, through the interaction of these hereditary and environmental factors, the time arrives when he senses a distinction between the *me* and the *not-me*. This is the first glimmer of self-consciousness. And as this distinction becomes more obvious, the awareness of self becomes correspondingly more potent and becomes *per se* the determining factor in human motivation and action. Hence, the fact is that in every choice *three* factors are involved, namely, heredity and environment (the forces of which are largely imponderables) *plus* the personal reaction. In the final analysis, it is the person, the I, who tips the scales in one direction, toward one alternative, in preference to another. We do not say, My eyes see, my ears hear, etc., but we say, I see and I hear; we are equally right in saying that I choose, I decide, I act, etc. Present effects follow from prior causes, to be sure; but the fact overlooked or ignored by the determinist is that the Self (the I) is one of those causes, indeed the efficient cause. As Kemeny has written (PLS, pp. 225-226): "We could restate the deterministic argument by saying that we cannot have a free choice because the Law of Nature says what the outcome of our choice will be. If it is already 'written,' then we have no real choice. The Law is not something binding, but a simple description of all events, past, present and future. Among other things it describes how we choose. This is the only reason why our decision must be in accordance with it. It would be just as correct, and perhaps less misleading, to say that the Law of Nature depends on our choice, instead of the reverse." That is to say, again, that "we are predestined to be free."



## GENESIS

(13) Kant, the German philosopher, held that freedom is not a natural inheritance of man; rather, that in order to have freedom we must create it for ourselves. If man, he says, were to follow his natural bent, he would not strive for freedom; he would choose dependence instead. It is much easier to depend on others to think, judge and decide for us, and so man is inclined to look upon freedom as a burden rather than a privilege. "Here the totalitarian state and the political myth step in" (Cassirer). In his chapter, "The Grand Inquisitor," Dostoevsky, in his novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*, perhaps the most profoundly searching psychological novel ever written, pictures the Inquisitor as meeting Jesus of Nazareth on the streets of the Spanish city of Seville and as chiding Him for having resisted the appeals of the Devil. By doing this, the Inquisitor argued, Jesus had condemned men to the assumption of responsibility, a burden which they did not want to bear. Men are naturally happy, the Inquisitor went on to say, only when they have no responsibilities, when they can live the life of grasshoppers floating downstream, so to speak. This, of course, is the negative way of putting before us the truth that with freedom necessarily goes responsibility. Unlimited freedom in any area of life would be equivalent to total irresponsibility and this in turn would be equivalent to complete anarchy. Obviously, if this be the true view of human character, there can be little hope for the future of democracy.

(14) If man does not have freedom of will, at least within a certain framework, then he is not responsible for anything he does; and if not morally responsible, then all his laws and all his courts and all his mechanisms of enforcement are but pompous vanities. If man does not have and exercise free will, then Might becomes Right, and there can be no such thing as morality, no such thing as real democracy, not even any science itself as free inquiry. This would mean, of course, man's abandonment

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH of all pretension to social order and his adoption of the ways of the jungle. (But even the evolutionist will agree that man has advanced beyond the brute stage.) We affirm, therefore, with Brennan, that "no power outside of will—either material force or physiological reflex, or instinctive urge, or even intellect itself—can so determine the human will as to leave it trapped and helpless in the face of superior agencies" (TP, 220). As Sullivan remarks (LS, 186): "As things are, biology's main contribution to our theoretical understanding of the world is the stale and unlikely surmise that a living organism will turn out to be nothing but a mechanical system." cf. also Negley (OK, 20): "The argument that men are in the grip of conditioned behavior-patterns from which there is no escape rests upon a description of experience which is simple to the point of simplemindedness."

(15) The following somewhat lengthy excerpt from the pen of Dr. Will Durant (MP, 100-102) is a fitting summarization of the problem before us: "The determinist will recall the conservation of energy; the organism cannot emit more energy than it has received. Which is to forget that life itself is energy, visibly transforming the forces and materials brought to it into combinations that aim at the mastery of environment by thought, and occasionally succeed. What issues from action may be no more in quantity than what entered in sensation; but how different in quality! This transforming power of life is the highest energy we know; it is known to us more directly and surely than any other energy in the world; and is the source and promise of our modest freedom. The determinist supposes that freedom is illustory because the 'stronger' motive always wins. Of course this is a vain tautology; the motive that is strong enough to win is stronger than those that fail. But what made it stronger if not its harmony with the will, with the desire and essence of the soul?—'Yet there cannot be any uncaused actions.' Verily; but

## GENESIS

the will is part of the cause; the circumstances of an action must include the forward urgency of life. Each 'state' of mind follows naturally from the total preceding state of all reality; but that state and this include the transforming energy of life and will.—'The same effect always follows the same cause.' But the cause is never the same, for the self involved is always in flux, and circumstances are forever changing.—'If I knew all your past and present I could infallibly predict your response.' You could if you knew also the nature and power of the life-force within me; you could, perhaps, if you abandoned mechanistic principles and asked yourself, for your guidance, what you—*i.e.*, life—would do in this complex of circumstance. Probably you could not predict successfully even then; probably there is in life an element of incalculability and spontaneity which does not accord with our categories and our 'laws,' and which gives peculiar zest and character to organic evolution and human affairs. Let us pray that we shall never have to live in a totally predictable world. Does not the picture of such a world seem ridiculously incongruous with life—mechanism in life being, as Bergson said, a passing jest?—'But all action is the result of heredity and environment.' Not quite; the determinist modestly fails to take account of himself. He supposes once more that life is the passing product of external forces; he neglects (if we may use a pleonasm) the very vitality and liveliness of life. We are not merely our ancestors and our circumstances; we are also wells of transforming energy, we are parts of that stream of directive force, of capacity for adaptive choice and thought, in which our forefathers also moved and had their being. These ancestors are in truth living and acting within us; but the will and the life that were once in them is in each of us now, creating the 'spontaneous me.' . . . Will is free in so far as it is creative, in so far as it enters, with its remoulding energy, as *one* of the determining condi-

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH  
tions of choice and action. There is no violation of 'natural law' in such a freedom, because life itself is a natural factor and process, not a force outside the varied realm of nature. Nature itself, as its fine name implies, is that living power through which all things are begotten; probably throughout the world this spontaneity and urgency lurk which we have claimed for life; how else could life have acquired it? *To say that our characters determine our actions is true. But we are our characters; it is we, then, that choose.*" (Italics mine—C.C.)

(16) Voluntariness is the actual exercise of freedom. The act of choice is the act of the person, an act stemming from the interaction of thought and desire, and accompanied by the set of the self toward the end-in-view. This is what is meant by the *human act*: it is the act which involves prior deliberation, freedom, and voluntariness. The person does choose between motives, but within the framework of hereditary and environmental factors. Adam and Eve had a choice to make between Divine ordinance and Satanic persuasion; though they could have done otherwise, they chose Satan, lust, sin, and death, and thus their choice brought into operation God's ineffable grace (Eph. 2:8) in His actualizing of His Plan of Redemption, lest man—the creature who bears His image and who is the supreme object of His love—should be lost forever (John 3:16-17). (We shall look *infra* at the problem of the relation between Divine foreordination and foreknowledge on the one hand, and human freedom and voluntariness on the other.)

9. *Some Pertinent Questions* which arise in connection with the Genesis Narrative of the Fall are the following:

(1) *Why did God create man capable of falling?* To this we reply: (a) That it is difficult to see how God could have created a *man* incapable of falling. If man is to be a moral creature in any sense of the term, subject to moral government (law), he must have freedom of choice

## GENESIS

to some extent, which surely would include freedom to choose between good and evil, right and wrong. *Lacking this power, he would not be man.* (b) That man's fall made it possible for the actualizing of the Divine Plan of Redemption the essence of which would be the Atonement, the supreme demonstration of God's love for the creature He had created in His own image. Moreover, by means of this Remedial System, not only has God's love, but Satan's total depravity as well, been demonstrated to all intelligent beings of the universe. God overruled evil for good in the sense that He made use of the Fall for benevolent ends. John Wild (IRP, 385): "Either we are free and sometimes choose wrongly, in which case the divine purpose is frustrated, or we are always made to choose in the proper way, in which case we are not really free." Trueblood (PR, 351): "Evil is the price we pay for moral freedom . . . the limitation on God's working, which accounts for the presence of evil, is due, not to the *nature of things*, but to the *nature of goodness*." Thompson (MPR, 497): "Although no morally evil act is itself necessary yet it may be necessary that evil should occur in a world of free but finite agents." Again (*ibid.*, 507-508): "A world free of evil would have to be a world which contained nothing capable of evil. . . . *Not even God can love a puppet.*" Plato, in the *Timaeus*, would have us believe that the creation of the world was "the victory of persuasion over force." This is a doctrine that Christian theologians can ill afford to overlook. Undoubtedly, as far as man can ascertain, God's will to give man freedom of will has made evil possible. However, God does not make it a practice generally to override human freedom of choice, for the obvious reason that for Him to do this, in view of His endowment of man with this power, would be the very height of inconsistency. Rather, God resorts to persuasion: hence the Gospel (Rev. 14:6—"eternal good

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH news") is *the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes* (Rom. 1:16). The Gospel embodies God's *persuasive*, rather than his *coercive*, power. (Cf. Luke 1:8-13, Matt. 28:18-20, Rom. 10:4-15, 1 Cor. 1:20-25, 2 Cor. 5:17-21, 1 Tim. 2:3-4, etc.).

(2) *Why did not God interfere and keep man from falling into sin?* To this we reply: (a) the fact that God *did not* interfere is conclusive evidence that He *should not* have done so. For man even to question the Divine Intelligence and Will is sheer presumption. (b) Temptation is not the *cause*, but the *proof*, of an inner disloyalty (cf. Matt. 5:28, 1 John 3:15). To the extent that the human heart is loyal (1 Cor. 15:58) temptation has little power over it. It follows, therefore, that temptation serves primarily to reveal our real interior selves to us and to our fellow men. (c) If God had interposed His power in the first temptation and so prevented man from disobedience, to act consistently He would be compelled to interfere in all similar cases; otherwise, He would be a respecter of persons, which by the authority of His own Word He is not (Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, 1 Pet. 1:17). In effect, this would be to set aside natural order and to govern the moral universe by force (miracle).

(3) *How could so terrible a penalty justly have been connected with disobedience to such an apparently trivial command?* To this we reply: (a) The very simplicity of the command enhanced the importance of the loyalty test involved, and so made disobedience all the more reprehensible. Adam and Eve could not have failed to understand the simple prohibition required of them; hence, their disobedience arose out of sheer disloyalty. The overt act of rebellion was, therefore, the revelation of a will corrupted by lust. This fact the guilty pair themselves recognized as evident from their attempt to hide from God's presence.

## GENESIS

4. *Does not the fall of man, and its consequences, prove the Creation to have been a failure? Most emphatically, it does not.* The real success of any undertaking, divine or human, is to be determined by the achievement of the desired *ultimate* end in view (Isa. 46:8-10). The end sought, both in Creation and in Redemption (Generation and Regeneration) is (a) God's own glory in His vindication from the false charges brought against Him by Satan and his rebel hosts, and (b) man's eternal Beatitude, which is inseparably linked with God's glory (Eph. 3:8-12). Therefore, if one, and only one, saint is revealed in the Judgment, redeemed in spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23, 1 Cor. 6:19-20), the process of discomfiting Satan which began at Calvary will be gloriously consummated (Rom. 12:19, 16:20; Deut. 32:25; 1 Cor. 6:2-3, 15:26). In short, the greatness of God's Plan of Redemption is to be measured, not by the number of the saved (Matt. 7:14), but by the sheer wonder of the salvation to be revealed at the last great Day (Acts 3:20-21; 1 Cor. 2:6-10, 15:50-58; Rev. 20-11-12, 21-1-6, 22:1-5).

\* \* \* \* \*

### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

#### *Lessons From the Story of the Fall*

The most poignant "human interest" stories in literature are to be found in the Bible, and of these the account of man's Temptation and Fall is second to none. Note the following practical lessons to be learned from this Genesis narrative:

1 *It points up the havoc that can be wrought by a single act of disobedience to God.* As a consequence of man's first act of rebellion against God, the race has suffered toil, sorrow, disease, and death universally.

"'Twas but a little drop of sin  
We saw this morning enter in,  
And lo, at eventide a world is drowned."

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

Farrar has written: "The guilty wish of one woman has swollen into the irremediable corruption of a world." Sin is self-propagating, and its reproductive powers are almost supernatural. Like a huge locomotive, it gathers momentum as it goes, saturating the whole human family with corruption, spreading violence, suffering, disease and death in its wake. There is no limit to the spread of the consequences of a single evil deed. Tom Paine once wrote a book, entitled *The Age of Reason*, a book which has pushed thousands of impressionable minds over the precipice into infidelity. The effects of this single activity will never disappear entirely. Why, then, should not the unrepentant person who sets in motion such a never-ending flood of iniquity suffer correspondingly a never-ending punishment? Just as the good lives of the saints do "follow with them" up to the Throne of God and the Life Everlasting (Rev. 14:13), so does the unrighteousness of the neglectful and the disobedient follow *with them* into their final state of eternal separation from God, timeless Hell. (Cf. Psa. 89:14; Matt. 25:31-46; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; 1 Pet. 4:17; Heb. 10:27, 31). Those squeamish souls who would eliminate the fact of Hell simply are blind to the fact of the heinousness of sin. Let no one be fooled into assuming that sin can ever be eradicated by such boastful devices as eugenics, "new thought," Theosophy, Bahatism, the "social gospel," the "religion of humanity," "salvation by character," *ad infinitum, ad nauseam*. There is one, and only one remedy for sin: that remedy is the atoning blood of Him who died on the Cross (Matt. 26:28, Acts 20:28, 1 John 1:7).

2. *It points up the contagious character of sin.* Every person is a center of moral influence from which he cannot possibly escape. There is a small stream which pours down one range of the Alleghenies in Western Pennsylvania, which is joined later by another small stream, near Pittsburgh: the union of these two streams (in fact they



## GENESIS

are now rivers themselves) forms a great river. Follow the course of this river past the peaceful hills and fertile valleys of Southern Ohio, past the place where it is joined by the Miami, past the southern border of Hoosierdom to the point where this now rapidly swelling river is united with the torrents of the Wabash, and by the time one reaches Cairo, Illinois, those waters which once stole quietly down their respective mountainsides in Pennsylvania and in West Virginia, are lost in raging billows of the mighty "Father of Waters," whence they find their way into the Gulf of Mexico and ultimately into the bosom of the great deep. So it is with moral influence. We repeat that it is only reasonable that a man who sets in motion a scheme of sin that will damn the souls of his fellow creatures in eternity, should suffer a punishment as timeless as the consequences of his sins. Eternal punishment is both Scriptural and reasonable. Indeed we not only believe that what is Scripturally recorded *is true because it is in the Bible*, but we believe also that what is recorded in the Bible *is in the Bible because it is true*, that is, in harmony with the very nature of things. Men do not like the doctrine of Hell because they are unwilling to admit that they are sinners.

3. *It points up the folly of trying to hide our sins from God.* Adam and Eve tried to hide their guilt; so did Cain (Gen. 3:9-15); so did King Saul (1 Sam. 15); so did Achan (Josh. 7); so did Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11)—and they all failed miserably. Num. 32:23—"Be sure your sin will find you out" (Luke 8:17, 1 Tim. 5:24-25). It is far better to flee to God when we sin, than to try to run from Him. It is far better to go to Him with open confession, as did the Prodigal Son, because confession is the shortest road to forgiveness (Luke 15:21, 1 John 1:7). David could say from personal experience, Psa. 32:1—"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." And the beloved John testifies:

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). *Catharsis* is the only remedy for the burden of guilt.

4. *It provides a meaningful prototype of Everyman's experience with sin.* Even though we regard the story of the Fall of Man as being essentially historical, we should not miss the profound spiritual teaching embodied in it, the aspect which is in fact the more important. This account in the third chapter of Genesis portrays vividly the manner by which sin gains entrance into the soul, and the consequences that ensue. At first, the suggestion may be very subtle, but once entertained, it bears evil fruit. Just as the disease germ enters the body, and, on finding conditions favorable, germinates and produces sickness and death, so the germ of sin (which usually takes the form of questioning God's goodness) entering the soul, if it finds even the least favorable condition, will ultimately breed vice and crime. We should avoid exposing ourselves to needless temptations, because human character is never so strong as to be able to resist Satan's subtlety under all circumstances. We should keep our inner lives so strong, by feeding on the Bread of Life who came down from Heaven (John 6:35, 48), that is, the Logos, the Word, that the germ of sin cannot readily find breeding-places in them. The prayer, "And bring us not into temptation" (Matt. 6:13) has real significance when viewed in this light.

5. *It points up the folly of failing to put God first in all things.* The Scriptures intimate that Eve was the first to sin, and that Adam, partly out of sympathetic affection, followed her into the transgression (I Tim. 2:13-14). There are, there have always been, sheer multitudes who prefer Hell with their relatives to Heaven with God. Adam had the opportunity of parting company with his wife and remaining true to God. Sapphira had the same

## GENESIS

opportunity, but she, like Adam, preferred her spouse above the Lord. People seem never to realize that faith, obedience, salvation, worship, etc., are personal (individual) matters. Lot seems to have been the one Bible personage who exercised good judgment in this respect. When the Divine order came to him and his family to flee Sodom and not look back under any circumstances, Lot obeyed. He did not even look back to see what was happening to his wife (Gen. 19)—he was too busily engaged in working out his own salvation, no doubt “with fear and trembling” (Phil. 2:12). Jesus’ teaching on this matter is too explicit for either conjecture or doubt (Matt. 10:34-39, Luke 14:26, Mark 3:31-35). There is no such thing in God’s Plan as salvation by proxy.

6. *It shows that God never intended that man and woman should be placed in competition with each other in any area of life.* Eve was created to be the man’s counterpart, a helper meet for his needs. This teaches us that her position is complementary, not competitive. As his counterpart, she is neither his superior nor his inferior. If man has the greater physical strength and more proper use of his reasoning faculties, woman undoubtedly has the greater sensitiveness and the more generous heart. However, in the penalty pronounced upon the Woman, the fact is clearly set forth that, in the marriage relationship, man is the divinely recognized head. The woman was created for the man, not the man for the woman. She supplies a place in the creation, by nature and impulse, that man cannot possibly fill, a place that would be a blank without her. Hence, any attempt to place the two in competition with each other, in any field of human activity, is a violation of the Divine intention. Woman’s true sphere of action is the home; and in discharging her obligations to husband and children she often exerts greater influence than the man: hence the well-known Scripture phrase, “Man that is born of woman” (Job 14:1, Matt. 11:11).

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

7. *It points up the fact that the essential principle of sin is selfishness.* The choice made by Adam and Eve was the choice of *their own way of doing things.* above *God's way of doing things.* It was the choice of earthiness over godliness, of worldly wisdom over heavenly wisdom, of pride over humility, of rebelliousness over obedience to authority. This is the choice which we must all make sooner or later (Matt. 25:31-46, Phil. 2:5-11, Rev. 20:11-15). Matt. 6:24—"Ye cannot serve God and mammon." It is doubtful that a sin is ever committed that is not the choice of self above God.

### *The Beneficent Curse*

Gen. 3:17—"Cursed is the ground for thy sake." Note the following matters embodied in this declaration:

1. *The significance of what is called in Scripture "the curse."* (1) In the language of everyday life, a curse (cursing, swearing) is an invocation, by one person, of Divine wrath and judgment on some other person or thing (Matt. 5:34, Luke 6:28, Rom. 12:14, Jas. 3:9-10). This, of course, is a human vanity, because no man has either the power or the right to try to manipulate God for his own selfish ends (Exo. 20:7, Deut. 5:11, Matt. 5:34, Jas. 5:12). This vanity is similar to that of the deluded cultists who would handle poisonous snakes to prove that God will protect them by miracle: as a matter of fact they are trying "to put God on the spot," whereas God alone chooses when and where He shall do "mighty works and wonders and signs" (Acts 2:22). Vindication belongs to God only (Deut. 32:35, Rom. 12:19), and only as He wills it to be accomplished. (Deut. 6:13, 10:20, and similar texts, have reference to the juridical oath, violation of which is perjury, a crime severely punished throughout the entire ancient world.) (2) In the Bible, however, the term ("the curse") is used frequently in a special sense, namely, as indicating the Divine penal decree covering all

## GENESIS

mankind as a consequence of the universality of sin (Rom. 2:23, Gal. 3:10-14, Rev. 22:3). This is the import of the term as it appears in Gen. 3:17. Translated into the concrete, it is *the curse of sin* that is implicit in this use of the word. Sin is the universal curse which man has brought on himself; it is sin that is, and has always been, the cause of all his troubles. I John 3:4—"Sin is lawlessness."

2. *The significance of the Divine anathema with respect to "the ground."* It is indeed significant that it is the *ground*, not man, which is under the curse. The Divine judgment—the various aspects of the penalty pronounced on mankind—was to come upon him from the ground. (1) With respect to *toil*, the ground contributes to the execution of this phase of the penalty by the niggardliness of the soil and the frequent fruitlessness of human labor. This aspect of the curse is actualized too in what is popularly known as "the struggle for existence," in the dog-eat-dog competition which the race apparently must suffer to attain any satisfactory measure of temporal security. (2) *Weeds and thorns and thistles* also are produced by, and come upon man from, the ground. (3) The human body, moreover, is ultimately consigned to the ground, that is, to the physical elements of which it is composed: the corporeal part of man is dust and ashes, whether ultimately suffering interment or cremation (Eccl. 3:20, 12:7; Psa. 103:14, 146:4). Physical death is a Divine appointment (Heb. 9:27) and one which all men keep sooner or later. Thus it becomes obvious that Mother Earth plays a prominent role in the execution of the penalty pronounced on humankind.

3 *The express Divine declaration that this was to be a beneficent curse.* "Cursed is the ground *for they sake.*" Never forget this phrase, "for thy sake." What does this teach us? It teaches us that every drop of perspiration that trickles down the toiler's face, that every weed and thorn and thistle which mars the beauty of woodland and

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

field and garden, that every solemn procession which wends its way to the city of marble, that every funeral dirge, every parting sob at the graveside, every clod of dirt that is heaped on the coffin—that all this is for the purpose of teaching man that he is lost and in danger of perishing forever, and indeed will perish in Hell unless he accepts and commits himself to the Remedy which God, out of the depths of His ineffable grace, has provided for his redemption. *Every decree, every ordinance of God, is for man's good.* And His positive ordinances are no exception. For example, both Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper are for our own good as Christians and especially for the good of others, in consequence of our witnessing visibly, by obedience to these ordinances, to the facts of the Gospel, that Christ died for our sins, and that He was buried and that He was raised up the third day according to the Scriptures (1 Cor. 15:1-4). Incidentally, any act which would substitute anything else than a burial in water and raising up therefrom for Scriptural baptism (Rom. 6:3-11, Col. 2:12), obviously vitiates the witnessing aspect of the ordinance and so thwarts the purpose of God in ordaining it.

*The fact needs to be emphasized that our world (mankind) is still under this curse,* and because sin is universal, the curse of sin is universal. John 3:17—"God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." Why did not God send the Son to judge the world? Because the world (mankind) is under Divine judgment, and has been since man allowed sin to come into it. It was in view of man's danger of perishing, of being lost forever, that God sent the Son *that the world might be saved through Him.* God gave His Son, the Son willingly gave His life, and the Spirit has given us the knowledge of the Way, the Way that leads to redemption in spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23). Without Christ, man would be without an Atonement (Covering) for sin, lost forever, condemned

## GENESIS

to the same fate as the angels who "kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation" (Jude 6).

The preacher's most difficult task today is that of convincing and convicting men of the fact of sin—sin generally, and sin in their own lives. And yet, to deny the fact of sin is to deny the existence of moral law; and this, in turn, is to deny the existence of the Eternal Lawgiver, the Author of the moral law. To deny sin, therefore, is to be, for all practical purposes, an atheist: it is to believe, and to live, as if there were no God, no right and wrong, no judgment, no life to come. Millions are walking in this broad way that leads to a godless eternity (Matt. 7:13-14). Note well that for God's saints there will be no curse in the Home over there (Rev. 22:3).

\* \* \* \* \*

### FROM INNOCENCE TO HOLINESS

#### *THE FALL*

Adam  
Eden  
Innocence  
Satan  
To Disobedience  
Death

The Person Tempted  
The Place  
The State  
The Tempter  
The Appeal  
The Result

#### *THE RECOVERY*

Christ  
"Wilderness"  
Holiness  
Satan  
To Disobedience  
Life

Sin the Conqueror  
(Gen. 3:1-8)

Sin Conquered  
(Matt. 4:1-11)

In Eden where everything pulsed with life, God spoke of death (Gen. 2:17, 3:3-4). In the world at large, where everything around us speaks of death, God, through His Son, speaks of life. (John 1:4, 5:40, 6:35, 10:10, 11:25-26, 14:6, 20:31; cf. Rom. 8:6; 2 Cor. 2:16, 5:4; 2 Tim. 1:10; Heb. 7:16; 1 John 5:12; Rev. 2:7, 2:10, 3:5, 22:2, 22:14). Is it not most significant that Jesus had so little to say about death, and so very much to say about life?

\* \* \* \* \*

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH  
REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART THIRTEEN

1. Explain how the Genesis account of the Fall exemplifies the "psychology of temptation."
2. Explain what is meant by physical evil as distinct from moral evil.
3. Define the three categories of evil as given by Leibniz.
4. Explain: "Order is nature's first law."
5. Why do we say that the problem of the origin of evil cannot be resolved by human speculation?
6. To what source, then, must we look for the understanding of this problem?
7. Explain how the caption, "The Inquest," is applicable to this chapter.
8. Explain what is meant by the "universality" of the content of the first three chapters of Genesis.
9. Explain the anthropomorphic character of this account and the probable reason for it.
10. What was the general reaction of Adam and Eve to the Divine Inquest?
11. List the steps in the uncovering of their guilt.
12. What facts in this section reveal their rebelliousness?
13. Explain what is meant by the "fatherly motif" in relation to this account.
14. Explain what is meant by *projection* as a "defense mechanism."
15. Show how the whole human race is guilty of this device of "passing the buck."
16. What factors do men today blame for their own neglect and disobedience?
17. Explain the statement that "the forbidden fruit turned sour" for Adam and Eve.
18. Explain the penalty pronounced on the serpentkind.



## GENESIS

19. Explain the mysterious oracle concerning the Seed of a woman.
20. Why do we say that this was the first intimation of redemption?
21. In whom was the oracle fulfilled?
22. According to this oracle, what is to be Satan's last end?
23. Explain what is meant by *catborsis* and how it is related to the unburdening of guilt.
24. Why do we say that the controversy about the words *almah* and *parthenos* is largely "academic" in relation to the accounts of the Virgin Birth given us by Matthew and Luke?
25. Show how the Bible is the most realistic of all books.
26. Show how it is, in a special sense, the Book of Life.
27. Show how it is, at the same time, unfailingly optimistic.
28. How is this optimism implicit in the oracle of Gen. 3:15?
29. Explain the progressive unfolding of the Messianic anticipation.
30. What was the penalty pronounced on womankind?
31. Explain the aspect of this penalty having reference to wifely pain and sorrow.
32. Explain the aspect of this penalty that has reference to woman's subordination to man in the conjugal relationship.
33. What are the reasons for this subordination?
34. Explain the apostolic teaching with respect to woman's role in Christian faith and practice.
35. What was the threefold penalty pronounced on mankind?
36. How is the cursing of the ground related to the execution of this penalty?

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

37. What are the blessings of honest labor?
38. In what sense, then, is toil a phase of the penalty?
39. What is the significance of the deterioration of nature as indicated by the "thorns and thistles" it produces?
40. What is man's last and most terrible enemy, and why is it so?
41. What are the three terms by which death is described in Scripture?
42. What are the two kinds of death indicated in the penalty for sin?
43. What does the phrase "dust of the ground" suggest in modern scientific language?
44. What is meant by the term *psychosomatic unity* as the definition of human nature?
45. Are we justified in supposing that man was *created* immortal?
46. What is the specific meaning of the term *immortality* as it is used in the Bible?
47. Distinguish between immortality and survival.
48. What was the probable correlation between the mortality of Adam and the fruit of the Tree of Life? How is this often explained literally? How may it be explained symbolically?
49. In what other texts do we find the Tree of Life mentioned in Scripture?
50. Is there any suggestion in the narrative of the Fall that man and woman would have lived forever had they not sinned?
51. What are some of the examples of man's insistence on playing God?
52. What is physical death?
53. Why do we say that it is not the *real* death?
54. In what sense is physical death but the "shadow" of real death (Psa. 23)?

## GENESIS

55. In what sense did Adam and Eve suffer spiritual death?
56. In what sense is spiritual death the root of all evils?
57. What, according to the Bible, is the *second* death?
58. Why, according to Scripture, is death in the world and why is it universal?
59. Explain Satan's progeny as listed in the Epistle of James.
60. What were the elements that characterized the immediacy of the execution of the penalty pronounced on man?
61. Why were the Man and the Woman expelled from Eden?
62. What probably did the Cherubim signify?
63. What evidently was signified by the Flaming Sword?
64. What is a prolepsis and why is verse 23 considered an example of it?
65. What is the apparent significance of the coat of skins?
66. Explain the fallacy implicit in the phrase, "the lost chance of immortality."
67. What must be regarded as the main sources of this fallacy?
68. Show how failure to take into account the teaching of the Bible as a whole contributes in a special sense to this fallacy.
69. State the three views of the ultimate destiny of the body.
70. Explain the Biblical doctrine of the redemption of the body.
71. Show how the Atonement is related to the Christian doctrine of immortality.
72. Explain the fallacy in the view that immortality can threaten the sovereignty of God.

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

73. Explain how the ultimate destiny of the bodies of the saints is an integral part of God's Eternal Purpose.
74. Show how the Biblical doctrine of the destiny of the bodies of the saved proves that the Genesis account of the Fall could not have been a borrowing from Babylonian mythology.
75. Review the symbolism of the various elements of the Genesis narrative of the Fall.
76. Do you agree that conscience is born in the passing from innocence to responsibility? Explain your answer.
77. How does the birth of conscience presuppose a Fall morally?
78. Explain how the Genesis account of the Fall is a picture of what happens in the life of every human being.
79. Distinguish between innocence and holiness.
80. To what extent is it true that man was created perfect?
81. Why do we insist that he was not created *morally* perfect, that is, *holy*?
82. Explain Campbell's view of the three states of man.
83. In what sense was the Fall a fall "downward"?
84. In what sense can it be considered a fall "upward"?
85. On what ground do we conclude that Creation and Redemption are closely related in God's Remedial System?
86. What is meant by the statement that man is "pre-destined to be free"?
87. Is man depraved? Is he totally depraved?
88. What intelligent beings are said in Scripture to be totally depraved? What are the Scripture texts that assert this truth?

## GENESIS

89. How does depravity differ from immaturity, and from irrationality?
90. How is freedom defined in this text?
91. To what extent is personal freedom more or less limited?
92. Can freedom be rightly defined as "motiveless action"? Explain.
93. How is freedom defined negatively?
94. Explain what is meant by self-determination.
95. Of what type of being only is freedom an essential property?
96. Define voluntarism and necessitarianism.
97. What are the two general kinds of necessitarianism?
98. What is meant by the statement that every person is unique?
99. Explain the three kinds of determinism.
100. Point out the fallacies in Skinner's theory of determinism.
101. What attitude has common sense always taken toward these deterministic theories?
102. What does immediate personal experience testify regarding the person's power of choice?
103. Why cannot life and personality be reduced to mechanistic theories?
104. Explain: In every human act three factors are involved, namely, heredity, environment, *and* the personal reaction.
105. Why does the stronger motive always win?
106. What was Kant's theory of freedom?
107. Explain why freedom of choice is necessary to a human act.
108. Explain why freedom of choice is necessary to morality, to democracy, and even to science as free inquiry.

## THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

109. What is voluntariness?
110. Why, then do we conclude that Adam and Eve could have chosen otherwise than they did choose?
111. How answer the question: Why did God create man capable of falling?
112. How answer the question: Why did not God interfere and keep man from falling into sin?
113. How answer the question: How could so terrible a penalty justly have been connected with disobedience to such an apparently trivial command?
114. How answer the objection: Does not the fall of man prove that the Creation was a failure?
115. List the important lessons to be gotten from the Narrative of the Fall.
116. Why do we affirm that this Narrative is one of the greatest "human interest" stories in world literature?
117. On what grounds do we hold that the curse pronounced on the ground, and the accompanying penalty on humankind, is a beneficent curse?
118. Does the Scripture teach that the world (mankind) is under Divine judgment?
119. What according to Scripture was God's purpose in sending His Son into the world?
120. When and under what circumstances, according to Scripture teaching, will this curse and the accompanying penalty be removed?