

GENESIS

THE BOOK OF THE BEGINNINGS

The Bible Study Textbook Series

NEW TESTAMENT			
New Testament & History By W. Wartick & W. Fields Vol. I - The Intertestament Period and The Gospels		The Gospel of Matthew In Four Volumes By Harold Fowler	The Gospel of Mark By B. W. Johnson and Don DeWelt
The Gospel of Luke By T. R. Applebury		The Gospel of John By Paul T. Butler	Acts Made Actual By Don DeWelt
Romans Realized By Don DeWelt		Studies in Corinthians By T. R. Applebury	Guidance From Galatians By Don Earl Boatman
The Glorious Church (Ephesians) By Wilbur Fields		Philippians - Colossians Philemon By Wilbur Fields	Thinking Through Thessalonians By Wilbur Fields
Paul's Letters To Timothy & Titus By Don DeWelt		Helps From Hebrews By Don Earl Boatman	James & Jude By Don Fream
Letters From Peter By Bruce Oberst		Hereby We Know (I-II-III John) By Clinton Gill	The Seer, The Saviour and The Saved (Revelation) By James Strauss
OLD TESTAMENT			
O.T. & History By William Smith and Wilbur Fields		Genesis In Four Volumes By C. C. Crawford	Exploring Exodus By Wilbur Fields
Leviticus By Don DeWelt		Joshua - Judges Ruth By W. W. Winter	I & II Samuel By W. W. Winter
Numbers By Brant Lee Doty		Deuteronomy By Bruce Oberst	
I & II Kings By James E. Smith		I & II Chronicles By Robert E. Black	Ezra - Nehemiah Esther By Ruben Ratzlaff
The Shattering of Silence (Job) By James Strauss		Psalms In Two Volumes By J. B. Rotherham	Proverbs By Donald Hunt
Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon—By R. J. Kidwell and Don DeWelt		Isaiah In Three Volumes By Paul T. Butler	Jeremiah and Lamentations By James E. Smith
Ezekiel By James E. Smith		Daniel By Paul T. Butler	Hosea - Joel - Amos Obadiah - Jonah By Paul T. Butler
Micah - Nahum - Habakkuk - Zephaniah Haggai - Zechariah - Malachi By Clinton Gill			
DOCTRINE			
Survey Course In Christian Doctrine Two Books of Four Volumes By C. C. Crawford		The Church In The Bible By Don DeWelt	The Eternal Spirit Two Volumes By C. C. Crawford

BIBLE STUDY TEXTBOOK

GENESIS

THE BOOK OF THE BEGINNINGS

C. C. CRAWFORD, Ph.D., LL.D.

Other Books by the Author

Published by

DeHoff Publications, Murfreesboro, Tennessee—

- *Sermon Outlines on Acts*
- *Sermon Outlines on the Restoration Plea*
- *Sermon Outlines on the Cross of Christ*
- *Sermon Outlines on First Principles*

Published by *The College Press*, Joplin, Missouri.

- *Survey Course in Christian Doctrine*
(in four Volumes)

Published by *Wm. C. Brown Book Co.*, Dubuque, Iowa

- *Commonsense Ethics*

College Press, Joplin, Missouri

Copyright © 1966

The College Press

Second Printing, October 1973

Third Printing, September 1978

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS

art., article
cf., compare
ch., chapter
chs., chapters
edit., edition
e.g., for example
esp., especially
et al., and others
ff., following
fn., footnote
Gr., Greek
Heb., Hebrew
ibid., the same
i.e., that is
in loco, in the proper place
l., line
ll., lines
Lt., latin
infra, below
Intro., introduction
op. cit., in the work cited
p., page
pp., pages
par., paragraph
per se, by or of itself
sect., section
supra, above
s.v., under the word
trans., translated
v., verse
vv., verses
viz., namely
vol., volume

SPECIFIC ABBREVIATIONS (BIBLIOGRAPHICAL)

- ACB Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*. Twentieth American Edition (revised by Stevenson). (Funk and Wagnalls, New York).
- ACR Wilhelm Moeller, *Are the Critics Right?* Trans. by C. H. Irwin. (Revell, New York, 1899).
- AD J. W. McGarvey, *The Authorship of Deuteronomy*. (Standard, Cincinnati, 1902).
- AOT Merrill F. Unger, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*. (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1954).
- ARI W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. (Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1956).
- ASV, or ARV American Standard Edition of the Revised Version of the Bible (1901).
- AtD Gaalyahu Cornfeld (Editor), *From Adam to Daniel*. (Macmillan, New York, 1961).
- AV Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible
- BA J. A. Thompson, *The Bible and Archaeology*. (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1961).
- BA Emil G. Kraeling, *Bible Atlas*. (Rand McNally, Chicago, 1956).
- BBA Charles F. Pfeiffer, *Baker's Bible Atlas*. (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1961).
- BC J. W. McGarvey, *Biblical Criticism*. (Standard, Cincinnati, 1910).
- BCOTP C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Pentateuch*, Vol. I. Translated from the German by James Martin. (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids).
- BE George Gamow, *Biography of the Earth*. (Mentor Book, New American Library, New York, 1948).
- BGJI Julian Morgenstern, *The Book of Genesis: A Jewish Interpretation*. (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, 1927).
- BMBE Ashley S. Johnson, *The Busy Man's Bible Encyclopedia*. (College Press, Joplin).
- CC C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity*. (Macmillan, 1943).
- CDHCG John Peter Lange, *Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical Commentary: Genesis*. Trans. from the German, with Comments, by Tayler Lewis and A. Gosman. (Scribners, New York, 1868).
- CEHS H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*. (Harper, New York, 1928).

- CG Adam Clarke, *Commentary: Genesis*. (Waugh and Mason, New York, 1832).
- CHB J. R. Dummelow, *Commentary on the Holy Bible*. (Macmillan, 1909, 1950).
- Conf. Augustine, *Confessions*. Pusey Translation. (Everyman's Library, Dutton, 1907).
- Cos J. A. McWilliams, S.J., *Cosmology*. (Macmillan, New York, 1939).
- Cr Arnold Guyot, *Creation*. (Scribners, 1884).
- CS A. Campbell, *Christian System*. (Christian Board of Publication, St. Louis, 1835).
- CU George Gamow, *The Creation of the Universe*. (Mentor Book).
- CVSS Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. (Eerdmans, 1954).
- CWB Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (in one volume). (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1961).
- DC James H. Breasted, *The Dawn of Conscience*. (Scribners, 1939).
- DD H. W. Everest, *The Divine Demonstration*.
- DGL Augustine, *De Genesi ad Litteram*. (Augustine's Treatise on Genesis).
- DG William Robinson, *The Devil and God*. (Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York and Nashville, 1945).
- EA Julian Huxley, *Evolution in Action*. (Mentor Book).
- EB Joseph Bryant Rotherham, *The Emphasized Bible*. (Kregel, Grand Rapids, 1959).
- EB Isaac Errett, *Evenings with the Bible*. (Standard, Cincinnati; now available from Gospel Advocate Company, Nashville).
- EBG Marcus Dods, *The Expositor's Bible: Genesis*. (Armstrong, New York, 1895).
- EHS Alexander Maclaren, *Exposition of Holy Scriptures: Genesis*. (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1904, 1912).
- ELD William Smith and Theophilus D. Hall, *English-Latin Dictionary*. (American Book Company, and Harper, 1871).
- EM Gilbert K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man*. (An Image Book, Doubleday, 1925).
- EOM Ernst Cassirer, *An Essay on Man*. (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1944).
- ET Ernest C. Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*. (Macmillan, 1932).
- FBM O. T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*. (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1943).

- FPOTC D. E. Sharp, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century*. (Oxford University Press, 1930).
- FSAC W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. Second Edition. (A Doubleday Anchor Book, 1957).
- FYPR Hamlin Garland, *Forty Years of Psychic Research*. (Macmillan, 1936).
- GB Charles Shook, *The Gist of the Bible*. (Standard, Cincinnati),
- GBBD Charles F. Kraft, *Genesis: Beginnings of the Biblical Drama*. (Board of Missions, The Methodist Church, 1964).
- GEL Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*. New Edition, Revised by Jones and McKenzie. (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1843, 1948).
- GP C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Philosophy*. (Victor Gollancz, London, and Dover Publications, New York, 1936).
- HC Robert Ulich, *The Human Career*. (Harper, 1955).
- HDT Jules Lebreton, S.J., *History of the Dogma of the Trinity*, Vol. I. Trans. by Algar Thorald from the Eighth Edition. (Benziger Brothers, 1939).
- HHH *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homerica*. Trans. by Evelyn-White. (Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1929).
- HSGP John Owen, *The Holy Spirit: His Gifts and Power*. (Kregel, Grand Rapids, 1954).
- HHH H. I. Hester, *The Heart of Hebrew History*. (Wm. Jewell Press, Liberty, Missouri, 1949).
- HU Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Hymn of the Universe*. (Harper and Row, 1961).
- IBG Cuthbert A. Simpson, Walter Russell Bowie, *The Interpreter's Bible: Genesis*. (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952).
- ICCFTh James Everett Frame, *The International Critical Commentary: First Thessalonians*. (Scribners, 1953).
- ICCG John Skinner, *The International Critical Commentary: Genesis*. (Scribners, 1910).
- ICCH James Moffatt, *The International Critical Commentary: Hebrews*. (Scribners, 1924, 1952).
- IGOT Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*. (Zondervan, 1951).
- IH Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*. Third Revision, trans. by J. W. Harvey. (Oxford, 1925).
- IHR C. H. Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religions*. (Harvard University Press, 1924).
- ISBE *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. James Orr, editor. (Howard-Severance Co., Chicago, 1915).

- ISA Herbert Wendt, *In Search of Adam*. (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1955).
- JCHE Meade E. Dutt, *Jesus Christ in Human Experience*. (Standard, Cincinnati).
- Lang. Edward Sapir, *Language*. (Harvest Book: Harcourt, Brace, 1921, 1949).
- LAP Jack Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past*. (Princeton University Press, 1947).
- LCL Loeb Classical Library of the Greek and Latin writings, in the original and in English translation. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge).
- LD Harper's *Latin Dictionary*. Andrews's Freund, revised by Lewis and Short. (American Book Company; Harper, 1879; copyright, 1907, by Margaret Lewis).
- LIP Harold W. Titus, *Living Issues in Philosophy*. Third Edition. (American Book Company, 1959).
- LOTB Albert T. Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*. (Sunday School Times Co., 1907).
- LOT Julius A. Brewer, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, Third Edition. Revised by Emil G. Kraeling. (Columbia University Press, 1962).
- LP Alexander Campbell, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*. (H. S. Bosworth, Cincinnati, 1867).
- MC C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*. (Macmillan, 1952).
- MDNSA A Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*. (Revell, New York, 1944).
- MDCB Theodore Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*. (Scribner, Armstrong and Company, New York, 1874).
- ME George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*. (Mentor Book, 1951).
- MFJH Max Lerner, *The Mind and Faith of Justice Holmes*. (Modern Library Edition, 1954).
- MG James G. Murphy, *Murphy on Genesis*. (Estes and Lauriat, Boston, 1873).
- MG Ralph H. Elliott, *The Message of Genesis*. (An Abbott Book, Bethany Press, St. Louis).
- MH Paul De Kruif, *Microbe Hunters*. (Pocket Books, Inc., 1940, 1959).
- MM Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker*. (Living Age Book, 1956).
- MPR Samuel M. Thompson, *A Modern Philosophy of Religion*. (Regnery, Chicago, 1955).

- MS A. J. Gordon, *The Ministry of the Spirit*. (Revell, New York, 1895).
- MS Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State*. (Doubleday Anchor Book. Yale University Press, 1946).
- MSH Rollo May, *Man's Search for Himself*. (Norton, 1953).
- MU Alexis Carrell, *Man the Unknown*. (Harper, New York, 1935).
- MUB Harry Emerson Fosdick, *The Modern Use of the Bible*. (Macmillan, 1924).
- NBG C. H. Mackintosh ("C.H.M."), *Notes on the Book of Genesis*. (Loizeaux Brothers, New York. First edition in 1880; twenty-sixth printing, 1959).
- NBS Sir James Jeans, *The New Background of Science*. (Macmillan, New York,).
- NMG Oliver L. Reiser, *Nature, Man and God*. (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1951).
- NMR George P. Fisher, *The Nature and Method of Revelation*. (Scribners, 1890).
- NPW Sir Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*. (Macmillan, 1933).
- NU Fred Hoyle, *The Nature of the Universe*. (Mentor Book, 1957).
- OG Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *The One God*. Trans. by Dom Bede Rose, O.S.B., S.T.D. (Herder, St. Louis, 1943).
- PBG Joseph Parker, *The People's Bible: Genesis*. (Hazell, Watson, and Viney, London, 1896).
- PC F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*. (Harcourt, Brace, 1937).
- PCG Thomas Whitelaw, Exposition, *The Pulpit Commentary: Genesis*. New Edition. (Funk and Wagnalls, London and New York).
- PCH J. Barmby and C. Jerdan, *Pulpit Commentary: Hebrews*.
- PCTH P. J. Cloag, *Pulpit Commentary: Thessalonians*.
- PE Timothy J. Brosnahan, *Prolegomena to Ethics*. (Fordham University Press, New York, 1941).
- PM Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*. (Harper Torchbook, 1961).
- PNK Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*. (Mentor Book, 1942).
- PPT Hocking, Blanshard, Hendel, Randall, Jr., *Preface to Philosophy: Textbook*. (Macmillan, 1947).
- PR Edgar S. Brightman, *A Philosophy of Religion*. (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1946).
- PR D. Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*. (Harper, 1957).

- PURT Erich Frank, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth*. (Oxford, 1945).
- RD Nelson Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert*. (Farrar, Strauss, and Cudahy, New York, 1959).
- RF L. P. Jacks, *Religious Foundations*. (Rufus M. Jones, Editor. Macmillan, 1923).
- RI Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg. (University of Chicago Press, 1960).
- RTOT Albert C. Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament*. (Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1918).
- RS H. C. Christopher, *The Remedial System*.
- RSFI W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*. (Appleton, New York, 1889).
- RSV The Revised Standard Version of the Bible.
- SBG W. E. Powers, *Studies in the Book of Genesis*. (Christian Alliance Publishing Company, New York, 1928).
- SH C. W. Ceram, *The Secret of the Hittites*. Trans. from the German by Richard and Clara Winston. (Knopf, 1956).
- SMP *Selections from Medieval Philosophers*, Richard McKeon, Editor. (Scribners, 1929).
- SOTI Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. (Moody Press, Chicago, 1964).
- SR Robert Milligan, *Scheme of Redemption*. (Christian Publishing Company, St. Louis, 1868).
- SRG James H. Jauncey, *Science Returns to God*. (Zondervan, 1961).
- ST Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology*. One-Volume Edition. (Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1907).
- ST Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*.
- STS R. M. MacIver, *Society: A Textbook of Sociology*. (Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1937).
- SUW Sir Arthur Stanley Eddington, *Science and the Unseen World*. (Macmillan, 1930).
- TMB J. W. Monser, *Types and Metaphors of the Bible*. (F. L. Rowe, Cincinnati, 1936).
- TMV Sir James Jeans, *This Mysterious Universe*. New Revised Edition. (Macmillan, 1943).
- TSMR Henri Bergson, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Translated by Audra and Brereton. (Henry Holt, 1935).
- TP Nathaniel Micklem, *The Theology of Politics*. (Oxford, 1941).

- UBG William Henry Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*. (Scribners, 1895).
- UDE Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*. (Sloane Associates, New York, 1948).
- VS George Matheson, *Voices of the Spirit*. (Hodder and Stoughton, New York).
- WLP E. V. Miller, *Within the Living Plant*. (Blakeston Company, Toronto, 1952).
- WMIA John Gillin, *The Ways of Men: An Introduction to Anthropology*. (Appleton-Century, 1948).
- WPNT A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. In six volumes. (Broadman Press, Nashville, 1930).

"Genesis is the Only Book of Antiquity Which is Ever Considered When Discussing the Scientific Accuracy of Ancient Literature on the Creation of the World. When Darwin's Origin of Species appeared in 1859, Huxley immediately called it 'Anti-Genesis.' Why did he think that it was the book of Genesis which Darwin's theory of natural selection confuted? Why did he not say anti-Hesiod, or anti-Timaeus, or anti-Metamorphosis in reference to Ovid's account of the creation? In the very fact that Huxley spoke of Darwin's work as anti-Genesis he confessed that the book of all ancient literature that contained an account of the creation of the world worthy of being discussed in our modern scientific age as of any scientific value at all was the book of Genesis. A vast number of books, and hundreds of articles, during the past one hundred years have been written, maintaining or denying the scientific accuracy of the first chapter of the book of Genesis, but where are you going to find any books and articles even discussing the scientific accuracy of other ancient accounts of the creation of the world? Whenever you hear anyone speaking disrespectfully of the book of Genesis, in its relation to modern science, remember that this first book of our Bible is the only piece of literature of all the ancient nations which anyone even thinks worthy of discussing, even if condemning in the same breath, with the phrase 'modern science.' It is of great significance that for two thousand years men have felt it necessary to consider this ancient Hebrew record when discussing the subject of creation. The Babylonian, the Greek, and the Roman accounts of the same beginning of our universe are, for the most part, counted mythological, and utterly incapable of being reconciled with the conclusions of modern science."

—Wilbur M. Smith, *Therefore Stand*, pp. 328,329.
(W. A. Wilde Company, Boston, 1945).

THE BIBLE

We search the world for truth. We call
The good, the true, the beautiful,
From graven stone and written scroll,
From all old flower-fields of the soul;
And, weary seekers of the best,
We come back laden from our quest,
To find that all the sages said
Is in the Book our mothers read.

—John Greenleaf Whittier

GOD'S WORD

I paused last eve beside the blacksmith's door,
And heard the anvil ring the vesper chime;
And looking in I saw upon the floor
Old hammers, worn with beating years of time.
"How many anvils have you had?" said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"
"Just one," he answered. Then with twinkling eye:
"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."
And so, I thought, the anvil of God's Word
For ages sceptics' blows have beat upon,
But though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The anvil is unchanged, the hammers gone.

—John Clifford

CONTENTS

	page
In Retrospect: An Apologia	11
Part One: General Introduction	26
Part Two: Principles of Interpretation	83
Part Three: In the Beginning, God	130
Part Four: The Hebrew Cosmogony	212
Part Five: The Beginning of the Beginnings	233
Part Six: The First Four "Days" of the Cosmic Week of Beginnings	269
Part Seven: The Last Three "Days" of the Cosmic Week of Beginnings	327
Part Eight: The Beginning of "Homo Sapiens"	404
Part Nine: The Beginning of Society	501
Part Ten: The Assumptions of Scientism	551
Addenda: Cosmological Theories	605

IN RETROSPECT: AN APOLOGIA

A bit of personal history is in order here, I think, by way of introduction.

I made the confession of Christ and was buried with Him in baptism in a little Christian Church in South Central Illinois, when I was only fourteen years old. At that time I began to read and study the Bible for myself, and not so long thereafter, to teach in the local "Sunday School." And throughout the intervening years my life has been devoted largely to studying and teaching this Book which is not only the religious basis, but the moral basis as well, of our entire Western civilization.

During the early years of life it was my privilege to sit under the tutelage of a generation of Christian ministers and evangelists who knew their Bibles, and knew them "from cover to cover," one might say without the slightest exaggeration. They knew how to "rightly divide" the Word of truth. It was also my privilege to collect in my library, and mentally and spiritually to feed upon, books of sermons and dissertations by these men, and by their predecessors, the founders and pioneers of the nineteenth-century movement which had for its ideal the restoration of the New Testament pattern of the local church of Christ. From this early homiletic and theological literature, I gained an understanding of the Simplicities of the Bible, especially of the Plan of Salvation as embodied in the facts, commands, and promises of the Gospel—in a word, an understanding of those things essential to the regeneration, sanctification, and eternal redemption of the human being—which has served me, throughout my whole life, as a bulwark of personal faith and an antidote to the vagaries of Biblical criticism, theological speculation, and scientific theory.

GENESIS

Incidentally, a volume of these sermons and dissertations of the pioneers has recently been republished, under the title, *Biographies and Sermons of Pioneer Preachers*. This volume is a reprint of an earlier work edited by W. T. Moore, which was entitled, *The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church*. The recently issued edition may be obtained from its editor, B. C. Goodpasture of the *Gospel Advocate* publishing house, Nashville, Tennessee. I commend this volume heartily to all ministers who have bogged down in the morass of human speculative theology and creedism. I commend it to all who may be seeking nourishing spiritual food: too much thin soup is being dished out from the modern pulpit.

Later in life—in my forties, to be exact—the opportunity of entering a secular university, while at the same time serving a local church as its resident minister, presented itself. I decided to take advantage of this opportunity. And because there was so much talk everywhere, at that time especially, about alleged “conflicts” between the Bible and science, on matriculating at Washington University, St. Louis, I decided to take every course in the different curricula that might be basically irreligious in content; that is, irreligious to the extent of challenging the subject-matter of the Bible or the fundamentals of the Christian faith. I wanted to know for myself. *It was, and still is, my conviction that no one need be afraid of truth.* What I am trying to say, without giving the appearance of boasting—for the one kind of snobbishness I detest the most is intellectual snobbishness—is that I set out deliberately to make, for my own satisfaction, as thorough an investigation as possible, of all those phases of human learning that have to do with the problems of Biblical interpretation and with problems of religious faith and practice generally. With this end in view, I enrolled in several courses in the sciences (of geology, biology, anthropology, and psychology in particular); in a considerable number of courses in Eng-

AN APOLOGIA

lish (including Anglo-Saxon, Chaucer, English poetry, the English drama, the English novel, etc.); in many courses in philosophy, including several seminars; in courses in ancient, medieval and modern history, and in the history of the Jewish people; and along with these, courses in Greek, Latin, French, and German. Three of these courses stand out vividly in my memory: one was an anthropological course in "human origins"; a second was a lecture course in the theory of evolution (biological); and the third a course entitled "The Evolution of Magic and Religion." The instructor in this last-named subject had one of the most erudite minds I have ever encountered. I found the course content, however, to be wholly speculative, that is, without benefit of any *external* evidence to support it.

It was my privilege to spend some ten years at the University, attending classes most of the time through winter and summer terms without a break. At the end I received my Bachelor's and Master's degrees, with the major in philosophy and minors in English and psychology, and was awarded the Phi Beta Kappa key. But I decided that having come this far, I should not abandon the quest for knowledge at this half-way point. Hence I transferred to the department of ancient languages, specializing in Greek and Latin, because I had reached the conviction that competence in philosophy (and in Biblical exegesis as well) requires a background of knowledge of the ancient languages. In this area of study, I spent many delightful hours in the study of Greek art and architecture, and as many rewarding seminar hours in reading (in the original) the Greek and Latin poets, dramatists, orators, historians, and philosophers. During this time I enjoyed the privilege also of taking courses in Scholastic philosophy at St. Louis University: these courses in medieval thought I found to be especially helpful, not only in their content, but especially in their disciplines. I was finally granted the doctor of philosophy degree by Washington University, with the

GENESIS

major in the Classics and the minor in philosophy. I had accumulated many more credit hours, by this time, than were required for all these degrees.

I do not present these facts here for the purpose of being critical of either of the higher educational institutions which I have named: certainly their scholastic standing is unimpeachable; their credits are accepted anywhere in the world. As for professional attitudes generally, I have found, in my association with college professors in various educational institutions, that almost uniformly they try to be intellectually honest and fair; only a small minority are guilty of taking advantage of their position to "sell" (propagandize for) agnosticism, or to "brainwash" their students with the insipidities of atheistic naturalism or humanism. As for my studies at St. Louis University, I have never ceased to be thankful for the intellectual discipline which I got from them. It is now my conviction that Scholastic philosophy is the only genuinely Christian philosophy that has ever been formulated; and that it is a priceless heritage, not only of what is known as Greek and Roman Catholicism, but also of what is known as Protestantism. These studies equipped me with a truly constructive background of thought against which many of the fallacies of our present-day *scientism* are shown up in their true colors. As a matter of fact, true science, in order to arrive at any degree of certitude, is compelled to use—and does use, oftentimes without realizing it—the discipline of metaphysics.

Nor do I present these personal matters to give the appearance of "glorifying" myself. Nothing is farther from my motives here. Indeed, I write with deep humility, for the longer I continued in school, the more I began to realize how little I knew. I try to impress the fact on my classes now that we actually do not live by knowledge, but by *faith*. (Even a so-called "law" in science is just a statement of very great probability: the assumption that it will *al-*

AN APOLOGIA

ways hold good is essentially an act of faith, else the man who makes it is presupposing his own omniscience.)

The fact is that I have presented the foregoing personal data for one purpose above all others, namely, to refute a notion that has come to be all too prevalent in higher educational circles in our time. I refer to the view that holds in contempt any effort on the part of anyone who, lacking extensive academic training, would venture into print in the field of Biblical exegesis (in the language of the seminaries, "systematic theology"); or stated conversely, the view that one who has had sufficient academic preparation cannot possibly cling to the traditionally accepted Biblical teaching concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures and the Deity of Jesus (including, of course, the doctrines of the Virgin Birth, the Miracles, the Atonement, and the Resurrection). I am presenting this data to declare with all possible firmness that anyone who has spent his life familiarizing himself with the content of the Bible itself, and in particular the simplicities of the Bible, can—and will—explore the areas of human knowledge and continue to accept the content of the Bible unreservedly as what it purports to be, namely, the Spirit-inspired record of God's progressive revelation of His eternal purpose for the world and for man. The very unity of the subject-matter of the whole Bible is proof in itself of the over-all inspiration of the Spirit in the giving of this Book—the Book of all books—to man, for his moral and spiritual guidance. Only by *arbitrarily* totally disregarding the Bible's own claim of having been specially communicated by the Spirit through the instrumentality of inspired men can one lose himself in the maze of theoretical criticism, conjectural "science," and speculative "theology."

As the net result of almost fifty years of combined ministerial and educational experience, I am prompted to make the following observations at this point, by way of introducing the content of this textbook:

GENESIS

1. The first half of the present century was truly one of the most shallow and superficial periods in the whole history of human thought. The dominance of the methodology which goes under the name of Positivism made it such. Positivism is the assumption that knowledge must be confined to "observable and measurable facts." One can readily see that implicit in this question-begging dogma is the ambiguity of the little word "fact." Just what is a "fact"? How can it be proved to be a "fact"? Positivism is a kind of wilful ignorance, an earlier version of Popeye's "philosophy," "I yam what I yam." As some wag wrote in days gone by—

There was an ape in days that were earlier;
Centuries passed, and his hair became curlier;
Centuries more, and his thumb gave a twist,
And he was a man, and a Positivist.

I am happy to take note of the obvious tendency in both present-day science and philosophy to return to sanity in thinking about the meaning of the cosmos and of man's life in it. After all, the three greatest problems of life are these: What am I? Whence came I? and, Whither am I bound? That is to say, the problems of the nature, origin, and destiny of the person—the problems of freedom, God, and immorality, respectively. These are of infinitely greater significance than the problem as to whether a man should build a fall-out shelter for his physical protection in these dangerous days. Obviously, neither a hydrogen bomb nor a death ray could affect the destiny of the human soul.

2. The alleged "conflicts" which we heard so much about in the nineteen-twenties and the nineteen-thirties were largely controversies over straw men (that is, false or non-existent issues) which were set up by fanatical protagonists on both sides. In my college work I did encounter now and then a professor who would go out of his way to cast aspersions on the integrity of the Scriptures. I soon discovered that those teachers who would pick out segments of

AN APOLOGIA

the Bible for the purpose of holding them up to subtle innuendo or outright ridicule, invariably demonstrated only their own misunderstanding of what they were talking about. *Their skeptical—at times scornful—attitude was the product of their own sheer ignorance of Bible teaching.* I must admit, too, in all fairness, that I have listened to dissertations on scientific subjects from the pulpit by men who displayed—by what they said—a correspondingly abysmal ignorance of the science which they were anathematizing. No wonder there was so much talk about “contradictions,” “conflicts,” “discrepancies,” etc.!

3. I have discovered that there are many secularly educated persons who criticize what they call “Christianity,” when as a matter of fact they are not criticizing Christianity at all, but are criticizing the institutional misrepresentations of Christianity which have always flourished in our world. They seem to be oblivious, however, of their failure to make this distinction. To discover what Christianity is, one must go back, not to Westminster, nor to Geneva, nor to Augsburg, nor to Rome, nor to Constantinople, nor even to Nice and the Nicene Creed—one must go back all the way to Pentecost, A.D. 30, the birthday of the church—back of all human theological speculation (Christian doctrine corrupted by Greek philosophical terms and phrases) to the teaching of Jesus and His Spirit-guided Apostles as embodied in the New Testament. Christ and Christianity must not be blamed for the superstitions and misdeeds of institutionalized Christianity.

4. I have discovered also that there are many secularly educated persons who actually will *not* to believe. I recall the words of Victor Hugo: “Some men deny the sun: they are the blind.” In this category, of course, we find the materialistic scientists, the so-called “naturalists” and “humanists,” the positivistic (self-styled “pure”) psychologists, et cetera. I find too that there are theological seminarians who are still living in the post-Victorian age, still clinging

GENESIS

to the outmoded hypotheses of German Biblical criticism (theories that were the offspring of the Teutonic analytical mentality which seemed never to be able to see the forest for the trees), still attempting to measure every phase of the cosmic or personal enterprise by the evolution dogma, and still victimized (and that willingly, it would seem) by the output of what has been called the "ideological junkshop" of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These persons are representative of the type of "intellectual" whom Shakespeare describes as "man, proud man," who

Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.¹

It will be recalled in this connection that Jesus, knowing too well that there have always been, and will always be, persons who are wilfully ignorant, reminds us of the futility of "casting pearls before swine" (Matt. 7:6). "If the blind guide the blind," said He, "both shall fall into a pit" (Matt. 15:14, Luke 6:39): that is to say, their blindness will not be the cause of their staying out of the pit, but the cause, rather, of their falling into it. (Cf. Isa. 6:10, John 12:40, Rom. 11:25, 1 Cor. 1:23, 2 Cor. 3:14, 2 Cor. 4:4, 2 Pet. 1:9, 1 John 2:11, etc.).

Do not misunderstand me. I have no quarrel with true science. Indeed science has been a great blessing to mankind in ways too numerous to mention. No sane person would oppose the scientific quest for truth. As a matter of fact, what is human science but man's fulfilment, whether wittingly or unwittingly, of the Divine injunction to the human race at the Creation: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon

AN APOLOGIA

the earth" (Gen. 1:28). Is not science the story of man's progressive conquest of his earthly environment?

I simply deprecate the apotheosis of science into a kind of "sacred cow." I deplore the spirit that would dethrone God and deify man in the specious name of "scientific humanism"—the chest-thumping bravado so well expressed by Swinburne (I think it was) in the nineteenth century, "Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things." Man's greatest delusion, it has been rightly said, is the delusion that his existence depends on himself, that he himself is the ultimate principle of his own origin, nature and destiny. Besides, the greatest scientists of all ages have been humble and reverent men—men who have stood in profound awe in the presence of the Mystery of Being. As Francis Bacon has written, "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion."

5. The older I grow and the more I come in contact with the present generation, the more amazed I am at the utter ignorance of the Bible which prevails on every hand, not only in circles that are dominantly secular, but even among professing Christians themselves. I am reminded here of what Mary Ellen Chase has written, as follows:

The Bible belongs among the noblest and most indispensable of our humanistic and literary traditions. No liberal education is truly liberal without it. Yet in the last fifty years our colleges have, for the most part, abandoned its study as literature, and our schools, for reasons not sufficiently valid, have ceased to teach it, or, in many cases, even to read it to their young people. Students of English literature take it for granted that a knowledge of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid*, and the *Divine Comedy* are necessary not only for the graduate schools but also for the cultured and civilized life, as, indeed, they are; but most of them remain in comfortable and colossal ignorance of

GENESIS

a book which antedates Dante, and in large part, Virgil, by many centuries, some of which was written before Homer, and all of which has contributed more to the humanistic civilization of the Western world than have the so-called "Classics."²

Clyde T. Francisco writes in similar vein:

It is a tragedy of modern civilization that through schools and colleges students are taught to appreciate the beauty and sublimity of the works of Byron, Shakespeare, and Browning, but are left completely uninformed on the greatest literature the world has ever known, just because it is in the Bible. If it were anywhere else, the literary world would bow before it.³

Indeed one would not be missing the mark to ask: To what extent is the Bible itself taught in our day and age, even in those institutions which go under the name of "church schools," "Sunday schools," "Bible schools," etc?

A press story appeared recently, in a local daily newspaper, which I am moved to reproduce here, because it speaks so eloquently to the point at issue. It went as follows (under the by-line of "G. K. Kodenfield, AP Education Writer"):

Washington—A test on the Bible was sprung on five classes of college-bound 11th and 12th graders in a public school.

Some thought Sodom and Gomorrah were lovers; that the Gospels were written by Matthew, Mark, Luther and John; that Eve was created from an apple; and that the stories by which Jesus taught were parodies.

Eighty to 90 per cent of the students could not complete such familiar quotations as: "Many are called, but few are chosen"; "A soft answer turneth away wrath"; "They shall beat their swords into plow-

AN APOLOGIA

shares"; "Pride goeth before a fall"; and "The love of money is the root of all evil."

All this happened in Newton, Mass., and English teacher Thayer S. Warshaw decided to do something about it. He arranged for two of his classes to study the Bible—not as a religious book, or even as literature, but as a source book for the humanities.

Teaching about the Bible in public schools can be a tricky business, particularly since the Supreme Court decision on school prayer.

But Warshaw, reporting his experience in the February issue of "The English Journal," believes it is essential.

"The Bible is indeed a religious book, but it is also a part of our secular cultural heritage. To keep it out of the public schools because it is controversial and because the public cannot trust the good sense of both the teacher and the pupil to treat it as a part of the humanities is a simple but questionable judgment," Warshaw wrote.

"A knowledge of the Bible is essential to the pupil's understanding of allusions in literature, in music, and in the fine arts; in news media, in entertainment, and in cultural conversation.

"Is he to study mythology and Shakespeare, and not the Bible? Is it important for him to learn what it means when a man is called an Adonis or a Romeo, yet unimportant for him to be able to tell a Jonah from a Judas?"

Warshaw first convinced his pupils of their need for a study of the Bible.

He assigned the reading of a few short stories which made no sense to them because they couldn't understand the Biblical allusions.

He showed them some political cartoons with Biblical references which left them in the dark.

GENESIS

The clincher was the quiz on which they fared so poorly.⁴

The courage of this English teacher is to be commended. It must be admitted that recent decisions of the Supreme Court have served the cause of irreligion and sheer secularism by catering to a small minority of fastidious self-styled atheists and agnostics. As a matter of fact it was never the intention of the Founding Fathers to put the state in a position of hostility to religious faith and practice. (We recall in this connection the action of a biology teacher in an Eastern high school who had the praying mantis removed from his laboratory lest the presence of the insect offend the sensibilities of the honorable Court.)

I doubt very much that any person has the right to be called "educated" who allows himself to remain ignorant of the content of this, the greatest of all books—the greatest collection of "human interest" documents that has ever been given to mankind. For this reason, I am convinced that secularly educated professors, no matter how learned they may be in their respective specialized fields, do not have the proper background for setting the standards for Bible colleges, for any kind of college that functions to train men for the ministry of the Gospel of Christ. Hence, I welcome the rise of the newly formed Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges.

One must actually live with the Bible in order to appreciate it. Cf. John 6:63, the words of Jesus: "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life." Again, the words of Jesus in John 8:31-32: "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Or, the words of the Apostle Paul, in 2 Cor. 3:17—"where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Or the powerful affirmations of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 4, verse 12: "For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any

AN APOLOGIA

two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart." Only those who study the Word of truth, who digest it and assimilate it into the very fabric of their lives, can truly appreciate both the simplicity and the sublimity of this Book of books. Those who do not "hunger and thirst after righteousness," that is, after the knowledge of God and of His way of doing things, are missing—tragically missing—so very much, so very much of that which makes life worth living, of that which gives it meaning, zest, order, and hope! And the tragedy of it all is that they are utterly oblivious of the fact of their great loss!

6. Furthermore, I should like to testify that I have found little or nothing in science or in philosophy that would serve to negate the fundamentals of the Christian faith. *As a matter of fact, I stand ready to defend the thesis anywhere, at any time, that there is greater harmony today between scientific theory and Biblical teaching than at any other time in the history of human thought.* I shall try to show that this harmony is apparent especially in the book of Genesis.

7. I have written this textbook for use by students in our Bible colleges, and for all Christians who may find it helpful; indeed, for all persons who may be seeking a constructive study of this over-all problem of the relationship between the Bible and science. I have striven throughout for simplicity and clarity. I know of nothing that has been a greater detriment to the Church, and to the spread of the Gospel, than theological "gobbledygook": this I have studiously tried to avoid. It takes no great measure of discernment to see that creeds, confessions, and theologies formed by churchmen are many times less intelligible than the Scriptures themselves. All one has to do, to realize the truth of this statement, is to try to "plough through" the writings of such contemporary "theologians" as Barth,

GENESIS

Brunner, Niebuhr, Tillich, et al. If men had to master the "systematic theology" formulated by these men (or by their predecessors in Christian history) in order to be saved, I am sure that both Heaven and earth would have been depopulated of saints long, long ago; that indeed Christianity would have died "aborning." As a matter of fact, the apostasies and sectism prevalent throughout the history of Christendom have been due primarily to the corruption of apostolic teaching by terms derived from the Greek philosophical systems and from the pagan mystery religions. Had churchmen adhered to the apostolic injunction to "hold the pattern of sound words" (2 Tim. 1:13), that is, to call Bible things by Bible names (1 Cor. 2:12-14), it is quite likely that the history of Christianity in the world would have been written in far less tragic terms. (Is it not a notorious fact that the professional "theologians" brought about the disunity of Christendom with their conflicting speculations? On what basis, then, do we expect their breed to effect the reunion of Christendom through present-day "ecumenical" movements?) I have never been able to convince myself that the Almighty is interested in the jargon of the seminaries.

I wish to acknowledge, with sincere thanks, the permissions which have been granted me to use the various excerpts from other works that will be found in this textbook. The names of publishers and authors who have been kind enough to grant these permissions are given, either in the List of Specific Abbreviations at the front of the book, or in the added Bibliographical Data at the end of each Part. In a very few instances, I have not been able to identify the publisher: in building a file over several decades I have neglected to attach this bibliographical data occasionally, and inadvertently. The excerpts themselves, however, are authentic.

Finally, it will be noted that quotations which appear in this text are from the American Standard Edition of the

AN APOLOGIA

Revised Version (A.D. 1901). A letter from Thomas Nelson and Sons informs me that permission is no longer necessary to quote from this Edition. I have used it, rather than the Revised Standard Version, largely for its accuracy. In my opinion, the Revised Standard Version tends to become more of a paraphrase at times than a translation.

C. C. C.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- ¹) Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, II, 2, 117 ff.
- ²) Mary Ellen Chase, *The Bible and the Common Reader*, p. 9. Macmillan, New York, 1944.
- ³) Clyde T. Francisco, *Introducing the Old Testament*, pp. 3,4. Broadman Press, Nashville, 1950.
- ⁴) From *The El Paso Times*, March 5, 1964.

PART ONE:

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. THE BIBLE: WHAT IT IS

To introduce this study, a few facts about the Bible are essential. Although we are concerned here only with the first book of the Bible, the book of Genesis, we must keep in mind that the importance of this one book is to be measured in terms of the relation of its content to that of the Bible as a whole. A few of the more important facts about the Bible that we need to know are the following:

1. It has been rightly said that *the Bible is a library of books*. It is from almost every point of view the greatest collection of books available to man, sixty-six books in all, thirty-nine in the part known as the Old Testament, twenty-seven in the part known as the New Testament. Hence the derivation of our English word "Bible" from the Greek neuter plural, *biblia* (which derived in turn from *byblos* and *biblos*, the Greek word which designated the papyrus reed from strips of which "books" were made in ancient times, usually in the form of "rolls"). In these various books of the Bible we find law, history, narrative, poetry, prophecy, letters, proverbs, parables, apocalypses, in fact examples of almost every literary form known to man.

2. *The Bible is a library of related books*. Despite the fact that the sixty-six books which go to make up The Book were written by many different authors, over a period extending from about 1500 B.C. to about A.D. 100, most of whom were unknown to one another, the amazing fact is that the completed whole is a *single* story with a *single* theme, namely, redemption through Christ Jesus. As Augustine once put it:

In the Old Testament is the New Testament concealed;

In the New Testament is the Old Testament revealed.
Everything in the Old Testament pointed forward to Messiah (*Christos*, *Christ*, "The Anointed One" of God);

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

everything in the New Testament points back to Him. The Central Figure of all human history is the Central Figure of the Bible.

3. *The Bible is a collection of selected books.*

(1) These books did not just "get together" in some mysterious manner without rhyme or reason. The inclusion of the various sixty-six books in the Canon was determined first by popular acceptance and use, and then by Christian scholarship directed to the specific problem of a final determination of the Canon. The essential criterion for this determination was the contribution made by each book to the history of redemption as worked out on earth in the Messianic Line—the genealogy that began with the "first Adam" and terminated with the "second Adam," the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 15:45-49).

(2) The Apocrypha (those books of "doubtful" authenticity) were present in the Greek version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint, the version used in Alexandria and in other cities of the Hellenistic world at the time of Christ. However, these books were never in the Hebrew Old Testament. Jerome included only two of them in his Latin translation, the Vulgate, made about A.D. 405; they were included in the Vulgate later, however, and hence they are still in Roman Catholic Versions. These books were included in the King James Version also, but the Puritans objected so strongly to the questionable moral standards indicated in some of them, that they came to be left out of many—but not all—Protestant Bibles. As a matter of fact, the contents of the Apocrypha have to do largely with inter-testamental history, wisdom books, traditions, etc., and contribute little or nothing to the development of the grand theme of divine revelation, the theme of human redemption as mediated by the ministry and work of the Messiah.

(3) In addition to these apocryphal books, there were many "books," that is, "gospels," "epistles," etc., in circu-

GENESIS

lation in the post-apostolic age; which are known as the Pseudepigrapha ("false writings"), so-called because they laid claim to authorship by churchmen distinguished in the early ages of Christianity. The fact of the matter is that the literary and doctrinal excellence of the canonical books above those of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha becomes so obvious by comparison, as to definitely establish the Canon and hence to distinguish the canonical from the non-canonical writings.

4. *The Bible presents itself to us as the Book of the Spirit of God.* It purports to be the record of a progressive revelation (cf. Isa. 28:10, Mark 4:28) of God's will toward man, as authorized, communicated, and protected against error, by the direct agency of the Spirit of God. This revelation took place first in history: in the lives of the patriarchs, in the establishment and guidance of the Hebrew theocracy under Moses and Joshua, in the chaotic period of the "Judges" (divinely called civil and military dictators), in the lives and ministries of the Hebrew prophets, in the life and preparatory work of John the Baptizer, and finally in the lives and ministries of Jesus and His Spirit-guided Apostles. This revelation took place on the stage of human history; the record of that revelation—line upon line, precept upon precept—and its meaning for mankind, is preserved for us by the agency of the Holy Spirit in this, The Book of books, the Bible. The whole is truly the book of the Spirit. In the first chapter of Genesis we are told of the Spirit's brooding over the darkness of non-being ("the deep") and arousing therein motion, energy, light, matter; and in the last chapter of the Bible, we hear the Spirit joining in the Gospel invitation, "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come; he that will, let him take of the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17). And the *imprimatur* of the Spirit is obvious on every book, indeed on every page, that lies between these first and last chapters.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21). The great Hebrew prophets sought diligently the meaning of the testimonies which the Spirit of Christ communicated through them, testimonies concerning the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them (1 Pet. 1:10-12), the testimonies later embodied in the Gospel message at first proclaimed by the Apostles and their co-laborers, by inspiration of the same Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven. Jesus, who possessed the Holy Spirit without measure (John 3:34) taught and wrought by the power of the Spirit (Luke 11:20, Matt. 12:28, Luke 4:4, 14, 18-19; Isa. 61:1-3). And the Apostles were guided into all the truth by the agency of the same Spirit in executing the Last Will and Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (Luke 24:45-49; John 14:16-17, 14:26, 15:26-27, 16:7-15, 20:21-22; Acts 1:1-5, 2:1-4; Acts 15:28; 1 Cor. 2:6-15). With the termination of the apostolic ministry, revelation—and along with it, demonstration (miracles)—came to an end (1 Cor. 13:8, Jude 3): all things that pertain “unto life and godliness” were revealed (2 Pet. 1:3, 2 Tim. 3:16-17). Before critics, motivated as they usually are by their own wishful thinking, project their destructive speculations in regard to the text of the Bible, they must come to grips with this doctrine of the Spirit. *It is the inspiration of the Spirit that is the source of the Bible's unity and the guarantee of its reliability.*

5. *Even though the Bible is a library of books, it is still one Book*, the Book of all books, the Book that has been translated, either in part or as a whole, into more languages (some 1100) than any other book known to man. We err when we think of the Bible as the source of two or three different religions. It is, rather, the record of the progressive revelation of the one true religion as it was actualized by the Spirit through three successive Dispensations. (The word “dispensation” has reference to the system by which

GENESIS

God dispenses His gifts and graces throughout any particular period or age: cf. Eph. 1:10, 3:2.) The Dispensations changed—from the family to the national to the universal—as the type of priesthood changed. The Patriarchal Dispensation was the age of family rule and family worship, with the patriarch (paternal head) acting as prophet (revealer of God's will), priest (intercessor), and king for his entire progeny. (*The book of Genesis gives us the history of the Patriarchal Dispensation.*) The Jewish Dispensation was ushered in with the establishment of a national institution of worship (first the Tabernacle, and later the Temple) and a national priesthood (the Levitical or Aaronic priesthood). The Christian Dispensation had its beginning with the abrogation of the Old Covenant and the ratification of the New Covenant by one and the same event—the death of Christ on the Cross (although the Jewish Institution was permitted to remain as a social and civil institution some forty years longer, that is, down to the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of its people by the Roman armies, A.D. 70). (Cf. John 1:17, Gal. 3:23-29, 2 Cor. 3:1-11, Col. 2:13-15; and especially the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews.) Under the Christian System, all Christians are priests unto God, and Christ is their High Priest (King-Priest after the order of Melchizedek, Psa. 110:4; Heb. 6:20, 7:1-25). (Cf. 1 Pet. 2:5,9; Rev. 5:10; Rom. 12:1-2, 8:34; Heb. 2:17, also chs. 3,5,7; 1 Tim. 2:5, 1 John 2:1, etc.) It will be recalled that Alexander Campbell referred to the Patriarchal Dispensation as the starlight age, to the Jewish Dispensation as the moonlight age, to the special ministry of John the Baptizer (to the Jewish nation) as the twilight age, and to the present or Christian Dispensation (which may also rightly be designated the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit) as the sunlight age, of the unfolding of the Divine Plan of Redemption. These successive “ages,” therefore, embrace the successive stages in the revelation

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

of true religion as set forth in the Bible. Refusal to recognize this fundamental unity of the Bible as a whole can result only in confusion, presumption, and ultimate rejection by the Author of the Bible Himself.

6. *The Bible is pre-eminently the Book of Life.* Its pages are replete with "human interest" stories covering every phase of life *as man lives it*. While portraying the virtues of the great heroes of the faith in all ages, not for one moment does it turn aside to hide their frailties. It never deceives man. 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 (the blood of Christ, John 1:29, I John 1:7), and the means of applying the remedy (the preaching and acceptance of the Gospel, 1 Cor. 1:21, Rom. 1:16, Acts 2:38, 1 Cor. 15:1-4, Rom. 2:8, 1 Pet. 4:17). The Bible is the most realistic book ever given to man. Because it deals honestly with men, it is the most frequently attacked, ridiculed, maligned book in literature; and, I might truthfully add, the most abused and misrepresented by half-baked intellectuals.

7. *The Bible is the world's all-embracing Manual of Civilization.* Where the open Bible goes, men's minds are liberated from ignorance, error, superstition, etc., as well as from the guilt and the consequences of sin (John 8:31-32, 17:17). Where the open Bible goes, science flourishes, freedom is appreciated and exalted, and democracy is spread abroad. If all men everywhere could be induced to accept and to actually *live* the principles of human relationships as set forth in the Ten Commandments, in the Two Great Commandments, and in the Sermon on the Mount, our world would be a very different world from that which it is at present. (Cf. 2 Cor. 3:17, Jas. 1:25, 2:12, Gal. 2:4.) No man can add one iota to the body of moral and spiritual truth that is revealed in Scripture.

GENESIS

II. THE BIBLE: WHAT IT IS NOT

It is almost as important for us to know, in this day of fantastic progress in human science, *what the Bible is not*, as to know *what it is*. The knowledge of *what it is not* will do much to clear away the false issues that have been raised in recent years in the form of alleged "conflicts" between the Bible and science. Let us look at the problem, therefore, negatively, as follows:

1. *The Bible is not, was never intended to be, a textbook of science.* The word "science" comes from the Latin *scientia*, "knowledge," which derives in turn from the Latin verb, *scio*, infinitive form, *scire*, "to know." A science is, literally, a knowledge, a human knowledge, of course. A science is of human origin strictly: it is what man assumes to know (or speaking precisely, what he *believes*, on the basis of very great probability) concerning the order which he finds characteristic of a given segment of the cosmos. (The Greek word *kosmos* means "order." If our world were not a framework of order, there could never be a science: not only would science be impossible, but life itself would be impossible: man could not live in a totally unpredictable environment.)

The Bible, on the other hand, presents itself to us as a book from God, as the record of God's progressive revelation of His will with respect to man's origin, nature, and destiny. It does not claim to be a scientific text: it offers itself strictly as the authentic textbook of Spirit-revealed religion.

As a matter of fact, the content of the Bible is largely pre-scientific. That is to say, the books of the Bible were written, for the most part, prior to the rise of human science. This is true especially of the books of the Old Testament canon; and even when the books of the New Testament were being indited, science was only in its initial stages: the *only* sciences that were being formulated at

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

this time were certain mathematical sciences, especially arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. It will be recalled that Plato, in the *Republic*, classified the mathematical sciences as follows: arithmetic, the science of numbering, or of one dimension; plane geometry, the science of two dimensions; solid geometry, the science of three dimensions; astronomy, the science of the three-dimensional world *and* motion; and harmony, the science of five functions, namely, the three dimensions *plus* motion *plus* numerical proportion. To these he added what he called the science of dialectic, the search for the essences (meanings) of things. Aristotle, Plato's pupil at the Academy for twenty years, wrote the first texts on economics, politics, ethics, logic, poetics (literary criticism), rhetoric, physics, astronomy, biology and psychology. The last four named, which belong in the category of what we now call the natural sciences, in the light of present-day knowledge were woefully unscientific as presented by Aristotle. However, his ethics, politics, logic, and poetics are almost as "modern" in their content as contemporary texts in these subjects.

It was never the intention of the Bible writers to produce a scientific textbook. The Genesis account of the Creation, for example, was not intended to be a scientific presentation: its author makes no attempt to give us an explanation of the *how* (the *method*) of Creation (and it must be remembered that the *how*, rather than the *why*, of things, is the specific area in which true science operates: outside that area it is no longer science). The writer of Genesis wrote with a purpose that was simply and solely *religious*: to impress upon man the truth that the cosmos and everything in it is the handiwork of the Will and Word of the living God (cf. Gen. 1:3,6,9,14,20,24,26; Psalms 33:6,9; Psalm 148:1-6; Hebrews 11:3).

This non-scientific character of the Bible has long been recognized, even by the most "conservative" of scholars.

GENESIS

For example, Marcus Dods, discussing the first two chapters of Genesis, has written as follows:

If any one is in search of accurate information regarding the age of the earth, or its relation to the sun, moon, and stars, or regarding the order in which plants and animals have appeared upon it, he is referred to textbooks in astronomy, geology, and palaeontology. No one for a moment dreams of referring the serious student of these subjects to the Bible as a source of information. It is not the object of the writers of Scripture to impart physical instruction or to enlarge the bounds of scientific knowledge. But if any one wishes to know what connection the world has with God, if he seeks to trace back all that now is to the very fountain-head of life, if he desires to discover some unifying principle, some illuminating purpose in the history of this earth, then we confidently refer him to these and subsequent chapters of Scripture as his safest, and indeed his only, guide to the information he seeks. Every writing must be judged by the object the writer has in view. If the object of the writer of these chapters was to convey physical information, then certainly it is imperfectly fulfilled. But if his object was to give an intelligible account of God's relation to the world and to man, then it must be owned that he has been successful in the highest degree.

It is therefore unreasonable for us to allow our reverence for this writing to be lessened because it does not anticipate the discoveries of physical science, or to repudiate its authority in its own department of truth because it does not give us information which it formed no part of the writer's object to give. As well might we deny to Shakespeare a masterly knowledge of human life, because his dramas are blotted by historical anachronisms . . .¹

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Alexander Campbell has written in like vein, warning us against trying to turn the Bible (Genesis included) into a scientific text:

It [the Bible] is not, then, a treatise on man . . . as he is physically, astronomically, geologically, politically, or metaphysically; but as he is, and ought to be, *morally and religiously*.²

I think I should repeat here, in passing, what I have stated heretofore, namely, that even though the content of the Bible (and of Genesis in particular), chronologically speaking, is pre-scientific, still and all it is fundamentally in harmony with contemporary science; that in fact there never was a time in the history of human thought when Biblical teaching and scientific theory were in greater accord than they are today. Why should it not be so? God has written two books: one is the Book of Nature in which He has revealed His "everlasting power and divinity" (Rom. 1:20, Psa. 19:1); the other is the Book of Redemption in which He has made known His immeasurable love and compassion (John 3:16-18, Eph. 2:4-7, Jas. 5:11, 1 Pet. 1:3). Now science is man's attempt to interpret the Book of Nature, and so-called "systematic theology" is man's attempt to interpret the Book of Redemption. Hence, there may be apparent conflicts between these interpretations, because the interpretations are of men and men are fallible, very much so. But by virtue of the fact that the Books themselves are from God, they cannot be contradictory in their contents. Hence, the Bible has no apology to make to science, nor has it anything to fear from science, for the obvious reason that it does not have any reason to fear truth under any guise, or in any branch of human knowledge. *And let me add here that it is a mistake to treat Genesis as a textbook of science by resorting to fantastic "interpretations" to make its content conform to the latest scientific theories. Insofar as this writer is concerned, the book of Genesis stands on its own two feet (if he may be*

GENESIS

pardoned for using such a mixed metaphor): *it has nothing to fear from, nor any need for accommodation to, human theory and speculation.*

2. *The Bible is not, was never intended to be, a history of the human race.* It is, rather, the history of one genealogical Line, that is, the Line that flowered and terminated in Messiah, the Redeemer. Hence, as stated previously, the Bible is the history of the unfolding of the Plan of Redemption.

The story of the Bible begins, as it should begin, with the archetypal pair, male and female, Adam and Eve. The name "Adam," literally translated is simply "the man." Hence his counterpart bore the generic designation, "woman": as *ish* signifies "man," so *ishah*, the word used here, signifies "she-man," or as in Anglo-Saxon, "womb-man." Her generic name was, and is, Woman (Gen. 2:23), but the personal name of this particular woman was Eve, meaning "life," hence, "the mother of all living" (Gen. 3:20). Incidentally, the Septuagint gives the literal and correct rendering, "And Adam called his wife's name *Life*, because she was the mother of all *living*."

The Author of the Bible, the Spirit of God, is not concerned with the story of the human race as a whole, at any time of its existence, but only with the particular segment of the race which was destined to bring forth Messiah, the One through whom the Plan of Redemption for mankind was to be effectuated. In chapter 4 of Genesis, we are given, but only partially, the antediluvian genealogy of the Cainites, and in chapter 5 the antediluvian line of the Sethites, the account culminating in the story of Noah and the Flood. In a word, after Abel's death, it was Seth and his progeny who were appointed to carry on the genealogical Line that was to culminate in Messiah, Christos, Christ (terms all meaning "The Anointed One").

The Bible is the history of Messianic Line only, the Line that was to bring forth "in the fulness of the time" (Gal.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

4:4) the world's Redeemer. This Line is traced from Adam to Noah, through Seth, in the fifth chapter of Genesis; and after a brief diversion to give us the story of Noah and the Deluge, the Line is traced on down from Noah to Abraham (ch. 11).

With the Call of Abraham, the history became narrowed down to the story of the fleshly seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the children of Israel, as they were known in Old Testament times. God literally separated this people from the rest of humankind and put them into the pulpit of the world to do five things: (1) to preserve the knowledge of the living and true God, (2) to preserve the knowledge of the moral law (Gal. 3:19—"the law" was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come," etc.), (3) to prepare the world for the advent and ministry of Messiah, and (4) to build up a system of metaphor, type, allegory and prophecy designed to identify Messiah at His appearance in the flesh, and (5) actually to give the Messiah—Prophet, Priest, and King—to the world.

The account of this Messianic Line is carried forward in the various genealogical tables scattered throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. The termination of the Line is given us in the genealogies which appear in the first chapter of Matthew and the third chapter of Luke. Matthew, beginning with Abraham, the father of the Jewish nation, evidently gives us the *legal* genealogy through David, thence through Solomon down to Joseph—the genealogy that must have appeared in the archives of the synagogue. Luke, on the other hand, a Greek, and hence uninhibited by Jewish tradition, gives us the *natural* genealogy through Mary (the daughter of Heli) back to Nathan, another of David's sons, thence all the way back to Adam (Matt. 1:1-17, Luke 3:23-28). (See Dr. James Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, pp. 36-37). These genealogical tables are integral parts of the Scriptures, and are not to be passed over lightly.

GENESIS

Suffice it to repeat here that the Bible is not intended to be a history of the human race. It is in fact the history of Redemption, the history of the Messianic Line, the Line that flowered in Messiah through whom God's Plan of Redemption for fallen man was executed. As Jesus Himself declared from His own Cross: "It is finished" (John 19:30).

3. *The Bible is not, was never intended to be, a book of philosophy.* Basically philosophy is the study of the meaning of concepts: it wants to know what the scientists mean by the terms from which they take off, in the various sciences—such terms as energy, matter, life, mind, consciousness, self-consciousness, personality, value, etc. In the branch of philosophy known as *philosophy of religion*, specialized attention is given to the subjects of God, freedom, and immortality: indeed, as Kant declared, these are the three fundamental subjects of philosophy in general. However, at its best, philosophy is strictly human speculation; hence it is not, and cannot be, a substitute for religious faith. The most it can do is to give us clues that might help us to a better understanding of the ultimates of the Mystery of Being. Although the Bible is not, in any sense of the term, a book of philosophy, still and all, as I have said to my classes many times, when I want the last word on almost any problem in philosophy, I turn to the Bible and there I find it. This is due to the fact, as stated previously, that the Bible is first, last, and always the Book of Life. Both scientists and philosophers would be safeguarded against skepticism, agnosticism, and all the other "isms," if they would literally live with the Bible and assimilate its teaching into their thought, and incorporate it into their living from day to day.

The Bible is the Book of Redemption; hence it is the book of the Spirit of God. "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him? even so, the things of God none knoweth, save the

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God. Which things we also speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth, combining spiritual things with spiritual words" (1 Cor. 2:11-13). To the Spirit of God we are immediately indebted for all that is known, or knowable, of God, of the unseen world, or of the ultimate destinies of men. All that ancient and modern pagans pretend to have known or to know of these sublime topics, has either been borrowed from this Revealer of secrets, or else is mere conceit or conjecture of their own. The simple fact is that the truth to be believed by man respecting his own origin, constitution, and proper ends, could never have been known but by revelation of the Spirit. How profoundly thankful we should be, then, that our God has not left us in darkness, in that gross darkness in which heathen peoples are still struggling and suffering, but has, by His Spirit, revealed His Plan for our eternal redemption, and revealed it so clearly that wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein (Isa. 35:8; cf. Rom. 16:25-27).

III. THE BOOKS OF OUR BIBLE

Our Bible is divided into two parts, known as the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Old Testament, with the exception of just a few passages written in Aramaic (Jer. 10:11; Ezra 4:8, apparently to 6:18, also 7:12-26; Dan. 2:4 to 7:28), was written originally in Hebrew. The New Testament was written originally in the Koine (common, "vulgar") Greek.

There are thirty-nine books in our Old Testament, classified as follows:

1. *Law* (5 books): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

2. *History* (12 books): Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles,

GENESIS

Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.

3. *Classics* (5 books): Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.

4. *Major Prophets* (5 books): Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel.

5. *Minor Prophets* (12 books): Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

There are twenty-seven books in our New Testament, classified as follows:

1. *Biography* (4 books): Matthew, Mark, Luke, John: all are narratives of the personal ministry of Jesus on earth, written to give us evidence that He is the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt. 16:16, John 20:30-31, Heb. 2:1-4).

2. *History* (1 book): Acts of Apostles, written to tell us what to do to become Christians, members of the New Covenant (Acts 2:37-38, 8:26-40, 16:28-34).

3. *Instruction in Righteousness* (21 letters, written by the Apostles, divided into (1) *Special Letters* (14 books): Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews; and (2) *General Letters* (7 books): James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, Jude. These epistles were all written to Christians "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

4. *Prophecy* (1 book): Revelation, or the Apocalypse, the story in prophetic symbolism (Rev. 1:1—"sign-ified") of the trials and triumphs, and the ultimate destiny of God's elect (chs. 21,22). Thus the Bible story which began with Paradise Lost, ends with Paradise Regained.

IV. THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES

The Hebrew Scriptures have always included all the

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

books that make up our English Old Testament, but not in the same general order or arrangement. Whereas there are only twenty-four books in the Hebrew Scriptures, there are thirty-nine in our Old Testament. The content, however, is the same. The Hebrew Scriptures are divided as follows:

1. *The Law* (5 books), in Hebrew, the *Torah*; in Greek, the *Pentateuch* (five "tools," "books"): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

2. *The Prophets* (8 books), in Hebrew, *Nebiim*. These are divided into two groups, designated the "former" and the "latter" Prophets, evidently with reference to the time order:

(1) *The Former Prophets* (4 books): Joshua, Judges, Samuel (one book, not two as in our Old Testament), and Kings (also one book, not two as in our Bible).

(2) *The Latter Prophets* (4 books): the three separate books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and one book of the Twelve (twelve separate books in our Old Testament).

3. *The Writings* (11 books), in Hebrew, *Kethubim*; in Greek, *Hagiographa*, "sacred writings." These are divided as follows:

(1) *The Poetical Books* (3): Psalms, Proverbs, Job.

(2) *The Five Rolls* (5): Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther.

(3) *The Historical Books* (3): Daniel, Ezra-Nehe-miah (one book), Chronicles (one book).

The Torah was always regarded as the most sacred of the holy writings, The Prophets next in point of reverence, and The Writings last. The Torah was Scripture *par excellence*, and still is, among the Jewish people. Using the structure of the Temple as a parallel, they said that The Writings were comparable to the Outer Court, The Prophets to the Holy Place, but The Law was, and is, the Holy of Holies.

GENESIS

Of the Five Rolls, one was read at each of the great national festivals, as follows:

The Song of Solomon, at the Passover (roughly in our April);

Ruth, at Pentecost (in our June);

Lamentations, at the Commemoration of the Fall of Jerusalem (on the ninth day of the month Ab, roughly our August);

Ecclesiastes, at the Feast of Tabernacles (in our October);

Esther, at the Feast of Purim (in our March).

As stated above, among the Jews the Torah has always been, and still is, the most revered document of Hebrew literature, and indeed of world literature. To the Jewish people, it is not only the Book of the Law—it is truly the Book of Life, that is, “life” as synonymous with “experience.” Hence the Jewish nation has ever taken pride in being known as “the People of the Book.”

V. THE BOOK OF GENESIS

The five books, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, which are known, as a unit, as the Torah in the Hebrew Scriptures, have come to be known, again as a unit, as the Pentateuch, in our Bible. This word *Pentateuch* derives from the Greek *penta* (“five”) and *teuchos* (primary meaning “tool” or “implement,” with secondary meanings of a “fabric” or a “case” for holding papyrus rolls; hence used for the “roll” or “book” itself).³ As Dummelow writes, “Pentateuch is a Greek word meaning ‘the fivefold volume,’ and has been used since the time of Origen (third century A.D.) as a convenient designation for the first five books of the Bible.”⁴

The first book of the Pentateuch, the Book of Genesis—the title is a transliteration of the Greek word *genesis*, which means “beginning”—is in a special sense The Book of Beginnings. In it we find the account of the beginnings

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

of the world and man, of domestic and civil society, of liberty and law, of sin and death, of the elements of true religion (altar, sacrifice, and priesthood), of the Plan of Redemption, of the facets of human culture, of the early ethnic groups of mankind, of the Messianic genealogy, of the Hebrew People and their divinely ordained mission, of the Abrahamic Promise and the Old Covenant: presenting as a whole the history of the Patriarchal Dispensation (which extended from Adam to Moses, that is, from the Creation to the establishment of the Hebrew Theocracy at Sinai). In view of these sublime themes, especially in their relation to the fundamental problems of the origin, nature and destiny of man, what a lacuna there would be in man's knowledge, and especially in his moral and spiritual understanding, had the Book of Genesis never have been written! Its profound revelations of these matters which are inseparably interwoven with every aspect of human thought and life, such themes as God, man, good, evil, sin, death, religion, redemption, etc., make it one of the indispensable works of revealed literature, and indeed of all literature both sacred and profane.

From first to last the sacred motif of redemption binds the sixty-six books of the Bible into a sublime whole: the motif of redemption through Christ Jesus. We are not surprised, therefore, to note that even the Book of Genesis is Christ-centered ("Christocentric"). Prophetic references to Messiah are numerous in Genesis, as follows:

(1) He would be the Seed of the Woman (Gen. 3:14-15, Matt. 1:18-23, Luke 1:26-38, Gal. 4:4-5);

(2) He would overcome the Old Serpent, the Devil (Gen. 3:14-15, Heb. 2:14-15; Rev. 12:10-12, 20:7-10);

(3) He would be of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, respectively (Gen. 12:3, 18:18, 22:18, 26:4; Acts 3:25-26; Gal. 3:16; Heb. 11:17-18);

(4) He would be of the tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10; Psa. 2:6-9, 60:7, 108:8; Heb. 7:14, Rev. 5:5).

GENESIS

Hence, said Jesus to the caviling Jews, John 8:56—"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." And the Apostle Paul testifies, Gal. 3:8—"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel before unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed." To this he adds, Gal. 3:16—"Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." As a matter of fact, the very heart of the Abrahamic Promise was the promise of the Reign of Messiah. Moreover, not only in prophecy, but in simile, metaphor, allegory, type, and poetic imagery, the content of Genesis foreshadows the Messiah and the Messianic Institution (cf. Rom. 5:14; Gal. 4:21-31; Gen. 28:12, John 1:51; Gen. 2:21-25; Rev. 21:2, 22:17; 1 Pet. 3:18-22, etc.). We may say rightly that from Adam to Abraham, the Gospel existed in *purpose*, that is, in God's eternal purpose (Eph. 3:1-13, 1:3-14; Rom. 8:28-30); that from Abraham to Isaiah, the Gospel existed in *promise* (the "Abrahamic Promise"); that from Isaiah to Malachi, the Gospel existed in *prophecy* (2 Pet. 1:21); that throughout the personal ministry of Jesus, the Gospel existed in *preparation* (preparation for the Reign of Messiah: cf. Matt. 28:18-20; John 16:7-16, 18:36-37, 20:19-22; Luke 24:45-49; Acts 1:1-8; Heb. 2:1-4); that beginning with Pentecost, A.D. 30, the advent of the Spirit, and the incorporation of the Body of Christ, the Gospel, with its facts, commands, and promises, exists and is proclaimed as *fact* (1 Cor. 15:1-4; Acts 2:22-42; Rom. 10:9-10; Rom. 6:23, etc.).

Critics, exegetes, commentators, "theologians," etc., would do well to accept the fact that they either distort or miss altogether much of the plain teaching of the Bible, including the Book of Genesis, by refusing to accept it as a whole and thus to let it "interpret" itself.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

VI. DIVISIONS OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS

Dr. Julian Morgenstern writes that one central theme gives to the Book of Genesis its unity of thought. "This central theme," he goes on to say, "is God's selection of Israel to be the witness and messenger of His truth and His law unto all the peoples of the earth, and His testing and preparation of Israel for this arduous and sacred task." This central theme, adds Morgenstern, is resolved into four "natural and logical concepts. (1) God and mankind, (2) God and Israel, (3) God's purification and preparation of Israel for His service, and (4) God's providence." This author then suggests four main divisions, writing of course strictly from the Jewish point of view, as follows: (1) Chs. I-XI, stories about mankind in general; (2) Chs. XII-XXV:18, the story of Abraham; (3) Chs. XXV:19-XXXVI, the story of Jacob; (4) Chs. XXXVII-L, the story of Joseph.⁵ (Morgenstern follows the now outmoded notion that these stories of the Patriarchs are simply "folk tales," not accounts of real events in the lives of historical personages. This view has been completely disproved by archeological discoveries.)

The Jewish point of view is clearly stated in a book recently published under the editorship of Gaalyahu Cornfeld, as follows:

The book of Genesis, in its present setting, may be divided into two parts, of which the first (chs. 1-11) presents a Hebrew view of the early history of mankind. This comprises the Flood; the rise of separate nations, and the genealogy of the sons of Shem (Semites); more particularly how the ancestors of the Hebrews were related to other nations, and how they emerged gradually into a separate and distinct existence beside them. Following this, but related to the foregoing, the second part of Genesis (chs. 12-50) comprises in particular the history of the Patriarchs, the immediate ancestors of Israel.⁶

GENESIS

Strictly speaking, Genesis is a book of two distinct parts, namely, Part One (chs. 1-11), giving us the early history of man without regard to distinction between Jew and Gentile, and Part Two (chs. 12-50) giving us the historical origins of the Hebrew people, the people whom God put in the pulpit of the world to preserve among men the knowledge of Him as the One living and true God.

Dr. G. Campbell Morgan suggests that in general outline the Book of Genesis might be divided, according to main themes, respectively, as follows:

Generation: 1:1-2:25

Degeneration: chs. 3-10

Regeneration: chs. 11-50⁷

Another rather simple plan of sectioning the Book that is frequently suggested is the following:

I. The Beginnings of History (chs. 1-11).

1. The Origin of the World and Man (chs. 1-5)

2. The Story of the Flood (chs. 6-9)

3. The Place of the Hebrew People among the Nations. (We use "people" here as synonymous with "nation." The United States is called the "melting-pot of nations," that is, of different peoples or ethnic groups.) (Chs. 10, 11).

II. The History of the Patriarchs (chs. 12-50)

1. The Abraham-Isaac Story (chs. 12-26)

2. The Jacob-Esau Stories (chs. 27-36)

3. The Story of Joseph and His Brothers (chs. 37-50)

Perhaps the best method of outlining the content of Genesis is that which is suggested by the use of the word *toledoth*. This word, meaning "generations," occurs as a kind of key to the ten sections of the book, as follows:

Introduction: The Creation Narrative (chs. 1:1-2:3)

I. The Generations of the Heavens and the Earth
(chs. 2:4-4:26)

II. The Generations of Adam (chs. 5:1-6:8)

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

- III. The Generations of Noah (chs. 6:9—9:29)
- IV. The Generations of the Sons of Noah (chs. 10:1—11:9)
- V. The Generations of Shem (chs. 11:10-26)
- VI. The Generations of Terah (chs. 11:27—25:11)
- VII. The Generations of Ishmael (ch. 25:12-18)
- VIII. The Generations of Isaac (chs. 25:19—35:29)
- IX. The Generations of Esau (ch. 36)
- X. The Generations of Jacob (chs. 37:2—50:26)

The plan of sectioning Genesis that we have chosen to use in this text, it will be noted, follows the general pattern of the successive beginnings described in the book, beginning with the Hebrew Cosmogony, the Beginning of all beginnings (1:1—2:3).

VII. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

The problem of the authorship of the Pentateuch, as projected by modern Biblical criticism, is too complex to be presented here in its various ramifications. Hence, a statement of the critical theory, in its broad outlines, will have to suffice for present purposes.

The Pentateuch as it has come down to us in the Hebrew Scriptures (as the Torah) is generally accepted as a unity in its general content. But—how was this unity effected? The traditional view, held by the Jewish Synagogue, by the New Testament writers, by the Christian Church throughout the centuries, and by practically all commentators, both Jewish and Christian, was that the Pentateuch basically was the work of a single writer, namely, Moses, the great Lawgiver and Mediator of the Old Covenant. This view was never seriously questioned until the rise of modern Biblical criticism in the eighteenth century, according to which the Pentateuch is the work either of a single editor (redactor), or more probably the work of a succession or “school” of redactors.

GENESIS

Perhaps it should be explained here that this modern Biblical criticism takes two general forms: (1) the *Lower Criticism*, which is defined as the highly specialized branch of "scientific" investigation of the authenticity of the text, including examination of root words, idioms, possible anachronisms, etc., to determine how closely the original text has been preserved; and (2) the *Higher Criticism*, which has to do with the authorship and dates of composition of the various books, and their historical reliability, especially as correlated with the cultural background indicated by each. Essentially the Lower Criticism is textual criticism, the Higher Criticism the combined literary and historical criticism, of the canonical books as such.

The four steps in the so-called historical method (of this Biblical criticism) have been well stated as follows: 1. The grammatical analysis of the document: the effort to arrive at what it says, including the study of distinctions between transliteration (transfer of letters) and translation (transfer of meaning); 2. The effort to determine to what extent the existing document reproduces the original; 3. The effort to determine whether the original document is a true record; and 4. The comparison of the record with other available documents, sacred and profane.

According to the modern critical theory, called the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and the Documentary theory, the Pentateuch (rather, the Hexateuch; the critics added the Book of Joshua to the Torah proper, as necessary, in their opinion, to the completeness of the unity of the whole), was formed from a number of documents ("codes") all originating long after the death of Moses, but containing Mosaic "traditions." (The only part of the entire Pentateuch which the advocates of this theory were willing to accept at first as of Mosaic origin, albeit this grudgingly, was the Decalogue itself.) The various "codes" postulated by the Documentary Theory were designated and dated as follows:

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. The *Yahwist Code* (J), alleged to have been indited in the ninth century B.C., in the Southern Kingdom (Judah), and said to be identified (1) by its use of the Name *Yahweh* for God(or *Jahweh*, rendered *Jehovah* in our earlier English versions), (2) by its felicitous use of the narrative style, (3) by its many human interest stories, (4) by its anthropomorphic pictures of God, and (5) by its special emphasis on God's dealings with His creature, man. Because it is thought to have originated in the Southern Kingdom it is also known as the *Judean Code*.

2. The *Elohistic Code* (E), alleged to have been written down in the eighth century B.C., in the Northern Kingdom (Israel), and said to be characterized especially (1) by its use of the Name *Elohim* for God, (2) by its emphasis on the transcendence (sublimity and majesty) of God as "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity" (Isa. 57:15), (3) by its lack of anthropomorphism, and (4) by its emphasis on the supernatural. Because it is thought to have originated in the Northern Kingdom, it is also known as the *Ephraimitic Code*, after the tribe of Ephraim, the most powerful of the tribes of Israel.

3. JE, said to have been put together by an unknown redactor (or redactors) and to have made its appearance in the seventh century B.C. (It is not claimed, of course, that these writers invented the material; rather, it is held that they put in writing the early ethnic traditions of the Hebrew people handed down orally for the most part, but along with some that had been preserved in writing.)

4. The *Deuteronomic Code* (D), the "book of the law," alleged to have been produced anonymously by a prophetic writer, but "in the spirit of Moses," some time between 715 and 640 B.C. (during the reign of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, or Josiah: there is disagreement on this point), for the purpose of centralizing the worship of Yahweh at one place ("the law of the central sanctuary"), attributed to

GENESIS

Moses by deliberate design to clothe it with the authority of the most revered name in Hebrew history and tradition; and hence to have been discovered—most opportunely—in the rubbish of the Temple, 621 B.C., in the reign of Josiah, as related in 2 Kings, ch. 22. Thus, according to the critical theory, the Book of Deuteronomy can hardly escape the onus of having originated as a kind of “pious fraud.”

5. The *Holiness Code* (H), identified as chs. 17 through 26 of the Book of Leviticus, and said to have been composed by an Exilic writer, to emphasize especially the holiness of God (Lev. 19:2, 20:7, 20:26, 21:8); hence its name. (This Code was first recognized as separate, and so named by Klostermann in 1877.) The critics find a close spiritual kinship between the style and content of H and that of Ezekiel, and hold that both played a large part in the legalistic development of the Jewish religion which culminated in the Priestly Code. We are told that we do not have H in its original form, but only as it has been incorporated into the great Priestly Code.

6. The *Priestly Code* (P), alleged to have been composed by a writer or writers of the priestly class during the Exile (586-536 B.C.). This Code is said to be identified by its emphasis on the ritual practices of the religion of Israel, on their laws of sacrifice, on their religious ceremonies and festivals, and on their long genealogies designed to emphasize the priestly purity of lineage. P is described as marked especially by its austerity of style, as in the narrative of the Creation (Gen. 1:1–2:3). It is said to have been the bulwark of the reign of legalism in ancient Israel.

The Priestly Code is held to have been completed about 500 B.C., and to have been the framework into which the various earlier Documents were fitted, to make complete the venerable “divine library” of the Pentateuch. By one or more redactors, we are told, all previous Codes were woven together, and thus the canon of the Torah became fixed by the time of Ezra. As Barclay summarizes:

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Everything points to the probability that the Law acquired the status of fully accepted Scripture, that it became in a sense the binding word of God for Israel, in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, that is, about 400 B.C.⁸

This conclusion is further established by the following facts: 1. The Samaritan Bible was the Torah or Pentateuch exclusively: the Samaritans never recognized any other ancient writings as Scripture. Hence, they must have received the Torah before the Samaritan Schism which occurred about 432 B.C. (The Samaritans claimed that their Pentateuch dated from 722 B.C., the date of the fall of their capital Samaria to their Assyrian conquerors. This claim, however, is discounted, we are told, by Bible "scholars" generally.) 2. In Neh. 8:3, we read that Ezra read "the book of the law" to the assembled people, and that the reading took from early morning until midday; hence it must have been the complete Torah that was read publicly on this memorable occasion, and not just one or more of the hypothetical Codes. The reading of ancient Semitic languages, we are told by linguistic scholars, took considerable less time than does the reading of English: this fact would allow for the reading of the entire Torah in the time specified. 3. After the time of Ezra, post-Exilic writers referred to the Law with special reverence (cf. Hag. 2:11, Zech. 7:12, Mal. 4:4). 4. The translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek, under the auspices of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (king of Egypt, 285-246 B.C.), known as the Septuagint (designated by the symbol LXX), makes it evident beyond question that by this date the Torah was *par excellence* the sacred book of the Jews. At that time the Pentateuch was Scripture and evidently had been venerated as such for no one knows how long previously.

The grounds on which the critics propose the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch may be summarized as follows:

GENESIS

1. The repeated occurrence of the two different names for God, *Yahweh* and *Elohim*. Cf. with Exo. 6:2 the following: Gen. 4:1, 4:26; 15:2,8; 16:2, 22:14; 24:31,35; 26:25,28, etc. Cf. also Exo. 6:3 with Gen. 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3, 49:25, with reference to the name El Shaddai ("God 'Almighty").

(N.B.—We are listing here Scripture passages, especially those from the Book of Genesis, that are cited by the critics in support of their theories: of course, we cannot cover the whole field of the Pentateuch in this textbook. We shall consider the validity of the critical arguments based on these passages, as we encounter them, one by one, in our study of the text of Genesis.)

2. Alleged discrepancies in accounts of the same event. *E.g.*, (1) The Creation. Cf. Gen. 1:1–2:3 and Gen. 2:4–25. In Gen. 1, the critics tell us, man and woman are said to have been created after the physical world and all the sub-human orders; whereas, in Gen. 2, man is said to have been created first, then the animals, and finally woman. (2) The Flood. Cf. Gen. 6:9–22 (esp. v. 19) with Gen. 7:1–10 (esp. vv. 2,3). In the former passage God is said to have ordered the animals taken into the ark by twos, the male and the female; in the latter, He is said to have ordered all clean beasts to be taken into the ark by sevens, and unclean beasts by two. Furthermore, in Gen. 7:8–9, we read that the animals went into the ark, two and two, "male and female, as God commanded it." The critics see much confusion in these various accounts. (3) Boundaries of the Promised Land. Cf. Gen. 15:18–21 with Num. 34:1–12. (4) Alleged differing accounts of how Beersheba got its name. Gen. 21:31—here the name is traced to a covenant between Abraham and Abimelech. Gen. 26:26–31: here the origin of the name is associated with a covenant between Isaac and Abimelech. (5) Alleged different accounts of how Bethel received its name. Gen. 28:18,19—here the origin of the name is associated with Jacob's vision on his way to

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Paddan-Aram. Gen. 35:15—here the origin of the name is traced to the incident of God's appearance to Jacob on the latter's return from Paddan-Aram.

3. Alleged anachronisms, in relation to the actual date of Moses and his work. (1) Deut. 34. The critics ask: Did Moses write his own obituary? (2) Gen. 36. Here we have a long list of the kings of Edom. In v. 31 we are told that all these reigned before Israel had a king. The critics contend that the royal succession in Edom was thus projected, in this passage, down to the time of King Saul at least, and hence long after the time of Moses. (3) Gen. 14:14. Here we read that Abraham pursued *as far as Dan* the kings who had taken Lot captive. Judges 18:29—here it appears that Dan was given its name long after the time of Moses. (4) Gen. 21-34, 26:14-18, Exo. 13:17. In these and other passages we find repeated references to the Philistines. But the best historical evidence obtained thus far seems to indicate that the Philistines did not enter Palestine (which got its name from *Philistia*) until about 1250 or 1200 B.C., a considerable time after the death of Moses, we are told.

4. Alleged variations in the accounts of specific events. (1) The Abrahamic Covenant. Cf. ch. 15 with chs. 17 and 18 of Genesis. (2) The taking of Sarah. Cf. Gen. 12:10-19 with 20:1 and 26:1-11. (3) The banishment of Hagar: in Gen. 16:9-21, apparently before Ishmael was born; in Gen. 21:9-21, apparently after the birth of Ishmael. (4) The Covenant with Abimelech. Cf. Gen. 21:22-34 with 26:26-33. (5) The story of Esau and his birthright. Cf. Gen. 25:27-33 with 27:1-40.

5. Alleged diversity of language, style, motif, and ideas, characteristic especially of E. and J. The Elohist is said generally to depict the simple and non-artificial mores of primitive times; the Yahwist, on the other hand, to reflect the era of Mosaic law and Levitical institutions. Again, the Elohist is described as writing of God in lofty and majestic terms; the Yahwist, in terms of His Fatherly rapport

GENESIS

with His chosen people. The Yahwist God is fundamentally the Covenant God.

Some of the alleged traces (in Genesis) of a later age which dispose the critics to reject the Mosaic authorship of the book, and of the Pentateuch as a whole, may be listed as follows:

1. The alleged Palestinian standpoint of the writer (Moses, of course, was not permitted to enter the Promised Land himself: cf. Deut. 34:1-8). Cf. Gen. 12:8, 50:11, for example.
2. The occurrences of the phrase, "unto this day." Cf. Gen. 19:37,38; 26:33; 32:32; 35:20; 47:26, etc.
3. Statements alleged to presuppose the occupation of the land. Cf. Gen. 12:6, 13:7, 36:31, 40:15.
4. Instances of the interpretation of ancient names of cities by the introduction of names of later origin. Cf. Gen. 14: 2,8,17; 23:2; 35:19.
5. References to customs alleged to belong only to a later age. Cf. Gen. 4:3,4,14; 7:8, 8:20, 17:26, 24:22,30; 25:22; 37:3,23. (The various Scriptures cited in the foregoing lists, and others of like import, will be dealt with in this text, when they occur in our study of the text of Genesis itself.)

(If the student desires to make a detailed study of this problem of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or of Genesis in particular, he will find what I consider to be the most completely organized and most comprehensive presentation of the subject, pro and con, in the articles, "The Authorship of the Pentateuch" and "Introduction to the Book of Genesis," by Thomas Whitelaw, in the General Introduction to *The Pulpit Commentary: Genesis*. Although this was a relatively early work, it covers all the ramifications of the subject in a thoroughgoing manner. Contemporary students would find themselves greatly benefited by returning to some of the standard works (defending the Mosaic authorship) which appeared in the days when the Documentary Theory was first being exploited.)

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Let us now take a look at the other side of the coin, for the benefit especially of students who, in the "standardized" theological seminary are usually dogmatically "brain-washed" in support of the Documentary Theory, and hence have little or no awareness of the arguments which can validly be marshaled against it.

In the first place, let us examine some of the claims made by the critics in the early days of the exploitation of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory which are now completely exploded. These may be summarized as follows:

1. The claim that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because script was unknown in his day. Archaeology has proved this contention to be completely false. The Amarna Letters discovered in the Nile Valley in 1887; the Nuzi (in Eastern Mesopotamia) and the Mari (from Mari, the ancient Amorite capital on the Middle Euphrates) clay tablets, found recently in Mesopotamia, the North Canaanite literature discovered at Ras Shamra (the ancient Ugarit), all pre-Mosaic in origin, all in cuneiform, prove that script was in common use long before the time of Moses. The evidence is also clear that scribal schools of translators were functioning in very early times. It is now recognized by archaeologists that Egyptian hieroglyphic script had its origin in great antiquity; that in Mesopotamia, the cuneiform writing was equally ancient. As a matter of fact, the cuneiform, we are told, became the medium in which many of the dialects of the Fertile Crescent became stereotyped. W. F. Albright, the distinguished Orientalist, writes: "Cuneiform . . . was employed to write many different languages, mostly non-Semitic, in the course of its long history and wide diffusion." Again, with reference to Hebrew script, Albright states unequivocally: "It is certain that the Hebrew alphabet was written with ink and used for every-day purposes in the 14th and 13th centuries B.C." Albright dates Moses and the Exodus at about 1280 B.C.⁹

GENESIS

2. The claim that the names of the Patriarchs as given us in Genesis, traditionally held to be personal names, most likely were not personal names at all, but tribal names, projected back into antiquity in the form of tribal folklore. As Wellhausen himself wrote:

We attain to no historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but only of the time when the stories about them arose in the Israelite people; this latter age is here unconsciously projected, in its inner and its outward features, into hoary antiquity, and is reflected there like a glorified image.¹⁰

This theory is completely discredited today. In Pfeiffer's explicit statements,

... we can now assert without fear of contradiction that the Biblical patriarchs need not be regarded as demigods or characters from the realm of folk-lore. They appear as real men, living in a real world which is now well-known because of the work of modern archaeology.¹¹

Or, in the words of the distinguished Jewish scholar, Dr. Nelson Glueck of Hebrew Union College:

The archaeological explorer in Bible lands must be aware of the fact that as important as the Bible is for historical information, it is definitely not primarily a chronicle of history, as we understand that term today. It is above all concerned with true religion and only secondarily with illustrative records. Even if the latter had suffered through faulty transmission or embellishments, the purity and primacy of the Bible's innermost message would not thereby be diminished. As a matter of fact, however, it may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted a Biblical reference. Scores of archaeological findings have been made which confirm in clear outline or in exact detail historical statements in the Bible. And, by the same token, proper evaluation of Biblical descrip-

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

tions has often led to amazing discoveries. They form tesserae in the vast mosaic of the Bible's almost incredibly correct historical memory.¹²

In a word, these dedicated fellows with their picks and spades and shovels have just about succeeded in demolishing every claim that was put forward by the destructive critics who flourished before and after the turn of the century. A final testimony here, from the pen of a distinguished contributor to the *Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I, is fitting:

Archaeology has revealed an extraordinary correspondence between the general social and cultural conditions portrayed in Genesis and those exposed by excavations. Discoveries from such sites as Nuzi, Mari, and elsewhere, provide the geographical, cultural, linguistic, and religious background against which the stories of the patriarchs are laid.¹³

Thus it becomes evident that the claim that the cultural background of Genesis reflects the milieu of a much later age, at least Exilic or post-Exilic, does not stand up in the face of the facts. The historicity of the personages and events related in the Book of Origins seems now to be firmly established. To this end Dr. Albright summarizes as follows:

As critical study of the Bible is more and more influenced by the rich new material from the ancient Near East we shall see a steady rise in respect for the historical significance of now neglected or despised passages and details in the Old and New Testaments.¹⁴

In the second place, the attitudes and presuppositions of the critics who formulated the Documentary Theory, are matters of prime importance. These may be stated as follows:

1. The critics were, without exception, men who rejected even the possibility of the miraculous, the superhuman, or the supernatural, and hence proceeded to rewrite Biblical history to make it conform to their presuppositions. This

GENESIS

bias, of course, prevented their examination of the contents of the Pentateuchal books simply as they found them and as we still have them in our day. 2. The Bible presents itself to us as the record of God's progressive revelation to man, communicated by the Spirit of God. (Cf. 2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 1 Thess. 2:13, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, etc.) The critic who proposes to treat the Bible as he would treat "any other book" must first dispose of this claim of special inspiration which the Bible makes for itself; this the destructive critics do simply by ignoring it. As far as they are concerned, it could be said of them as the disciples whom Paul, on occasion, found at Ephesus said of themselves, namely, that they did not so much as know that there is a Holy Spirit (Acts 19:1-7). This could hardly be said to be an intellectually honest attitude. 3. These critics exemplify the Teutonic mentality which seems always to have been afflicted with two blind spots especially, namely, (1) the inability to see the forest for the trees, that is, the predilection to search microscopically for discrepancies and hence to find them where they do not occur, but arbitrarily ignoring any likelihood of harmonies; and (2) the unwillingness to accept any literary product as new, but always persisting in the search for "sources," even where sources were not to be found.

4. In their approach to their task, these critics have depended on minute analytical examination of internal characteristics of ancient literary productions. This has resulted in confusion confounded, even among the critics themselves. This type of critical study has led to the most absurd claims, pretensions, disagreements, and controversies, even over the most trivial matters. This is true not only of their critical studies of the Old and New Testament books, but equally so of their treatment of the Homeric epics, of the dialogues of Plato, of the texts of Aristotle, indeed of every ancient document that might be found to lend itself to this hair-splitting type of subjective analysis. Take, for exam-

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

ple, the critical theories of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* of Homer. Wolf dubbed the *Iliad* a conglomeration of fragments; Lachmann proposed the theory of nineteen different "lays" as constituting the framework of the poem; G. Herman advanced what is called the "kernel" theory, a poetic core supplemented and completed by redactors. (How could we get along without these "redactors"?) Christ assigned two-third of our *Iliad*, Bergk two-fifths of it, Leaf about one-sixth of it, to the original Homer. Kirchhoff, Wilamowitz, Seeck, Sittl, Doerpfeld, et al, are responsible for as many conflicting views of the structure of the *Odyssey*.¹⁵ Similarly, one might compare the theories of the Platonic canon as put forward by such German critics as Tenneman, Schleiermacher, Ast, Socher, K. F. Hermann, Munk, Teuchmueller, Ueberweg, et al, to find little more than a "labyrinth of disagreement." The amazing fact about it all is that many of these theories were accepted, at least for a time, in spite of the fact that the critics seldom if ever agreed among themselves. Practically all ancient writings have been made the butts of this irresponsible methodology.

5. The methodology of the critics who formulated the Documentary Theory was simply that of the application of the notion of *evolutionary* development to Biblical history and religion. To them, Biblical religion, indeed any and all religion, was not a Divine communication (revelation) of any kind, but simply a human invention. The "reconstruction" made by the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school was based on the Hegelian (theoretical) norm of the historical process, as a kind of spiral evolution consisting of a sequence of theses, antitheses, and syntheses, respectively (it will be recalled that Marx made this Hegelian norm the basis of his theory of economic change). In applying this Hegelian norm to the Pentateuchal subject-matter, the critics postulated a threefold development as pre-prophetic, prophetic, and legal, in the order named. To

GENESIS

this they added the general "evolutionary" theory of man's invention of religion, by describing the process as proceeding from the polytheistic (animistic), to the henotheistic (characterized by the sovereignty of a single god over the entire pantheon; as Zeus in Greece, Jupiter in Rome, etc.), to the monotheistic (the sovereignty of one God). This developmental theory was extended later by the positivistic school to include the alleged ultimate "evolution" of monotheism into pantheism (the identification of God with nature or with a Force operating in nature) or into a self-styled "scientific humanism," which Comte designated "the religion of humanity" (whatever that phrase might mean). This notion of a "religion" without any real God (objective Deity) was fully elaborated by the late John Dewey in his little book, *A Common Faith*. Here Dewey rejects the conception of God as "some kind of Being having prior and therefore non-ideal existence" (obviously, this circumlocution, "non-ideal," could designate only existence as Other than man, that is, Dewey's "God" exists only in man's imagination); he states explicitly that the term "God" for him denoted "the unity of all ideal ends arousing us to desire and actions,"¹⁶ a kind of insipid, colorless phrase, one that surely could never generate any great measure of zeal in man. (Comte was convinced that his "religion of humanity" would ultimately become the one and only "universal religion," once the intelligentsia—rather than the meek—should inherit the earth.)

Thus it will be seen that the Documentary Theory was simply another of the many determined attempts, so prevalent at the turn of the century, to apply the evolution yardstick to all aspects of human knowledge and activity. As such, writes a currently eminent scholar, "the documents of the Hexateuch . . . must now be considered as mainly editions, employing far older material," and to this he adds, and the evolutionary scheme, supposedly derived from them, is now known to be far too simple. For example,

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

ancient religion by the time of the Patriarchs was far advanced beyond an animistic stage, though survivals of animism are common throughout the Bible. In fact, archaeology through its demonstration of the antiquity of "high gods" reveals that the whole question of a simple animism is open to some suspicion.¹⁷

(This author insists, of course, that the over-all framework of the Hexateuch as hypothesized by the Graf-Wellhausen theory ("reconstruction") is still generally valid.)

In the third place, we must consider briefly the theory of "literary fabrication," an integral part of the whole Documentary Hypothesis. According to this theory, in ancient times literary works produced rather late chronologically were often projected in content back into antiquity, in order to vest them with the necessary authority of a venerable name, to secure their acceptance by the people, all this for religious ends, of course (such as centralization of worship, restoration of the authority of a priestly caste, etc.). The notable example of this practice, as alleged in the Documentary Theory, is the Book of Deuteronomy. If this theory of Deuteronomy is true, the book must be regarded, in its origin at least, as a "pious fraud." Albright makes the following comments:

The principle of the authority of the written word is not really new, since it has long been recognized as obtaining in most periods and regions where the art of writing has been sufficiently practiced. However, biblical scholars have been misled by the analogy of Graeco-Roman antiquity into exaggerating the possibility of "pious fraud" in the fabrication of written records and documents beyond all analogy. Nearly every book and passage of the Old Testament has been stigmatized as a literary forgery by at least one scholar. Now it cannot be emphasized too strongly that there is hardly any evidence at all in the ancient Near East for documentary or literary fabrications.¹⁸

GENESIS

It is difficult to understand how this theory of "literary fabrication" could be seriously entertained by anyone who has any respect for piety and right. Unfortunately, however, intellectual honesty is often not valued too highly in some academic circles.

Let us now consider what the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch does not necessarily exclude, as follows:

1. It does not necessarily exclude the use of both oral tradition and written sources by the great Lawgiver. As Whitelaw has written:

That the author of the Book of Origins should have availed himself of pre-existing materials in the composition of his great historical work seems no more an unreasonable suggestion than that the four evangelists should have drawn upon already circulating memoirs of our Lord's life and work in the construction of their respective Gospels. Nor does any sober critic or intelligent student of the Bible now believe that such a supposition is fatal to the claims either of the Pentateuch and the Gospels to be received as canonical Scriptures or of their writers to be regarded as inspired teachers.¹⁹

We must remember that Moses was nurtured in the faith of his people even from his mother's breast (Exo. 2:7-10) and was also instructed, we are told, "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7:22). Hence, in the composition of the Pentateuch he may well have used long-existing oral traditions and written sources as well. It is well-known to-day that the content of many ancient religious books was transmitted orally from generation to generation. Oral communication was highly regarded in ancient times; as a matter of fact, Plato repeatedly emphasized the superiority of the oral to the written word.²⁰ Albright comments: "As has often been emphasized by scholars, writing was used in antiquity largely as an aid or guide to memory, not as a substitute for it."²¹ There can be little doubt that oral

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

traditions were extant among the Hebrews in the period of their beginnings (the Patriarchal Age), probably going back into the far reaches of Semitic history, and that these were available to Moses when the time came for him to assume his momentous task of building a nation.

The same is true with reference to written sources. It is likely that Moses had access to records which had been carefully preserved from earliest times. An educated Egyptian of the Exodus period surely would have been familiar with both the cuneiform of Mesopotamia and the hieroglyphs of Egypt. References to such source materials are found in the Bible itself. *E.g.*, in Num. 21:14-15, we find a quotation specifically said to have been taken from the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah." In Josh. 10:13 and in 2 Sam. 1:18, we find rather extensive quotations from what was called the "Book of Jashar," evidently a book of songs celebrating the glory of ancient Israel. Scholars are inclined to view the "Song of Lamech" (Gen. 4:23-24) as the first poem to have been incorporated in Scripture, after having been passed down from generation to generation, until inserted by Moses, under the guidance of the Spirit, into the Book of Genesis. Pfeiffer suggests that the Hebrew *toledoth*, used so frequently, "reflects the existence of genealogical tables or other materials which were in due time incorporated into Genesis."²²

2. Nor does the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch necessarily preclude explanatory names, words, and phrases ("interpolations") inserted by later writers. Again quoting Pfeiffer:

The recognition of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch does not deny the possibility, or even probability of later editorial revision. Place names may be modernized in order to make them intelligible to a later generation. Joshua, the "minister" and successor of Moses, may have written the account of Moses' death recorded in the last chapter of Deuteronomy.

GENESIS

The Jewish tradition of the part Ezra played in the preservation of Scripture may reflect a final editing after the return from Babylon.²³

The fact is that no human leader in all history ever took such a disorganized rabble as that which crossed the Red Sea, and left it, as did this reputedly meek man Moses, a nation that is still, after more than three millenia, a nation, a people separate, in all countries in which they flourish today. Such a man was surely the most eminently qualified person of his own time to give us the greatest book of his time, that which we know as the Torah or the Pentateuch.

I have no specific theory of inspiration to offer here, except to insist that the Divine inbreathing (revelation) in any age must have reference essentially to the truth that is communicated rather than to the *modus operandi* of the communication. We are all familiar, of course, with the power of suggestion by which thought may be communicated by one person to another, under hypnosis. Obviously, if the spirit of one human being can thus communicate thought (in words, to be sure) to the spirit of another human being, who can gainsay the possibility that the Spirit of God can communicate Divine thought (truth) to the spirit of man in the same manner? (Cf. Matt. 16:16-17, Acts 2:1-4, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, etc.). Inspiration must have reference especially to the authenticity and reliability of the end-product, the totality of truth embodied in any canonical book as it contributes to the Divine unfolding and human understanding of God's Eternal Purpose and Plan for the redemption of fallen man. (Eph. 1:3-14, 2:11-22, 3:1-12; Rom. 8:18-30; 1 Cor. 15:35-58, etc.).

The fact of the matter is that the Documentary Theory is a conglomeration of conjectures without benefit whatever of *external* evidence to support them. Indeed a fundamental weakness of the Theory is the fact that it is constructed generally on alleged *internal* "evidences." Not one of the critics ever manifested having the foggiest notion as

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

to *who* the various authors and redactors of the different hypothetical Codes could have been, or as to *when* and *where*, with any degree of preciseness, the "authoring" and "redacting" was done. Moreover, the scholars who currently persist in clinging to the general framework of the Theory have modified it to such an extent that much of the groundwork on which it was based originally has been pulled out from under it, leaving it only a shell of what it was formerly.

Another important problem, in any careful evaluation of the Critical Theory, a problem which simply cannot be disregarded, is this: Why is the name of Jerusalem, the city of David, not to be found in all the Pentateuch (except possibly in the mention of Melchizedek as "king of Salem" in Gen. 14:18)? Is it conceivable that a succession of writers and redactors could have produced the Torah, after the time of David, without so much as a reference to their beloved city? Is it conceivable that they could have produced the books of the Torah at a late date, without mentioning Jerusalem, short of a deliberate conspiracy, entered into beforehand, to avoid the mention of the name? On this view, it is difficult, if not actually impossible, to explain how such a conspiracy of silence could have been deliberately formed and executed by a succession of writers and redactors, extending at least through several generations, most of whom surely were unknown to one another. Under such a theory, therefore, the fact of the unity of the Pentateuchal content becomes utterly amazing!

The following paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Merrill Unger constitute a kind of summary which is too meaningful to be overlooked:

The basic mistake of the critical theory on the subject of the determining principle of the formation of the Old Testament canon is the false pre-supposition that the Ancient Oracles were not written with the avowed purpose of being held sacred and divinely

GENESIS

authoritative and obligatory from the start, but that in the course of centuries came to be treated with a veneration which was not at first granted them.

In some cases, it is true, it may have taken time for inspired writings to have been received and recognized as authoritative. But to postulate extended time periods, running into centuries, is totally unnecessary historically, and at variance with the internal evidence and tacit claims of the Scriptures themselves.²⁴

Finally, therefore, in this connection, we shall consider briefly what the Scriptures themselves have to say about the authorship of the Pentateuch. Note the following passages:

1. *From the Pentateuch itself.* Exo. 17:14, 24:4—Moses engages in writing in a book, literally, in *the* (already existing?) book. Exo. 24:7—Moses reads “the book of the covenant” in the hearing of the people. (The core of the Old Covenant was the Decalogue (Exo. 19:5, Deut. 5:1-21). Hence, we see no real reason for assuming that the titles, “book of the covenant” and “book of the law,” referred to separate books. Perhaps the designation, “book of the law,” was simply a more comprehensive term, designating the Torah as a whole, and hence came into more common use as the writing of the Torah was, little by little, brought to completeness by Moses, and then continued by his successor, Joshua. The Old Covenant, as every Bible student knows, was first made with the Patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), and under Moses, at Sinai, it was amplified into a national covenant). Num. 33:1,2—Moses is writing the story of the journeyings of his people. Deut. 31:9,24,26—Moses completes “the writing of the words of this law in a book,” and this book he orders to be placed, by the Levitical priests, beside the ark of the covenant, that it might serve as a witness against them (the priests) as representatives of the nation; in the Holy of Holies this book was thus protected by the awesome majesty of God’s

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

own presence. Note other references to the "book of the law" in Deut. 28:61, 29:21, 30:10. Note that the affirmations, "Jehovah spake unto Moses," "God said unto Moses," etc., occur repeatedly in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, and especially in Leviticus. Note also Deut. 17:18—here it is enjoined upon the people by Moses (who is expressly called a prophet in Scripture: Deut. 18:15, 34:10; Acts 3:22-26, 7:37-40; John 1:21,25) that when they shall have taken possession of the Land of Promise and established a monarchy, each successive king "shall write him a copy of this law in a book," and shall "read therein all the days of his life." This seems to have been a feature of the coronation ceremonies (cf. 2 Ki. 11:12, Exo. 25:16, 2 Chron. 23:11). This surely indicates that several copies of the "book" in question were in existence, probably in the care of the priesthood exclusively, not long after the establishment of the monarchy, and probably long before that time (*i.e.*, in the time of Joshua and the Judges: the so-called "Judges" were in fact theocratic dictators).

2. *From the rest of the Old Testament books.* (1) Josh. 1:7,8—here Yahweh is represented as enjoining upon Joshua, Moses' successor, unceasing meditation on, and obedience to, all the provisions of "the book of the law," that is, "all the law which Moses, my servant, commanded thee." Josh. 24:26—here we read that Joshua added his own writing to the "book of the law." (2) Note other references to "the book of the law of Moses" (Josh. 8:31, 2 Ki. 14:6; Judg. 3:4, Neh. 8:8, Mal. 4:4), to "the book of Moses" (2 Chron. 25:4, 35:12; Ezra 6:18, Neh. 13:1), to "the book of the covenant" (Exo. 24:7, 2 Ki. 23:2, 23:21; 2 Chron. 34:30), etc. (3) We find also that as Joshua continued the writing (chronicles) after the death of Moses, so Samuel is said to have carried it on after the time of Joshua (1 Sam. 10:25). Moreover, Samuel was the founder of the "school" of the prophets which arose in such centers as Ramah, Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, Naioth, and probably other places

GENESIS

(1 Sam. 3:20, 7:3, 7:15-17, 8:4, 9:9, 10:9-13, 19:18-24, 19:20-23, etc.). These centers of prophetic training continued to flourish throughout the entire period of the monarchy; in all likelihood, among those "schooled" at these places were Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, and many of the later prophets. We can readily see how the historical, prophetic, and classical books of the Old Testament canon came into existence. After the prophets, in the time of the Captivity and later, there arose a group of scholars specifically trained for studying and interpreting the ancient Hebrew manuscripts: these men were known as *scribes*.

(4) In 2 Sam., ch. 6, and 1 Chron., chs. 13 and 15, we find the story of David's bringing the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem. After being kept there throughout the rest of David's life, in a tent-like sanctuary, the ark was finally installed by Solomon in the Holy of Holies of the newly built Temple. We read that, at that time, there "was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb" (1 Ki. 8:9). What, then, had become of the "book" which Moses had turned over to Joshua, to be placed beside the ark of the covenant to be preserved and cherished by the priests, when Joshua had taken over the leadership of the children of Israel? This ancient book could have been lost in those chaotic centuries of the Conquest and the period of the Judges, and later in the early years of the monarchy when the ark was being bandied about, captured by the Philistines, then recaptured by the Israelites, before being hauled on a "new cart" (2 Sam. 6:3) to Jerusalem. But even if the original Mosaic document had been lost, certainly copies of it were extant. In the great reformation instituted by Hezekiah (who ruled about 715-687 B.C.), we are told that the king "clave to Jehovah" and "kept his commandments, which Jehovah commanded Moses" (2 Ki. 18:6,12; cf. 2 Chron. 30:16). After Hezekiah, however, there was another relapse into gross paganism.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

(5) At this point the most significant event of this period of decline occurred as described in 2 Kings, ch. 22, namely, the discovery of "the book of the law" in the rubbish of the Temple ("the house of Jehovah") by Hilkiah the priest. What book was this—a book which made such a profound impression on Josiah the king, and through him, on the people? As the story goes, Hilkiah took this book to Shaphan the scribe, who recognized it as the book of the law; the two, Hilkiah and Shaphan, then took the book to Josiah the king, and read it to him; "and when the king heard the words of the book of the law, he rent his clothes" (v. 11). But King Josiah wanted to be sure about the identity of this book and so he sent Hilkiah and Shaphan and others of his court, to show the book to Huldah, the prophetess; and Huldah immediately accepted it as the book of the law. A great reformation ensued, as had occurred previously under Hezekiah. The finding of this book caused consternation throughout all Judah; the king commanded a national fast in sackcloth and ashes, after reading to the assembled people "the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of Jehovah" (2 Ki. 23:2). (Note the use interchangeably of the two designations, "book of the law" and "book of the covenant.") What was this book? Was it really the Deuteronomic Code? If the book was a "pious fraud," as the critics have assumed, certainly all these leaders of the nation were either privy to it, or were "taken in" by the deception. *Or—was this book which Hilkiah found in the rubbish of the Temple the ancient writing, the Torah (or a very early copy of it) which had been turned over to Joshua by Moses himself, the original book of the law in the great Lawgiver's own hand?* If so, no wonder the book brought about such an upheaval in the form of a nation-wide spiritual reformation: it was the voice of Yahweh speaking out of the hoary past!

(6) There seems to be no question, even among the critics, that the "book of the law of Moses" which Ezra

GENESIS

read to the people, in the restoration of the Theocracy after the return from the Captivity, was the Torah substantially as we have it today. (Cf. Ezra 6:18, 7:6; Neh. 8:1-8, 9:3, 13:1.)

3. *From the books of the New Testament canon.* Note the following passages especially: Matt. 8:4; cf. Lev. 13:49, 14:2ff. Matt. 19:7,8; Mark 10:1-4; cf. Deut. 24:1-4. Mark 7:10; cf. Exo. 20:12, Deut. 5:16, Exo. 21:17, Lev. 20:9. Mark 7:10; cf. Exo. 3:6. Mark 12:26; Luke 2:22, John 1:17, 5:45-47, 7:19, 7:23; Acts 13:39, 15:5, 28:23; 2 Cor. 3:15; Gal. 3:10; Heb. 10:28, etc. Note also the passages listed below, referring to "the law and the prophets," "Moses and the prophets," "the book of Moses," etc. At this point, we may summarize with a well-known passage from the Talmud, as follows: "Moses received the book of the law from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua; Joshua delivered it to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue, from whom it passed to the heads of the families of the scribes." This is the testimony of what is perhaps the highest Jewish authority.

VIII. THE DETERMINATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON

1. *The Prophets.* We have already noted that The Law (Torah) was venerated as the oldest and most sacred of the Hebrew Scriptures, that The Prophets were next, and The Writings last, in ecclesiastical and popular esteem. We now ask, When did the complete collection known as The Prophets become canonized? And when did the collection known as The Writings become canonized?

The Great Synagogue is said to have been an assembly of outstanding Jewish leaders (scribes, priests, prophets) whom Ezra the Scribe selected to assist him in the restoration of the Theocracy. Ezra himself was the head. Hence Jewish tradition has persisted in the claim that Ezra and his collaborators collected all the Jewish sacred writings,

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

edited and revised and transcribed them, and thus established the Old Testament canon as we now have it, that is, as it came to exist as the Hebrew Scriptures, consisting of The Law, The Prophets, and The Writings.

Let us now consider passages from the teaching of Christ and His Spirit-guided Apostles which throw light on this question.

(1) Note the following references to "the law and the prophets, "Moses and the prophets," "the book of Moses," "the book of the prophets," etc.: Matt. 5:17, 7:12, 11:13, 22:40; Luke 16:16, 16:29-31; Luke 24:27; Mark 12:26; Acts 7:42, 24:14, 28:23; Rom. 3:21. (2) Note Acts 13:15—here we have a description of the synagogue service in New Testament times (cf. Acts 15:21).

(3) Luke 16:16—The Law and The Prophets were in existence until John (the Baptizer); but beginning with John the Gospel of the Kingdom (the Reign of Messiah) was proclaimed (as in preparation, "at hand," Matt. 3:2, throughout the personal ministry of Jesus; and as fact beginning with Pentecost and the establishment of the Church, Acts 1:1-8, Acts 2). Luke 24:27—beginning from Moses and from all The Prophets, Jesus expounded the Scriptures to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus. Acts 13:15—it was The Law and The Prophets that was customarily read in the worship of the Synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia. Acts 15:21—"from generations of old" it was the custom in every Synagogue to read from Moses on the Sabbath day. Luke 4:17-21: It was by reading from the prophet Isaiah in the Synagogue at Nazareth that Jesus announced the beginning of His ministry. From these Scriptures it seems obvious that The Law and The Prophets was the designation for the Hebrew Scriptures at the beginning of the Christian era.

(4) Note the evidence that the Old Testament prophets had committed their messages to writing before the old (Mosaic) Dispensation had come to an end. Isa. 8:16—

GENESIS

"Bind thou up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." Ezekiel (38:17) quotes words which God had spoken by the prophets of old. As noted heretofore, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are classed as prophetic books, largely, it would seem because they give us the story of the earlier prophets, namely, Nathan, Samuel, Ahijah, Elijah, Elisha, etc. Each of the writers whom we know specifically as the Hebrew prophets, beginning with Isaiah and ending with Malachi, has put his own imprimatur on his writing by some such introductory phrase or statement as the following: "the vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos" (Isa. 1:1), "the word of Jehovah came unto me" (Jer. 1:4), "the word of Jehovah came expressly to Ezekiel" (Ezek. 1:3), "thus saith Jehovah" (Amos 1:3), "the vision of Obadiah: thus saith the Lord Jehovah" (Obad. 1:1), or the formula most commonly used. "the word of Jehovah came unto Jonah" (Jon. 1:1), etc. These men all belonged to the age of revelation which ended with Malachi, only to be resumed at the proper time by the last of the great prophetic line, John the Baptizer. Incidentally the references in the apostolic writings to the prophetic books of the Old Testament are too numerous to mention here. We can surely affirm, from all the evidence produced here, that the New Testament designation for the sacred books of the Hebrew people was The Law and the Prophets. This does not necessarily mean, however, that there were no other sacred books extant.

2. *The Writings*. What evidence have we as to the time of the canonization of The Writings as sacred Scripture?

(1) Let us start with Luke 24:44—"written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms" (concerning Messiah): This would seem to indicate that the Psalms (the nucleus of The Writings) were considered as separate from The Prophets, at the time of Jesus' incarnate ministry. (The Psalms are quoted repeatedly in the New Testament as Holy Scriptures: cf. Matt. 4:6, 21:6, 22:44; Mark 12:10,

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

36; Luke 20:17,42; John 2:17, 10:34, 15:25, 19:24, 19:36-37; Acts 1:20, 2:25-28, 2:34-35, 4:11, 4:25-26, 13:2, 13:35; Rom. 3:4, 3:10-18, 4:7, 10:18, 15:3,11; 1 Cor. 3:20, 15:27; 2 Cor. 5:12, 9:9; Eph. 4:8,26; Heb. 1:5,7,8,10,13; 2:6,12; 3:7,15; 4:3,5,7; 5:5,6; 7:17,21; 10:5-7, 13:6; 1 Pet. 3:10-12.) (2) Note also references to the Book of Daniel in Matt. 24:15 and in Mark 13:14 (cf. Dan. 9:27, 11:31, 12:11, also 1 Maccabees 1:54, 6:7.) Note also the numerous reflections of the language of Daniel in the book of Revelation; according to Goodspeed there are no less than sixty-six of these.²⁵ Obviously, Daniel is a prophetic book. Yet there is no evidence that it was ever included in The Prophets; rather, it was included in The Writings. (3) In the Apocryphal book of 2 Maccabees, ch. 2, v. 13, we read that Nehemiah founded a library, "gathering together the books about the kings and prophets, and the things of David," etc. In this context, the phrase, "the things of David," must have had reference to the Davidic writings (the Psalms). This would indicate that the Psalms were extant at the time of Nehemiah, as far back as the middle of the fourth century B.C.

(4) In this connection, the Apocryphal book of *Ecclesiasticus* provides some significant information. In the Prologue to this interesting book, the grandson of one Jesus ben Sirach tells of his coming into Egypt "in the eight and thirtieth year of Euergetes the king" (132 B.C.) and finding a copy of the book (*Ecclesiasticus*) which was written by his grandfather, which he proceeded to translate into Greek. In the Prologue, the translator speaks of "the many and great things" which had been delivered unto the Jews "by the law and the prophets, and by the others that had followed in their steps." He states that his grandfather had been much given to "the reading of the law, and the prophets, and the other books of our fathers," and comments on the difficulty of translating "the law itself, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books," into other languages. In

GENESIS

chs. 44-50 of the book, by the grandfather, Jesus ben Sirach, the author gives us the roll of the famous men of Israel, one of the most eloquent passages in religious literature. He lists the heroes of the faith, not only those of the five books of Moses (The Law), but also those of the historical-prophetic books (The Prophets), and lists them in the order in which they appear in the divisions named. In ch. 49, there is an obvious reference to the book of the "twelve prophets" (v. 10). He concludes the list with the name of Simon the high priest, son of Onias, who, he tells us, in his (Simon's) lifetime, repaired the house and strengthened the temple. Throughout this entire chapter 50, he eulogizes Simon. Now this Simon lived about 200 B.C. This means that Jesus ben Sirach lived about 180 B.C., and was already familiar with The Law and The Prophets. What, then, did the translator, the grandson, mean by "the rest of the books"? He does not tell us what these books were, nor does he mention the term, The Writings. However, it is clear, from this evidence, that by the second century B.C., there was extant, in addition to The Law and The Prophets, a growing body of writings that was being regarded as canonical, as an integral part of the sacred literature of the Jews.

(5) We shall now call up another witness, Josephus, the Jewish historian, who lived about A.D. 37-100. In one of his works, Josephus states that the Jews had only 22 sacred books. He arrives at this figure by reckoning Judges and Ruth as one book, and Jeremiah and Lamentations as one book. He elaborates by stating that there were the five books of Moses, the thirteen books of The Prophets (among which he included Daniel, Job, Chronicles, Ezra-Neemiah, and Esther); "the remaining four books," he adds, "contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life." He then goes on to say:

... how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation, is evident by what we do; for during

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

so many ages as have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them.²⁶

Certainly this indicates that by the time of Josephus the books included in The Writings were regarded as fixed because the total number of books in the entire Hebrew canon was so regarded.

When, therefore, was the list of The Writings permanently determined? Crushed by the tragic siege and destruction of their holy City and Temple and by the Dispersion of the whole nation, and no doubt disturbed by the rapid spread of Christianity, an authoritative Council of Jewish rabbis and scholars was called at Jamnia, A.D. 90, in Palestine (near Jaffa and not far from the Great Sea), for the purpose of establishing the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures as an act necessary to the preservation of their faith. At this Council, we are told, the question was discussed whether the *Song of Songs* or *Ecclesiastes* "defiled the hands." What did this phrase mean? It meant just this: A genuine book of Scripture was regarded as so holy that when a man touched it, his hands were sanctified and were not to be used for ordinary purposes until they had been washed or "de-sanctified," just as by touching a corpse the hands became regarded as so unholy and defiled that washing (ceremonial cleansing) was necessary. (A modern analogy of this, from the viewpoint of science, rather than that of magic or superstition, is the germ theory.) All this means, then, that this question with respect to the two books named was still undecided, as late as A.D. 90. However, it must also be understood, as one writer puts it so clearly that

GENESIS

the Councils of Jamnia (A.D. 90, 118) composed of Jewish scholars, did not settle on the canon; rather, they discussed the problem of leaving certain books in the canon that were already there. Public opinion had determined the books in the Old Testament before the scholars met to discuss them. Book after book found acceptance by the people as they sifted them out from the mass of material available, on the basis of how the books agreed with God's past revelation and met the needs of the human soul. Thus God guided the formation of the canon as surely as He inspired the writers of its books.²⁷

It seems to this writer that it may be taken as established that the entire canon of the Hebrew Scriptures had been established even before the beginning of the Christian era.

VI. THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE APOCRYPHA

The oldest version of the Old Testament extant is the Septuagint (LXX), more than two thousand manuscripts of which have been catalogued from the second to the sixteenth centuries. This, according to the Letter of Aristeas of Cyprus to his brother, Philocrates (a third century B.C. document) was the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek by some seventy-two Jewish scholars who were brought from Palestine to Alexandria specifically for that task, by Ptolemy II Philadelphus (who reigned 285-246 B.C.). This translation was begun in Ptolemy's reign; however, the exact date of the completion of the work is not well established. However, the LXX does contain all the books of the Old Testament which we have today, and was itself included in the *Hexapla*, the monumental work of Origen, who lived about A.D. 185-251. There is no evidence that the Apocryphal books were ever included in the Hebrew Scriptures, although they did make their way into the Septuagint which became literally the Old Testament of the early Christian Church.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The fourteen Apocryphal books are generally regarded as non-canonical for the simple reason that they contribute nothing to the unfolding of the divine Plan of Redemption or to the demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus. These books are usually classed as historical (I Esdras, I Maccabees, II Maccabees), didactic (Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus), prophetic (Baruch, II Esdras), "religious romance" (Tobit, Judith) or "legendary" (Prayer of Manasses, The Remainder of Esther, Song of the Three Holy Children, History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon). For the most part these books reflect the thought and life of the Jewish people characteristic of the interim between the Testaments, that is, in the period from Malachi to John the Baptizer. Though never included in the original Hebrew Scriptures, the Apocryphal books became associated, by Greek-speaking Jews in Egypt, with the translated Old Testament books, and hence came to be included in the Greek Old Testament (used by the early Christian Church), the so-called Septuagint.

The Vulgate of Jerome, the monk of Bethlehem, was a translation into Latin of the original Hebrew Scriptures, completed about A.D. 405. Jerome did not accept the Apocryphal books as canonical; he did, however, translate *Judith* and *Tobit*. The other twelve were added to the Vulgate later, and hence through the influence of the LXX, were included in the Douai Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, and in many of the early Protestant Bibles. They have been omitted from all recent non-Catholic revisions and versions.

(For the student who wishes to examine in some detail the history of the Septuagint, the following works are recommended: The *Cambridge Septuagint* text, edited by H. B. Swete, 3 vols., 1887-1894, Cambridge University Press; *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, by H. B. Swete, revised edition by Ottley, Cambridge, 1914; M. Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, Harpers, New York,

GENESIS

1951; and especially *The Septuagint Bible*, "Foreword" and "Introduction," Charles Thomson translation, published by the Falcon's Wing Press, Indian Hills, Colorado, 1954. Thomson, an eminent Greek Scholar, was Secretary to the Continental Congress, 1774-1789.)

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART ONE

1. What is the origin of the word *Bible*?
2. In what sense is the Bible a library of books?
3. In what sense is the Bible a library of related books?
4. In what sense is the Bible a collection of selected books?
5. By what criterion are the books of the Bible accepted as canonical?
6. Explain the terms: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha.
7. In what sense is the Bible the Book of the Spirit?
8. In what sense is the Bible *one* book?
9. Name the three Dispensations of God's redemptive Plan, and state the extent of each.
10. In what book do we find the history of the Patriarchal Dispensation?
11. In what sense is the Bible pre-eminently the Book of Life?
12. In what sense is the Bible the world's Manual of Civilization?
13. State what the Bible is not designed to be, in God's purpose.
14. We find the history of what particular genealogical Line in the Bible?
15. What in particular were the Hebrew people "elected" to do in the unfolding of God's Eternal Purpose?
16. In what sense is the Bible *not* a book of philosophy?
17. What is the over-all theme of the Bible?
18. How many books in the Old Testament? In the New Testament? In the whole Bible?

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

19. Classify and name the books of the Old Testament in our English Bible.
20. Classify and name the books of the New Testament in our English Bible.
21. What are the three general divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures?
22. Name the books of The Law, as given in the Hebrew Scriptures.
23. Name the books of The Prophets, as given in the Hebrew Scriptures.
24. Name the books of The Writings, as given in the Hebrew Scriptures.
25. What does the word *genesis* mean?
26. Cite the passages in Genesis that prove the book to be Christ-centered.
27. What is the preferred method of sectioning Genesis? On the basis of what Hebrew word are the sections best determined? What does the word mean?
28. Explain what is meant by the Lower Criticism. By the Higher Criticism.
29. What is the Pentateuch? What does the word mean?
30. State briefly the so-called Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch.
31. On what specific claims is the Documentary Theory based?
32. What specific arguments that were offered to support the Documentary Theory in its early days are now disproved by archaeology?
33. With what presuppositions did the advocates of the Documentary Theory approach their analysis of the Pentateuch?
34. What, generally, does the phrase, "destructive criticism" mean?
35. In what way have the modern Biblical critics made use of the "evolution" norm?

GENESIS

36. What is meant by the phrase, "literary fabrication"?
37. In what sense is the Documentary Theory of the origin of Deuteronomy to be regarded as a "pious fraud"?
38. What has Dr. Albright said about this device of "literary fabrication"?
39. State what the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch does not necessarily exclude.
40. How account for the absence of the name of Jerusalem from the Pentateuch?
41. What, according to Dr. Unger, is the basic fallacy in the Documentary Theory?
42. What evidence concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch is provided by the Pentateuch itself?
43. What evidence concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch is provided by the rest of the Old Testament?
44. What evidence concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch is provided by the New Testament books?
45. What evidence do we have about the determination of the canon of The Prophets?
46. What evidence do we have about the determination of the canon of The Writings?
47. What important evidence concerning the canon of The Writings do we get from the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus?
48. What evidence is contributed by Josephus about this problem?
49. What is the Septuagint? What evidence does it provide about the determination of the Old Testament canon?
50. Why are the books of the Apocrypha generally regarded as non-canonical?
51. How did the Apocrypha come to be included in the Septuagint?
52. What is the Vulgate? When, where, by whom, and from what sources was it produced?
53. What was the Council of Jamnia? When was it held, and for what purpose?

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

54. What did this Council do with respect to the Old Testament canon?

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- 1) Marcus Dods, *The Expositor's Bible: Genesis*, pp. 1,2. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1895.
- 2) A. Campbell, *Christian System*, p. 15. John S. Burns and Sons, 1835.
- 3) See *Greek-English Lexicon*, Liddell and Scott, s.v. New Edition, revised by Sir H. S. Jones, Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1948.
- 4) J. R. Dummelow, *Commentary on the Holy Bible*, Introduction, p. 24. Macmillan, New York.
- 5) Julian Morgenstern, *The Book of Genesis: A Jewish Interpretation*. Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, 1927.
- 6) *Adam to Daniel*, edited by Gaalyahu Cornfeld, p. 2. Macmillan, New York, 1961.
- 7) G. Campbell Morgan, *Analyzed Bible: Genesis*.
- 8) William Barclay, *The Making of the Bible*, p. 22. Abingdon, New York, 1961.
- 9) W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Second Edition, Doubleday Anchor Book, 1957, pp. 35, 253, 254, 256. Originally published by Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1940.
- 10) Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, English translation, pp. 318-319.
- 11) Chas. F. Pfeiffer, *The Patriarchal Age*, p. 14. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1961.
- 12) Nelson Glueck, *Rivers in the Desert*, p. 31. Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, New York, 1959.
- 13) James Muilenburg, "The History of the Religion of Israel," *Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I, *Genesis*, p. 296. See also Millar Burrows, *What Mean These Stones?* American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1941.
- 14) Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

GENESIS

- 15) See Wilmer Cave Wright, *A Short History of Greek Literature*, Ch. II. American Book Company, Cincinnati, 1907, 1935.
- 16) John Dewey, *A Common Faith*, p. 42. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1934.
- 17) G. Ernest Wright, art., "Biblical Archaeology," in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by V. Ferm, p. 74. Philosophical Library, New York, 1945.
- 18) W. F. Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
- 19) Whitelaw, "Introduction to the Book of Genesis," p. 84. *Pulpit Commentary, Genesis*.
- 20) See Plato, *Phaedrus*, especially.
- 21) Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
- 22) Pfeiffer, *The Book of Genesis*. pp. 6,7. Baker, Grand Rapids, 1963.
- 23) Pfeiffer, *ibid.*, p. 7.
- 24) Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*, Second Edition, pp. 65-66. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1956.
- 25) Edgar J. Goodspeed, *How Came the Bible?* p. 43. Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York and Nashville, 1940.
- 26) Josephus, *Against Apion*, I, 8. The Works of Josephus, Vol. IV, translated by Wm. Whiston, Brainard Publishing Co., Boston and New York.
- 27) Clyde T. Francisco, *Introducing the Old Testament*, p. 12. Broadman Press, Nashville, 1950.

PART TWO:

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

The word "interpretation" has become a much abused word in our day, to the extent, one may say rightly, that human speculative theology has introduced confusion into man's understanding of the Bible. As a matter of fact, the Simplicities of the Christian faith—the terms of admission into the New Covenant, the essentials of Christian worship, the excellences of Christian character and life, need no interpretation (but need only to be exemplified in the lives of the saints): these matters are made so clear in the New Testament that "wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein" (Isa. 35:8). Still and all, the word "interpretation" is legitimate, and the process itself is equally so, provided the correct norms are followed. Moreover, the correct norms or principles are too obvious to be questioned by anyone except an utterly biased person.

Note, therefore, the following important matters, by way of introduction:

1. What interpretation does *not* mean. C. A. Sillars, writing in *The Christian* some time ago, stated this side of the case in simple terms, as follows:

Let's begin by saying what interpret does not mean. It *does not* mean to change the original truth. It does not mean to add or subtract. It does not mean that any man or group has the right to alter the truth of God as revealed in the Bible. It does not mean that a man may obey the Biblical injunctions he likes and disobey the ones he finds hard to accept.¹

There could hardly be any statement of the case any clearer than this.

2. Correct interpretation, in any case, must have its basis in correct translation, from the original Hebrew (Old Testament) and Greek (New Testament) texts. If the translation is erroneous, the interpretation is bound to be so. Unfortunately, untold confusion has been introduced into Christian faith and practice by the substitution in the early

GENESIS

centuries of our era of *transliteration* for *translation*, confusion which probably will never be cleared away because of the rigidity with which denominational clergy and people cling to their respective traditions. (*Transliteration* is the transfer of the letters, *translation*, the transfer of meaning, from one language to another.) Take, for example, the Greek word *presbyteros* (transliterated *presbyter* in ecclesiastical Latin, but translated *senior*, as it should be, in the Latin of the Vulgate). (The Romans were notorious for taking over the Greek words, letter by letter, into the Latin.) Now *presbyteros* in Greek, classical or Koine, never did mean anything but "elder" or an "elderly" man: it should be so translated wherever it occurs in the New Testament. However, in Tim. 4:14, we read of "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery"; translated, however, it reads "the laying on of the hands of the eldership." This is the only passage in which the word *presbytery* occurs in the English New Testament, and it is a *transliteration*, not a translation: where *presbyteros* occurs in other New Testament passages, it is translated "elder" as it should be. Another example is our word "bishop," which derives from the Greek *episcopos*, from *episcopeo*, "look out over," "oversee," "exercise oversight," etc. The Greek word means literally an *overseer*, supervisor, that is, in the sense of jurisdictional authority, the authority of governance, and hence is also rendered *ruler* in some passages (cf. Rom. 12:8; 1 Tim. 3:5, 5:17; Heb. 12:7,17; 1 Pet. 5:1-5, etc.). Now the word "bishop," like "presbyter," is a transliteration, and not a translation, from *episcopos* in the New Testament Greek, to *episcopus* in ecclesiastical Latin, to *ebiscopus* in vulgar Latin, to Old English *bisceop*, finally to the modern English *bishop*. Translated, the word wherever it occurs in the New Testament would be rendered "overseer," for this is precisely what it means.² Incidentally, the term "pastor" or "shepherd" comes from the Greek *poimén*, and the verb form *poimaino* means, "I shepherd"

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

(the spiritual flock). In Acts 20:17-35, the three words, "elder," "overseer," and "tender" or "pastor" of the flock (vv. 28, 29) occur explicitly or implicitly as designations for the same kind of ministry: in churches of the apostolic age, a local congregation had as many pastors as it had elders or overseers (cf. Eph. 4:11-12). Had churchmen followed the apostolic injunction to hold the pattern of sound teaching (2 Tim. 1:13, 2:2, 3:16-17), Christendom would not be cluttered up, as it is today, with hierarchical systems and self-constituted prelates who have succeeded only in keeping alive sectarian speculative creeds and unscriptural practices. These were the gentlemen who divided Christendom: how, then, can we logically expect their kind to bring about reunion?

Another notorious example of the substitution of transliteration for translation—one which has kept the Christian world in confusion for centuries, and is still doing so—is that of the Greek verb *baptizo*. In the Greek, classical or New Testament, this word never did mean anything but "dip," "plunge," "immerse," or figuratively, "overwhelm" (as in reference to Holy Spirit baptism: Acts 1:5, 2:1-4, 10:44-48, 11:15-18, 15:7-11), and is never rightly translated anything else. In the original it never did mean "sprinkle" (the Greek word for this act is *rhantizo*) or "pour" (the Greek word for which was *cheo*). Certainly it never had any such innocuous meaning as "to administer baptism"—to attach such import to the word is to take it out of its original setting altogether. It signified one, and only one, action, namely, a *dipping*. Unfortunately for us, the Greek *baptizo* (like the words *presbyteros* and *episcopos* cited above) was never translated into Latin; had it been translated, it would have been rendered *mergo* or *immergeo*. But instead of translating the word, the Latin Fathers, including Jerome in the Vulgate, simply transliterated it as a first conjugation Latin verb, *baptizo* (-are, -avi, -atus), whence it was again transliterated into English

GENESIS

(Anglicized) as "baptize." Had the verb been translated, as it is in Alexander Campbell's version of the New Testament, *Living Oracles*, it would read "immerse" (or, in a few instances, "overwhelm") in our current English versions.

Not so long ago, I purchased a book entitled, *The Authentic New Testament*, a translation by the eminent Jewish scholar and linguist, Hugh J. Schonfield. (In the Introduction to this book, we are told that Dr. Schonfield spent some thirty years working on this, his own modern version of the original Greek text.) On perusing this work, lo and behold! I discovered, to my amazement, that the Greek *baptizo* is rendered throughout by the word "immerse," that is to say, it is actually translated. The following, for example, is Schonfield's translation of Matt. 3:1-6, 13:17,—

At this period John the Baptist made his appearance, proclaiming in the wilderness of Judea, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand!" . . . Then Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the vicinity of Jordan flocked to him, and were immersed by him in the river Jordan as they confessed their sins . . . Then Jesus arrived at the Jordan from Galilee to be immersed by John. But John stopped him and said, "I need to be immersed by you, yet you come to me?" Jesus replied, "Never mind that. It is of more consequence that one should do one's whole duty." So John let him have his way . . . After his immersion Jesus at once rose up from the water, and lo, the skies were parted, and he saw the Spirit of God descend like a dove alighting on him, while a voice from the skies declared, "This is my dear Son with whom I am well satisfied."³

(It will be noted that for some strange reason this author did not translate the epithet, *Baptistes*, which is applied to John. Campbell, however, did translate it as it should be, "John the Immerser.") Note also Schonfield's translation of the first few verses of the sixth chapter of Romans:

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

What are we to say then? Are we to continue in sin that mercy may be magnified? God forbid! We who have died so far as sin is concerned, how can we still live in it? Can you be ignorant that those who have become associated with Christ by immersion, have become associated by it with his death? Through this association with him by immersion we are thus united with him in burial, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by means of the Father's glory, we too should conduct ourselves in newness of life. For if we have become identified with the manner of his death, surely we should be with his resurrection also . . .³

The foregoing are glaring examples of the obfuscation of New Testament teaching by the substitution of transliteration for translation: the obfuscation becomes doubly apparent when the passages as transliterated are compared with what they would be if correctly translated.

3. As stated above, human theological jargon has caused untold confusion in the interpretation of New Testament teaching, confusion — and accompanying apostasy — from which in all likelihood Christendom will never recover. This compounding of confusion, in flagrant disregard of the apostolic injunction to "hold the pattern of sound words" (2 Tim. 1:13), that is, to call Bible things by Bible names (cf. 2 Tim. 2:2, also 1 Cor. 2:13—"combining spiritual things with spiritual," that is, interpreting spiritual truths in spiritual or Spirit-inspired language), came about in two ways, generally speaking: (1) through the use of Greek metaphysical terms to "explain" Biblical doctrine, and (2) through the projection of the concepts and practices of the ancient pagan mystery "religions" into institutionalized Christianity. Speculative churchmen initiated these apostatizing trends as early as the second century, and by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they had so distorted New Testament teaching, that the church of the apostolic age was hardly recognizable in the creeds and

GENESIS

rituals of the medieval hierarchies.

Under the first-named of these categories of corruption, we have fallen heir to such terms—not one of which is to be found in the New Testament—as “homousianism,” “homoiousianism,” “heterousianism,” “soteriology,” “ecclesiology,” “eschatology,” “transubstantiation,” “consubstantiation,” “substance,” “accident,” “form” as distinguished from “spirit,” “ecumenicity,” “historic episcopacy,” “apostolic succession,” “unconditional election and reprobation,” “total depravity,” “original sin,” “eucharist,” “premillennialism,” “postmillennialism,” “existentialism,” “confrontation,” “kerygma,” “demythologizing,” “open membership,” “closed membership,” “open communion,” “closed communion,” etc., etc. One of the latest and most intriguing of these innovations is the phrase, “the substantive thing done.” Dr. C. C. Morrison, for example, uses this phrase to try to explain—but actually to explain away—the Scriptural design of the ordinance of Christian baptism: immersion, he tells us, is not “the substantive thing done” in this particular ordinance.⁴ Where in Scripture do we find such a phrase as this? What theologian coined it in the first place? Whoever it was, he should be given a prize for hitting a new “high” of absurdity in theological lingo. Baptism, in New Testament teaching, is simply an act of faith on man’s part, an act in which human faith and Divine Grace hold solemn tryst; the act in which the penitent believer testifies, in this visible act of obedience, to the facts of the Gospel, namely, the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ (Rom. 6:1-9, 6:17; 1 Cor. 15:1-5; Col. 2:12). Hence anything short of a visible burial and resurrection, in and from water as the element, vitiates the ordinance completely.

Under the second of the categories named above, that of the projection of the superstitious beliefs and rites characteristic of the ancient pagan mystery “religions,” into the Christian faith, we have fallen heir to the esoteric practices

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

("ecstatic" and "orgiastic") associated with "sacramentalism," "sacerdotalism," "shamanism," dogmas of "miraculous conversion" and "second blessing," "trances" and other emotional extravagances of so-called "holiness" cults. (The tendency seems always to have been prevalent in human-kind to regard "heartfelt religion" as something too mysterious to be understood, rather than as something to be done, to be put into practice in everyday living, as the Bible clearly teaches: *e.g.*, Matt. 7:20-21, 24-27; Matt. 25:31-46; Gal. 5:16-25). Thus sheer primitive magic was taken over by churchmen in the early Christian centuries, only to result in the prostitution of New Testament Christianity. Today, in many sects and cults professing to be "Christian," we have only the carry-over and the embodiment of pagan superstitions in Christian vestments. These various apostasies from the apostolic teaching as found in the New Testament continue to produce untold confusion in Biblical interpretation.

4. Interpretation, in the true sense of the term, is the business of bringing to light the meaning of Scripture, in whatever text or texts may require such "explanation." The technical name for the "science" of interpretation is *Hermeneutics*, from Hermes, the messenger of the gods, and the interpreter of the will of Zeus. Correct interpretation is simply allowing the Bible to "explain" itself by the correlation of all passages bearing on a given subject. One may want to know, for example, what the Bible has to say about *faith*; he should, therefore, using his Concordance as a guide, study all the passages in which the word "faith," or its equivalent, occurs; by this method he will understand, from the viewpoint of Scripture, what faith is, how it is obtained, and how it manifests itself. In the same way one may acquire a correct understanding of what the Bible teaches about other subjects, such as repentance, confession, baptism, the spiritual life, judgment, heaven, hell, immortality, etc. And let me say here, most emphatically,

GENESIS

that *the Bible itself is far more intelligible than the massive tomes which theologians have written about the Bible and its great themes.*

We are now ready to suggest the following general rules or principles of correct interpretation, as follows:

1. *The A B C's of correct interpretation* of any Scripture passage are four in number, best stated, perhaps, in question form thus: (1) *Who is speaking or writing?* There are many instances in the Bible in which persons speak, that is, men or women; there are some in which the devil (or devils) do the speaking; there are some, as in the Epistles, in which the author is addressing his words to a specific group of Christians or to Christians generally; and there are innumerable passages in which God is represented as speaking, two or three times directly from Heaven, but usually through chosen human instrumentalities. (2) *To whom are the words of the given text directed?* For instance, a grievous fallacy occurs when one overlooks the fact that all the New Testament Epistles are addressed only to those who have already become Christians, members of the Body of Christ. It is the design of the Book of Acts to tell alien sinners what to do to be saved, and that of the Epistles is to tell Christians what to do to keep saved, "to grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3:18). (3) *Under what Dispensation were the words spoken or written?* Failure to distinguish between Dispensations—Patriarchal, Jewish, Christian—often results in egregious errors of interpretation. For instance, we frequently hear the question, "Why can't we be saved like the thief on the Cross?" The answer is obvious: Because Jesus lived and died under the Mosaic Law, in the Jewish Dispensation, and by the shedding of His blood on the Cross, He abrogated the Old Covenant and at the same time ratified the New (John 1:17; Eph. 2:13-18; Col. 2:13-15; Heb. 9:11-28, 10:10-14, etc.). Now as long as a man is still living he has the right to dispense his property per-

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

sonally, as he sees fit; however, after his death, his property must be allocated according to the terms of his will. So it was with our Lord. While He was on earth, in His incarnate ministry, He had, and frequently exercised, the right of extending the forgiveness of sin to whomsoever He saw fit, as in the case of the penitent thief (Luke 23:43; cf. Matt. 9:1-8; Mark 2:1-12; Luke 5:17-26, 7:47-50). But after His resurrection and return to the Father's right hand of sovereignty, He left His Last Will and Testament, which was probated on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2) by the properly appointed executors, His Spirit-guided Apostles (John 16:7-15, 20:21-23; Luke 24:45-49; Matt. 28:16-20; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4, 2:22-42, etc.), according to the provisions of which—faith in Christ, repentance toward Christ, confession of Christ, and baptism into Christ (Acts 2:38, 2 Cor. 7:10, Luke 13:3, Matt. 10:32-33, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 10:9-10)—forgiveness, remission, justification, etc., are granted to all obedient believers. The simple fact of the matter is that Jesus is not on earth today to forgive sins in person. (4) Finally, under this heading, *Under what circumstances were the words written or spoken?* This has much to do with the meaning of any Scripture passage. For a concrete example, take Paul's well-known injunction, 1 Cor. 14:34-35, "Let the women keep silence in the churches . . . for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." Note the word *aischron* which the Apostle uses here, which means a "shameful," "disgraceful," "indecent" thing to do. What he was writing in this case was literally true when the words were written: it really was a disgraceful thing for a woman to speak out in the Christian assembly or in any kind of assembly for that matter. We must remember that women were not held in very high esteem in those days, especially in pagan circles. The Apostle does not say that this was a *sin* (*hamartia*); rather, it was a disgraceful thing in the fact that it brought upon the church the criticism of the pagan community, Wives of pagans

GENESIS

would not think of creating the disturbances which women in the Corinthian congregation were causing by spontaneously bursting out into song, prophecy, "tongues," etc.: they were turning the worshiping assembly into a kind of bedlam (cf. vv. 27-31). In the eyes of the pagan community this was "shameful," "disgraceful," etc. Obviously, if the same attitude toward women prevailed in our time, the same injunction would apply. However, women are held in such high regard today that for a woman to speak decorously in the Christian assembly, or to teach as a ministerial function, is considered entirely proper. The Apostle Paul has been belabored repeatedly as a "woman hater": but this notion is completely negated by his language in Gal. 3:28—"There can be neither Jew nor Greek . . . neither bond nor free . . . no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." I am reminded here of a certain preacher who, when a young woman came forward to make the Good Confession, actually escorted her outside the church building for the purpose of doing this, lest the Pauline injunction that women should keep silent in the church, be violated. Of course, this was an exception, yet it proves just how literalistic some fanatics can be in their misapplication of Scripture passages. Always the question arises in the interpretation of any text, Under what circumstances were the words elicited, and do the same conditions apply today? (Note that the daughters of Philip the Evangelist were prophetesses: see Acts 6:1-6, 21:8-9.) The solution of the problem of woman's activity in the Christian assembly belongs to the category of *custom*, and customs, as we surely know, do change, as do the attitudes on which the customs are based. Hence, in the category of custom we must put also the matter of proper attire in the worshiping assembly: the sole apostolic injunction is that immodesty and ostentation (in attire, hair-do, wearing of jewelry, ornaments, etc.) must be avoided (1 Tim. 2:9-10; 1. Pet. 3:1-6; cf. Luke 20:46-47; Matt. 6:2,5,16; Matt.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

23:5-7; Acts 5:1-11). (Note the Apostle's use of *aischron*, again as "disgraceful," "indecent," etc., in 1 Cor. 11:6, and as "not proper" in Tit. 1:11, as "shameful" in Eph. 5:12.) With respect to the veiling (covering) or not veiling the head in the *ekklesia*, the Apostle again advises adherence to established custom: in the contemporary popular view, he tells us, for a woman to wear long hair was a mark of "glory" (femininity), but for a man to do so was a mark of effeminacy. The principle involved is simply this: that although customs are not matters of Divine legislation, still and all, unnecessary violation of established customs is liable to bring upon the Christian community the criticism of an outside (and unsaved) world, and may become, therefore, an unwarranted extension of a Christian's liberty in Christ Jesus. There are many things which for the Christian may be perfectly lawful, but which under certain conditions are not expedient (as, for example, those which may cause a weak brother to "stumble" or those which may bring the criticism of the pagan community on the church), that is, attitudes and acts which generally are not contributory to the propagation of the Faith. (Cf. Rom. 14:12-23; 1 Cor. 6:12-14, 8:1-13, 10:23-33, 11:2-16.) The Apostle warns, however, that all such matters (of custom) should not be permitted to be carried to the point of contentiousness (1 Cor. 11:16). We might note also in this connection the passages in the New Testament which refer to the "holy kiss" (Rom. 16:16, 2 Cor. 13:12, 1 Thess. 5:26, 1 Pet. 5:14): this was an ancient custom, and one which persists down to our time in many Eastern lands. We of the West, however, shake hands instead of greeting one another with a kiss, "holy" or otherwise. Another Oriental custom which belongs in this category was that of the washing of feet; indeed it was especially important as a feature of the mores of hospitality. According to the custom, the servant would wash the feet of the master or those of the guest when the latter came in from the dusty roads or fields (Luke 7:38;

GENESIS

John 11:2, 12:3): Indeed this was a necessary act in those lands where only sandals were worn. Jesus used this custom for the purpose of teaching His quibbling and prestige-seeking disciples a lesson of humility; He reversed the usual procedure: He, the Master, taking basin and water and towel, washed the feet of each of His disciples, the servants in the case (John 13:1-20). There is no evidence, however, that the Apostles were guided by the Holy Spirit to establish this custom as a Divine ordinance for the Church to maintain (1 Tim. 3:15); as a matter of fact, the custom is not even mentioned in the apostolic Letters. To sum up: In order to correct interpretation of Scripture, one must always keep in mind the distinctions between matters of faith (the facts, commands, and promises of the Gospel: 1 Cor. 15:1-4; Acts 2:38; 2 Cor. 7:10; Luke 13:3; Matt. 10:32-33; Rom. 6:1-11, 10:9-10; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 5:5; 1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19; Rom. 6:23), and matters of speculative "theology" (Deut. 29:29); between matters of faith and matters of custom, and between matters of faith and matters of expediency. Failure to recognize these distinctions is largely responsible for denominationalism, and especially for the sectarian "splinter" groups which have disgraced Christendom from the second century to the present.

2. *The method of dialectic* must be used in the interpretation of certain Scriptures, the method of first studying the given text negatively (determining what it does *not* mean), then moving to the positive conclusion as to what it does mean. Dialectic insists that the rubbish of human opinions and clichés must be cleared away before the light of truth can shine through. (1) For a clear example of this method, let us consider the meaning of the words of John the Baptist, as recorded in Matt. 3:11. Here we find John talking to a mixed audience of Jews who had gathered from "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan" (v. 5). To them John said: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

mightier than I . . . he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire." Now we ask, who could *not* have been included, of those in John's audience, in the scope of this promise of Holy Spirit baptism? Obviously, the unbelieving and the unrepentant could not have been included; it would be sacrilege to say that unbelieving and unrepentant persons ever received the *overwhelming* (baptismal) measure of the Spirit's gifts and powers. Who, then, did receive this baptismal endowment? To find the answer to this question we must read on into the Book of Acts especially. There we find, in the first place, that the Apostles, all Jews, received Holy Spirit baptism on the Day of Pentecost (Luke 24:45-49; John 14:16-17, 14:26, 15:26-27, 16:7-14, 20:22-23; Acts 1:1-5, 2:1-4): this outpouring of the Spirit in baptismal measure was to qualify them with the authority and infallibility to execute properly the Lord's Last Will and Testament (Acts 10:37-43). Again, the overwhelming measure of the Spirit's powers was also bestowed on the first Gentiles to be received into the New Covenant, Cornelius and his household at Caesarea (Acts 10:44-48); in this instance, the Divine purpose was to break down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile and to signify to the Church and to the world that both were to receive forgiveness, remission, justification, redemption, etc., on precisely the same terms (Acts 11:15-18, 15:6-12). Hence Paul could write, 1 Cor. 12:13, "In one Spirit were we all baptized [*overwhelmed, immersed, incorporated*] into one body, *whether Jews or Greeks*"; that is, the distinction between Jew and Gentile no longer existed in the Mind and Will of God. *But who among those present to whom John was preaching were to receive the baptism of fire?* All one needs to do, to know what John meant here by "fire," is to read Matt. 3:12: the verse clearly teaches that he meant the use of fire as a form of judgment, the judgment that will overtake the disobedient at the end of our age (2 Thess. 1:7-10); and we know that many who

GENESIS

were in his audiences at the Jordan lived and died in disobedience, and hence will suffer this ultimate judgment (Luke 3:17; Matt. 13:24-40, 25:41; Mark 9:47-48; Luke 16:24; Jude 7, etc.). Hence John's statement was a general one: to put it in simple terms, he was saying: "The baptism I administer is a baptism in water; however, the One who comes after me, Messiah, He will administer Holy Spirit baptism (John 15:26) and the baptism of fire which is to overtake the wicked and neglectful at the Last Assize" (Matt. 25:31-46, Rev. 20:11-15). (2) Another Scripture which requires the use of the dialectic method of interpretation is found in Joel 2:28 and repeated by Peter in Acts 2:17. Here we read that God promised through the prophet Joel, "And it shall be in the last days . . . I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh," Now what does "all flesh" include here? Let us ask, first, what it does *not* include. Certainly it does not include *animal* flesh. Certainly it does not include unbelieving and impenitent flesh (persons), because Jesus is the Author of eternal salvation to one class only: "unto all them that obey him" (Heb. 5:9). Hence, the "all flesh" of Joel's prophecy means what this phrase usually means in prophecy or in promise, namely, "all flesh" in the sense that distinction between Jew and Gentile would no longer exist (Eph. 2:11-22). (3) In this connection, note the Great Commission as given in Matthew 28:18-20, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Baptizing *them*—whom? All the people of all the nations? Of course not: Jesus Himself taught expressly that many will take the broad way that leads only to destruction (Matt. 7:13-14, 25:41-46; Luke 8:4-15). Does "them" include *infants* from among all the nations? Are infants included, as some have argued? Of course not. Infants—the innocent—are not proper subjects of baptism. By His death on the Cross our Lord purchased the redemption of the innocent unconditionally:

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

hence, to such, he tells us, "belongeth the kingdom of God" (Matt. 18:1-6, 19:13-15; Mark 9:36-37, 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17). Baptizing *whom*—then? Obviously, *all who have been made disciples, learners, followers, believers*. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you," etc. Teaching *whom*? All who have been baptized into Christ, all Christians. The Great Commission envisions three activities. making disciples (by preaching, teaching); baptizing those disciples into Christ; and nurturing those Christians in the most holy faith (Jude 3:20; Col. 2:6-7). This Commission "interprets" itself: it is too simple and clear to be misunderstood by any unbiased mind. (4) In Acts 2:1, we have a case in which grammatical construction allows only one meaning. The text reads: "And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place." The question arises: Who are the "they"? What is the antecedent of "they"? If we recall that the original manuscripts of the Bible were not divided into chapters and verses, and that therefore we should read the last verse of chapter 1 and this first verse of chapter 2 without any break, it becomes clear that the "they" of 2:1 has to be the "apostles" of 1:26. To go all the way back to the "one hundred and twenty brethren" of Acts 1:15 for the antecedent of the "they" of Acts 2:1, as some would have it, shows utter disregard for elementary principles of grammatical construction. Besides, the explicit statements of Acts 1:1-8 make it certain that the promise of Holy Spirit baptism was a promise made to the Apostles: this is abundantly confirmed by what follows in Acts 2:1-4.

3. *Proper correlation of a given text with its contexts* is also necessary to correct interpretation. (1) The relation of the given text to its immediate *context* is first to be considered. The business of "scrapping the Scriptures," that is, taking a passage out of its context here, and another out of its context there, and putting them together to prove a point, is a vicious procedure, but one of which clergymen

GENESIS

have often been guilty, in their zeal to support some pet dogma. (The classic example, of course, is the following: Judas "went away and hanged himself," "go, and do thou likewise," Matt. 27:5 and Luke 10:37.) I recall a sermon I heard some years ago which was based on the story of the conversion of the eunuch, as related in the eighth chapter of Acts. The preacher read the story, from the King James Version, down through verse 37, "And he [the eunuch] answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and there he quit reading, closed his Bible, and started preaching. He omitted the entire section which followed verse 37, verses 38-40, in which the eunuch's immersion, and his rejoicing following his immersion, is all clearly set forth. By these omissions, that is, by disregarding an important part of the context (because of his denomination's downgrading of immersion as Christian baptism), he left in the minds of his hearers a completely distorted view of New Testament conversion. I recall here another experience of this kind. On occasion, I dropped in at an evening service at a denominational church in Iowa, intrigued by the preacher's subject as announced on the church bulletin board. Again the subject was: "What Must One Do To Be Saved?" Naturally I was curious about what this particular denominational brand of clergyman would have to say on this subject. To my amazement, he used as the background for his message the Old Testament story of Jacob's wrestling with the heavenly visitant, as related in Gen. 32:22-32, and throughout his sermon he kept urging all sinners present to "take hold of God, hold on, and never let go," until the Spirit should come upon them and save them by a miraculous "call" (ecstasy, vision, trance, heavenly voice, or what not), which should be the evidence of God's pardon. This surely was taking a Bible text (Gen. 32:22-32) out of its context completely—a glaring example of utter distortion of Biblical teaching.

(2) Moreover, any given Scripture must be studied in

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

the light of *the teaching of the Bible as a whole*: only in this way do existing harmonies become manifest. Yet this is the point at which interpretation often goes awry. Take again, for example, the important question, "What must I do to be saved?" as addressed by the Philippian jailor to Paul and Silas (Acts 16:30). The Evangelists replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house" (v. 31). Now, should one stop reading at this point, as did another denominational clergyman in preaching on this subject, at a service which I attended, the question would be answered only partially. Here was a poor superstitious heathen man who was unacquainted with the Gospel message; hence only a general answer could be given, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house." But how could this jailor and the members of his household believe on the Lord Jesus, of whom they knew little or nothing? (cf. Rom. 10:14-17). Hence, we continue to read that Paul and Silas "spake the word of the Lord unto him and all that were in his house." What was the result? The jailor "took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God" (vv. 32-34). (Evidently, speaking the word of the Lord to the unsaved includes telling them what to do to be saved and this in turn includes telling them to be baptized: (Acts 2:37-38, 8:34-36). The point is that one cannot take just one of the cases of conversion recorded in Acts to find the complete answer to the question, What must one do to be saved? To get the complete—and correct—answer, one must examine *all* the cases of conversion, under apostolic preaching, that have been put on record. By putting all of these together one soon finds that all who came into the Church under the preaching of the Apostles and their co-laborers came in precisely the same way and on the same terms

GENESIS

(Acts 2:37-42, 8:1-13, 8:26-40; Acts 9:1-19, 22:1-21, 26:1-23; Acts 10; Acts 16:11-15, 16:16-34, 18:8; Matt. 10:32-33; Rom. 10:9-10, etc.). In short, by examining and putting together the incidents of all the recorded cases of conversion, one has the whole truth and nothing but the truth, namely, that the terms of admission into the New Covenant are four: belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, repentance from sin, confession of Christ, and baptism into Christ (John 20:30-31; Luke 13:3; Rom. 6:1-4; 2 Cor. 7:10; Gal. 3:27, etc.).

Another case in point, illustrating the necessity of correlating any particular passage of Scripture with the content of the Bible as a whole, is the story of Melchizedek, the King-Priest of "Salem," to whom Abraham paid tithes, as related in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. This story has been booted around by critics and "theologians" as an anachronism, a folk tale, a fiction, a "literary fabrication," etc., when, as a matter of fact, it becomes entirely plausible historically and doctrinally, in the light of its defined relation to the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ, the doctrine as set forth in the sixth and seventh chapters of Hebrews. Confusion confounded always occurs when stories of Old Testament incidents are wrested out of their entire Biblical context; that is, treated as totally unrelated to the rest of the Scriptures. As a matter of fact, the Old Testament in many instances becomes fully intelligible only in the light of New Testament teaching, and conversely, Old Testament doctrine becomes essential in many instances to the understanding of what is revealed in the New Testament. Refusal to take the Bible as a whole, as the Spirit-inspired record of God's progressive revelation of His Eternal Purpose and Plan, simply incapacitates anyone for the clear apprehension of this revelation. This incidentally is the self-imposed limitation (a kind of "mental block" or "blind spot") which has blinded Jewish scholarship throughout the ages to the overwhelming mass of

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

evidence given us in both the Old and the New Testaments to support the truth of the Messiahship of Jesus (John 5:40; Matt. 23:37-38; Acts 7:51-53; Rom. 11; Isa. 6:9-10, Acts 28:25-28, etc.).

4. *Proper discernment between the literal and the figurative* (in the form of symbol, emblem, metaphor, parable, allegory, poetic imagery, anthropomorphism, type, etc.) is absolutely essential to the correct interpretation of Scripture. This is a principle or rule which is of primary concern to us in the present textbook because it is the one to which we shall have to resort more frequently than to any other, in getting at the basic truths presented in certain sections of the Book of Genesis. However, a very simple norm will suffice to guide us into the discernment between the literal and the figurative. (A "figure" is perhaps best defined as that which represents something else by a certain resemblance or by several resemblances.) The norm of discernment is this: *If a Scripture text makes good sense taken literally, it should be taken literally, but if it does not make sense taken literally, in all likelihood it is designed to communicate profound truth in the guise of the figurative or metaphorical, that is, a truth which cannot be stated clearly or fully in prosaic (propositional) language.* For example, take some of the well-known sayings of Jesus: "I am the bread of life" (John 6:35), "I am the way" (John 14:6), "I am the door" (John 10:9), "I am the true vine" (John 15:1), etc. Jesus, in these sayings, did not mean that He was a literal loaf of bread, or a literal door to the fold, or a literal road, or a literal vine. On the contrary, He was communicating spiritual truth in metaphorical language: only common sense is needed to recognize this fact. As in His parables, Jesus used this method to convey truth far more comprehensively and with greater depth of meaning than it could have been conveyed in propositional terms. Think of all that is involved, for instance, in thinking of Him as the Door to the Fold, the Kingdom, the Church, etc. Ser-

GENESIS

mons and even books have been written to elaborate the utterly inexhaustible depth of spiritual truth that is compressed into these metaphors and parables. (Recall the fact here also that the Book of Revelation, from beginning to end, is couched in prophetic symbolism: cf. Rev. 1:1, "signified," that is, expressed in symbols. This means that it is not amenable generally to literalistic interpretation.)

One of our pioneer preachers and educators, D. R. Dungan, suggests the following rules for recognizing figurative language in the Bible:

1. The sense of the context will indicate it.
2. When the literal meaning of a word or sentence involves an impossibility.
3. If the literal sense makes a contradiction.
4. When the Scriptures are made to demand that which is wrong.
5. When it is said to be figurative.
6. When the definite is put for the indefinite number.
7. When it is said in mockery.
8. By the use of common sense.⁵

Literalists, writes Dungan

do not stop to consider that God spoke to men in their own language, and by such methods of speech as would render the thoughts of God most easily understood.⁶

While pointing up the fact that undue and unjustified "allegorizing" and "spiritualizing" of Scripture (indulged by such early writers as Philo Judaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen et al, and such modern writers as Emanuel Swedenborg and Mary Baker Eddy) is to be rejected, unjustified literalism, writes Dungan, is equally to be rejected. We all know, of course, that both extremes have been at times carried to the point of sheer absurdity. This writer goes on to say:

We have before seen the evils resulting from the Allegoric method, and yet it is but little, if any, more likely to prevent the right interpretation than the Material or Literal. Either one is a foolish and hurtful extreme.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

Much of the Bible is written in language highly figurative. And not to recognize the fact, and treat the language according to the figures employed, is to fail entirely in the exegesis. This, of course, does not imply that God has said one thing while He means another, but simply that He has spoken in the language of men, and in the style of those to whom the revelations were made. No one reading the Prophecies or the Psalms without recognizing this fact, will be able to arrive at any reliable conclusions whatever as to their meaning.⁷

Undoubtedly the inadequacy of human language for the communication of Divine thought must always have been one of the greatest problems confronting the Spirit of God in His sublime works of inspiration and revelation, and undoubtedly resort had to be taken oftentimes to many figurative devices to achieve this end. Moreover, on the necessary principle, known as the Law of Accommodation, it was necessary that the revelation be communicated to the people of each successive age in which it was delivered, in the language, both literal and figurative, which the people of each successive age could understand. Hence, we should approach our study of Genesis with this understanding, namely, that much that is revealed in the book was communicated early in the historic period, and hence necessarily abounds in the devices indispensable to making this communication intelligible to those who lived at that time. The amazing thing about it is that the subject-matter of the Book of Genesis is of such an adaptable character that even in our modern age, with a developed science and scientific modes of thought and speech, its teaching is astonishingly up-to-date. It is a revelation that seems to be suitable to those living in any and every period of human history. Nor is any wresting of the Scripture text necessary to establish this fact.

We shall now consider some of the more important figurative devices used by the Spirit to facilitate the com-

GENESIS

munication of Divine thought, with special emphasis on those which we shall encounter in the Book of Genesis, as follows:

1. The *Symbol*. "Symbol" is in a sense a generic term which may be used properly for various kinds of "representation." As a matter of fact, man is specified—set apart as a species—primarily by his tendency to think and to live in terms of symbols: indeed all the facets of his culture—language, art, myth, ritual, and even science (especially, in its formulas)—are products of this human predilection. Biblical symbolism embraces analogies of various kinds and is explicit or implicit in practically all kinds of figurative media of Divine revelation. Although *types* belong in the general category of symbols, the symbol, nevertheless, differs from the *type*, in the sense that the former may refer to something in the present *or* in the future, whereas the *type* refers only to what is in the future (its antitype). Dungan classifies symbols as *miraculous* (e.g., the "Cherubim and the flame of a sword" of Gen. 3:24, and probably in some sense the "tree of life" and the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" of Gen. 2:9,17); as *material* (e.g., the "bow in the cloud," Gen. 9:13, the symbol of God's covenant with Noah; circumcision, the symbol of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 17:9-14), which was also the *type* of the cutting off of the body of the guilt of sin under the Gospel Covenant (Rom. 6:1-11, Eph. 2:11, Phil. 3:3, Col. 2:11); and as *visional*, those experienced in a dream, in a vision, or in fantasy (daydreaming), and which are generally *prophetic* (e.g., the almond tree and the seething caldron of Jer. 1:11-14; the smoking oven and the blazing torch of Gen. 15:17; the birthright and the blessing of Gen. 25:27-34 and 27:1-40, symbols of the rights of primogeniture; and the various symbols of Joseph's dream (Gen. 37:5-11), and of the dreams of Pharaoh's chief butler and chief baker (Gen. 40:9-23); and of Pharaoh's own dream (Gen. 41:1-36). There is a great deal of various kinds of

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

symbolism in the Book of Genesis. Milligan writes:

It is obvious that symbols are generally used for the sake of perspicuity; for the sake of presenting more clearly to the understanding the spiritual and abstract qualities of things, by means of outward signs and pictures addressed to the senses. Sometimes, however, they are also used for the sake of energy and ornament; and occasionally they are used, also, for the sake of obscurity. It was for this last purpose that Christ sometimes spoke to the people in parables (Matt. 13:1-17).⁸

Semanticists usually differentiate *signs* and *symbols*: signs, they hold, belong to the realm of *being*, whereas symbols belong to the realm of *meaning*. This differentiation seems to prevail in Scripture: "signs," in New Testament times especially, were actual events, palpable to the senses of spectators, and performed for evidential purposes (cf. John 20:30-31, 11:38-44; Acts 2:22; Heb. 2:2-4; cf. Exo. 4:1-9). Biblical symbols, however, are to be understood in relation to the truth which each may represent; that is, what it stands for in the world of meaning.

2. The *Emblem*. This is properly defined, by Milligan, as merely a material or tangible object of some kind, that is used to represent a moral or spiritual quality or attribute, on account of some well-known analogy between them.⁹

The emblem is closely related to the metaphor. Emblems differ from types, however, in that the latter were preordained and have relation to the future, whereas the former are neither preordained nor related to the future. The beehive, for example, is an emblem of industriousness; the crown, the emblem of royalty; the scepter, the emblem of sovereignty, etc. Noah's dove was the emblem of purity and peace; hence the dove was in some instances, in Scripture, the emblem of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:16, John 1:32). We are justified in asserting that the unleavened

GENESIS

bread and the fruit of the vine, of the Lord's Supper, are emblems respectively of the body and the blood of Christ (Matt. 26:26-29, Mark 14:22-25, Luke 22:17-20, John 6:48-59; 1 Cor. 10:16, 11:23-28; Heb. 9:11-13, 1 Cor. 15:1-4, 1 Pet. 2:21-25). To take these various passages literally, that is, on the presumption that by some kind of priestly blessing the *substance* of the bread and of the wine becomes the actual *substance* of the body and of the blood of Christ, is to vest the Communion with a magical esoteric meaning which surely was not our Lord's intention in authorizing it. He stated specifically that it was to be a *memorial* of His Atonement (death on the Cross) and at the same time a *testimony* to the fact of His Second Coming (1 Cor. 11:23-26).

3. The *Type*. A type, in Scripture, is an impression, a figure, a shadow, of which the very image, or the substance, is something that lies in the future, hence is known as the *antitype* (cf. Heb. 10:1). Both type and antitype are real persons, things, offices, or events. Typology is one of the most fascinating, and most rewarding, and yet most generally neglected, of all branches of hermeneutics. (1) According to Scripture, God elected the fleshly seed of Abraham (the children of Israel) to do certain things in the execution of His Eternal Purpose. Among these divinely ordained tasks were the following: that of preserving in the world the knowledge of the living and true God. (Deut. 5:26, 6:4; Psa. 42:2, Matt. 16:16, Acts 17:24-31, 1 Thess. 1:9, Heb. 10:11); that of demonstrating the inadequacy of the moral law to rescue man from the guilt, practice, and consequences of sin (John 1:17, 3:16-17; Rom. 3:19-28, 7:7, 8:3-4; Gal. 2:15-16, 3:23-29); and that of developing a pictorial outline of the Christian System which would serve to identify the Messiah at His coming and the institutions of Messiah's reign (1 Cor. 10:11, Col. 2:16-17, Rom. 15:4; Heb. 8:4-6, 9:9, 10:1-4, etc.). It is this pictorial outline, consisting of types which point forward to their corre-

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

sponding antitypes, with which we are concerned at this point. (2) There are certain facts, to which we call attention here, with respect to the relation between types and antitypes, as follows: (a) There is always some resemblance between the type and its antitype. (b) This likeness between type and antitype is but partial; therefore care should be exercised not to extend the likenesses beyond the bounds of reason or even beyond those of Scripture authorization. As one of our pioneer educators has written:

To understand well the law of typology, and the types themselves, is a matter of much consequence in Bible exposition, for two good reasons. First, because it enables us correctly to discern and interpret the types in the Old Testament, so rich with instruction as regards the Christian faith and the Kingdom of God; and secondly, because it will save us from the very common vice of professional type-mongers, who create types in the Scriptures out of their own fertile imaginations, where none exist. It is the folly of the old Jewish allegorists and their Christian imitators, who made the Bible a vast wilderness of allegories . . .

This writer goes on to warn us that there is but one correct and safe rule governing this subject, namely,

that types are only to be found where the Scripture has plainly pointed them out. In a book so vast and so varied as the Old Testament we may trace a thousand similitudes which rhetorical liberty allows us freely to use as illustrations; to make these, however, types in the divine intention, would be quite another thing and an altogether unwarranted license.¹⁰

(c) The points of resemblance between type and antitype were divinely preordained: this would needs be the case for the analogy to prove out correctly. For example, it was preordained concerning the paschal lamb that it should be a male, without blemish; that it should be slain between the two evenings, that is, between noon and sunset (Exo.

GENESIS

12:5-11); that not a bone of its body should be broken (Exo. 12:46); so the same Divine wisdom planned the Antitype, Christ our Passover, with these points of resemblance (John 1:29,36; 1 Pet. 1:19; John 19:31-37; 1 Cor. 5:7). (d) Finally, every type is a sort of prophecy. Every lamb slain upon the Patriarchal and Jewish altars pointed forward to the Lamb of God who offered Himself on the Cross for the redemption of mankind (Heb. 9:23-28). The Levitical Priesthood was designed to typify the priesthood of all obedient believers in Christ (1 Pet. 2:9, Rev. 1:6). The Tabernacle (and later the Temple) with its various parts and furnishings typified, with remarkable precision of detail, the structure and ordinances of the Church of Christ; indeed, it might well be said to have typified the entire Christian System (cf. Acts 2:37-42, also Heb., chs. 8 and 9). (3) The design of Biblical typology may be summarized as follows: (a) Undoubtedly God's purpose in giving to His ancient people this system of Old Testament types was that the type should establish the divine origin of the antitype, and, conversely, that the antitype should prove the divine origin of the type. (b) The writer of Hebrews tells us that what Moses did, as a servant in the Old Testament House of God served as testimony confirming the Divine origin and constitution of the New Testament House of God, the Church (Heb. 3:4-6). The types set up by Moses were designed to prove the Divine origin of the entire Christian System. (c) The Jews of old, throughout their history, were engaged in setting up types which they themselves could not understand as such, because these types required Christianity for their fulfilment (exemplification). Hence, we must conclude that they did not set up a system of their own origination or on their own authority, but that it was given to them by Divine authorization and inspiration. (d) As stated heretofore, the books of the Bible were written by many different authors living in practically every age of the world's history from 1500 B.C. to A.D. 100.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

Yet when these various books were assembled into The Book, we have an unbroken *motif* from beginning to end, namely, redemption through the intercessory work of Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God. Hence we have types fulfilled, at times in minutest detail, in their corresponding antitypes, as explained by these different writers who as a rule had no means of communicating with one another personally. Can this positive evidence that the Scriptures were Divinely inspired (communicated to men) in a special way, be successfully refuted? I think not. (e) Preachers seldom if ever discuss the typical and antitypical relationship between the Old and New Testaments. In this respect, they are neglecting one of the grandest themes of Divine revelation, as well as the most positive evidence obtainable to warrant our acceptance of the Bible as the Spirit-inspired Book, and the most forceful means put at their disposal by the Holy Spirit for the edification of the saints and their confirmation in the faith "once for all" delivered unto them (Eph. 4:11-16, 2 Tim. 3:16-17, Jude 3).

(4) *Typology is expressly authenticated by apostolic teaching* (1 Cor. 10:11, Col. 2:16-17, Rom. 15:4; Heb. 3:1-7, 8:4-6, 9:9, 10:1-4, etc.). To repudiate Biblical typology is to flatly contradict apostolic teaching and to belie what is presented to us as the testimony of the Holy Spirit (John 16:7-15, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, 2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:3-12, 1 Thess. 3:13, etc.). The truth of Scripture teaching will never be grasped in any appreciable degree of completeness except by the integration of the content of every book and part within the whole. One who refuses to recognize this general—and obvious—principle of the unity of the whole Bible, thereby shuts himself off from the possibility of any adequate understanding of God's Eternal Plan. Unfortunately, that is what the destructive critics and the majority of the speculative "theologians" do.

(5) We are interested in types because we find them in the Book of Genesis. For example, the Apostle Paul tells

GENESIS

us that Adam "is a figure of him that was to come" (Rom. 5:14, 1 Cor. 15:45). The Apostle Peter tells us that the deliverance of Noah and his family from the world of the ungodly into a cleansed world, through water as the transitional element, was typical of Christian conversion in the sense especially that the water of the Deluge was designed to typify Christian baptism (1 Pet. 3:18-22). Not only do we have significant types, explicitly declared to be types, in Genesis, but we also have many similarities—though not Scripturally designated types—between the lives of Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, respectively, and the incarnate life and ministry of Christ. These will be pointed out as we proceed with our study of the text of Genesis.

4. The *Simile*. This is a direct, strong, vivid comparison. Jer. 4:4—"lest my wrath go forth like fire." Dan. 3:25—"the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods." Luke 7:32—"like unto children that sit in the marketplace," etc. Matt. 23:27—"ye are like unto whited sepulchres." Isa. 53:6—"all we like sheep have gone astray." From beginning to end, the Bible is replete with similes.

5. The *Metaphor*. (1) This device occurs repeatedly in Scripture. It is an indirect comparison, yet one that is more vivid than the simile. It is the use of a word denoting an attribute or characteristic of one thing, to explain, by way of a similitude, a like quality in another thing. It involves a transfer of meaning. It takes a known term and bends it to a richer use by contributing color and liveliness to it. It points up a similarity in objects really dissimilar, and oftentimes it serves to make more vivid the dissimilarities implicit in the analogy. (2) Again quoting Loos:

The metaphor is the most abridged form of the simile or comparison—compressed into a single word. It abounds in all forms of human language, prose as well as poetry. As it is the most effective method of word-painting, it is peculiarly adapted to the purposes of poetry. It gives light, force, and beauty to lan-

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

guage.¹¹

(3) Monser writes:

Plutarch and Quintilian say that the most illustrious metaphors in use are to be classed under four heads. First: To illustrate animate things by animate, as when God is put for a magistrate, or a shepherd for a prince or ruler. Second: To illustrate inanimate things by animate, as when the earth is said to groan. Third: To illustrate animate things by inanimate, as when Christ is called a door or the way. Fourth: To illustrate inanimate things by inanimate, as when religion is called a foundation. 1 Tim. 6:19.¹²

(4) God, for example, is described metaphorically as our "dwelling-place" (Psa. 90:1), "portion" (Psa. 73:26), "shield," "fortress," "rock," "high tower" (Psa. 18:2), "strong tower" (Prov. 18:10), "refuge and strength" (Psa. 46:1), a "husbandman" (John 15:1), "builder" (Heb. 3:4), "potter" (Isa. 64:8), "Judge" (Gen. 18:25, Psa. 58:11). Among Scripture *metaphors of Christ and His mission* are the following: "true witness" (Rev. 3:14), "refiner" (Mal. 3:3), "Advocate" (1 John 2:2), "testator" (Heb. 9:16), "surety" (Heb. 7:22), "Lamb of God" (John 1:29,36), "our Passover" (1 Cor. 5:7), "physician" (Matt. 9:12), "good shepherd" (John 10:14), "son of righteousness" (Mal. 4:2), "fountain" (Zech. 13:1), "bread of life" (John 6:48), "door" (John 10:9), "true vine" (John 15:1), "corner stone" (Matt. 21:42, Acts 4:11, 1 Pet. 2:6-7), "bridegroom" (Matt. 25:6). *Metaphors of the Holy Spirit*: "guide" (John 16:13), "Comforter" (John 14:16), "earnest" (Eph. 1:13), "seal" (Eph. 4:30), "water" (John 7:28-29). *Metaphors of the Word*: "lamp," "light" (Psa. 119:105), "fire" (Jer. 23:29), "hammer" (Jer. 23:29), "sword" (Eph. 6:17), "seed" (Luke 8:11). *Metaphors of the Church*: "city" of God (Matt. 5:14, Heb. 11:16, Rev. 21:2), "temple" of God (suggesting solidarity, stability, Eph. 2:21), "body" of Christ (suggesting fellowship of parts,

GENESIS

Eph. 1:23, 4:4; 1 Cor. 12:12), "household" (family) of God (suggesting a spiritual affinity; cf. the Greek *agape*; cf. Eph. 2:19), "bride" of Christ (suggesting purity, constancy, Eph. 5:22-23, Rev. 21:2,9; Rev. 22:17), "pillar and ground" of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15). *Metaphors of the obedient believer, the saint, the Christian* ("babe" (1 Pet. 2:2), "soldier" (Eph. 6:10-20, 2 Tim. 2:3); "pilgrim" (1 Pet. 2:11), "light" (Matt. 5:14), "salt" (Matt. 5:13), "palm tree" (Psa. 92:12, 1:3), "sheep" (John 10:27), "vessel" (2 Cor. 4:7, 2 Tim. 2:21, Acts 9:15), "steward" (1 Pet. 4:10), "jewels" (Mal. 3:17, A.V., in A.S.V., "possession"). The foregoing are the more important of the many metaphors that are to be found in the Bible. The metaphor is one of the most meaningful of all figures of speech. (5) Metaphors occur in the book of Genesis: ch. 49, in which we find Jacob's death-bed prophetic utterances concerning his sons, has many of them: v. 9—"Judah is a lion's whelp," v. 14—"Issachar is a strong ass," v. 17—"Dan shall be a serpent . . . a horned snake," v. 21—"Naphtali is a hind let loose," v. 27—"Benjamin is a wolf that raveneth," etc. A metaphor is often difficult to explain in prosaic terms, yet, paradoxically, it is rather easy to understand.

7. The *Parable*. A parable is a "likely story," a narrative in which various things and events of the natural world are made to be analogies of, and to inculcate, profound truths of the moral and spiritual realms. Parables occur in the Old Testament: notable examples are to be found in 2 Sam. 12:1-6, in 2 Sam. 14:1-24, in 1 Ki. 20:35-43, etc. We all know, of course, that Jesus is distinguished for His use of the parable as a medium of communicating Divine truth. His parables stand alone in literature for their fusion of simplicity and profundity; human genius has never been able even to begin to duplicate them. (Incidentally, the *fable* is a literary form which differs from the parable, as follows: (1) in the fable, the characters are fictitious (un-real), whereas the actors and events in a parable are taken

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

from real life: (2) the fable is constructed generally by the use of animals, or even plants or flowers or trees, as its characters, endowing them with powers of thought, speech and action. The fable is used, of course, to point up a moral lesson of very high order, but the actors are creatures who are incompetent to do the things that are reported of them. A fair example of a fable is to be found in 2 Kings 14:8-10.)

8. The *Allegory*. (1) This has been properly called a "prolonged metaphor." It is a *sustained* analogy, made up of a variety of particulars, the whole becoming a connected and complete story. The allegory is identifiable also by the fact that "it suppresses all mention of the principal subject, leaving us to infer the writer's intention from the resemblance of the narrative, or of the description, to the principal subject." "The distinction in Scripture between a parable and an allegory is said to be, that a parable is a *supposed* history, and an allegory a figurative application of real facts."¹³ (2) The famous medieval morality plays, of which *Everyman* is perhaps the most noted, were all allegories. Another famed allegory, from the Shakespearean age, was Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Of course, the greatest of all allegories in human literature, from every point of view, is Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. (3) We are interested here especially in the *meaningful allegory of the Covenants*, as intended, the Apostle tells us in the fourth chapter of Galatians, in the story of Hagar, the bondwoman, and Sarah, the freewoman, as related in the Book of Genesis, chs. 16 and 21 especially. We shall look into this very important allegory when we take up the study of these chapters.

9. The *Anthropomorphism*. This word derives from the Greek *anthrôpos*, "man," and *morphé*, "form," and means "in the form of man." Hence, to think anthropomorphically is to think of some other form of being in terms of our own human experience. A correct understanding of the design of anthropomorphisms and of poetic imagery is essential

GENESIS

to the correct interpretation of many of the early chapters of Genesis. These are devices which cause the many "human interest" stories in these chapters to glow with a richness of meaning for us, which, because of the inadequacy of human vocabulary, could never have been achieved through the medium of prosaic ("scientific" or "logical") language. We must never lose sight of the fact that even the Divine Spirit has ever been under the necessity of revealing the Divine will to man in terms which the latter can understand, and that recognition of this Law of Accommodation to the vocabulary of the human recipients, from age to age, will enable us to comprehend more clearly what the content of Genesis has to say to us. Both extreme literalists and extreme "allegorizers" accomplish nothing but to obscure Divine revelation, and, in the long run, to sow the seeds of agnosticism and skepticism, when there is really no reason for doing so.

The old Greek thinker, Xenophanes (6th century B.C.) was the first, as far as we know, to have brought the charge of anthropomorphism against religion, and in so doing he initiated a mode of criticism, unintelligent as it is, which has persisted to this day. Again and again in subsequent history this charge has been made, and effectively countered, and yet it survives, and even today it continues to be bandied about, and urged upon men, as a plea for the adoption of the agnostic attitude toward religion in general. Why this is, it is not difficult to explain; it would seem that, on the part of those who accept the charge, the wish is often father to the thought; that is, the acceptance is inspired by the will *not* to believe, rather than by an intelligent consideration of the matter.

Xenophanes is reported to have said, in substance, that if lions could have pictured a god, they would have pictured him in fashion as a lion, and horses like a horse, and oxen like an ox, etc.,¹⁴ and so man, it is implied with no more justification, inevitably thinks of Deity as a magnified

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

man. The holes in this argument are as big and deep as the sea. The charge becomes not an outright denial of fact, but what is worse—an utter distortion of the whole issue. In the first place, it is too obvious for questioning that lions, horses, oxen, animals in general, simply do not think of Deity at all, and indeed are incapable of doing so. Man alone thinks of God and man alone seeks to apprehend God and His ways. Even the atheist who denies the existence of God must think of God in order to deny His existence; that is, he must have some notion of what the word “God” signifies. In the second place—and this is the point at which the Xenophanean argument becomes utterly illogical, *man simply cannot think of any other form of being except in terms of his own experience*, that is, “in the form of man.” The master, for example, who sees his faithful old dog lying in front of the fireplace apparently dozing, occasionally stretching, yawning, or perhaps groaning or growling, will tell himself that the old dog is dreaming. But how does he know this? How *can* he know it? He cannot know it, for the simple reason that he cannot put himself in the dog’s skin, so to speak. However, common sense tells him that human experience is not to be equated with canine experience. Again, the man who would explain the world in terms of a machine is thinking anthropomorphically; that is, he is trying to explain physical reality in terms of the characteristics *which he sees* in a machine. In terms of logic, all too frequently a “science” mistakes the *a priori* for the *a posteriori*. It is always true of man that he cannot achieve a helpful understanding of any other form of being except in terms of his own experience.

Now there are anthropomorphic passages throughout the Bible, and there are several such passages in the Book of Genesis, as we shall see later. Indeed our Lord has used two terms—and two only—which make God more intelligible (congenial) to man than all the names which have been coined by scientists and philosophers (most of which

GENESIS

are utterly absurd). Jesus tells us that, as to His being, God is a Spirit (John 4:24), that is, in some sense possessing the elements of personality such as man possesses (hence, man is said to have been created in God's image, Gen. 1:26-27). As to His relations with His saints, with the sheep of His pasture (Psa. 100:3), God, said Jesus, is their Heavenly Father; hence, they should address their prayers to Him with the salutation, "Our Father who art in heaven" (Matt. 6:9). Is the term "Father" anthropomorphic? Of course. But this does not obviate the fact of God's existence. This term, "Father," makes God understandable; it makes Him congenial to His people. Not only do they address Him as their Father, but they do so because He is really their spiritual Father, as in a general sense He is the God and Father of all mankind (Heb. 12:9—"the Father of spirits"). All the Freudian gobbledygook about the "father-image" is simply a proof of the obtuseness of agnosticism and skepticism. The God who is not truly Father in His attributes is not a God to be desired at all, except possibly by a certain type of intelligentsia. By his very emphasis on the universality of the "father-image," Freud acknowledged that it is only the meaningfulness of the name "Father" that a really existing God could ever satisfy the religious aspirations of mankind.

There are numerous anthropomorphisms in the Book of Genesis. (Note especially Gen. 3:2-13, 4:9-15, 6:5-7.) These are so simply and realistically presented, and filled with such human interest and appeal, that they serve to point up most vividly the vast difference between the Biblical God and the truly anthropomorphic deities of the old pagan polytheisms. The pagan deities were too numerous to mention: they were characterized by sex distinctions (gods and goddesses); they were pictured in pagan mythologies as guilty of every crime in the category—lust, rape, incest, treachery, torture, deceit, and, indeed, what not? (See Plato's criticism of the tales of the immoralities

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

of the gods, in the *Republic*; see also these actual tales in the Homeric epics; and read especially the *Ion* of Euripides.) Whereas these *many* pagan divinities were, in most cases, *personifications* of natural forces or human attributes, the God of the Bible is not in any sense a personification—He is, rather, pure *personality* (Exo. 3:13-15); and the difference between *personification* and *personality* is, in this case, the difference between the vagaries of the human imagination on the one hand, and the inerrancy of Divine revelation on the other. (Of course, crude anthropomorphic notions of God still exist among the vulgar: we still hear expressions bandied about in the marketplace, such as, for example, “the Man upstairs,” etc. The persistence of such notions can be attributed only to supine ignorance.)

The anthropomorphisms of Genesis give us an understanding of our God which all the speculations of science and philosophy can never give us. Biblical anthropomorphisms, by the very purity of their conceptions, provide for us a profound insight into the “heart” of the God whom we worship, the God and Father who gave His Only Begotten Son for our redemption (John 3:16). Moreover, the Biblical anthropomorphisms serve a purpose which no other figurative device could possibly serve: they make our God *real* to us in a way that no other way of speaking can even approximate.

10. *Poetic Imagery*. At this point we must look at a word, the careless uncritical use of which has caused untold confusion in the area of Biblical interpretation—the word “myth.” This is one of the most ambiguous words in the English language. What does it mean? It has come to mean just about all things to all men, with certitude for none. (1) According to the dictionary definition, the function of a myth is to account for the origin of natural phenomena (including especially the astronomical), of ethnic groups, and of social institutions; hence, myths are usually classi-

GENESIS

fied as cosmogonic, ethnogonic, and sociogonic, respectively. Astronomical (celestial) myths are generally solar, lunar, or meteorological. (2) In common parlance myths are generally looked upon as purely imaginary fabrications, that is, *sheer fictions*. (3) By many persons the myth is regarded as a literary device which embraces practically all forms of symbolism. Under such a view, however, the fact is often overlooked, that a symbol, in order to be a symbol, has to be a symbol of *something*; that is, it must point to a referent that has some measure of real existence. Hence, if a symbol is in some sense a myth, the myth cannot be a sheer fiction.

(4) It is my conviction that the term "myth" is not legitimately usable in the sense of a sheer fiction; that confusion is to be avoided only if the word is used to designate the *personifications* both explicit and implicit in the ancient pagan polytheisms. These certainly were, in every legitimate sense of the term, mythological systems. Much of this pagan mythology, it will be recalled, centered around ideas of the "Sun-father" and the "Earth-mother" (*Terra Mater*). Dr. Yehezkel Kaufmann, in a most interesting book recently published, lists the chief characteristics of the gods of the ancient polytheisms as follows: (a) They are subject, in the last analysis, to a primordial realm or fate, which allocates, both to the gods and to men, their respective "portions" in life. (The Greek word *moira*, "portion," had this exclusive meaning, and is found throughout all Greek literature.) (b) They are personifications of "seminal" forces of this primordial realm in which there are manifold powers or "seeds," such as water, sky, light, darkness, life, death, etc. (They are sometimes personifications of virtues and vices, as Athena, for example, was the goddess of wisdom.) (c) Their genealogy occurs through what men would call natural processes (cf. the *Theogony* of Hesiod, a Greek poet of the 8th century B.C.); hence subject to powers and differences of sex. Pagan mythologies

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

abounded with goddesses as well as gods. (d) They are wholly anthropomorphic, subject to all temptations and passions to which men are subject (only more so *because they are of the divine order* rather than of the human); hence, as stated heretofore, they are guilty of every crime in the category—incest (Zeus' consort was Hera, his sister-wife; in Rome, they were Jupiter and Juno), rape, murder, deceit, treachery, torture, kidnaping, and indeed what not? As a matter of fact, these ancient systems simply reeked with all forms of phallic worship, ritual prostitution, and like perversions. After calling attention to the chief features of these pagan "religions," Dr. Kaufmann contrasts the God of the Bible as follows:

The basic idea of Israelite religion is that God is supreme over all. There is no realm above him or beside him to limit his absolute sovereignty. He is utterly distinct from, and other than, the world; he is subject to no laws, no compulsions, or powers that transcend him. He is, in short, non-mythological. This is the essence of Israelite religion, and that which sets it apart from all forms of paganism.

He then goes on to say, with respect to the store of Old Testament narratives that these narratives

lack the fundamental myth of paganism: the theogony. All theogonic motifs are similarly absent. Israel's God has no pedigree, fathers no generations; he neither inherits nor bequeaths his authority. He does not die and is not resurrected. He has no sexual qualities or desires and shows no need of, or dependence upon, powers outside himself.¹⁵

(Parenthetically, and regrettably, it is apparent that the statement above, "He does not die and is not resurrected," is a reflection of the typically Jewish rejection of the death and resurrection of the God-Man, Christ Jesus. Cf. Jn. 1:11—"He came unto his own, and . . . his own received him not.").

GENESIS

The whole issue here may be summed up, I think, in one transcendent distinction, namely, the God of the Bible is pure *personality* (Exo. 3:13-15), whereas the gods of the pagan mythologies were *personifications*. In his comprehensive treatment of this subject, Dr. Kaufmann is emphasizing the obvious, namely, that mythology, in the legitimate sense of the term, is conspicuously absent from the Old Testament Scriptures. (And to this, I might add, conspicuously absent from the New Testament writings as well.)

However, we are all aware of the experience of "thoughts that lie too deep for words," of ideas which the vocabulary of man is inadequate to communicate. (Indeed, in ordinary life, there are words, especially those which name qualities, which defy definition, except perhaps in terms of their opposites. For example, how can I describe "red" or "redness" in such language that others can know they are seeing what I see? The fact is that I cannot describe redness—I experience it. Of course, the definition could be provided by physics in terms of vibrations, refractions, frequencies, quanta, etc. But about the only way one could define "sour" is by saying it is the opposite of "sweet," or define "hot" by saying that it is the opposite of "cold," etc. Such is the woeful deficiency of human language (Isa. 64:4, 1 Cor. 2:9-10). Why, then, should we be surprised that the Spirit of God should have to resort to something more than propositional language to reveal God's thoughts and purposes to man? We read in Rom. 8:26-27, that oftentimes in prayer it becomes necessary for the Holy Spirit to take the "unutterable longings" of the soul of the saint whom He indwells (1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19) and bear them up to the Throne of Grace "with groanings which cannot be uttered." Need we be surprised, then, that the Spirit should have resorted to the richness of *poetic imagery* at times in order to communicate the ineffable; paradoxically, to describe the indescribable? I might add

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

here that this is precisely what Plato meant by the *mythos*: in his thinking the *mythos* was the "likely story" designed to be *instructive*; the use of poetic imagery to communicate truth so profound that it cannot be communicated in any other way. We do have just such instances of poetic imagery in the Bible (although this figurative device must not be confused with *apocalyptic symbolism*; they are similar in some respects, but not identical). The sooner we abandon the use of the word "myth" in Biblical interpretation, the sooner will confusion in this area of human thinking be dissipated. We shall call attention to instances of this type of poetic imagery as we proceed with the study of the text of Genesis.

The following comment by Dr. John Baillie about the Platonic *mythos* sets forth clearly what I have been trying to say *in re* the function of poetic imagery in Scripture:

When Plato warns us that we must be content with a "myth," he is very far from meaning that *any* myth will do, or that one myth is as good as another. No, all readers of the *Republic* know that Plato entertained the very strongest opinions about the misleading tendency of some of the old myths and that he chose his own with greatest care. If we tell a myth, he would say, it must be "a likely story (*eikota mython*)"—a myth that suggests the right meaning and contains the right moral values. The foundation of myth and apocalypse, then, can only be the possession of some measure, however small, of true knowledge.¹⁶

However, I am inclined to repeat, for the sake of emphasis, that the ambiguity of the word "myth," as it is currently used, makes it quite unsuitable for use in the interpretation of Scripture.

11. *Prolepsis*. This, although an explanatory device, is not figurative in character. However, we shall mention it here because it occurs frequently in Scripture, and for some reason Biblical critics seem to know little or nothing about

GENESIS

it, or else they choose to ignore it, because it upsets their preconceived norms of determining "contradictions." (1) A *prolepsis* is a connecting together, for explanatory purposes, of two events separated in time, in such a way as to give the impression that they occurred at the same time. A notable example is to be found in Gen. 2:2-3. God rested on the seventh-day period at the termination of His creative activity, but He did not *sanctify* (set apart as a memorial, Deut. 5:15) the seventh week-day as the Jewish Sabbath until many centuries later, as related in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. Hence the Sabbath is not even mentioned in the Book of Genesis. Cf. Gen. 3:20—Adam named his wife Eve when she was created, but she was not the mother of a race at that time—she became that later. Cf. also Matt. 10:2-4, "and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him." Matthew wrote this account some thirty years after the calling of the Twelve. But in this passage he connects the calling and sending out of Judas with the betrayal of Christ by Judas as if the two events had happened at the same time, when as a matter of fact they occurred some three years apart, (2) A *prolepsis* is also defined as a kind of anachronism which sometimes appears to be a contradiction but actually is not from the writer's point of view. In this sense it occurs when a writer mentions a long-standing place-name in two separate passages, in one of which he gives the origin of the name, but in the other mentions an event which occurred there at a different time. For example, Gen. 28:10-19. Here we read that Bethel ("house of God") was given its name by Jacob on his flight to Paddan-aram because of the heavenly visitation which he received there in a vision. However, in Gen. 12:8, we find that long before this, Abraham is said to have built an altar at Bethel on his arrival in the Land of Promise. There is no contradiction here. It is obvious that the writer in giving us the account of Abraham's arrival in Canaan, simply used the name by which the place had

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

come to be known generally by the people of the land. A similar case occurs with reference to Hebron. It was originally called Mamre, it seems, but later acquired the name of Hebron; hence, because it was known by the name Hebron when Genesis was written, it is so designated in the earlier record (cf. Gen. 13:8, 14:13, 23:2, 35:27). As a matter of fact, the writer seems to use the two place-names interchangeably. (Other apparent anachronisms will be treated in this textbook wherever they are encountered in our study of the text of Genesis.)

We conclude here with a word of caution with reference to the use of the term "figurative." It seems to be a common fallacy among those who apparently are out looking for grounds on which to reject clear Scripture teaching, to assume that to explain a text as "figurative" is equivalent to "explaining it away," that is, rendering it meaningless. Nothing could be farther from the truth. *Being* is the first category of all human thinking. A thought must be a thought about *something*; a proposition must be a proposition about *something*; a sentence must be a statement about *something*. So a "figure" in Scripture must be a figure of *something*; a sign must point to *something*; a symbol must be a symbol of *something*. (A symbol of nothing would be utterly meaningless.) All this means that to say that a passage must be interpreted figuratively is to enhance its meaning, rather than to nullify it. If Heaven is to be described figuratively as "New Jerusalem," "the holy city," "the city that lieth foursquare," the city that is "pure gold," with foundations "adorned with all manner of precious stones," with "the river of water of life . . . in the midst of the street thereof," etc. (Rev., chs. 21 and 22), how then can eye see, or ear hear, or the genius of man conceive what the Reality will surely be? Heaven cannot be described in human language; it must be experienced in order to be "understood." But the same is true of Hell (Gehenna), is it not? If hell is described figuratively in

GENESIS

Scripture as "eternal fire," (Matt. 25:41), "outer darkness" (Matt. 8:12), "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 22:13, 25:30), "the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone" (Rev. 19:20, 20:10,14,15), "the abyss" (A.V., "bottomless pit": Rev. 20:1,3), "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:48, cf. Isa. 66:24, Rev. 6:16-17, Heb. 10:31, Deut. 4:24, Heb. 12:29)—if all this is figurative language, I repeat, may God deliver us from the reality to which it points! To try to belittle these expressions as figurative is certainly not to "explain them away"—rather, it is to multiply their significance a thousandfold!

Permit me to terminate this section of our textbook by quoting, with respect to all figurative devices in Scripture, what J. W. Monser has written, so forcefully and so exquisitely, about types, as follows:

Thus, these types become a confirmation to us of all that the spirit of man is interested in, as respects our holy religion. We fit the type to the antitype as a glove to the hand or a ball to its socket. The exterior fits into the interior. As you prove a criminal's steps by fitting his boot into the tracks about your doorway, or his guilty shot by the mold of his bullet, so are we enabled, by a comparison of these types, to declare to the world that we have not followed any cunningly devised fables when we made known the power and coming of our Lord Jesus. He alone answers to the typical photographs. All the qualities foreshadowed in the sacrifice and the priest unite in him. Remove him from consideration, and while you rob humanity of the most essential help and the sublimest gift conceivable, you cast an element of confusion into all God's previous work. Promise, prophecy, and type are equally void and chaotic. The tabernacle and the temple become meaningless, the outer court a butcher's yard, and the daily sacrifice of the Jew a burden greater than

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

any sane man can bear. The Garden of Eden, the expulsion of Adam and Eve, the curse pronounced upon the serpent, the premature death of man, all these are mysteries, unless we recognize in each event the providential hand of God. Such is the unity of the Divine Purpose, that, look at what portion of it we will, there meets us some allusion to, or emblem of, our common salvation. The Scheme of Redemption is one gorgeous array of picture-lessons. The nation who typified it was a rotating blackboard, going to and fro, and unfolding in their career the Will of the Eternal. Let us not despise the day of small things.¹⁷

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWO

1. Discuss the validity of *interpretation* with reference to the Bible.
2. What is the science of Biblical interpretation called?
3. State what "interpretation" does not mean.
4. Distinguish between *transliteration* and *translation*.
5. Cite examples of the confusion caused by failure to make this distinction between transliteration and translation.
6. What two influences especially, in the first few centuries of our era, tended to corrupt Christian doctrine?
7. What is meant by the phrase, "calling Bible things by Bible names"?
8. What is meant by the phrase, "permitting the Bible to interpret itself"?
9. State the four A B C's of Biblical interpretation.
10. What is a Dispensation in Biblical terms?
11. Give an example of the importance of making proper distinctions between Dispensations in interpreting Scripture.
12. Cite two or three examples to show the importance to correct interpretation of knowing under what circumstances the content of a passage of Scripture was elicited.

GENESIS

13. Explain what is meant by the method of dialectic in interpreting Scripture.
14. Give some examples of the necessary use of this method, citing appropriate Scripture texts.
15. What are the two general contexts to be considered in the interpretation of a Scripture text?
16. Cite examples of the confusion caused by failing to correlate any Scripture passage with the teaching of the Bible as a whole.
17. What general principle is to be followed in distinguishing the figurative from the literal in Scripture interpretation?
18. What are some of the indications of figurative language in the Scriptures?
19. What is meant by a *symbol*?
20. Into what three classes does Dungan put Biblical symbols?
21. Show how Divine revelation is affected by the inadequacy of human language.
22. Explain what is meant by an emblem?
23. How do emblems differ from types?
24. What is meant by type and antitype? How are they related?
25. What was the design of the Old Testament types?
26. Show how those who deny the validity of typology contradict Scripture teaching.
27. What Scripture authority have we for accepting the validity of typology?
28. Mention two types in the Book of Genesis that are explicitly declared to be types, in the Scriptures themselves.
29. What is a simile? Give examples.
30. What is a metaphor? How does it differ from a simile?
31. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of God.
32. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of Christ and His mission.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

33. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of the Holy Spirit.
34. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of the Word of God.
35. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of the Church.
36. Give some Biblical examples of metaphors of the Christian.
37. Give some examples of metaphors which are to be found in the Book of Genesis.
38. What are the characteristics of a parable?
39. How does a parable differ from a fable?
40. What are the characteristics of the allegory?
41. What important allegory is to be found in the Book of Genesis?
42. What is an anthropomorphism?
43. Why are anthropomorphisms necessary to the human understanding of God?
44. What was the saying of the ancient philosopher Xenophanes about anthropomorphisms.
45. What are the fallacies in his argument? What is the half-truth in it?
46. What were the characteristics of the anthropomorphisms of the ancient pagan polytheisms?
47. Where do we find anthropomorphisms in the Book of Genesis?
48. How do Biblical examples of anthropomorphism differ from the anthropomorphisms of the ancient pagan "religions"?
49. Explain why anthropomorphism is necessary in any human attempt to "understand" God and His ways.
50. What is meant by saying that the Biblical anthropomorphisms serve to make God *real* (congenial) to us?
51. What are the two terms which Jesus used specifically to make our God real to us?

GENESIS

52. What, according to the dictionary, is the function of myth?
53. What are the four classes into which myths are usually categorized?
54. What were the characteristics of the ancient pagan mythological systems?
55. What was the character essentially of the gods and goddesses of these systems?
56. How does the God of the Bible differ from the mythological deities?
57. Explain the significance of the distinction between personification and pure personality.
58. Explain the significance of the Name by which God revealed Himself to Moses.
59. On what grounds do we say that mythology, in the legitimate sense of the term, is conspicuously absent from the Bible?
60. Explain what Plato meant by the *mythos*.
61. To what extent may we recognize the validity of the *mythos* in Scripture?
62. Why the necessity oftentimes of resorting to *poetic imagery* in communicating Divine thought to man?
63. What essentially is meant by this term, *poetic imagery*?
64. If we should find poetic imagery in Scripture, what would be its function?
65. Is poetic imagery to be identified with sheer fiction?
66. Is poetic imagery closely related to apocalyptic symbolism?
67. Just how can the ineffable be revealed to man?
68. What is a prolepsis?
69. Give two examples of prolepsis which occur in the Book of Genesis.
70. What is the fallacy often implicit in the popular use of the term "figurative"?
71. Can we have figures that are not figures of something, or symbols that are not symbols of something?

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

72. Explain what is meant by Monser's statement that "the Scheme of Redemption is one gorgeous array of picture-lessons."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- 1) *The Christian*, published by the Christian Board of Publication, St. Louis, Mo.
- 2) See *The Oxford English Dictionary*.
- 3) Hugh J. Schonfield, *The Authentic New Testament*. A Mentor Religious Classic. Published by the New American Library of World Literature, New York, 1958.
- 4) See *The Christian Evangelist*, St. Louis, Oct. 27, 1954, and *The Christian Century*, Chicago, Mar. 5, 1958.
- 5) D. R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics*, p. 11. Standard Publishing, Cincinnati. (Out of print.)
- 6) Dungan, *ibid.*, pp. 79-80.
- 7) Dungan, *ibid.*, pp. 81-82.
- 8) R. Milligan, *Scheme of Redemption*, p. 72. Christian Publishing Company, St. Louis.
- 9) Milligan, *ibid.*, pp. 71-72.
- 10) Charles Louis Loos (one-time president of Kentucky University), in his Introduction to *Types and Metaphors of the Bible*, by J. W. Monser. Published by F. L. Rowe, Cincinnati, 1936.
- 11) Loos, *ibid.*, x.
- 12) J. W. Monser, *op. cit.*, p. 161.
- 13) D. R. Dungan, *op. cit.*, pp. 258-259.
- 14) See *Elegy and Iambus*, Vol. I, pp. 182-215. Translation by Edmonds. Loeb Classical Library, Published by the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1931. See also fragments from Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies*.
- 15) Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, pp. 60, 61. Translation by Moshe Greenberg. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960.
- 16) John Baillie, *And the Life Everlasting*, p. 243. Scribner's, New York, 1936.
- 17) J. W. Monser, *op cit.*, pp. 38-39.

PART THREE:

"IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . ."

Not: In the beginning, nothing—for the simple reason that from nothing, nothing comes to be (*ex nihilo, nihil fit*). That Something is, that Isness is a fact, must be admitted by all who are not in a lunatic asylum.

Therefore, "In the beginning, God." This is the only formula that makes sense. Psa. 14:1—"The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Note the phrase, "in his heart"; "heart" in Scripture designates the interior man, with special emphasis on emotion and will. Atheism is traceable in most instances to an emotional reaction: no man can logically think himself into it.

The Bible presents itself to us as The Book from God communicated by the Holy Spirit (1 Pet. 1:10-12, 2 Pet. 1:21, Heb. 1:1-4, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, 1 Thess. 2:13). What author, in writing a book, prefaces it with an article intended to prove his own existence? Why, then, should the Holy Spirit have prefaced the content of the Bible with a chapter designed to prove the existence of God? To ask this question is to answer it.

The Bible, in explaining the universe, does not indulge specious theories of "the eternity of matter," of "an undifferentiated ocean of energy," of "life force," of "infinite regress," or anything of the kind. The Bible does not try to account for the Fact of Being by dispensing with a First Cause: it assigns to all things a Sufficient Reason, an Adequate Cause, in God: in the God of the Bible, the theistic God who transcends the cosmos in His Being but is immanent throughout the cosmos in His power. (All power is ultimately of God.)

The existence of God is the First Truth on which all truth depends. He is the all-sufficient First Truth. Accept God's existence and the rest is not difficult. Deny it, and no foundation is left for life, law, faith, hope, love, truth, justice, freedom, beauty, goodness, holiness, or any other value.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

Whatever begins to exist must have an Adequate Cause. Not, as it is sometimes erroneously stated, that all effects must have their adequate causes, but that whatever *begins* to exist must have an Adequate Cause. To close one's mind to this principle of Adequate Causality is to shut one's self off from all possibility of comprehensive knowledge of any kind.

One of the most common, and most grievous, errors of modern science is its tendency to ignore the fact of Efficient Causality, which is the very cornerstone of the structure of metaphysics (the science of being-as-such), and indeed of all human knowledge. To understand what is meant by Efficient Causality, we must recall here the Aristotelian doctrine of Four Causes, which is a very helpful concept, one which affords valid clues to the understanding of the world and our life in it.

According to Aristotle, there are four "causes" (explanations, ways of defining) anything; that is, four factors which combine to effectuate the constitution of any created thing. These are as follows: the *material* cause (the stuff of which a thing is made: the cause *of which*); the *formal* cause (that which gives to the matter the precise form or specificity it has, that which puts it into the class to which it belongs: the cause *according to which*); the *efficient* cause (that agent or power which unites the form and the matter, to give the object concrete existence: the cause *by which*); and the *final* cause (the end or function to be served by the object: the foreseen final cause that precedes all other causes: that which is first in purpose or motive, even though last in realization: the cause *for which*). Take for example, a statue: the *material* cause is wood, bronze, stone, marble, etc.; the *formal* cause is the idea embodied in the matter, a likeness of Washington, or of Lincoln, or of Venus of Milo, or of Athena Parthenos, etc., the *efficient* cause is the sculptor; and the *final* cause, ornamentation, commemoration, or it could be simply art for art's sake; in

GENESIS

any case, it is that which motivates the sculptor. For another example, consider a human being: the *material* cause is the complex of living cells that make up the body; the *formal* cause is the soul (mind, power of thought, reason, etc.,) which informs the body and thus specifies man *as man*; the *efficient* cause is the Creative Intelligence and Power (First Principle, First Cause, God) which gave man concrete existence as *homo sapiens*, a mind-body unity; and the *final cause*, the natural and proper intrinsic and extrinsic ends to which man is divinely ordained, as indicated by the impulses of his nature, namely, Perfect Happiness in Union with God, to be achieved by the living of the Spiritual Life. (No human being ever sets out to make himself ultimately and permanently miserable). (Cf. Matt. 22:35-40; Gal. 5:16-25.)

With the foregoing introductory matter to guide us, we shall now look briefly at the various proofs of the existence of God. I use the term "proofs," rather than "arguments," simply from the conviction that necessary truths (that is, propositions, the opposites of which are inconceivable) do constitute proofs in the fullest sense of the term, or, as stated a bit differently, whatever the inflexible formulas of logic and mathematics demand, must have real existence in the structure of Reality. Let us now examine these proofs which support the simple but sententiously sublime declaration of the first verse of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

1. The Cosmological Proof

(1) Who has not been overwhelmed at times by the awesome sense of the Mystery of Being-as-such! Such an emotion might take hold of one, for example, at the sight of the ocean for the first time, or when walking down the cathedral aisle of a seemingly ageless forest, or when wandering about in the fairy palaces of the Carlsbad Caverns, or (as Van Loon puts it, *Geography*, p. 3) when "stunned by the incredible beauty of that silent witness of

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

the forces of Eternity," the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. (When our God, who is the Author of beauty and majesty, builds a cathedral, He builds one.) Since living in the Southwest, I have often experienced this sense of awe while strolling on a clear night under the scintillating skies of the New Mexico desert where the stars seem close enough to earth to permit one to reach up and pluck them from the heavens. Who, under the spell of such awesome experiences, could be so insensitive to the music and the dream of living as to fail to ask himself, *How*, and especially *why*, did all this come to be? No person who *thinks* can possibly avoid such ultimate questions. (Cf. the experience of Jacob, Gen. 28:16-17.)

(2) To deny that *something is* would be a mark of insanity or idiocy. There is one thing I know, and know from immediate experience: *I know that I am*. (Descartes, 1596-1650, it will be recalled, decided to make a fresh start in pursuit of the philosophy of being, by doubting everything provisionally, the testimony of sense-perception, of reason, of external authority of any kind, even of the existence of a God who is goodness and truth and beauty (since it might turn out that a malevolent being has created man for his own sport), etc. Thinking thus, it suddenly dawned on him that he could not doubt the fact of his doubting or the fact of his own existence as the doubter: *dubito, ergo sum*, "I doubt, therefore I am." From this point he went on logically to affirm, *cogito, ergo sum*, "I think, therefore I am." Obviously, this has to be the taking-off point for all human thought, whether the person realizes it or not. Thought simply does not take place apart from the thinker; hence the first category of all thinking is the category of being, the universal, or of beings, the particulars. I cannot understand why well educated persons are so prone to overlook or to disregard these facts. There simply cannot be love without a *lover*, law without a *lawgiver*, behavior apart from a *being to behave*, adaptation without a *being*

GENESIS

to adapt and *being to be adapted to*. Being, I repeat, is the first category of human thought, whether recognized to be so or not.) I know; therefore, I am. I know that within me there is a world so vast that it staggers my imagination—a world of thoughts, feelings, desires, sentiments, images, memories, etc. I know too that there is a world outside me, a world of something (sense data?) the motions of which produce sensations within me (sights, colors, sounds, smells, tastes, etc.), and thus provide the raw material of my knowledge. (Was it not John Locke who defined “matter” as “permanent possibility of sensation”?) All these things I know.

(3) In a word, I know, we all know, that *something is*. Hence, the basic question, properly stated, is not, Where did God come from? but, *How and why is there something instead of nothing?* Moreover, because something is, something must always have been: we must start in our thinking with a Something (the First Principle, or God) that is without beginning or end, or we are driven to the inconceivable postulate that *nothing must have produced something*. As someone (unidentified) has written in facetious vein:

Once nothing arrived on this earth out of space;
It rode in on nothing; it came from no place;
It landed on nothing—the earth was not here—
It worked hard on nothing for year after year;
It sweat over nothing with mighty resolve—
But just about then things began to evolve:
The heavens appeared, and the sea and the sod;
This Almighty Nothing worked much like a god.
It started unwinding without any plan,
It made every creature and ended with man.
No god here was needed—there was no creation;
Man grew like a mushroom and needs no salvation.
Some savants say this should be called evolution
And that ignorance only rejects that solution.”

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

This, to be sure, is nonsense. Even the ancients recognized such a postulate to be inconceivable: said they, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, "from nothing nothing comes to be." "That something must be unbegun follows from the principle *ex nihilo nihil fit*. If there had ever been a state in which there was nothing, then that state would have continued forever. It is impossible for our imagination to grasp unbegun duration, but the failure of our imagination is overcome by the necessity of rational thought. As surely as there is anything now, so surely there must have always been something" (Brightman, PR, 364-365).

(4) That *something* is—that which we call a universe, a world, a cosmos—is undeniable. That the existence of this *something* is unexplainable apart from the operation of a Power sufficient both to produce it and to sustain it, must be evident to all honest and intelligent thinkers. Certainly, no comprehensive, hence no satisfactory, explanation of this world is possible for one who either ignores or denies Efficient Causality. (By Efficient Causality we mean the Creative Intelligence and Power that philosophy designates the First Cause or First Principle, and that theology calls God.) This is the well-known *Cosmological Proof*, reasoning from the existence of the world to the existence of God as its Cause (hence it may be designated the "causal" argument). As first stated by Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), it is necessary reasoning from the facts of motion (change) in the cosmos to the Prime Mover (the unmoved or self-moving, self-existing, and self-determining) First Mover, the only possible alternative being the admission of infinite regress. As revised by Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), the argument consists in necessary reasoning from the experienced fact of motion to the Prime Mover, from secondary efficient causes to the First Efficient Cause, and from contingent (may or may not be) being to the necessary (must be) Being, God. "The cosmological argument is based on the principle of sufficient cause. The world is

GENESIS

an effect; therefore it must have had a cause, outside itself, sufficient to account for its existence. There must be a cause of the series of causes which we experience. Thus we come to a First Cause or to a self-existent Being. The First Cause could not be material, since this would involve the qualitatively less as being able to produce the qualitatively greater—an absurd notion. We are led then to a self-dependent entity or Spirit of God" (Titus, LIP, 403). Or to put it in another form: Change is an incontrovertible fact of human experience. But there must be something permanent—something which persists through all change—otherwise nature would be nothing but a sequence of creations and annihilations (with what in between?). Therefore, we must distinguish between the accidental and the essential features of reality, between the temporary and the permanent in human experience. "Change presupposes a cause, and logically we must go back to an uncaused, self-existent cause or to self-existent Being. God is thus imminent in the universe of which he is the constitutive principle. God is the condition of the orderly development of the universe, as well as its permanent source or ground" (Titus, *ibid.*, 404).

(5) Someone may object as follows: You argue, obviously, from the "principle of sufficient reason," viz., that for every effect there must be an *adequate* cause, that the cosmos therefore, considered as an effect, must have its Adequate Cause. But is not this a begging of the question (*a petitio principii*)? That is to say, are you not assuming as true *a priori* the very proposition to be established, namely, that the cosmos is an effect? Perhaps the cosmos simply is, and has always been, in some form or other, and that is the end of the matter. To this I reply as follows: Surely it may be taken for granted that certain aspects of the cosmos that are known to us *are* effects—of something. Take, for example, man himself: man either has existed always or he had a beginning: no third view is conceivable.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

But that he had a beginning no one doubts: surely no scientist would make himself so ridiculous as to contend that man has existed always. Very well, then, if he had a beginning, as is universally admitted, he either created himself or he was the handiwork of an Efficient Causality external to himself. If he made himself, then he existed before he existed—and this would be utter nonsense. It must follow, therefore, that man is the product of an Efficient Causality antedating himself and external to himself. There was a time in the process of Creation when man—*homo sapiens*, should anyone insist on the strictly scientific designation—did not exist: hence a Cause must have been operating equal to the effect produced, that is, adequate to the creation and preservation of the human species. Moreover, if in thought we move backward in contemplation of the creative process (which, even in the Hebrew cosmogony is pictured as having been a progressive development, extending over at least six “days”), we can conclude only that there must have been a time when life did not exist, at least did not exist on our earth. All texts on historical geology frankly admit that life had a beginning sometime, somewhere, and that the story of that beginning, as far as science can claim to speak, is still enshrouded in mystery. Again, thinking back in terms of regress, let us ask: What existed prior to the appearance of life on the earth? Certainly the earth had to exist as a “home” for living things as we know them, and the sun had to exist to furnish light, and the atmosphere had to exist to sustain life, that is, life as we experience it. These factors are all necessary to the process of photosynthesis — that mysterious process by which plant life converts the sun’s energy into stored food energy and which is necessary to the sustenance of animal life in its various forms. Shall we not conclude, then, that “the heavens and the earth,” the suns and planets and stars, all the galaxies and universes—in short, our astronomical world—existed prior to the introduction of life?

GENESIS

But what existed prior to these bodies terrestrial and celestial? Probably only molecules and atoms: for are we not in these days reading books with such titles as *The Creation of the Universe* and *Biography of the Earth* (by Gamow), *Stellar Evolution* (by Struve), *From Atoms to Stars* (by Davidson), and the like—books whose contents are devoted to a theoretical (and basically conjectural) description of the alleged “evolution” of the astronomical bodies of the cosmos, an “evolution” envisioned as having had its inception in the explosion of a primordial atom, or, perhaps, in the “chance” production of hydrogen atoms from some kind of an original Source. (Cf. also *The Nature of the Universe*, by Fred Hoyle, especially the chapters entitled “The Origin of the Stars” and “The Origin of the Earth and the Planets.”). *But what existed prior to the molecules and their atoms, or prior to the atoms themselves?* Shall we say protons and electrons, or possibly photons only: the tendency in most recent physics is to look upon radiant energy as an ultimate in the physical world. Or, shall we say that there was a time when only what is now regarded as the elusive absolutely “first particle” (center of force?) of matter existed, which physicists designate the *neutrino*? (The neutrino has been superseded recently by the *Omega Minus*.) (These ultimate or first constituents of matter, as matter is interpreted today, are in fact quasi-material rather than material (in the traditional sense of that term), and because man is achieving apprehension of them, not by means of sense-perception, nor even by means of physical sense implemented by mechanical devices, but solely by means of mathematical formulas, present-day physics is all the time becoming more metaphysical than physical. Indeed the line between the material and the immaterial is so closely drawn today that it is scarcely existent.) But we are now ready to ask: *What existed prior to the neutrino, prior to photons, electrons, mésons, protons, etc.?* The late Dr. Arthur H. Comp-

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

ton, the distinguished physicist, in an article, "The Case for Hope," published in the *Saturday Review*, issue of July 18, 1955, states that before the beginning of our universe "it seems that not only were there no stars and atoms, but that time itself was something of only indefinite meaning." Still and all, we cannot logically carry this method of "infinite regress" (that is, in our thinking) back to nothing: otherwise it would not be *infinite* regress; that is to say, it would have a terminus or limit, and hence would be finite rather than infinite. Besides, what existed "back there" to see to it (to cause) that these neutrinos, photons, protons, electrons, atoms, etc., would march into being in the form of a cosmos, with its ultimate mysteries of life, consciousness, thought, self-consciousness, sense of values, etc? Whatever that Something—or Someone—was, that is precisely what we mean by Efficient Causality. And so we must admit the existence of the Self-moving Mover, the First Cause, the Self-existent Being, Necessary Being, as the Ground of all contingent being, etc., or we face infinite regress as the only possible alternative. And this infinite regress, moreover, cannot be regress back to nothing or nothingness: it is inconceivable that some "almighty nothing" could have produced something, the world as we know it. (Annihilation, *i.e.*, reduction of the something that is, to sheer nothing, is equally inconceivable.) It is true now and always that, as the ancients put it, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. No person can account for his own thought except on the presupposition that he, the thinker, exists; nor can any thinker (person) account for his own existence except on the ground of the prior existence of the species of which he is a unit; nor can he account for the species of which he is a unit—the human species, *homo sapiens*—except on the ground of an Efficient Causality capable of having brought his own species into actual existence. The theory presupposes the thinker, the person; the person presupposes the human species; and the human species presupposes an

GENESIS

Efficient Causality of all things. These conclusions are inescapable. I repeat that no valid explanation of the totality of being is possible except on the basis of an Adequate Cause. I repeat that one of the obvious evidences of the superficial character of much recent thinking has been its tendency to ignore, even to deny outright, the fact of Efficient Causality.

(6) Experience finds nature, both as a whole and in its particulars (objects and events), contingent, that is, such that it might not have been (lacking necessary existence). The mark of contingency is *change*: that which changes is subject to influences beyond itself. The "bridge" from contingent being to self-existent Being (reality) is found in the principle of Efficient Causality. Contingent (secondary) causes do not explain themselves. Both logic and reality require not only causes in nature but also a Cause of Nature. Obviously the Cause of Nature must be the Existent who is capable of bestowing existence. This must be the self-existent (but not self-caused) Being, God. (It has ever been a matter of amazement to me that intelligent persons should have "fallen for" Hume's shallow repudiation of causality (*i.e.*, causality in any real sense), his contention that mind reads causality (necessary connection) into what is nothing more than a sequence of events. This notion is contrary to human experience. For example, the fusion of two atoms of hydrogen with one atom of oxygen to form a molecule of water is certainly more than a mere sequence of events: there is motion, change, power, involved in the process. Again, suppose that a man inadvertently takes hold of a highly charged "live" wire—and he dies. There is more involved here than a sequence of events: there is the power of the electric current that causes the man's death. Moreover, in either case, the same effect necessarily follows the same cause. This is true throughout all nature; otherwise, our so-called laws of nature would be fictions and we would be living in a totally unpredict-

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

able world. (The fact is that man *could not* live in an unpredictable world.) (7) Even the theological doctrine of Creation *ex nihilo* does not mean, strictly speaking, Creation *out of nothing*, but rather creation by the Efficient Causality who is essentially Spirit, Mind, Person, etc., that is, non-corporeal, and hence Creation *without the use of pre-existing matter*. (Cf. Gen. 1:1; Psalms 33:6,9; Psalm 148:5,6; Hebrews 11:3.) As Professor W. E. Hocking states the case: "For the author of Genesis, mentality is original. It does not enter a physical world already running on its own. On the contrary, it is the physical world which enters the realm of mind. It is the Eternal Mind who in the beginning created the raw materials of the world, and whose word evoked order from chaos" ("A World-View," PPT, 436).

(8) That, from the viewpoint of science itself, a creation of matter actually did take place in some sense, contends Fred Hoyle, the astronomer, who writes as follows: "Perhaps you may think that the whole question of the creation of the universe could be avoided in some way. But this is not so. To avoid the issue of creation it would be necessary for all the material of the universe to be infinitely old, and this it cannot be for a very practical reason. For if this were so, there could be no hydrogen left in the universe. . . . Hydrogen is being steadily converted into helium throughout the universe and this conversion is a one-way process—that is to say, hydrogen cannot be produced in any appreciable quantity through the breakdown of the other elements. How comes it then that the universe consists almost entirely of hydrogen? If matter were infinitely old, this would be quite impossible. So we see that the universe being what it is, the creation issue simply cannot be dodged" (NU, 113-114). Contending for his theory of "continuous creation," the same author says: "The most obvious question to ask about continuous creation is this: Where does the created material come from? It does not come from anywhere. Material simply appears—it is cre-

GENESIS

ated. At one time the various atoms composing the material do not exist, and at a later time they do. This may seem a very strange idea and I agree that it is, but in science it does not matter how strange an idea may seem so long as it works—that is to say, so long as the idea can be expressed in a precise form and so long as its consequences are found to be in agreement with observation” (*ibid.*, 112). Cf. Heb. 11:3—“By faith we understand that the worlds [literally, *ages*] have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear.”

(9) It is also interesting to note that these scientists (astronomers, geologists, paleontologists, etc.) all begin with *something*: Hoyle, with a hydrogen fog; Gamow, with *ylem* (“primordial mixture of nuclear particles”); Lemaitre et al, with an exploding “primordial atom”; the monoparental theory, with a cooling and contracting hot nebular mass, *e.g.*, the nebular hypothesis of LaPlace; the Chamberlin-Moulton biparental theory, with a sun and passing star, etc. No one presumes to start with nothing and get a universe; or should we not say, universes?

(10) Protagonists of the evolution theories seem not to realize that their theories are, after all, theories of creation. (Biological evolution is simply a theory of the origin of species, based largely on inferences. No theory of evolution purports to explain the origin of life, the life movement itself, the *modus operandi* of heredity, or that of mutations. As Cassirer writes: “Even in the field of the phenomena of nature we have learned that evolution does not exclude a sort of original creation” (EOM, 49). It will be recalled that even Darwin himself admitted Divine agency as the ultimate source of life, that is, life as implanted in the hypothetical primordial cell.) There is simply no getting around the facts of Creation and Efficient Causality: this is the long of the matter, the short of it, and the all of it. Gen.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

1:1—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

In several of his writings Bertrand Russell goes to considerable pains to let us know that, as he states it, he gave up the Cosmological Argument early in his life. He seems to think this was a matter of great import to all humanity—a most unwarranted assumption, I should say. In his treatise, *Why I Am Not a Christian*, p. 7, he writes: "There is no reason to suppose that the world had a beginning at all. The idea that things must have a beginning is really due to the poverty of our imagination." Certainly the cosmos of our time has not been the same cosmos that it is now, throughout all preceding millenia of its history: this fact is explicit in the titles that present-day scientists are using, such as, *From Atoms to Stars*, etc. Certainly, as stated above, any notion of the "eternity of matter" (or, as Hoyle puts it, that "matter is infinitely old") implies, if traced backward, infinite regression (*not* regression to nothing), or, if traced forward, infinite progression (but *not* a progression from nothing). As a matter of fact, the concept of the "eternity" of matter, such as Russell would have us accept, is a concept of *timelessness*, and affords plenty of room for catastrophism and for the theory of the cyclical movement of cosmic history. Moreover, it is in conflict with the geological theory of uniformitarianism (that now existing processes are sufficient to account for all geological changes): indeed it would seem to necessitate cycles of cosmic history and catastrophism as well, to pave the way for uniformitarianism. To accept Russell's view would require an almost inconceivable measure of imagination, greater in fact than the measure of faith implicit in the acceptance of a transcendent intelligent Creator. Indeed there is no theory that can logically eliminate the operation of an Efficient Causality that, regardless of what it started with, has actualized and continues to support the phenomena characteristic of our present-day cosmos, such phe-

GENESIS

nomena as the atomic processes, the life processes, the thought processes, etc. It is far more reasonable, from the philosophical point of view, to accept the Aristotelian doctrine of the Unmoved Mover as First Cause of all things than the notion of an infinite regress—a process that would go on into infinity without any conceivable stopping-point. That is to say, “In the beginning, God.”

2. The Ontological Proof

This is the proof that is based on the conviction of the existence of Perfect Being, a conviction implicit in every man's awareness of his own imperfections. The concepts of perfection and imperfection cannot be disassociated.

(1) The *Ontological Proof* (from the Greek neuter singular *to on*, “that which is,” or “being” as the universal; plural, *ta onta*, “the things which exist,” or “beings” as particulars) was first formulated by Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), but actually derived in principle from Plato's Theory of Forms (Ideas). According to the Platonic theory, the Forms or Ideas of all classes of things (as known to us in our concepts) are permanent, eternal, and real, and go to make up the world of being, whereas material objects which merely participate in the eternal Forms are ever impermanent and changing, and constitute our world of becoming, the phenomenal world or world of appearance. Hence the more universal the Idea, the greater its reality, its causal efficacy, and its worth. And therefore the Supreme Universal, the Form or Idea of the Good, is the Supreme Good; the Supreme Cause, Perfect Being, etc. On the basis of this principle, Anselm formulated the Ontological Proof substantially as follows: We define God as the Being than which nothing more perfect can be thought. Now there is in the mind the idea of such a Being. But also such a Being must exist outside the mind (objectively); if it did not, it would fail to be the Being than which nothing more perfect can be thought, since a being with the added attribute of existence must be more perfect than

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

one existing only in idea. Therefore, if we wish to retain the meaning that the word "God" conveys to the human mind, we must affirm that God exists. In a word, the proposition that "the most perfect being that can be thought of, really exists objectively," is self-evident. (*Perfection*, from *per* and *facere*, "to make thorough" or "complete," means *completeness, wholeness, holiness.*)

(2) A modification of the ontological argument occurs in Descartes substantially as follows: There must be in every cause at least as much reality as reveals itself in the effect; otherwise we should have a portion of the effect emanating from nothing. Hence, if there exists in my mind any single idea which is too great to have originated from my own nature, I can be sure that the adequate (commensurate) cause of that idea is to be found outside me. But I discover in myself only one idea which thus evidently requires something outside me as the cause of it, and that is my idea of God as infinite thinking substance, eternal, immutable, independent, omniscient, omnipresent, etc., by which all contingent things have been created. It is inconceivable, and therefore impossible, that the idea of attributes so exalted should have come from the imperfect and finite nature which I know my own nature to be. For the same reason it is impossible for this idea to have derived from my parents or from any other source that falls short of the perfection of the idea itself. Therefore, infinite thinking substance, God, must actually exist to have imparted to me this idea of Perfect Being: in this manner alone can I bridge the gulf that exists between me and eternal reality: God as real Existent must be postulated as the only Existent great enough to account for the presence in me of the idea of God which indubitably exists in my own mind.

(3) It is often objected, of course, that this argument embodies an unwarranted *leap* from the subjective to the objective, from the *idea* of God to the *actual existence* of

GENESIS

God objectively. It is argued that man formulates, for example, ideas of a Centaur, a unicorn, etc., but that such ideas or images in the mind do not constitute proof of the actual existence of the creatures thus imaged or imagined. To these arguments we may reply as follows: (a) that a Centaur or a unicorn is a creation of the human *imagination*, formed by the mind's putting together of fragments of different sense-perceptions, whereas the concept of a Perfect Being is not something that can be imaged (imagined), for indeed the mind finds itself incapable of forming a mental image of it—it is, on the contrary, a necessary concept of pure (imageless) thought; (b) that all such concepts of pure thought must point to, or have as their referents, actual existents in the objective world; in a word, that a necessary conclusion, one that is demanded by pure logic or mathematics, must stand for a fact in the structure of external reality. (Just as, for example, the laws of thought—the laws of identity and contradiction, “That which is, is,” and “What is, cannot at the same time and in the same sense be and not be”—are not exclusively laws of thought, but actually laws of things as well. *E.g.*, an oak-tree cannot at the same time and in the same sense be and not be.) No one questions the fact that the laws of thought actually embody the laws of things. *E.g.*, I may not know how many persons will make up the population of El Paso in the year 2000, but I do know that any two of them plus any other two will make four of them. Again, I know that a circle, either as a figure-symbol in geometry textbooks or in actual land measurement, is a figure all the points on the circumference of which are equally distant from the center, and that not by definition alone, but by the very nature of the circle as such. A necessary truth is defined in philosophy as that, the opposite of which is inconceivable. It is inconceivable that nothing should have produced something; therefore it is a necessary truth that Efficient Causality, God, exists without beginning or end.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

Moreover, pure logic, in demanding Adequate Causality, Perfect Being, the Highest Good, etc., is referring to that Existent who indubitably exists as the Source and Ground of the whole creation.

Recapitulation: Thomistic Proofs of the Existence of God, those put forward by Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica*: *First Proof: From Motion*: i.e., the passing from power to act, as it takes place in the universe, implies a first unmoved Mover, who is God; else we should postulate an infinite series of movers, which is inconceivable. *Second Proof: From Efficient Causes*, i.e., for the same reason efficient causes, as we see them operating in this world, imply the existence of a First Cause that is uncaused: that is, that possesses in itself sufficient reason for its existence: and this is God. *Third Proof: From the Contingency of Beings in the World*: the fact that contingent beings exist, i.e., beings whose non-existence is recognized as possible, implies the existence of a necessary being, who is God. *Fourth Proof: From the Degrees of Perfection in Beings*: The graduated perfections of being actually existing in the universe can be understood only by comparison with an absolute standard that is also actual, i.e., an infinitely perfect Being such as God. *Fifth Proof: From the Order Prevailing in the Universe*: the wonderful order or evidence of intelligent design which the universe exhibits implies the existence of a supra-mundane Designer, who is no other than God Himself. This is commonly called the *Teleological Proof*, as set forth in some detail in the pages immediately following.

3. The Teleological Proof

(1) Let us now consider the *Teleological Proof* of the existence of God (from the Greek *telos*, "consummation," "fulfilment," "end," etc.). It is significant that the Greek word *kosmos* (translated in Scripture "universe" or "world"), from which we get the English *cosmos*, means "order." (*Chaos* in ancient Greek meant "empty space.")

GENESIS

Thus by the very use of the word *cosmos* we recognize that the framework of nature is one of order; this must be true, otherwise man could never have formulated a science. Man's sciences are simply his accomplishments in discovering, interpreting and describing (by means of "formulas," "theories," "laws," etc.) the order he finds in the various realms of being. *Indeed man could not live in an unpredictable world.*

(2) Take, for example, a great building. In what form did it exist before it became a building? The answer is obvious: it must have existed in the *mind* and *plan* of the person (architect) who conceived and designed it. All human artifacts have existed first in vision, theory, plan, etc., before being brought into existence as the concrete things they are designed to be. This is true of the dress that is worn, of the dinner that is served, of the house that is built, even of the atom bomb that is constructed, etc. A building presupposes a builder, design a designer (just as thought presupposes the thinker, love the lover, law the lawgiver, etc.).

(3) The idea of design includes not only the *structure*, but also the *function* (intended use) of the thing designed. Paley's illustration of a watch and its uses is, though old, simple and sound: the design in a watch is obvious; but before there could have been a watch, there had to be the watch-maker; moreover, the watch-maker must not only have designed the watch, but obviously must also have designed (consciously intended) the arrangements of its parts to serve the purpose for which the watch was brought into being, namely, to provide an accurate measure of time. Design therefore includes both the *structure* and *function* of the thing designed. Furthermore, since it is evident that the watch-maker must antedate the watch, the architect the building, etc., the Supreme Architect must also have antedated His creation. These are simply matters of ordinary common sense. (Cf. Gen. 1:31—"And God saw

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." That is to say, all created things were at that time attaining the ends to which they were ordained by Universal Intelligence; hence there was complete harmony of the potential and the actual. Disharmony entered the picture only when man rebelled against the will of God and so became separated from God by his own sin. Cf. Rom. 8:22—"the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together," etc.).

(4) *A convincing proof of the order which characterizes the cosmic processes is their basically mathematical structure.* Examples: (a) The mathematical precision of celestial movements, not only of the bodies which compose our own solar system, but of the galaxies as well which go to make up the cosmos as a whole: this preciseness is such that for purposes of dating, any one of these heavenly bodies may be taken as the mathematical center (frame of reference); such that the movements of all of them (as, e.g., eclipses, comets, etc.) can be accurately dated as far back in the past or as far forward in the future as the human mind may care to reach in its computations. (b) The differentiation of the physical elements on the basis of the number of protons in their respective atomic nuclei and corresponding number of electrons in their respective orbits (from one proton and one electron in the hydrogen atom up to 92 protons and 92 electrons in the uranium atom); hence the periodic table of the elements. (c) The differentiation of minerals according to their respective basic geometrical patterns (crystal forms) such that the plane surfaces become the external expression of the definite internal structure in each case; hence the science of crystallography. (d) The varying arrangements of atoms and molecules in space, in such a manner as to make possible identification and classification of both molecules and compounds, as depicted in stereotypic chemistry. (e) The differentiation of living species generally according to the

GENESIS

number of chromosomes in the reproductive cells of the male and female (in the human species, 23 in the male sperm and 23 in the female ovum): the process by which the mystery of heredity is effectuated. (f) The now known possibility of the actual reduction of certain sensations, such as color and sound, usually described as qualitative, to mathematical quantities. Color sensations are known to be produced by the impingement of refracted light waves of specified different lengths upon the retina of the eye; sensations of sound, by the impingement upon the ear of auditory stimuli in the form of sound waves traveling at various vibration rates by way of a medium, usually the air. Music has its basis, of course, in the mathematics of sound, a fact discovered by Pythagoras in the long, long ago (6th century B.C.). (Pythagoras is traditionally credited with having coined the phrase, "the music of the spheres.") To sum up: The mathematical structure of our world points directly to a Universal Intelligence (Mind, Spirit, Reason, *Logos*) as its source and ground. Cf. Galileo: "Nature's great book is written in mathematical symbols." Einstein: "How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought independent of experience, is so admirably adapted to the objects of reality?" Pythagoras: "Number rules the universe." Plato: "God ever geometrizes." (See E. T. Bell, *Men of Mathematics*.) Cf. also Sir James Jeans (NBS, 158): "Today there is widespread measure of agreement which on the physical side approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine." Jeans (TMU, 168): "If the 'true essence of substances' is for ever unknowable . . . then the universe can best be pictured, although still very imperfectly and inadequately, as consisting of pure thought, the thought of what, for want of a wider word, we must describe as a mathematical thinker." Jeans (*ibid.*, 175): "We may think

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

of the laws to which phenomena conform in our waking hours, the laws of nature, as the laws of thought, of a universal mind. The uniformity of nature proclaims the self-consistency of this mind." Jeans (*ibid.*, 181, 182): "If the universe is a universe of thought, then its creation must have been an act of thought . . . And yet, so little do we understand time that perhaps we ought to compare the whole of time to the act of creation, the materialization of the thought." (Cf. Plato, 427-347 B.C., in the *Timaeus*, 38c—"Time, then, and the heaven came into being at the same instant in order that, having been created together, if ever there was to be a dissolution of time, they might be dissolved together . . . Such was the mind and thought of God in the creation of time." Plato describes time as "the moving image of eternity." Cf. also Augustine, A.D. 354-430, in *De Genesi ad Litteram*, "On the Literal Meaning of Genesis," Book V, ch. 5—"The course of time began with the motions of creation, wherefore it is idle to ask about time before creation, which were to ask for time before time. For were there no motion of any creature, spiritual or corporeal, whereby the future might through the present succeed to the past, there would be no time. But the creature could have no motion unless it existed. Time, therefore, rather hath its commencement from the creation, than creation from time, but both from God."). Cf. finally Jeans (TMU, 165): "The Great Architect of the Universe now begins to appear as a pure mathematician."

(5) *A second proof of cosmic order is the principle of adaptation of means to ends* which characterizes our world throughout (the inorganic to the organic, the organic to the conscious, the conscious to the self-conscious, the self-conscious or personal to the moral and spiritual, etc.). Consider in this connection the following obviously necessary relations which prevail in the cosmos: that of radiant energy, to the other forms of energy; that of the inter-relationships (possible transmutations) of all forms of

GENESIS

energy (lose mass and gain energy, lose energy and gain mass); that of light and atmosphere to plant photosynthesis and animal life (plant life is dependent on carbon dioxide, animal life on oxygen); that of photosynthesis to all higher organic life (all higher physical life is dependent on plant photosynthesis; cf. Gen. 1:30—"to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the heavens, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for food," etc.); and that of the physiological and psychological processes in man (as he is presently constituted), etc.

(6) *A third evidence of cosmic order is the fact of the adaptation of nature to man and his needs.* The distinguished scientist, A. Cressy Morrison, makes this fact the thesis of his excellent little book, *Man Does Not Stand Alone* (written in reply to the book by Julian Huxley, *Man Stands Alone*). Throughout the last century, he contends, we have thought so generally in terms of the visible adapting of man to nature that we have been inclined to overlook the less visible but no less obvious and amazing adaptation of nature to man. Morrison's thesis is, in general, that the wonders of nature and man, and the existence of life itself, can be shown by calculation (the statistics of probability and chance) to be impossible without a Supreme Intelligence and a definite purpose, that purpose being ultimately the preparation of the human soul for immortality. He writes (MDNSA, 99-100): "My purpose in this discussion of chance is to bring forcefully to the attention of the reader the fact that . . . all the nearly exact requirements of life could not be brought about on one planet at one time by chance. The size of the earth, the distance from the sun, the temperature, and the life-giving rays of the sun, the thickness of the earth's crust, the quantity of water, the amount of carbon dioxide, the volume of nitrogen, the emergence of man and his survival—all point to order out of chaos, to design and purpose, and

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

to the fact that, according to the inexorable laws of mathematics, all these could not occur by chance simultaneously on one planet once in a billion times." Again (*ibid.*, 87): "The advance of man beyond the necessities of existence to a comprehension of time lifts him out of the limits apparently set by physical evolution as a thing apart. As he approaches a complete understanding of time, he also approaches an understanding of some of the eternal laws of the universe and an apprehension of the Supreme Intelligence." Again (*ibid.*, 100): "We have found that there are 999,999,999 chances to one against a belief that all things happen by chance." Cf. Titus (LIP, 405): "Take, for example, the long process of development leading to the human brain and the mind of man. The process has produced minds which begin to understand the world, and it has produced thought and understanding. This is unintelligible unless the course of evolution is directed. The term *emergence* by itself is a good description but is no adequate explanation." (It is my conviction—permit me to say, parenthetically—that the word "evolution" is one of the most overworked words in our human vocabulary; moreover, that the biological theory itself rests by and large upon inference; whether the inference is *necessary* inference or not is the crux of the whole problem. However, two facts stand out clearly, namely, that if any kind of evolution did take place, on any level of being, it must have taken the form of a *progressive* development or emergence of species, as indeed the word "evolution" itself implies; and that this forward movement, always toward the more neurally complex, is evidence *per se* of conscious direction, that is, direction by Mind or Logos. As someone has rightly said, evolution necessarily means new increments of power *plus* continuity of plan—and *plan* presupposes the Planner.) To recapitulate, then, if man has the right to his present "natural" life, surely he has the right to the natural means necessary to sustain that form

GENESIS

of life; and those necessary means have been provided for him in the subhuman orders of being—the mineral, vegetable, and animal orders. (Cf. Gen. 1:27-31, 8:15-17; Ps. 104:14, 136:25, etc.) Apart from man as lord tenant of the earth (God's steward) there would be no earthly reason for the existence of any of the subpersonal species.

(7) *A fourth evidence of cosmic order is that of the marvelous design of the human organism as a mind-body (psychosomatic) unity.* The body is built up hierarchically, that is, in an ascending order of complexity, from cells into tissues, from tissues into organs, from organs into systems, and from systems into the organism. Personality, in like manner, is a hierarchical structure, again in an ascending order of complexity, of reflexes, habits, dispositions, traits, and finally the self. (Incidentally, there is no alchemy of wishful thinking by which psychology can be reduced wholly to physiology, that is, the higher thought processes to sheer neurosensory arcs, etc.) To think for one moment that "nature" could have produced this living and thinking (personal) being mechanically (whatever that word may mean) by chance operation of "resident" forces alone is, to say the least, absurd. The body is but the "tabernacle" in which the real person (the self, the ego, the I) dwells. (Cf. Gen. 1:27, 2:7; 1 Cor. 6:19, 15:35-49; 2 Cor. 5:1.) However, the human being as presently constituted is a mind-body unity; interaction of the physical and mental is constantly taking place; we know this to be true, even though the mode of this interaction remains inscrutable. Ps. 139:14—"I am fearfully and wonderfully made." (Cf. the quip of the "man of medicine," so often recurrent in literature, the boast that if he had had the task of creating the human body he could have done a better job than, in his opinion, was done. As a matter of fact, no human being as yet has succeeded in creating a living cell, much less an entire body vitalized with life. Nor has any man ever been able to synthesize a living cell in the laboratory, and

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

even if man should succeed in doing this some day, even that would leave unanswered the question as to what or who created the first living cell, an event which must have long antedated man's appearance on earth. Any purveyor of the above-mentioned bit of smart-Aleckism would show about as much consistency as the chap (whom H. L. Mencken tells about) who burst forth on occasion exclaiming, "I am an atheist—thank God!"

(8) *A fifth evidence of cosmic order is the fact of the Will to Live which permeates the whole animate creation: the natural tendency of all living creatures to resist extinction.* The bird, for example, wounded by the hunter's shot, will have its wings spread to take refuge in flight the moment it reaches the ground. (Someone has said that the fear of death is in fact the lust for life.) (a) Instinct, which has been called "the Great Sphinx of nature," is that power in the subhuman organism by which nature's God ensures the perpetuation of the species. (Intelligence in man, on the other hand, enables him to grow in knowledge by the process of trial and error; if he were confined to grooves of instinct, he could never attain any measure of control of his environment. The much-touted *conditioned reflex* explains only the extension of the range of stimuli which will elicit a single response. Man's development potential, however, lies in his ability to consciously vary his responses to the same stimulus.) (b) Cosmic conation (striving of species and individuals toward natural ends, toward the actualization of their natural potencies) characterizes all orders of the living world within us and around us. Consider, in this connection, the rhythmicity which pervades the cosmos: the alternation of day and night, of seedtime and harvest, of spring and summer and fall and winter (Gen. 8:22); the varying life cycles of natural species—of the human being, childhood, youth, maturity, senescence, and finally the "eventide"; the play of opposites, especially of life and death, etc.

GENESIS

(Cf. the Pythagorean Table of Opposites, as given us by Aristotle: limit-unlimited; odd-even; unity-plurality (the one and the many); right-left; male-female; rest-motion; straight-crooked; light-darkness; good-evil; square-oblong. Cf. also the Chinese doctrine of *yang* and *yin*.) (c) It will be recalled that one of the Platonic (Socratic) arguments for survival is that which is based on the alternation of opposites: contrary states, argued Socrates, pass into each other, and therefore death must pass into its contrary, life. (See Plato, *Phaedo*, 70-71; cf. also Paul, in 1 Cor. 15:35-49, with reference to the immortality of the saints.) No doubt this ineradicable Will to Live is one of the factors which has prompted the race as a whole to persist in believing that the person cannot perish; because man believes himself to be of a higher order than the brute, he repudiates the notion that his ultimate end can be six feet of earth and nothing more. (d) The Will to Live is evident in every aspect of the upward surge of life, from the process of segmentation ("protoplasmic irritability") in the lowliest cell up to the multiplex psychosomatic entity known as man. Theories of evolution may presume to account for the origin of species, but no such theory accounts for the life movement itself; they all simply accept that movement as a fact (hence a postulate). (Freud's libido is, after all, nothing in the world but this venerable Will to Live. See Plato, *Symposium*, for a discussion of the Earthly and Heavenly Eros (Love); also G. B. Shaw's preface to his play, *Back to Methuselah*.) (e) Individual conscious conation is characteristic only of the *person*: psychologists are unanimous in saying that any person who has come to feel that he has nothing to live for, is on the verge of a mental crack-up. Any measure of fulness of life must include a self to live with, a creed (faith) to live by, and a goal (hope) to live for.

(9) Throughout the entire cosmos there is cause and effect, and design. (Even the "abnormalities" of nature,

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

such as cyclones, earthquakes, pestilences, etc., all have their respective causes.) No honestly intelligent person can think for a moment that all this order is the product of *chance*. Besides—what is *chance*? Some have suggested that “chance” is perhaps just another term for our human ignorance. It has even been said that what we call “chance” might turn out to be the free will of God. Ordinarily, however, when we use the word “chance,” we mean just the opposite of purpose and design—we mean *purposelessness*. (We are reminded here of the bombastic claim put forward in all seriousness in the heyday of what was called “naturalism,” that if a monkey were stationed at the keys of a typewriter, given sufficient time it would pound out *by chance*, letter by letter, one of Plato’s dialogues. Actually there are men who can countenance such drivel, who at the same time refuse to believe that there is a God. Such is the capacity for credulity of the *will to disbelieve*. One is reminded here of the well-known lines—

“There was an ape in days that were earlier;
Centuries passed, and his hair became curlier;
Centuries more, and his thumb gave a twist,—
And he was a man, and a Positivist.”

The “useful collocation” (to use a phrase coined by Dr. A. H. Strong) characteristic of all parts of our world simply forbids the notion that all this has come about and is perpetuated by mere chance. If man ever were to discover that, beyond any possible doubt, the cosmos is simply a “fortuitous” thing, a product of blind “chance” alone, hence completely meaningless—something that might as well *not be* as *be*—that would be a tragic day indeed in the history of the race. To requote the astronomer, Dr. Dan Schilt of Columbia (as originally quoted in *Collier's*, August 11, 1951, in reply to the reporter’s question, Why is the universe as it is and what it is?): “The hope and faith of astronomers is that eventually we shall find that it is so because it couldn’t be otherwise. The greatest shock would

GENESIS

be to find that it all just happened by chance." Dr. Einstein is quoted (Barnett, UDE, 29) as saying: "I cannot believe that God plays dice with the world," As Fred Emerson Brooke has written in "The Grave Digger,"—

"If chance could fashion but one little flower,
With perfume for each tiny thief,
And furnish it with sunshine and with shower—
Then chance would be Creator, with the power
To build a world for unbelief."

(10) Dr. Hocking (PPT, 431) sees three pervasive types of order in the cosmos, as follows: "First, the order of *classes*, which we meet in observing that all things come in kinds. Second, the order of *causality*, which we notice in the form of force and law as factors of change. Third, the order of *purpose*, which is always present in the activity of mind."

(11) Order is nature's first law. Dr. A. H. Strong points out (ST, 77) that it is "a working-principle of all science . . . that all things have their uses, that order pervades the universe, and that the methods of nature are rational methods." He adds: "Evidences of this appear in the correlation of the chemical elements to each other; in the fitness of the inanimate world to be the basis and support of life; in the typical forms and unity of plan apparent in the organic creation; in the existence and cooperation of natural laws; in cosmical order and compensations." Brightman (PR, 379) summarizes the evidence for teleology as follows: "It consists of all personal experience of purpose, end, or plan; the signs of purpose or conation in subpersonal selves; the adaptation of means to ends (of inorganic to organic, of organic to conscious) in nature, and hence 'the fitness of the environment'; the arrival of the fit, the beauty of nature; the harmony and interaction of mind and body; and, we may add, the spiritual life—the striving for ideal values—that arises wherever man develops the possibilities of his consciousness, whether in

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

China or Japan, India or Babylonia, Greece or Israel, Egypt or Rome, among Teutons or among Incas." Why should men say, The more law, the less God? Is it not more reasonable to say, The more law, the greater the evidence of God. As Henry Ward Beecher once put it, "Design by wholesale is greater than design by retail." How account for the singular fact that whenever we find out *how* a thing is done, our first conclusion seems to be that God had nothing to do with it. Are not the "laws of nature" the laws of God? Hath He not "established them for ever and ever"? Hath He not "made a decree which shall not pass away"? (Psa. 148:6). We accept the universality of design (as described by our humanly discovered and formulated "laws") as positive proof of the *immanence of God*.

(12) We conclude that before this world could have existed in fact it must have been planned, designed and created by the Supreme Architect whom we know as God. His handiwork is evident everywhere in it; His footprints are everywhere upon it; His Spirit is the inexhaustible source of every form of power by which it is conserved. Even Herbert Spencer admitted that "one truth must ever grow clearer—the truth that there is an inscrutable existence everywhere manifested, to which we can neither find nor conceive beginning or end—the one absolute certainty that we are ever in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed." Shelley wrote his name in the visitors' book at the inn at Montanvert, and added, "Democrat, philanthropist, atheist." But he also wrote (*Adonais*): "The One remains, the many change and pass; Heaven's light forever shines, Earth's shadows fly." And Darwin wrote (*Life*, 1, 274): "In my most extreme fluctuations, I have never been an atheist, in the sense of denying the existence of a God." (See Strong, ST, 57.) No one can intelligently and profoundly contemplate the mysteries of the world around him and within him without admitting the fact of God. (Gen. 1:1; Heb. 1:10, 11:3;

GENESIS

Psa. 19:1, 102:25; Job 38:1,4) God has piled so high around us and within us the proofs of His existence that wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein (Isa. 35:8).

4. The Anthropological Proof

Let us consider next what is called the *Anthropological Proof* of the existence of God (from the Greek *anthropos*, "man," and *logos*, "account" or "study," "science," etc.). It is in a sense an application of both the cosmological and teleological arguments to the human being.

(1) The human being is the most complex *whole* known to us by any process of sense-perception, and is properly designated a *person*. According to the classic definition proposed by Boethius (A.D. 480-524), a person is "an individual substance of a rational nature." Personality cannot be dissociated, of course, from the person; hence, we may define the person as the "carrier" of the elements of personality. Personality undergoes modification constantly, but through all such changes there is an essential "core," so to speak, which remains permanent: this "substance" we may rightly call the person. Hence personal identity remains intact from the cradle to the grave; nor is there any valid reason for assuming that it will be affected even by the "death" of the body. Personality is a structure built on the prior structures of matter, life, and mind.

(2) The essential properties of a person are self-consciousness and self-determination. By *self-consciousness* is meant precisely what the term signifies: awareness of the self. An animal is conscious, but a person is self-conscious: I am not only aware of the desk at which I am writing, but I am also aware that *I* am aware of it. Memory is significant, as William James has said, not because it dates events in the past, but because it dates

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

events in *my* past: hence it is charged with the feeling of familiarity. *Self-determination* is the power of the self to determine its own ends: in every choice, factors of heredity and factors of environment play their respective roles, but the ultimate choice (determination) is that of the personal reaction to given alternatives, the reaction of the "I." The stronger motive always wins, true; but the stronger motive is stronger because it is the one most in harmony with the self, the ME.

(3) Goldenweiser, the anthropologist, writes (*Anthropology*, 32): "All the fundamental traits of the psychic make-up of man anywhere are present everywhere." That is, *homo sapiens* is *homo sapiens* wherever and whenever he is found to exist: he is an intellectual, moral and volitional being. As such he had a beginning on this planet—he was the product of an Efficient Causality which antedated him, a Source and Ground of being, adequate to account for his *unique* powers as well as for those which he shares with the lower orders. Material, unconscious forces (atoms, protons, electrons, etc.) do not provide a sufficient cause for man's powers of reason, conscience, and free will; the more complex and mysterious phenomena, those of life, consciousness, thought, self-consciousness, abstract and creative thought, the sense of values, etc., do not yield to interpretation solely in terms of physical and chemical forces. The gap between a sensation, which is an event in the nervous system, and the consciousness of that sensation (which includes the word-symbol by which the sensation is identified *plus* the meaning which this symbol has in terms of individual memory and experience) is the abyss which cannot be bridged by any physiochemical theory. (Some forty years ago John Dewey wrote a book entitled, *How We Think*. This book became a "must" in a great many of our colleges. I had to use it as a college textbook myself. But I discovered that, after reading it, I had learned much about neurosensory arcs,

GENESIS

receptors, effectors, synapses, and the like, but very little, after all, about how we think. As man is now constituted, thought may be, and probably is, correlated with neural energy of some kind; but this does not mean that neural processes and the thought processes are identical, not by any manner of means.) The meaning of meaning lies outside the realm of either the physical or the chemical, or even the biological. Psychology cannot be reduced to sheer physiology.

(4) In the light of the vastness of the cosmos as it is now apprehended under the telescope, the individual man seems to be reduced to an infinitesimal fragment of the whole. Eddington tells us (NPW, 1-3) that "the atom is as porous as the solar system." He adds: "If we eliminated all the unfilled space in a man's body and collected his protons and electrons in one mass, the man would be reduced to a speck just visible with a magnifying glass." Speaking in dimensional terms, then, man is indeed insignificant. Man, however, is not to be evaluated in terms of body, that is, of three-dimensional being; man is to be interpreted, rather, in terms of the fourth dimension—that of mind or soul. The tendency has been in recent years to belittle the doctrine of *anthropocentrism* as an evidence of human vanity; as someone remarked, on occasion, "Astronomically speaking, man is insignificant." To which the pointed reply was made, "Yes, but astronomically speaking, man is the astronomer." The world is, and always will be, anthropocentric, that is, in the sense that every person is inevitably the center of his own experienced world: this is a fact which no amount or kind of human theorizing will change. Nature is individualistic: we come into the world one by one, and we go out of it one by one, and every person, while in it, is unique—he is an *other* to every other person. There is no alchemy by which the elements of my personality—my thoughts, memories, experiences, etc.—can become the constituent factors of any

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

other person's personality. Nor is it vanity for man to think that he is the consciously intended end-product of the whole creative process, of the plan of the universe: it is simply a fact that if the world with its systems and galaxies is not here for man's contemplation, use and benefit (to provide for him not only physical sustenance, but also the truth, beauty and goodness (order) which in his innermost being he craves), then the whole subpersonal realm is without meaning—neither the cosmos itself nor any man's life in it has any significance whatever. (A colleague once remarked to me that he simply could not believe that a certain grasshopper was begotten and born to furnish breakfast for a certain turkey gobbler. Probably not—it is doubtful that anyone would carry teleology to such an extreme as this. But the fact remains that unless food of some kind were provided for turkey gobblers, they could not exist; and unless turkey gobblers existed in their turn, we as human beings could never enjoy a Thanksgiving dinner of turkey and the "trimmings." The world we live in is a world of ends and means, and by the grace of God man is appointed to be the lord tenant of it (Gen. 1:27-30, 9:1-7; Ps. 8:3-6).

(5) The vastness of space is indeed overwhelming, and even only a partial apprehension of this vastness by a human mind engenders profound awe: as Pascal has put it, "The eternal silence of infinite space is terrifying." Such vast distances seem to us so impersonal, as someone has said, "so unconcerned with human life and destiny." Indeed this must have been the feeling of the Psalmist when he cried out (Ps. 8:3, 4):

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

The plain fact is that "if there is no friendly Spirit behind it all and through it all—no infinite concern of God for

GENESIS

man—man is utterly lost.” This is true beyond all gain-saying. Man needs, therefore, an object of affection above and beyond his own kind: One who can call forth his highest efforts, One who can lure him on to the realization of his noblest potentialities. Matt. 5:48—“Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Only the Being of infinite wisdom, power, goodness and holiness can meet the needs and aspirations of the human soul. This Being must exist. Otherwise man’s greatest need would be forever unsatisfied, and his whole existence would be but a synonym for complete frustration. As Chesterton has put it: “Man is either the image of God or a disease of the dust.” Ps. 42:7—“Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterfalls.” Or in the memorable words of Augustine: “Thou awakest us to delight in Thy praise; for Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee.”

(6) The normal person knows himself to be an inscrutable synthesis of thought, feeling, desire and will. Because of this knowledge of his own being, he persists in acknowledging and seeking the God who is in some measure congenial to him through the possession of like powers. This is the reason why the religious consciousness of man will never be satisfied with the cold-blooded, mechanistic, Spinozistic god of the pantheist. Man is compelled to think of God in terms of his own experience: he cannot do otherwise. Every power that is specifically characteristic of man (*i.e.*, characteristic of man *as man*) points directly to the God of the Bible, the God who is essentially Spirit (John 4:24), the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Gen. 1:27; Job 33:4; Ps. 42:2, etc.).

5. The Moral Proof

Let us now look at the *Moral Proof* of the existence of God, namely, that the fact of the existence of values in our world, both subjectively and objectively, points directly

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

to the Summum Bonum (God) as the Beginning and End of all values.

(1) By *subjectively* we mean, existing in the mind of the subject, the person. By *objectively* we mean, existing in the structure of the cosmos or of the totality of being. By the Summum Bonum we mean the Highest Good, *i.e.*, Wholeness, Holiness or Perfection. This is variously called the moral, ethical, "valuational," or *axiological* argument (from the Greek *axios*, meaning "worthy of," "deserving," "having value," etc.). Obviously there is some overlapping of this and the other arguments cited, particularly the Argument from the Fact of Personality.

(2) From time immemorial men have puzzled over the problem of evil, the problem of "justifying the ways of God to men" (the *motif* of all epic poetry: cf. Milton, *Paradise Lost*, I, 26). Some have tried to "explain away" evil as an "illusion of mortal mind," but of course they do not tell us how "mortal mind" came to be possessed (or obsessed) by such an "illusion." As a rule, the race has been so concerned with the problem of evil that it has been prone to overlook *the fact of the good*. But anthropology, archaeology, and history all agree to the fact that there has been just as much good as evil, just as much cooperation as conflict, in the story of man, even from the very beginning of his life upon this earth. As a matter of fact, if the good had not outweighed the evil in his life, personal and social, man probably would have destroyed himself long ago. (Tomes have been written about prehistoric man, a great deal of which is sheer fantasy. As Chesterton says (EM, 26, 27, 28): "People have been interested in everything about the cave-man except what he did in the cave." He adds: "Now there does happen to be some real evidence of what he did in the cave . . . What was found in the cave was not the club, the horrible gory club notched with the number of women it had knocked on the head. The cave was not a Bluebeard's

GENESIS

Chamber filled with the skeletons of slaughtered wives; it was not filled with female skulls all arranged in rows and all cracked like eggs." What *was* found there? "Drawings or paintings of animals; and they were drawn or painted not only by a man but by an artist . . . They showed the experimental and adventurous spirit of the artist." Breasted, the Egyptologist, tells us (DC) that such words as "righteousness," "truth," "justice," and the like are to be found in the Egyptian fragments as early as the fourth millenium before Christ. The same is true of the evidence of the Mesopotamian fragments.) Man, as far back as he is known historically, aboriginally, and prehistorically, has ever exhibited by his activities the fourfold quest for truth, beauty, goodness (order) and wholeness.

(3) *Man is a creature of moral law.* As Rollo May writes (MSH, 174): "Man is the 'ethical animal'—ethical in potentiality even if, unfortunately, not in actuality. His capacity for ethical judgment—like freedom, reason and the other unique characteristics of the human being—is based upon his consciousness of himself." The human being has never been known, even in the most primitive state, to be without conscience, without a sense of values, without a sense of obligation or duty. If man were merely an aspect of "nature" (a very ambiguous term, one which certainly needs to be defined prior to any intelligent discussion which may involve its use), then any injunction to obey the ways ("laws") of nature or to depart from them would be meaningless. But it is well known that the sense of duty may impel men at times to act in direct opposition to the will to live. In the recent World War, for example, heroes of the Resistance, men without belief in eternal values, in fact without belief in anything except perhaps the pleasure of the moment, nevertheless gave themselves up to torture and death rather than to betray their fellows to the Nazis; and the same has happened recently in outbreaks against the Soviet tyrants. Surely this sense of duty

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

in man implies God as the Source of it and the Guarantor of its integrity. (Cf. Wordsworth, "Ode to Duty":

"Stern Daughter of the Voice of God!

O Duty! if that name thou love

Who art a light to guide, a rod

To check the erring, and reprove;

Thou, who art victory and law

When empty terrors overawe;

From vain temptations dost set free;

And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity!")

Cf. Heb. 11:6—"He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." This, basically, was the argument of the German philosopher, Kant (1724-1804). We cannot prove God, said he, by pointing to the starry heavens above, awesome as they may be; rather, it is the moral law within which convinces us that God actually exists. This moral law within is an unconditional mandate (categorical imperative) to heed the call of duty. Conscience, which is the internal apprehension of this moral law, assumes that moral ideals *can be* and *ought to be* realized. But they can be realized only if there is a Sovereign Moral Will, God, as their Source and Guarantor; only God can achieve that proper balance between rewards and punishments which is the essence of perfect justice. Thus the moral law *per se* demands that God exist. It demands, moreover, a future life ("immortality") for the actualization of this reign of perfect justice, that is, for the balancing of accounts; it is only by postulating God, freedom, and immortality, that man can hope to achieve ultimate unity and coherence of his actions.

(4) *Man is a creature of conscience*: by nature he is a moral being; inevitably and inescapably he has what is properly called a "moral experience." Brosnahan (PE, 3, 4): "In our moral experience one fact stands out pre-eminently, primary, universal, and specific. Every man who

GENESIS

has attained the use of reason is aware of a magisterial power incorporated in his being, that watches over his conduct, hales him before its tribunal, and judges him impartially and without appeal . . . This indwelling power has been variously designated. For the present we shall call it conscience. The functions of conscience are threefold: it judges, condemning, commending, or exculpating the past act; it witnesses, accusing, justifying, or defending the present act; it dictates, commanding, permitting, or forbidding the future act." All men judge that there is a difference between right and wrong, good and bad, in man's free activity; as a consequence, therefore, they judge that there are some free human acts which the person *ought not* to elicit, and some which he *ought* to elicit: the universality of this judgment is what Scholastic philosophers have designated the Ethical Fact. Codes of morality may vary with time and place, as a result of social conditioning, economic pressure, diverse traditions, and other variable factors. But the fundamental categories of right and wrong are inherent in human nature; moreover, there is an undercurrent of unanimity as to basic ethical principles throughout all human thought. (The recognition of the fundamental right to life, for example, and the law against the taking of human life on one's own authority (murder) are characteristic of all cultures throughout the story of man's existence upon earth.) Aristotle held, and many thinkers after him, that the sense of justice is innate in man. Conscience in the person is defined as the voice of practical reason; it follows, therefore, that where man *with reason* has existed (and without the power of reason he could not be called *homo sapiens*) there man *with conscience* has existed: reason and conscience are inseparable. Again, it must be obvious that the very fact of conscience demands the Sovereign Good as its Guarantor.

(5) Man is specified *as man*, among other things, by a sense of values. Cassirer points out (EM, 79-86) that man

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

is to be distinguished from the brute by his power to think and act in terms of the possible as distinguished from the actual, in terms of the ideal as distinguished from the "real." (Sociology, for example, is the study of human behavior as it apparently *is*; ethics, on the other hand, is the study of human *conduct*, i.e., human behavior as it *ought to be*. (MacIver, the sociologist, says (STS, 520): "To live is to act, and to act is to choose, and to choose is to evaluate." As human beings we are making choices constantly every day of our lives, and choice is a personal selection of that which is desired, in preference to something else, because it is more valued. Persons would never be involved in disagreements, would never quarrel, if there were not at the root of differences a question of value. The world in which man really lives is a world of values rather than the world of things: things have meaning for him only in terms of their value. Hence, history testifies eloquently to the fact that the life of man is a story of his

"Straining forever to the light

That flows from regions out of sight."

Moreover, because man lives in a world of values, he has never been known to be without some form of law, either customary (existing as handed down by tradition) or statutory (existing in stereotyped form: on stone tablets, on parchment or papyrus, or in the form of the written or printed word). What is human (positive) law *in essence* but the amplification and clarification of the natural law (the law which is incorporated in human nature and in human natural relationships), and what is it *as to function* but man's efforts at conserving those ideals and practices which his reason (aided by revelation, of course, in our culture in which we are privileged to have the Bible) tells him to be of value to him as an individual and as a society? Law, however, is the expression of the will of the lawgiver; hence, natural laws of any kind—even those of physics and chemistry—must be regarded as the expression of the Will

GENESIS

of the Divine Lawgiver, God, whose Will is the constitution of the universe, both physical and moral. Truly, a lawless world would be a godless world, and vice versa. (Cf. Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, etc.; Ps. 33:6, 9; Ps. 148:1-6; John 1:1-3, 14; Col. 1:15-17; Heb. 1:1-3, 11:3, etc.).

(6) In any reasonable and just world, it would seem that goodness and happiness should be linked together: that is, that the morally good man should be happy and the wicked man unhappy. But, obviously, such is not always the case: as far as our present world is concerned, the righteous often suffer while the wicked prosper, a Judas gets along about as well as a Socrates, and a Nero about as well as a Paul. But man refuses to believe that this is the final word on the subject. There must be an ultimate Good, a Sovereign Will, who will see to it that justice (the proper relation of goodness and happiness) shall eventually reign, in the day of the "restoration of all things" (Acts 3:21). There must be the Holy and Righteous One who will, in the day of reckoning, render to every man according to his deeds, whether they be good or bad. If justice is anything more than a fiction, there must eventually be a judgment, an accounting. There is no point in calling this "wishful thinking"—it is the spontaneous outcry of the human soul for the Ultimate Right, the Highest Good. (Cf. Ps. 89:14, Acts 17:31, Rom. 2:5-6, 2 Cor. 11:15, Heb. 10:27, John 5:29; Matt. 16:27, 25:31-46, 13:24-30; 2 Pet. 2:4-9, 3:8-13; Rev. 20:11-15.)

(7) *Man and his values are a part of the structure of the totality of being.* The superficial distinction too often made between "facts" and values is an arbitrary one: *values are facts* of the world we live in. Ultimate truth, both physical and moral, is in the very structure of being-as-such. The "laws" of physics and chemistry, for example, are simply descriptions of processes which man discovers in the world around him. Lightning, for instance, was a form of electricity long before Ben Franklin flew his kite

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

and discovered it to be such. King Tut might easily have had a radio or television set to provide him with entertainment on his journey to the land of Osiris, had his contemporaries only had the know-how in the field of electronics. Rome could easily have dropped a hydrogen bomb on Carthage if her engineers had known how to harness the power of the atom. All that was lacking in any case was the knowledge on man's part: all the ingredients and the processes involved have been part of the cosmic order from the dawn of creation. *In the physical world, truth is one, and man only discovers it.* (For a simple illustration, let us suppose that Smith and Jones have a mutual friend, Brown. Smith meets Jones on the street one day and says to him, "I saw Brown a few minutes ago and he was wearing a lovely brand new overcoat, one that reached to his ankles and had five buttons on the front." Jones replies, "I saw him too, new overcoat and all. But you are mistaken about the number of buttons—it had only three buttons in front spaced widely apart." Smith reaffirms, "No, the overcoat had five buttons. You are the one who is mistaken." And so the argument waxes warm. Until Smith declares, "Five buttons is right and true *for me.*" Jones hotly replies, "Three buttons is the truth *for me.*" Obviously, the phrase, "for me," is utterly irrelevant, insofar as the actual truth is concerned. Smith and Jones hunt up Brown and take a look at the overcoat. The truth turns out to be that the actual number of buttons on the overcoat is four. What Smith and Jones thought about it had no bearing on the facts in the case. And so it is always with respect to the cosmos around us: it is what it is. Truth is in the objective order; it is one; and it is discovered, not formulated, by man. *The same is true with respect to truth in the moral realm: ultimate moral truth is incorporated in the structure of human nature and human natural relationships.* This is what is meant in our Western tradition by the phrase, "natural moral law," or just the "moral

GENESIS

law," or, as it is sometimes designated, "the law of human nature." Aristotle: "The law is reason unaffected by desire." Cicero: "The law is not in opinion but in nature." As Dorothy L. Sayers has written (MM, 24, 26): "There is a universal moral law, as distinct from a moral code, which consists of certain statements of fact about the nature of man; and by behaving in conformity with which, man enjoys his true freedom . . . The universal *law* (or natural law of humanity) is discoverable, like any other law of nature, by experience. It cannot be promulgated, it can only be ascertained, because it is a question not of opinion but of fact. When it has been ascertained, a moral *code* can be drawn up to direct human behavior and prevent men, as far as possible, from doing violence to their own nature . . . Defy the commandments of the natural law, and the race will perish in a few generations; cooperate with them, and the race will flourish for ages to come. This is the fact; whether we like it or not, the universe is made that way." *Moral law has its foundation in human nature and human natural relationships.* Man's external relationships are three in number, namely, (a) that of *dependence* upon "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" (to borrow the appropriate phrase from the Declaration of Independence), the natural relationship which is the source of all religious rights and duties; (b) that of *equality* with his fellows, the relationship which is the source of all social and civil rights and duties; and (c) that of trusteeship or *proprietorship* over the sub-human orders, the relationship from which all property rights originate. (All human beings are equal in the sight of the Creator in the sense that they have all been created *persons*; and this equality is confirmed by the fact that Christ died for all men alike. See Mal. 2:10; Acts 17:26; Rom. 5:6-8; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15; 1 Thess. 5:9, 10; 1 Tim. 2:5, 6; Heb. 10:10, etc.). It should be noted, moreover, that these relationships inhere in the nature of things;

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

they are the "givens"; man does not create them, nor can he change them in any way; he finds them here on his arrival in the world; and from them all his rights and obligations derive. Therefore, we may rightly define the Natural Moral Law (the Moral Law) as that law which is *the promulgation in man* of the Eternal Law, the Will of God, the Law by which the human being is constituted a person and by which, therefore, human nature and human natural relationships are ordained to be precisely what they are. The *primary* principles of the Moral Law are set forth in the two Great Commandments (Matt. 22:35-40; Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18). The *secondary* principles of the Moral Law are incorporated in the broad general norms of the Decalogue (Exo. 20:1-17). These moral norms were indeed known to man from the beginning, embedded in his conscience and handed down by tradition, but because of the growing wickedness of the race it became necessary for them to be codified (in order to be preserved) through the mediatorship of Moses. Gal. 3:19—"the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come." Each of these secondary principles must be applied, of course, to the concrete life situation. (Think of the many different kinds of homicide, of disrespect for parents, of theft, of lying, of false witness, of contract-breaking, of covetousness, etc.) The *tertiary* principles of the Moral Law are set forth in human customary or statutory law: all human law is just to the extent only that it amplifies and clarifies the natural moral law. (Traffic regulations, for example, are for the ultimate end of protecting man's most fundamental right, namely, the right to life.) The basic principles of the moral law are amenable to human apprehension (even to reason unaided by special revelation) by means of *the principle of universalization*; that is to say, the determination of the goodness or badness of an act on the ground of what the result would be if the act were universalized, that is, if everybody did it.

GENESIS

It would have to be agreed, I am sure, that the universal practice of murder, theft, adultery, lying, perjury, covenant-breaking, disrespect for parents, etc., or indeed of any one of these, would destroy social order and in all probability would bring about the destruction of the race.

(8) *Legality*, then, if it has any real basis, must have it in *morality*, and morality has its basis in human nature and in human natural relationships; that is, in the Moral Law promulgated in the *person as such*, the law which is in turn the promulgation of the Eternal Law, the expression of the Sovereign Will. This Will is the ultimate norm by which the person is constituted a person with all the rights and duties that attach to him solely and simply *because he is a person*. As Nathaniel Micklem of Mansfield College, Oxford, writes (TP, 60): "The Source of our being and the Artificer of our nature is God Himself. That 'law of nature' which, as the Apostle held, is written on the hearts even of the heathen (Rom. 2: 14-16), is an expression of the Reason which of itself is a reflection of the wisdom and 'eternal law' of God; second, as reflecting it, the 'law of nature,' and third, the customary and statute law of men, which has no validity except as an approximation to the 'law of nature.'" Moral obligation is not physical compulsion; nor is it mere custom or convention; nor is it mere advantage or expediency: it is the obligation placed upon the human will, *proximately* by the positive law insofar as that law reflects the natural moral law, *mediately* by the natural moral law, and ultimately by the Eternal Law, the Will of God. Hence *morals* are not to be identified with *mores*, nor is morality to be identified in all respects with legality: doing right is of a higher order than being careful or keeping out of the penitentiary. This is a lesson which our age needs to learn. Moreover, the *morale* of a nation inescapably is dependent on its *morality*.

(9) Even the ethical relativist, the man who would insist that morality is nothing but the fashion of a particular

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

time and place, finds himself obliged, if he has a single drop of the milk of human kindness in his veins, to accept at least the human being himself as the norm of moral action. Dr. Robert Ulich, Professor of Education at Harvard tells (HC, 149-150) of a scientist (the man was a physician and also a social psychologist) who, in the course of a scholarly discussion, affirmed his espousal theoretically of the relativist position for the scientist. Whereupon one of the discussants present asked him if it would be possible to work out the variables essential to a valid scientific experiment designed to work over into criminals a group of normal children. The speaker replied that he thought it could be done. The discussant then asked him if he did not think it in the interest of the science of criminology that such an experiment should be made. The scientist answered that in his opinion such an experiment would indeed prove enlightening. He was then asked point-blank why he had never undertaken such an experiment. His reply was that children could not be found for such an experiment for the simple reason that parents could not be found who would be willing for their children to be subjected like human guinea pigs to such a test. Then the final question was put to him: "But, sir, if the children, and consenting parents, could be found, would you be willing to make the proposed experiment?" The scientist replied, with an oath, "Do you think I am one of those Nazi war crime doctors who tortured human beings for so-called scientific experiments? Who would wilfully turn a child into a criminal?" Dr. Ulich adds: "What was happening in this discussion was the denial of relativism by its defender. Unconsciously, he had always made his scientific system relative to something he apparently considered absolute, namely the human being. This human being was to him not another piece of flesh or another species of animals (with which he constantly experimented). Rather it was sacred, belonging, if one wants

GENESIS

to say so, to a system superior to all other systems. Making a criminal out of a man by scientific means would have meant to him not only degradation of the value and dignity of humanity, but also of science itself."

(10) *Legal positivism* is the denial of natural law and natural right and obligation altogether. The legal positivist admits no more ultimate source of law and right than the law of the tribe or state of which the person happens to be a unit. Yet the legal positivist cannot, any more than the ethical relativist, eliminate *the human being as such* as the natural norm. (The Bible makes it crystal clear that even all divinely revealed law is *for man's benefit*. Cf. the penalty pronounced on mankind, Gen. 3:17—"cursed is the ground *for thy sake*," etc. Also the words of Jesus, Mark 2:27—"The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.") Even the late Justice Holmes, who certainly was inclined to the positivist view, felt obliged to admit (see Max Lerner, MFJH, 396) that certain necessary elements would have to characterize a society "which would seem to us to be civilized," namely, "some form of permanent association between the sexes, some residue of property individually owned, some mode of binding oneself to specified future conduct, and at the bottom of all, some protection for the person." (But why "some protection for the person"? Obviously and solely because of the person's dignity and worth *as a person*. And what is the basis of man's dignity and worth as a person? Could it be anything else than the fact that he is created *in the image of God*, Gen. 1:26, 27?) The simple fact of the matter is that if the will of one man, or of a group of men, or even of a majority of men, is that which constitutes law and right, then the right of individual conscience, or the right of the minority, does not actually exist. Manifestly, there must be a law somewhere that is of higher obligatory power than the law of the tribe or state: a law superior to the will of one man or that of a few men or even that of a

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

majority. There must be a law somewhere that is binding alike on the ruler and on the ruled; otherwise the ruler could never do wrong, the majority could never enact an unjust law, and such rights as the right of individual conscience and the right of the minority would become mere fictions or at most only gratuities bestowed by a ruling regime. If there is no law anywhere superior to the civil authority, to the will of the ruling regime, then the will of that ruling regime, backed as it always is by physical force, becomes the absolute source of law and right from which there is no appeal. This is simply the world-old doctrine that *Might makes Right*. Hence, the enlightened conscience of man has ever held that there is a *Moral Law*, the expression of the *Eternal Law*, the *Will of the Creator*, which is superior to, and the ground of, all just civil authority and civil law. To abandon this credo is to turn man over to the whims of tyrants and totalitarian regimes. As William Penn once put it, If men are not willing to be governed by God, they will be governed by tyrants.

(11)^r Will legal positivism stand up, under either logical or empirical scrutiny, or even under the scrutiny of common sense? I think not. For example, is an enactment of a state legislature or national congress necessary to create the division of sex into male and female, the division which lies at the root of all forms of society and upon which the continuity of the race depends? Of course not. This is a provision of "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God." Again, is an enactment by any human legislative body necessary to ordain that parents shall have children, and shall provide for and protect their children, or that children shall respect their parents? I think not. Such obligations inhere in the very nature of the world and of man, and indeed were more scrupulously observed in primitive society than in modern society. Again, Is a legislative enactment necessary to establish the Golden Rule as a principle of human conduct—the principle that every man

GENESIS

should do unto others as he would have others do unto him? I think not. This principle (of reciprocity) is as old as antiquity itself and indeed, in all probability, contemporaneous with *homo sapiens*. Still again, two years ago the faculty and staff of Columbia University celebrated that institution's Bicentennial. The theme of the various sessions was "the right to knowledge." I therefore ask: Must man have a legislative enactment to give him the right to knowledge? I think not. Does not his natural capacity for knowledge—by virtue of his having been created or constituted a *person*—give him the natural right to knowledge? Is not the natural right to knowledge the necessary means to the right to life in its growing fulness—the necessary means to personal self-realization and to social adjustment as well? This brings us, of course, to the ultimate question: Does man simply *live*, or does he have the *right* to life? Is man simply to accept himself as a person without giving any thought to the rights and duties of personality? Must we stop thinking in terms of ultimates and simply adopt Popeye's philosophy (which is, incidentally, that of Positivism), "I yam what I yam"? In short, Has man been constituted a person by any act of a human legislature? The question is absurd, of course, on the face of it. Man is a person, with the *right to personality*, by virtue of having been *created* a person, and that by the Efficient Causality, God, who is the Source and Ground of His being. Concerning this right to personality, Cassirer gives us, I think, "the conclusion of the whole matter," as follows (MS, 219): "There is at least one right which cannot be ceded or abandoned: the right to personality . . . If a man could give up his personality he would cease being a moral being. He would become a lifeless thing—and how could such a thing obligate itself—how could it make a promise to enter into a social contract? This fundamental right, the right to personality, includes in a sense all the others. To maintain and to

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

develop his personality is a universal right. It is not subject to the freaks and fancies of single individuals and cannot, therefore, be transferred from one individual to another. The contract of rulership which is the legal basis of all civil power has, therefore, its inherent limits. There is no *pactum subjectionis*, no act of submission by which man can give up the state of a free agent and enslave himself. For by such an act of renunciation he would give up that very character which constitutes his nature and essence: he would lose his humanity." (Thus we see what is meant by the phrase, "unalienable rights.")

(12) *Natural law* and *natural right* and *obligation* are terms which have no meaning whatever apart from the Sovereign Will of God as the obligating norm of moral action. Hence the profound affirmations of our Declaration of Independence, that all men are *created* equal; that they are endowed *by their Creator* (not by any man or group of men, not even by a majority vote of men) with certain *unalienable rights*; that among such rights are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that *to secure these rights*, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from *the consent of the governed*. That is to say, all men have these specified unalienable rights by creation, by virtue of having been created persons; hence, the proper function of government is that of protecting these rights (of making them secure). Obviously, no human government can grant rights and impose duties which inhere in all men by virtue of their having been created persons. Moreover, these are said to be *unalienable* rights, that is, rights which cannot be alienated from the person as such. They attach to the person simply and solely because he is a person: he can neither give them away nor can they be taken from him by another. There is a subtle distinction to be made here between the right itself and the exercise of the right. True it is that a man may be called on to jeopardize the exercise

GENESIS

of his right to life in the interest of the common good; or he may be unjustly deprived of the exercise of the rights to life and liberty by the act of a tyrannical government. But under any and all conditions, the rights themselves remain unimpaired; they can no more be alienated from the person than his memories, thoughts, and experiences can be alienated from him: these rights inhere in personality itself and remain forever unimpaired both in this world and in the world to come. (The same is true of man's natural obligations; one of which is to render to God the internal and external worship that is due Him.) (Note, too, that the idea of personal survival (i.e., beyond the death of the body) is implicit in this doctrine of unalienable rights.) (For a thoroughgoing presentation of this doctrine of the Moral Law, see Corwin, *The "Higher Law" Background of American Constitutional Law*, a Great Seal Book, published by the Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.)

(13) *Natural moral law, natural right, and natural obligation*, all belong, of course, in the realm of those facts which usually are categorized as *values*. Hence, like all values, they are not amenable to observation, measurement, or "proof," in a laboratory of science. But certainly it has been proved again and again, from laboratory of human history, that the moment a nation or an individual abandons or ignores these values, that nation or that individual is on the way to every form of injustice and cruelty imaginable.

(14) All good, all right, all law, all values, all rights, etc., have their ultimate Source in the Sovereign Will of God if they have any binding force whatever, that is, any binding force that is moral rather than physical (sheer might). To illustrate, I am reminded of the story of two salesmen who, in the days when travel was chiefly by train, boarded a passenger coach standing in the railroad yards, disposed themselves and their bags as comfortably

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

as possible, and leaned back to enjoy an hour or more of relaxation. Not long afterward the brakeman thrust his head in at the front door and asked, "What are you fellows doing in here?" "What do you think we're doing?" answered one of the salesmen, rather sarcastically, and added: "We're going over to the county seat, of course." "Not in this coach," declared the brakeman. The salesmen, exasperated, shouted, almost in unison, "Why not in this coach?" "Because," answered the brakeman, "if you'd used your eyes, you'd know why. You could 'a' seen that this coach ain't coupled onto anything that'll take you anywhere." Laws, goods, values, rights, etc., that are not "coupled" onto the Sovereign Will of God as the Guarantor of their integrity are not sufficient to take any human being anywhere either in this world or in the next. Denial of natural law and natural right is the final proof of the shallowness which has characterized recent ethical and political thought.

(15) The clearest and simplest presentation of the ethical or valuational argument for the existence of God, of which I have any knowledge, is that from the pen of C. S. Lewis, in his excellent little book (which certainly every Christian should read) entitled, *The Case for Christianity* (published by Macmillan, New York, 1943). His presentation may be summarized briefly as follows: There is in every accountable person the concept of a Law of Right and Wrong (whether it be called a Law or Rule of Fair Play, of Decent Behavior, or what not), that is to say, a Law of *Human Nature*; otherwise, there would not be repeated differences, even quarrels, about the significance of human acts. "Quarreling means trying to show that the other man's in the wrong" (p. 4). Two facts stand out in all human experience: "First, that human beings, all over the earth, have this curious idea that they *ought* to behave in a certain way and can't really get rid of it. Secondly, that they don't in fact behave that way. They know the

GENESIS

Law of Nature; they break it. These two facts are the foundation of all clear thinking about ourselves and the universe we live in" (p. 7). This twofold intuition is proof of the fact that men do believe in a real Right and Wrong, no matter how variously they may interpret the *modus operandi* thereof. The ordinary "laws of nature," describing "what Nature in fact does," do not give us the whole story. The Law of Human Nature tells us what we as persons "ought to do, and don't." "Progress means not just changing, but changing for the better. If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other there would be no sense in preferring civilized morality to savage morality, or Christian morality to Nazi morality. In fact, of course, we all do believe that some moralities are better than others" (p. 11). Yet comparisons of better or worse do, in themselves, point to an ultimate (absolute) Morality or Good Will. Life is made up of the facts (how men *do* behave) *plus* something else (how they *ought* to behave), and these "oughts" are also facts, facts which cannot be accounted for by any impersonal Life-Force, Creative-Evolution or Emergent-Evolution philosophy. There is a Moral Law in us declaring that men ought to be fair, that they ought to be unselfish. But men are not always fair, not always unselfish, and they *know they are not*. This Moral Law points definitely to a Something or Somebody from above and beyond the material universe who "is actually getting at us." We have two bits of conclusive evidence about this Somebody: namely, the universe which He has made, and the Moral Law which He has put into our minds (p. 25). It is at this point that Christianity comes into the picture, as the only system which resolves our basic human problems. This it does by dealing with man realistically: it tells him that he is not just an imperfect creature who is in need of improvement, one who can lift himself up to perfection simply by tugging at his own bootstraps; that, rather, he is a rebel who must lay down his

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

arms and accept the Remedy which God has provided for him. That Remedy is the Supreme Sacrifice on the Cross (*supreme*, because it was not made by man for man, but made by God Himself for man, and made out of His love for fallen man; hence, the Atonement). "The central Christian belief is that Christ's death has somehow put us right with God and given us a fresh start" (p. 46). 2 Cor. 5:19—"God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Christianity proves its divine origin by its realism: it finds man in precisely the fallen and helpless state morally in which his conscience testifies that he is (if, of course, he will only be honest with himself; cf. Luke 8:15); and it does even more: it offers the remedy, it provides the way out—the way to forgiveness, restoration and life everlasting. It presents the living and true God, who is not only Sovereign Righteous Will, but who is also the Forgiving Father who, by the offering of His Son, has made it possible for Eternal Justice "himself to be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:26).

(16) God is Truth, Beauty, Goodness, all these and more: He is Wholeness or Holiness (John 17:11, Isa. 6:3, Rev. 4:8). *Worship* (praise, adoration, commemoration, meditation, prayer, service, etc.) is man's acknowledgment of the *worth-ship* of God. (Rudolph Otto, in his book *The Idea of the Holy*, proposes the view that *religious* value is characterized by a single unique quality which he designates the *numinous*, a quality totally different from any profane or secular experience, the quality of mysterious and fascinating awe. The "holy" in God is the "awesomeness" of God. Cf. Gen. 28:17—Jacob's experience at Bethel: "And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." Deut. 4:24—"Jehovah thy God is a devouring fire." Heb. 10:31—"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.")

(17) Dr. Samuel M. Thompson writes (MPR, 197):

GENESIS

"Men pass judgment upon themselves. They are aware of their failure to fulfil the obligations they accept. They judge themselves, what they are, in the light of a conception of what they ought to be . . . A man is, and so is a fact; but he demands of himself that he be what he ought to be, and he judges himself by that standard. By virtue of his moral nature he denies his complete submergence in natural fact. He is fact, it is true; but he sees himself also as under a moral necessity to make fact, and to make it in accordance with models which are not themselves mere facts of nature. Human nature contains within itself the power to act for the sake of what it understands its own end to be. This is will; it is genuine action, not merely reaction . . . Man has ideas of what he should be and he acknowledges his obligation to act in accordance with those ideas. But on what does this obligation rest? What justifies the judgment he passes upon himself when he fails to do what he thinks he should do?" That is, what does it mean in relation to the Reality of the cosmic structure that some of its inhabitants have a "moral experience" which is qualitatively different from every other class of phenomena in the world and is not reasonably to be accounted for by the operation of the physical and chemical, or even vital, forces? Both common sense and Scripture give only one satisfactory answer to these questions: that answer is—God. The fact of values in man and his world is proof that God exists as the Summum Bonum, the Beginning and the End of all true value. A world without the cardinal virtues or values (prudence, fortitude, temperance, and justice), and especially one without the theological virtues or values (faith, hope, and love) would be a lawless world and a godless world: it would be a world without any meaning whatsoever. Only a world with values inherent in it can have meaning, and these values can derive their integrity only from the Sovereign Good Will. Again quoting Thompson (MPR, 432): "How is man to

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

find real value, and to distinguish it from the appearance of value? There is only one way, and that is to find absolute value embodied in real existence. This is the answer of religion, and it is an answer most explicit in the Christian religion. When absolute good comes to man through the channel of his own nature alone its image is so twisted and distorted by the medium through which it passes that he cannot see it as good." Again (*ibid.*, 529-530): "Theism, as a philosophy, begins and ends with a sense of our own finiteness. The nineteenth century positivist, on the contrary, was sure of everything. What he knew was certain, and what he did not know he was sure could not be known. Such cocky arrogance was made possible only by his ability to ignore the difficulties involved in any ultimate questioning. It never occurred to Mill or Comte, nor has it occurred to their twentieth century offspring, ever to stare at such a problem as that raised by Leibniz's question: Why is there something rather than nothing?" Again (*ibid.*, 15): "Any conception of God, whatever else it may include, must regard God as really existing. A non-existing God is a contradiction in terms. A conception of God must consider God to be the primary or ultimate existent; that is to say we cannot apply the word *God* to anything which depends on something else for its existence. Finally, we mean by God the source of the good and the final reality of value." The following excerpt from a radio address by Karl Stern, M.D., July 17, 1955, entitled "Psychiatry and Religion," is especially pertinent here, in conclusion. Dr. Stern calls attention to "the general positivistic atmosphere of our time," "the belief that science is the only fountain of truth and that revelation is bunk," the view that "has pervaded large sectors of our culture." He goes on to say: "In the time of the Renaissance, philosophers butted into the realm of the scientists. They wanted to disprove discoveries about the movements of stars on the basis of what Aristotle or Aquinas had to say. Now the tables are turned.

GENESIS

Now some of our scientists want to apply the scientific method to problems which lie in the realm of philosophy. And the result would be quite unimaginable. There are two basic and entirely different modes of human insight—*science* and *wisdom*. Wisdom can tell us nothing about the chemical composition of proteins. And science can tell us nothing about the moral values of Man. At a religious soap box meeting at Hyde Park Corner an atheist heckler once remarked, concerning the creation: 'If I had made a universe I certainly would do a better job than God,' whereupon the speaker remarked: 'I don't want to challenge you on this, but would you mind, for the time being, making a rabbit, just to establish confidence?' The world of spiritual values is also a universe, and no matter how many new things we discover in the science concerning Man, we won't be able to do the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount over. None of us would be able to improve on them."

N. B.—No doubt the student has taken note of the unusual length of this Lesson. I have gone to this length in order to make clear the theological foundation of democracy. It is my belief that there can be only one real foundation for respect for self or respect for others, and that is the deep conviction that every person has been created in the image of God. The close correlation between Biblical teaching and social and political democracy is undeniable, and this is a fact which every citizen of the United States of America should clearly understand and never forget.—(C.C.C.)

6. The Aesthetic Proof

This is the Proof based on the Fact of Beauty throughout the cosmos. Man's history down through the ages has ever been characterized by his recognition and contemplation of the various aspects of cosmic beauty. This is evident from the fact that from his most primitive state down to the present, he has invariably left behind his works of

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

art. As G. K. Chesterton has written about the art which the cave-man left on the cave walls of Western Europe (EM, pp. 1-44): "They were drawings or paintings of animals; and they were drawn or painted not only by a man but by an artist . . . They showed the experimental and adventurous spirit of the artist . . . it would seem that he was not only an artist but a naturalist; the sort of naturalist who is really natural." He goes on to say that there is no evidence whatever that this was the end-product of a long prior artistic development: "For in the plain matter like the pictures there is in fact not a trace of any such development or degree. Monkeys did not begin pictures and men finish them; Pithecanthropus did not draw a reindeer badly and Homo Sapiens draw it well. The higher animals did not draw better and better portraits; the dog did not paint better in his best period than in his early bad manner as a jackal; the wild horse was not an Impressionist and the race-horse a Post-Impressionist." These artistic productions on the cave walls, Chesterton says, testify "to something that is absolute and unique; that belongs to man and to nothing else except man; that is a difference of kind and not a difference of degree. A monkey does not draw clumsily and a man cleverly; a monkey does not begin the art of representation and a man carry it to perfection. A monkey does not do it at all; he does not begin to do it at all; he does not begin to begin to do it at all. A line of some kind is crossed [from brute to man] before the first faint line [of art] can begin." And finally: "It is the simple truth that man does differ from the brutes in kind and not in degree; and that the proof of it is here; that it sounds like a truism to say that the most primitive man drew a picture of a monkey and that it sounds like a joke to say that the most intelligent monkey drew a picture of a man. Something of division and of disproportion has appeared; and it is unique. *Art*

GENESIS

is the signature of man."

Of course, art is not to be confused with utility. As Trueblood writes, "Truth always requires corroboration, but beauty, wherever we find it, is self-justifying." The beautiful, he adds, "is not primarily something which we seek, but something, rather, which claims us" (PR, 121). As Cassirer has written (EM, 143-145), art is also to be distinguished from science, because art is the "intensification" of reality, whereas science is the "impoverishment" of reality (that is, in the form of symbols, formulas, laws, etc.).

That beauty is not merely subjective is evident from the fact that persons *argue* about aesthetic judgments, and the subjectivists argue as much as other persons do. Moreover, the sense of Beauty, as of a landscape, for instance, is publicly shared, and this could not be true if beauty were merely subjective. This public sharing of the appreciation of "all things bright and beautiful" is what Kant has called "aesthetic universality." Hence, to say that a thing is "beautiful *for me*" has no relevance. This means that there is such a thing as natural beauty *objectively*: the beauty of the restless ocean, of the wind-swept prairie, of the starry heavens above, of the cathedral aisles of the Rockies and the pine-clad mountain slopes of the Alleghenies. Is there not, then, an Artist who is responsible for all this natural beauty? We must conclude with Dr. Trueblood (PR, 130): "If the world is the creation of Infinite Mind, the prodigious beauty of the world makes sense. In short, if theism is true, the esthetic experience of natural beauty is what we should expect to find."

7. The Intuitional Proof

(1) Man is universally endowed with religious intuitions and aspirations, all of which point unmistakably to the Supreme Being who alone is able to supply his needs. Every human being enjoys salvation from physical death daily and hourly through the beneficence of a kind Provi-

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

dence. Man has always been profoundly conscious of his creaturehood, of the brevity and incompleteness of his temporal life: "the tragic sense of life" has borne down heavily upon his consciousness in all ages. (See Homer, *Iliad*, VI, 145-149: the words of Glaukos to Diomedes on the battlefield before Troy: "Why dost thou inquire of my generation? Even as are the generations of leaves so likewise are those of men: the leaves that be, the wind scattereth upon the earth, and the forest buddeth and putteth forth more leaves again, when the season of spring is at hand; so of the generations of men one putteth forth and another ceaseth to be." Cf. also Psa. 115:15-16, 90:5-6; Job 14:1-2; Isa. 40:6-8; Jas. 1:10; 1 Pet. 1:23-25.) M. M. Davis, *How To Be Saved*, p. 20: "However fallen and degraded, there is something within man that reaches after God, and a piteous voice that cries to the unseen for help." All attempts by political cultists to brainwash man's consciousness of his need of God, as the Rock of his salvation and his refuge and strength in time of trouble, out of his thoughts and his life, are doomed from the outset: their very unnaturalness consigns them to ultimate destruction. All people have their belief in some kind of God (or gods) no matter how depraved their concepts of His nature and character. Those who reject the living and true God will, in order to fill the vacuum thus created in their lives, heap to themselves false "gods" in the form of a Fuehrer, a Party, a Cause, etc., to which they give fanatical monolithic devotion, and in this manner make a "religion" of irreligion.

(2) The Vedas declare: "There is but one Being—no second." The creed of Judaism was, and is, "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah" (Deut. 6:4, 4:35,39). The cry of a united Mohammedanism has always been: "Allah is God, and Mohammed is his prophet." Even Brahma, Tao, The One, Unity, etc., of the philosophical mysticisms are designations for what is popularly designated "God." The late Dr. Einstein is quoted by Lincoln Barnett (UDE, 106) as

GENESIS

follows: "My religion consists of a humble admiration of the illimitable, superior spirit who reveals himself in the slight details we are able to perceive with our frail and feeble minds. That deeply emotional conviction of the presence of a superior reasoning power, which is revealed in the incomprehensible universe, forms my idea of God." This, of course, is the pantheistic god of Spinoza, not the God of the Bible at all; still, it is a concept of God. Strong (ST, 56): "The lowest tribes have conscience, fear death, believe in witches, propitiate or frighten away evil fates. Even the fetich-worshiper, who calls the stone or tree a god, shows that he has already the idea of a God." It is most interesting to note, too, that back of the mythological (and grossly anthropomorphic) pantheons of the early historic nations, as their foundation and support, was the belief in an "All-Father" or "Great Spirit."

(3) Dr. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh has written recently (NMG) of "customs and impulses which cannot be uprooted from a humanity in whom the instinct to survive, the instinct to reproduce, and the instinct to worship the unknown source of all life, are of equal strength and validity." It should be noted also that the former outspoken pessimist and agnostic, Aldous Huxley, not so long ago turned to mysticism: see his book, *The Perennial Philosophy*. The late C. E. M. Joad, of the University of London, professor of philosophy and well-known author, also lived to experience a change of heart from agnosticism. Note also Walter Lippmann's emphasis on the natural moral law, in his latest work, *The Public Philosophy*; and Joseph Wood Krutch, the critic, calls man back to a sense of his responsibility for making "independent choices and value judgements," in a recent book, *The Measure of Man*. The fact that our contemporary literateurs are showing evidences of renewed sanity in their thinking may indeed be a hopeful sign.

(4) According to the anthropologist, Sir James Frazer,

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

primitive magic must not be confused with religion; its real affinity, he contends, is with science rather than with religion. The shaman or medicine man, he says, presumes to control the higher powers by means of the appropriate ritual or incantation, just as the scientist claims the know-how to control, by formulas and rules, the forces of nature. Their approach is the same, even though magic is superstition, whereas science is usually what it claims to be, — science. Religion, on the other hand, is anything but presumption to control: it is essentially humility, trust, faith, love, and prayer or petition to the superhuman Power or Powers. The very heart of religion is expressed in the well-known words, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt" (Matt. 26:39-42). Hangovers of primitive magic may be seen today in the antics of religious racketeers who presume to put God on the spot by demanding that He work a miracle at the time and place *set by them*, when as a matter of fact God causes miracles to occur at times and places *set by Him* and for His own ends: *e.g.*, those persons who make a practice of showing off their alleged high standing with the Almighty by deliberately handling poisonous snakes, or those who demand repeated miracles of healing or other kinds of "signs," as evidence of God's approbation of them personally or of His fellowship with them. There is still too much barter, even in Christianity, too much saying to God, "If you'll scratch my back, then I'll scratch yours." Pure love for God makes no such propositions, does not seek a "sign" (Matt. 16:1-4); in perfect trust it says always and only, "Thy will be done" (Matt. 6:10). I am reminded here of the incident which occurred in the nineteen-twenties (the decade which Frederick Lewis Allen, in his book, *Only Yesterday*, dubs "the Great Age of Whoopee and Ballyhoo"), in which the novelist, Sinclair Lewis, standing in the pulpit of an influential church in Kansas City, took advantage of the opportunity to prove, as he thought, that there is no God. Lewis had previously

GENESIS

declared publicly that he did not believe in God, and, like most of his kind, evidently he thought that his disbelief was a matter of some consequence to the public; so, in the role of a clergyman, he stood in the pulpit, struck a defiant attitude, and with a sweeping gesture publicly defied Divine Power to strike him dead on the spot. With utter lack of good taste, he shouted, "If there be a God, I defy him to strike me down in the next ten minutes." Dramatically, he pulled out his watch—and waited. Of course, nothing happened, and thus Mr. Lewis proved to his own satisfaction that there was no God. The columnist, Arthur Brisbane, commenting on the incident afterward, had this to say: "Mr. Storey of the Santa Fe Railroad manages railroads from Chicago to the Pacific. The trains pass over hundreds of railroad ties, and between the ties there are thousands of tiny ants, everywhere busy making a living. One ant says to another, 'They tell me that a mysterious W. B. Storey runs this railroad. I don't believe that there is a W. B. Storey, and just to prove it, I defy him, if he does exist, to come down here in the next ten minutes and step on me and kill me.'" "At the end of ten minutes," wrote Mr. Brisbane, "that ant would feel as proud as Sinclair Lewis. But that would not mean that Storey could not step on the ant and kill it, if he wanted to; nor that the Ruler of the universe could not strike Lewis dead, if it were worth while. The point is that *it isn't worth while*." Some fifty years prior to this incident in Kansas City, Mrs. Annie Besant, who was then engaged in inflicting on the gullible the hocus-pocus known as "theosophy," while addressing an audience of working-men in the Hall of Science, a slum auditorium in Old Street, London, struck a defiant pose, and, taking her watch in her hand, shouted dramatically, "If there be a God in heaven, I give Him five minutes in which to strike me dead." There was complete silence as the minutes ticked slowly away and nothing happened. At the end of the allotted time, she turned to

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

the audience and cried: "Where is your God?" This occurred on a Sunday evening. The following Sunday morning, Joseph Parker, the renowned minister of the City Temple, referred to Mrs. Besant's challenge. He said: "If on your return home this morning, your little boy, just learning to talk, were to surprise you by lifting his head up from the pillow to say, 'You say you are my father. I don't believe you. If you are my father, I give you just five minutes to prove it by crushing the life out of me,' what would you do? Would you prove yourself the great being that you are and take your child by the throat and strangle him to death? No, you would press the little fellow's head back on the pillow, rock the cradle a while, and say, 'Sleep, sleep, little one. Some day when you have grown bigger and learned a few things, you will *know* that I am your father.'" Then, in a whisper that could be heard throughout that vast auditorium, Joseph Parker said, "There is your God!"

(5) We can neither assume nor recognize the finite as finite except by comparison with the Infinite. As Victor Hugo once said: "Some men deny the sun: they are the blind." Even the atheists and ethical nihilists, whose first tenet is that God and duty are bugbears to be abolished, assume that God and duty exist *somehow*, and that they are impelled by a *sense of duty* to abolish them. The fanatical Marxist-Leninist, even though clinging to the silly notion that religion is the opium of the people, will resort to lies, treachery, torture, and even murder *en masse*, to bring in those values which he envisions as inherent in what he calls a "classless society." (Let us not forget that the word *utopia*, which is derived from the Greek negative prefix, *ou*, and the Greek *topos*, "place," means literally "no place.") In modern times, the woods are full of these pseudo-religions, such as National Socialism, Fascism, Communism (falsely so-called), Humanism, etc., so-called "religious substitutes" for true religion. All of which goes

GENESIS

to show that, as it has often been said, man is incurably religious. Or, as Toynbee has put it: "Religion is manifestly one of the essential faculties of human nature. No individual human being and no human community is ever without a religion of some kind; and, when people are starved of religion, the desperate spiritual straits to which they are reduced by being deprived of this necessity of life can fire them to extract grains of religious consolation out of the most unpromising ores."

(6) "Blind unbelief is sure to err," wrote Cowper. Of course. It errs, *because it is blind*: cf. Matt. 15:14. In all ages, of course, there have been individuals and groups who have indulged in the sport of throwing spitballs at the Almighty. Even in ordinary swearing, men seem to be unable to find any Names worthy of being invoked in oaths except those of God and Jesus Christ: unwittingly they are paying compliments, albeit left-handed ones, to the God of the Bible. Cf. Ps. 2:1-4: What does God think about all this human presumption and vanity? Verse 4 answers the question: "He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh: the Lord will have them in derision." I have the feeling that the Almighty's sense of humor is being aroused in our day by the antics of ignorant mobs, rioting, vandalizing, destroying, and shouting their loyalties to self-appointed tyrants whose number at present seems to be Legion. I have the feeling also that the Laughter of God is something inexpressibly awesome, something to be dreaded. I for one pray God that I may never have to hear it.

(7) Practically all peoples have their conceptions of a future life. Archaeological discoveries have shown that the Cult of the Dead flourished among all prehistoric peoples of whom we have any records whatever. (See Sir James Frazer's three-volume work, *Belief in Immortality Among Primitives*.) To the Greeks the future heavenly world was known as Elysium (with Hades as the Underworld, and Tartarus (cf. 2 Pet. 2:4) as the place of eternal punishment

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

of all great sinners). Among the Germanic tribes, future bliss was to be enjoyed in Valhalla; among the American Indians, in the Happy Hunting Ground. Among the Hebrew people of old, the glories of the heavenly state were designated by such names as Paradise or Abraham's Bosom. (The Hebrew Underworld, corresponding to the Greek Hades, was known as Sheol. However, Hades and Sheol were regarded simply as abodes of the dead "shades" without reference to their happiness or the opposite.) (Cf. Luke 23:43, 16:22; Gen. 37-35, 42:38; 1 Sam. 2:6; Job 14:13; Psa. 16:10, 139:8; Matt. 16:18; Acts 2:31; 1 Cor. 15:55; Rev. 20:13.) Among Christians, the Life Everlasting, Union with God, is Heaven, the "Home Over There," and the state of eternal loss of God and all Good is Hell (Gehenna, 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Matt. 5:22,29,30; Luke 12:5; Mark 9:47). Have these intuitions of the future life with God and Christ and the Holy Spirit been implanted in us merely that we may, at the end, be disillusioned and mocked? Is a man no better than a brute, only to lie down and die, and cease to be? Does a cruel Satirist sit on the Throne of the Universe and play with us as with puppets? A thousand times—No!

(8) We can arrive, therefore, at but one valid conclusion, namely, that the intuition of the Supreme Being, upon whom men everywhere more or less conceive themselves to be dependent, *is so universal that it can be accounted for only on the ground that it was originally implanted in the very nature of man by the Creator Himself*, that is, by the act described in Scripture as a Divine *inbreathing* (Gen. 2:7). To quote Christlieb (MDCB, 141): "Cicero's question (*De Natura Deorum*, 1,16) still holds good—'What people is there, or what race of men, which has not, even without traditional teaching, some presentiment of the existence of Gods?' Does not this indicate that the belief in some higher and more powerful Being by which he is conditioned, is both *a logical and a moral necessity* for

GENESIS

man? Or must not that in which not merely many (which would prove nothing) but *all* agree, be grounded in the nature and essence of man himself? Yes, human thought *must* recognize God *just* as certainly as itself and the world." Man simply can not in any way rid himself of the idea of God.

8. The Experiential Proof

This is the Proof deriving from the testimony of righteous persons who declare themselves to have personally experienced fellowship with God in this present life and to have actually tasted of the benefits and blessings of His grace.

(1) Faith, which is based on testimony (revelation) gives us at least partial understanding of those realities which are not accessible to sense alone, namely, God's existence, His attributes, His Creatorship, and His relations with His creation, etc. Faith has been called, therefore, the highest form of knowledge. (We recall here Thompson's definition of knowledge as "all that we believe as a result of sound evidence and logical thinking.") Perhaps it would be more correct to say that faith leads to the highest form of knowledge, namely, that form of knowledge which stems from love. For the person who believes that God is at once the Creator and Preserver of nature and also the Revealer of the Mysteries (Rom. 16:25-26; Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 6:19; 1 Tim. 3:9,16; Heb. 11:6), there can be no contradictions between the knowledge of nature through science and the knowledge of the spiritual mysteries through Biblically-produced faith (Rom. 10:14-17). One who is steeped in the language, lore, and spirit of the Bible *knows* that revelation complements reason, that faith, far from being a limitation on knowledge, is an enhancement of it. He knows that faith fertilizes the mind and heart: as many of the Church Fathers put it: *Credo ut intellegam*, "I believe in order to understand." Belief in an object gives one understanding of that object: hence

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

faith has been rightly called the insight of the two eyes of the heart—understanding and love. Pascal: "We know truth, not only by reason, but by the heart . . . The heart has its reasons which the reason knows nothing of." Emerson: "Belief consists in accepting the affirmations of the soul; unbelief, in rejecting them." (Heb. 11:3, 2 Tim. 1:12, 1 John 3:2).

(2) 1 Cor. 13:13. Faith based on testimony (revelation) can give us partial understanding of God and His ways, but only love can give the fuller knowledge. Love is attraction to, and union with (*en-rapport-ness*) its object. As Erich Fromm writes (art., "Man Is Not a Thing," *Saturday Review*, March 16, 1957): "The only way to full knowledge lies in the act of love; this act transcends thought, it transcends words." The act of love (John 3:16, 1 John 4:7-11) was God's only way to the understanding of man (Phil. 2:5-8; Heb. 2:5-18, 4:14-16; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:25; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2-14); likewise, pure love for God is man's only means to his own fuller knowledge of God (John 17:3, 1 John 4:7-8). As the late Henri Bergson, the French philosopher, has written (TSMR, 240, 246): "God is love, and the object of love; herein lies the whole contribution of mysticism." Again, "The mystics have blazed the trail along which other men may pass. They have, by this very act, shown to the philosopher the whence and whither of life." Nor should it ever be overlooked that love seeks oneness with its object in submission and in service (John 8:31-32, 15:10, 14:15, 7:17; Matt. 7:24-27). It is only by love that the believer is brought into true fellowship (eternal life) with God (Rom. 13:10).

(3) The errors of the intellectualist are errors of defective vision: intellect has been arbitrarily divorced from a right disposition, right affections, right motives, right directionality of life; that is, from what Jesus calls "an honest and good heart" (Luke 8:15). The intellect will say, "I cannot know God," and the intellect is right: what intellect

GENESIS

says, Scripture also says (Job 11:7; Rom. 11:34; 1 Cor. 2:14). Cf. especially 1 Cor. 1:21-24: to the soul steeped in literal-minded traditionalism (as represented here by "Jews"), the idea of a crucified Savior (the doctrine of Atonement) has ever been a stumblingblock; to the speculative, intellectualistic type of mind (as represented here by "Greeks"), the idea has ever been utter foolishness (Acts 17:21-23). This is just as true today as it ever was. The good seed of the Kingdom (the spiritual seed, the Word of God) can be expected to fructify only in an "honest and good heart" (Luke 8:15, 1 Pet. 1:22-25). Men can know the truth only in proportion to their willingness to do the truth; in like manner, only love can understand love, only holiness can understand, and therefore appreciate, holiness. (Surely the devil would be unspeakably miserable if he should ever find himself in Heaven.) (Psa. 34:8; John 3:21, 7:17, 8:31-32). Secular scientists have always been prone to turn theologians and to break into print on matters concerning which they show that they know little or nothing. I think it was Will Rogers who once remarked that the man who is highly specialized in some particular field is apt to be completely ignorant outside the field in which he is specialized. How true this is! In my earlier days, for example, I believed practically anything the first Henry Ford had to say about the manufacture and marketing of automobiles, and I was justified in so doing; he was an authority in that particular field. But I believed little or nothing that he had to say on political and religious subjects: every time he broke into print on these subjects he showed that he knew practically nothing about either. Yet because of our subservience to a great name, the newspapers would print anything that Ford had to say on any subject, whether what he said was worth anything or not. (In logic, this is known as the *argumentum ad verecundiam*, that is, the fallacy of appealing to the authority of a famous name.) The same can be said of such

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

men as Edison, Burbank, Einstein, Darrow, and many others; their name is Legion: men who demonstrated every time their comments on religion appeared in print, that they had no conception whatever of the Bible and its teaching. (Cf. also the tomes of pseudo-intellectual insipidity that have been published recently under the title, *This I Believe*.) Just how much are the opinions of such persons on religious matters actually worth?

(4) The noblest affirmations of God have their foundations in profound and genuine religious experience. The Bible itself has come down to us through the mystic experiences of God's own men and women: "men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21). (See especially the following: Enoch (Gen. 5:24), Noah (Gen. 6:13-22, 9:1-17), Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3, 15:1-20, 17:1-22), Jacob at Bethel (Gen. 28:10-22) and at Peniel (Gen. 32:24-32), Moses (Exo. 3:1-18, 19:1-20:26 ff., Deut. 5:1-33, 18:15-19; Heb. 11:27), Samuel (1 Sam. 3:1-21), David (2 Sam. 22:1-23:6), Elijah (1 Ki. 19:9-18), Isaiah (6:1-13), Ezekiel (chs. 36,37), Daniel (chs. 7,8), John the Baptizer (Matt. 3:1-2, Mark 1:1-4, Luke 1:80, John 1:19-34), the Transfiguration (Matt. 17:1, 2 Pet. 1:16-18), Cornelius (Acts 10:1-7), Peter (Acts 10:9-17), Paul (Acts 9:1-20, 22:1-21, 26:1-29; 1 Cor. 15:1-10, 9:1; 2 Cor. 12:1-5, Gal. 1:11-12); John the Beloved's successive visions on Patmos, of the seven golden candlesticks (Rev. 1:9-3:22), of the door opened in Heaven (Rev. 4:1-11:18) and of the temple of God in Heaven (Rev. 11:9 to the end of the book). (Note also the divine formulas by which the various prophetic books of the Old Testament are introduced: "the word of Jehovah came" to Isaiah (1:10, 8:1), Jeremiah (1:2), Ezekiel (1:3), Hosea (1:1), Joel (1:1), Jonah (1:1), Micah (1:1), Zephaniah (1:1), Haggai (1:3), Zechariah (1:1), Malachi (1:1), John the Baptizer (Luke 3:2). Also "thus saith Jehovah," etc. (Amos 1:6), Obadiah (1:1), "the book of the vision of Nahum (1:1), "the bur-

GENESIS

den which Habakkuk the prophet did see" (1:1).

(5) We must remember that where the Word of God is, there the Spirit of God is, for the Spirit is the Revealer of the Word (Isa. 59:21); hence the prophets of old, from Samuel down to John the Baptizer were in a special sense 'men of the Spirit' (2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12). Jesus is said to have possessed the powers (gifts) of the Spirit without limitation (John 3:34-35, 4:14, 7:37-39; Matt. 12:28, Luke 11:20), and the Apostles were men who were guided into all the truth by the same Holy Spirit (John 14:16-17, 14:25-26, 15:26-27, 16:7-15, 20:21-23; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 2:9-16). (The Bible, from beginning to end, presents itself to us as the work of Spirit-filled men.) Consider also the experiences of the saints of all ages, men and women who have testified that they cried out unto God and found Him—found Him perhaps not in the wind, nor in the earthquake, nor in fire, but in "a still small voice" (1 Ki. 19:9-18): men and women who have testified that their prayers were heard and answered by our God, that their spiritual aspirations were realized, and their spiritual needs satisfied, through repentance, prayer, meditation, worship, Bible study, and sacrificial service. How many thousands of saints have found God to be their Refuge and Strength at all times! (Deut. 33:27; Psa. 46:1, 62:7, 94:22, 18:2, 31:3, 71:3, 91:2, 144:2; Jer. 16:19; 2 Sam. 22:2-3; 2 Tim. 1:12, 4:7-8, etc.) Are these testimonies to be passed up lightly as mere "superstitions" or as, at most, only "wishful thinking"? Are they not just as valid experientially as that of the physical scientist who may look at the "craters" on the moon through a telescope, or watch a cell divide under the microscope, or witness the terrific effects of the phenomenon of atomic fission? Does not the average scientist exclude himself from apprehension of ultimate truth by his own arbitrary assumption (presupposition) that "knowledge" is limited strictly to observable and measurable "facts"? Besides, what is a "fact"?

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

(6) A word of caution here: There is no evidence that the mystic experience occurs in our Dispensation for the purpose of fresh disclosures of moral and spiritual truth to man. Indeed we are told that with the compiling of the New Testament Scriptures *all things* pertaining to life and godliness were given (2 Pet. 1:3), that the Christian System is the Faith "which was *once for all* delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3), that the Scriptures themselves are sufficient to furnish the man of God "*completely unto every good work*" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). Hence, all alleged special revelations, since the completion of the Canon, must be rejected summarily on two grounds: first, that not any one of them (nor all of them together) has added, or can add, one iota of moral and spiritual truth to that which is given us in the Bible; and second, that these alleged revelations cancel one another out by their diverse and even contradictory contents. God, we are told, is "not a God of confusion, but of peace" (1 Cor. 14:33). The Spirit of God is the Spirit of truth (John 14:16-17, 15:26-27); hence it is inconceivable that the Spirit should have been the source of all these diverse cults built up on post-canonical alleged "visions" and "revelations." Truth, in any area, does not contradict itself. For these reasons we must reject so-called mystic experiences purporting to disclose fresh spiritual truth, outside the Judeo-Christian revelation as given us in the Bible. Mystic experiences may be considered valid, however, which serve to confirm the saints, individually and experientially, in the grace and in the knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18).

(7) Man does not create his physical thirst for water—it is born in him: it is an organic tension demanding satisfaction if he is to live in this present world. In like manner, thirst for God is inborn: it is a spiritual tension, so to speak, which can be satisfied only in fellowship with Him. If this thirst for God were not founded in Reality, it would have

GENESIS

died out long ago. *It is of the essence of religion to have the object of devotion outside the self.* Man can no more get along without "living water" (Psa. 23:2, John 4:13-14, 7:37-39) to quench his spiritual thirst than he can get along without natural drinking water to quench his physical thirst (Psa. 63:1, 42:1-2, 143:6). The vitality of the religious consciousness of man is evident from the fact that it survives all the attacks of its enemies—atheists, agnostics, naturalists, positivists, humanists, and all their ilk; just as it will survive the Marxist-Leninist brainwashing of our time. The Church, like the burning bush of old, has ever burned (with the fires of heresy, apostasy, sectarianism, hypocrisy, formalism, clerical jealousy, ecclesiastical pretension, poor business management, and what not) but remains unconsumed. Man simply refuses to give up God, for he comes to realize sooner or later that in doing so he gives up everything—he has nothing left. (This was the experience of Job: catastrophically denuded of his herds, and then of his own offspring, afflicted with a loathsome disease, and, as the crowning indignity, scornfully urged by his wife to "renounce God and die," Job replied, "Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh" (Job 2:10). Job realized that if he should "let go" of God, then indeed he would have nothing left.) The simple fact of the matter is that if my life is to have meaning, I must believe in myself, in my fellow-men, and in my God.

(8) Do you live in personal intimacy with God? Do you "pray without ceasing" and "in everything give thanks" (1 Thess. 5:17,18)? Do you give thanks at the table? Do you know that God answers prayer? Even when as a child you lisped, "Now I lay me down to sleep," you prayed to Someone—to One who can hear and understand and respond—did you not? Let us never forget that we can come to God anywhere, at any time, if we come to him *in Jesus' name*

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

(Matt. 18:20; John 14:13,14; John 15:16; Col. 3:17), for He is ever

“Nearer to us than breathing,
Closer than hands and feet.”

9. The Biblical Proof

The Bible bears on its own pages the imprimatur of the Spirit of God, that is, self-evident proof that it is The Book from God.

(1) The Bible is a fact—a fact to be accounted for. In the past one hundred and fifty years, all Bible Societies, we are told, have handled some two trillion copies of the Bible either as a whole or in part. According to the report of the American Bible Society, the Bible as a whole or in part has been translated into more than twelve hundred languages. It is the most up-to-date book in the world. As Clayton Potter has written, in the *Front Rank*, June 10, 1956: “Man’s hopes and despairs, sins and virtues, guilts and aspirations, loves and hates, tendency to doubt and capacity for faith, the causes of his evil and the means of his redemption, were all noted long ago. The Bible is as up-to-date as the latest textbook. Its words must be revised from time to time, for language changes with the years, but its ideas are permanent and its insights forever fresh.” Is it any wonder that the demand for the Bible, the world over, grows greater with the passing of every year?

(2) As stated heretofore, no author in presenting his book to the public thinks of prefacing it with the proofs of his own existence: his name on the backbone and on the title page is considered sufficient evidence of his existence and authorship. So it is with the Bible. It does not attempt to prove that God is: it simply presents itself to us as God’s Book, the revelation of His Will and Plan for our redemption. Hence it opens with the sublime affirmation, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” It takes it for granted that men cannot be so foolish

GENESIS

as to deny that God is, or that He, by the agency of the Spirit, is the Author of this Book of all books. Let me testify here that the person who feeds upon the spiritual content (food) of the Bible, who assimilates it into the very essence of his interior being, who lives its teaching from day to day to the best of his human ability, can, and does, appreciate both its simplicity and its depth of meaning, and is bound to accept it wholeheartedly as what it claims to be. Rejection of this claim can be attributed only to ignorance or to a perverted will. (3) The Bible is pre-eminently the Book of the Spirit. (Cf. 2 Pet. 1:21; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; John 3:34, 14:16,17; John 12:26, 15:26-27, 16:7, 13, 20:21-23; Heb. 1:1-2; Acts 1:8, 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; Eph. 1:13-14, 3:1-13, etc.). As Canon Robinson writes (CEHS, 5): "On its first page there is painted the impressive picture of chaos, when darkness was upon the face of the deep; but the Spirit of God was brooding, like a mother-bird, upon the face of the waters. From the last page there rings out the evangelical challenge of the Church to the world, 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come.' Between them there is the story of a divine evolution, which is from God's side, revelation, and from man's side, discovery." The language of the Bible is the language of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:6-14). One who has made his mind a storehouse of this language of the Spirit has an almost impregnable defense against every form of materialism and secularism; (It will be noted that Jesus resisted Satan by quoting Scripture: "it is written," said He, in meeting each of the three Satanic appeals: Matt. 4:4,7,10.) Moreover, only the person who is familiar with the thought and language of the Bible can discern the mediocrity of such other "religious" writings as the Vedas, the Avesta, the Upanishads, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, Science and Health, etc., mediocrity in all those characteristics in which the Bible is unapproachable.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

(4) Those characteristics of the Bible which give it the *imprimatur* of Divine origin are the following: (a) its *unity* (though made up of sixty-six books, written by many different authors, in all ages of human history from about 1500 B.C. to A.D. 100, yet it is *one* book with just *one* theme, redemption through the person and work of Messiah, from beginning to end); (b) Its *realism* (it presents life just as men lived it and as they live it today, both in its beauty and in its ugliness: it finds man in sin, as indeed every honest man knows that he is, and it shows him the way out); (c) its sublime *themes* (God, the Son of God, the Spirit of God, grace, sin, faith, hope, love, justification, redemption, sanctification, the Spiritual Life, heaven, hell, immortality, etc.—no other “religious” writing even pretends to deal with all these facts of human life and experience); (d) its *literary excellence* (it contains the most exquisite examples of every form of the literary art: note especially the unparalleled beauty of the imagery of the apocalyptic books, Daniel, and Revelation; the great epic poem, the Book of Job; the gorgeous hymnody of the Psalms; the idyllic (pastoral) beauty of the Book of Ruth; the books of law, history, prophecy, biography; the parables of Jesus, etc.); (e) its *artistic excellence* (*fine art* being the fusion of thought (forty per cent) and feeling (sixty per cent): cf. Job 14:1-15, 19:23-29; 1 Cor. 15:1-28 and 15:35-58; 1 Cor. 13:1-13; Rom. 8:18-37, 11:25-36, etc.); (f) its *idealism* (it presents the only perfect code of morals (values) that has ever been given to man: cf. the Decalogue (Exo. 20), the Sermon on the Mount (Matt., chs. 5,6,7), the Two Great Commandments (Matt. 22:34-40), the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-25), the Christian excellences (2 Pet. 1:5-9, etc.); (g) its *finality* (not one iota of moral and spiritual truth can be added to that which is given us in the Bible: its finality is in its completeness); (h) its *central Figure*, Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God (John 20:30-31, 3:16; Matt. 16:16;

GENESIS

Heb. 1:1-4; 1 John 2:22-23, 4:1-4), anticipated throughout the Old Testament, presented throughout the New Testament.

(5) It is significant, too, indeed most significant, that no book of religion in the entire gamut of world literature has ever been so thoroughly dissected by critics, so smirked at by convictionless "liberals," so ridiculed by sceptics and so viciously attacked by evil men, as the Bible has been, down through the ages. The Vedas, the Avesta, the Upanishads, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, Science and Health, etc.—not one of these books has ever received the critical analysis, the prejudiced, at times vicious, treatment that has been heaped upon the Bible by its enemies.

An excellent example of the business of critical dissection occurs in the treatment of the life of Jesus which was presented to the public in the December 25, 1964 issue of *Life* magazine. However, there is one simple refutation of this "demythologizing" process, namely, that we have the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John before our very eyes—their content cannot be denied because we have it in black and white. We know these biographies were written in the first century, whether or not by the writers to whom they have always been attributed. Hence, as someone has said, If the transcendent Personage whose biography we have in these four books never lived on this earth, the men who wrote the books would have to be regarded as great as He, by virtue of their ability to conceive such a Character and such a Teaching. Or, as the late S. Parkes Cadman once said, in substance, This demythologizing business has itself produced only a myth.

The vicious methodology of these self-appointed critics ("debunkers") of assuming *a priori* (1) that any event described in Scripture as a miracle must be regarded as unhistorical and hence must be "explained away" (when the fact is that the Bible does not purport to be a general history, but only the history of the Messianic Line), (2)

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

that the narration by different writers of different aspects of the same event constitutes discrepancy or even outright contradiction, when as a matter of fact the various narratives complement one another and are designed to be put together to give us the *complete* story of the particular episode, and (3) that the doctrine of inspiration must be disregarded, completely ignored, as if there were no Holy Spirit; this has done irreparable injury to the souls of multiplied thousands of mankind, whose sane judgments are distorted by the "scholarly" aura which hovers over these speculative critics and "theologians." Why do these discrepancy hunters and pickers persist in never looking, or even trying to look, for harmony in the Scriptures? They could find it easily if they were to turn their talents to efforts to build faith rather than to destroy it.

(6) God is really to be found throughout the pages of the Bible, and especially in its revelation of the person and work of Christ. Multiplied thousands today are trying to find God, but they are either looking for the wrong kind of God or looking for the living and true God in the wrong places. The living God is not to be found adequately in the things of this world, nor in the laboratory of science, nor in the traditions of men, nor in the speculations of philosophy. God is to be adequately apprehended only from the pages of the Bible, and especially in the central Figure of the Bible, God's Only Begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, whose mission it was to reveal Him (John 1:14,18; John 14:9; Heb. 1:1-3). The following excerpt (source unidentified) is especially to the point here: "The assurance that the Bible is a unique and indispensable witness to God does not come upon men as a reality because someone else has said so, no matter how authoritative. It comes only by experience with the Bible. If our generation and the generations to follow are to find in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the one Being worthy of absolute loyalty; if we are to lean our whole

GENESIS

weight on Him for the saving that we and the world so desperately need, the only place we and the world can find Him is in the Bible, and the one thing we need to do with the Bible is to read it—and read it and read it. Courage to stand off other preoccupations, faith that here is the supreme hope for us, patience with what we may never understand, and willingness to do God's will—this and *reading* are all that we really need. That is the Bible's way of bringing us into the presence of God." In the characteristic simplicity of the hymnology of Isaac Watts—

"The stars that in their courses roll

Have much instruction given;

But Thy good Word informs my soul

How I may climb to Heaven."

(Note well, however, that the lore of the Bible is accessible only to those who "hunger and thirst after righteousness" (Matt. 5:6), *i.e.*, after God's way of doing things (Matt. 6:33, 3:15), and hence are unremitting in their effort to gain the knowledge of the truth. He who does not seek cannot expect to find.) (Matt. 7:7-8; Phil. 2:5; 1 Cor. 2:16.)

10. The Ultimate Proof

The ultimate Proof of the existence of God is Christ Himself, the central Figure of the Bible, the Son of the living God. The living and true God is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (John 20:30-31; Acts 2:36, 11:17; Rom. 5:1; 1 Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:3, etc.). The New Testament writings confirm the Messiahship (Christhood) and Sonship of the Lord Jesus by numerous texts which affirm His pre-existence, His condescension and humiliation (as the Word who became flesh and dwelt among us), His exaltation and coronation, and His present universal Sovereignty. These Divine relationships are further validated by the Scriptures setting forth the nobility of His teaching, the faultlessness of His character and life, the supernaturalness of His claims, the fulfilment of Hebrew prophecy in Him,

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

the greatness and variety of His miracles, the grandeur of the names ascribed to Him, and indeed by many infallible proofs (Acts 1:3). God has piled the evidence so high throughout the ages, as recorded in Scripture by the inspiration of the Spirit, to authenticate the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, that he who fails *to read* and *to heed* this testimony will find himself without excuse in the great and notable Day of the Lord, the Day of the Last Judgment (Acts 2:20, 17:30-31; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 3:5, 21:7, 22:4).

Thus Jesus Himself leaves us no middle ground to take between complete acceptance and complete rejection of His Messiahship and Sonship. This is pointed up so sharply by C. S. Lewis (MC, 40, 41). The strange and significant thing about Jesus, says Lewis, is that "even His enemies, when they read the Gospels, do not usually get the impression of silliness and conceit. Still less do unprejudiced readers. Christ says that He is 'humble and meek' and we believe Him; not noticing that, if He were merely a man, humility and meekness are the very last characteristics we could attribute to some of his sayings." Lewis continues: "I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him: 'I'm ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept His claim to be God.' That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on a level with the man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God: or else a madman or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But let us not come with any patronizing nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to." Jesus of Nazareth is either everything that He claimed to

GENESIS

be and everything that the Spirit claimed about Him and for Him (John 16:13-15)—or He is the rankest impostor who ever appeared in the world. He is either all that He claimed to be—or He was not even a good man! There is no halfway house for us to hide in, with respect to Him.

Moreover, the absolutely ultimate Proof of the existence of God is the Resurrection of Christ. Why so? Because it was God the Father who, through the agency of the Spirit (Rom. 8:11) raised Him from the dead, and “made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places”, etc. (Eph. 1:20-23; cf. Acts 2:32, Phil. 2:9-11, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, 1 Pet. 3:18-22, Heb. 1:1-4, 2:14-15). Thus was this Jesus “declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead—even Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 1:4). Thus the Resurrection was the crowning proof of the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, and the proof of the Sonship of Jesus at the same time is the proof of the existence of God the Father who raised Him from the dead. (For detailed studies of the Deity of Jesus and the Historicity of His Resurrection, see my *Survey Course in Christian Doctrine*, Vols. III-IV, published by the College Press, Joplin, Missouri.)

To summarize the content of this entire section, we affirm the following unequivocally: *Should any of the foregoing Proofs be thought seriously amenable to challenge, certainly all of them, taken together, coalesce to put the fact of God's existence beyond legitimate possibility of rejection by honest and good hearts.* Acceptance of this fact, of course, could hardly be expected of the prejudiced mind or perverted will.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART THREE

1. What is meant by the First Truth? Who is the First Truth?
2. State the Principle of Sufficient Reason or Adequate Cause.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

3. Explain what is meant by Efficient Causality.
4. Explain what is meant by the Mystery of Being.
5. Explain what is meant by "infinite regress."
6. State the Cosmological Proof of the existence of God.
7. What does the doctrine of Creation *ex nihilo* really mean?
8. State the Ontological Proof as formulated by Anselm and by Descartes respectively.
9. State the Teleological Proof of God's existence.
10. What is the origin and meaning of the word "cosmos"?
11. List the evidences of the order characteristic of the universe.
12. Explain: If the universe were not orderly, there could be no science.
13. Explain what is meant by the Will to Live.
14. State what the word "chance" signifies.
15. Summarize briefly the Anthropological Proof of the existence of God.
16. What is meant by "anthropocentrism"? In what sense is the universe really anthropocentric?
17. Summarize the Moral Proof of God's existence.
18. Explain what the word "value" means.
19. Explain: "Man is a creature of moral law."
20. What is the significance of the universality of conscience in man?
21. Explain: "Values are facts of the world we live in."
22. What must be the foundation of moral law?
23. State the three external relationships into which every person is born and the class of rights and duties stemming from each of these relationships.
24. What is meant by "legal positivism"?
25. Explain what is meant by the phrase, "unalienable rights." Explain clearly the far-reaching significance of this phrase.
26. Explain what is meant by the Natural Moral Law.
27. State the Aesthetic Proof of the existence of God.