

GENESIS

28. State the Intuitional Proof of the existence of God.
29. State the Experiential Proof of the existence of God.
30. Explain: "Where the Word of God is, the Spirit of God is."
31. What special claim does the Bible make for itself?
32. State the Biblical Proof of the existence of God.
33. State the characteristics of the Bible which evidence its Divine origin.
34. What is the Ultimate Proof of God's existence?
35. Explain how the Resurrection of Christ is the final supreme confirmation of the existence of the God of the Bible.

PART FOUR:

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

As we have learned, the Greek *kosmos*, the English *cosmos*, means "order." *Cosmology*, then, is that branch of human knowledge which deals with the order that is found to prevail in the different areas of the physical world. This word *cosmology* must not be confused with the word *cosmogony*. A *cosmogony* is an account or narrative of the Creation. The Hebrew Cosmogony is given us in Gen. 1:1-2:3. This account is a compact and complete literary and doctrinal *whole*, and must be considered as such. It would be well, therefore, before taking up the study of the Biblical text itself, to take a look at the various interpretations of the Hebrew Cosmogony which have been suggested, as follows:

1. *The ultra-scientific interpretation.* Those who hold this view insist that the Genesis Cosmogony must conform in every respect to the conclusions of the sciences. This, however, is asking too much, for two reasons especially: In the first place, the Bible is not, was not even designed to be, a textbook of science; in the second place, science changes its concepts from age to age; hence no account of the Creation could possibly be sufficiently flexible to be in harmony with all these changing views. Moreover, prac-

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

tically the entire content of the Bible is pre-scientific in origin; that is, it was indited before human science had begun to be formulated. The Biblical account of the Creation is designed to give us the truth about the nature, origin, and destiny of man, and his position in the totality of being as the lord tenant of the earth which was created for his habitation (Gen. 1:28-30). The fundamental truth explicit in this Cosmogony is that the Will of the living God is the constitution of our world, both physical and moral; that the totality of the world we cognize by sense-perception and subsequent reflection is the embodiment of the Thought, Will, and Word of God the Creator. In a word, the motif of the Hebrew Cosmogony is *religious* (spiritual), not scientific. However, the amazing fact is that the Biblical account of the Beginnings has never been seriously in conflict with scientific thinking at any time in human history; that indeed the harmony between Biblical teaching and scientific thought is greater today than it has ever been. We may state the facts as follows: God has written two Books, the Book of Nature and the Book of Redemption. In the former, He reveals his "everlasting power and divinity" (Rom. 1:20; Psa. 19:1); in the latter, His ineffable love for His creature, man, and His plan for man's ultimate redemption (John 3:16). Now we may properly state that Science is man's attempt to apprehend and describe the content of the Book of Nature, and that what is commonly called Theology is man's attempt to understand what is written in the Book of Redemption. Of course, the result may be apparent discrepancies between the two interpretations because man is ever fallible and prone to error, and, in addition to this, is always faced with the problem of the inadequacy of his language as a vehicle for the communication of Divine Truth. But certainly there can be no discrepancies or contradictions between the two Books themselves, because both are from God, and therefore Truth, and Truth does not contradict

GENESIS

itself. Much of the alleged conflict between the Bible and Science does not actually exist; it is the by-product, rather, of the human propensity for setting up and shooting at straw men (that is, speculatively creating issues which are not actually relevant).

2. *The ultra-literal view*, that the Genesis account pictures the Creation as having been begun and finished in seven days of twenty-four hours each. Cf. Murphy (MOG, 44): "The days of this creation are natural days of twenty-four hours each. We may not depart from the ordinary meaning of the word without a sufficient warrant either in the text of Scripture or in the law of nature. But we have not yet found any such warrant. Only necessity can force us to such an expedient. Scripture, on the other hand, warrants us in retaining the common meaning by yielding no hint of another, and by introducing 'evening, night, morning, day,' as its ordinary divisions. Nature favors the same interpretation. All geological changes are of course subsequent to the great event recorded in the first verse, which is the beginning of things. All such changes, except the one recorded in the six days' creation, are with equal certainty antecedent to the state of things described in the second verse. Hence no lengthened period is required for this last creative interposition." Simpson writes in similar vein (IBG,471): "There can be no question but that by *Day* the author meant just what we mean—the time required for one revolution [rotation?] of the earth on its axis. Had he meant an aeon he would certainly, in view of his fondness for great numbers, have stated the number of milleniums each period embraced. While this might have made his account of creation less irreconcilable with modern science, it would have involved a lessening of God's greatness, one sign of which was his power to do so much in one day." (I would have to say that these statements are dogmatic, and filled with assumptions for which there is no justification.) The late Dr. Ashley S. Johnson

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

presents an interesting—and, in a sense, mediating view, as follows (BMBE,5): “The fact that the creative work had been going on for unnumbered ages, leads the reverent student to the conclusion that the “days” were ordinary periods of twenty-four hours each, and that each product of Almighty Power was finished and appointed to its sphere on its designated day.” I am not certain that I understand these statements precisely, but I take them to mean that the successive days of the Genesis account should be understood as the days on which each successive phase of the Creation—all phases of which had been in process of actualization “for unnumbered ages”—was brought to fruition. This is an interesting theory, to say the least.

An interesting angle *in re* this whole problem is that in the advocacy of the ultra-literal interpretation of the Genesis Cosmogony, those who are usually regarded as the most “orthodox” or “fundamentalist” find themselves in the same company with the radical critics who advocate the solar-day theory in support of their view that the Cosmogony as a whole was pointed up to, and was composed primarily to account for, the origin and observance of the Jewish Sabbath, with the consequence that, in their view, the accounts of the Divine “hallowing” of the seventh day as the Sabbath which we find in Gen. 2:3 and in Deut. 5:15 are said to be in conflict. (This phase of the problem is treated below and also in the course of the study of the text of Gen. 2:3.)

However, there are many distinguished scholars—men whose Biblical orthodoxy is not open to question, beginning with several of the Church Fathers—who find it impossible to accept the ultra-literal interpretation of the Hebrew Cosmogony, nor do they consider that any necessity is laid upon them to accept it. They hold that the design of the Mosaic account is to affirm the truth that our world is the handiwork of the living God who has only to order a thing to be done and it *is* done (for with the God of the Bible

GENESIS

to think is: to create.) (Note the statement, "And God said," which occurs repeatedly in the first chapter of Genesis.) These men hold that the Spirit's purpose in giving us the account is to emphasize the *religious* truth about the Creation, without regard to possible scientific or unscientific aspects of it. Hence, although we are indeed told expressly that whatever God commanded "was done," we are not told just *how* it was done (cf. Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6; Heb. 11-3). Whether the Creation extended over seven solar days or seven (shall we say?) *aeonic* days, they contend, is not a matter of too great significance for a very simple reason, namely, *that the same measure of Creative Power (Efficient Causality) would have been prerequisite in either case.* Therefore, the problem, according to those who hold this view, is not one of *power*, but of *method*. (Obviously, Infinity in God has no reference to magnitude of any kind; rather, it designates the inexhaustibility of the Power which created and which sustains the whole of the Creation.) Those who take this general *aeonic-day* view cite the following facts to support it:

1. The indefiniteness which characterizes the use of the Hebrew word *yom* ("day") throughout the Genesis Cosmogony itself. E.g., in Gen. 1:5 and 1:16, the word simply designates *daylight* (*light* as distinguished from darkness, and *day* as distinguished from night; in Gen. 1:14, it stands for a period of *twenty-four hours*; in Gen. 2:4, it designates the whole Creation Era. (This same indefiniteness of meaning characterizes the use of *yom* throughout the Old Testament; and of the Greek *hemera* as well as used in the New Testament. Cf. Zech. 14:6-7: Note that here the word indicates a day altogether unique, one of God's days, "known unto Jehovah," but "not day, and not night," as if to distinguish it from one of man's ordinary civil days. Cf. also Deut. 9:1, Psa. 95:8, Isa. 49:8; John 9:4, 8:56; Heb. 8:9, 13:8; 2 Pet. 3:8, etc.).

2. The fact that there is nothing in the Genesis narrative

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

to indicate that God spoke all living species into existence at one and the same instant; on the contrary, according to the account itself, the Creation extended over six successive "days" and, in all probability, a fraction of the seventh (note that God is said to have "finished" His work *on* the seventh day, Gen. 2:2).

3. The fact that no actual measurement of time is indicated in connection with the first three "days"; chronology had its beginning, it is expressly declared, on the fourth "day."

4. The fact that the "evening" which preceded the "morning" of Day One must have been in the sphere of *timelessness*; as the distinguished commentator, John Peter Lange, puts it (CDHCG, 166,167): "evening and morning denote the interval of a creative day, the terms indicating respectively the first and second halves of this 'day'; we cannot think of the usual evening and morning here, because the earth, and indeed our entire galaxy, did not become astronomically arranged until late in the entire process."

5. Eternity, which is God's realm, is *timelessness*. God Himself is timeless (always He is I AM, Exo. 3:14), and His activity is likewise timeless (Psa. 90:1, 2 Cor. 6:2, 2 Pet. 3:8); unlike men, and unlike Americans especially, God never gets in a hurry.

6. The fact that the account of the seventh "day" does not terminate with the formula, "there was evening and there was morning, a seventh day," such as occurs in connection with the account of each of the preceding six "days"; this indicates—does it not?—that the Father's Sabbath is still going on? (This could well be what Jesus meant when, in defending Himself against the carping of the Pharisees that He was desecrating the Sabbath by doing works of healing on that day, He said, John 5:17, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work"; that is, the Father had been working works of benevolence

GENESIS

throughout all these intervening centuries—His *aeonic* Sabbath—and now His critics were caviling at Him for doing works of benevolence on their little week-day Sabbath! (cf. Mark 2:27). From the arguments as presented above, there are many sincere believers who conclude that the days of the Genesis cosmogony were *aeonic* (epochal, or geological) days, and not days of twenty-four hours each. As Thomas Whitelaw writes (PCG, 12.13): "The duration of the seventh day of necessity determined the length of the other six. Without anticipating the exposition of ch. 2:1-4, it may be said that God's sabbatic rest is understood by the best interpreters of Scripture to have continued from creation's close until the present hour; so that consistency demands the previous six days to be considered as not of short, but of indefinite, duration." (We shall discuss the Sabbath question in more detail later, in dealing with the text of Gen. 2:1-3.)

The following note, by Rotherham (EB, note "m," p.33), with regard to the formula with which the account of each "day" of the Creation is concluded, *e.g.*, "there was evening and there was morning, a first day," etc., seems to me to be convincing: "By a well-attested Heb. idiom—'a first day.' Here grammatical exegesis steps in and claims its own. Two ways of explaining this striking 'refrain' are conceivable—the one unnatural and absurd; the other, at once living and luminous. Either this six-times-repeated statement is a mere extraneous patch of information, having no organic connection with the creative acts amongst which it is inlaid—which no thoughtful reader can seriously suppose—or else on each occurrence it grows out of what has gone before. This being conceded, and the words then being grammatically rendered, the reader is on the high road to a correct decipherment of the days, as God-divided rather than sun-divided. Did the calling forth of 'light' constitute the first morning? If it did, then the previous 'darkness' and the preparatory 'brooding' must

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

surely have constituted the first 'evening.' Then how long was the first day? If no one knows, then no one can say what was the length of the six days. Essential harmony suggests as a crown to the exegesis: That, as is man, the little worker, doing a small work on six short days, so is God, the great worker, doing a large work on his six far-reaching days." (We shall discuss Exo. 20:11 in relation to Gen. 2:1-3 below.) Furthermore, the astronomical bodies obviously were in the process of being fashioned, out of some form of primal energy, throughout the first three days of the Creative Period. It follows that these could hardly have been solar days—the astronomical world was not yet sufficiently developed for solar measurement. It seems obvious, too, that the "light" and "darkness" of verse 5, for example, designate not the *duration*, but the *phenomena*, involved. This ultra-literal interpretation of the Genesis Cosmogony would have us believe that the world is only 144 hours older than man, a view which is contrary both to science and to revelation.

The view that the "days" of the Hebrew Cosmogony were *aeonic* days, that is, days of indefinite length, was held by several of the Church Fathers, even those who adopted the literal rather than the allegorical method of interpretation of Scripture, *e.g.*, Ephrem of Edessa, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine of Hippo, *et al.* (See the book, *Evolution and Theology*, by Ernest C. Messenger, published by Macmillan, New York, 1932.) On the basis of this exegesis, of course, there was ample time to allow for progressive development—by means of *secondary* causes, that is, what we call the "laws of nature" or "natural laws," which are, in fact, the laws of nature's God—claimed by modern science. From the instant God spoke out, saying, "Light, Be!" (v.3) to the instant when the Three, in Divine *Consilium*, decided, "Let us make man in our image" (v.26), the stretch of time, as man measures it, was indeed

GENESIS

ample for all the eras that may be claimed by geology, paleontology, and other contemporary sciences.

In a word, we must reject the ultra-literal theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony on the ground that this theory puts it—and does so unnecessarily, insofar as religious faith is concerned—in direct conflict with some of the known facts of present-day science. This, we insist, is setting up a conflict for which there is no real justification.

With respect to the *time* employed in the Creation, those at one extreme seem to be obsessed with the notion that the extension of the exercise of Creative Power over a long stretch of time (the view which is designated *materialistic* evolution when attributed to chance, or *theistic* evolution when attributed to the power of God) is derogatory to God. To be sure, materialistic evolution is atheistic, agnostic, and unscriptural, but theistic evolution need not be so, for the simple reason, as stated above, that regardless of the time or the method involved, certainly the same measure of Efficient Causality would be the necessary prerequisite. On the other hand, those at the opposite extreme seem to be obsessed with the notion that any kind of *instantaneous* creation (such as mutations appear to be) or any kind of what is called *progressive creationism* (the insertion of new increments of Power into the Creative Process by direct Divine action; hence the “jump” from the non-living to the living, from the merely living by cellular processes to the consciously living, from the conscious to the self-conscious or personal) is sheer superstition. This likewise is an unjustified assumption, because if God is truly God, He can do whatever He pleases to do, whenever and in whatever way He pleases to do it, that is consistent with His character and purpose (Isa. 46:9-11, Acts 17:24-28).

I should like it to be noted here, also, that the statement often made by scientists that the earth is so many years old (the latest figure is about five billion years), or that

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

man has existed on the earth for so many years, hypothetically specified, certainly implies that a Creation occurred: nothing can be "old" except in terms of relation to a beginning. Moreover, that Creation could have occurred at all presupposes the operation of a Power sufficient to accomplish it; and that it could have occurred "progressively," actualizing a cosmos, a rule of order, presupposes, not mere chance, but Intelligence and Purpose. One thing is sure—man had nothing to do with it.

3. The *mythological* view. According to this view, the Hebrew Cosmogony was derived at least in part from Babylonian mythology, or perhaps from a general Semitic mythological deposit long anterior to the Babylonian. Advocates of this view find echoes of Babylonian Cosmology especially in the allusion in Gen. 1:7 to the division of "the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament"; and of the Babylonian Cosmogony, known from its two opening words as *Enuma elish* ("When on High"), especially (1) in the reference to a "watery chaos" at the beginning, (2) in the description of the order of events in the Creation, first the firmament, then dry land, the luminaries, and man, in the order named, and (3) in the conclusion picturing the Creative Power (Elohim vs. gods) at rest.

However, the fact cannot be emphasized too strongly that the ethico-theological abyss (as one might well call it) between the two Cosmogonies cannot be bridged by any so-called mythological correspondences. The simple fact of the matter is that whereas the Babylonian account is definitely mythological and polytheistic, the Hebrew Cosmogony is non-mythological and strictly monotheistic. As Finegan states it, referring expressly to the Genesis account (LAP, 54): "the dignity and exaltation of the words of the Bible are unparalleled." From every point of view, the Genesis Cosmogony is strictly in a class by itself.

The Babylonian Cosmogony takes off with two mythical

GENESIS

personifications, the male Apsu (the primordial sweet-water ocean); and the female Tiamat (the primordial salt-water ocean). (Some authorities suggest possible etymological kinship between *Tiamat* and *tehom*, the Hebrew word for the "deep" in the Genesis account.) These two, the male and female principles—as the account goes—became the progenitors of the gods. In time, however, the doings of these offspring became so annoying that Apsu announced his intention of destroying them. But the god Ea, becoming aware of what was about to happen, managed to muster up sufficient strength to overcome and slay Apsu. (In Greek mythology, Kronos emasculated his father, Uranos; and Zeus, in his day, dethroned Kronos, cast him into Tartarus, the abode of great sinners, and seized power for himself.) "Mother" Tiamat, in the Babylonian myth, bent on revenge, created an army of gruesome monsters whose bodies were filled with poison instead of blood, and appointed one of her own offspring, Kingu, the general of her forces. It was then that Marduk, the city-god of Babylon (Ashūr in Assyria), made himself the leader of the gods in their war against Tiamat. A terrible battle ensued in which Marduk emerged as the complete victor. The description of this battle is gory and gruesome. When Tiamat and Marduk finally faced each other in mortal combat, as Tiamat approached Marduk and opened her mouth to devour him, the latter drove a raging wind into her belly and distended it. Marduk then shot an arrow into her inward parts; this arrow tore her belly and pierced her heart. Marduk then, having destroyed the "life" of Tiamat, cast down her carcass, and standing upon it, proclaimed himself (much in the manner that a referee proclaims the victor in a prize fight in our time), "the winnah," after which, he created the world out of her corpse. The gods then condemned Kingu for having instigated Tiamat's revolt, and slew him, and then fashioned mankind out of the blood that flowed from his arteries. Marduk was finally

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

advanced from his first position as the city-god of Babylon to the headship of the entire pantheon. *Surely it is approximating profanity even to assume that in these crude pagan mythologies we find the source material of a Cosmogony so pure in its revelation of God, so majestic in its portrayal of His creative activity, so elevated in its literary beauty and simplicity, as is the Genesis account of the Creation.*

I quote here the testimony of eminent Jewish scholarship of our time (Cornfeld, AtD, 12) in regard to this problem. While not in agreement with certain statements, I feel that the following excerpt is worthy of presentation, in view of the clear-cut terms in which the Babylonian and Hebrew Cosmogonies are contrasted therein, as follows: Both Genesis and the Babylonian myth, we are told, "express in their own symbols a fundamental notion of the world: the victory of cosmos over chaos, and creation seen as the reducing to order of a primeval disorder. But Babylonian cosmogony . . . is not really a 'creation story' as in Genesis, but a story of the growth of the cosmos through procreation of gods and struggles between their generations, while the gods themselves personify nature and its elements. But in the Bible God is an independent and self-existent source, or the creator of nature and cosmos. It has been pointed out that in the Bible there were scattered references (in Job 9:13, Psa. 89:10 and Isaiah 51:9) to a primeval conflict between Yahweh and mythological rebellious figures bearing the names of Rahab, Leviathan, the dragon and the serpent. But the dogma in Gen. 1 shears off this mythological content. Any such tale would be a figment to be scrupulously avoided by the writers of the account of Creation. While Hebrew lore must originally have used myth or anthropomorphic concepts, it eventually de-mythed its concepts of a very ancient polytheist version of the primordial world." (We cannot accept, of course, the notion that Old Testament intimations of Satanic power

GENESIS

are mythological, because in the full light of the New Testament revelation Satan (the Devil) is presented as a very real enemy of God, man, and all good (John 8:44; Matt. 4:1-11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 6:10-12; 1 Pet. 5:8; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6; Rev. 20:10), and certainly what is revealed in Scripture about Satan and his operations is confirmed by every issue of every newspaper published in our day. Experience testifies that this life is essentially a probationary period in which the forces of good and the forces of evil are engaged in mortal combat for the souls of men.)

The transcendence of the God of the Genesis Cosmogony, by way of contrast to the deities of the ancient mythological systems, is stated eloquently by Ralph H. Elliott (MG, 27,28) as follows: "Is there nothing distinctive which Genesis on its own presents? Very definitely and uniquely there is. Creation originated in the will of God (1:3f). God's speech—'Let there be light,' etc.,—is always prior to, and makes possible, the existence of something. Thus, everything 'owes its existence to God's creative word'; hence, it is all good. The step-by-step design suggests that God works with a pattern and purpose. There is nothing here of the irrational or whimsical. All is according to the willed design of God. Hence, God is a personal being. He transcends the universe and is independent of the universe. There is not the slightest room for pantheism here . . . God *before* all, God *back* of all, God *above* all are appropriate statements."

We must reject the mythological theory of the Genesis account of the Creation on the following grounds: (1) the transcendent purity of the concept of God and His operations, as revealed in the Hebrew Cosmogony, removes it far from any connection with these alleged pagan sources; (2) the fact that the account is attached to the history of the early life of man on the earth gives it historical support that all pagan mythologies lacked; (3) there is not the slightest trace of myth in the Genesis narrative,

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

and those who allege to the contrary are obviously confused regarding the factors which make a narrative really mythical. To realize that there is no mythology in the Mosaic account all that one has to do is to compare it with the actual creation myths of the primitive and pagan peoples. Mythology was polytheistic. Its characters were *personifications* of natural forces (as distinguished from the pure incorporeal *personality* of the God of the Bible, Exo. 3:14), anthropomorphic creatures with sex distinctions and guilty of all the crimes in the category. Kaufmann (RI, 38:39): "The [pagan] gods themselves are subject to evil forces and impulses, and, having sinned, they too must suffer for their guilt. Thus, the guilty Kingu is slain for his part in Tiamat's attack upon the Babylonian gods. Gilgamesh rebukes Ishtar for her wantonness and cruelty. The Hindu creator Prajapati lies with his daughter, and is punished by the terrible Rudra. Indra, having committed murder, is depressed, and so purifies himself. Cronus castrates his father, and Zeus brings him, in turn, down to Hades. Zeus, Aphrodite, and most of the gods of the Greek pantheon are steeped in promiscuity. The Teutonic Odin is a drunkard, a deceiver, an adulterer, a murderer; it is the same in one mythology after another."

This eminent present-day Jewish authority (RI, 21-24) summarizes the theories and practices characteristic of the ancient pagan mythologies which made them so greatly inferior to the Hebrew Cosmogony and its God (Elohim), as follows: 1. The fundamental idea that "there exists a realm of being prior to the gods, and above them, upon whom the gods depend and whose decrees they must obey." This realm is conceived to be "the womb in which the seeds of all being are contained." This means, of course that these pagan deities were limited in their powers. (In the Homeric epics, for example, Zeus, although the head of the Greek pantheon and designated "the father of gods and men," is pictured, nevertheless, as having been

GENESIS

subject to the determinations of an over-ruling Destiny, Fate, etc.) 2. The pagan gods "emerge out of the primordial substance, having been generated by its fertility" (as depicted in the ancient theogonies.) (A *theogony* is an account of the generation of the gods, goddesses, demigods, etc. Cf. the *Theogony* of Hesiod, a seventh century B.C. Greek poet.) 3. These gods were "personal embodiments" of the various "seminal forces of the primordial realm" (in simpler terms, personifications of the forces of nature). 4. These gods were all sexually differentiated and subject to all sexual drives (motivations), drives even more powerful than those of the human libido. These early mythologies are fairly saturated with tales of the gross immoralities of the gods: Plato criticizes them severely for this very reason. 5. Finally, "just as the fundamental idea of paganism found poetic expression in myth, so it found practical expression in magic."

In a word, these gods and goddesses of pagan myth were limited in power, sexually generated and differentiated, wholly anthropomorphic, grossly unspiritual and immoral. This was equally true of the deities of the Babylonian Cosmogony as of all the ancient theogonies and cosmogonies. *They were mere personifications, in striking contrast to the God of the Bible who is pure personality (Exo. 3:14). There are no genuinely mythical, allegorical, or even metaphorical connotations either explicit or implicit in the Hebrew Cosmogony and its portrayal of the living and true God: He is personal, spiritual (i.e., non-corporeal), ethical, compassionate, purposeful, and sovereign, in short, theistic and monotheistic. Moreover, the Biblical God is sharply differentiated from the Greek philosophical pantheistic To Theion ("the Divine"); whereas the latter is That Which Is, the God of the Bible is He Who Is.*

A final word from the pen of Dr. Kaufmann (Intro., RI, 2) is sufficient here as a conclusion: in reference to the "conventional view of the origins of Israelite monotheism,"

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

namely, that it is to be regarded "as an organic outgrowth of the milieu of the ancient Orient," he writes: "This view is here rejected *in toto*. We shall see that Israelite religion was an original creation of the people of Israel. It was absolutely different from anything the pagan world ever knew; its monotheistic world view had no antecedents in paganism . . . It was the fundamental idea of a national culture, and informed every aspect of that culture from its very beginning."

I feel obliged to dissent, however, from one statement in the foregoing excerpt, namely, the statement that "the Israelite religion was an original creation of the people of Israel." I must affirm that *this religion was not a human creation, but a Divine revelation to the people whom God elected to preserve theistic monotheism for all future ages*. It is inconceivable to me that such an exalted Deity as the One whom we meet in Exodus 3:14 (Yahweh, I AM, He Who Is) could ever have been a formulation ("intuition," "insight") of the unaided ("uninspired") human mind, whether the mind (genius) of a single individual (*e.g.*, Moses) or of an ethnic group, and especially of an ethnic group known historically to have been surrounded on all sides by neighbors all of whom were devoted to such gross immoralities as those which characterized the pagan Cult of the Dead and the pagan Cult of Fertility. To me, this "great and incommunicable Name" of our God is evidence *per se* of the Divine origin (inspiration) of the Old Testament Scriptures.

4. The *reconstruction* theory. This is also variously designated the "restitution" or "renovation" theory. It is the theory that we have described in the Genesis Cosmogony what is called the *Adamic renovation* of our cosmos following a pre-Adamic cataclysmic reduction of this cosmos to a chaos. This view goes along with the *cyclical* view of cosmic history (cf. Isa. 65:17, 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1-2), a view which, incidentally, was

GENESIS

held by the Stoics in ancient Greece and Rome.

This view is clearly stated by W. E. Powers (SBG, 8-11), as follows: "The opening verse of Genesis says, 'In the beginning God created (*bara*) the heaven and the earth.' This does not mean that He made the world as it is today only six thousand years ago, but that way back, no one knows how long ago, God created all the universe with its myriads of solar systems, including our own earth, and it came from His hand a perfect masterpiece. To imagine the earth coming from God's hand in a chaotic condition, void and waste, would be altogether out of order. He created it . . . in perfect beauty, and was compelled to throw it into chaos through some catastrophe, as a judgment upon its first inhabitants. There is ample Scriptural evidence for the above statement. Let us turn to Isaiah 24:1, 45:18, also to Jeremiah 4:23-26. These passages clearly indicate that the earth has undergone in the far distant past a terrible catastrophe which turned it from perfection into disorder and a void because of sin and rebellion. Therefore, between the first and second verses of Genesis, there is ample space of time for all the geological ages that our earth's strata reveal." This author then suggests that Satan may have been the governor of our earth in its pre-Adamic state of beauty and perfection (cf. Isa. 14:12-15, Ezek. 28:11-15, Dan. 10, Luke 10:18, Matt. 4:10, etc.). Powers continues: "What the beings on the earth at that time were is somewhat hard to know, but it is perfectly clear that in that awful far-off event they perished, and then in the first chapters of Genesis we find a reconstruction of our planet and a re-peopling of it . . . Beginning at verse 3, we do not have six days of creation, but more correctly we should say, six days of reconstruction. In this connection, we find God bringing our chaotic earth back to order and preparing it for a new system under the hand of man."

In opposition to this argument, I point out (1) that the texts quoted from Isaiah and Jeremiah obviously had ref-

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

erence to judgments about to descend on the lands of contemporary peoples including even those of Jerusalem and Judah (also the perennial problem as to whether the Hebrew *erets* should be translated "earth" or "land" is here involved); (2) that to hold that references in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 to Satan's primordial status as an arch-angel who chose to rebel against the Divine government, for which rebellion he was cast out of Heaven (Luke 10:18), justify the conclusion that he became the ruler of a hypothetical pre-Adamic earth is too far-fetched for serious consideration; or to identify any of the personages who appear in Daniel's vision, as recorded in Daniel 10, with Satan, is equally far-fetched; (3) that the notion that God would ever have created a chaos in the sense of a universal disorder is totally irrelevant, for the simple reason, as we shall see later, that the counterparts in ancient languages of our English word "chaos," did not mean *disorder*, but rather, as their primary meaning, *infinite space*, with such secondary meanings as *unformed matter*, *primal energy*, the *abyss*, *darkness*, etc.

This theory—also designated the *chasm* theory—is clearly refuted, it seems to me, by Tayler Lewis (CDHC, 167,168), on the following grounds: (1) That it does not in any way obviate the peculiar difficulties that attend the solar-day theory, such as "a morning and evening without a sun, or the language of succession, of growth, and of a seeming nature, without any consistent corresponding reality"; (2) that "it is a building of this world on the ruins of a former, without any natural or moral reasons therefor. The states preceding, as understood by this hypothesis were in no sense preparatory; the catastrophe which makes way for it seems entirely arbitrary, and in no sense resembles the pauses described in Genesis, each one of which is in the upward order, and anticipatory of the work that follows"; (3) that "there is another and greater incongruity in connecting this with a former and

GENESIS

very different state of things, or mode of proceeding, with which, after all, it has no real connection either in the realm of nature or of divine providence"; (4) that the theory "is evidently brought in as a possible escape from the difficulties of geology, and would never have been seriously maintained had it not been for them"; (5) that it "has to make the heavens of the first verse a different heavens from that of the eighth, without any exegetical warrant"; therefore, "is a *rationalizing* interpretation, carrying with it a conception of our modern astronomy, and almost wholly unknown to the Scriptures, which everywhere speak of the heavens and the earth therein mentioned as one system"; (6) that "it violates the principles of a rational and grammatical exegesis, in making a separation between the first and second verses, of which there is no trace or reason in the language itself." (As a matter of fact, does not the conjunction with which the second verse begins nullify any hypothesis of severance?) (Perhaps it should be noted here that T. Lewis stoutly champions the view that the "heavens" (or "heaven") of verses 1 and 8 are the same, not the astronomical heavens of the planetary systems, galaxies, universes, etc., but the "heaven of the earth-world," that is, the star-studded sky, which together with earth, makes up the whole as presented in Scripture. (Cf. Psa. 104, 1 Sam. 2:8; Isa. 65:17, 66:22; Psa. 102:25; 2 Pet. 3:5-7, 3:13; Rev. 21:1.) This would be in harmony, of course, with the obvious fact that the entire Genesis Cosmogony is presented from the terrestrial (tellurian) viewpoint, that is, the point of view of a dweller on our earth.) (See further discussion of this problem *infra*, in the study of the verses involved.)

To sum up: In the opinion of this writer, there is no real reason for bringing in the *reconstruction* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony, when, as a matter of fact, the *aeonic-day* theory is the only one which provides the greater number of solutions for the problems involved.

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

5. The *prophetic-vision* theory. According to this theory, the "days" of the Genesis Cosmogony were actually seven successive ordinary days in the life of the prophet Moses (Deut. 18:15-19, Acts 3:22, 7:37), on which he was vouchsafed what might be called panoramic visions of the progressive stages of the Creation. According to this view, the "days" mentioned might be named *visional* or *revelational* days. Objections to this view are the following: (1) Visions are specifically designated such wherever they are related in Scripture (e.g., Gen. 12:7, 15:12-17, 28:10-17; Num. 24:4; Job 7:14; Isa. 1:1, 6:1-13; Ezek., chs. 1, 10, 11, 37, 40; Dan., chs. 4, 7; Zech. 1:18-21, 2:1-5; Acts 2:17, 10:3, 10:9-17; 2 Cor. 12:1; Rev. 1:9-20, etc.); however, there is not the slightest hint in the Genesis Cosmogony that mere visions are being described therein; the whole account is presented in declarations that have all the character of forthright history. (2) What about the affirmation presented in Gen. 1:1? This evidently is not included in the first *visional* day. Hence the question arises as to whether it was included in the first vision granted Moses or was communicated in some non-*visional* manner. As Archer states it (SOTI, 175,176): "If Genesis 1 was only a vision (representing, of course, the events of primeval history), then almost any other apparently historical account in Scripture could be interpreted as a vision—especially if it relates to transactions not naturally observable to a human investigator or historian." As a matter of fact, this general view has never been entertained by any great number of Biblical commentators.

6. The *panoramic* or *cinemascopic* theory, that we have in the Genesis account a vivid unrolling, before the mind of Moses, of the process of Creation in its successive stages, and without particular regard to detail. (Strong, ST, calls this the *pictorial-summary* view.) One is reminded here of the words of Augustine, *De Gen. ad Lit.*, 4:27, "The length of these days is not to be determined by the length

GENESIS

of our week-days. There is a series in both cases, and that is all." (It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the heathen cosmogonies represent creation as having been accomplished in a series of ages of prolonged duration. As we shall see later, heathen notions on many moral, social, and religious subjects, all but prove themselves to be corrupted versions of primordial fact.) This *panoramic* or *pictorial-summary* interpretation of the Hebrew Cosmogony is the one which is accepted in this textbook.

So much for introductory matters. We shall now proceed to our study of the text of Genesis itself.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART FOUR

1. What is a *cosmology*? What is the derivation of the word?
2. What is a *cosmogony*? A *theogony*?
3. State the *ultra-scientific* interpretation of the Hebrew Cosmogony and the objections to it.
4. Explain the *ultra-literal* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony.
5. State the different uses of the word "day" (*yom*) in the first two chapters of Genesis.
6. What are the chief objections to the ultra-literal theory?
7. Discuss the statement that the same measure of Efficient Causality must have been employed in the Creation regardless of the method used.
8. How "long" probably was the first "evening" of Day One? What conclusion follows?
9. What probable significance is there in the absence of the usual concluding formula from the account of the seventh day?
10. State briefly Rotherham's comment on the "days" of the Genesis narrative.
11. Distinguish between "theistic evolution" and "progressive creationism."

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

12. State the *mythological* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony.
13. Explain how the Babylonian Cosmogony differs from the Hebrew Cosmogony.
14. List the characteristics of the Hebrew Cosmogony which make it so far superior to the Babylonian.
15. List the attributes of the God of the Hebrew Cosmogony which make Him so much superior to the "gods" of the pagan mythologies.
16. In what special attribute is the God of the Bible transcendently superior to the deities of paganism?
17. Explain the difference between *personification* and *personality*.
18. List the characteristics of the pagan mythologies as given by Dr. Kaufmann.
19. How does the God of the Bible differ essentially from "The Divine" of Greek philosophical thought?
20. In what way does the Name of God as given in Exodus 3:14 confirm the doctrine of special revelation?
21. State the *reconstruction* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony and the objections to it.
22. Why is it called the *chasm* theory?
23. Why is it spoken of as a *rationalizing* interpretation?
24. Explain the *prophetic-vision* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony. State the objections to it.
25. Explain the *panoramic* view of the Hebrew Cosmogony. On what grounds is this theory preferred in this textbook?

PART FIVE:

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS

Gen. 1:1

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

1. What is the relation of this verse to the Creation Narrative as a whole? (1) It could refer to the creation of "first matter," the first form or forms of what we call "physical" energy (the elemental forces to be arranged subsequently into the cosmos). This seems to be the view of the majority of commentators. (2) It could be designed to emphasize the fact that God created the physical (inanimate) universe *first*; that is, prior to His creation of living beings to inhabit it. (3) Or, does it designate an earlier beginning (creation) of a cosmos which later suffered a cataclysmic reduction to its elemental forms, with v. 2 describing the beginning of a reconstruction of the whole? As Rotherham paraphrases (EB, 33): "In the beginning (of the present order of things) God created (that is, shaped or formed according to his own divine idea) the heavens (above) and the earth (below). Now the earth (emphasized idiomatically for the purpose of singling it out for first remark) had become waste and wild (probably by previous catastrophe); and darkness (emphasized as about to be dealt with) was on the face of the roaring deep; but (preparing the mind for a new order of things) the Spirit of God was brooding (with quickening effect) on the face of the waters. And (things being so; such being the state of the earth) God said (and thus the renewing, re-creating divine acts commence)." (See the objections to this reconstruction theory under Part Four *supra*. My main objection is that it in no way resolves the problems it is intended to resolve, namely, those of the geological "history" of the earth, and much less those of the origins of the celestial worlds. However, there are many eminent scholars who champion this theory.) (4)

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

Finally, this verse could be intended to serve as a general introduction to the entire Cosmogony that follows, beginning with v. 2—as a summary of the whole creative process narrated in the section ending with Gen. 2:3. The fundamental truth designed to be impressed upon our minds in this “sententiously sublime” introductory affirmation is the truth that it was God (Elohim) who did the creating. Cf. Isa. 42:5, 45:18; Job 38:4; Psa. 24:1-2, 104:5; Acts 14:15, 17:24-28.

2. One of the most impressive facts about this Cosmogony is its general agreement (1) not with the early creation mythologies, such as, for example, the Babylonian in particular; (2) not with medieval or early modern science, (3) but especially with the science which has developed, and is in process of further development, *in our own time*. Its amenability to interpretation in the light of present-day science especially, is so obvious that I choose deliberately to emphasize this aspect of it in this textbook. Whereas the mythological interpretation raises all kinds of questions and apparent discrepancies with science, exegesis in the light of present-day scientific thinking about the world and its origin eliminates them. This interpretation, moreover, does not require any wresting of the Scripture text out of its context, much less does it require any fantastic distortion of the Scripture text. It seems to me that the acceptance of any account of the Creation as divinely inspired would have to be justified by its correspondence with progressively developing human science. As stated previously, God has written two books—the Book of Nature and the Book of Redemption. Now science and theology, which are the products of man's efforts to interpret these two Books, respectively, may produce apparent discrepancies, because man is fallible, ever liable to error. But the Books themselves cannot be in conflict, for the simple reason that both embody Truth, and Truth does not contradict itself.

Murphy (MG, 28-30): "This great introductory sentence of the book of God is equal in weight to the whole of its subsequent communications concerning the kingdom of nature. It assumes the existence of God; for it is he who in the beginning creates. It assumes his eternity; for he is before all things: and as nothing comes from nothing, he himself must have always been. It implies his omnipotence; for he creates the universe of things. It implies his absolute freedom; for he begins a new course of action. It implies his infinite wisdom; for a *kosmos*, an order of matter and mind, can only come from a being of absolute intelligence. It implies his essential goodness; for the Sole, Eternal, Almighty, All-wise, and All-sufficient Being has no reason, no motive, no capacity for evil. It presumes him to be beyond all limit of time and place; as he is before all time and place. It asserts the creation of the heavens and the earth; that is, of the universe of mind and matter. This creating is the omnipotent act of giving existence to things which before had no existence. This is the first great mystery of things; as the end is the second. Natural science observes things as they are, when they have already laid hold of existence. It ascends into the past as far as observation will reach, and penetrates into the future as far as experience will guide. But it does not touch the beginning or the end . . . This sentence assumes the being of God, and asserts the beginning of things. Hence it intimates that the existence of God is more immediately patent to the reason of man than the creation of the universe. And this is agreeable to the philosophy of things; for the existence of God is a necessary and eternal truth, more and more self-evident to the intellect as it rises to maturity. But the beginning of things is, by its very nature, a contingent event, which once was not and then came to be contingent on the free will of the Eternal, and, therefore, not evident to reason itself, but made known to the understanding by testimony and the reality of things. This sentence is the

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

testimony, and the actual world in us and around us is the reality. Faith takes account of the one, observation of the other."

Gen. 1:1, Murphy goes on to say, "bears on the very face of it the indication that it was written by man, and for man; for it divides all things into the heavens and the earth. Such a division evidently suits those only who are inhabitants of the earth . . . With no less clearness, however, does it show that it was dictated by superhuman knowledge. For it records the beginning of things of which natural science can take no cognizance . . . This simple sentence denies atheism; for it assumes the being of God. It denies polytheism, and, among its various forms, the doctrine of two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil; for it confesses the one Eternal Creator. It denies materialism; for it asserts the creation of matter. It denies pantheism; for it assumes the existence of God before all things, and apart from them. It denies fatalism; for it involves the freedom of the Eternal Being. It indicates the relative superiority, in point of magnitude, of the heavens to the earth, by giving the former the first place in the order of words. It is thus in accordance with the first elements of astronomical science. It is therefore pregnant with physical and metaphysical, with ethical and theological instruction for the first man, for the predecessors and contemporaries of Moses, and for all the succeeding generations of mankind."

3. *In the beginning*: There is some question here about the use of the definite article: probably it should read, "in beginning." Some authorities would render it, "In the beginning of God's creating the heavens and the earth," etc. However, this rendering does not materially affect the meaning of the statement. (1) *In the beginning—of what?* Evidently, of the space-time continuum in all its aspects, thereafter designated in Scripture "the creation" (Rom. 1:20, 8:20,22; Mark 10:6, 13:19; 2 Pet. 3:4). Hence, Roth-

erham: "At first." That is to say *When time began*, or, *When God began creating*, etc. Time, said Plato, is "the moving image of eternity." That is, the changing (phenomenal) aspects of our world of Becoming simply reflect the eternal Ideas (Forms) in the mind of the Creator which go to make up the world of Being (cf. 2 Cor. 4:18, 5:7). Time has also been described aptly as "the narrow vale between the mountain peaks of two eternities." Thompson (MPR, 310): "Time . . . is the measure of change. Without change, existence has no temporal aspect. Without change there is no way in which we can distinguish between *before* and *after*; without change a thing has no *before* and *after*." Timelessness, on the other hand, is the eternal *now*. (Cf. Exo. 3:14, 2 Cor. 6:2.) (2) We are prone to think of eternity as a kind of stretched-out time; it must be, rather, *timelessness*, a state characterized essentially by illumination; for the saints of God, it is the knowledge and love that constitutes their ultimate *union with God* (1 Cor. 13:9-13, 1 John 3:2). This, to be sure, is a concept which the human mind, imprisoned as it is now in the world of sense-perception, is utterly unable to comprehend. (3) One must distinguish between *mathematical* time (that which is *measured* by the movements of the heavenly bodies) and *real* time (that which is experienced in terms of sheer intensity of living, as, for example, the experience of the soldier on coming out of battle, who says, "I feel as if I had lived a lifetime in the last few hours"). In either case, time presupposes intelligences so constituted as to be able to do the *measuring* and the *experiencing*. (4) Surely the beginning of the Creation was the beginning of time. As Erich Frank writes (PURT, 69): "Creation is, as it were, that moment in which eternity touched upon time. In a similar way Christ's advent in the world means that eternity again invaded time and thus a 'new creation' came about. Both Creation and Redemption are absolutely unprecedented; they are unique events

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1
 which are fixed in time. 'Christ died and rose from the dead only once; he will not die again.' His death was an event which will never recur. It belonged to a definite moment in time which, through its lasting importance, gave the merely natural course of time a new content, a meaning. Thus it became history; that is, time filled with meaning."

(5) *Who, or what, existed prior to the beginning of time?* For the answer to this question we must appeal to the Scripture as a whole. On doing so, we learn that *God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God*, all existed from eternity and participated in the Creation: in the light of New Testament teaching these are fully revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2). (*Logos, Verbum, Word—or Wisdom*, 1 Cor. 1:24—was the name which designates the co-eternal relationship between the Father and His Only Begotten Son, the One who became flesh in the Bethlehem manger, and whom we confess as Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt. 16:16). Cf. John 1:1-3, 1:18, 8:58, 17:4-5, 17:24; 1 Cor. 1:24, 8:6; Phil. 2:5-6; Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:2, 1:10; Rev. 3:14; Gen. 1:2, Psa. 139:7, John 4:24, Heb. 9:14.) Moreover, *God's Eternal Purpose existed from before the foundation of the world*. Obviously, an *eternal* purpose is one that begins and ends beyond time, that is, in the realm of the timeless. Cf. Isa. 46:9-10; Matt. 25-34; Neh. 9:6; Psa. 102:25; Rom. 8:28-30, 16:25-27; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:3-4, 3:9-11; 2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Rev. 13:8, 17:8. All these Scriptures clearly point back to pre-temporal, pre-mundane intelligent Being and Purpose. *Absolutely no being existed, however, before the triune personal God and His Eternal Purpose*, who is from everlasting to everlasting (Psa. 90:1-2, Isa. 9:6, Heb. 9:14), that is, *sui generis* or self-existent, without beginning or end.

4. In the beginning, *God*: that is, *El* (the general Semitic Name for the Deity), but here, *Elohim*, the plural

form, and yet used with a singular verb. This is the most frequent designation of God (occurring more than two thousand times) in the Old Testament, and the only designation occurring in the Genesis Cosmogony. Why the plural subject with a singular verb? Neither that *Elohim* (1) suggests a remnant of polytheism, nor (2) indicates a plurality of beings through whom God reveals Himself, as, *e.g.*, angels (angels are creatures, not creators: cf. Gen. 32:1-2; Dan. 7:10; Psa. 148:1-8; Luke 2:13; Heb. 1:13-14, 12:22; Rev. 5:11), but (3) designates a "plural of quality" equal to the term *Godhead*, a "plural of majesty," a "plural of intensity" that expresses the fulness of the Divine nature, or (4) includes all of these as indicating excellence, perfection, etc., *plus*—in the light of Scripture teaching as a whole—a foreshadowing of the triune personality of the living and true God (1 Thess. 1:9) as fully revealed in the New Testament (hence, to be correlated with the "us" passages in the Old Testament, as Gen. 1:26, 11:7, and Isa. 6:8). Indeed, throughout Scripture *Elohim* designates God as Creator and Preserver (Isa. 57:15—"the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity"), as distinguished from *Yahweh*, the Name which designates God as Redeemer. The former Name designates our God the Creator-God, the latter designates Him the Covenant-God. It seems perfectly reasonable that from the very beginning of the Old Testament the Name of the Deity should be revelatory of all aspects of the Godhead; hence, says Delitzsch, "*The Trinitas* is the plurality of *Elohim* which becomes manifest in the New Testament." Perhaps this diversity of the essential unity (tri-unity) within the Godhead was not disclosed in the early ages of the world, lest God's ancient people should drift into tritheism (the worship of three Gods), but was held concealed in the eternal "mystery" (Eph. 1:9, 3:4, 3:11; 1 Pet. 1:10-12) until the fulness of God's Eternal Purpose was disclosed in the Last Will and Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. (Cf. Deut.

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1
 6:4, Mark 12:29—"Jehovah our God is one Jehovah." It seems obvious that "one" here has no numerical connotation, but expresses, rather, *uniqueness*: that is to say, the God of the Bible is the *only* living and true God: cf. Isa. 45:6, 46:9.) Cf. also Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:1-2. (Note the linguistic kinship between the Hebrew *Elohim* and the Arabic *Allah*.)

Whitelaw (PCG, 2): "Unless where it refers to the angels (Psa. 8:5) or to heathen deities (Gen. 31:32, Exo. 20:3, Jer. 16:20) or to earthly rulers, *Elohim* is joined with verbs and adjectives in the singular, an anomaly in language which has been explained as suggesting the unity of the Godhead." G. Ernest Wright (IBG, 365): "The whole of this universe was God's creation, and its stability was due to his continuing and sustaining power. Life was possible because God created and preserved a space for it in the midst of the primeval waters, a space which could be done away at any moment were it not for His gracious Will to preserve it (cf. Gen. 6-9). The utter dependence of all life upon the creative will and energy of God was thus the Hebrew emphasis." (For God's continuous sustaining Power, cf. Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6; Psa. 102:25-27; Acts 17:24-27; Heb. 1:1-4; Col. 1:17, etc.). Joseph Parker (PBG): "I conclude, therefore, by saying—finishing thus the first part of my discourse—that, given the universe, given human life, given the whole scheme of things as now known to us, to account for them, no other solution so fully satisfies my intelligence and my heart as the solution—God. Given this solution, God, no interpretation of that term, pantheistic as including the great sum total, deistic as including a general but not special providence, can satisfy my heart. I find the only interpretation of God I can rely upon and rest in is the interpretation given by Jesus Christ. With that I will fight my fight in time; with that I will face the great unknown."

Christlieb (MDCB, 210ff.) on Biblical Theism: "The

teaching of Scripture concerning God is based on the theistic conception, that, namely, which holds fast at once His supramundane and His intramundane character; the one in virtue of His nature and essence, the other of His will and power. For while Theism on the one hand, regards the *Theos* (God) as a personal Being, and so as essentially distinct from the whole created universe and from man, it is no less careful, on the other hand, to present Him as the ever-living and working One in His immediate personal relationship to man and the universe by the doctrine of a universal Divine Providence. This view of the divine nature is virtually expressed in the first verse of the Bible." This writer then goes on to show how Gen. 1:1 and many other Scriptures exclude all that is false in other conceptions of God. "First, against *atheism*, which we need scarcely mention, Scripture here, as everywhere, teaches an eternally existing unbeginning God, from whose creative activity heaven and earth and time itself took their beginning—an absolute self-existing One, who saith, I AM THAT I AM, having in Himself the ground of His own being." (Exo. 3:14, John 5:26, Rev. 1:4,8.) "Against *materialism* we find a protest in the first sentence of the Bible. *Matter is not eternal*. It had a beginning along with time; heaven and earth were created in that beginning. Matter, therefore, cannot itself be God, but came into existence through an act of His will. And He is distinguished from it not only by priority of existence, but difference of nature." (Psa. 92:5, 147:5; John 4:24). "In like manner we find in those first words of Scripture a protest against *pantheism*, with its confusion of God and world, and its assumption of the identity of essence in both. God is both antemundane and supramundane, and as to His essence distinct and separate from the world, and existing independently of it: 'In the beginning God created—heaven and earth.' God IS—is absolutely and without beginning; the world is brought into existence, and is dependent on its Creator,

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1
 not He on it. Moreover, it came into existence *through* Him, not *from Him*. Every theory of emanation which would make the world, in whatever form, old Indian or modern pantheistic, an efflux from the Divine Essence, is from the first excluded by the word 'created,' which simply expresses the fact that the world's origin is not derived from the essence, but from the will, of the Creator: that its production was not a necessity, but a free act on God's part, who is therefore to be distinguished and separated from the world as a living, willing and *personal* Being. Throughout Scripture God speaks as a person—I—who does not, as Hegel thought, attain to self-consciousness in the human spirit, but has possessed it independently from the beginning. So little, according to Scripture, is God from us, that we are rather from Him. He is not a mere Idea, but Personality itself, Absolute Freedom, and the highest Self-consciousness—the prototype of all other Self-consciousness, all other Personality—that which alone and eternally IS, which we are always becoming; who is before and above all, and from whom our own personality is derived (Gen. 2:7, Eph. 4:6)." (Isa. 45:8; Psalms 139, Jeremiah 29:11, Acts 15:18). "Finally, against the false *deistic* and *rationalistic* separation between God and the world, Holy Scripture makes like protest in that same opening sentence, which declares the dependence of the world in both its parts (heaven and earth) on the will of Him who called it into being. The same is also indicated in the divine names most commonly used in Scripture, expressive of divine power and might (*Elohim, El, Eloah*), as well as of lordship and dominion (*Adon, Adonai*), and indicating at once the essential unity of God in opposition to Polytheism (Deut. 6:4) and His fulness of living energies . . . He is, therefore, in the highest sense the living One and the living Agency, which not only created the world, but also continuously upholds and maintains it." (Heb. 1:3, Acts 17:25, Psalm 104:29; Acts 17:27,28; Phil. 2:13; Psalm 33:13,15). "All these

attributes follow still more clearly from the name 'Jehovah.' Just as the general activity of God in the world is referred to *Elohim*, so almost every divine action which relates to the theocratic revelation is ascribed to Jehovah."

Deism is the notion which arose in the Newtonian era, according to which God as the lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, came out of that eternity long enough to establish the cosmos and to actualize all the "laws of nature," and then withdraw from all further intercourse with what He had created, much in the same manner as a man would wind a clock and then expect it to keep on running on its own power. Deism is the denial of any kind of special providence; the "light of nature," that is, reason, is held by deists to be man's only reliance. In a word, *deism* emphasizes the transcendence of God exclusively, while denying His immanence. *Pantheism*, on the other hand, which would identify God with the world, nature, the universe, etc., emphasizes the immanence of God exclusively, while denying His transcendence. *Theism*, however, is the doctrine that God is both transcendent and immanent, transcendent in His being (prior to, separate from, and sovereign over, His creation), but always immanent (throughout His creation) in His will and power (Psa. 139:7-10). The God of the Bible is uniquely *theistic*.

The theocracy of Israel was the first corporate witness of the living and true God. The greatest spiritual struggle that the Children of Israel had throughout their national existence was the struggle to hold fast to the monotheistic self-revelation of God delivered to them through Moses, and thus to resist the temptation to drift into the idolatrous polytheisms of their pagan neighbors, all of whom were devoted to the orgiastic and licentious rites that characterized the Cult of Fertility. The pure conceptions of the Old Testament of the nature and attributes of God render absurd the notion that Jehovah was merely a "tribal deity," that is, a creation and development of the "inner conscious-

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

ness" of the Hebrew patriarchs, kings, and prophets. The Old Testament presentation of God can be explained satisfactorily only on the ground that its details were divinely revealed to holy men of old who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12).

5. *Created*. (1) The Hebrew *bara*, translated "create," occurs three times in this chapter (vv. 1, 21, 26): in v. 1, as descriptive of the beginning in an absolute sense (either of the Creation considered as a whole, or of first energy and matter to be subsequently fashioned into an ordered cosmos); in v. 21, as describing the beginning of animal life; and in v. 26, as describing the beginning of man. Here, and throughout Scripture, this verb is used uniformly of Divine activity only, and surely designates a *primary* beginning. It is thus to be distinguished from the verbs *yatzar*, translated "form" or "fashion," as in Gen. 2:7,8,19, etc., and *asah*, translated "make," as used in Gen. 1:7,16,25,26,31, and Gen. 2:2,3,4, etc. Throughout Scripture these verbs are predicated equally of both God and man, and designate a fashioning or shaping out of pre-existing materials, that is, *secondary* beginnings. Whitelaw (PCG,3): "Thus, according to the teaching of this venerable document, the visible universe neither existed from eternity, nor was fashioned out of pre-existing matter, nor proceeded forth as an emanation from the Absolute, but was summoned into existence by an express creative fiat." So, in vv. 21 and 26, the same verb, *bara*, is used to affirm the primary beginning of what previously had not existed *per se*, namely, animal life and the human spirit, respectively. In the sense of introducing absolute novelty into the Creative Process, it occurs frequently in Scripture (cf. Isa. 65:18). (2) Now a *fiat* is an *authorizing order* or *decree*. So it was in the Creation: God spoke, commanding it, and whatever He thus commanded, was done (Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6; John 1:1-3; Rom. 4:17; Col. 1:16-17;

Heb. 1:2). *However, it strikes me that failure to recognize the fact that God's having decreed ("said") a thing to be done, does not indicate in itself when and how it was done, points up a certain measure of obtuseness on the part of all who fail (or refuse) to recognize this distinction. The fact is that the Genesis narrative is designed to impress upon our minds one sublime truth above all others, namely, that the Will of God is the constitution of the whole Creation, both physical and moral.*

(3) Current Jewish thought on this subject is expressed clearly as follows (AtD,8): "The first chapter of Genesis begins with God existing as a transcendent deity outside of the world, to create it. He was when nothing else existed." (Again, p.3): "A governing idea is expressed in the statement that God used merely his creating word: God said . . . and creation came into existence. Contrary to other ancient myths about the origin of the world . . . there is no wrestling with the primeval abyss, no struggle against other divine beings. Furthermore, since God is all-powerful, all that He creates is well made . . . But the text does not go further: it does not deal, for example, with the philosophical question of whether anything existed before God began to create." (I must protest the indirect allusion, in this excerpt, to the Genesis narrative as a "myth." See Part IV *supra*, under "the mythological view.")

(4) Skinner (ICCG, 7): "The central doctrine is that the world is *created*—that it originates in the will of God, a personal Being transcending the universe and existing independently of it. The pagan notion of a Theogony—a generation of the gods from the elementary world-matter—is entirely banished. It is, indeed, doubtful if the representation goes so far as a *creatio ex nihilo*, or whether a pre-existent chaotic material is postulated; it is certain at least that the *kosmos*, the ordered world with which alone man has to do, is wholly the product of divine intelligence

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

and volition. The spirituality of the First Cause of all things, and His absolute sovereignty over the material He employs, are further emphasized in the idea of the *word* of God—the effortless expression of His thought and purpose—as the agency through which each successive effect is produced; and also in the recurrent refrain which affirms that the original creation in each of its parts was ‘good,’ and as a whole ‘very good’ (v.31), *i.e.*, that it perfectly reflected the divine thought which called it into existence.”

(5) Adam Clarke (CG, 27): Genesis 1:1 should read: “‘God in the beginning created the *substance* of the heavens, and the *substance* of the earth,’ *i.e.*, the *prima materia*, or first elements, out of which the heavens and the earth were successively formed.” This passage “argues a wonderful philosophic accuracy in the statement of Moses, which brings before us not a *finished* heavens and earth, as every other transaction appears to do, though afterward the process of their formation is given in detail, but merely the *materials* out of which God built the whole system in the six following days.” Again: “The supposition that God formed all things out of a pre-existing eternal nature is certainly absurd; for, if there was an eternal nature besides an eternal God, there must have been two self-existing, independent, and eternal beings, which is a most palpable contradiction.” (I may add that this kind of *dualism* is wholly unphilosophical in that it postulates two First Principles, when only one—the Eternal God who is Spirit—is necessary. Mind alone, not matter, can account for *all* the phenomena of human experience, such as thought, meaning, values, etc.) Lange (CDHCG, 162): “That in this creating there is not meant, at all, any demiurgical forming out of pre-existing material, appears from the fact that the kind of material, as something then just created, is strongly signified in the first condition of the earth (v.2) and in the creation of light.”

(6) What does present-day science have to say about the Creation? As we have noted previously, Bertrand Rus-

sell thinks there is no necessity for assuming that the cosmos ever had a beginning. But one thing is certain, namely, that the cosmos has not existed always *as we know it today*. All branches of science—physics, chemistry, geology, biology, etc.—are dogmatically, and to a great degree, arbitrarily—treating the whole cosmos as the product of a long-drawn-out developmental (“evolutionary”) process. As stated heretofore (see the Cosmological Proof, Part IV, *supra*), the only possible alternative to an absolute beginning would be an infinite regress, and infinite regress is inconceivable. The notion of the eternity of matter necessarily embraces the cosmic cycle theory of successive cataclysms and reconstructions, with the last reconstruction paving the way for what is known in the geology of our time as uniformitarianism. Moreover, in whatever form cosmic energy may once have existed, it would have required Efficient Causality to have actualized all its potencies, for the simple reason that the power to actualize itself lies beyond the power of *any* potency. The fact is that our scientists, almost without exception, in explaining the universe, find that they have to begin with something. Lemaitre began with the explosion of a primordial atom; Gamow begins with “an inferno of homogeneous primordial vapor seething at unimaginable temperatures,” such heat that no elements, no molecules, not atoms, but only “free neutrons in a state of chaotic agitation,” existed; Hoyle *et al* begin with a hydrogen fog, Whipple, with a “rarefied cosmic dust cloud,” etc. No one begins with nothing, for *ex nihilo, nihil fit*. As Lincoln Barnett writes (UDE, 104): “Even if one acquiesces to the idea of an immortal pulsating universe, within which the sun and earth and supergiant red stars are comparative newcomers, the problem of initial origin remains. It merely pushes the time of Creation into the infinite past. For while theorists have adduced mathematically impeccable accounts of the fabrication of galaxies, stars, star dust, atoms, and even

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

of the atom's components, every theory rests ultimately on the *a priori* assumption that *something* was already in existence—whether free neutrons, energy quanta, or simply the blank inscrutable ‘world stuff,’ the cosmic essence, of which the multifarious universe was subsequently wrought.” It is generally conceded, I think, by modern physicists that the problem of Creation cannot be avoided even from the scientific point of view.

(7) At the risk of being thought repetitious, I should like to note here that in the science of our day there are two chief rival theories of the origin of the universe. First, there is what is known as the “big bang” theory, that of Lemaitre, that the universe began billions of years ago in the explosion of a primordial atom and has been expanding ever since. This, of course, is a theory of the Creation, in a general sense; however, it does not account for the existence of this super-atom. Hence we may ask, Did this primordial atom ever have a beginning, or was it without beginning? Second, there is the “steady state” theory, or that of “continuous creation” (à la Hoyle), with new hydrogen being somehow created spontaneously in inter-galactic space, to fill the voids left by cosmic expansion or by the “death” of galaxies. As noted heretofore, Hoyle declares that the question of Creation cannot be avoided because the matter of the universe cannot be infinitely old (else the cosmic supply of hydrogen would have been exhausted long ago, by conversion into helium). The only solution, therefore, writes Hoyle (NU, 112-114), must be that of continuous creation by which new hydrogen is thrown into the hopper. He writes: “Where does the created material come from? It does not come from anywhere. Matter simply appears—it is created. At one time the various atoms composing the material do not exist, and at a later time they do.” Gamow and his school present a somewhat different theory (CU, Intro.), namely, “that the present state of the universe

resulted from a continuous evolutionary process, which started in a highly compressed homogeneous material a few billion years ago—the hypothesis of ‘beginning.’” Gamow writes, in *The Scientific American*, March, 1954: “During the first few minutes of the Universe’s existence matter must have consisted only of protons, neutrons and electrons, for any group of particles that combined momentarily into a composite nucleus would immediately have dissociated into its components at the extremely high temperature. One can call the mixture of particles *ylem* [pronounced *eelem*]—the name that Aristotle gave to primordial matter. As the Universe went on expanding and the temperature of *ylem* dropped, protons and neutrons began to stick together, forming deuterons (nuclei of heavy hydrogen), tritons (still heavier hydrogen), helium and heavier elements.” Dr. Tolman of the California Institute of Technology suggests another hypothesis, that of a pulsating universe, of alternating “periods” of expansion and contraction, the cycles being governed by changes in the totality of matter. This presupposes, of course, that, as in Hoyle’s theory, somewhere in the universe new material is being formed. However, as a matter of fact, even though it appears to be true that the totality of matter in the cosmos is constantly changing, *the change appears to be in one direction only*, toward what is called a “heat-death,” technically defined as a condition of “maximum entropy.”

The problem before us, therefore, resolves itself basically into this: Whence the primordial atom of Lemaitre? Whence the new matter continually being poured into the cosmic process, according to Hoyle? Whence Gamow’s *ylem*? Whence Tolman’s constantly changing supply of matter? Whence Dr. Whipple’s “dust cloud”? Did all these—or any one of them—*simply exist without a beginning, that is, unbegun*? Or, *did whatever the scientist may start from, or start with, in accounting for the exist-*

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

ence of the cosmos, have a beginning? The answer of Genesis is unequivocally in the affirmative: *the cosmos did have a beginning: before anything of the nature of "physical" energy began, there was God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God: only the God of the Bible, the triune God, is without beginning or end.* Psalms 90:2—"even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." Exodus 3:14—"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM." Cf. Psalms 102:24,27; Jeremiah 10:10; John 4:24; Acts 17:24-28.

(8) The consensus is, generally, that Genesis does not teach Creation *ex nihilo*, that it teaches, rather, Creation without the use of pre-existing material; that is, Creation by the power of the Divine Thought and Will, as expressed by the Word of God, and effectuated by the Spirit of God (Psalms 33:6,9). (It seems that in all activities of the Godhead, the Father is the originating Power, the Son (Logos) the executive Power, and the Spirit the realizing Power, that is, according to Biblical teaching.) For the God of the Bible to think a thing, is for Him to create it. An interesting, albeit greatly inferior, analogy may be cited in the phenomena of *psychokinesis*, now a subject of research in various colleges and universities, notably in the Department of Parapsychology at Duke University, under the direction of Dr. J. B. Rhine. (See Rhine's latest books, *The Reach of the Mind*, *The New World of the Mind*, etc.). Psychokinesis is defined as the power of human thought (thought energy) to effect the movements of ponderable objects. Included in this category are such phenomena as levitation, automatic writing, ectoplasms, etc. Phantasms, we are told by investigators in this field, may be called "embodied thoughts" (that is, ethereal reconstructions of matter by the power of thought), even as a man may rightly be called an embodied thought of God. All such phenomena serve to support the view of the primacy of mind or thought in the totality of being. In the possessing and functioning of these powers of

thought energy, thought projection, and thought materialization, man; it is contended, again reveals the spark of the Infinite that is in him, and thus himself gives evidence of having been created "in the image" of God. (By virtue of the fact that man is the "image" of God, does it not follow reasonably that he should manifest in some slight measure the powers belonging to the Divine Mind and Will?) Is not the cosmos itself, according to Biblical teaching, a constitution of the Divine Will, a projection of the Divine Spirit, an embodiment of the Divine Thought as expressed by the Divine Word?

(9) Heb. 11:3—"By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear." Obviously, Creation out of visible materials is clearly denied in this Scripture (cf. 2 Pet. 3:5, Rom. 4:17, 2 Cor. 4:18). This is in harmony with the view held generally, that Gen. 1:1 teaches Creation by the power of Divine Thought and Will without the use of pre-existing matter. Still and all, can not the present-day nuclear physicist make the same affirmation, in the light of his knowledge of atomic and sub-atomic forces—the affirmation that what is seen has not been made out of things which appear (things visible)? Has an atom ever been seen by the naked human eye, or even by the naked eye implemented by the most powerful microscope? Of course not. What is an atom? Is it properly described as a "particle," "corpuscle," etc.? Hardly. It seems best described as a kind of "field" in which elemental forces operate. Does an atom occupy space? It is difficult to determine just how it does so, if at all. If these characteristics are true of the atom, how much more so of the sub-atomic forces that are constantly operating within the atom? In our day physicists talk about both "matter" and "anti-matter." They give us a strange—almost weird—picture of thirty or more of these inconceivably powerful sub-atomic forces, existing in, or

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

emanating from, the nuclei of atoms. (In recent days we hear about the neutrino, the Xi-minus, and now the Omega-minus, and indeed what yet lies in the offing to be discovered, no one knows.) An electron has been defined as an elementary "something" which can move in all directions at once without ever being found at any intermediate point. All this means that these ultimate facets of what is called "physical" energy are completely invisible to the human eye; that matter in its ultimate form is so attenuated as no longer to be regarded as "material," or hardly even as quasi-material. The fact is that our knowledge of matter and its elemental forms has been derived originally through the media of mathematical formulas, and not by means of sense perception. These original forms of energy, then, belong to the realm of things *not seen*; and matter, in our present-day understanding of it, is metaphysical in its ultimate aspects, rather than "physical." And the things that are not seen, the Apostle tells us, are eternal (2 Cor. 4:18). Does this statement take in these elemental forces also? And where is the line to be drawn between the strictly non-material (mental, invisible) on the one hand, and the material and visible on the other? Or is it so thinly drawn as to be well-nigh non-existent? Can God as Spirit (John 4:24) rightly be thought of as including in His own being these forms of first energy? We do not know. We can not know. Much would depend, it seems, on how we define "Spirit" and "material" or "physical." Surely we are justified in affirming that all power is of God. Perhaps, in the final analysis, we are bogged down here in semantics; hence, in the limitations of human language. Quoting Barnett again (UDE, 114): "Man's inescapable impasse is that he himself is part of the world he seeks to explore; his body and proud brain are mosaics of the same elemental particles that compose the dark, drifting dust clouds of interstellar space; he is, in the final analysis, merely an

ephemeral conformation of the primordial space-time field. Standing midway between macrocosm and microcosm he finds barriers on every side and can perhaps but marvel, as St. Paul did nineteen hundred years ago, that 'the world was created by the word of God so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear.'"

(10) D. Elton Trueblood contends (PR, 98-105) that our scientific thinking at present, by two of its most fundamental laws, *positively supports* the doctrine of Creation. These two laws are what is known as The Second Law of Thermodynamics and what is known as the Evolution Hypothesis. (Trueblood writes of the latter, quite arbitrarily, it seems to me, as The "Fact" of Evolution.) The First Law of Thermodynamics is the well-known law of the conservation of energy, that is, that the totality of energy-matter making up our universe is constant. But, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, the fact that the totality of energy is constant does not mean that this energy is always available. This is what is known among physicists as the "progressive degradation" of energy, namely, that because there is diffusion of energy constantly with no accompanying addition to the total supply, we are compelled to envision a final state of complete stagnation. McWilliams (Cos., 42): "As the useless energy increases, the useful decreases by the same amount. This ratio of useless to useful energy is called *entropy*. The law of entropy states that the ratio is constantly increasing. This means that the amount of energy available for the energizing process of the world is ever growing less." How, then, is this law related to the problem of Creation? Trueblood explains: "We are driven, logically, to the conclusion that the physical world is something which not only will have an end, but also something which had a beginning. 'If the universe is running down like a clock,' says Dr. Inge, 'the clock must have been wound up at a date which we could name if we knew it. The world, if it

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

is to have an end in time, must have had a beginning in time.'” (Would it not be precise to say that if the world is to have an end *with* time, it must have had a beginning *with* time?) Trueblood continues: “This follows strictly from the fact that the law of energy is irreversible. A clock which always runs down and is never rewound cannot have been running forever.” Again quoting Barnett (UDE, 103-104): “If the universe is running down and nature’s processes are proceeding in just one direction, the inescapable inference is that everything had a *beginning*: somehow and sometime the cosmic processes were started, the stellar fires ignited, and the whole vast pageant of the universe brought into being. Most of the clues, moreover, that have been discovered at the inner and outer frontiers of scientific cognition suggest a definite time of Creation. The unvarying rate at which uranium expends its nuclear energies and the absence of any natural process leading to its formation indicate that all the uranium on earth must have come into existence at one specific time, which, according to the best calculations of geophysicists, was about two billion years ago. The tempo at which the wild thermonuclear processes in the interiors of stars transmute matter into radiation enables astronomers to compute with fair assurance the duration of stellar life, and the figure they reach as the likely average age of most stars visible in the firmament today is two billion years. The arithmetic of the geophysicists and astrophysicists is thus in striking agreement with that of the cosmogonists who, basing their calculations on the apparent velocity of the receding galaxies, find that the universe began to expand two billion years ago. And there are other signs in other areas of science that submit the same reckoning. So all the evidence that points to the ultimate annihilation of the universe points just as definitely to an inception fixed in time.”

As stated above, the other "law" which Trueblood cites to support both theism and creationism is the Evolution Hypothesis. Contrary to the thinking of many, writes this distinguished scholar, the inclusion of man in the evolutionary scheme, does not make religious faith "difficult or even impossible"; it is this very inclusion which subsequent reflection has fastened upon as one of the chief features of the natural order among those which substantiate and corroborate the theistic hypothesis." (Perhaps I should state here that the inclusion of man in the evolutionary process is precisely the notion which I cannot accept. Trueblood admits that evolution is "a highly speculative theory," adding, however, that "the evidence is sufficient to satisfy most minds which have considered it fairly." This last statement, too, is debatable: too often the evidence alleged to support this theory is presented as *fact*, when as a matter of fact, it is evidence arrived at only by inference. This raises the corollary question, Is the inference *necessary* (unavoidable) inference? This general subject will be treated later in the present text. Suffice it, at this point, to present Trueblood's argument.) The argument is as follows: (a) The climax of the creative process is the capacity to understand the world around us, and this capacity is inherent in man only. (b) This capacity has arisen by degrees in the natural order, the evidence to support this being the claim that "man shares much of his mental experience with the humbler creatures." (This too, it seems to me, is debatable: see *infra* under the comments on Gen. 2:7.) (c) Any plan is to be properly evaluated by its end product (cf. Isa. 45:5-7, 45:12, 46:9-11). Therefore, "the ground of rationality need not appear until the end of the series of events, but when it appears it illuminates the entire process." (d) "If the general evolutionary theory is true and if man's life be included in this theory, we cannot escape the conclusion" that "mind and nature are genealogically, as well as cog-

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1
 nitively, akin." (e) Therefore, "how can nature include mind as an integral part unless it is grounded in mind?" Mind, that is, is not something alien or accidental to the scheme of things, but is a phenomenon "which is deeply rooted in the entire structure." (f) In virtue of the fact that "science knows nothing of the wholly fortuitous," that is, that there are no truly accidental events, "then mind, so far as we know it, is an integral part of the system and a revelation of the nature of nature." The obvious conclusion must be that "cosmic and biological evolution are one," and that there has been "a single orderly development with mind and matter belonging to the same inclusive system." "At one end of the evolutionary series is unconscious life, and at the other is self-conscious life, but *it is all one series*." (This, to be sure, points up the argument that Evolution is properly described as a theory of Creation.) (I should like to add here that if the evolutionary series is described in terms of an unbroken continuity, it demands Mind as the directing Force and it demands that all higher phenomena of our experience—those of the processes of life, thought, personality, etc.—must have been present potentially in the first material with which the process of Creation had its origin. It demands, furthermore, an Efficient Causality to actualize all these potencies in the upward surge of being. It has long been an accepted norm of evidence that before anything can be established beyond all possibility of doubt, it must be supported by the testimony of two or more eye-witnesses. (Cf. Deut. 17:6, 19:15; 2 Cor. 13:1; Acts 10:40-43; Acts 2:32; 1 Cor. 9:1.) Unfortunately, the time element that is involved in the Evolution Hypothesis puts it beyond either proof or disproof on the ground of this indispensable norm.) Dr. Trueblood's argument is presented here for whatever value it may have in strengthening the student's faith.

(11) *Why the Creation at all?* The esthetic theory would have it that Creativity is the very nature of Love; that because our God is Love, it is of the very essence of His being *freely to create*. (John 3:16; 1 John 4:7-21; Rom. 5:5.) It could well be that Creation and Redemption are all of one general Plan of the ages, and that Creation, insofar as man is concerned, will not be complete until the saints appear in the Judgment clothed in glory and honor and immortality (Rom. 2:6-10, 8:28-30); that this will be the ultimate of Creative activity—the end foreseen by our God, and the goal of His Eternal Purpose, from the “beginning” (Eph. 3:1-12, 1:3-14; Isa. 46:9-11). This would mean that the physical or “natural” Creation was just one phase of the Divine Plan and designed to set the stage for the Recreation or Regeneration, the end purpose being the vindication of Divine Justice challenged by Satan and his rebel host, and the conclusive demonstration to all intelligences of the universe that the diabolical charges were utterly false. (Cf. 2 Pet. 3:4, Jude 6; Luke 10:18, John 8:44, 1 Cor. 6:3, 2 Cor. 4:4, Eph. 6:10-16, John 12:31, Rev. 20:7-10.) This vindication was achieved by just such a demonstration of Love as was actualized in God’s offering of His Only Begotten Son for man’s redemption. These problems are all inherent in the over-all problem of moral evil (sin) and physical evil (suffering), a problem which lies beyond the scope of human intelligence to fully resolve; hence, concerning which Divine revelation has given us only intimations. Unless by faith one accepts these intimations, one can never hope to attain any satisfying understanding of the Mystery of Being.

(6.) *The heavens and the earth.* (1) In view of the obvious fact that the Genesis Cosmogony is written from the terrestrial viewpoint (that is, that of a person on earth), some commentators hold that this phrase designates simply “the earth and the starry skies above it.” Others hold that the phrase is descriptive of our own solar

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

system; others that the term "earth" stands for the cosmic mass out of which the earth was composed, and the term "heavens" for the rest of the universe. (2) Again, the "earth" alluded to in verse 1 could not have been the "dry land" of verse 10: this was not separated from the Seas until the third "day" of Creation. Moreover, in v.10, the "dry land" as Earth and "the gathering together of the waters" as Seas are associated in such a way that we are obliged to think of them as two parts of the whole, namely, the Lands and Seas which go to make up the geography of our planet. (3) We conclude that the phrase, "the heavens and the earth" of verse 1 is intended to designate the whole *organized* universe or cosmos. This view, of course, lends support to the doctrine that this verse is to be taken as an introductory heading to the rest of the Creation Narrative.

(4) According to Scripture, the old or natural Creation consists of "the heavens and the earth" and "all the host of them" (Gen. 2:1; Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:1-6), the former phrase designating, as stated above, the *organized* cosmos. The "host of heaven" takes in (a) the sun, moon, and stars, and (b) the angels. Deut. 4:19, 17:3; Gen. 32:1-2; Ki. 22:19; Psa. 103:21 (cf. Heb. 1:13-14); Dan. 7:10 (the prophet's Vision of the Ancient of Days); Heb. 12:22; Rev. 5:11. The "host" of earth, of course, takes in all living creatures upon the earth. Cf. Gen. 7:21-22; also Rom. 8:20-22—"the whole creation" of this text evidently includes all living things upon the earth, all of which are regarded in Scripture as being under the curse, and therefore suffering the consequences, of sin (Gen. 3:17, Rom. 3, Gal. 3:13, Rev. 22:3)—and hence is equivalent to the "host" of earth. We have here a picture of the "struggle for existence" more graphic than any portrayal by Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, or any of the evolutionists.

7. The following *concluding word* from the pen of the distinguished physicist, Sir Arthur Eddington (SUW, 37, 69-70) is especially pertinent here: "In comparing the certainty of things spiritual and things temporal, let us not forget this—Mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience; all else is remote inference. That environment of space and time and matter, of light and colour and concrete things, which seems so vividly real to us is probed deeply by every device of science and at the bottom we reach symbols. Its substance has melted into shadow. None the less it remains a real world if there is a background to the symbols—an unknown quantity which the mathematical symbol x stands for. We think we are not wholly cut off from this background. It is to this background that our own personality and consciousness belong, and those spiritual aspects of our nature not to be described by any symbolism or at least not by symbolism of the numerical kind to which mathematical physics has hitherto restricted itself. Our story of evolution ended with a stirring in the brain-organ of the latest of Nature's experiments; but that stirring of consciousness transmutes the whole story and gives meaning to its symbolism. Symbolically it is the end, but looking behind the symbolism it is the beginning." Again: "Theological or anti-theological argument to prove or disprove the existence of a deity seems to me to occupy itself largely with skating among the difficulties caused by our making a fetish of this word. It is all so irrelevant to the assurance for which we hunger. In the case of our human friends we take their existence for granted, not caring whether it is proven or not. Our relationship is such that we could read philosophical arguments designed to prove the non-existence of each other, and perhaps even be convinced by them—and then laugh together over so odd a conclusion. I think

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

that it is something of the same kind of security we should seek in our relationship with God. The most flawless proof of the existence of God is no substitute for it; and if we have that relationship the most convincing disproof is turned harmlessly aside. If I may say it with reverence, the soul and God laugh together over so odd a conclusion." 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."

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Strong (ST, 371): "By creation we mean that free act of the triune God by which in the beginning, for His own glory, he made, without the use of pre-existing materials, the whole visible and invisible universe." Everest (DD, 147): "It is objected that the creation of something out of nothing is absurd. Now the Bible does not say that the world was created out of nothing. There always was something in existence, and this something was the cause of whatever else came into being. Matter was produced by the divine energy. That this was impossible, no man can know; for we do not know what matter is. What is an atom? Has an atom ever been seen, measured, weighed, or analyzed? One of the most plausible theories is that an atom is a mathematical point where force is located; a point around which there play unceasingly attractive and repulsive forces. If this is true, that God should call it into being would not be impossible, but analogous rather to what we know of mental power; for man is also a creator, calling into existence thoughts, choices, and bodily motions." In the final analysis, Creation, in the absolute sense, is a truth that is to be received by *faith*; it transcends both human reason and imagination. (Cf. Gen. 1:1, John 1:3, Rom. 4:17, Heb. 11:3.)

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

The Mystery of Being

1. Who has not been overwhelmed at times by a profound sense of the Mystery of Being? What is it "to be"? Someone may say, "It is to exist." But this is just a synonym, not a definition. The fact is that being can only be experienced, never defined. 2. Being exists either *potentially* or *actually*. For example, a mighty oak existed once, potentially, in an acorn. A baby is actually a baby; potentially it is an adult person. A seed is actually a seed; potentially it is a plant. Cold water is actually cold; potentially, it is hot. One does not inherit diseases; rather, one inherits the tendency to a certain disease because the mechanism is not present in his body metabolism to prevent it; all such mechanisms must be potentially present at conception, in the fertilized ovum in which one begins to be. 3. A potency, however, cannot actualize itself: it requires an efficient causality to make it actual (just as, *e.g.*, the living being requires food and water in order to grow). So it is with the totality of being. It can be explained only as the complex or manifold produced by the Efficient Causality who actualizes all the potencies inherent therein. This cosmic Efficient Causality is God, the Intelligence and Will (Power) who creates and sustains all things (Psa. 33:6-9, 148:1-6). 4. God alone is pure actuality (completeness, perfection: cf. Matt. 5:48, Rom. 12:2, Lev. 19:2—holiness is *wholeness*). In God existence and essence are one; it is the very essence of God *to be* (Exo. 3:14, John 8:58). The Russian astronaut is reported to have said that while he was traveling through the upper reaches of space he looked everywhere for God but found Him not. What stupidity! Our God is Spirit (John 4:24), hence not apprehensible by sense-perception. Although no man has seen Him at any time (John 1:18), the fact is, in the words of the Psalmist, that

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

"the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork" (Psa. 19:1). (6) God, who is being, is *one*. He is *Spirit*, that is, without body or parts, but having understanding and free will. He is *everywhere*; wherever anything exists, God is there giving it existence. God is *eternal*; because it is His nature to be, He could never be non-existent, but is without beginning or end (Rev. 1:17-18, Heb. 9:14, Isa. 9:6, Exo. 3:14, Job 36:26, Psa. 90:2; Rom. 1:20, 16:26; Eph. 3:9; 1 Tim. 1:17, 6:16; Rev. 1:8, 22:13). All contingent things depend on other things for existence, but our God depends on nothing outside Himself for His existence, that is, His ground of existence is within Himself: He is *self-existent*.

The simple fact is that there must be Being who is without beginning or end; otherwise the something that exists must have come from nothing. This is absurd. The Self-existent Being is known in philosophy as the First Principle or First Cause, but for religious faith He is God. No man can logically *think* His way into atheism. When it occurs, atheism is the consequence of an emotional reaction of some kind.

In the Beginning

This phrase is used with great significance in the Bible. As a matter of fact, the Bible is the only book to which we can go for the truth about cosmic beginnings. Science treats of the *how* of things only; its laws are descriptive of the processes which the human mind discovers in the various realms of the natural world. Revelation alone can give us the truth about cosmic beginnings, especially the beginnings absolute, because absolute beginnings occur only by the operation of the Intelligence, Will, and Power of God. Absolute beginnings lie outside the realm of what is called natural law, in the area of the Primary or First Cause. Things once begun, however, are perpetuated in their various natures and functions by secondary causes,

that is, by the decrees of God as exercised through the "laws of nature." Let us consider the three passages in which this phrase, "in the beginning," occurs in Scripture, used in a context such as to make it profoundly meaningful, as follows:

1. John 1:1-3. John is described in Scripture as the disciple whom Jesus loved. (John 13:23, 19:26, 20:2, 21:7, 20). He it was who leaned on the Master's bosom on the occasion of the Last Supper, and he it is who has given us, in the fourth Gospel narrative, the sublime spiritual truths concerning the origin, person, and ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1) It was John who, in the first three verses of His Prologue, climbed into the very "heaven of heavens" to give us the revealed truth that "in the beginning was the Word," the Logos. In the beginning of what? This phrase can be measured chronologically only if eternity can be so measured. It declares simply that *from all eternity was the Word*, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. From all eternity Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten, was with God—"in the bosom of the Father" (John 1:18), in a position of loving intimacy with Him (John 17:5,24). From all eternity the Word, the Only Begotten, was God, that is, one of the Godhead, and therefore is to be worshiped with the worship that is due the Father. What man could have given us such a profound revelation? Because the Spirit alone searches the deep things of God, He alone can give us insight into these eternal truths (1 Cor. 2:10). In the manger at Bethlehem the eternal Logos became in fact the Only Begotten Son of God, through the passive instrumentality of the Virgin (Matt. 1:18-25, Luke 1:26-38, Gal. 4:4-5). (2) Note that in John's Prologue, before he has anything to say about the Creation, he declares that the Logos was in being "originally." In this "hymn" on the Creative Logos, he takes us back even farther than Moses does in Gen. 1:1; back, indeed, to the eternity

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

before time itself had a beginning. Note the other Scriptures in which the pre-existence of Christ is affirmed: John 1:14, 17:5, 8:58; Col. 1:17; Gal. 4:4; Phil. 2:5-11; Heb. 2:14-15. (3) Note the meaningful affirmations about the Logos in John 1:1-3: (a) His *eternity*: "originally," that is, from all eternity, He is the Word of God (1 John 1:1-2, Rev. 1:17-18, 22:13). (b) His *fellowship* with the Father: "and the Word was with God," that is, there were Two, God and the Word; (c) His *deity*: lest anyone get the notion that the Word was less than God, John adds, "and the Word was God," that is, as truly God as the entire Godhead (Heb. 1:8, Rev. 19:13-16). (4) Note that John uses Logos and not Sophia (Wisdom: cf. Prov. 8:22-30). Thus the Hebrew doctrine of the going forth of the Divine Word from God is emphasized, by way of contrast with the Greek idea of the immanent Divine Reason, as the governing idea in the revelation of the true relationship between the Son and the Father. (Cf. John 1:18, 5:30, 6:38, 10:30, 17:4-5, 17:18-21; Gal. 4:4; 1 John 1:1-2, 5:20.)

2. *Gen. 1:1*. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." In the beginning of what? Of the space-time process. "Beginning" is a familiar word with most of us, but we are inclined to think of it as a fashioning or rearrangement of what is already existent. But the "beginning" of *Gen. 1:1* was, as we have noted previously, an absolute Creation by the Power of Divine Thought and Will. There was a time when the cosmos was not; when there were only God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God (in the sunlight of the New Testament revelation, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). Hence we are told expressly that "the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear" (*Heb. 11:3*). This beginning was of necessity the work of Divine power, and hence

is properly designated *supernatural*. As a matter of fact, changes from non-being to being, from the unconscious to the conscious, from the conscious to the self-conscious (personality), apparently lie outside the scope of any strictly natural process (cf. Gen. 1:1, 21, 27). Energy-matter, the cosmos, animal life, human personality (self-consciousness and self-determination)—all must have been originated by Divine agency, through the introduction of new increments of power into the Creative Process at successive intervals—and hence, although originating in a miracle of absolute creation, are nevertheless perpetuated in what we call natural processes (secondary causes).

3. Acts 11:15—the words of Peter to the brethren at Jerusalem, explanatory of the conversion of the first Gentiles, Cornelius and his household at Caesarea. (See Acts 10, 11, and 15.) “As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them” (Cornelius and his household, the first Gentile converts) “even as on us” (the Apostles, all of them Jews) “*at the beginning.*” What beginning? The beginning of the regeneration, of the spiritual creation (John 3:3-7, Tit. 3:5, 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:10, 4:24), of the Reign of the Messiah, of the Church of Christ, of the New and better Covenant (Jer. 31:31-34, Heb. 8:6), of the Dispensation of the Spirit. The time was A.D. 30; the place, Jerusalem. On that occasion, the Spirit descended on the Apostles in baptismal measure (Luke 24:45-49, John 20:21-23; Acts 1:1-5, 2:1-4), thus making them charter members of the Church by miracle. They in turn preached the Gospel to the assembled multitude, telling inquiring sinners what to do to be saved. Some three thousand persons heard, believed, repented, and were baptized into Christ (Acts 2:37-42). “And there were added together in that day about three thousand souls” (Acts 2:41): thus the Body of Christ was incorporated, vitalized by the indwelling Spirit. It seems reasonable to

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

conclude that the Apostles were thus made members of the Body by the miracle of Holy Spirit baptism; those who obeyed the Gospel on that day, and all who have done so since that day, have been added to them—literally, *added together*—by the psychological process of conversion (Acts 3:19-20, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 10:9-10); and so that which began in miracle is perpetuated by the hearing and obedience of faith (Acts 2:38, Rom. 6:3-5, Eph. 2:19-22, Gal. 3:2).

Conclusion: Things that are begun *supernaturally* are perpetuated *naturally*. The beginning of the world, of man, of life, of all things in God's Eternal Purpose, was of necessity outside the realm of the strictly natural. The beginning of the Jewish nation was accompanied by miracles (Exo. 4:1-9). The ministry of Jesus was authenticated by miracles (Acts 2:22). The beginning of the church was in a miracle (Acts 2:1-4). The Gospel in its earliest proclamation was attested by miracles (Acts 8:4-24, 9:32-35, 9:36-42, 10:38-40, 19:1-7, 28:1-6; Mark 16:17-20; Heb. 2:2-4). In the days of the early Church, when disciples had to depend on the *oral* teaching of the Apostles, God graciously confirmed the word by the signs that followed (Rom. 1:11, 1 Cor. 12). However, when the New Testament was written and compiled, this miraculous element passed away (1 Cor. 13:8, Eph. 4:8-16). Do not expect a miracle to be performed today to convert a sinner. *Demonstration accompanies revelation*; however, when the revelation is completed, the demonstration is no longer necessary (2 Tim. 3:16-17; Matt. 12:38-40, Rom. 1:4). Rom. 10:6-10—the righteousness which is of faith says, "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach," etc. Accept and obey the Gospel, enjoy salvation through obedience to its commands, and live in the blessed hope of life everlasting.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART FIVE

1. State the various theories of the relation of Gen. 1:1 to the rest of the Creation Narrative that follows.
2. What are the objections to the reconstruction theory?
3. What does our text say about the agreement between the Genesis Cosmogony and present-day science?
4. Name the various concepts which, according to Murphy, are denied by the first verse of Genesis.
5. The phrase, "in the beginning," implies the beginning of what?
6. Explain the distinction between *mathematical* time and *real* time.
7. What seems to be the essential difference between *eternity* and *time*?
8. Who or what existed prior to the beginning of time, according to Biblical teaching?
9. What is the name used for the Deity in Gen. 1:1? What is the special significance of this name?
10. What suggestions have been made to account for the use of the plural subject with a singular verb, in this Scripture?
11. What explanation of this problem harmonizes with the teaching of the Bible as a whole?
12. Explain the theistic doctrine of God.
13. Explain how, according to Christlieb, Genesis 1:1 is a protest against atheism, materialism, pantheism, emanationism, deism, and rationalism.
14. Show how theism differs from both deism and pantheism.
15. What is the significance of the verb *bara* as used in the first chapter of Genesis? How does this verb differ from the verb *asah* in meaning?
16. What are the objections to the notion of the "eternity" of matter?
17. Explain what is meant by Efficient Causality.

THE BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNINGS 1:1

18. State the main rival theories, in present-day science, of the origin of the universe.
19. In explaining the cosmos, with what *something* does each of the following scientists begin: Lemaitre, Hoyle, Gamow, Whipple?
20. What kind of Creation does Genesis teach?
21. What is meant by Creation without the use of pre-existing material? How does this differ from Creation *ex nihilo*?
22. Show how research in the field of psychic phenomena supports the Biblical doctrine of Creation by the power of Divine Thought.
23. On what grounds do we say that matter as it is understood today in its ultimate forms is *metaphysical* rather than *physical*?
24. How does the Second Law of Thermodynamics give scientific support to creationism?
25. How, according to Trueblood, does the Evolution Hypothesis support both theism and creationism? Do you agree?
26. Show how the teaching of Heb. 11:3 might be harmonized with current knowledge in the area of nuclear physics.
27. What answers may be given to the question, Why Creation at all?
28. Give the various suggested meanings of the phrase, "the heavens and the earth." Which view is preferred in this textbook?
29. What is included in this phrase, "the heavens and the earth"?
30. What is included in "the host of heaven"?
31. What is included in the "host" of earth?
32. State Dr. Strong's definition of Creation and discuss the various parts of this definition.

PART SIX: THE FIRST FOUR "DAYS" OF THE COSMIC WEEK OF BEGINNINGS

Gen. 1:2—1:19

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The verb *bara*, translated "create," writes Skinner (ICC,15) is used exclusively in Scripture of Divine activity, "a restriction to which perhaps no parallel can be found in other languages"; expresses the idea of *novelty*, *extraordinariness*; expresses the idea of *effortless* production ("such as befits the Almighty") "by word or volition" (as another puts it, the verb emphasizes "the unconditioned Creatorship of God"; cf. Psa. 33:6,9; Psa 148:1-6; Rom 4:17). With this introduction which, apparently, is a caption to the Cosmogony that follows, or, it may be, a designation of the activity by which the first form of undifferentiated energy-matter was called into being by the Divine Will and Word, the writer proceeds to the description of the successive steps by which this first form of energy-matter was arranged into an organized cosmos.

Day One: Energy-Matter, Motion, Light
(1:2-5)

"And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

1. The writer singles out the earth for special emphasis. This is consistent, of course, in that it points up the fact immediately that the entire Cosmogony is to be written from the viewpoint of an inhabitant of earth. However, as Lange points out (CDHCG,163), the description given here of the genesis of the earth may well serve, by way of analogy, for the generation of the universe.

2. The earth "was waste and void." (1) This description takes us back to the first stages in the Creative Process subsequent to the first putting forth of energy from the being of God; the Spirit, literally, *was brooding*;

that is, the process was actually going on when the account opens; as yet the primal energy (was it psychical or physical?) had not transmuted itself into gross matter (which present-day physicists describe as "frozen" or "congealed" energy). There was only *formlessness* and *voidness*; literally, the earth was *formless* and *empty*. Again quoting Lange (CDHCG,163): "It is through the conception of voidness, nothingness, that *Thohu* and *Bohu* are connected . . . The *desert* is *waste*, that is, a confused mass without order; the *waste* is *desert*, that is, *void*, without distinction of object. The first word denotes rather the lack of form, the second the lack of content, in the earliest condition of the earth. It might therefore be translated form-less, matter-less."

(2) There are some who hold that the phrase *thohu vabohu* supports the notion of a previous overthrow, a cosmic upheaval. For corroboration they refer us especially to Isa. 34:11, where the same terms are rendered, respectively, "confusion" and "emptiness" (cf. also Jer. 4:23). Whitelaw (PCG,41) rejects this view: the phrase, he contends, does not suggest the ruin of a previous cosmos, because Elohim never intended anything to be thus formless and empty, hence utterly *functionless* (that is, not "good" for anything); rather, He created the earth to be inhabited, and to be inhabited by man as the crown of Creation. Obviously, the Genesis Cosmogony gives us the clear picture of an *organized* cosmos, the ultimate end for which the Divine activity was first set in operation. Our God is purposeful: He sees (plans) the end from the beginning (Isa. 46:9-11).

(3) I suggest that "form" (in "formless") here does not connote shape or configuration essentially, but, rather, the ancient concept of "form" as the principle of specification, that is, of the identity of particulars in any given class. For example, one who looks at a mustard seed and a poppy seed can hardly distinguish between them. But

one thing is sure: one cannot plant a poppy seed and get a mustard plant, for the obvious reason that all poppies have the form of "poppy-ness," whereas all mustard plants have the form of "mustard-ness." Or, just as a mind or soul "informs" the human body, so man is specified (set apart as a species) by his thought processes. Hence, we have in this verse of Genesis a picture of the earth when it had not yet assumed the form of a planet, but was still only a "part" of a huge, shapeless, objectless, motionless, and tenantless mass of "world stuff" (the hydrogen fog of Hoyle? or Gamow's ylem? or Whipple's "dust cloud"?), perhaps little more than a potential field of elemental forces, out of which the earth and all other planets and suns, and perhaps all other universes, were eventually to emerge as a result of the "brooding" of the *Ruach Elohim*. It was that state in which all electronic, gaseous, liquid, and solid elements were commingled (present only potentially), but as yet lacking any trace of differentiation. Moreover, this primal world-stuff was "shrouded in the thick folds of Cimmerian gloom, giving not the slightest promise of that fair world of light, order, and life into which it was about to be transformed."

3. "*And darkness was upon the face of the deep.*" (1) Is this a reflection of the Babylonian cosmology in which the earth was thought of as resting upon a subterranean ocean? Such a view is based, of course, on the presupposition that the Babylonian traditions of the Creation and the Deluge were the originals from which the Biblical accounts were derived—a view which ignores altogether the possibility of Divine revelation as the source of the Genesis Cosmogony (or the account of Noah's Flood). In opposition to this *derivation-theory*, it will be noted that the preceding affirmation (in v.2) that the earth was formless and empty, indicates clearly that as yet the earth *as such* did not even exist, that in fact the whole heavens and earth were as yet unformed, at this stage of the Cre-

ative activity. It is granted, of course, that the "deep" is a term used frequently in the Hebrew Scriptures to designate the sea (cf. Psa. 42:7, Job 38:30, Isa. 44:27). But again there is no evidence that a sea or ocean existed at this point in the Creation. The writer is not picturing here the ultimate state of the cosmos; rather, he is describing its state prior even to the beginning of its arrangement into a cosmos, prior to the genesis of physical force, motion, and ultimately gross matter, through the continuous activity of the Spirit of God. In view of these considerations, I suggest that the "deep," in this particular connection, could well refer to the "deep" of *limitless Space*. (This could be the import of the term as used in Gen. 8:2 also.) Under this view, then, we have here a picture of limitless Space filled with, and shrouded in, thick darkness, with the "world-stuff" beginning to emerge at God's command, through the Spirit's activity of stirring, energizing, that is, actualizing forms of energy which had not before that moment operated, and which were capable of transmutation into the kinds of matter known to us today. (It is impossible for the human mind to conceive of the transition from Eternity to Time (which necessarily involved the beginnings of what we call the "physical" aspects of the Plan of the Ages) as having occurred in any other way. Basically, to be sure, this transition must always remain a mystery to human intelligence because it embodies the ineffable, and must, in the final analysis, be largely a matter of faith.) In its first state, of course, the very first "world-stuff" was motionless and objectless (that is, wholly undifferentiated); as a matter of fact, had there been anything at this point desirable to be seen, there was no light by which to see it, for thick darkness "was upon the face of the deep." This interpretation is supported by the language of the very next sentence, "*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,*" the term "waters" suggesting an even more advanced stage in the Creative

Process, probably the stage at which matter had begun to assume, incipiently at least, a gaseous ("atmospheric waters"), or perhaps even the beginning of a fluidic, state.

(2) It is significant, I think, that the tradition of such a primordial Chaos, the chief characteristics of which were *formlessness*, *emptiness*, and *darkness*, was widespread among ancient peoples. The Greek word, *Chaos*, for instance, meant primarily, empty, *immeasurable space*, and only secondarily, *the rude, unformed mass* of something out of which the universe was created. Thus Hesiod, the Greek poet of the 8th century B.C., wrote as follows: "Verily at the first Chaos came to be, but next wide-bosomed Earth, the ever-sure foundation of all the deathless ones who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus, and dim Tartarus in the depth of the wide-pathed Earth, and Eros (Love), fairest among the deathless gods, who unnerves the limbs and overcomes the mind and wise counsels of all gods and all men within them. From Chaos came forth Erebus and black Night; but of Night were born Aether and Day, whom she conceived and bare from union in love with Erebus. And Earth first bare starry Heaven, equal to herself, to cover her on every side, and to be an ever-sure abiding-place for the blessed gods" ("Theogony," HHH, LCL). Of course, these are all personifications, but their import is obvious. Chaos (Space), says Hesiod, was first of all; of him was born Erebus (Darkness) and black Night; and by the union of Darkness and black Night came Aether (the upper air) and Day. And Plato, some four centuries after Hesiod, writing in an imaginative vein, in his well-known "likely story" (*mythos*) of the *Timaeus*, described the Creation of the cosmos, by the *Demioergos* (Master Craftsman), out of the Receptacle of Becoming (Space) according to the patterns supplied by the Eternal Forms or Ideas that go to make up the World of Being. Plato seems to imply that these Eternal Forms (principles of specificity, e.g., the "cow-ness" of a

cow, "horse-ness" of a horse, etc.) exist in the Divine Reason, although I have never been able to find any passages in which he affirmed this explicitly. The Receptacle, he describes as having no qualities of its own; it is not, according to the Platonic picture, that *out of which* things of our World of Becoming are made, but that *in which* the qualities that make up this "physical" or "corporeal" world (in the form of the Opposites which are said to be continuously passing, the one into the other and back again, cyclically) appear as in a mirror (See F. M. Cornford, PC). Lange, on Gen. 1:2 (CDHCG, 163): "Chaos denotes the void space (as in a similar manner the old Northern Ginnungagap, gaping of yawnings, the gaping abyss, which also implies present existing material), and in the next place the rude unorganized mass of the world-material." (Incidentally, one principle that must always be kept in mind in the study of the Old Testament is that *mythological (and traditional) distortions of ancient beliefs and practices all point necessarily to a genuine original.*) Certainly it is worth noting well, in this connection, that one of the concepts which has gained widespread credence among physicists of our own time is that Space may have been the very first "stuff" of which the physical universe had its beginning. For example, Mr. Walter Russell, one-time President of the Society of Arts and Sciences, was quoted in the metropolitan press several years ago, as follows: "The question arises, Is there any line of demarcation between a spiritual and a physical universe? And have we been calling the invisible universe spiritual just because we could not see it? We have begun to see something tangible and inspiring beyond place, mass and dimension. There must be a limitless source of static energy somewhere back of all this dynamic expression." With reference to the ultimate particles or forces of which matter is composed, continued Mr. Russell. which seem to constitute light, and which carry energy, scientists find

them all acting suspiciously like some of the processes of human thought. He added: "Tomorrow physics will undoubtedly divorce energy from matter and give it to space . . . What we call the spiritual universe may prove to be the static source in space of electric energy. If Einstein's prophecy is fulfilled it would cause a far greater upheaval in science than Copernicus caused in the concept of Ptolemy. Basic conclusions of today would be either reversed or discarded entirely, for if energy belongs to space as the new cosmogony suggests, light would belong to space, as Jesus inferred. When energy is found to belong to space, light will be understood to be an emergence from space, and God will be found to be what Jesus said He was—Light. As we study Jesus' teaching from the point of view of science, we become convinced that He understood light, energy, motion, and space, and knew what filled space. Jesus taught that life is eternal, that there is no death. Science may prove this to be literally true, and that the body, like all other material phenomena, merely registers the intensity of the thinking of a Supreme Intelligence. If science proves this, it will give meaning to the words of Sir James Jeans that 'matter may eventually be proved to be pure thought.'" (Recall Pascal's vivid line: "The eternal silence of infinite space is terrifying." Cf. *Psa.* 139:7-10.) We might well ask: Can any real line of demarcation be drawn between psychical (mental, spiritual) light (illumination) and physical light (illumination)? (See again the comments by Fred Hoyle on "continuous creation," as quoted on preceding pages.) (Of course, *we must always avoid dogmatizing in our attempts to correctly apprehend the sublime truths that are incorporated in the Genesis Cosmogony.*)

(3) The Bible teaches throughout that our physical cosmos is an embodiment of Divine Thought as expressed by the Divine Word (*Logos*), and as actualized by the Divine Spirit. The Will of God is the constitution of the

totality of being, both visible and invisible (Psa. 148:1-6, 33:6,9; Heb. 11:3). These are fundamental truths to which the physical science of our time is gradually groping its way back, despite its tendency to cling tenaciously to pantheistic assumptions.

(4) As in the physical realm, so it is in the spiritual. M. Henry (CWB, 2): "This chaos represents the state of an unregenerate graceless soul: *there* is disorder, confusion, and every evil work; it is empty of all good, for it is without God; it is dark till almighty grace effects a blessed change." (This change is wrought, of course, through our hearing, accepting, and obeying the Gospel of Christ.)

4. "*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*" (1) Literally, the Spirit of God (*Ruach Elohim*) *was brooding*. Not a "wind" of God, for the obvious reason that the air did not exist at this particular stage in the development of the cosmos. Skinner (ICCG, 17-18): "Not, as has sometimes been supposed, a *wind* sent from God to dry up the waters, but the divine Spirit, figured as a bird brooding over its nest, and perhaps symbolizing an immanent principle of life and order in the as yet undeveloped chaos." "In accordance with Biblical usage generally," writes Whitelaw (PCG, 4), this term, Spirit of God, "must be regarded as a designation, not simply of 'the divine power, which, like the wind and the breath cannot be perceived, (Gesenius), but of the Holy Spirit, who is uniformly represented as the source or formative cause of all life and order in the world, whether physical, intellectual, or spiritual . . . As it were, the mention of the *Ruach Elohim* is the first out-blossoming of the latent fulness of the Divine personality, the initial movement in that sublime revelation of the nature of the Godhead, which, advancing slowly, and at the best but indistinctly, throughout Old Testament times, culminated in the clear and ample disclosures of the gospel." (Cf. Job 26:13, 27:3, 33:4, 32:8; Psa. 33:6, 104:29-30; Acts 17:25).

(2) "The Spirit of God *was brooding*." The Hebrew word used here has a double meaning. In the first place, it conveys the idea of a stirring, a fluttering, as of an eagle stirring up her nest and teaching her young to fly. (The word has this import also in the Song of Moses, Deut. 32:11.) Thus the entrance of the Spirit into the primordial Chaos — formless, objectless, immeasurable Space — was signaled by a stirring therein, an energizing, a *setting in motion*. In the second place, the word *merachepeth* (from *rachaph*, to be tremulous, as with love) signifies a *brooding*, an incubation. The complete picture is that of a mother-bird brooding over her nest, hatching her eggs, and nurturing her young. In Milton's stately elegiac verse, the Spirit

" . . . from the first

Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread,

Dove-like, sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,

And mad'st it pregnant . . .

Rotherham (EB, 3,n.): "The beautiful word *brooding*, an exact rendering of the Hebrew, is most suggestive, since it vividly describes the cherishing of incipient life, as a preparation for its outburst. The participial form of such a word clearly denotes a process, more or less lengthened, rather than an instantaneous act." John Owen, (HSGP, 56): "The word 'moved' (*merachepeth*) signifies a gentle motion, like that of a dove over its nest, to communicate vital heat to its eggs, or to cherish its young. Without him, all was a dead sea, a rude unformed chaos, a confused heap covered with darkness; but by the moving of the Spirit of God upon it, he communicated a quickening prolific virtue . . . This is a better account of the origin of all things than is given us by any of the philosophers, ancient or modern." Moreover, does not this verb suggest clearly that the Creation was an act or outpouring of Divine Love as well as of Divine Power—of Divine Love seeking perhaps the fellowship of kindred holy spirits,

that is, the spirits of the redeemed of mankind? And may we not reasonably conclude that this activity of the cherishing Spirit was the origin of the myth of Eros, and of the mythological world-egg, whether regarded as Persian or Greek?

"The breath of man," writes Lange (CDHCG, 164), "the wind of the earth, and the spirit, especially the spirit of God, are symbolical analogies. The breath is the life-unity, the life-motion of the physical creature, the wind is the unity and life-motion of the earth, the spirit is the unity and life-motion of the life proper to which it belongs; the spirit of God is the unity and life-motion of the creative divine activity. It is not a wind of God to which the language here primarily relates . . . From this place onward, and throughout the whole Scripture, the spirit of God is the single formative principle evermore presenting itself with personal attributes in all the divine creative constitutions, whether of the earth, of nature, of the theocracy, of the Tabernacle, of the church, of the new life, or of the new man. The Grecian analogue is that of Eros (or Love) in its reciprocal action with the Chaos, and to this purpose have the later Targums explained it: *the spirit of love*." M. Dods (EBG): "This, then, is the first lesson of the Bible: that at the root and origin of all this vast material universe, before whose laws we are crushed as the moth, there abides a living, conscious Spirit, who wills and knows and fashions all things." (Cf. John 4:24; Psa. 104:29-30; Job 26:13, 27:3, 33:4; Acts 17:25; Gen. 2:7, Psa. 33:6—"the breath of his mouth"; Exo. 31:1-11, 35:30-35; Num. 11:16-17; Deut. 34:9; 2 Sam. 23:12; 1 Chron. 28:11-12; John 14:26, 16:7-14, 20:22-23; Acts 1:1-5, 2:1-4; Eph. 2:19-22; John 3:1-7; Rom. 5:5; Acts 2:38; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Rom. 8:11.) Robinson (CEHS, p.5): "The Bible is the Book of the Spirit. 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."

(3) *As the first brooding of the Spirit over the primordial "deep" was the beginning of the actualization of the physical creation, so the overshadowing of the Virgin by the same Holy Spirit, effecting the conception, hence the incarnation, of God's Only Begotten Son, was the beginning of the actualization of the spiritual creation, the Regeneration (1 Cor. 15:45-49). The divine creation of the physical nature of Mary's Son, the incarnate Logos, constituted His body the perfect offering as the Atonement (Covering) for the "sin of the world" (John 1:29), and also constituted it a body over which death had no power. Thus it will be seen that the Incarnation by the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection are all necessary to the framework of Christianity; not one of these doctrines can be rejected without vitiating the entire Christian System. It would be well for the unitarians and the cultists to keep this in mind. (I am reminded here of the man who said he had flirted with Unitarianism for a long time, but simply could not bring himself to address his prayers, "To whom it may concern.") (Luke 1:35; John 1:14; Luke 24:45-49; Acts 2:30-33, 4:10-12; Rom. 8:11; Heb. 4:14-15, 7:26-28, 9:23-28; 1 Pet. 2:21-25, 3:21-22; Rev. 1:17-18).*

(4) Note here also the correlations of various Scriptures which identify the Spirit of God of the Old Testament with the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord, of the New Testament. Correlate Luke 4:18-19, Isa. 61:1-2, Acts 10:38; Matt. 22:43, Psalms 110:1; Acts 4:25, Psalms 2:1-2; Acts 1:16, Psalms 69:25, 109:8; Heb. 3:7-11, Psalms 95:7-11; all these with 1 Sam. 16:13, 2 Sam. 23:2;

Acts 2:17-21, 2:4, 2:32-33; Acts 28:25-28, Isa. 6:9-10; Isa. 61:1-3, Luke 4:18-19; John 3:34, Matt. 12:28; Luke 11:20; Exo. 8:19, 31:18, 32:16, 34:1, 34:27-28; Deut. 9:10, Psa. 8:3 (the "finger of God" in Scripture is a metaphor of God's Spirit-power): 2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:1-11. Note where identifications occur in the same passage: Acts 16:6-7; Acts 5:3,9; 2 Cor. 3:17-18; Rom. 8:9. The Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit (Neh. 9:20, Matt. 28:19, Acts 2:38, John 1:33), the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord—all these are terms designating "the one and the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:11, Heb. 9:14). (Cf. also Isa. 63:10-11; Isa. 11:2, 42:1, 48:16, 61:1; Matt. 3:16, John 1:32, etc.)

(5) The transmutation of psychical energy into physical energy and action occurs all the time in man: it occurs when any human being "makes up his mind" to walk, run, climb, jump, sit down, lie down, or to use his mind or body in any way. There is no more mysterious power in our human experience than this power of thought and will to direct the activity of mind (as in cases of voluntary recollection) and that of the body (a notable example being that of the pitcher who throws the baseball *if* and *when* and *where* he "makes up his mind" to throw it.) Yet this is so commonplace in our lives that we never give any thought to the unfathomable mystery involved. May we not reasonably conclude, then, that in the possession of such powers man but reflects the spark of the Infinite which was breathed into him originally by the Spirit of God (Gen. 2:7, 1:26,27)? And if psychical energy in man is capable of self-transmutation into physical energy, who can gainsay the fact that psychical energy in God (who is Spirit, John 4:24) is capable of an absolute creation of physical energy? We hold, therefore, that primal energy is Pure Thought, the activity of pure Spirit. (We recall that Aristotle defined God as Pure-Thought-Thinking-Itself.) This primal energy is the source of every

other form of energy in the cosmos. Spirit-power, Will-power, Thought-power, Word-power (which is Thought-power willed and expressed) in God are one and the same in activities and in effects. Our cosmos is the product of Universal Intelligence and Will, the construct of Pure Thought. This is precisely what the Bible teaches—that God the absolute Spirit, by the instrumentality of His Word and the agency of His Spirit, is the eternal (un-originated) First Cause of all things that exist. Moreover, the Creation itself was essentially that act of Pure Thought which embraces the entire Space-Time Process (Continuum) in a single Idea; hence, with God it is always the eternal NOW (Exo. 3:14). As Augustine writes, referring to the Creator (Conf., 262, 260): “Thy years are one day; and Thy day is not daily, but To-day, seeing Thy To-day gives not place unto to-morrow, for neither doth it replace yesterday. Thy To-day is Eternity; therefore didst Thou beget the Co-eternal, to whom thou hast said, *This day have I begotten Thee*” (Psa. 2:7. This divine begetting referred to in the Psalm was in the Eternal Purpose of God: it became concretely actualized in the Incarnate Logos.) Again: “In the Eternal nothing passeth, but the whole is present.”

(6) The beginning of the brooding of the Spirit over the thick darkness of “the deep” marked the first transmutation from the psychical to the physical. The introduction of physical energy was the creation of motion: the natural transitions followed, from motion to heat, to light, etc. It is important to note, however, the distinction between *energy*, which is primary, and the propagation and application of *energy* in terms of *force*, which is secondary. It is obvious, moreover, that the application of energy in terms of force presupposes a *directing Will*. Without the guiding Intelligence and Will to direct the expenditure of energy along definite and well-prescribed lines, and for specific and respective ends depending on the kinds of

energy put forth, the result would surely be disorder and catastrophe. It seems evident that all natural law, which is but descriptive of the operations of natural forces (in terms of specific formulas), is of necessity predicated upon the guiding Intelligence and Will which is superior to that which it directs and governs: speaking by way of analogy, law, of whatever kind, presupposes a lawgiver. Science, in its use of the word "law" which it borrowed from jurisprudence, wittingly or unwittingly, pays tribute to the cosmic Lawgiver. The guiding Intelligence and Will which directs the expenditure of energy in terms of force presupposes, in turn, the Divine Personality. It is unreasonable to presuppose an *impersonal* energy, or source of energy, as the First Cause. *This definition of force as applied and directed energy is fundamental to any proper understanding of the cosmic processes. Moreover, wherever there is divine Will, there is divine Personality; and wherever there is divine Intelligence and Will, there is the Eternal Spirit. In a word, apart from the Eternal Spirit there is no rational explanation either of energy or of force; however, with the acceptance of the activity of the Eternal Spirit, no other explanation is needed, either of energy or of force, or of the Creation and Preservation of the Cosmos.* Where the Eternal Spirit is, there is law, light, life, love, order, peace. (Cf. again John 4:24, Heb. 9:14.) Where the Spirit is not, there is license, darkness, death, hate, disorder, strife: in short, evil in every diabolical form. Or, as someone else has put it: "It is indeed significant that the two characteristics of the primordial Chaos which occur in all the ancient traditions are those of *emptiness* and *darkness*. That is to say, *where God is not, there is always emptiness, darkness, non-being. Where God is, there is, by way of vivid contrast, life, light, being. And the ontological difference between non-being and being consists in the activity of the Divine Spirit.*" We shall now follow the account, as given in the remaining

verses of the Genesis Cosmogony, of the progressive development, step by step ("day" by "day"), of the primal undifferentiated world-energy, *under the continuous brooding of the Spirit of God*, into the organized cosmos that is the object of man's scientific quest throughout the ages.

"And God said, *Let there be light: and there was light.*"

1. Literally; "And God said, Light, Be! and light was." According to Scripture, God as Father *plans*, God as the Word (Logos) *executes* (decrees), and God as the Spirit *actualizes* that which is decreed (Psa. 148:6; Isa. 45:22-23, 46:9-11; Eph. 3:9-12). In the first verse of Genesis, Elohim, the Absolute, the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9), is introduced to us as the originating First Cause; in verse 2 the Spirit of God is introduced to us as the actualizing First Cause; in verse 3, the Word of God is introduced to us as the executive First Cause, of the initial phase of the Creative Process. From this point on, throughout the entire Cosmogony, the formula, "And God said," introduces the account of each successive advance in the physical (natural) Creation. That is to say, whatever God willed and *decreed* at the beginning of each "day," was done (actualized) on that "day," in that particular stage of the total Process. Just *how* it was done seems to have been a matter of little or no concern to the inspired writer, or, therefore, to the Spirit who inspired him to write; the purpose was to emphasize only the religious fact of the Creation, namely, that it was God who did the creating, through the executive agency of the Logos and the realizing agency of the Spirit. The problem of the *how* of the Process was left for human science to spell out slowly and laboriously throughout the centuries. Hence, under the energizing activity of the Spirit, the Word, we are told, the Logos, interposed His executive authority, ten times in succession, in the form of Divine ordinances or decrees, to give intelligent direction and order to the Process as a whole.

We must not forget that our God—the living and true God—“declares the end from the beginning” (Isa. 46:10). The end result was the *organized* cosmos, the cosmic order which makes human science possible. As a matter of fact, it is this order which makes human life possible; man simply could not live in an unpredictable world.

2. From this verse onward we must not forget that we are thinking in terms of the writer’s point of view, that is, in terms of earth, and of the solar system of which the earth is a planet, in short, of the viewpoint of a person on earth. Of course, the development described here, apparently, of what occurred in the formation and development of our solar system, may be regarded as paralleling what was occurring in other celestial systems (galaxies, or “island universes”).

3. How long a time elapsed between the first stirring of the Spirit of God in the primeval “deep,” and the issuance of the first Divine decree, “Let there be light,” we do not know and obviously cannot know. Both the Bible and science indicate, however, that the stretch of time was very, very long: the various heating and cooling processes hypothesized by science, and the activity of “brooding” attributed in Scripture to the Divine Spirit, all imply an indefinitely long period.

4. *The Logos.* (1) In the Old Testament, we meet God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God: in the full light of the New Testament revelation, these become Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2). Why was not this triune personality of the God of the Bible clearly revealed to God’s ancient people, the children of Israel? We cannot say definitely. It is obvious, of course, that God did not fully reveal Himself in Old Testament times. Perhaps if He had disclosed His triune personality to the Hebrew people, they would have drifted into tritheism, that is, into the worship of three Gods instead of the one living and true God. Hence, under the

Old Covenant, it is the *uniqueness* of God which was given special emphasis, in the oft-repeated creed, Deut. 6:4, "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah," that is, the *only* Jehovah (Yahweh). (Deut. 4:35,39; Isa. 45:18, 46:9; Acts 17:23-29.) It seems that the revelation of the tri-unity of God was withheld from the Israelites of old, lest they drift into polytheism and idolatry, the besetting sins of the ancient pagan world. However, although the doctrine is not fully disclosed in the Old Testament writings, there are many clear intimations of it, as we shall see later.

(2) We are especially concerned here with the significance of the name *Logos* as it occurs and its meaning is fully revealed in the Bible as a whole: Let us not forget the principle of interpretation which is followed throughout this textbook, namely, that any Bible doctrine must be studied and interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Bible as a whole, in order that its full meaning may be brought to light. Hence, with reference to the *Logos*, we find that Scripture unequivocally, from beginning to end, identifies the One whom we know historically as Jesus of Nazareth, and whom we confess as the Christ, the Son of the living God, as the true Biblical *Logos*. In proof of this statement, note the following catenae of Scripture passages: (a) Those which affirm generally His pre-existence, His co-eternity with the Father, and His pre-existence, moreover, as a personal Being (Phil. 2:5-7; Heb. 2:14; John 1:18, John 10:17-18; John 17:5, 17:24; Col. 1:17; John 8:58; Rev. 1:17-18, 21:6; Isa. 9:6; Mic. 5:2; John 6:38, 6:62, 7:33-34; Gal. 4:4); (b) those which present Him as the executive Agent of the Creation and Preservation of the world (Col. 1:16-17; 1 Cor. 8:6; John 1:1-3; Heb. 1:3, 1:10); (c) those which declare either explicitly or implicitly, His deity (John 8:58, here He assumes for Himself the "great and incommunicable" Divine Name, Exo. 3:14), John 1:18; Rev. 1:17-18, 21:6; John 1:1-3 ("and the *Logos* was God"), John 20:28 (here

Jesus accepts forms of address due to Deity alone); Matt. 1:23 ("God with us"); John 10:30, Rom. 9:5, Col. 2:19, 1 Tim. 3:16, Heb. 1:3, 1 John 1:2); (d) those Old Testament passages which intimate pre-incarnate appearances of the eternal Logos. These include *the passages referring to the activity of the "Angel of Yahweh"* (Gen. 3:2-4, 16:7,9,13; Gen. 18:1,2,13,17,20,23; Gen. 22:11-19, 31:11-13, 32:30; Exo. 3:2-4, 14:19 (here the Angel's presence is indicated by the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire, symbols, respectively, of the Spirit and the Word, who go together, Isa. 59:21); Exo. 13:21-22 (cf. 1 Cor. 10:1-4, Heb. 11:26-27), Judg. 13:20-22, Josh. 5:13-15, Dan. 3:25,28, Mic. 5:2); *those passages in which Wisdom is represented as existing eternally with God, though distinct from Him* (Job 28:20-23, Prov. 8:1-6, 7:21 (cf. 1 Cor. 1:22-24, 1:30); Jer. 10:10-12); *those passages in which the Word, as distinguished from God, is presented as the executor of God's will from eternity* (Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:5-6, 119:89, 147:15-18, 107:20; Heb. 11:3, 2 Pet. 3:5).

As Epiphanius, one of the Church Fathers, wrote, in substance: the Divine unity was first proclaimed by Moses (Deut. 6:4); the Divine duality, that is, the distinction between the Father and the Son, Messiah, by the prophets (Isa. 9:6, 11:1-2; Mic. 5:2); but the Divine tripersonality was first clearly shown forth in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles (Matt. 28:19, 2 Cor. 13:14, 1 Pet. 1:2).

The term *Logos* was in rather common use at the time of our Lord's ministry in the flesh. Hence, John wrote his Prologue (1:1-18) to set forth the true doctrine of the *Logos*, in Latin *Verbum*, in English, *Word*. The *Logos*, he declared, is not the Platonic World Soul, not the Gnostic inferior intermediary between God and the world, not just the Philonian Divine Thought (Word) or its manifestation in the world (Wisdom), not the Stoic World Fire, *but the Person who became flesh and dwelt among us as Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God.* (1 Tim.

2:5, Matt. 16:16). Lebreton (HDT, I, 187): "The Messianic belief is as foreign as belief in the Incarnation to the Philonian theory of the Logos, and is equally characteristic of Christianity. As the Messiah, prepared for by the whole past of Israel, awaited and predicted by the prophets, came upon earth to inaugurate the Kingdom of God and redeem the elect, and due, later on, to return to judge the whole world, Jesus fills the whole of history. The Philonian Logos is foreign to history; he may be the object of the speculation of philosophers, he has no contact with the life of men." Again (*ibid*, 414): "Human speculation flattered itself in vain that it could sound the depths of the life of God, its proud efforts resulted in nothing but barren and deceptive dreams; it is in the humility of the Incarnation that the mystery of God has been revealed: for the Jews a scandal, a folly to the Greeks, the strength and wisdom of God for the elect."

A. Campbell has written on the doctrine of the Logos (John 1:1-3), in the *Christian Baptist*, May 7, 1927, as follows: "The names Jesus, Christ, or Messiah, Only Begotten Son, Son of God, etc., belong to the Founder of the Christian religion, and to none else. They express not a relation existing before the Christian era, but relations which commenced at that time . . . To understand the relation betwixt the Savior and His Father, which existed before time, and that relation which began in time, is impossible on either of these [*i.e.*, the Arian or Calvinistic] theories. There was no Jesus, no Messiah, no Christ, no Son of God, no Only Begotten, before the reign of Augustus. The relation that was before the Christian era was not that of a son and father, terms which always imply disparity; but it was that expressed by John in the sentence under consideration. The relation was that of 'God and the Word of God.' This phraseology unfolds a relation quite different from that of a father and a son—a relation perfectly intimate, equal and glorious. This

naturally leads me to the first sentence of John. And here I must state a few *postulata*. 1. No relation amongst human beings can perfectly exhibit the relation which the Savior held to the God and Father of all, anterior to His birth. The reason is: that relation is not homogenial, or of the same kind with relations originating from creation. All relations we know anything of, are created, such as that of father and son." (Note: where there is father and son, the father must of necessity *antedate* the son.) "Now I object as much to a created relation as I do to a creature in reference to the original relation of God and the Word of God. *This relation is an uncreated and unoriginated relation.* 2. When in the fulness of time, it became necessary in the wisdom of God to exhibit a Savior, it became expedient to give some view of the original and eternal dignity of this wonderful visitant of the human race. And as this view must be given in human language, inadequate as it was, the whole vocabulary of human speech must be examined for suitable terms. 3. Of the terms expressive of relations, the most suitable must be, and most unquestionably was, selected. And as the relation was spiritual and not carnal, such terms only were eligible which had respect to mental and spiritual relations. Of this sort there is but one in all the archives of human knowledge, and that is the one selected. 4. The Holy Spirit selected the name, WORD, and therefore we may safely assert that this is the best, if not the only term, in the whole vocabulary of human speech at all adapted to express that relation which existed 'in the beginning,' or before time, between our Savior and His God." What are the implications of this name? At this point I paraphrase Mr. Campbell's answer to this question thus: (1) A *word* is commonly defined as the sign or symbol of an idea. It is the idea expressed in written or spoken form. (When I speak of a chair, for instance, there immediately flashes into your mind an image of the thing of which I have the same image in my

own mind; and the image represents an *idea*. The word is therefore the sign or symbol of the idea.) (2) the human intellect *thinks*, *i.e.*, it formulates and relates ideas by means of words, and the result is *language*. Men cannot express their ideas without words of some sort. (3) It follows that the word, and the idea which it represents, must have their origin at the same time, and are therefore of like antiquity—or, as we say, co-etaneous. And though the word may not be the same in different languages, the same idea is expressed. (4) The idea and the word are distinct, of course; that is, they are *two*. (5) Yet the relationship between the two is the most *intimate* of which we have any knowledge, and is a relationship of the *mind* or *spirit*. An idea cannot exist without a word, nor a word without an idea. (6) To be acquainted with the word is to be acquainted with the idea, for the idea is in the word, and the word stands for the idea.

We continue Mr. Campbell's exegesis verbatim from this point, as follows: "Now let it be most attentively observed and remembered that these remarks are solely intended to exhibit the relation which exists between a word and an idea, and that this relation is of a mental nature, and more akin to the spiritual system than any relation created, of which we know anything. It is a relation of the most sublime order; and no doubt the reason why the name, Word, is adopted by the Apostle in this sentence, was because of its superior ability to represent to us the divine relation existing between God and the Savior prior to His becoming the Son of God. By putting together the above remarks on the term Word, we have a full view of what John intended to communicate: (1) As a word is an exact image of an idea, so is 'The Word' an exact image of the invisible God. (2) As a word cannot exist without an idea, nor an idea without a word, so God was never without 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' without God. Or, as a word is of equal age, or co-etaneous with its idea, so 'The Word'

and God are co-eternal. (3) And as an idea did not create its word, nor a word its idea, so God did not create 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' God. Such a view does the language used by John suggest. And to this do all the Scriptures agree. For 'The Word' was made flesh, and in consequence of becoming *incarnate*, He is styled the Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father. As from eternity God was manifest in and by 'The Word,' so now God is manifest in the flesh. As God was always with 'The Word,' so when 'The Word' becomes flesh, He is Immanuel, God with us. As God was never manifest but by 'The Word,' so the heavens and the earth and all things were created by 'The Word.' And as 'The Word' ever was the effulgence or representation of the invisible God, so He will ever be known and adored as 'The Word of God.' So much for the divine and eternal relation between the Savior and God. You will easily perceive that I carry these views no farther than to explain the nature of that relationship uncreated and unoriginated, which the inspired language inculcates."

Mr. Campbell concludes as follows: "These views place us on a lofty eminence whence we look down upon the Calvinistic ideas of 'eternal filiation,' 'eternal generation,' 'eternal Son,' as midway between us and Arianism. From this sublime and lofty eminence we see the Socinian movement upon a hillock, the Arian upon a hill, and the Calvinist upon a mountain; all of which lose their disproportion to each other because of the immense height above them to which this view elevates us. The first sentence of John, I paraphrase thus: 'From eternity was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was, I say, from eternity with God. By Him all things were made, and He became flesh and dwelt among us. He is become a child born and a son of man. As such He is called Immanuel, Jesus, Messiah, Son of God, Only Begotten of the Father.'"

Again, in the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1846, pp. 634-636, Mr. Campbell wrote the following on the same subject, the Person of Christ, the Savior: "Our attention is first called to his person. Right conceptions of his person are, indeed, essential to right conceptions of His office. Our guide to both are the oracles of God. What, then, say the Holy Scriptures? They represent the person called Jesus the Messiah as having been born of a Virgin in the reign of Herod the Great, and in the thirtieth year of Caesar Augustus. But while they thus represent his nativity as having been at that particular time, they also intimate that his birth was only an *incarnation* of one who previously existed, whose 'goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.' . . . Jesus is the name of an *incarnation*, but it is not the name of that which became incarnate. It was not Jesus, but *the Word* that was made flesh. The person called THE WORD 'became flesh and dwelt among us.' . . . Evident, then, it is that Jesus of Nazareth had in some other nature a pre-existence. His human existence commenced at a fixed date, and in a certain place; but in some other nature, and in some other place, he pre-existed. What that nature was, and where that abode, must be learned from that Spirit which 'searches all things—even the deep things of God.'" Finally, "We have, then, GOD, the WORD of God, and the SPIRIT of God; and these three are not three Gods, but one God—denominated in the remedial system as the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, relations of a truly mysterious and sublime character. We can, indeed, apprehend, though we may not comprehend them. They are intelligible, though not comprehensible." (I consider Mr. Campbell's explanation of the doctrine of the Logos the clearest I have been able to find anywhere. Hence I have taken sufficient space here to reproduce it in its entirety.)

Logos has a twofold meaning in the Greek: (1) reason

or intelligence, as it exists inwardly in the mind, and (2) reason or intelligence as it is expressed outwardly in speech; hence, an account, a tale, a study, a revelation. Both of these meanings are implicit in the use of this word as the eternal name of our Savior. Jesus is inwardly the Word of God in the sense that He exists from everlasting to everlasting in the "bosom" of the Father (John 1:18), and, as nothing is as close to a person as his own thought, so there is no one as close to the Father as His Only Begotten Son. Jesus is the Logos outwardly in that He reveals to us "the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" both in life and in teaching (Rom. 12:1-2; John 14:9-12, 16:13-15). He was with God before the world was called into being, before even time began; He is with God now, seated at God's right hand, the Acting Sovereign of the universe and the Absolute Monarch of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 28:18; Acts 2:36; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 1:20-23; Col. 1:13-20; Phil. 2:5-11; Heb. 1:1-4; 1 Pet. 3:20-22; Rev. 1:17-18). He is God in the sense that He is one Person of the Divine Tri-unity, of which He is the executive Agency (John 1:1-3). *The manger of Bethlehem was not the place of Christ's beginning*: on the contrary, He is the Logos personally and timelessly, the Logos unbegun and unending; His goings forth have been from everlasting (Mic. 5:2; John 17:5,24; John 8:58; 1 Tim. 3:16). What really happened at Bethlehem was that the pre-existent Logos took upon Himself a new order of being: in the Apostle's language, the Logos "became flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:14). Jesus Christ, the Son of God, left eternal glory (John 3:16, 17:5; Gal. 4:4) and took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:14-18; Phil. 2:5-11), to purchase redemption for sinful man (John 1:29; 1 Cor. 6:19-20; Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Heb. 9:12; Rev. 5:9-10). That is to say, the non-material passed over into the material. This happens every day when man causes his own thoughts to transmute

themselves into corporeal activities of many different kinds. Conversely, man transmutes the material into the non-material (or at most, the quasi-material) in the application of the ultimate forms of energy and the relations existing among these, which are apprehensible only in terms of mathematical formulas. Those who discount or reject the Virgin Birth are called upon to "explain away" the doctrine of the Savior's pre-existence, one of the explicit and most prominent doctrines of the Bible.

To summarize: Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, is known to us *historically* as Jesus (Jesus of Nazareth); His *eternal* name, however, is Logos, Word; his *temporal* name (that which existed only in God's Eternal Purpose until it was given actuality in our world, at Bethlehem, in the reign of Caesar Augustus) is Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father (Psa. 2:7; Col. 1:13-18; Luke 1:30-35; John 1:14); His official title is Messiah, Christos, Christ, meaning "The Anointed One." These names are all meaningful, and must not be wrested out of their respective Scriptural contexts.

5. "*Let there be light: and there was light.*" (1) Note well the manner in which these decrees were expressed, the formula which occurs throughout the whole Cosmogony: "Let there be," etc., etc. (vv. 3,6,9,14,20,24). Does not this intimate that the Divine Will was operating through the media of what we speak of as secondary causes, that is, "the laws of nature"? Note the significant change in v. 26: it is no longer, "let there be," it is now "let us," that is, Elohim communicating within His own being, a Divine *Consilium* of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit.

(2) *What kind of light* is indicated here? Do we have here the idea of light without a sun? Simpson (IBG, 469): "Light was therefore created before even the sun—one of the features of the story which renders impossible all attempts to bring it into line with modern scientific knowl-

edge." This statement is dogmatic, to say the least. Of course, this is to be expected of exegetes who find the source-material of these Scriptures in various aspects of the Babylonian myths. True it is, that in the early pagan accounts of Creation, we find a sun-god, that is, a *personification* of the sun, presented as creator; and that we also find in these accounts the antithesis of darkness and light portrayed under the guise of a deadly conflict between this sun-god and some kind of a chaos-monster. But the idea of light as the first *created* being is not to be found in any of these pagan traditions (which, by way of contrast with the Hebrew account, are myths in the proper sense of that term). It is agreed, of course, that it was not the intention of the writer of Genesis to give us a scientific account of the Creation (indeed the entire book was written in pre-scientific times). It was his intention, rather, to give us the religious (spiritual) truth about the origin and development of the Creative Process. But who has any legitimate ground or right to assume that the Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of Truth (John 15:26), could not have put this account in language that would be found to be in accord with human science as the latter advanced in its understanding of the mysteries of the physical world? Indeed the broad general terms in which this narrative is communicated to man has made it adaptable even throughout the changes which have occurred from time to time in scientific theory.

(3) What kind of light was this first light, as decreed in v.3? In opposition to the dogmatism of the mythologizing interpreters, it should be noted that among physicists of our time it is a commonplace that the primal form of energy—the ultimate, the irreducible—to be called into being was some form of *radiant* energy. But there are many kinds of radiant energy, in addition to those few reflected by a surface and then refracted by the retina of the human eye to give man his sense of colors, those

embraced within the limits of the *visible* spectrum. There are many other forms of radiant energy operating both above and below these limits, such as radio waves, for example. Cosmic rays which bombard us constantly from outer space are perhaps the most mysterious of all these primal forms of energy. Or, again, was this first light some form of molecular light?—light resulting, let us say, from heat produced by the motion induced (by the Divine Energy) into the now gradually shaping cosmic mass, which by this time was probably molten? There is no certain answer to these questions, of course. We know, however, that luminosity is the result of incandescence. Any solid body can be rendered luminous (incandescent) by being heated to some 800 degrees Fahrenheit. Any liquid that can absorb as great a quantity of heat likewise emits light. To be incandescent is to be white, glowing, or luminous with intense heat. Strong (ST, 395): “The beginning of activity in matter would manifest itself by the production of light, since light is the resultant of molecular activity. This corresponds to the statement in verse 3. As the result of condensation, the nebula becomes luminous, and this process from darkness to light is described as follows: ‘there was evening and there was morning, one day.’ Here we have a day without a sun—a feature in the narrative quite consistent with two facts of science: first, that the nebula would naturally be self-luminous, and, secondly, that the earth proper, which reached its present form before the sun, would, when it was first thrown off, itself be a self-luminous and molten mass. The day was therefore continuous—day without night.” Someone has rightly remarked that men called Moses a fool for putting light previous to the sun, and Laplace a scientist for doing the same thing.

(4) In a famous essay, *On Light (De Luce)*, Robert Grosseteste, made the first Chancellor of Oxford in 1221, apparently anticipated some of the concepts of present-day

physics, in his treatment of *lux* (light in its source) and *lumen* (reflected or radiated light). His theory came to be known as the "light metaphysics," and was elaborated by two of his contemporaries, Roger Bacon and the Italian mystic, Bonaventura. According to this theory, along with the Creation *ex nihilo* of unformed matter, God brought into existence the first form, *lux spiritualis*. This *lux*, conceived as an extraordinarily rarefied form of corporeal light, something, in fact, that approximated *spirit*, originated space; and as the form of corporeity in primordial matter, was the primary source and cause of all created things. As McKeon writes (SMP, I, 261): "The characteristic of all light is to engender itself perpetually, and diffuse itself spherically about a point in an instantaneous manner. Originally, the luminous form and matter were equally unextended, but the first form created by God in the first matter, multiplies itself infinitely, and spreads equally in all directions, distending thus the matter to which it is united and constituting thus the mass of the universe." Moreover, according to this theory, just as light is the power by which the purest Spirit produces the corporeal world, so too it is the instrument by which the soul comes in contact with the body and the things of sense; hence, viewed in this aspect, the *lux* becomes *lumen*. Commenting on Grosseteste's theory, Miss Sharp has this to say (FPOTC, 23): "It appears that Grosseteste experienced the same difficulties as modern physicists. The functions he assigns to light . . . show that he regards it as an energy; but his desire to speak of it as resembling body is strikingly like the present-day application of such terms as 'wave lengths' and 'rays' to the ether, which in itself is admitted to be imperceptible to the senses and is thought of only as the subject of activity or as that which is conserved throughout change. As a principle of unity in the universe, this light is comparable to the modern ether, which fills all space from the most

distant star to the interspaces of the atom. Again, Grosse-teste's theory is not unlike the modern hypothesis of the convertibility of matter and energy. Lastly, we find something resembling the modern ethereal attributes of electricity, magnetism, and chemical activities, in his view of *lux* as the source of all movement and life and as the basis of sound." (Modern physics, to be sure, has abandoned the notion of ether; however, this does not affect the foregoing argument, as space itself seems to have taken over the role once assigned to the ether.) Two other pertinent facts should be pointed out in this connection: first, that Grosseteste's theory of *lux* and its creative function is strikingly parallel to the tendency of present-day physicists to regard *radiant energy* as the ultimate irreducible of matter; and second, that this "light metaphysics" is strikingly adaptable to the Biblical doctrine of the ultimate glorification of the bodies of the redeemed (Dan. 12:3; Rom. 8:11,30; 1 Cor. 15:35-49; Acts 9:1-9; 2 Cor. 5:1-5, etc.) and it was used by its advocates, by Bonaventura especially, to elaborate that doctrine.

(5) That the light decreed in the third verse of Genesis was *not* the light of our sun seems obvious. Solar light did not penetrate the vapors which enveloped the earth until the fourth "day." Moreover, it seems that our entire solar system was in process of being formed, but only *in process* of being formed at this stage of the Creation: as part of an organized cosmos, it did not yet exist *as a solar system*. Lange (CDHCG,165): "The light denotes all that is simply illuminating in its efficacy, all the luminous element; the darkness denotes all that is untransparent, dark and shadow-casting; both together denote the polarity of the created world as it exists between the light-formations and the night-formations, the constitution of the day and night." However, whatever may have been the nature of the light described in this meaningful passage, the religious truth remains the same,

namely, that the entrance of the Divine Word always brings light, whether that entrance be into the impenetrable darkness of the primordial Chaos or into the dark recesses of the human soul. Where the Spirit of God operates through the Word, the darkness flees before the light; so in the Creation, there was at first darkness, non-being, but when the Spirit began to energize there was light and being. On Day One, then, occurred the beginning of matter-in-motion in the primal forms of energy and light.

"And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day."

1. *The light was called "good."* In Scripture anything is called *good* that is doing what the Creator designed it to do in the total scheme of things. Hence we may rightly say that the Creation was the field in which God's perfections were manifested. Note also that only the light is called good, not the darkness, nor even the co-existence of light and darkness.

2. *"God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night."*

(1) Because God is all-powerful, all that He creates is good for some purpose or end. Did God Himself bring the darkness into existence? Whatever the darkness implies here, whether it be an absolute void or a motionless, objectless, amorphous "world-stuff," man does not have and cannot even claim to have the certain answer to this question. It may well be that the darkness existed by God's sufferance; hence, whatever may be implied by the term, this darkness when reduced to order by Divine decree, became a good: the whole Creation was later Divinely pronounced *good*, and after the creation of man, *very good* (vv. 25, 31). Thus has God always been bringing forth being out of non-being, perfection out of im-

perfection. (2) Titus Burckhardt writes ("Cosmology and Modern Science," in *Tomorrow*, Vol. 12, No. 3): "Modern science will never reach that matter which is at the basis of this world. But between the qualitatively differentiated world and the undifferentiated matter there lies something like an intermediate zone: this is chaos. The sinister dangers attendant on atomic fission are but a pointer indicating the frontier of chaos and of dissolution." (3) By thus separating the darkness and the light, as specific—yet relational—forms, God imposed order on the darkness and gave meanings to both darkness and light; meanings both physical and spiritual. (4) At the same time that He gave meaning to both darkness and light, as Lord of both, He gave them their appropriate names, Night and Day, respectively, and thus set in motion the ordered alternation of night and day generally.

3. "*And there was evening and there was morning, one day.*" (Literally, "Day One.") (1) Simpson (IBG, 471); rejects the aeonic-day theory. While this view, he says, "might have made the account of creation less irreconcilable with modern science, it would have involved a lessening of God's greatness, one sign of which was His power to do so much in one day." Is not this a begging of the question? How is God's greatness lessened by the view that this first day was one of indefinite length? Did it not take the same measure of power to actualize the Creation regardless of the length of time that God may have taken to do it? (2) We certainly do not take the position here that God could *not* have created the cosmos in six days of twenty-four hours each: God can do whatever He may will to do that is consistent with His Being and Character. M. Henry (CWB, 2): "The Creator could have made his work perfect at first, but by this gradual proceeding he would show what is, ordinarily, the method of his providence and grace." (Cf. 2 Pet. 3:8). Whitelaw (PCG, 12): "Of course the length of Day One practically

determines the length of all six. If it was a solar day, then they must be considered such. But as the present sidereal arrangements for the measurement of time were not then established, it is clearly gratuitous to proceed on the assumption that it was." M. Henry again (*ibid.*, 2): "This was not only the first day of the world, but the first day of the week. I observe it to the honour of that day, because the new world began on the first day of the week likewise, in the resurrection of Christ, as the light of the world, early in the morning. In him the dayspring from on high visited the world." (Luke 1:78, Matt. 28:1, Mark 16:1-2, Luke 24:1, John 20:1-10, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2, Rev. 1:10). (3) How long was the darkness that preceded the light of this Day One? This question could be answered only if we knew precisely what the darkness was. This, however, we do not know. That the darkness was of indefinite duration seems obvious from the reading of the text. It has been asserted that this sequence of darkness and light, night and day, evening and morning, was determined by the Hebrew custom of reckoning time from sunset to sunset. Is it not more reasonable to think that, on the contrary, the Hebrew custom was derived from the Hebrew Cosmogony as handed down from the remote past in the Torah?

Day Two: The Atmosphere
(1:6-8)

"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day."

1. These verses precipitate us into the very core of the problems incidental to the origin of the celestial (astronomical) universe. They mark the end of cosmo-

logical reference and point to the beginnings, respectively, of the geological and the biological. As heretofore stated, the content of this section of the text has reference primarily, it seems, to our solar system, as explained from the viewpoint of a terrestrial inhabitant. However, it can be just as readily applied to the various units (galaxies, stellar systems, supernovae, etc) of the entire cosmos. We shall now examine these verses rather carefully because of the importance of the subject-matter involved.

2. *Progressive Revelation.* Many eminent authorities have held that the Genesis Cosmogony as a whole is a record of the Creation couched in the language of the commonality and presented from the viewpoint of ordinary human experience and common sense: in a word, in conformity with what is designated the "law of accommodation." We find this law exemplified in the instances of poetic imagery and anthropomorphism occurring throughout the Old Testament, and especially the book of Genesis. Because of the limitations of human vocabulary, its inadequacy as a vehicle for the communication of Divine thought, the most God could do for man was to supply him with an anthropomorphic image of Himself (John 1:18), that is, until He could supply the real, and far more adequate image, in the person of His Only Begotten Son (John 14:6-11). Hence, it follows that revelations given to the infancy of the race were necessarily more anthropomorphic, and stated in simpler terms, than those made in subsequent ages as men advanced in their ability to understand the significance of what was being revealed. God's revelation to men of Himself and His Eternal Purpose was a progressive revelation, and the record of that revelation and its meaning for us was set down, from age to age, by men who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21), precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little, etc. (Isa. 28:10,13; cf. Mark 4:28). Failure to recognize this aspect of the Divine method

leads to absurd distortions of Scripture teaching in the form of half-truths which are often more deceptive than complete error.

3. *The Law of Accommodation.* This is clearly stated by Marcus Dods (EBG, 4-5) as follows: "Accepting this chapter [the first chapter of Genesis] then as it stands, and believing that only by looking at the Bible as it actually is can we hope to understand God's method of revealing Himself, we at once perceive that ignorance of some departments of truth does not disqualify a man for knowing and imparting truth about God. In order to be a medium of revelation a man does not need to be in advance of his age in secular learning. Intimate communion with God, a spirit trained to discern spiritual things, a perfect understanding of and zeal for God's purpose, these are qualities quite independent of a knowledge of the discoveries of science . . . Had the writer of this book (Genesis) mingled with his teaching regarding God an explicit and exact account of how this world came into existence—had he spoken in millions of years instead of speaking of days—in all probability he would have been discredited, and what he had to say about God would have been rejected along with his premature science. But speaking from the point of view of his contemporaries, and accepting the current ideas regarding the formation of the world, he attached to these the views regarding God's connection with the world which are most necessary to be believed. . . . Here then instead of anything to discompose us or to excite unbelief, we recognize one great law or principle on which God proceeds in making Himself known to man. This has been called the Law of Accommodation. It is the law which requires that the condition and capacity of those to whom the revelation is made must be considered. If you wish to instruct a child, you must speak in language that a child can understand." Strong (ST, 393-394) writes that what he calls

the pictorial-summary view of the Genesis Cosmogony "holds that the account is a rough sketch of the history of creation, true in all its essential features, but presented in a graphic form suited to the common mind and to earlier as well as later ages. While conveying to primitive man as accurate an idea of God's work as man was able to comprehend, the revelation was yet given in pregnant language, so that it could expand to all the ascertained results of subsequent physical research. This general correspondence of the narrative with the teachings of science, and its power to adapt itself to every advance in human knowledge, differences it from every other cosmogony current among men." There is a world of truth in these statements. What was necessary in the primitive world to save men from groveling in polytheism and idolatry was the knowledge that there is a living and true God; that He is one, not many; that He is just, holy, and good; that He made the world and all that therein is (Acts 17:24-28); that the crowning achievement of His handiwork was the creation of man in His own image, to be lord tenant of earth. All these truths are expressly set forth in Genesis. The scientific account of the Creation has been written by the finger of God upon the crust of the earth and in the natures of living species; the religious account was incorporated by inspiration of the Spirit of God in the graphic panoramic affirmations of the Genesis Cosmogony.

4. *The "Mythologizing" of the Radical Critics.* The radical critics have developed fantastic pseudo-Biblical cosmologies by reference to alleged Babylonian mythological source-material. In so doing they have created a cosmological "mythology" of their own. Perhaps the radical critics' point of view is best expressed by Harry Emerson Fosdick (MUB, 46-47) as follows: "In the Scriptures the flat earth is founded on an underlying sea; it is stationary; the heavens are like an upturned bowl or

canopy above it; the circumference of this vault rests on pillars; the sun, moon, and stars move within this firmament of special purpose to illumine man; there is a sea above the sky, 'the waters which were above the heavens,' and through the 'windows of heaven' the rain comes down; within the earth is Sheol, where dwell the shadowy dead; this whole cosmic system is suspended over vacancy; and it was all made in six days with a morning and an evening, a short and measurable time before. This is the world view of the Bible." An examination of the Scriptures cited as the basis on which this cosmic view was formulated shows that they are not necessarily subject to the interpretation put upon them by these critics; that in fact protagonists of this view fail to distinguish between poetic imagery and propositional truth. (The Scriptures cited are the following: Psa. 136:6, 24:1-2; Gen. 7:11; Job 37:18; Gen. 1:6-8; Isa. 40:22; Job 26:11; Psa. 104:3; Gen. 1:7; Psa. 148:4; Isa. 14:9-11; Psa. 93:1, 104:5; Psa. 104:2; Gen. 1:14-18; Psa. 78:23; Gen. 7:11; Job 26:7.)

Many authorities, including distinguished Semitic scholars have taken these "mythologizers" to task for "imposing on the Bible a stilted, artificial cosmology that is nowhere clearly and systematically taught in Scripture." A striking example of the far-fetched inferences of these critics is found in the alleged association of the Hebrew word *tehom*, "the deep," with the Babylonian *Tiamat*, "the she-dragon of chaos." However, this connection, if it actually existed, simply proves the Hebrew account to have been the original, because the natural object, *tehom*, surely preceded the mythological personification of it. (Cf. Psa. 136:6, 24:2.) For a thoroughgoing and conclusive treatment of this important phase of our subject, for which we have not available space here, the student is advised to read Bernard Ramm (CVSS, 96-102), who concludes as follows: "The best we can do is to (i) indicate the freedom of the Bible from mythological polytheistic or

grotesque cosmologies, (ii) note the general hostility of the Bible to cosmologies which are antitheistic, and (iii) clearly present the *theocentric* view of the Bible towards Nature." (I call attention here to the thesis of the excellent book by Yehezkel Kaufmann, recently published, *The Religion of Israel*. This distinguished Jewish scholar writes, obviously, with but one end in view, namely, to establish the fact that Hebrew monotheism was definitely *not* an evolution from surrounding pagan mythologies and traditions, but was in fact a complete *revolution* against such systems.) The Fosdick interpretation, as quoted above, is a reading into the first few chapters of Genesis a mass of conjecture that simply cannot be validated without unjustifiable distortion of fact.

Similarities between the Babylonian Cosmogony and the Hebrew Narrative of the Creation: (1) Both know of a time when the earth as such did not exist. (2) In Genesis, light dispels darkness, and order follows chaos. In the Babylonian record, Marduk, a sun-god (like the Sanscrit *Dyaus pitar*, the Greek *Zeus patér*, the Latin *Iu piter*, meaning "father of light") overthrows the she-dragon of darkness, Tiamat. (3) In Genesis, the dry land appears after a time, in obedience to Divine decree. In the Babylonian tablets, Marduk creates the earth out of one part of the corpse of the slain Tiamat. (4) In Genesis, the sun, moon, and stars are set in the heavens, again by the decree of Elohim. In the Babylonian record, Marduk creates them to serve as mansions for the gods. (5) In Genesis, God brings into existence the lower species, again by the operation of His ordinances. In the Babylonian record, the assembly of the gods creates them. (6) In Genesis, God creates mankind. In the Babylonian record, Marduk fashions the first man out of the blood of the slain Kingu who had been Tiamat's consort. Finegan (LAP, 53): "The sequence of events in the creation also is the same in the two stories, in that the following happenings take

place in the same order: the creation of the firmament, the creation of dry land, the creation of the luminaries, and the creation of man. Both accounts begin with the watery chaos and end with the gods or the Lord at rest." (Incidentally, in the Genesis account, there is no reason for assuming that the creation of the celestial luminaries took place on the fourth "day," as we shall see later.)

The Contrasts between the Babylonian Cosmogony and the Hebrew Account of Creation. These unlikenesses are tremendous. (1) Genesis reveals God as the Creator of all things. The Babylonian record brings in a number of deities. (2) Genesis pictures an original darkness, abyss, deep, etc. The Babylonian account personifies them, and the earth, the sky, the sea, and the heavenly bodies as well. (3) Genesis reveals a God without a female counterpart; in fact the Hebrews had no word in their language to express the idea of a goddess. The Babylonian records give to almost every great deity a female counterpart: indeed this was a feature of all pagan polytheisms. (4) Genesis is purely spiritual in character. The Babylonian account is shot through with base passions, jealousies, hates, plots, wars, and like evils. (5) Genesis is purely monotheistic, whereas the Babylonian record is grossly polytheistic. The gods of all the ancient polytheisms were anthropomorphic *personifications* of natural forces (in particular, of the sun-father and the earth-mother). The God of Hebrew and Christian monotheism is pure personality.

Did the writer of Genesis borrow his account from Babylonian sources? Although this view prevails today in certain academic circles, it is, to a great extent, absurd and unwarranted. A comparison of the religious teaching of the two accounts should be sufficient to settle this question in the mind of anyone not blinded by preconceived opinion. Clay (LOTB, 73); "Upon the differences of the two stories we need not dwell. The crude polytheistic

grotesqueness of the Babylonian, with its doctrine of emanation or evolution from chaos to order, which makes the gods emerge from this chaos, or brings the firmaments out of a carcass, put it altogether in another class; and it is in no respect to be compared with the dignified and sublime conception of the beginning of things, with God as the supreme Creator, who called all things into existence." The theory frequently advanced that the prophets of Israel took these Babylonian traditions and "purified them by the subtraction of their grosser elements," for the purpose of making them "the vehicle for teaching the impressive truths of God's personality, unity, and relationship to Israel" (H. L. Willett), is, in McGarvey's language (BC, 389) "about as sensible as to say that the parable of the prodigal son was derived from *Peck's Bad Boy*, or from Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer*."

Did the Babylonian account (known as *Enuma Elish*, from its two opening words, meaning "when on high") have its origin from Genesis? This is improbable, but not at all impossible. Or, are the few likenesses between them due to a common Semitic inheritance, each handing on from age to age records concerning the early history of the race? Granting that this hypothesis be acceptable, how are we to account for the fact that the Genesis narrative remained pure, the least uncolored by the extravagances of all these ancient traditions? The history of the Hebrew people began with Abraham. How did Abraham or his immediate successors come into possession of such an idealistic religious account of the Creation? How can we account for the pure conceptions embodied in the Genesis account on any other basis than that of supernatural origin and oversight. Granting that the account was a revelation from an early age, what prevented it from becoming steeped in mythological accretions as did the creation stories of all other ancient peoples?

I am not willing to admit that the Mosaic narrative is

an embodiment of traditions, when it has all the earmarks of a special divine revelation. This is true regardless of the time in which it may have originated. Why omit all consideration of the Spirit of God in dealing with this problem? Does not special revelation include special inspiration, and vice versa? Why could not the Holy Spirit have revealed these truths to some ancient patriarch who gave them down through his descendants to Moses? Why could not the Holy Spirit have embodied them in a revelation directly to Moses himself? Or—if the critics would insist that it be so—to an inspired writer in the ages following Moses? Our claim here is *that Divine inspiration is the only basis on which anyone can account for the pure conceptions of the Genesis Cosmogony. These simply cannot be explained away as figments of the human imagination.* Orr (ISBE, V, 3107): “No stronger proof could be afforded of the truth and sublimity of the Biblical account of the origin of things than is given by the comparison of the narrative of creation in Gen. 1–2:4, with the mythological cosmogonies and theogonies found in other religions.” Ramm (CVSS, 102): “It is typical of radical critics to play up the similarity of anything Biblical with the Babylonian, and to omit the profound differences or gloss over them. When the Biblical account is set side by side with any other cosmology its purity, its chasteness, its uniqueness, its theocentricity are immediately apparent.” Again (*ibid.*, 102, n.43): “Conservative Christianity explains Babylonian and Biblical parallels by the theory of *cognateness* (not of dependence, nor of purification.”

5. *The Firmament. The Waters under the Firmament, and the Waters above the Firmament.* (1) The word *rakia*, translated “firmament,” means literally, “stretched out,” hence “expanse,” and by necessary inference, alludes to the atmosphere. Obviously, this is the space above the earth, in general what we call the sky, the habitat of the winds and clouds, and the space in which the celestial

bodies of our solar system move in their courses. Hence, v.5 "God called the firmament Heaven." Not the heavens of the entire cosmos, referred to in v.1, but the *celestial* heaven which is in close proximity to the earth, "the heaven of the earth-world" (Delitzsch). (2) Does this passage refer to a separation of the "heavenly waters," described as held back by a "solid arched firmament" to which the heavenly bodies were attached, from the "watery abyss" below, on which the flat earth was supposed to rest—the customary explanation built on the theory of a borrowing from Babylonian cosmology? Not necessarily. It has been stated above that the customarily accepted theory of an adaptation of Babylonian source material to the Hebrew account, is built on the failure of the critics to recognize the poetic imagery of the Hebrew Scriptures and to differentiate this imagery from astronomical fact.

(3) We accept the interpretation here that is presented by Arnold Guyot, in his excellent little book, *Creation*; though published as far back as 1884, like many other works of earlier vintage, it gives us a far more sensible understanding of the Genesis Cosmogony than those appearing on the market since the turn of the century, a period in which textual criticism in all areas has been characterized by sheer conjectural extravagances. The word translated "waters," Guyot tells us, being the best afforded by the Hebrew language to express the idea of fluidity (nebulousness), is used here to designate the primordial cosmic material, the amorphous world-stuff, the molten mass (now heated to intense degrees by the energizing of Divine Power) of the undifferentiated sun, planets, satellites, etc., of our solar system. (Psalm 148 seems to have this same meaning, where we read of the "waters that are above the heavens" (v.4)—waters which are distinguished from the "deeps" below (v.7) and the "vapor" above (v.8). Hence, the separation of the earth

from the parent mass, and the development of it into an independent sphere, answers, according to Guyot, to the dividing of "the waters which were under the firmament" from "the waters which were above the firmament." That is to say, "the waters which were under the firmament" (the detached earth in its most primitive state as such) became divided from "the waters which were above the firmament" (the parent molten mass, which apparently became a sun) by the intervening *expanse*. Moreover, after having become detached from the parent mass, naturally the earth began to cool at its surface, as it whirled through space; and as this process of cooling continued, the gases were thrown off which formed the *atmosphere*. And no doubt the entire earth-mass became enshrouded in dense vapors at this stage, these vapors thus obscuring for a time the light of the parent sun from which the planet had been detached. Guyot writes (Cr, 66-67): "One fact admitted by all is the work of separation, of individualization, which must have preceded the present combination of the heavenly bodies, and this is indicated as the special work of the second cosmogonic day . . . thus we follow the gradual concentration from a gaseous state to a compact and well-defined body . . . We see how a family of planets has been detached from a vast central body which holds them in bondage in their orbits by the power of its mass." That is to say, the entire process by which the earth was detached and developed as a separate planet could well have been duplicated in the detachment and separate development of all the celestial bodies from their respective central suns. This all occurred on Day Two. Thus under the impulsion of the "brooding" of the Spirit of God, the cosmos began to march into being. And so "there was evening and there was morning, a second day."

(4) Note the remarkable correspondence between the foregoing interpretation of Gen. 1:6-8 and current scien-

tific hypotheses of the origin of our solar system. In general, these are two, namely, the *monoparental* and the *biparental* hypotheses. According to the former, as envisioned especially in the nebular hypothesis of Laplace (1749-1827), the huge primordial mass of nebulous matter, revolving in space with sufficient velocity and gradually condensing from an intensely high degree of heat, may have eventually, by throwing off successive rings of nebulae, set the stage for the development of all the celestial bodies, moving in their respective orbits, which make up our planetary system. The biparental hypothesis, on the other hand, first suggested by the French naturalist Buffon (1707-1788), pictures the formation of our planetary system as the result of a violent collision between the sun (which in more recent terms is thought of as having become a nova or supernova in the far distant past) and some other celestial body, which he called a "comet," by which he apparently meant, however, another star of comparable size. Although some of the fragments caused by this collision must have been lost forever in interstellar space, others, Buffon thought, held in check by the gravitational pull of the central mass (sun), were forced to continue revolving around it in the form of separate planets. This biparental hypothesis has been modified in recent years by the Chamberlin-Moulton theory in which the notion of direct physical collision has been abandoned for the tidal wave theory, namely, that the planets were first formed when a giant tidal wave of nebulous matter was raised on the surface of the sun by the gravitational attraction of an intruding star which passed by the sun at a distance of several solar diameters. This tidal wave theory has been further elaborated by Sir James Jeans. The theory has also been implemented by the planetesimal hypothesis, that these separate planetary masses subsequently grew by accretion of smaller compact masses of nebulae (each surrounding a nucleus) called planetesimals. This tidal

action hypothesis has been chosen, instead of that of direct collision, we are told, on the ground that the close passing of two great stars is much more probable than a direct collision. However, it is interesting to note that the British geophysicist, Jeffreys, has suggested recently that the hypothetical stellar encounter must have been much closer than was assumed in the tidal theory, that in fact the passing star must literally have "brushed" the surface of the sun, in order to tear away masses of solar matter. If this view should be the right one, we are back to the original form of Buffon's hypothesis. Note the following pertinent comments from Gamow (BE, 29): "We must conclude that the solid crust of the Earth must have been formed from previously molten material about two million years ago. Thus we can picture the Earth two billion years ago as a completely molten spheroid, surrounded by a thick atmosphere of air, water-vapors, and probably other volatile substances." The Genesis Cosmogony thus speaks for itself in the many features in which it is in harmony with current scientific thinking about the origin of our planetary system.

Day Three: Lands and Seas, Plant Life

(1:9-13)

And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, herbs yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, after their kind: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a third day."

1. Need it be pointed out here that there had to be

light, and there had to be an atmosphere, before there could be any vegetation upon the earth. Moreover, the earth itself had to be put in order to receive and to nourish this vegetation from the time of its first appearance. Hence we have here, in all likelihood, a description of the steps necessary to this end: the partial condensation of the vapors enveloping the earth's surface, at this stage in the Creative Process, together with the cooling of the earth's crust, resulted, of course, in the outlining of continents and oceans. Hence, at this point something entirely new—a new increment of power—entered into the progressive development of the Creation. This something new was the appearance of the first forms of life, those of the plant world. This marked the crossing of the “great divide” between the world of physiochemical energy and the world of living things.

2. Just as there had to be light, and there had to be an atmosphere, so there had to be plant life before there could be any form of animal life. Plant cells differ from animal cells in the fact that they alone contain the pigment chlorophyll, which is responsible for the green color of plants and which is best known for its mysterious action in photosynthesis, the amazingly subtle and complex process by which plants convert the energy of the sun's rays into stored food energy that is necessary to the existence of all living things. Scientists have not yet been able to break this process down, to learn exactly how it works. It is a scientific fact, however, that with the creation of plant chlorophyll, photosynthesis commenced and the plant kingdom began to flourish, “sucking in sunlight and dumping out oxygen.” E. V. Miller (WLP, 117): “With few exceptions all life on this planet owes its existence to the fact that green plants are able to store up the energy of the sun.” Light is known to be the sole source of energy for this process of photosynthesis. Other necessary factors are water, carbon dioxide, oxygen, and

temperature of varying degrees. (In oceanic life, the microscopic organisms known as plankton carry on photosynthesis, like their relatives on the land, and so supply fish and other marine animals with food.) Thus the Genesis Cosmogony is again found to be in accord with present-day biological science.

3. On Day Three the Creative Process moved upward from the astronomical beginnings to the geological and biological phases. As we have already noted, on Day Two, the earth, when it became detached from the parent sun, began to cool. It would seem that as it cooled, the solid portions gathered at the center, with the liquids resting upon them, and the gases forming the outer envelope. As this cooling of the earth's crust continued, the elements were thrown off which comprise our atmosphere, and the entire mass became surrounded by dense vapors. This expanse (atmosphere) separated the earth below, not only from the parent sun, but probably from the other planets as well, all of which were in process of being formed in the same way. Science could hardly improve on the brevity and comprehensiveness of this description. Then on Day Three, the partial condensation of the enveloping vapors, and the continued cooling of the earth's crust, brought about the genesis of lands and seas, and so paved the way for the appearance of vegetation. Everest (DD, 150): "The earth shrank upon itself as it cooled, continents and mountains were lifted up, ocean beds were depressed, and the waters flowed together. Evaporation began, the wind-wafted clouds passed over the lands, the rains fell, the rivers dashed down the slopes, and another great wheel began to revolve and flash in the presence of the Master Mechanist."

4. "Let the earth bring forth," etc. (1) Various commentators hold that the classification of flora here is *threefold*—grass, herbs, and trees. Skinner (ICCG, 24), thinks it is *twofold*, based on two different methods of

reproduction, the one kind (grass, verdure, herbage, terms designating "all plants in the earliest stages of their growth") producing seed merely, the other producing fruit that contains the seed. (2) "And it was so." This oft-repeated formula is simply an affirmation that whatever the Creator "spake,"—that is, willed, ordained, ordered—was done, that whatever He "commanded," "stood fast" (Psa. 33:9). (3) Note the threefold description of the "trees" here: their *specific nature*, "fruit-bearing"; their *peculiar characteristic*, seed enclosed in fruit; and their *external appearance*, rising above the ground. (4) "After their kind." Surely this means, not that God made every kind of plant, tree, or seed, outwardly and directly; it means, rather, that He instituted the causation, in the form of seminal power, from which each individual of a kind or class (genus, species, etc.) proceeds to grow and to reproduce its kind. Since it is the *form* which is embodied in the seed, it is the form (the principle of specification, e.g., the "oakness" of an oak tree, or that which makes it an oak tree and not some other kind of tree) which determines the structure, and not the structure which determines the form. Hence an oak tree is an oak tree and cannot be a birch tree, any more than a poppy seed can be planted and a mustard tree be produced from its germinal seed. This principle of "each after its own kind" is one which prevails today as always, and no doubt will continue to do so, among all living things. If this were not true, taxonomy—the classification of animals and plants on the basis of their natural relationships—would be impossible, as indeed would be all the biological sciences. Note that the Genesis account makes it clear that the causative power is in the seed, a causative power which requires light, soil, atmosphere, moisture, etc., to actualize it. Note also the clear implication of secondary causation (as described in the form of "laws of nature") in the repeated formula, "Let the earth put forth grass," etc., "Let the

THE FIRST FOUR DAYS 1:14-19

waters swarm with swarms of living creatures," "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind," etc. In a word, God provides the seminal power, but His power operates at the direction of His eternal decrees (Psa. 148:5-6). (5) "And God saw that it was good." This formula (one might say, refrain), appearing at the end of each section of the Creation narrative, affirms that whatever God commanded, was done; and that the Divine purpose for which it was done was being realized. It was all *good* in the sense that each thing produced was doing what the Divine Will ordained it should do in the total structure of being.

Day Four: Chronology (1:14-19)

"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day."

1. Evidently we have here the account of the genesis of chronology, the measurement of time. On this day the sun, moon and stars were bidden to give light for the earth, and were appointed as timepieces, for signs, seasons, days and years.

2. This does not necessarily mean that the heavenly bodies were brought into existence at this time. It is our conviction that the various systems of suns and planets and satellites had all been passing through the same formative processes as that which had brought into existence our

own planetary system. Milligan (SR, 29): "There is nothing in the text that implies that they were just then *created*. They had doubtless existed in some state, as had the earth, from the beginning. But on the fourth day the clouds were most likely dispersed, and the atmosphere became perfectly transparent, and these luminaries then became visible from the earth; and hence this was the most suitable time that could have been selected *for making them our chronometers*."

3. This section obviously refers to the appearance of sun, moon and stars *in the firmament*, in such a way as to be plainly discernible to the naked eye of an observer upon the earth. During this entire period, the atmosphere was gradually being purified. Plants continued to grow in this humid environment, although the source of the rapidly increasing light was probably not apparent for some time; however, plant growth itself, by absorption, assisted in the complete dissipation of the enveloping vapors, so that the heavenly bodies finally appeared in full view in the firmament.

4. Note that the Divine decree was not, Let the luminaries be brought into existence; it was, rather, Let the sun, moon and stars *give light upon the earth*. This was necessary in order for them to be appointed as our time-pieces. Note our word "appointed"—not created. This means that these celestial luminaries which had been in process of creation from the beginning were now divinely appointed as the instruments for man's use in measuring signs (the zodiac?) and seasons, and days and years; just as the rainbow which had existed from the beginning in the relationship between the sun's rays and the rainfall, was in Noah's day divinely appointed to be the sign of His covenant that He would never again destroy man with the waters of a flood (Gen. 9:8-17); and just as the unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine, which had existed from the beginning, were appointed by our Lord to be

the appropriate emblems of His offering of His body and His blood on the Cross of Calvary for the redemption of mankind (1 Cor. 11:23-33).

In order to adapt to his present environment, man has need of the sequence of day and night, of seedtime and harvest, of the times and the seasons. For practical ends, he must have norms for the measurement of space and time. However, mathematical time must be distinguished from real time. Whereas the former is measured, the latter is experienced: it is the very intensity of life, as *e.g.*, the soldier who will say, on coming out of battle, "I feel as though I have lived a lifetime in the last few hours." This experience of the intensity of living affords one at least a faint glimmer of the meaning of eternity as *timelessness*.

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

The Primordial Darkness a Metaphor of the Unconverted Soul

The thick darkness of the first "day" of the Creation is a fit metaphor of the darkness of the unconverted soul. In the beginning the world was (1) *without order*. It was in a state of formlessness and emptiness. So the unconverted soul lives in a state of spiritual formlessness and emptiness, a condition which requires a special Divine arranging in order to bring harmony and beauty out of this formlessness (1 Cor. 2:14). (2) *Without light*. In the beginning there was thick darkness everywhere. So the unconverted soul walks in darkness (Eph. 4:17-19) devoid of that true spiritual light which came down from heaven to illumine the emptiness of men's hearts (John 1:4-9, 2 Cor. 4:4-6). One may be alive to culture, to education, to science, to social problems, to political issues, but unless one is born again, born of water and the Spirit, *he is spiritually dead* (John 3:1-6). (3) *Without life*. There were no indications of life in the great deep until the Holy Spirit began to brood "upon the face of the waters." So, until the human soul yields itself to the

quickenings impulse of the Holy Spirit, it is dead in its own trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1, Rom. 3:23). Persistence in such a course leads ultimately to eternal separation from God and from the glory of his might (2 Thess. 1:7-10, Rev. 20:14). (4) *Yet not beyond the limits of Divine grace.* As the Holy Spirit brooded over primeval darkness, so He broods today over unconverted souls, longing for the proclamation of the Word to introduce light, life, order, and beauty; by wholeheartedly responding to the Divine Word; all who thus hear and obey the Gospel are made "partakers of the divine nature" (Rom. 10:8-10, 10:17; 2 Pet. 1:4).

Darkness was upon the face of the deep until God said, "Let there be light." A beautiful symbol of the appearance of the true Light who lighteth the world. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not" (John 1:4-5, 14:5). When Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, the world of men was enshrouded in spiritual darkness (Rom. 1:18-32). Judaism had become hopelessly encrusted with sheer formalism and traditionalism. So-called "natural" religion had failed. Current philosophies did not assuage the pessimism in men's souls. Stoicism, Hedonism, Libertinism, Epicureanism, Cynicism, and the other isms; had served their day and been found wanting. The whole world was under condemnation, lost, in danger of perishing (John 3:16-17). "Then cometh Jesus"—the world's hope, the Light and Life of mankind, and the *only* Light and Life of mankind.

Light as a Metaphor of the Gospel

1. Light and the Gospel are analogous, as regards (1) their *source*, God; (2) their *nature*, which is, in each case, to shine, to illumine, to dispel darkness; (3) their *effect*. Light simply shines: it does not have to be advertised. What would you think of a man who would put a sign on a lighthouse, reading "This is a lighthouse"? What

would humanity do without light? What would the world be without the Gospel?

2. God's gift of light resembles His gift of the Gospel, in that (1) both are *pure*, (2) both are *free*, (3) both are *universal*, (4) both are *gentle*, (5) both are *pervasive*, (6) both are *indispensable*, (7) both are *transcendent*, (8) both are *satisfying*.

3. It is the will of God: (1) that all men shall have the light of salvation. God despises both physical and moral darkness. To dissipate moral darkness, He sent His Son, His Spirit, His Church, His ministers, etc. (2) That His Church shall be the light of the world (Matt. 5:14-16, 2 Cor. 3:2-3). God does not expect the world to be spiritually enlightened by literary, philosophical, cultural, or social service societies; nor by clubs, lodges, or secular schools; nor by the "social gospel," eugenics, fraternalism, or any other human instrumentality in itself. God expects the world to be spiritually enlightened by His Church, and *only* by His Church, which is the "habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22). As Christ was the Incarnation of the Father, so the Church is the Incarnation of the Son (Eph. 1:23). There is no substitute for the Church of the living God. (3) That the whole world—all peoples—shall be illumined by the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ. The twofold mission of the Church is that of preserving the Truth of God and proclaiming it unto all the nations (Isa. 11:9, 60:19; Heb. 2:14; 1 Tim. 3:15; Matt. 28:18-20, 24:14).

Have you the light of Divine grace in your heart? Can you truly sing,

"Once I was blind, but now I see—

The light of the world is Jesus?"

Is your soul so flooded with Gospel light that you can peacefully "wait for the morning" (Psa. 130:6)? Are you letting your light shine before men? Are you truly a living epistle of Christ?

“In the beginning, God”

“God created”—“God said”—“God saw”—“God called”—“God made”—“God set”—“God blessed”—always there is God. God—the explanation of all things; without Him, there is no ultimate explanation of anything.

Joseph Parker (PBG): ‘I claim no finality; I scorn no other man’s thinking; I had a universe given me to account for. One man told me that it was to be accounted for by chance, and I *felt*—that he was a fool. I had human life given me to account for, in all zones and climes, in all ages and seas and lands. I studied it. One man told me it was to be accounted for by the law of averages, and I felt that he was a fool. I had the Bible to account for. I read it straight through, and I was told by one man that it happened to come together just as it is, that there is no purpose in it, no organic spiritual genius and unity, and that it was a gathering up of fragments that have no mutual relation; and as I read the thing, as it got into me and made my blood tingle, I felt that he, too, was a fool. Then I came to this revelation, “In the beginning, God”—God, not a name only, but a character, a spirit, a life, a reality: God is light, God is love, God is Savior, God blessed forevermore, King of kings and Lord of lords, and I *felt* that the answer was grand enough to be true!’

The Word-Power of God

Man’s besetting sin has ever been that of rejecting the Word of God. But search the Bible from cover to cover, and you will find that nothing so displeases God as lack of confidence in, and disrespect for, His Word. For example, Saul and the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15).

There are those who speak of “the mere Word” as if it were of no importance. But words are always important, because they communicate ideas. Words are the media of intelligent intercourse among persons. So the Word of God is the revelation of the Mind and Will of God. God’s Spirit-Power, Will-Power, Word-Power, are equally all-

powerful. (Cf. Luke 1:37; Matt. 24:35, 12:36-37, 7:24-27; Mark 8:38.) This Power is the sovereign Power in the cosmos, as evidenced by the following facts: 1. *The worlds (ages) were framed by the word of God* (Heb. 11:3). The formula, "And God said," occurs ten consecutive times in the first chapter of Genesis, and in each case that which God ordained came to pass. John 1:1-3, 1:14; Psalms 33:6,9; Psalm 148:1-6; Col. 1:15-17. The Logos was the executive Agent of the Godhead in the Creation of the universe. 2. *The cosmos is sustained in its processes by the same Word-Power.* This is the Power that maintains the order which human science discovers and describes both in the physical and in the moral realm. Heb. 1:1-3, 2 Pet. 3:7. 3. *Biblical miracles were performed by the use of the same Word-Power.* The rod of Moses was an emblem of this Power. But Moses failed to sanctify God's Word in the sight of the Israelites by smiting the rock instead of speaking to it, as God had commanded (Num. 20:7-13). Note Joshua's command addressed to the sun and the moon (Josh. 10:12). 4. *This Word, Logos, became incarnate in the person of Jesus of Jesus of Nazareth.* John 17:5,24; John 8:58, 1:1-3, 1:14; Col. 1:15-17. Jesus was the Logos inwardly in that He is from all eternity in the bosom of the Father (John 1:18). He is the Logos outwardly in that He is the complete revelation of God to man (John 14:9-12, 16:13-15). The Babe in the Bethlehem manger was God's Power clothed in flesh and blood. 5. *Jesus wrought mighty works (miracles) by the same Word-Power.* Acts 2:22; Matt. 14:19, 8:26-27, 8:3; John 4:50; Matt. 8:32, Mark 1:25; Luke 7:14, John 11:43. Matt. 8:8—"only say the word, and my servant shall be healed." Jesus gave no treatments, absent or present; He had only to speak the Word and the miracle was wrought. 6. *When Jesus returned to the Father, this Word-Power was dispatched to the Apostles at Pentecost through the agency of the Holy Spirit.* Luke 24:49; John 14:16-17, 14:26; John

15:26-27, 16:7-15, 20:22-23; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4. Note the effect of the preached Word on the multitude (Acts 2:37). 7. *The Word-Power of God, since the first proclamation on the Day of Pentecost, is embodied in the Gospel.* Psal. 19:7—it converts the soul. Isa. 2:3, Mic. 4:2—this Word to go forth from Jerusalem. Acts 2:4—this it did on the first Pentecost after the Resurrection. Luke 24:47—the Gospel to be proclaimed first at Jerusalem. Rom. 1:16—the Gospel, not just *a* power, nor *one of the* powers, but *the* Power of God unto salvation to all who accept and obey it. 8. *By the same Word Power, the Apostles performed miracles.* Acts 3:6, 9:34, 9:40, 13:8-12. 9. *The Word, written or spoken, makes believers.* Acts 2:14-37, 8:5-12, 8:30-35, 9:6, 22:10, 11:14, 10:34-43, 16:14-15, 16:32, 18:8; Heb. 4:12; 1 Thess. 2:13; Rom. 10:8-11, 10:17. *Conclusion:* Division in Christendom arises from two causes, namely, refusal to accept and obey the laws of God, and the making of laws by men where God has not made any. The Word is irresistible by material things: when it is spoken, nature obeys. Man alone has the power to resist the Word (Rom. 13:1-2) and the power to neglect it (Heb. 2:1-4). Note the ultimate destiny of all who ignore, neglect, or resist the Word (2 Thess. 1:8, 1 Pet. 4:17). Let us obey the Gospel of Christ (Heb. 5:9) and so enjoy the fulfillment of the precious and exceeding great promises of God (2 Pet. 1:4, Heb. 5:9, Acts 2:38, Rom. 6:23).

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SIX

1. What is the import of the word *bara* in the first chapter of Genesis?
2. What was done on Day One of the Creation?
3. State the probable meaning of the phrase, "formless and empty," as descriptive of the original state of the earth.
4. What is suggested by the first syllable, "form," in the word "formless," as used in v.2?

THE FIRST FOUR DAYS

5. What is the probable meaning of the term, "the deep"?
6. What is the meaning of the word *chaos* in Greek?
7. How does the picture of the primeval "chaos" suggest the state of the unregenerate soul?
8. What does the word "brooding" suggest, as descriptive of the work of the Spirit of God in the Creation?
9. Point out the correlation between the Spirit's "brooding" at the beginning of the physical Creation and His "brooding" at the beginning of the spiritual Creation.
10. List some of the Scriptures which identify the Spirit of God of the Old Testament with the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of Christ, of the New Testament.
11. Cite some examples from everyday life of the transmutation of psychical energy into physical energy.
12. What light does this throw on the origin of the first form of physical energy?
13. What is presupposed in the application of energy in terms of force?
14. What probably was the kind of "light" indicated in the third verse of Genesis?
15. What reasons have we for concluding that this was not solar light?
16. With what formula is the description of each epoch of Creation introduced in the Genesis narrative?
17. In the light of the entire Bible what is the significance of this formula?
18. Point out some of the Scriptures which identify Jesus of Nazareth as the Eternal Logos.
19. What is the twofold meaning of the term *Logos* in Greek, and how does Jesus fulfill this twofold aspect?
20. State the historical, eternal, and temporal names of our Savior. What is His official title and what is its import?
21. What is the significance of the repeated formula, "Let there be," etc.?
22. What reasons have we for thinking that the first form

GENESIS

of light was an elementary kind of radiant energy rather than solar energy?

23. What does the word "good" imply, as God is represented as using it, in the Genesis account?
24. What was done on Day Two of the Creation?
25. Explain what is meant by the "law of accommodation."
26. List the contrasts between the Babylonian and the Mosaic Cosmogonies.
27. Why do we reject the theory that the Genesis account was borrowed from Babylonian sources?
28. What are the grounds on which we accept the Genesis account as divinely inspired?
29. What does the word "firmament" mean, as used in vv. 6 and 7?
30. What is probably meant here by the separation of "the waters which were under the firmament" from "the waters which were above the firmament"?
31. State the monoparental and biparental hypotheses of the origin of the earth.
32. What is the import of the word "Heaven" as used in v.8?
33. What was done on Day Three of the Creation?
34. By what processes were lands and seas probably differentiated?
35. Explain what is meant by secondary causation.
36. What do we mean by saying that God probably operated through secondary causes throughout most of the Creation? By what formula is this method indicated?
37. What is the import of the phrase "each after its kind"?
38. What was done on Day Four of the Creation?
39. Why do we reject the view that sun, moon and stars were created at this stage?
40. Correlate Gen. 1:17 with Gen. 9:8-17 and with 1 Cor. 11:23-33.
41. State some of the aspects in which the primordial

THE LAST THREE DAYS 1:20-31

- darkness was a metaphor of the unconverted soul.
42. State the aspects in which light is a metaphor of the Gospel.
 43. What do we learn from the first chapter of Genesis concerning the Word-Power of God?
 44. Where is this Word-Power to be found today?

PART SEVEN: THE LAST THREE "DAYS" OF THE COSMIC WEEK OF BEGINNINGS

Gen. 1:20-31

The heart of the Genesis Cosmogony is that all things have been brought into existence by the Supreme Creative Will, acting either directly (primary causation) or through the agency of forces and materials of His own creation (secondary causation). "God created," "God said," "God called," "God saw," "God made," "God blessed," etc. The name of God, Elohim, occurs forty-six times in the first two chapters of Genesis. The facts that God wills it means that He is Absolute Sovereign over what He has created; that He rules, determines, and brings to their pre-determined ends all the ages (Isa. 44:6); that He is sovereign over all aspects of the cosmos, including life, man, society, peoples, and even the destinies of individuals and nations (Acts 17:24-28, Jer. 18:5-10). God *before* all, God *back* of all, God *over* all: God's creative Word is the Efficient Cause of the existence, and continuance in existence, of all things. God Himself is without beginning or end, the First and the Last, the Alpha and the Omega, the Self-existent Living One.

Every process of the cosmos is divinely willed; every good end is divinely designed and ordained. Hence the living and true God is personal—an Other to all other persons. He is the sovereign God, transcending the cosmos and independent of it. He is the personal, sovereign, rational and moral Divine Being. He is "over all, and through

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Day Five: the Water and Air Species

(1:20-23)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1:24-31)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

God—Pure Thought Thinking Itself

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

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

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

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

Of systems possible if 'tis confest

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

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

The resultant picture is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

is indicated in the phrase, "Let us," etc. (3) Is this an occurrence, then, of what is commonly designated "the plural of majesty"—that is, the use of "we" by an Oriental potentate, in his royal edicts, to connote his power, majesty, glory, and all the attributes which may be inherent in him, in the eyes of his subjects? Skinner (ICCG, 30) objects that this usage is absent from Hebrew theology. (4) Is this a "remnant," a "hang-over," of polytheism? Evidently *not*. Such a view is completely out of accord with the strict Hebrew monotheism. (5) The "us" evidently connotes the involvement of all the powers of the Godhead in the creation of man. By correlating this verse (1:26) with Gen. 3:22, 11:7, and Isa. 6:8 (note the three-fold "holy, holy, holy" in v. 3 of this chapter), it becomes evident that all these Scriptures designate a *consilium* among persons; in short, in the light of Scripture teaching as a whole, they are intimations of the triune personality of God. In the Old Testament we have God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God. In the full light of the New Testament revelation, these become Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19). (This is in accord, too, with the use of the plural form *Elohim* as the Name used for God in this chapter: see Part V this text, *supra*.) (The credo of Deut. 6:4 evidently has no numerical significance: it means simply, and positively, that the Yahweh of the Bible is *one* Yahweh in the sense of being the *only* Yahweh: cf. Isa. 45:18, 46:8-11; 1 Tim. 2:5, Acts 17:23-31).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Day Seven: Rest

2:1-3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

The Fool's Decision

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

GENESIS

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

Back of the loaf is the snowy flour,

And back of the flour the mill;

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

And the sun, and the Father's will.

(—Maltbie B. Babcock)

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

(—Francis W. Bourdillon).

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

The Living God

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

Let us approach this question, first, negatively:

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

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

The Living Word

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

Note the following matters of profound importance:

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SEVEN

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

GENESIS

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

GENESIS

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

THE LAST THREE DAYS

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

GENESIS

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