

PART EIGHT: THE BEGINNING
OF “HOMO SAPIENS”

Gen. 2:4-7

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

Day

Day

1. Energy,

4. Chronology,

Matter-in Motion,

or Measurement

Light

CREATION—

of Time

THE

2. Atmosphere

5. Water and

Air Species

BEGINNINGS

3. Lands and Seas

6. Land Animals,

Man,

Naming of Animal

Plant Life

Species,

Woman

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

13. *Man is Specified as Man by His Thought Processes.*

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

FOR MEDITATION, SERMONIZING, AND SPECIAL STUDY

What Is Man?

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

On the Tripersonality of God

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

On the Divine Names in Genesis

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

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

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART EIGHT

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF HOMO SAPIENS

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

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

PART NINE: THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY (Gen. 2:8-25)

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

Adam as a Type of Christ

(Review concerning types and antitypes in Part Two.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Eve as a Type of the Church

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART NINE

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

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

the intent of the prohibition regarding the fruit of this Tree?

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

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIETY 2:8-25

the particular part of Adam's body that God used to build into the Woman?

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

GENESIS

PART TEN: THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

The word "science" is from the Latin *sciētia*, which means "knowledge"; the Greek equivalent is *episteme*, hence epistemology, the study of the ways of knowing, of the criteria of truth. I have already made it clear in this text that I have only profound respect for true science and its achievements, the blessings it has conferred on mankind. I would be the last to seek to deter in any way the progress of the human race in the understanding of its environment and in the task of overcoming those factors which prevent adaptation to this environment. But let me emphasize the fact anew that in making these statements I have in mind *true* science—the science, especially the scientific attitude, that is seasoned with a proper measure of both humility and faith: that is, with the awareness of man's creaturehood and his necessity of depending on faith, in the main, to guide his activity and his progress, rather than on absolute certitude. For absolute certitude man does not have in any great measure: even the "laws" of the physical, chemical, biological, psychological, and sociological sciences are, after all, but statements of *very great probability*. For example, two atoms of hydrogen unite with one atom of oxygen to form a molecule of water: thus far no exception to this "law" has ever been noted. But this does not mean there never will be an exception: and for any man to put forward such a claim is to arrogate unto himself *omniscience*; and omniscience, or the potentiality of omniscience, man does not have. We think we live in this present world by *sight*, but careful analysis of human experience will soon make it obvious to all "honest and good hearts" that we live, for the most part, by *faith*. Very great probability is itself a measure of faith. What is usually designated knowledge is simply inference. But—is this inference *necessary* inference? (Necessary inference is rightly defined as that view, the opposite of which is inconceivable.)

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

1. *Science versus "Scientism."* While I have all the respect in the world for true science and the scientists who pursue it, I have none whatever for what has come to be called "scientism." By "scientism" we mean the deification of science, and, naturally, of man himself as the originator of science. (Devotees of scientism are prone to forget that their science is purely descriptive of what lies "out there"; that truth is written into the structure of the universe, and that all they can do is to *discover it*.) "Scientism," writes Trueblood, "is so naive as to be almost unbelievable . . . God is a fiction because He cannot be discovered by laboratory technique. Prayer is futile because it cannot be proved by scientific method. Religion is unworthy of serious attention because it arose in the prescientific age." He concludes: "What we have here, of course, is not merely *science*, but a particularly unsophisticated philosophy of science, which deserves the epithet *scientism*."¹ Scientism is, of course, the product of a closed mind, or in the final analysis, a form of wilful ignorance. It feeds on assumptions (as premises) which cannot be proved to be valid.

This distinction between science and scientism must certainly be kept in mind in the study of the book of Genesis. It is in this area especially, in which we deal with such problems as those of the Creation, of the beginnings of human society, of the origin of evil, of the institution of religion, that "discrepancies" between Biblical teaching and scientific thinking have been alleged by extremists on both sides of the controversy. It is our purpose, in this resume, to show that these alleged "discrepancies" or "contradictions" are in the main "straw men" which have been set up by the zealots of these conflicting "schools" of thought with their contrary methodologies.

On the one side of this controversy, we have the "die-hard" preachers who refuse to entertain anything but an ultra-literal interpretation of Scripture, whether it makes

GENESIS

sense or not (that is, in the relation of the particular text to its context, and to *the context of the Bible as a whole*), and who flatly reject all possible alternatives which do make sense. We still have these gentlemen with us, and in this writer's opinion they often contribute to the destruction of faith, on the part of young people of high school and college age, as truly as do their ultra-"scientific" antagonists. This should not be. God knows that the one excellence needed perhaps more than any other by the confused youth of our time is *faith*, especially faith in the integrity of Scripture as the record of God's revelation to man. They need to realize, once and for all, that nothing, absolutely nothing, has been discovered by the so-called "modern mind" that downgrades in any way this integrity and reliability. As a matter of fact the "modern mind" is itself pretty largely a myth of the so-called "modern mind."

However, in my opinion, the worst offenders are the materialistic "scientists" and "philosophers": those who, in their desire to exclude God from the cosmos and to reduce what they call "religion" to an innocuous, indefinable "convictionless religiosity," deliberately seek out alleged discrepancies between Biblical and scientific teaching, and seem bent on conjuring up discrepancies where they do not exist at all. These "seminarians" never seek harmonies; they are out looking only for contradictions; they cannot see the forest for the trees. Believe me, the will *not* to believe motivates many of the intellectuals of our modern world. I have encountered students, from time to time, who have been "sold" on the claims of "positivism," "naturalism," "humanism," "existentialism" (the contemporary fad among the ultra-sophisticates), and in most cases I have found them utterly impervious to any view which may be in conflict with their pet notions. It is this class of collegians who have completely closed minds: they will not even give an honest hearing to contrary views. They are right, and anyone who suggests the con-

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

trary is an "old fogey." These persons—both instructors and students—who take advantage of every opportunity to throw paper-wads at the Almighty simply demonstrate their utter ignorance of much of Biblical teaching. Unfortunately there are so many young people who do not know that these are just paper-wads and not golden nuggets of truth, paper-wads saturated with human speculative saliva (if a mixed metaphor be permitted), because these are young people who have never had any opportunity to hear the other side of the case. And unfortunately young men and women are too prone to take as "law and gospel" what their instructors hand out, no matter how fallacious, and oftentimes utterly absurd, these professorial pronouncements may be. (I am willing, of course, for any man to be "sure," so long as he is not "cocksure," about what he believes.) The result of much of this confusion, not only in state institutions of learning, but in "theological" seminaries as well, is what the humorist Mr. Dooley must have had in mind when he remarked that the trouble with so many people is that "they know so many things that aint so."

I want not to be misunderstood here. College instructors who manifest this bias, and who go out of their way to cast innuendo on Biblical teaching and on anyone so "credulous" as to accept it at face value, and on religion in general, are the exception and not the rule. At least I have found it to be so. Unfortunately, however, only three or four professors committed to this type of thinking, are sufficient to confuse young impressionable minds and to brainwash them into a kind of skepticism (which is rooted in pessimism at its worst) that has but one thesis, namely, the meaninglessness of life and utter futility of living. Naturally there would be little point in living in the here and now, in a world, supposedly, of sheer chance (instead of choice), much less would there be any ground for hope of amelioration in a future life of any kind.

GENESIS

The tragedy of all this is that it need not be. It is the by-product of ignorance of the teaching of the Bible, and the immediate product largely of over-specialization so characteristic of modern education, that is, of specialization in a particular area of knowledge attended by misinformation or gross ignorance of what is to be accepted as valid in other areas of life and knowledge, and in particular of the area commonly described as "religious," the area of the Spiritual Life. Someone has said that "man is the only joker in the deck of nature," and the pitiful aspect of this fact is that he persists in playing his most tragic jokes on himself.

2. *Harmonies of Science with Biblical Teaching.* Let us now recapitulate what we have learned up to this point of the harmonies which prevail in our day between scientific theory and Biblical teaching, especially concerning matters introduced in the book of Genesis, as follows:

(1) According to the Bible, the first form of "matter-in-motion" was some kind of radiant energy (light: Gen. 1:3). This is a commonplace of present-day nuclear physics. Moreover, in our day, the line between the "non-material" ("ideal," "mental," "spiritual") and the "material" is so thinly drawn as to be practically non-existent. As a matter of fact, energy-matter has become *metaphysical*, apprehensible in its primal forms by mathematical calculations only, and not by sense-perception. It is interesting to note that, according to the testimony of "top-flight" physicists, the as-yet-undiscovered elementary forces in "matter" may turn out to be "new and sensational sources of energy vastly more powerful than that loosed by hydrogen bombs." No one knows what the future has in store for man's understanding of the Mystery of Being.

(2) According to the Bible, animal life had its beginning in the water (Gen. 1:20-21). This is a commonplace of present-day biological science.

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

(3) According to the Hebrew Cosmogony, the order of Creation was as follows: light, atmosphere, lands and seas, plant life, water species, birds of the heavens, beasts of the field, and finally man and woman. This is precisely the order envisioned by the science of our own time. That the order (sequence) pictured in Genesis—in an account known to have been written in prescientific times—should be in exact accord with twentieth-century science, is amazing, to say the least. There is but one logical conclusion that can be derived from the fact of this correspondence, namely, that Moses was writing by inspiration of the Spirit of God. (We all know today that light and atmosphere (nitrogen, hydrogen, oxygen, carbon dioxide, etc.) had to exist before any living thing could exist, that the process of plant photosynthesis had to be in operation to support both animal and human life. But who knew anything about hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide, chlorophyll, photosynthesis, etc., at the time Genesis was written? We simply cannot invoke human experience to account for these facts recorded in Genesis centuries ago, facts that have become known only as a result of the progress of science in modern times, indeed some of them as the product only of more recent discoveries.)

(4) It has been pointed out previously in this text that there is no necessity for assuming conflicts between the Genesis Cosmogony and present-day geological science. On the basis of the *reconstruction* theory of the Mosaic Narrative—that in Gen. 1:1 we have a general statement about the absolute beginning of the physical Creation, and in Gen. 1:2 the account of the beginning of what is called an *Adamic renovation*, following an alleged pre-Adamic reduction of the cosmos to a state of chaos—it is obvious that in the interim thus hypothesized there was ample time for all the periods envisioned by the modern earth sciences. Again, on the basis of the *panoramic* theory of the Hebrew Cosmogony, according to which the “days”

GENESIS

of the Creation Narrative are held to be aeonic days or periods of indefinite length (the interpretation which we have chosen in this text as the preferable one), certainly sufficient time could have elapsed between the moment when God decreed, "Light, Be!" and the moment when He said, later, "Let us make man in our image," to allow for all the terrestrial developments set forth in the textbooks of geology and kindred sciences.

(5) The description of man—the human being—as a spirit-body or mind-body unity (Gen. 2:7) is in exact accord with the psychosomatic approach in medicine, and the organismic approach in psychology, to the study of man.

(6) According to the Genesis account, God decreed something at the beginning of each stage of the Creation, and that which He decreed "was so" (vv. 1, 7, 9, 11, 15). "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast" (Psa. 33:6,9; 148:5,6). We have already noted that recent studies in the area of the phenomena of the Sub-conscious support the phenomenon of psychokinesis, the power of thought energy in man to effect different kinds of "materializations" and to affect the movements of ponderable objects or things. Certainly such phenomena support the Biblical doctrine that man was created in the image (likeness) of God (Gen. 1:26-27). That is to say, as the image and likeness of God, man should have within him, infinitesimally of course, the power to transmute "thoughts into things," powers which the Creator exercised in bringing the cosmos into existence.

3. *The Blind Spots of the Materialists.* Materialists have ever been eager to seize upon theories which would reduce man—including the life processes and thought processes characteristic of man—ultimately to some kind of "physical" energy or "motion": that is, to an aggregate of protons and electrons. There are scientists and philosophers in our

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

day whose theories are materialistic, but who shy away from being labeled materialists, preferring to be known by more sophisticated terms, such as "humanists," "naturalists," etc. Nevertheless, they are one with the materialists in their efforts to discredit religion in general, and the fundamentals of the Christian faith in particular. These gentlemen repeatedly seize upon theories which they mistakenly interpret—largely because of their incomplete knowledge—as supporting materialistic predilections, but which in fact do not necessarily do so. This type of "half-baked" know-how ("scholarship"?) simply adds to the already existing confusion brought about by their own kind.

For example, materialists, holding as they do that when the body dies the person perishes *in toto*, assume that T. H. Huxley's theory of *epiphenomenalism* supports their view that all forms of being are reducible ultimately to energy-matter and so disproves any possibility of continued personal existence beyond the grave. (As stated heretofore, epiphenomenalism—the word means literally, "an accompanying phenomenon," that is, a phenomenon "upon a phenomenon"—is the theory that what is called "consciousness" or "mind" or "mental process" is a kind of aura (something like the electrical glow that may be seen hovering over a machine at work), a refined kind of neural energy that is thrown off by the activity of brain cells; hence, that all so-called "mental" events are merely incidental and cannot be causative, or cannot be thought of as having independent existence, in any sense whatever; that mind, rather, in whatever sense it may exist, is affected (determined) by body or brain, but in no way affects body or brain. Incidentally, I have already emphasized the fact that there is no correlate in the brain for meaning in thought; hence, that *meaning* cannot be reduced to "physical" energy or motion. This is the evidence

GENESIS

of common sense and experience and needs no other empirical verification.) As far as I know, it has never been denied by informed persons, either scientists or theologians, that there is some correlation between brain and mind in the human organism. *But correlation is not identity.* The fact that must be emphasized here, however, is that the theory of epiphenomenalism is not necessarily to be regarded as materialistic at all. In fact it is in accord with the Christian doctrine of immortality, that the person—and most assuredly the *redeemed* person—is a body-spirit or body-mind unity, both in the here and in the hereafter, the only difference being in the transmutation of the physical body adapted to its present environment, into an ethereal (“spiritual,” 1 Cor. 15:44) body adapted to the needs of the saint in his heavenly environment. Certainly, present-day physics has nothing to say against this teaching, this doctrine of the redemption of the body, or personal immortality, promised to all of God’s elect (Rom. 8:18-23, Phil. 3:20-21, 1 Cor. 15:35-58, 2 Cor. 5:1-10). Physicists are still seeking the ultimates, the irreducibles of energy-matter. (These as yet unisolated irreducibles of physical energy are now known as *quarks* in the vocabulary of physics, and are thought to be even more powerful than those which have been discovered.) It is a commonplace of physical science in our day that matter can, and does, function in such attenuated forms that the possibility of an ethereal body, to replace the present earthly body, is no less scientific than it is Scriptural. For all we know, every person may be carrying around with him, while in this terrestrial body, the elements essential to the structure of the body he will need in the next world; that death, in short, is just such a metamorphosis as is taking place throughout nature all the time. (Of course, we are not told in Scripture just what kind of bodies the wicked will inhabit in their state of separation from God.)

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

Unfortunately, many who have written on this subject seem to have been unaware of, or misinformed about, the Christian doctrine of immortality. For example, the late C. E. M. Joad, a distinguished teacher of philosophy and author of books on various phases of the subject, a truly scholarly gentleman whose writings are characterized by a sane and sensible approach to philosophical problems, seems to have been beset by this confusion. According to Thomas Aquinas (writes Joad), "man is a combination of soul and body, the body being the substance, which owes its qualities to the imposition of the various forms upon the *materia prima*, and the soul being the substantial form. Conformably with his doctrine of matter and form, St. Thomas insists upon the necessity of the body to the soul, in order that there may be a soul at all. Hence, the soul could not survive the death of the mortal body, unless it were provided with a new and glorified body. But it is with precisely such a body that, he teaches, it is provided at death."² Evidently the scholarly Joad was not aware of the fact that Aquinas was, in substance, simply repeating the doctrine which had already been clearly stated in the New Testament Scriptures by Jesus Himself and by the Apostle Paul. (John 6:38-40, 2:19-22, 12:24, 11:23-26; 1 Cor. 6:19; Rom. 8:11, etc.).

The same facts apply generally to the arbitrary absorption by materialists into their cult, of the theory known as that of "emergent evolution." There are various ramifications of this theory, but in the main it is the theory that in the progressive development of the cosmos with its many and varied forms of being, both non-living and living, new forms with new properties appeared from time to time, which cannot be accounted for in terms of the powers characteristic of the entities existing on lower levels, *e.g.*, energy-matter (sometimes dealt with as space-time), life, consciousness, self-consciousness (personality), etc., in the order named. These apparently original and unpredictable

GENESIS

realities common to human experience are called "emergents" by the proponents of the theory (Samuel Alexander, C. Lloyd Morgan, R. W. Sellars, et al). If one asks, What causes these "emergents" to "emerge"? the answer is that a *nisus* (a pull) of some kind does it. (See *infra* for a further critique of this theory, also the Tables at the end of this Part). However, the point with which we are concerned here is not the validity of the theory (in the view of the present writer, it is certainly questionable), but *the fact that the theory is not necessarily to be regarded as grossly materialistic. Obviously, if mind or soul (self, person) is an "emergent," it certainly exists in its own right*, (just as water exists in its own right, and continues to do so, as a result of the fusion of hydrogen and oxygen atoms in right proportions); hence, despite the rejection, by advocates of the theory, of what they call "an alien influx into nature" (a special Divine act?), it seems evident that the theory does not completely close the door to the possibility of the continued existence of the mind or soul (the person) beyond the grave, that is, the possibility of personal immortality. Moreover, "emergence," especially in the form of what is called a "mutation," certainly bears a striking resemblance to a special creation, that is, to a Divine "influx" into nature, regardless of what the evolutionists may say about it.

4. *The Ambiguity of the Word "Evolution."* We come now, in this text, to the study of the word (and its referent) which has been the cause of the most intense and sustained controversy in the entire area of the agreement (or the lack of it) between Biblical teaching and scientific thinking in our time. That word is "evolution." With the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 (his contemporary, Alfred Russel Wallace, had already arrived at the same general theory), this word has been seized upon, on the one hand, as a forensic watchword, by all those thinkers who would like to destroy Biblical religion;

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

and on the other hand, as a kind of diabolical device to be resisted at all costs, by churchmen who unyieldingly adhere to the most literal interpretations of certain sections of Genesis largely because of their fear of the effect of the theory on young impressionable minds. They honestly fear the theory itself, and more particularly the doctrinaire manner in which it is often presented by its over-zealous advocates. And indeed they have real grounds for these fears: for without justification the theory has been blown up into a full-fledged dogma. *It is my conviction, however, that Christians need have no fear of the truth.* I propose, therefore, that we try to sift out as carefully as we can whatever measure of truth is embodied in the evolution theory, and ascertain as best we can the extent to which it is actually in conflict, if in conflict at all, with the Genesis Cosmogony. *I think I should state here that my own criticism of the theory is based, not so much on theological, as on scientific and philosophical considerations.*

The word "evolution" is one of the most ambiguous words in our language. It means literally "an unrolling," "an unfolding," etc. As used originally, the term had reference only to the *origin of species*: its use was confined to biological science. Since Darwin's time, however, it has become a yardstick for analyzing and tracing chronologically every cosmical, biological, sociological, and even theological, development in the history of humankind. Hence we have books with such titles, as *Stellar Evolution*, *From Atoms to Stars*, *Biography of the Earth*, etc., and innumerable published articles of the same general trend of thought. (Nowhere, perhaps, is this attempted universal application of the term made more obvious than in the title of a book recently published, *From Molecules to Man*.) Implicit in the meaning of the word "evolution," as used generally, is the idea of progression or *progressive development*; and the basis of this idea is the *a priori* concept that the historical order must coincide with a certain

GENESIS

logical order in each case; that is to say, as applied by evolutionists, all change necessarily takes place from the simple to the more and more complex. In logic textbooks, this idea is now designated "the genetic fallacy." As stated in one such textbook: "It is an inexcusable error to identify the temporal order in which events have actually occurred, with the logical order in which elements may be put together to constitute existing institutions. Actual recorded history shows growth in simplicity as well as in complexity."³ The fact is that in some areas change is not from the simple to the complex, but just the reverse—from complexity to greater simplicity. This is true, for example, in the field of linguistics especially: the history of language is the story of a continuous process of simplification. The same is true in the area of social organization: all one has to do to realize this fact is to contrast the long tortuous genealogical tables of the most primitive peoples with the tendency to minimize, even to disregard, genealogies altogether (cf. 1 Tim. 1:4, Tit. 3:9). To quote again: "Science, as well as art and certain social organizations, is sometimes deliberately changed according to some idea or pattern to which previous existence is not relevant."⁴

I am reminded here of Herbert Spencer's theory of "cultural evolution," namely, that all cultures have moved "forward" from savagery through barbarism to civilization. This idea has long been abandoned by anthropologists and sociologists alike. The evolution yardstick was, for a long time, applied to the history of religion: it was contended that animism (the belief that everything is "ensouled") was the first form of "religion"; that in time, animism gave way generally to polytheism; that polytheism was succeeded by henotheism (a pantheon with a single sovereign deity); and then henotheism was succeeded by *monotheism* (these systems all having been inventions of the human imagination). It is held further that monotheism will ultimately give way to *pantheism*, a

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

sophisticated religion, hence the only system which is acceptable to the intelligentsia. Again, it is doubtful that this general theory is seriously entertained in our day; there is too much evidence that monotheism has existed along these other views, somewhere and in some form, from earliest times. Moreover, a dry-as-dust intellectualized cult, such as pure pantheism, or any other cult which ignores the personal and living God will never appeal generally to the aspirations or needs of the human soul.

In common parlance, the word "evolution" means simply development, progression, in terms of a sequence. But progression is not always easy to define. I might line up a wheelbarrow, a gig, a buggy, a wagon, an automobile, and even an airplane, in a single row. There would be some structural resemblance, of course. But we know, in this case, that one of these vehicles is not the outgrowth ("emergent") of that type which preceded it; we know, rather, that all of them were products alike of human technology, inventions of the human mind. We know also that as a sequence they spell progression; this progression, obviously, is distinct from that kind of progression which is brought about by the operation of *resident* forces characteristic of different levels of being. However, "evolution" is often used to signify a going forward, a development, a progression, that is not "emergent" in any sense of the term. Hence we speak of the evolution of political systems, of social organization, of the science of medicine, of technology, of ethics and law, etc.

This, however, is not what the term "evolution" means in biology. Here, it means, according to a well-known definition, by LeConte, *continuous progressive change, according to fixed laws, by means of resident forces*. (Note the full import here of the word "resident.") The full-fledged—and rather pompous—definition of biological evolution was given us in the Spencerian formula: Evolution, said Herbert Spencer, is "an integration of matter and

GENESIS

concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity," that is, of structure and function, "and during which the retained motion goes through a parallel transformation." (It should be noted that Spencer's use of the word "motion" here leaves a great deal to be explained.) Obvious theories of this type are based on the assumption that all so-called progressive change (evolution) is fortuitous, that is, occurring by accident or chance (purposelessness); hence they are commonly designated "mechanistic" or "materialistic" theories. This writer finds it difficult to accept the notion that a movement can be "progressive" and at the same time "fortuitous": surely we have here a semantic paradox, to say the least! (The same is true of the phrase, "natural selection." Selectivity, in all human experience, presupposes deliberation and choice: how, then, can impersonal nature be rightly said to "select" anything? Thus we seem to have another semantic paradox.) However, it is an outstanding characteristic of the devotees of evolutionism to indulge equivocation, perhaps unwittingly, in their use of language.

Theories of what is called *emergent evolution* tend to the *organismic*, rather than the mechanistic, explanation of the various facets of the life process. Emergentism, as stated above, is the theory that in general evolution is a naturalistic process proceeding from the operation of resident, yet essentially vitalistic, force or forces; that each "emergent" has a different structure with additional properties, and its own different behavior patterns; that each emergent not only has subsistence *per se* (that is, after emerging), but also acts as a causal agency, a transmitter of effects. Moreover, it is said to be beyond the ability of human intelligence to know how many levels of emergence there may be or yet come to be. If one should ask, what is it that causes these "emergents" to "emerge," the

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

answer is that a *nisus* or pull does it. The theory of some members of this school is that the pull is exerted by "whatever lies ahead." But it is difficult to understand just how "whatever lies ahead" actually exists in order to exert a pull, when according to the theory it is in the process of being actualized (or should we say, of actualizing itself?). If "God" is envisioned as the Ultimate Emergent—the Goal of the Process—then God is, in terms of the theory, in the indeterminable process of becoming God. Hence, other advocates of the theory identify the *nisus* with a push—an impulsion—from within. Be that as it may, in either case, God is presented to us as engaged in the age-long business of Becoming not Himself, but Itself. Emergentism is pantheistic: its "God" is either "nature" as a whole, or an impersonal process operating in nature. (Cf. the philosophical system known as "Holism." According to this system, the Creative Process (Evolution) stabilized being in successively more complex *wholes* (the atom, the cell, etc.), of which the most advanced and most complex is the person or personality.⁵ Holism is a form of Emergentism.)

On the basis of the inclusion of human intelligence in evolution, as playing, perhaps, the most important role in the process, advocates of the theory in our day take the position generally that *societal* (or psychological) evolution has superseded in large measure what has heretofore been known as organic (biological) evolution. (For a clear presentation of this view, see the book, *Human Destiny*, by Lecomte du Nouy, published in 1947 by Longmans, Green. See also the concluding chapters of the Mentor books, *The Meaning of Evolution*, by George G. Simpson, and *Evolution in Action*, by Julian Huxley.) In line with this general idea, the academic world has been thoroughly stirred in recent years by the serious and profound view of human evolution put forward by the late French priest-scientist, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. In his

GENESIS

principal works, *The Phenomenon of Man* (1959) and *The Future of Man* (1964), Teilhard envisions evolution through a gradation of forms from atomic particles to human beings, in ever increasing complexity of structure, and along with it, development of consciousness. Man is the focal point in whom all facets of the evolutionary process converge, and in man reflective thought finally emerges. The unique idea in Teilhard's system is his view that the ultimate reality of this cosmic development (that is, of Evolution) is the incarnate Christ (not the "super-man" of Nietzsche, nor that of Samuel Butler, nor that of G. B. Shaw's *Man and Superman* and his *Back to Methuselah*), but the God-man. Two quotations from this writer are pertinent: "The only universe capable of containing the human person is an irrevocably 'personalizing' universe." Again, "In one manner or the other, it still remains true that, even in the view of the mere biologist, the human epic resembles nothing so much as a way of the Cross."⁶ This, to be sure, is another—and more profound—theory of emergentism. Like that of Bergson's *creative evolution* (described below), this is an honest effort to describe the *modus operandi* of the evolutionary process, which in the last analysis becomes an effort to describe the indescribable—the ineffable. *The mystery of the life movement itself is too profound to yield its secrets to the mere human intellect.*

5. *Evolution and Evolutionism.* One fact should be emphasized before we proceed further with this study, namely, that evolution must not be confused with evolutionism. The word "evolution" designates only the process itself, the process of continuous progressive change; the word "evolutionism," however, designates how the process "proceeds," that is, the phenomena that are said to actualize it. (Evolutionism is also properly designated the *theory of evolution.*) These phenomena are usually listed as follows: (1) Lamarck (1744-1829): *the transmission of char-*

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

acteristics (*modifications*) *acquired through the interaction of the organism and its environment*. This theory is now generally rejected, except by the Russian biologist, Lysenko, who has been all but canonized by the Kremlin oligarchy for his revival of it. (2) Charles Darwin (1809-1882), getting his cue from Malthus's *Essay on Population* (the thesis of which was that because population increases in geometrical proportion, whereas the earth's resources multiply only in arithmetical proportion, the time will come when the earth will not be able to provide food for its population, unless some selective process removes the surplus), advanced the theory of evolution by *natural selection*. The process of struggle for existence, Darwin held, selects out and preserves only those organisms which prove to be the most capable of adapting to environment (the doctrine of *the survival of the fittest*, that is, the fittest to demonstrate survival quality by adaptation). Darwin's contemporary, Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913) had arrived at the natural selection theory even before Darwin, but Darwin happened to beat him into print. (They were always good friends, however.) Wallace pointed out the fact to Darwin that while natural selection might account for the survival of an existing species, *it did not account for the arrival of a new species*. (3) August Weismann (1844-1914) contended that the explanation of evolution lies in *the continuity of the germ-plasm*. It seems obvious, however, that only process and form (the form being that which specifies man as man) can be transmitted from generation to generation through the germ plasm. Germ-cells are affected only by variations or mutations in themselves, and not by what goes on in the life of the parent. (Still and all, it seems incontrovertible that any modification in the parent organism is transmissible only through the chromosomes and genes. Moreover, genes are but hypothetical "determiners" of heredity operating beyond

GENESIS

the world of sense-perception.) (4) Mutations, discovered by the Dutch botanist De Vries (1848-1935), are sudden big leaps to new species which *per se* breed true. It is commonly held that evolution might have proceeded by these abrupt and relatively permanent germinal changes, rather than by slight variations. (There are some, however, who contend that mutations might have come about through slowly accumulating changes in the genes.) To this writer's thinking mutations are indispensable to any possible validation of the evolution theory. Moreover, mutations certainly have all the appearance of special creations. (The German philosopher Lotze, and others, have taken the position that at different stages in the Creative Process, God infused into it new increments of force, that is, new and distinct powers, by direct action, thus bringing into existence the successively higher levels characterized by matter-energy, life, consciousness, and self-consciousness, in the order named. According to this view, Creation involved *new increments of power plus continuity of plan*. (Cf. the title of the book by Hoernle, *Matter, Life, Mind, and God*.) It should be noted too that this theory accords in the main with Aristotle's Hierarchy of Being, according to which Being is organized on successively higher levels of matter-in-motion, the vegetative psyche, the animal psyche, the rational psyche, with God over all as Pure Self-thinking Thought. (5) The "laws" of heredity as first formulated by the Austrian monk and botanist, Gregor Mendel (1824-1884) are believed to play a significant role also in the evolutionary process. (6) Protagonists of the theory in our day are inclined to agree that evolution may have proceeded in all these ways, with the sole exception of the Lamarckian notion of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. *However, the phenomena characterizing this life movement leave the movement itself unexplained.*

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

The following excellent summation by Patrick is in order here: "When the doctrine of evolution was brought prominently before the world by Darwin in the middle of the last century, two misconceptions arose, which in our time have been largely corrected. The first was that there is some kind of *conflict* between evolution and religion, and the second was that evolution has explained the world. As regards the first, we have come to learn that the religious attitude has been greatly strengthened by the enlarged vision which evolution has brought us. We have become accustomed now to the idea of development, and we understand its immeasurable superiority over the old spasmodic theory of creation . . . The other misunderstanding that arose about evolution was almost the opposite of the first. It was that evolution had explained the world, and that no other philosophy or religion was necessary. This curious error probably came about because of a confusion between evolution as a method or law of change, and evolution as a force or power. There is a popular belief that evolution is a kind of creative force, something that can do things. On the contrary, it is a mere description of nature's method. We see in evolution that nature behaves in a certain uniform way, or, if you choose, that God creates by a certain uniform method. The student of philosophy, who has already learned that natural laws are not forces or powers, but merely observed uniformities, is not likely to fall into the mistake of making a God of evolution."⁷

6. *The Movement of Evolution.* Under this caption, we call attention to two significant views, as follows: (1) What is called *orthogenesis*, that is, "straight line" evolution. This is the view that variation in successive generations of a succession of parents and offspring follows a specific line of development, finally undeviatingly evolving a new type. The classic example usually cited is that of the very ancient and tiny "eohippus" which by gradual,

GENESIS

step-by-step change is said to have evolved into the horse that we know today. This is called the theory of "determinate variation." (2) *Fountainlike evolution*. This is the doctrine of the late French philosopher, Henri Bergson (1859-1941).⁸ Bergson's main thesis was that the phenomena envisioned by evolutionism do not explain evolution, that is, the life movement itself; that this surge upward of what might be called the core of the Creative Process is explainable only as the *Elan Vital* (Life Force). In Bergson's thought, this *Elan Vital* is the primordial cosmic principle, the ground of all being, that is at the very root of evolution, a vital push or impulsion "pervading matter, insinuating itself into it, overcoming its inertia and resistance, determining the direction of evolution as well as evolution itself."⁹ This never-ceasing free activity is Life itself. Indeed Bergson speaks of it as "Spirit," as a directing Consciousness as well as an actualizing Power. The unique aspect of this view is Bergson's picture of Life Force operating like a fountain, so to speak, with a center "from which worlds shoot out like rockets in a fireworks display," "as a series of jets gushing out from the immense reservoir of life."¹⁰ We must be careful, however, not to think of this center or core as a "thing"—we must think of it only as a process. Moreover, as the core-movement pushes upward, according to Bergson's theory, the push encounters resistance by the matter on which it works; hence there is a falling back toward gross matter by the residue that is left behind by the progressive push of Life toward fulness of being. According to this theory, the *Elan Vital* manifested itself in the lower animals in the form of *instinct*; in man, it manifests itself in the form of *intelligence* (intellection), the power that enables him to surge upward through learning by trial-and-error; it will ultimately push on to what Bergson calls *intuition* in man, which will be immediacy in man's apprehension of truth, corresponding in a way, but on a much higher level, to

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

the immediacy of the brute's response to sensory stimuli. Bergson envisions nothing beyond this power of intuition. Of course, his fountainlike description of evolution, allowing for both progression and retrogression, is another theory of emergentism. (One of my science professors remarked to me once that to him "evolution" meant variation, and variation either upward (progression) or downward (retrogression). This is approximately Bergson's view.)

7. *Evidence for Evolutionism.* The evidence usually cited to support the evolution theory includes the following factors: (1) *Comparative anatomy*, or structural resemblance among species. (But, to what extent does structural resemblance necessarily prove emergence? Could it not be interpreted as supporting the view that a Creative Intelligence simply used the same general pattern in creating the living species?) (2) *Embryology*: the embryos of different animal species tend to similar development in early stages. Those of lower animals are said to cease developing at certain points; those of higher animals move upward through additional stages of development. It has long been contended that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny; that is, that each individual organism of a certain phylum tends to recapitulate the principal stages through which its ancestors have passed in their racial history. (This idea is seriously questioned today by many biologists.) (3) *Serology*: the blood composition of higher animals is the same. Samples of blood from closely related higher animals can be mixed, whereas an antagonistic reaction sets in if there is wide separation between the species. (4) *Vestigial remains*: the presence of unused organs. Usually cited in this category are the appendix in man, degenerate eyes in cave animals, wings of the female gypsy moth, etc. (5) *Geographical distribution of animals*: arrested development of flora and fauna in areas cut off in prehistoric times from continental land masses. The

GENESIS

classic example of this are the marsupials of Australia. (Yet the opossum, whose only natural habitat is America, is a marsupial.) (6) *Paleontology*: correlation of the ascending scale of the simple to the more complex fossil forms with successively earlier to later geological strata. (Thus geologists rely on the evidence of paleontology to support historical geology, and the paleontologists cite the evidence of geology to support their chronology of fossil remains. This, some wag, has remarked, borrowing from the comic strips of the nineteen-twenties, is a kind of Alphonse-and-Gaston act.) (7) *Artificial selection*. That is, changes brought about by selective breeding, by the application of human intelligence; for example, by Mendel, Burbank, and others. This, it is claimed, adds momentum to the whole process. (8) *Classification* of animals in phyla, classes, genera, species, orders, families, etc., in ascending order of complexity, from unicellular organisms up to man. This, it is held, gives evidence of an over-all relationship among all living organisms.

8. *The Evolutionism Dogma*. The chief protest by Christians with respect to evolutionism is a protest against the blowing up of the theory into a dogma. A dogma is a proposition to be accepted on the ground that it has been proclaimed by the proper authority; in this case, of course, the "proper authority" is human science. Evolution is presented in many high school and college textbooks as an *established fact*; and in others, the inference that it is factual is expressed by innuendo, with the accompanying inference that persons who refuse to accept it are naive, childish, or just plain ignoramuses. It seems to be assumed by these devotees of the cult that they have a monopoly on the knowledge of this particular subject. The fact is that much of the material appearing in these textbooks is simply parroted by teachers who are so ignorant of Biblical teaching they are not even remotely qualified to pass judgment on the matter. Unfortunately, too, many

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

persons of eminence in certain highly specialized fields are prone to break into print on various aspects of Biblical doctrine only to prove by their statements that they are completely uninformed on the subjects on which they choose to expatiate. Pernicious fallacies, based on the authority of a great name, thus have a way of persisting from generation to generation even though they have been shown to be fallacies many times: it is the prestige of the "great name" or "names" with which they are associated which gives them apparent deathlessness. I want to make it clear at this point that whatever objections I have to evolutionism are not based so much on the view that, in certain forms, it is anti-Biblical or irreligious, but on the conviction that it is based all too frequently, not on established *fact*—that is, by the testimony of eye-witnesses—but on *inference*. The important question, therefore, is this: Is the inference drawn from alleged phenomena in this field *necessary inference*?—inference, that is, the opposite of which is inconceivable? Or does much of it savor of little more than conjecture?

Dr. James Jauncey states the case clearly in these words: "Of course you will often hear from some enthusiastic evolutionists that evolution is now indisputable, that it has been proved beyond doubt, and that anyone who disputes this is an ignoramus or a fanatic. This is jumping the gun, to say the least. The vehemence of such statements makes one suspect that the speakers are trying to convince themselves. When a scientific theory crystallizes into law, such as that of relativity, it speaks for itself. All we can say at the moment is that evolution is generally accepted, possibly because of the lack of any scientific alternative, but with serious misgivings on the adequacy of some aspects of it. As for the kind of rigorous proof that science generally demands, it still isn't there. Indeed, some say that because of the philosophical aspects of the theory, that proof will never be possible."¹¹

GENESIS

A clear example of the blind spots which seem to characterize the devotees of evolutionism is the title of an article appearing recently in *Reader's Digest* that reads "Can Science Produce Life?" This title is misleading, to say the least: life never was produced (created) by human agency. This fact, the author of the article in question, seems to realize. Toward the end, he writes, with reference to *microspheres* (proteinoids formed by the fusion of amino acids): "Although these spheres are not true cells—they have no DNA genes and they are simpler than any contemporary life—they do possess many cellular properties. They have stability; they keep their shapes indefinitely. They stain in the same way as the present-day protein in cells, an important chemical test. But the real significance of these microspheres is that scientists do not *synthesize* them piece by piece; they simply set up the right *conditions*—and microspheres produce themselves." Thus it will be noted that the eminent scientist-author of this article flatly contradicts the import of the title, by stating that man can only set up the conditions necessary to the production of microspheres but cannot do the "producing." (The title is, in fact, an excellent example of the manner in which careless use of language can spread confusion.) Man indeed sets the stage, but the God of nature alone, as the cosmic Efficient Causality, can actualize the life process.

I recommend that every reader of this textbook procure a copy of the latest issue of Everyman's Library Edition (published by E. P. Dutton, New York) of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and read the Preface written by W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., and Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada. Thompson states expressly that the content of his Preface will not follow the tenor of previous introductions to Darwin's work, those written by other scientists, in particular that of Sir Arthur Keith. "I could not content myself," Thomp-

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

son writes, "with mere variations on the hymn to Darwin and Darwinism that introduces so many textbooks on biology and evolution . . . I am of course well aware that my views will be regarded by many biologists as heretical and reactionary. However, I happen to believe that in science heresy is a virtue and reaction often a necessity, and that in no field of science are heresy and reaction more desirable than in evolutionary theory." After stating in no uncertain terms what he considers to be the weaknesses of the Darwinian theory (which he describes as a theory of the "origin of living forms by descent with modifications"), Thompson goes on to point out the fallacies involved in the argumentation used by the evolutionists. This, he declares, "makes the discussion of their ideas extremely difficult." In what way? Because "personal convictions, simple possibilities, are presented as if they were proofs, or at least valid arguments in favor of the theory" (repeating an evaluation made by De Quatrefages). Thompson adds: "As an example De Quatrefages cited Darwin's explanation of the manner in which the titmouse might become transformed into the nutcracker, by the accumulation of small changes in structure and instinct owing to the effect of natural selection; and then proceeded to show that it is just as easy to transform the nutcracker into the titmouse. The demonstration can be modified without difficulty to fit any conceivable case. It is without scientific value since it cannot be verified; but since the imagination has free rein, it is easy to convey the impression that a concrete example of real transmutation has been given. This is the more appealing because of the extreme fundamental simplicity of the Darwinian explanation . . . This was certainly a major reason for the success of the *Origin*. Another is the elusive character of the Darwinian argument. Every characteristic of organisms is maintained in existence because it has survival

GENESIS

value. But this value relates to the struggle for existence. Therefore we are not obliged to commit ourselves in regard to the meaning of differences between individuals or species since the possessor of a particular modification may be, in the race for life, moving up or falling behind. On the other hand, we can commit ourselves if we like, since it is impossible to disprove our statement. The plausibility of the argument eliminates the need for proof and its very nature gives it a kind of immunity to disproof. Darwin did not show in the *Origin* that species had originated by natural selection; he merely showed, on the basis of certain facts and assumptions, how this might have happened, and as he had convinced himself he was able to convince others." (We are reminded here of Mark Twain's evaluation: "There is something so fascinating about science: one gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investments of fact.")

On the subject of mutations, Thompson writes as follows: "As Emile Guyenot has said, mutations are powerless to explain the general adaptation which is the basis of organization. 'It is impossible to produce the world of life where the dominant note is functional organization, correlated variation and progression, from a series of random events.'"

Again, from the same author: "An important point in Darwin's doctrine, as set out in the *Origin*, was the conviction that evolution is a progressive process . . . The Victorians accepted this idea with enthusiasm. Here I need only say on this point Darwin was inconsistent since, in his view, natural selection acts not only by the survival of the fittest but also by the extermination of the less fit and may produce anatomical degradation as well as improvement." "Darwin himself considered that the idea of evolution is unsatisfactory unless its mechanism can be explained. I agree, but since no one has explained to my

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

satisfaction how evolution could happen I do not feel impelled to say that it has happened. I prefer to say that on this matter our information is inadequate."

(I should like to interpolate here a few personal statements as follows: An outstanding example of the down-right fanatical zeal with which early exponents seized upon Darwin's theory and blowed it up to such fantastic extremes (notably, by means of the intellectual vacillations of the erratic T. H. Huxley, the semantic pomposity of the agnostic Herbert Spencer, etc.) is the "tree of life" as hypothesized by the arrogant German, Haeckel (1834-1919). Haeckel presumed to arrange existing forms in an ascending scale from the simple to the complex, by arbitrarily inserting imaginary names to identify all the necessarily numerous "missing links." Today Haeckel's famous "tree" is largely famous, even in the scientific world, for its absurdities.)

Dr. Thompson concludes his Preface with what is obviously the most telling objection of all to evolutionism, "A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the *Origin*," he writes, "was the addiction of biologists to unverifiable speculation," the net result of which was that "the success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity. This," he adds, "is already evident in the reckless statements of Haeckel, and in the shifting, devious, and histrionic argumentation of T. H. Huxley." Finally, his conclusion: "It may be said, and the most orthodox theologians indeed hold, that God controls and guides even the events due to chance; but this proposition the Darwinians emphatically reject, and it is clear that in the *Origin* evolution is presented as an essentially undirected process. For the majority of readers, therefore, the *Origin* effectively dissipated the evidence of providential control. It might be said that this was their own fault. Nevertheless, the failure of Darwin and his successors to attempt an equitable assessment of the religious issues at stake indi-

GENESIS

cates a regrettable obtuseness and lack of responsibility. Furthermore, on the purely philosophical plane, the Darwinian doctrine of evolution involves some difficulties which Darwin and Huxley were unable to appreciate." (I might well add that their devoted disciples in our day seem to have closed minds on the same matters). "Between the organism that simply lives, the organism that lives and feels, and the organism that lives, feels, and reasons, there are, in the opinion of respectable philosophers, abrupt transitions corresponding to an ascent in the scale of being, and they hold that the agencies of the material world cannot produce transitions of this kind." Again, "Biologists still agree on the separation of plants and animals, but the idea that man and animals differ only in degree is now so general among them, that even psychologists no longer attempt to use words like 'reason' or 'intelligence' in an exact sense. This general tendency to eliminate, by means of unverifiable speculations, the limits of the categories Nature presents to us, is an inheritance of biology from the *Origin of Species*."

(I urge every student to procure a copy of this book and read Dr. Thompson's Preface in its entirety. Another book I recommend, one which deals with the evolution theory in terms of biology itself, is that by Douglas Dewar, entitled *The Transformist Illusion*; this book may be purchased from DeHoff Publications, 749 N.W. Broad Street, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.)

Space is not available here for a review of the conjectural absurdities which have been put forward at different times by over-zealous evolutionists: they are far too numerous to be catalogued anyway. Darwin himself set the fashion of conjecture. It is amazing to note the number of times such words as "apparently" and "probably" occur in his writings. One reliable authority may be quoted for the information that the phrase, "we may well suppose," occurs over eight hundred times in his two principal works,

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

The Origin of Species, and *The Descent of Man*.¹² This would seem to indicate that in all such instances the eminent scientist was guessing. Indeed, is not "hypothesis" after all the academic term for what is to be taken only as a fairly good guess?

(For a review of some of the absurdities advanced by evolutionists in days gone by, the student is referred to the little book, *In His Image*, a collection of lectures and addresses by William Jennings Bryan, published by Revell, New York, in 1922. Mr. Bryan's name recalls, of course, the role which he played in the widely publicized Scopes trial in Tennessee, at which his antagonist was the Chicago attorney, Clarence Darrow. The underlying issue in this trial was the contention of the prosecution that money contributed by taxpayers for the support of public schools could not be used legitimately by teachers to destroy the faith of young people in their classes, and that the teaching of evolution was in a special sense destructive of Christian faith. Hence evolutionism, by indirection, became the real issue that was debated by the two antagonists. I know of no event in my lifetime about which more sheer nonsense has appeared in magazines and newspapers than in the publicity which has been given the Scopes trial, in particular the Bryan-Darrow debate over the theory of evolution. I doubt that any debate was ever held in which both antagonists were as incompletely informed on the subject they were debating as were Bryan and Darrow in this particular case. Darrow's questions were for the most part puerile and irrelevant in the manner in which they were stated: he simply rehashed questions which have been heard again and again in the history of Christianity, from as far back as the time of Celsus and Porphyry. Bryan's answers were often childish, largely because he allowed himself to be on the defensive; he should have kept the offensive, which he could have done easily, which any informed Christian can do in exposing

GENESIS

the shallowness of atheism or agnosticism. The fact is, however, that Bryan was not the nit-wit that uninformed science teachers and popular writers have tried to make him appear to be. And I know of no more interesting collection of the genuine absurdities which have been advanced by over-zealous evolutionists than those which are presented in Bryan's book, *In His Image*. It is interesting to note, too, that Darrow was flabbergasted in two debates with the late P. H. Welshimer (for some fifty-five years Minister of the First Christian Church, Canton, Ohio), the first at Canton, the second at Akron, Ohio. In the Canton debate Welshimer stressed the marvelous unity of the Bible, dwelling especially on the Messianic prophecies and their fulfilment; and just before the debate at Akron, Darrow sought him out privately and asked for the source of his information, admitting that he himself had never encountered such arguments. Welshimer gave him the titles of some important books of Biblical prophecy. But Darrow died just two weeks after the Akron debate. Of course, these facts never get into print in popular news media¹³).

9. *A Critique of Evolutionism*. I shall now list the more common, and what I consider to be the most valid criticisms of, and objections to, the evolution theory in general, as follows:

(1) Mention has already been made of the attempt to extend the general concept of *continuous progressive change* (the fundamental thesis of evolutionism) to every aspect of the world man lives in and of his life in it. As Patrick has written: "The fact is that evolution is a very much overworked word. As the close of the last century and in the beginning of this one, the idea of evolution held almost undisputed sway. It was extended far beyond its original application and applied quite universally. We began to hear of inorganic, cosmic, astral, geologic and atomic evolution. Even the 'delirious electrons' evolved

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

into atoms and matter itself was the product of a process of development. Social evolution had already made its appearance . . . nothing is fixed or final; nothing is created; everything just grew and is growing,"¹⁴ This, as has been stated previously, is what is now recognized as the *genetic fallacy*. There are areas in which this notion of continuous progressive change simply is not in accord with the facts.

(2) In addition to the *genetic* fallacy, evolutionists commit another common fallacy of the inductive method, namely, that of *over-simplification*, also known as the "nothing but" fallacy. This they do in making no effort to account for the *modus operandi* of the many leaps occurring in the alleged evolutionary process (as Thompson has stated it, leaps from "the organism that simply lives" to "the organism that lives and feels" to "the organism that lives and feels and reasons"). They simply take it for granted that these are only matters of *degree*. (Even in one's personal life, one simply cannot explain how the psychical takes hold of and moves the physical: how a person moves his body if and when he "makes up his mind" to do so.) In simple truth, they have no explanation of the leap from an existing species to a new species, except by mutations, and these, of course, themselves need to be explained. As Chesterton writes: "Far away in some strange constellation in skies infinitely remote, there is a small star, which astronomers may some day discover . . . It is a star that brings forth out of itself very strange plants and very strange animals and none stranger than the men of science." Again: "Most modern histories of mankind begin with the word evolution, and with a rather wordy exposition of evolution . . . There is something slow and soothing and gradual about the word and even about the idea. As a matter of fact, it is not, touching primary things, a very practical word or a very profitable idea. Nobody can imagine how nothing could

GENESIS

turn into something. Nobody can get an inch nearer to it by explaining how something could turn into something else. It is really far more logical to start by saying, 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth' even if you only mean 'In the beginning some unthinkable power began some unthinkable process.' For God is by its nature a name of mystery, and nobody ever supposed that man could imagine how a world was created any more than he could create one. But evolution really is mistaken for explanation. It has the fatal quality of leaving on many minds the impression that they do understand it and everything else; just as many of them live under a sort of illusion that they have read the *Origin of Species* . . . What we know, in a sense in which we know nothing else, is that the trees and the grass did grow and that a number of other extraordinary things do in fact happen; that queer creatures support themselves in the empty air by beating it with fans of various fantastic shapes; that other queer creatures steer themselves about alive under a load of mighty waters; that other queer creatures walk about on four legs, and that the queerest creature of all walks about on two. These are things and not theories; and compared with them evolution and the atom and even the solar system are merely theories. The matter here is one of history and not of philosophy; so that it need only be noted that no philosopher denies that a mystery still attaches to the two great transitions: the origin of the universe itself and the origin of the principle of life itself. Most philosophers have the enlightenment to add that a third mystery attaches to the origin of man himself. In other words, a third bridge was built across a third abyss of the unthinkable when there came into the world what we call reason and what we call will. Man is not merely an evolution but rather a revolution . . . the more we look at man as an animal, the less he will look like one."¹⁵

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

(3) Evolutionism has no adequate explanation of the process by which a variation in a parent organism becomes embodied in the parental reproductive cells (the fertilized ovum), obviously a change necessary to the transmission of the variation to the offspring. (4) Evolutionism does not give us any satisfactory account of the origin of the life process itself. (Spontaneous generation is now *theoretically* considered to have been a possibility, but as yet no direct evidence of its actual occurrence in nature has been brought to light.) (5) Evolutionism does not afford any explanation of the life process itself, that is, of the mysterious movement of life; rather, it simply starts with this movement as a fact, apparently indifferent to the importance of the *how* and *why* of it. One may watch the division of a single cell into two cells (as, *e.g.*, again the fertilized ovum), but no one understands why the cell divides and the process continues in geometrical proportion (one into two, two into four, four into eight, etc.), or how the daughter cell inherits the particular forms and functions of the parent cell. Why does this movement of life push upward, by differentiation of structure and specialization of function, into the vastly more and more complex forms and finally into the most complex form of all,—man. There is no evidence that a potency can actualize itself. What then is the Efficient Causality which actualizes all these changes which are supposed to become stabilized into the multifarious forms that make up the living world? (“Protoplasmic irritability” is a high-sounding phrase which reminds us of John Locke’s definition of matter as “something-I-know-not-what”).

(6) Evolutionism requires an almost unlimited stretch of time to account for all the changes envisioned by its advocates. Apparently they expect us to accept without question the necessity of such an extent of time to any adequate explanation of the process; and at the same time they arbitrarily use this hypothetical extent of time to

GENESIS

support their theory of the process. Is not this a form of begging the question? Is it not true that the stretch of time required by the theory puts it beyond any possibility of clear proof or disproof empirically, that is, by the testimony of eye-witnesses? One is reminded here of a stanza of Hilaire Belloc's "Ode to a Microbe"—

The Microbe is so very small
You cannot make him out at all,
But many sanguine people hope
To see him through a microscope.
His jointed tongue that lies beneath
A hundred curious rows of teeth;
His seven tufted tails with lots
Of lovely pink and purple spots,
On each of which a pattern stands,
Composed of forty separate bands;
His eyebrows of a tender green;
All these have never yet been seen—
But Scientists, who ought to know,
Assure us that they must be so . . .
Oh! let us never, never doubt
What nobody is sure about!

—From Belloc's *More Beasts for Worse Children*, in Belloc's *Cautionary Verses*. (Knopf, 1951).

(7) That the gap between the intelligence potential of man and that of any known animal species existent or extinct is inconceivably vast, is conceded by evolutionists today. Indeed, many eminent men in biological science are prone to accept the view that man's appearance on the scene is explainable only in terms of a mutation. (Incidentally, it should be made clear that evolutionists do not take the view that man is "nothing but" an animal. On the contrary, they hold that he has "evolved" beyond the brute stage; that, in short, he is *animal plus*. However, they insist that the difference is only one of *degree*, not one of *kind*.)

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

(8) The theory of mutations is that new forms come into being as wholes, as the result of sudden jumps in the process, and continue to "breed true" from the time of their "emergence." Do biologists have any explanation of the mysterious process by which a mutation is brought about? Obviously they do not. They seem to take it for granted that resident forces of some kind, or of various kinds, work effectively, either singly or collectively, to produce the mutation. Why this process occurs, or just how it occurs, no one knows. (Cosmic rays have been found to produce mutations in fruit flies, we are told). Yet it is inconceivable that evolution could ever have taken place unless the fact of mutations is granted. Many biologists, however, frown on the theory of mutations simply because they find it difficult to harmonize the theory with the mechanism of natural selection which they seek to establish. It is obvious that mutations have all the appearance of special creations.

(9) Despite positive assertions in which, as a rule, the theory to be proved is taken for granted, *the simple truth is that as yet no one knows just how a new species emerges or could emerge.*

(10) Evolutionism is unable as yet to give us a satisfactory account of the origin of sex differences. (It is interesting to note here that the Genesis Cosmogony is silent regarding the origin of females among subhuman orders, with the sole exception of the implication in Gen. 1:22. It is the human female, Woman, to whom our attention is especially directed in Scripture: Gen. 1:27-31).

(11) Evolutionism has no adequate explanation of the fact of *instinct*, of the almost inconceivable manifoldness of instinctive responses among subhuman creatures. Instinct has rightly been called "the Great Sphinx of Nature." If complexity of instinct were to be made the criterion of the classification of living forms in ascending order, it is obvious that the lowly Insecta would stand at the head

GENESIS

of the list, and man, poor man, would be somewhere near the bottom. Are not instinctive responses the media by means of which Divine Intelligence ensures the preservation of non-intelligent species? (12) It is doubtful that evolutionism could ever adequately account for the great variety of special organs in different species (characteristic of the entire complex of nature's adaptation to the needs of living creatures), organs such as wings, feathers, eyes, ears; fins and electric organs of fishes, poison glands and fangs of snakes, the "radar" system of bats, migratory powers of homing pigeons, and many others too numerous to mention. (13) As stated heretofore, structural resemblance does not necessarily prove emergence of the higher form from the lower. It may be the product of the activity of the Divine Mind creating according to an archetypal pattern (as in the instance of man's invention of the wheelbarrow, buggy, wagon, chariot, automobile, airplane, all of which manifest some structural resemblance). (14) Ordinarily, nature, when left to its own resources, seems to deteriorate rather than to advance. Any gardener knows that tomatoes produced by properly cultivated plants are always superior to those which are produced by seed or plant in what is called "volunteer" fashion. (15) The apparent non-fertility of hybrids would seem to militate against the evolution theory. (16) Apparently useless organs are not necessarily reduced or rudimentary, in many cases. Ignorance of the use or purpose of an organ is not in itself a proof that the organ has no necessary function at all. (17) Neither similarity nor gradation (nor both together) can prove emergence, that is, "continuous progressive change, according to fixed laws, by means of resident forces" (LeConte).

(18) Man has no known existing animal ancestors: those alleged humanoidal forms which are supposed to have existed prehistorically are now extinct, hence hypothetically identifiable only by isolated sparse skeletal remains

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

which have been found in different parts of the world. These remains of prehistoric man—prior to Cro-Magnon—are too fragmentary to allow for any reliable reconstruction of man's ancestry from the so-called *hominidae*. Nor do these widely scattered skeletal remains necessarily indicate that there were different "centers" of the origin of *homo sapiens*. What Dr. Bloom has said about such finds in Southern Africa is equally applicable to all other such discoveries: "When we speak of Plesianthropus as a found 'missing link,' this does not mean that man came from even that species. We mean only that we have a member of the family from one of whom man arose."¹⁶ As far as I know, no real evidence has ever been found that would discredit the generally accepted view that the cradle of the human race was where the Bible pictures it to have been, that is, in Southwest Asia. Moreover, evolutionists must accept the fact *that there had to be a space-time locus* at which the transition from *hominidae* to *homo sapiens* actually occurred; and that with the appearance of *homo sapiens*, reason also appeared (as indicated by the Latin *sapiens* or *sapientia*), and along with reason, conscience, which is the voice of practical reason. In view of these facts, it must also be recognized that all humanoidal forms existing prior to this transition were not forms of *homo sapiens*. The tendency of so many scientists to pontificate about these humanoidal finds makes it necessary for us to put their significance in proper perspective in order that we may not be led astray by exaggerations.

(19) The Mendelian laws of heredity have been generally accepted in biological science. However, it must be kept in mind that these "laws" are simply descriptions of what evidently takes place in transmission through the media of genes; they do not tell us why these transmissions take place as they do, nor do they give us any information as to the *modus operandi* of the transmissions themselves.

GENESIS

Even the genes themselves are only hypothetical "determiners" of heredity. This is true, of course, of practically all facets of the evolution theory: nearly all that the advocates have to tell us is *descriptive* in character; descriptive of *what* occurs, not of *why*, nor specifically of *how*, it occurs. Perhaps these are mysteries that lie beyond the scope of human comprehension.

(20) In the final analysis, *the arrival of a new species* is to be accounted for only on the ground of variations transmitted through the chromosomes and genes: as far as we know, inheritance in man takes place in no other way. If mutations be the final "explanation" of these genetic changes, then the mutations must have occurred in chronological sequence to have produced the continuous progressive changes (demanded by the theory) into more and more neurally complex organisms, culminating in the human organism. It is only a mark of sanity to conclude that there is reason and order back of this entire process, actualizing all such changes; and that the Cosmos is the handiwork of the Universal Mind and Will whom we call God (Psa. 19:1-6).

A word of clarification is needed at this point: I do not mean to assert that we are now in possession of all the information available with reference to the various aspects of evolutionism. Undoubtedly additional information will be coming to light, and, as is usually the case, the acquiring of this information will gain momentum, as time goes on, information tending either to refute the various criticisms of the evolution theory as presented in the foregoing paragraphs or to give added substantial support to the various facets of the over-all theory. We must await the discoveries that time may have in store for us in this particular area of knowledge, *always keeping in mind the firm conviction that truth never contradicts itself and that it will ultimately "out."*

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

10. *Materialistic evolutionism*. This is the doctrine that all things have evolved by accident or chance (that is, *purposelessness*). Devotees of this cult simply refuse to acknowledge Efficient Causality of any kind in the origin and preservation of the cosmos (with the possible exception of some form or forms of primal physical energy): they rest their case on the eternity of matter-in-motion. (Obviously this primal physical energy is their "god.") With disarming simplicity they proceed to describe all phenomena of the cosmos, including those of the life processes and of the thought processes, in terms of a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" (or sub-atomic forces). The creed of the materialistic evolutionists is bluntly stated in what may rightly be designated their "Bible," namely, the book by George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*. Simpson writes: "In preceding pages evidence was given, thoroughly conclusive, as I believe, that organic evolution is a process entirely materialistic in its origin and operation . . . It has also been shown that purpose and plan are not characteristic of organic evolution and are not a key to any of its operations . . . Man was certainly not the goal of evolution, which evidently had no goal," etc. He goes on to say, however, that with the entrance of the human mind into the process, purpose and plan did come into operation: this he designates "the new evolution." He writes: "But purpose and plan are characteristic in the new evolution, because man has purposes, and he makes plans. Here purpose and plan do definitely enter into evolution, as a result and not as a cause of the processes seen in the long history of life. The purposes and plans are ours, not those of the universe, which displays convincing evidence of their absence."¹⁷

Materialistic evolution is usually described as "mechanistic." The word "mechanism," however, has a question-begging aspect. Machines are contrivances, but as far as human experience goes, they are contrivances of some

GENESIS

intelligent agent to serve some function, to gain some end. Moreover, anyone who insists that the cosmos is just a great machine, is simply reading into his understanding of it the properties and powers *that he himself sees in a machine*. Now it seems obvious that in an organization of any kind an organizing agency is required: some power by which elements are organized into wholes of being; some power to marshal them into a cosmos or world order. This moreover, would have to be some kind of power that is entirely different from mechanical forces and the opposite of gravitational force; gravitational force tends to drag the physical world down to a "heat-death," which is technically defined as a state of "maximum entropy." (The physicists tell us that the cosmic clock, so to speak, is running down as matter continues to dissolve into radiation and energy continues to be dissipated into empty space.) However, the basic thesis of evolution is progression or progressive development: and progression is precisely the aspect that is of importance to it. But progression implies a goal to which the movement is directed, toward which someone or something is striving; and thus the idea of progression belies the concept of mechanism. Obviously, "mechanism" and "evolution" are irreconcilable terms. As Butler has written, in his famous *Analogy*: "The only distinct meaning of the word 'natural' is *stated, fixed, or settled*: since what is natural as much requires and presupposes an intelligent agent to render it so, *i.e.*, to effect it continually or at stated times, as what is supernatural or miraculous does to effect it for once." In a word, with respect to what are called "the laws of nature," we should not say, "the more law, the less God," but we should say, "the more law, the more God." LaPlace once declared that he had swept the heavens with his telescope and could not find a God anywhere. One of his contemporaries remarked that "he might just as well have swept his kitchen with a broom." Because God is not corporeal being in any

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

sense (John 4:24, Exo. 3:14), He is not to be apprehended by any physical or corporeal means (John 1:18). Hence the stupidity of the Russian cosmonaut who is reported to have said that in all his travels throughout the celestial realm he had searched the stratosphere in every direction to find God but had failed to do so. Of course he failed—the humblest, most uneducated student of the Bible knows why.

The Christian, of course, cannot possibly accept materialistic evolutionism, because it directly contradicts the Biblical doctrine of the sovereignty and eternal purpose of God (Isa. 46:9-11; Acts 15:18, 17:30-31; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; Eph. 3:8-12). Nor is there any special reason why any Christian, or any other intelligent person, should accept it, for several reasons. In the first place, any unbiased person can readily see that the phenomena of personality (perception, consciousness, and especially *meaning*) are not entirely reducible, if reducible at all, to "matter in motion" (brain cell activity). As the noted physicist, Arthur Eddington, has written: "Force, energy, dimensions belong to the world of symbols: it is out of such conceptions that we have built up the external world of physics . . . We have to build the spiritual world out of symbols taken from our own personality, as we build the scientific world out of the symbols of the mathematician."¹⁸

In the second place, materialistic evolutionism cannot be harmonized with the empirical fact of cosmic order. This order is clearly evident (a) from the mathematical relations characteristic of the processes of the physical world and the mathematical formulae by which they are amenable to precise description; (b) from the manifold interrelationships of ends and means, as empirically discerned, prevailing throughout the totality of being; (c) from the predetermined (planned) life cycles of all living species; and (d) from the over-all adaptation of nature

GENESIS

to human life and its needs. As stated often herein, the word *cosmos* means *order*; lacking this order, human science would not be possible, for the simple reason that science is man's discovery and description of the order prevailing in the various segments of the natural world. Surely this architectonic order presupposes a Supreme Orderer, a directing Mind and Will. *It is inconceivable that sheer chance could have produced the order we see all around us.*

To be sure, in our day evolutionists admit the introduction of purpose, now that—as they contend—psychological evolution has taken over from the biological. (We have noted this in the excerpt quoted above from Simpson's book.) Purpose entered the cosmic picture—we are told—along with the human intellect and its power of purposeful selection and striving. It strikes me, however, that by correlating purpose with *human mental activity*, by analogy we are bound to conclude that the design which prevails throughout the subhuman world points irrefutably to *another and superior kind of mental activity*, that of the Creative Intelligence and Will. Man obviously does not create; he simply uses the material he finds at hand to be used.

11. *Theistic evolutionism.* This is the view, stated in simplest terms, that evolution is God's method of creation. Under this view, the important question for us is this: Can theistic evolutionism be harmonized with Biblical teaching, in particular with the Genesis account of the Creation?

It should be emphasized here, first of all, I think, that Darwin never did deny God's Creatorship. In the closing paragraphs of his *Origin of Species* he wrote as follows; "Authors of the highest eminence seem to be fully satisfied with the view that each species has been independently created. To my mind it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by the Creator, that the

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

production and extinction of the past and present inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes, like those determining the birth and death of the individual . . . There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved." In the *Life* of Darwin, we find this statement: "In my most extreme fluctuations, I have never been an atheist, in the sense of denying the existence of a God."¹⁹ Darwin was a very modest man, even to the extent of making an interesting "confession"; he described his own mind as having become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts, with the result of producing "atrophy of that part of the brain on which the higher tastes depend."²⁰ This is a remarkable statement and one which scientists generally should treat seriously. Apparently T. H. Huxley had the same experience, albeit unwittingly; as stated in terms of May Kendall's parody:

"Primroses by the river's brim
Dicotyledons were to him,
And they were nothing more."

(We are reminded here of Lord Bacon's declaration that man cannot enter the kingdom of science, any more than he can enter the kingdom of heaven, without becoming as a little child.) It was not Darwin who developed evolutionism in such a form as to make a Creator superfluous (nor in truth was it either Huxley or Spencer); rather, it was Haeckel (whose fulminations became most embarrassing to Darwin at times) and his successors in the present century who are responsible for this development. Dr. Strong is right in saying that "an atheistic and un-

GENESIS

teleological evolution is a reversion to the savage view of animals as brethren, and to the heathen idea of a sphynx-man growing out of the brute."²¹

Theistic evolutionists, as stated above, hold that evolution was in all likelihood God's method of creation. There are many educated and sincerely religious persons who hold that theistic evolutionism if "properly stated" (that is, within certain limitations) is not necessarily in conflict with the teaching of Genesis, if the latter is also "constructively interpreted." In the exposition of this general view, the student should consider the following matters of importance:

(1) There is a clear correspondence between the Genesis Cosmogony and present-day scientific thought on many points. (These harmonies have been listed on preceding pages of this Part of our textbook.)

(2) It must always be kept in mind that the major aim of the Genesis Cosmogony, and indeed of the whole Bible, is to tell us *who* made the cosmos, and not *how* it was made. It was what *God* said that "was so," that is, that "was done" (Gen. 1:3,7,11,15,21,25; Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148:6), but the inspired writer makes no effort whatsoever to inform us as to how it was done. It is crystal clear that the narrative is intended to be a *religious*, and not a scientific, account of the Creation.

(3) There is nothing in the Genesis text that constrains us to accept the ultra-literal view that God spoke all living species into existence at one and the same time. On the contrary, according to the narrative itself, the activity of Creation was extended over six "days" and a fraction of the seventh. This is true, however we may see fit to interpret the word "day."

(4) Certainly the weight of all the evidence available, as explained in an earlier section of this textbook, is in support of the view that the "days" of the Genesis account were not solar days, but *aeonic* days; that is, indefinite

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISM

periods of time. *Thus the narrative allows for all the time the evolutionists may want to muster up theoretically in support of their theory.*

(5) Evidently infinity in God has no reference to any kind of magnitude because God is Spirit (John 4:24); rather, the term designates the inexhaustible Source of Power by which the cosmos was created and is sustained in its processes. Hence the problem before us is not one of *power*, but one of *method*. What method, then, did the Creator use? Was Creation a long-drawn-out process of progressive development, or was it a process of actualization in a very brief time-span? But, after all, what difference does it make, whether it was the one or the other? Whether the Creation extended over six or seven solar days, or over six or seven aeonic days, *the same measure of Creative Power would have been necessary in either case.*

Because this problem is one of method, and not one of power, why do not the textbooks writers on this subject make this clear, and by so doing remove much of the ground on which their texts are resentfully criticized by Christian leaders. All that would be required would be a simple statement of the fact that the time element involved has little or nothing to do with the expenditure of Energy necessary to effect the actualization of the process. The reason seems obvious, I should say: Many of them actually want to belittle Biblical teaching and to create a thorough-going "naturalism" which would rule the Creator out of the cosmic picture altogether. I have long been convinced that this is a case in which the wish is father to the thought; that the will not to believe is the primary motivation; and that the elimination of everything superhuman or supernatural is the ultimate objective of the "positivists," "naturalists," "humanists," and all those of like persuasion.

GENESIS

(6) As a matter of fact, the language of the Genesis Cosmogony allows for Divinely directed progressive development through the media of secondary causes, throughout the Creation. This is clearly implicit in God's decrees, "Let the earth put forth grass," etc., "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures," "Let the earth bring forth living creatures," etc.; and even in the earlier decrees with reference to non-living being, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters," "Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place," "let the dry land appear," etc. The idea implicit in the original here is that of *causation*, as if to say, "let the earth *cause* . . . let the seas *cause*, it to be done," etc. We see no reason for rejecting the view that God, whose Will is the constitution of the cosmos and its processes, should operate through the majesty and the sovereign power of His own established decrees.

(7) There are philosophers and theologians who take the position that at certain stages in the Creation, God, by *direct* action (that is, *primary*, as distinguished from *secondary*, causation) inserted new and higher powers into the Cosmic Process, the first above the inanimate world (matter-in-motion) being the *life process* (cellular activity), then *consciousness* (the product of sensitivity), and finally, *self-consciousness* (person and personality). Obviously, these are phenomena which mark off, and set apart, the successively more complex levels of being as we know, these levels empirically. On the basis of this theory, it is held that even though variations—both upward (progressive) and downward (retrogressive)—by means of *resident* forces, may have occurred on the level of plant life and that of animal life, the actualization of the first form of *energy-matter*, first *life*, first *consciousness*, and first *personality* (homo sapiens) must have been of the character of special creations. It is interesting to recall the fact here that Wallace, the author with Darwin of the

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

theory of natural selection, held that there were three breaks in the progressive continuity, namely, with the appearance of life, with the appearance of sensation and consciousness, and finally with the appearance of spirit. These breaks seem to correspond in a general way to *vegetable*, *animal*, and *rational* (human) life, in the order named.²²

(8) Finally, it must be admitted that one of man's most common fallacies is that of trying to project his own puny concepts of time into the sphere of God's *timelessness*. God does not hurry; His timelessness is Eternity. (2 Pet. 3:8, 2 Cor. 4:18).

12. *Theistic evolutionism and Gen. 2:7*. The crucial problem involved here, of course, is that of the origin of *homo sapiens*; as stated in a nutshell, can theistic evolutionism be harmonized with the teaching of Gen. 2:7? Can a Christian accept the view that man arrived on the scene through descent (or ascent?) from a brute animal species? Can such a view be harmonized in any way with the description of man as a body-spirit unity (or body-mind unity) that is explicitly given us in Gen. 2:7? Dr. A. H. Strong argues rather eloquently for an affirmative answer to these two questions, as follows: "Evolution does not make the idea of a Creator superfluous, because evolution is only the method of God. It is perfectly consistent with a Scriptural doctrine of Creation that man should emerge at the proper time, governed by different laws from the brute creation yet growing out of the brute, just as the foundation of a house built of stone is perfectly consistent with the wooden structure built upon it." (Is not this, however, an irrelevant analogy?) Again: "The Scriptures do not disclose the method of man's creation. Whether man's physical system is or is not derived by natural descent from the lower animals, the record of creation does not inform us . . . We are compelled, then, to believe that God's 'breathing into man's nostrils the

GENESIS

breath of life' (Gen. 2:7), though it was a mediate creation as presupposing existing material in the shape of animal forms, was yet an immediate creation in the sense that only a divine reinforcement of the process of life turned the animal into man. In other words, man came not *from* the brute, but *through* the brute, and the same immanent God who had previously created the brute created also the man."²³

To me it is inconceivable that the inspired writer of Genesis 2:7 could have had any such idea in mind as that suggested by Dr. Strong in the statements quoted above. Of course, it is entirely possible that the Spirit of God deliberately caused the material of the Genesis Cosmogony to be presented in a form such as to make it adaptable to man's ever-increasing knowledge of his external environment (cf. Gen. 1:28). This seems to have been true of the over-all panoramic picture of the Creation given us in Gen. 1:1–2:3. That is, having sketched in broad outlines the religious truths of the Genesis narrative, He may well have left it to man himself to spell out as best he can the essentially scientific (empirical) evidence concerning the origin of the cosmos and its manifold forms.

In relation to evolutionism, the meaning of Gen. 2:7 is to be studied primarily in the light of the phrase, "the dust of the ground." Surely we have here, in the verse as a whole, a portrait in what we of the modern world would call *archaic* language. Yet the portrait turns out to be scientific in the sense of the now-recognized fact that man is in truth a *psychosomatic* unity. Obviously, in terms of modern scientific thought, the writer of Gen. 2:7 would have us to know that man in his present state is both *body* and *mind* (or *spirit*) and that he is immeasurably more than body alone; that his body—"the earthly house of our tabernacle" (2 Cor. 5:1, Wisdom 9:15)—like all things corporeal, shares the properties of what is commonly designated physical energy or matter; that in short he has

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

a body akin to all earthly living bodies. This is surely the import of the verse as a whole: as Murphy tersely puts it: Man "is a combination of matter and mind."²⁴ The narrative here, writes Whitelaw, "which, beginning with the construction of his body from the fine dust of the ground, designedly represents it as an evolution or development of the material universe."²⁵ Marcus Dods writes: "The discovery of the process by which the presently existing living forms have been evolved, and the perception that this process is governed by laws which have always been operating, do not make intelligence and design at all less necessary, but rather more so."²⁶ Obviously, the writer could not have presented this thought in present-day scientific terms: he did not have the language for such a communication, and even if he could have had the proper language at his disposal, no one could have understood it. It seems, therefore, that the Spirit has left it to man's intelligence to fathom the implications of this revelation. The passage, as it stands, appears to me to be irrelevant in respect to modern scientific explanations, even though possibly amenable to interpretation in modern scientific terms. Hence, it can hardly be said either to prove or to disprove them.

Is the "breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life" to be correctly explained (as in Strong's language) as a "reinforcement of the process of life" that "turned the animal into a man"? The word "reinforcement" as used here strikes me as being exceedingly vague. What kind of "reinforcement"? Or, just what did this "reinforcement" involve? Surely the text of Gen. 2:7 leaves us with only one valid interpretation, namely, that "the breath of God" carried with it a direct impartation from God Himself of those powers which specify man as man—his intellectual, moral and spiritual endowments, in fact the whole of his interior life: hence the declaration in Gen. 1:28 that he was created in the image of God. Surely this phrase,

GENESIS

"image of God," disallows the claim one frequently encounters that the "breath of God" of Gen. 2:7 designates the impartation to man of the vital principle only. Gen. 1:28, if it means anything, surely means that God breathed into him, not just the life principle, but the rational principle as well. (Cf. Gen. 6:17, Acts 17:25, Eccl. 12:7). These are the powers which separate man from the brute creation. Hence, because these powers are so far superior to any that are manifested by brutes, even by the highest primates, I find it impossible to accept the view that the difference of man from the brute is simply one of *degree*. My conviction is that the difference is, and will always be, one of *kind*. However Dr. Strong's theory of "reinforcement" is to be explained, whether anthropomorphically (which certainly is not to be ruled out) or by mutation (in some manner biologically) it certainly was of the character of a special creation. Even though evolutionistic progression may have occurred on the plant level, on the animal level, or on both, certainly in the vast leap from the brute to man, a special Divine operation of some kind affords the only satisfactory explanation of its occurrence. I am not convinced that the case for the evolution of man's interior mental, moral, and spiritual propensities—his essential being, *as man*—from hypothetical primate and humanoidal forms has ever been proved. In all likelihood this is a mystery which will never become fully known to man, either by divine revelation or by scientific discovery, simply because it lies beyond the scope of comprehension by the human intellect.

I therefore summarize as follows: I strenuously object to the manner in which the theory of evolution has been built up into what might be called a *dogma*. Many modern textbooks are replete with assertions of, and statements about, what is designated the "fact" of evolution. This usually occurs when, from an author's viewpoint, the wish is father to the thought. It is unfortunately true that when

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

certain of the intelligentsia lose their faith in God, they avidly seek every possible device to bolster their unbelief. To say that evolution is a "fact," however, is going entirely too far, especially in the attempt to establish a theory which is constructed for the most part on *inference*. Whether this inference is *necessary* inference or not, or just sheer conjecture, remains a moot question. Bold assertions do not cover lack of concrete evidence. Although I have never been able to bring myself to the point of accepting many of the exaggerated claims that are made by the evolutionists, yet after some fifteen years of dealing with college students, it has become my conviction that there is no real need for adding difficulties for them unnecessarily, or setting up and shooting at what may turn out to be straw men. Hence, the material of this section has been organized and presented with the end in view of helping the student to be strengthened in the most holy faith. If this can be accomplished without doing violence to the sacred text, *on any subject that has been more or less controversial*, I think it should be done. *I cannot convince myself that acceptance or rejection of any theory of the method of the Creation that recognizes and allows for the operation of Divine Intelligence and Power should ever be made a test of fellowship in a church of the New Testament order.* (See my *Survey Course in Christian Doctrine*, Vol. I, pp. 175-186. College Press, Joplin, Missouri, 1962.)

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TEN

1. Define the word *science*. What is epistemology?
2. Why do we say that the "laws" of nature (of physics, chemistry, geology, biology, etc.) are statements of *very great probability*?

GENESIS

3. Distinguish between science and scientism.
4. Why do we affirm that much of the loose talk about alleged "conflicts" between Biblical teaching and scientific thinking in our day simply "need not be"?
5. List the harmonies between present-day science and the Genesis Cosmogony.
6. What is meant by the "blind spots" of materialists, naturalists, humanists, etc.?
7. Explain how the theory of *epiphenomenalism* is not necessarily to be regarded as antiBiblical.
8. Explain how present-day physics supports the Christian doctrine of immortality.
9. Explain how the theory of *emergent evolution* is not necessarily to be regarded as antiBiblical.
10. Explain the ambiguity of the word "evolution."
11. Explain what is meant by the *genetic fallacy*.
12. State LeCôte's definition of evolution.
13. Explain the present-day theory of *societal* (or *psychological*) evolution as related to the biological.
14. What is the meaning of the word "organismic" in relation to theories of "emergent" evolution?
15. Explain the difference between *evolution* and *evolutionism*.
16. State the contributions of Lamarck, Darwin, Weismann, De Vries, and Mendel, respectively, to evolutionism.
17. What are mutations?
18. Explain what is meant by the movement of evolution.
19. Explain orthogenesis, also Bergson's fountainlike evolutionism.
20. List the kinds of evidence usually cited to support the theory of evolution.
21. Explain what is meant by the evolution *dogma*.

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

22. Explain the fallacy in the title, "Can Science Produce Life?"
23. Summarize Thompson's critique of evolutionism.
24. Explain how scientists have extended the notion of "continuous progressive change" to practically every aspect of the cosmos.
25. Explain what is meant by the fallacy of *over-simplification*.
26. Explain what is meant when we say that evolutionism has no adequate explanation of the transmission of variations from parents to offspring.
27. Does evolutionism give us any adequate explanation of the life movement itself? Explain your answer.
28. Explain how the unlimited stretch of time that is required by evolutionism is a form of *begging the question*.
29. How do mutations fit into the general theory of evolution? How are mutations to be accounted for?
30. Does structural resemblance necessarily prove emergence? Explain your answer.
31. List various facts of the world we live in, for which evolutionism can give no satisfactory explanation.
32. What is materialistic evolutionism? Explain why Christians cannot accept it, and why there is no real ground for any intelligent person to accept it.
33. What is the fallacy in the so-called "mechanistic" explanation of the origin of the cosmos?
34. Explain what is meant by theistic evolutionism?
35. What did Darwin have to say about the activity of the Creator in the origin of the biological world?
36. Summarize the arguments that may be offered in support of theistic evolutionism.
37. What is meant by the statement that the Creator may have operated through secondary causes in bringing the world into existence?

GENESIS

38. Summarize Dr. Strong's application of evolutionism to the account of the creation of man in Gen. 2:7. Do you consider the explanation valid? Explain your answer.
39. Discuss the likelihood of any correlation between the phrase, "the dust of the ground," as occurring in Gen. 2:7, and the theory of evolution.
40. What, obviously, is the full meaning of Genesis 2:7?
41. Summarize our general conclusions about evolutionism in relation to the Hebrew Cosmogony.

- 1) D. Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 168. Harpers, 1957.
- 2) C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Philosophy*, p. 309. Dover, 1936.
- 3) Cohen and Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*, p. 389. Harcourt, Brace, 1934.
- 4) *Ibid.*, p. 390.
- 5) See J. C. Smuts, *Holism and Evolution*, pp. 261-262. Macmillan, 1926.
- 6) Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, pp. 290, 311. Trans. from the French by Bernard Wall. Harper Torchbook, 1961.
- 7) G. T. W. Patrick, *Introduction to Philosophy*, Revised Edition, pp. 122-124. Houghton Mifflin, 1935.
- 8) See Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, trans. by Arthur Mitchell. Holt, 1911.
- 9) Patrick, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
- 10) Arthur Kenyon Rogers, *A Student's History of Philosophy*, Third Edition, pp. 472-473. Macmillan, 1937.
- 11) James H. Jauncey, *Science Returns to God*, p. 57. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1961.
- 12) See *Herald and Presbyter*, Nov. 22, 1914. Quoted by William Jennings Bryan, *In His Image*, p. 91. Oliphants, London, and Revell, New York, 1922.

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

- 13) See "P. H."—*The Welshimer Story*, by Francis M. Arant. Standard, Cincinnati, 1958.
- 14) G. T. W. Patrick, *op. cit.*, p. 144.
- 15) G. K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man*, pp. 21-25. Doubleday Image Book, 1955.
- 16) Quoted by Douglas Dewar, *The Transformist Illusion*, p. 125. DeHoff, Murfreesboro, Tenn., 1957.
- 17) George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*, p. 143. Mentor Book Edition.
- 18) Sir Arthur Eddington, *Science and the Unseen World*, p. 82. Macmillan, 1930.
- 19) *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, 1:274.
- 20) Quoted by A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, One Volume Edition, p. 36. Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1907.
- 21) Strong, *ibid.*, p. 473.
- 22) Alfred Russel Wallace, *Darwinism*, pp. 445-478. Quoted by Strong, *ibid.*, p. 473.
- 23) See Strong, *ibid.*, pp. 465-466.
- 24) *Murphy on Genesis*, p. 84. Estes and Lariat, Boston, 1873.
- 25) Thomas Whitelaw, *Pulpit Commentary: Genesis*, p. 41. Funk and Wagnalls, New York.
- 26) Marcus Dods, *The Expositor's Bible: Genesis*, p. 10. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1895.

ADDENDA: COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

(Theories of the Origin and Organization of the Cosmos)

EMANATIONISM: Unity prior to plurality. Creation is conceived as a process of the "watering down" of perfection, as, for example, light, in moving away from its source and thus becoming diffused, is finally lost in darkness. Darkness is non-being, and non-being is usually identified with gross matter. The most thoroughgoing emanation cults were those of the Gnostics and especially that of Plotinus, which is known as Neoplatonism.

GENESIS

PLOTINUS (A.D. 205-270).

(The Egyptian Neoplatonist, who derived his system largely from his teacher, Ammonius Saccas. His writings were published by Porphyry in six books, each consisting of nine sections, hence entitled the *Enneads*.) Origen and Augustine both were greatly influenced by Neoplatonism. The following should be read downward:

The One

Nous	one: world unity, prior to the possibility of plurality
	many: "ideas" or "forms" of all possible existents: (1) universals, (2) particulars
Soul	one: world soul, undivided
	many: individual souls, (1) unconscious, (2) conscious of ideas
Body	one: world body, as a whole
	many: particular bodies (1) as wholes, (2) decomposed

The Void

Gross matter: non-being

Gnosticism, in its various cults, postulated a series of emanations from the Absolute Being or Unity in the forms of psychic intermediaries, known as *aeons*. According to this early Christian heresy, Christ Himself was just such an emanation or aeon. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the Deists of a later age were prone to regard the "laws of nature" as emanations, hence as having a kind of independent existence.

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

PHILOSOPHICAL HINDUISM

(or Hindu Mysticism. Very old, as set forth in the
Upanishads)

Again, read downward:

Brahman (perfect unity)

Atman (unity that pervades plurality)

Souls (plurality that is really unity)

Illusion (*Maya*) Bodies (plurality that is mistaken for reality)

Castes (levels of social classes)

Animals (levels of animal life)

Plants (levels of plant life)

Matter (levels of decomposition)

It will be noted that emanationist systems all tend toward pantheism, the doctrine that identifies God with what we commonly call His Creation. The fallacies of pantheism are clearly pointed out in the following terse statements by C. H. Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religions*, p. 476: "Pantheism has never commended itself to the masses of men . . . The demand for a deity with whom one may enter into personal relations—the simple concept of a God who dwells apart satisfies the religious instincts of the majority of men. The ethical questions arising from pantheism seem to them perplexing: how can man be morally responsible when it is the deity who thinks and acts in him? and how can he have any sense

GENESIS

of loyalty to a deity whom he cannot distinguish from himself? . . . Man demands a method of worship, and pantheism does not permit organized worship." Moreover, pantheism, by distributing the Divine essence through all cosmic existents, inanimate or animate, amoral or moral, makes God to be the author of evil as well as of good; to this fact the only alternative would be *that evil is illusion*, and this is the corner in which Absolutists are uniformly forced to take refuge. May I remind the student that an illusion is necessarily an illusion of something: an illusion of nothing or nothingness is inconceivable.

PLATO'S COSMOLOGY

(Plato lived 427-347 B.C. See his "likely story" of the Creation, in the *Timaeus*.)

Being: The Forms (Ideas): The Form of the Good,

Unity

Forms of all classes of existents

The Demiurgos (Craftsman, Architect)

The World: World-Soul

Becoming: Rational Souls

Irrational Souls

Inanimate Bodies

Non-being: Indeterminate matter

Plato can hardly be classified as an emanationist: in fact it is difficult to put his cosmology in any definite category. In the *Timaeus*, he pictures the Creation as having been actualized by the Demiurgos (Master Craftsman, Great Architect,) as the World-Soul, according to the archetypal Forms, out of what he calls the Receptacle. This last term

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

seems to have been the word he used to designate the Void (empty space). It will be recalled that the Greek word *chaos* denoted, not disorder, but empty space; hence this was the Greek term generally used for non-being which was conceived to be what we call "matter." (Cf. Plotinus, above). The Forms, in Plato's thought, were the Principles of classification, *e.g.*, the "mustardness" of a mustard seed, the "horseness" of a horse; that is, that which specifies the individuals of each particular kind of things. Had he put these Forms in the Mind of "The Divine"—The Form of the Good, that is, Unity—his system would have to be regarded as theistic; however, there seems to be no evidence in his writings that he took this step; he apparently gave the Forms an eternally separate existence in themselves. Hence, we must conclude that on the whole Plato favored a view of the Deity as immanent, and that his system was weighted in the direction of a "higher pantheism." This is evident from the fact that the World-Soul (as the "Prime Mover") is presented as spreading out throughout the cosmos and as directing its processes and changes from within. As a matter of fact, Plato obviously belonged to the Greek philosophical tradition (Aristotelianism alone excepted) in which the Divine Principle ("God") is conceived pantheistically as That Which Is, in striking contrast to the Hebrew voluntarism in which God is revealed as He Who Is (Exo. 3:14), in a word, as pure personality.

ARISTOTLE'S HIERARCHY OF BEING

God

(defined as Pure Thought Thinking Itself: cf. John 4:24)

GENESIS

rational psyche ("soul")

(physiochemical processes, cellular processes, sensitivity, locomotion, *plus* reason)

animal psyche

(physiochemical processes and cellular processes *plus* sensitivity and locomotion)

vegetative psyche

(physiochemical processes, *plus* the cellular processes)

matter-in-motion

(or in modern terms, the physiochemical processes of the inanimate world)

Aristotle, in his *De Anima* ("On the Soul"), pictures the totality of being as a hierarchy, that is, as organized on different levels in an ascending scale of complexity of powers, in which each higher order subsumes the powers of those below it. Analysis of the nature of "movement" (change) convinced Aristotle that in order to account for the complex of contingent causes-and-effects which is the cosmos, there must be a First Cause, a First or Prime Mover, who is self-existent (*sui generis*), that is, non-contingent and without beginning or end, the only alternative being that somewhere, at some time, nothing must have originated the first something—a notion utterly absurd, of course; or, as someone has put it, the "first mover" must himself be unmoved, except from within, and different from the "first moved." This Prime Mover, otherwise described as Pure Thought Thinking Itself, is Aristotle's God, who is presented as affecting the universe without being a part of it. Hence, it will be seen that Aristotle's

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

God is transcendent, and that his system more nearly approximates theism than that of any other Greek philosopher. (Aristotle lived 384-322 B.C., and was a student at Plato's school, the Academy, for some twenty years.)

Why does our world exist instead of any other kind of world? asked the German philosopher, Leibniz (1646-1716). Simply because (Leibniz concluded) God has chosen, not to create any kind of world at random, but to create the best of all possible worlds, that is, the best He found it possible to create for achieving His ends, the actualization of the greatest possible good and the least possible evil. (Evil, Leibniz held, is of three kinds, namely, physical evil (suffering), moral evil (sin), and metaphysical evil: this he defined in terms of the necessary imperfection of finite beings.) Therefore, because our world is the handiwork of this Perfect Being (The Absolute Monad), it must be the actualization of the fulness of created being. In such a world (reasoning *a priori*, of course), all possible beings must be actualized, all possible levels (grades) filled therein: there must be *unbroken continuity in the form of progressive gradation of organisms* from the very lowest living being up to the very highest, God Himself. Thus arose the doctrine of the Great Chain of Being, a doctrine which flourished in early modern times, and which, obviously, is largely in accord with present-day evolutionism. (For a thoroughgoing presentation of this view, see the excellent book by Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, published by the Harvard University Press, 1950. The concept is also clearly set forth in the poem by Alexander Pope, "An Essay on Man.")

GENESIS

EMERGENTISM

(This is the view that unity is in the process of emerging out of plurality. The process is, and probably will always be, an unfinished process. The following tables are to be read upward,)

	God	
Mind	Mind	Society
	Life	Mind
Life	Matter	Life
Matter	Space-Time	Matter

C. Lloyd Morgan, Samuel Alexander, Roy Wood Sellars,
in his book, *Emer-* in his book, *Time* in his book, *Evolu-*
gent Evolution, and Deity, 1920. *tionary Natural-*
1923, *ism*, 1922.

Emergentism (discussed on preceding pages), though at times paying lip service to a "God," is strictly pantheistic in character. In all cases, it rejects the theistic doctrine of God's transcendence. It ignores uniformly the necessity of Efficient Causality in all cosmic processes.

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

I have presented the foregoing concepts (and diagrams) for the purpose of demonstrating the futility of all efforts to obtain complete knowledge of the origin and organization of the cosmos through unaided human reason. The ultimate mysteries are inscrutable. These various philosophical theories surely prove this to be true; that is, they prove the inherent incapacity of the human mind to explain (as Chesterton has put it) how nothing could turn into something or how something could turn into something else. How refreshing to turn away from the best that human wisdom can afford us, and to accept by faith the Biblical teaching, on these subjects! (Cf. Job 11:7; Isa. 55:6-11; 1 Cor. 1:18-25, 3:18-20; Rom. 11:33-36; Heb. 11:3).

The following tables will serve to point up the correspondences between the empirical (commonsense) and the Biblical accounts of the origin and organization of the created world:

self-consciousness (the person)	God (Pure Spirit: John 4:24)
consciousness (the brute)	Angels (ethereal beings, "ministering spirits": Heb. 1:14)
life (the cell)	Souls (Gen. 2:7)
energy-matter (non-living)	Bodies Matter

The EMPIRICAL ACCOUNT of the Dimensions of Being, based on observation and experience.

(Read upward)

The BIBLICAL ACCOUNT of Being.

(Read upward)

GENESIS

Day 7—rest

Day 6—man and woman, *bara*, v. 28; Gen. 2:7
land animals

Day 5—water and air species,
bara, v. 21

Day 4—chronology (measurement
of time)

GOD

Day 3—plants,
lands and seas

Day 2—atmosphere (“expanse”)

Day 1—energy, light, matter:
bara, v. 1

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY (Gen. 1:1–2:3)
(read upward)

Some hold that God, the Eternal Spirit, created without the use of pre-existing materials, inserting new increments of power into the Creative Process at successively higher levels. Some hold that God put into Prime (First) Matter all potentialities (Forms) later actualized by His Efficient Causality.

N.B.—For the diagrams presented above as illustrative of the Emanation and Emergent-Evolution theories of the origin and organization of the cosmos, I am indebted to Dr. Archie J. Bahm, Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico. These diagrams appear in his well-known book, *Philosophy: An Introduction*, published by Wiley and Sons, 1953. It is by his permission that I reproduce them here, and for this privilege I am deeply grateful.—C.C.C.

COSMOLOGICAL THEORIES

Dr. A. H. Strong, in his *Systematic Theology*, suggests that the content of the Biblical teaching falls under the category of what is philosophically designated Ethical Monism.

It is my conviction, however, that Dr. Bahm, in the work cited above, presents a philosophical view which approximates rather closely the essence of the Genesis Cosmogony. Dr. Bahm has named his theory Organicism. Should the student wish to pursue the subject further, he can do so by familiarizing himself with the argument presented in Chapter 20 of Bahm's book.

The late Martin Buber, the Jewish theistic existentialist, in his book entitled *The Eclipse of God* develops the thesis that whereas philosophy holds fast to an image of God, or even to a faith in God, religion holds fast to God Himself. This is a true contrast.

I must confess that I find philosophical theory and terminology, aside from suggesting clues now and then to the understanding of certain matters of Christian doctrine, to have little in common with Biblical revelation as a whole.

Now may I close this volume with a personal confession, namely: I could never substitute for faith in the Biblical Heavenly Father who has revealed Himself to us in His Son Jesus Christ (Heb. 1:1-4, 11:6; John 15:1), any coldly intellectual philosophical theory of the origin and nature of the Mystery of Being. I recall here the striking forcefulness of the questions which Zophar the Naamathite addressed to Job in olden times: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" (Job 11:7). There is but one answer to these questions—an

GENESIS

unequivocal negative. Or, as the Apostle Paul puts it: "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God" (1 Cor. 3:19). Again: "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:21). Through the foolishness of the preaching of what? The preaching of "Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumblingblock, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:23-24).