

GENESIS

THE BOOK OF
THE BEGINNINGS --- --

Other Books in the
BIBLE STUDY TEXTBOOK SERIES

- ACTS MADE ACTUAL
- THE CHURCH IN THE BIBLE
- ROMANS REALIZED
- HELPS FROM HEBREWS
- THE GOSPEL OF JOHN VOL. I & II
- GUIDANCE FROM GALATIANS
- THE GREATEST WORK IN THE WORLD
- PAUL'S LETTER TO TIMOTHY AND TITUS
- SURVEY COURSE IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE VOL. I
- SURVEY COURSE IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE VOL. II
- SURVEY COURSE IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE VOLS. III & IV
- LETTERS FROM PETER
- THINKING THROUGH THESSALONIANS
- STUDIES IN FIRST CORINTHIANS
- STUDIES IN SECOND CORINTHIANS
- THE SEER, THE SAVIOUR, AND THE SAVED IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION
- STUDIES IN LUKE
- JAMES AND JUDE
- THE GOSPEL OF MARK
- GENESIS VOLUME I
- HEREBY WE KNOW—THE EPISTLES OF JOHN
- STUDIES IN SAMUEL
- OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

Other Books by C. C. Crawford

Published by *DeHoff Publications*, Murfreesboro, Tennessee

- SERMON OUTLINES ON ACTS
- SERMON OUTLINES ON THE RESTORATION PLEA
- SERMON OUTLINES ON THE CROSS OF CHRIST
- SERMON OUTLINES ON FIRST PRINCIPLES

Published by *The College Press*, Joplin, Missouri

- SURVEY COURSE IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE (in four Vols.)
- GENESIS: THE BOOK OF THE BEGINNINGS VOL. I

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

- COMMONSENSE ETHICS

BIBLE STUDY TEXTBOOK SERIES

GENESIS

THE BOOK OF
THE BEGINNINGS

Vol. II.

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

College Press, Joplin, Missouri

Copyright, 1968

The College Press

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS

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

SPECIFIC ABBREVIATIONS (BIBLIOGRAPHICAL)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL SPECIFIC ABBREVIATIONS (BIBLIOGRAPHICAL)

(as used in this Volume only)

- ABOT Aldo J. Tos, *Approaches to the Bible: The Old Testament*. Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- AC Miguel de Unamuno, *The Agony of Christianity*, trans. by Pierre Loving. Payson and Clarke Ltd., New York, 1928.
- ADB John W. Haley, *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*. Originally published in 1874. Out of print.
- Anth. Alexander Goldenweiser, *Anthropology*. Crofts, 1946.
- BG Charles F. Pfeiffer, *The Book of Genesis*. Shield Bible Study Series, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1963.
- BMS Henry M. Morris, *The Bible and Modern Science*. Moody Press, 1958.
- BS Godet, *Biblical Studies*. Out of print.
- BWR Hugh J. Schonfeld, *The Bible Was Right*. Signet Key Book, New American Library of World Literature, 1959.
- CAL Edw. F. Campbell, Jr., *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*. Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, 1964.
- CBL Kitto, *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature*. Out of print.
- CDD G. K. Chesterton, *Chesterton Day by Day*, Second Edition. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, et al, 1912.
- CG F. E. D. Schleiermacher, *Christliche Glaube*.
- CR Moses E. Lard, *Commentary on Romans*. Christian Publishing Company, St. Louis, 1975.
- CR F. A. Filby, *Creation Revealed*. Revell, 1963.
- DBI Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*. Out of print.
- DEAM J. D. Thomas, *The Doctrine of Evolution and the Antiquity of Man*. Biblical Research Press, Abilene, Texas, 1963.
- DHS John Owen (1616-1683), *Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Earlier issues undated. Reissued by Kregel, Grand Rapids, 1954.
- DM Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Divine Milieu*. Paris, 1957.
- EE Jacques Maritain, *Existence and the Existent*, trans. by Galantieri and Philan. Pantheon Book, 1948. Image Book, 1957.
- EG H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, 2 vols. Baker, 1942.
- EHS F. E. Marsh, *Emblems of the Holy Spirit*. Pickering and Inglis, London, 1888, 1923.
- Exst. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism*. Trans. by Frechtman, New York, 1947.
- FG John W. McGarvey and Philip Y. Pendleton, *The Fourfold Gospel*. Standard Publishing, Cincinnati.

- FI. Alfred M. Rehwinkel, *The Flood*. Concordia, St. Louis, 1951.
- FM Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*. Trans. by Denny, Harper, 1964.
- GEOTP Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, Second Edition. University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- GF Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *The Genesis Flood*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1966.
- GP Moses Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed*. Trans. from the original Arabic by Friedlander. Dover, 1956.
- GPE Jacques Maritain, *God and the Permission of Evil*. Trans. by Evans. Bruce, Milwaukee.
- GPS T. W. Brents, *The Gospel Plan of Salvation*. Gospel Advocate, Nashville, 1928.
- HBD *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, Sixth Edition. By Madeleine S. and J. Lane Miller. New York, 1959.
- Herm. D. R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics*. Standard, Cincinnati. Out of print.
- HSBS W. E. Biederwolf, *A Help to the Study of the Holy Spirit*. Revell, New York, 1904.
- HU Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Hymn of the Universe*. Trans. by Bartholomew. Harper, 1965.
- ICR John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Trans. by Battles. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 2 vols., 1960.
- IHI William Jennings Bryan, *In His Image*. Revell, 1922.
- ILSM Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel, *Introduction to Logic and the Scientific Method*. Harcourt, Brace, 1934.
- IRP John Wild, *Introduction to a Realistic Philosophy*. Harper, 1948.
- ISA Herbert Wendt, *In Search of Adam*. Trans. from the German by Cleugh. Houghton Mifflin, 1956.
- JB *The Jerusalem Bible*. Alexander Jones, Editor. Doubleday, 1966.
- KV *Knowledge and Value*, edited by Sprague and Taylor. Harcourt, Brace, 1959.
- LPh *Living Philosophies*. "A series of intimate credos." Simon and Schuster, 1931.
- LS J. W. N. Sullivan, *The Limitations of Science*. Mentor Book, 1949.
- MOT Abba Hillel Silver, *Moses and the Original Torah*. Macmillan, 1961.
- MP Will Durant, *The Mansions of Philosophy*. Simon and Schuster, 1929.
- NBD J. D. Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*. Eerdmans, 1962.
- NG C. H. Mackintosh ("C.H.M."), *Notes on Genesis*. First Printing, 1880; Twenty-sixth Printing, 1959. Loizeaux Brothers, New York.
- OBH B. S. Dean, *Outline of Bible History*. Standard, Cincinnati.
- OK Glenn Negley, *The Organization of Knowledge*. Prentice-Hall, 1942.

- OTH William Smith and Wilbur Fields, et al, *Old Testament History*. College Press, Joplin, Missouri, 1967.
- PA Charles F. Pfeiffer, *The Patriarchal Age*. Baker, 1961.
- PC William Henry Roberts, *The Problem of Choice*. Ginn, Chicago, 1941.
- PHD James R. Illingworth, *Personality: Human and Divine*. Bampton Lectures for 1894. Macmillan, London, 1923. A small book, now out of print, but a classic in its field.
- PLS John G. Kemeny, *A Philosopher Looks at Science*. Van Nostrand, 1959.
- PPI Gordon W. Allport, *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*, Holt, 1937.
- RH *The Restoration Herald*, Cincinnati, Ohio
- RMNC M. M. Davis, *The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century*. Standard, 1914.
- RSB Charles F. Pfeiffer, *Ras Shamra and the Bible*. Baker, 1962.
- SBS Henry M. Morris, *Studies in the Bible and Science*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1966.
- SHS C. Gordon Brounville, *Symbols of the Holy Spirit*. Out of print.
- SIB *The Self-Interpreting Bible* (in four volumes), James W. Lee, Editor. N. D. Thompson Publishing Company, New York and St. Louis, 1896.
- SMP Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*. Scribner, 1936.
- STC R. M. MacIver, *Society: A Textbook of Sociology*. Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.
- TAB Charles F. Pfeiffer, *Tell El Amarna and the Bible*. Baker, 1963.
- TBHB A. P. Weiss, *A Theoretical Basis of Human Behavior*, R. G. Adams Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1925.
- TP Robert E. Brennan, O.P., Ph.D., *Thomistic Philosophy*. Macmillan, 1941.
- TWC Edw. Chiera, *They Wrote on Clay*. University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- WSAE Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution*. Baker, 1966.
- YGOT Robert W. Gleason, S.J., *Yahweh: The God of the Old Testament*. Prentice-Hall, 1964.

EXPLANATORY

It will be noted that I have included in this Volume excerpts from works that were in common use in "theological" circles at the turn of the present century and even earlier. Unfortunately, most of these books are now out of print despite the fact that they provide a complete refutation of the various (falsely so-called) "liberal" views now in vogue throughout the "standardized" seminarian world (cf. 1 Tim. 6:20). (A notable example is the great work by William Henry Green, entitled *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*; another is *The Authorship of Deuteronomy* by our own J. W. McGarvey.) Now it so happens that I have kept excerpts from some of these books in my files for some forty years or more. To try to run down the information as to the publisher, date of publication, and page number or numbers of these, is entirely too time-consuming. Hence, I have simply given, in all such cases, the name of the author and the title of the book from which the excerpt was taken. I vouch for the accuracy of these quotations.

The present intention is to bring out a third and final Volume in this series, the content of which will cover the story of the Patriarchal Age—that of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. We hope to have this ready for publication within a year and to provide therein an index for all three Volumes.

C. C. Crawford.

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
Part Eleven: The Problem of Evil	1
Part Twelve: The Beginning of Moral Evil on Earth ..	60
Part Thirteen: The Beginning of Physical Evil on Earth	142
Part Fourteen: Theological Gobbledygook and the Narrative of the Fall	220
Part Fifteen: God's Eternal Purpose	289
Part Sixteen: Evolutionism and the Narrative of the Fall	313
Part Seventeen: The Beginning of True Religion	364
Part Eighteen: The Beginnings of Human Culture	430
Part Nineteen: The Beginnings of the Messianic Line ..	443
Part Twenty: The World Before the Flood	471
Part Twenty-one: The World Under the Flood	499
Part Twenty-two: The World After the Flood	556
Part Twenty-three: The Beginnings of the Nations	602
Part Twenty-four: The Beginning Again of Human Presumption	625

CHRONOLOGY OF PRE-MOSAIC AGES

(all dates are B.C. and approximate only)

<i>Egypt</i>	<i>Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine</i>	<i>Mesopotamia (Tigris-Euphrates)</i>	<i>Iran (Persia)</i>
5000 End of the Late Stone (Neolithic) Age			
4000 First Union (<i>Helikopolis</i>)		Sumerians	
3500 Second Union, under Menes, <i>Memphis</i>		Ur I	
3400-2500 Pyramid Age	3000 Amorites	2500 Sumer-Akkad Dynasty of Sargon Ur II	2500 Elamites at <i>Susa</i> (Shushan)
	2500 Mari clay tablets	2050 Ur III	
2200-1800 Feudal Age (<i>Thebes</i>)	2400 Hittites	Kassites	
	1900-1600 First Hittite Empire (<i>Hattusas</i>)	2000 Abraham leaves Ur	
1800-1580 The Hyksos	1500 Mitanni invaders	1700 Hammurabi at Babylon	
1580-1150 The Empire Thutmoses III (<i>Thebes</i>)	1400-1200 Second Hittite Empire 1400 Ugaritic tablets	1250 Rise of Assyria 1118-1078 Reign of Tiglath-Pileser (use of iron)	
1400 Amenhotep IV, (Ikhnaton) <i>Amarua</i> The Amarna Letters	1240-1020 Hebrew Conquest Period of the "Judges" 1020-900 Saul, David, Solomon	Temporary Decline of Assyria	
1280 Exodus of Hebrews (<i>Thebes</i>)			
1100 End of Egyptian Empire			The Medes

PART ELEVEN:

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

1. *The Problem of Evil*. Generically, evil is of two kinds: *moral* evil (sin), and *physical* or *natural* evil (suffering). The over-all problem is well stated by Brightman as follows: "There is no dialectic of evil corresponding to the dialectic of good, for good is inherently rational and evil inherently nonrational. Good is a principle of totality, of coherence, of meaning. Evil is a principle of fragmentariness, of incoherence, of mockery. Hence there is no immanent logic in evil; evil is the Satan that laughs at logic. Yet there is logic in thought about evil, and many more or less logical solutions of evil have been proposed."¹ (Of course, for the unbelieving pessimist, to whom the totality of being is the product of sheer chance, and life meaningless, the problem of evil does not exist. Nor does it exist for the crass materialist who rejects *morality* in toto and substitutes *expediency* for it.) However, it should be noted here, at the outset, that in any study of the problem of evil, the problem of good cannot be avoided: in fact the problem is a compound one—the problem of good and evil. We list here some of the more significant proposals which human "philosophy" (speculation) has put forward in the course of time, as solutions of the problem.

(1) *The proposal that suffering is a Divine infliction of punishment on a person directly for a specific sin or course of sin indulged by him.* "He must not have been living right." "Why did God take our baby from us?" (a) The simple truth is that God does not directly "take" anyone: the God of the Bible is not a murderer. It is the Devil who is the murderer: the Devil murdered the whole human race when he seduced the Man and the Woman into sin (Gen. 3:17-19, John 8:44, Heb. 2:14-15). To be sure, in an over-all sense, death is in the world because sin is in the world (Rom. 3:23, 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:20-26; Jas. 1:13-15). But this does not mean that suffering is a

GENESIS

calamity directly inflicted on a person as punishment for his own personal sins. (b) This crude theory is flatly contradicted by the discourses which go to make up the Old Testament book of Job. Job's "comforters," it will be recalled, tried in vain to convince him that his calamities were Divine inflictions for some great sin he had committed. Job steadfastly refused to give any credence to their platitudes. The conclusion of the whole matter was the pronouncement of God Himself that the mystery of good and evil, in its deepest significance, is beyond human understanding (chs. 38-41, 42:1-6). (c) This "old wives' fable" (1 Tim. 4:7) is just as flatly repudiated by Jesus Himself and by the tenor of New Testament teaching as a whole (Matt. 5:45, 13:24-30; Luke 13:1-5; John 9:1-12, 30-34). (d) This proposed solution accounts only for suffering, and not for the greater evil, sin (Jas. 1:12-18; 1 John 3:4; Rom. 8:18-23; Ezek. 18:19-20). (e) The notion is not in accord with human experience of observed events in nature. St. Louis was hit by a devastating tornado in 1927. From many St. Louis pulpits the following Lord's Day congregations had to listen to pious fulminations to the effect that God had sent the tornado on the city as a punishment for its wickedness. But was St. Louis any more wicked than New York, or Chicago, or Los Angeles, or any other big city? Why, then, should St. Louis have been singled out for such a catastrophic punishment? One is reminded of the well-known couplet:

"If it's true God spanked the town for being over-frisky,
Why did He burn the churches down and save Hotal-
ing's whiskey?"

(f) A final objection to this theory is that it is an insult to God, in its implicit assumption that the wholesale destruction of innocent children which always accompanies such catastrophes is to be a part of the Divine judgment. (g) Ten young men set out across No Man's Land in

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

World War I. Only two returned: it is likely that the mother of each said, "I thank God for saving my boy." But what did the mothers of the other eight say? (h) There is no Scripture evidence to the effect that Christians will be shielded from physical evils just because they are Christians. Indeed, the evidence is all to the contrary. "In this world ye have tribulation," said Jesus (John 16:33; Matt. 5:45, 13:24-30; Rom. 8:35-39). (i) But, someone may be asking: Why does God allow the wicked to prosper and the righteous to suffer? One of the older Catechisms gives the best answer, perhaps, to this difficult question, as follows: "For two reasons: because the righteous can be confirmed in true holiness only by trials and sufferings; because God will not allow even the little good which the wicked may do, to go unrewarded; and therefore, as He cannot reward it in the next world, He takes this means of allowing it to be rewarded in this world."²

(2) *The proposal that all evil is illusory.* The Absolutists who define the Absolute as the All-embracing—Plotinus, Spinoza, Hegel, *et al*—must either concede that God embraces evil as well as good, or deny that evil actually exists. Invariably they drift into the latter position. But is it true? Certainly it is belied by press reports from over all the world, with their mass of sordid news about wars and rumors of wars, riots, sex orgies, murders, horrible cruelties, and crimes of every kind. Truly, violence abounds over all the earth today. Moreover, an illusion cannot be an illusion of nothing; hence, those who adopt this hypothesis must explain how the illusion originated. We are prone to forget that a figure must be a figure of *something*, a symbol a symbol of *something*, an appearance an appearance of *something*, a proposition a proposition of *something*, etc. It is just as difficult to account for an "illusion of mortal mind" as it is to account for sin and suffering. An even more serious objection to this theory is that, as Trueblood puts it, "it would cut the nerve of moral effort

GENESIS

if it were taken seriously." He adds: "If all evil, whether moral, natural, or intellectual, is truly illusory, we are foolish indeed to *fight* it; it would be far preferable to *forget* it."³ Dr. L. P. Jacks asks the question, "How shall we think of evil?" and answers it by saying, "We shall think ill of it." But how can we think ill of it if it does not exist? "For my own part," he goes on to say, "I would rather live in a world which contained real evils which all men recognize than in another where all men were such imbeciles as to believe in the existence of evil which has no existence at all."⁴ Trueblood rightly declares that "it is hard to think of God in moral terms if there is no genuine evil to fight." Whittaker Chambers, in the final chapter of his great book, *Witness*, in which he tells what he wants for his son as the latter becomes a man, makes this final impressive statement: "I want him to understand that evil is not something that can be condescended to, waived aside or smiled away, for it is not merely an uninvited guest, but lies coiled *in foro interno* at home with good within ourselves. Evil can only be fought." Plato wrote of evil as "the wild beast" that is in the soul. The notion that evil is illusory cuts the nerve, not only of individual moral effort, but of social progress as well: it is difficult, if not impossible, to generate zeal with respect to that which does not really exist.

(3) *The proposal that evil is incomplete good.* Advocates of this notion hold that the true is the *whole*, which alone is truly the good and the true and the beautiful. For example, "many patches of color within a painting are ugly, but the entire painting is beautiful," or, "ditch-digging might seem worthless until its contribution to civilization is perceived." Our weakness as human beings is that of finitude; as Spinoza would have it, in this world we are compelled to look at things *sub specie temporis*; if only we could view the whole *sub specie aeternitatis*, we

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

could see that this whole is a plenum in which everything is rigidly necessitated; hence, that what we call "evil" is in reality only incomplete or unrealized good. But—how can we reasonably derive the goodness of the whole (the complete) from our awareness of the incompleteness of things? In fact, is it not just as correct to say that in some cases good is incomplete evil, as to say, in others, that evil is incomplete good? The mystery of evil is, in some way, inscrutable to us, tied up with the mystery of wholeness (holiness) or perfection: this we do not deny. But proposed palliative pronouncements do not give any proportionate explanation of the *mass of evil* in the world and the *gross viciousness* which attends it. Sin and suffering are not to be explained away with fastidious folderol, no matter how apparently sophisticated it may be. This view tends in the main toward Pollyana-ism: to become so saturated with mere mental mush as to be irreconcilable with the observed facts of the world around us. (Cf. Gen. 3:14-19, where we are told explicitly that nature is not perfect, but is, for the time being at least, under the curse of sin: cf. Rom. 8:18-25.) The Bible is the most realistic book ever given to the world.

(4) *The proposal that evil is needed as a contrast to the good.* From the beginning, the human mind has been impressed with, and intrigued by, the play of opposites discovered by experience. The ancient Pythagoreans constructed a Table of Opposites, and Socrates is made to argue for immortality on the ground that, as opposites tend to pass into each other, so what we call death is likely to be but a passing over into new life. (See the *Phaedo* of Plato.) A monotonous world—a world without all these contrasts—(it is said) would be too boring to be endured. Good is in constant danger of being lost in its conflict with evil; this fact alone teaches us to appreciate its value. As Henry van Dyke has put it, in quite simple terms:

GENESIS

"If all the skies were sunshine,
Our faces would be fain
To feel once more upon them
The cooling spash of rain.

"If all the world were music,
Our hearts would often long
For one sweet strain of silence
To break the endless song.

"If life were always merry,
Our souls would seek relief
And rest from weary laughter
In the quiet arms of grief."

This theory of contrast, it would seem, is not wholly false: the contrasts of experience surely do often stimulate the good. Still and all, this theory, like those stated above, fails to account for the *great body of evil* in the world and for the *gross inhumanities* associated with it.

(5) *The proposal that suffering has a necessary disciplinary function.* This view is supported both by experience and by Scripture. Suffering disciplines us, strips us of false pride, teaches us that we are but pilgrims on this earth, weary pilgrims who are sadly in need of a Refuge and Strength. Suffering burns up the superficial ambitions and pride of life, and turns us out as pure gold tested by fire. Without suffering we should soon be swallowed up by our own conceits; without suffering we could never understand God's love or be prepared for Heaven. If, as Scripture states, it was necessary for the Author of our salvation to be made perfect through suffering (Heb. 2:10), how can His saints hope to be perfected short of the same discipline? True it is that to the already rebellious sinner, suffering may become a goad to increased rebelliousness (which usually takes the form of an orgy of self-pity); on the other hand, the true believer uses suffering as a means of strengthening his moral fiber

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

and deepening his faith in God. Adversity does not create good or evil in the heart, but is a potent force in bringing into the open the good and evil attitudes that are already there. It is also true, however, that suffering has brought many a hard-hearted worldly sinner to his knees in repentance. The principle of vicarious suffering and sacrifice (the innocent for the guilty) is the fundamental principle, not only of man's redemption, but also of his moral, social and spiritual progress in this present world. Freedom will work only if we make it work; democracy will work only if we make it work; and all too frequently the preservation of democracy and freedom will demand the shedding of innocent blood. The principle that without the shedding of blood there is no remission (Heb. 9:22)—and no moral and spiritual progress—runs throughout every aspect of man's life on earth. As Elizabeth Barrett Browning has stated this eternal truth so clearly:

“‘There is no God,’ the foolish saith,
But none, ‘There is no sorrow,’
And nature oft the cry of faith
In bitter need will borrow.
Eyes which the preacher could not school
By wayside graves are raised,
And lips cry, ‘God, be merciful,’
That ne’er said, ‘God be praised.’”

(For the disciplinary function of suffering, cf. Job 5:6-7, 17-20; Psa. 119:67, 71; Prov. 3:11-12; Rom. 8:18, 8:35-39; 2 Cor. 4:7-18, 12:9-10; Heb. 12:5-13; Jas. 1:12; 1 Pet. 4:12-14; Rev. 3:19.)

So much for human speculative attempts to fathom the profound mystery of sin and suffering. It is quite evident that these various proposals fall far short of giving any adequate clues to this mystery; hence, we are compelled to turn elsewhere in our quest for the solution of it. To what source, then, shall we turn? Obviously, to

GENESIS

revelation, to the Bible. God alone can give us the answer we seek—an answer that must be accepted, to some extent, by faith. All human thinking is evidence of the fact that the heart of the problem lies beyond the scope of sheer human intellection; that, as with most ultimates, reason must be supplemented by faith. After all, knowledge is *all that we believe* on the basis of sound evidence and logical thinking, *plus* trustworthy Divine revelation (Rom. 10:17; 1 Cor. 2:9-15; Eph. 1:6-12, 3:1-12). Then what does the Bible teach us?

The Bible teaches clearly that sin originated in the free choice of a personal being to challenge the sovereignty of God. (After all is not *any* sin committed by *any* person just such a challenge?) *And certainly this teaching is confirmed uniformly by our human experience. Sin must have originated in the free choice of some personal being to assert his own will above the will of God.* Human experience is bound to testify that impersonal (subhuman) entities are incapable of free choice; hence that they are neither normal nor immoral *per se*, but *amoral*. Only persons are moral beings. Whoever the first sinner was, therefore, he was the first anarchist, and anarchy is the first earmark of godlessness. The Bible teaches, moreover, that this present life is but the battle-ground on which the forces of good and the forces of evil are engaged in mortal combat for possession of the souls of men (Eph. 2:1-3, 3:10-12, 6:11-12; 2 Cor. 4:4; 1 Pet. 5:8-9). This, too, is unquestionably in accord with human experience. Furthermore, Scripture teaches that physical evil is, in a general sense, the penalty that follows upon the indulgence of moral evil (Gen. 3:16-19; Rom. 5:12-14, 8:18-23). (For the first statement of the law of heredity in literature, see Exo. 20:5-6. This passage has reference to the *consequences* of sin. In Ezek. 18:19-20, the reference is to the *guilt* of sin.) Suffering and death serve to put man in proper perspective to himself; they are proofs that

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

he is a creature utterly dependent on God's providence for his very continuance in existence.

Who, then, was this personal being who committed the first violation of God's law. Is man alone to be held responsible for the introduction of moral and physical evil into our world? I cannot convince myself that such is the case—that man can be made to bear the whole burden of responsibility for sin and suffering. In the name of eternal Justice—that Justice which is said to be the foundation of God's throne (Psa. 89:14)—something further, something or someone above and beyond man must be involved in this mystery with its many complex ramifications. Principal William Robinson of Overdale College, quotes Canon Wheeler Robinson on this problem as follows: "For anything we know to the contrary, there may be other spiritual influences from beyond the human sphere, such influences as were recognized crudely enough in the ancient belief in demons and in Satan. We cannot rule out the possibility of such extra-human influences." Principal Robinson himself adds: "All I am concerned to point out at the moment is that the question of believing in the actuality of the Devil is not a question of being 'advanced' or 'antiquated' in one's views. It is a much deeper question than this. It is not a question of Biblical literalism, but of seeing what the Bible is 'driving at.' It is a question of being able to account for the evil in the world—both physical and moral evil—while at the same time preserving belief in the goodness, integrity, and all-sufficiency of God. Most, if not all, moral evils can be accounted for on the assumption that man has free will and that his will is in rebellion against the will of God. Much physical evil can be accounted for as a by-product of the life process, but not all. Writers like Dr. Tennant think of physical evil as 'necessarily incidental.' But if it is both *necessary* and incidental, how is it possible to relieve God from responsibility for it? Either we must assume a 'fall' of some kind

GENESIS

in a sphere beyond the human, or God must be the author of evil. Strictly monotheistic religions have no other course open to them than to assume either (1) that evil is in the will of God, or (2) that there has been a primal rebellion of some *created* will or wills against the will of God. Is there any third alternative?" This writer goes on to say that there have not been wanting teachers from Origen (at the beginning of the third century) down to our own day "who have realized that something further is necessary, even in the matter of emphasis, if we are to account for physical as well as moral evil. The sin of man cannot be made to bear the whole burden. They have claimed that if we allow for the existence of discarnate spirits and for the fact of a collateral or of a primary 'fall' in such a realm, this explains better than any other existing theory the wide diffusion of evil in a universe which, as Christians, we believe to have been created by an all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving God. Admitting that vagueness and indefiniteness of outline must necessarily be accepted, and that there are many gaps in our knowledge which condition this vagueness, such a view certainly does help to explain evil present at subhuman levels as well as throw light on the practical question of temptation in man, and on certain New Testament passages which insist that the redemption of God extends to the whole cosmos and is not concerned merely with man (see Acts 3:21, Rom. 8:21, 2 Pet. 3:13)."⁶

That evil did have its first beginning in the fall of Lucifer, an angel of superior attainments, is the teaching of the Bible. (Cf. John 8:44, 1 Tim. 3:6, Luke 10:17-18, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6, Matt. 25:41, 1 Cor. 6:3, Rev. 20:10.)

Nor does this doctrine necessarily impugn either God's omnipotence or His goodness. For what does Omnipotence mean? It means that God has the power to do the intrinsically possible, but not the intrinsically impossible (*e.g.*, it is impossible for God to lie, and yet be our God); the

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

intrinsically impossible would be that which is not consistent with His character, intelligence or will. God is self-limited only; never can He be limited by means and ends determined by any source external to Himself. His goodness is clearly seen in the Supreme Sacrifice of Love which He made for the redemption of His Creation (John 3:16-17; Rom. 3:23-24, 8:32; Eph. 2:4-10; Heb. 2:9-18, 12:1-2).

Note the following pertinent statements: "That evil exists is true, but is it necessarily evil that it does exist?" "A world free of evil would have to be a world which contained nothing capable of evil." "The theistic solution of the problem of evil, as against those who see the very possibility of evil as something itself evil, can be summed up in this: *Not even God can love a puppet*. It goes without saying that no puppet, however complicated may be the motions through which it is put, can love."

The "conclusion of the whole matter" is well stated by W. Robertson-Smith as follows: "To reconcile the forgiving goodness of God with His absolute justice, is one of the highest problems of spiritual religion, which in Christianity is solved by the doctrine of the Atonement."⁸ To which, in all truth, it should be added that it is resolved nowhere else, in no other system, in no other cult, in no other "religion," than in the Christian religion—in the fact of the vicarious Sacrifice of the Lamb of God for the sin of the world (John 1:29, 1 Cor. 15:3): the Act in which God did for man what man could not do for himself, to overcome the ravages of sin and suffering (Rom. 3:21-26, 2 Cor. 5:17-21), and to vindicate His own designs and sustain the majesty of His law (Rom. 2:5).

Although there is mystery here still, nevertheless we can fathom it to an appreciable extent: undoubtedly the residue of the mystery will be fully revealed when we shall see God face to face and know fully even as also we shall be fully known (1 John 3:1-2, 1 Cor. 13:12). Genuine faith,

GENESIS

as in Job's case, is willing to await the revelation of the righteous judgment of God (Rom. 2:5-6).

2. *The Doctrine of Angels.* Strong: "As ministers of divine providence, there is a class of finite beings, greater in intelligence and power than man in his present state, some of whom positively serve God's purpose by holiness and voluntary execution of his will, some negatively by giving examples to the universe of defeated and punished rebellion, and by illustrating God's distinguishing grace in man's salvation."⁹⁹ Biblical teaching regarding angels, their origin, nature, attributes, and works, may be summarized as follows: (1) *They are created beings* (Col. 1:16, Psa. 148:1-6). (2) *They are personal beings, i.e., possessing intelligence, feeling, and will* (2 Sam. 14:20, Luke 2:8-15, 2 Tim. 2:26, 1 Pet. 5:8, Rev. 7:11-12, 12:12). Certainly they are not just "good and evil thoughts." (3) *They are a special order (kind) of celestial (ethereal) beings, incorporeal in any physical sense of the term, yet not entirely bodiless:* that is, they share the ethereal luminous substance of all creatures of the heavenly world. Celestial beings cannot in the very nature of the case have the characteristics of our physical organization. It is for this reason we must lay aside our earthly bodies, and our blood which is the seat of physical or animal life, and put on spiritual (ethereal) bodies adapted to our environment in the next world, before we can be fully conformed to the image of God's Son (Rom. 8:29; Lev. 17:11; 1 Cor. 15:44, 49, 50; 2 Cor. 5:1-8). (The reference in these last two Scriptures is to the saints, not to the unconverted.) Hence, not having physical bodies, angels are unlimited by any sense of time or space, and know nothing of age, growth, or death (Heb. 1:14, Luke 20:36); hence they are also without sex distinctions (Matt. 22:23-30, 1 Cor. 15:50). It is obvious that pictorial representations which have come down to us from medieval art, in which they are represented as feminine creatures with wings, are wholly

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

without scriptural warrant. Angels are referred to in the Bible in the masculine; moreover, ethereal beings have no need for wings. This means, of course, that angels constitute a company, and not a race; and that in all probability each was created separately and that each apostate angel fell by his own act. Again, the assumption that angels are creatures of the human imagination, corresponding to the demigods of the ancient mythologies, is absurd. Demigods were usually thought of as the offspring resulting from sensualistic relations between all sorts of imaginary creatures: the gods themselves were represented as consorting with humans, and even with brutes, and fantastic creatures of every kind were supposed to have inhabited the earth as a consequence of such illicit relations. (The tragedies of Euripides point up these facts more vividly, perhaps, than any of the other works of Greek literature. The Homeric epics also give us graphic pictures of the frailties of the gods: they are even represented as actually engaging in the battle before Troy and suffering the wounds of battle, in the manner of ordinary soldiers. Plato, it will be recalled, objected strenuously to these tales of the frailties and immoralities of the gods: The Divine, he insisted, must never be thought of as the author of evil.) It is silly to think that the Bible writers, surrounded as they were by sensualistic and idolatrous pagan neighbors, could have imagined an order of beings purely ethereal in nature and benevolent in their ministry, as angels are represented to be in Scripture. We therefore accept the teaching of the Bible about angels and their nature and work, as divine revelation.

(4) *They are a class of beings older than man and distinct from man.* They are not spirits or souls of the righteous dead. In Heb. 12:22-23, "innumerable hosts of angels" are clearly distinguished from "the general assembly and church of the firstborn" and from "the spirits of just men made perfect," that is, the righteous dead in their fully

GENESIS

redeemed state, clothed in glory and honor and immortality. (Cf. also Heb. 2:16, 1 Cor. 6:3, Matt. 18:10, Acts 12:15, Luke 1:19, etc.) The mention of the serpent in Gen. 3:1 implies the fall of Satan before the fall of man. In Gen. 2:1, "all the host of them" which God had created is generally taken to include the angels. Man was evidently the crowning achievement of God's creativity, created after the angelic host had been created. Angels are to be thought of as sharing in some incomprehensible way, the timelessness of the heavenly realm, as distinct from the temporality of our natural world.

(5) *They possess superhuman intelligence and power* (Psa. 103:20, 2 Pet. 2:11, Jude 9, 2 Thess. 1:7). (6) *Their intelligence and power, although superhuman, is not supernatural (infinite)* (Job. 2:6, Matt. 24:36, 1 Pet. 1:12, Rev. 20:1-3, 7-10). God alone is infinite, eternal, omniscient, timeless, without beginning or end. (7) *In number they are a great multitude* (Dan. 7:10, Heb. 12:22, Rev. 5:11). (8) *They seem to have organization, with various ranks and endowments* (1 Ki. 22:19; Matt. 26:53; Eph. 2:2, 3:10; 1 Thess. 4:16; Col. 1:16; Jude 9). (9) *Their work is to act as ministers of God's providence in the world of nature and of men* (Dan. 12:1; Luke 15:10; 1 Tim. 5:21; Matt. 4:11; Heb. 1:14; Matt. 13:39, 18:10, 25:31; Mark 8:38; 2 Thess. 1:7; 1 Pet. 1:10-12, etc.).

(10) *The angels were created innocent* (Gen. 1:31, Jude 6). (11) *Many of them preserved their original innocence, and by unbroken obedience to God, attained holiness* (Mark 8:38, Psa. 89:7, 1 Tim. 5:21). (12) *But others fell from their original state of innocence and of fellowship with God* (Job 4:18, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6, 1 John 3:8, Matt. 25:41, Rev. 12:7-12). (13) *The angels who fell from their original state of innocence are wholly confirmed in evil, that is, totally depraved* (Matt. 6:13, John 8:44, Matt. 25:41, 1 John 5:18-19, 2 Pet. 2:4, Rev. 20:1-3, etc.). The evil angels rebelled purely of their own volition

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

and hence for them there is no plan, no hope, of salvation. Man disobeyed as a consequence of yielding to temptation (seduction) from without, and for him, therefore, God could consistently plan and execute the Scheme of Redemption. (14) *The leader of this pre-mundane rebellion was an angel of superior attainments, by the name of Lucifer, probably an archangel, who deliberately chose to assert his will above the sovereignty of God, and who, through the specious plea of unlimited "personal liberty," persuaded some of his kind to embark on a course of open warfare against God and all Good (Isa. 14:12-14, Ezek. 28:13-17, Luke 10:18, John 8:44, Rev. 12:7-10, etc.).*

3. *The Mystery of Lawlessness* (1 John 3:4, 5:17; Rom. 4:15, 7:8; 2 Thess. 2:7). The Mystery of Lawlessness is the Mystery of Sin. Only a person who is utterly spiritually blind will deny that *sin is a fact of our world*. All great Bible themes—redemption, atonement, justification, remission, salvation, pardon, forgiveness, adoption, reconciliation, regeneration, sanctification, immortalization—all these have significance only in relation to the fact of sin. Make no mistake about it—*sin is a fact*. Sin is not just *irrationality* as the "depth psychologists" would have it; it is not just *immaturity* or just "missing the mark," as academic pundits would have it—not by any means! *Sin is depravity*, it has always been, is now, and will always be, open rebellion against God. Sin is the offspring of human presumption and oftentimes is wilfully cultivated, that is, sinners are sinners in most cases because they choose to walk after their own lusts (2 Pet. 3:3). Those who would "explain away" sin as "illusion of mortal mind," I would remind that the "illusion," and the origin of it, remain to be accounted for. Sin proceeds from the interior life of man, from vincible ignorance, a perverted will, or a seared conscience (1 Tim. 4:2); and the essential principle of sin is *selfishness*: there never was a sin committed that was not the choice of self above God, of man's right-

GENESIS

eousness (his own way of doing things) above God's righteousness (God's way of doing things). (Cf. Matt. 3:15, 6:33; Rom. 1:16-17, 9:30, 10:3; John 4:34.) To do things according to God's way is to obey the moral law; to do things contrary to God's way is to flout the moral law—this is lawlessness. A lawless world is a Godless world, and vice versa.

The "mystery of lawlessness" is commonly designated the "problem of evil," both moral and physical. Apparently all forms of evil descend upon human beings from one or more of three sources: (a) from what a person does to himself, (b) from what others do to him, and (c) from the physical framework in which he is destined to live in this present life. There is no doubt that a measure of impenetrable mystery attaches to this problem, the problem especially of the *origin* of sin and suffering and of the persistence of the *tremendous volume* of sin and suffering in our world. Cf. Job 11:7, chs. 38-41, also Isa. 55:8-9, Rom. 11:33-36: these passages clearly teach us that there are aspects of the mystery which lie beyond the pale of human understanding (Deut. 29:29). Hence, we must accept what God has revealed to us through His Spirit (1 Cor. 2:11-16) concerning this mystery and its relevance to human life and destiny. For if God has not revealed what we need to know, we simply have no solution for the deeper aspects of this problem. *But God has revealed to us all that we need to know*, for our own good, and this revelation is clearly set forth in Scripture, embracing the following particulars:

(1). *Sin had its beginning in the free choice of a person, uninfluenced from without, to rebel against the sovereignty of God.* This author will defend the thesis anywhere, at any time, *that sin could not have originated in any other way than in a personal choice to disobey the moral law, just as crime originates only in the free choice of a person to disobey the civil law.* As far as our knowl-

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

edge goes, only *persons* are capable of making such a choice: indeed, the powers of self-consciousness and self-determination are the powers which constitute a person to be a person. Subhuman entities (rocks, plants, trees, fishes, birds, insects, beasts of the field)—all these are without the potentiality of being either moral or immoral: literally, they are *amoral*. (We do not haul animals into court and charge them with crimes.) Only persons are moral beings; therefore, only persons are responsible for their deeds (Rom. 3:20, 4:15, 5:13, 5:20, 7:7; Acts 17:30-31; Matt. 24:31-51; 1 Cor. 3:13; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:7; Heb. 2:2-3; 2 Pet. 2:4; Rev. 20:11-15, 22:12). Hence, in attributing the origin of sin to a person, Scripture teaching is in harmony with human experience and common sense.

(2). *Personal beings are of three kinds (as affirmed in Scripture), namely, divine, angelic, and human.* (a) The divine Persons who make up the totality of the Godhead are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:16-17, 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14; 1 Pet. 1:2). In the dim light of the Old Testament revelation these Three were known as God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God (Gen. 1:1-3; Psalms 33:6, 9; Rev. 19:13; John 1:1-14; 1 John 1:1, 5:7). (b) Angels, as we have noted, are represented in Scripture to be a special order of celestial (ethereal) personal beings, superhuman in intelligence and power, who serve as the ministers of God's providence. (c) The human being is described in Scripture (Gen. 2:7) as a body-spirit unity, a person, "a living soul." He is set apart as a species (as person and personality) by his thought processes. These are matters of human common sense and experience. Sin, of course, is not to be attributed to the Godhead who is altogether holy (John 17:11, 25; Heb. 4:15; Rev. 15:4). *Therefore sin must have originated among the angels or among men.*

(3). *According to the Bible, sin originated in the pre-mundane rebellion of the archangel Lucifer, who sought to*

GENESIS

break away from the sovereignty of God and to set up a rival throne somewhere beyond our universe. (a) The Scriptures intimate that Lucifer, prior to his fall, was an angel of superior rank and endowment: the name "Lucifer" itself means "the shining one," and in the Revised Version is rendered "Day-star." Cf. Isa. 14:12-15. Hebrew prophecy runs in parallels: hence in this Scripture the fate of the king of Babylon evidently is described as analogous to the fall of Lucifer. Cf. also Ezek. 28:13-14. Here the prophetic parallel is between Lucifer and the king of Tyre. "Anointed cherub" is a phrase designating an angel of high official rank, undoubtedly an archangel. The descriptive language which appears in these passages simply cannot be applied to any human being, except by analogy, and that only in a limited sense. (2) 1 Tim. 3:6, John 8:44. Cf. these passages with Isa. 14:12-15 and Ezek. 28:13-14. These statements could hardly have been made with reference to earthly monarchs. It seems evident that orthodox Christian scholarship is right in interpreting them as alluding to the rebellion and fall of Lucifer. It seems, too, that the archangel's fall was caused by pride, jealousy and false ambition; and that his appeal to his fellow creatures was the specious plea of "personal liberty," that is, for complete freedom from the binding force of any kind of law—a plea which has damned more souls than any other single lie. (*Liberty, it must be remembered, is not license.*) It is quite possible that he influenced other angels with false charges and lying accusations against God, as, for example, that the Creator was a tyrant who imposed His will on free creatures, etc., and that he exhorted them to follow him in breaking away from all Divine restraint and in setting up a rival government somewhere in the heavens. It would seem that up to this time God had never revealed His love to His angelic host; that they probably were aware only of His power. Hence some of the angels were prompted to heed Satan's lies and to follow him into open

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

rebellion; by far the greater number, however, remained loyal to the Divine government. As Milligan writes: "How pride got possession of Satan's heart it may be difficult for us to conceive. But it seems probable, from the statement of Paul in First Timothy (3:6), that it was in some way owing to his elevation above those around him. He may once have been the archangel, superior even to Michael. But in an evil hour his eye was turned from the Creator to himself as the highest, the most gifted, and the most influential of all the creatures of God. His heart swelled with pride; ambition took possession of his soul; and rebellion was then seen in heaven. But justice and judgment are the dwelling-place of God's throne, Psa. 89:14. He reigns in the midst of the most perfect righteousness, and no sin can be tolerated for a moment in His presence. And hence He had but to speak the word, and Satan, with his rebel host that kept not their first estate, was instantly cast out of heaven and bound in 'eternal chains under darkness to the judgment of the Great Day,' Jude 6."¹⁰ (Cf. 2 Pet. 2:4, Matt. 25:41, Luke 10:18, 1 Cor. 6:3.)

(4). *Apparently Satan and his rebel host, having attempted a direct encounter with those of their kind who remained loyal to God, were cast out of Heaven, to become wanderers "to and fro in the earth" (Job 1:7). Cf. Ezek. 28:16, Isa. 14:15, 2 Pet. 2:4, especially the words of Jesus, in Luke 10:18 (the Logos was present, of course, when this incident occurred; hence, as Jesus, He was recognized by these evil spirits: cf. John 17:5; Jas. 2:19; Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24, 5:7; Luke 4:34; Acts 19:15). (This is a notable instance in which the truth about a given subject cannot be obtained in its fulness short of taking into consideration the teaching of the Bible as a whole.) The rebellion of these wicked angels was inexcusable from any and every point of view. Eternal Justice forbade any plan of salvation for them. Prior to their rebellion they had*

GENESIS

been in close personal fellowship with God; they had known Him as their Creator and Ruler; they had been fully aware of His wisdom and power; they must have known that all being depended on Him for continuance. Besides all this, they sinned purely of their own volition, without having been influenced from any source outside themselves. They were not seduced, as man was. They decided of their own free will to enter upon a course of sin, motivated by their own inordinate ambition. *They became in fact the first anarchists.* For these reasons, and possibly others unknown to us, their rebellion was inexcusable. Therefore, their moral state, as a result of this complete rejection by their Creator, is one of *total depravity*. They are "kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6), "committed to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. 2:4). What kind of "bonds," and what kind of "darkness"? Bonds of reprobation, undoubtedly, and the darkness of implacable hatred and despair. Having realized from the time of their fall, that they are irretrievably and eternally lost, they are *totally depraved*. From the moment of his fall, Lucifer became "Satan" or "the Devil," the chief of evil spirits. The word "Satan" is from the Hebrew, and means "Adversary," "Accuser," "Enemy," etc. The Devil is an implacable and insatiable enemy of God, man, and all Good.

(5). *The last end for these wicked angels, and all their ilk, including all wicked, neglectful, and unforgiven human beings, will be eternal segregation in hell.* (1) Someone may ask, Why did not God annihilate these evil angels when they rebelled against Him? Of course, it would be sheer presumption on our part to answer this question dogmatically. There are certain intimations, however, which may give us clues to a partial apprehension of this mystery. Science, for example, teaches that God does not, and reflection leads us to believe that He would not, annihilate that

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

which He has created. One of the first laws of nature is that the total amount of energy (or matter) of the cosmos is constant. Matter changes form, but nothing of the original total stock is lost in the process. Reason would add, it seems to me, that if God does not annihilate matter, He surely will not annihilate spirit. As a matter of fact, were He to annihilate anything that shares personality with Him, either angelic or human, He would be acting inconsistently, that is, in opposition to Himself. But to act thus inconsistently is contrary to His nature as Deity; hence, it seems that the word "annihilation" is not in the vocabulary of Heaven. Certainly there is every reason to think that at the "times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets" (Acts 3:21) this earth which we now inhabit will be *renovated* rather than *annihilated* (Isa. 65:17, 66:22; 2 Pet. 3:1-13).

I am reminded of a story which appears in one of the published books of sermons by W. H. Book, longtime Minister of the great Tabernacle Church of Christ, Columbus, Indiana. Book tells us that he was holding a revival meeting in Hagerstown, Maryland, once upon a time, and, as was the custom in earlier days, prior to the sermon each evening he spent a few minutes answering questions that individuals might see fit to put into a "query box" at the entrance to the meeting hall. One evening he received a question which read substantially as follows: If God is all-powerful, as you preachers say, and there is so much evil in the world, as you say, and if the devil is the source of this evil, as you also say, then why doesn't God kill the devil and put an end to all this sin and misery? Brother Book read the question aloud, carefully, and then answered: "I would say that God would not want to kill the devil, because that would leave too many orphans in Hagerstown." To this we would be justified in adding, I think, that if God should kill the Devil, the large part of the earth's population would be orphaned. Despite the

GENESIS

apparent flippancy of this answer (to the question equally flippant), the fact remains that it was in harmony with the teaching of Jesus, who, on a certain occasion in answer to the caviling Jews, blistered them with the statement: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do" (John 8:44).

Hell, the penitentiary of the moral universe, was, according to our Lord's own statement, "prepared for the devil and his angels"; as Chrysostom was wont to say, in the early days of Christianity, Hell was prepared, not for men, but for the devil and his angels, but if men go there, it will be strictly because they cast themselves into it. The eternal segregation of all the wicked, both angels and men, in hell (Gehenna) will follow the Great Judgment. (Note Matt. 8:29—"to torment us before the time"; also Matt. 25:31-46, esp. v. 41; John 5:28-29; Acts 17:30-31; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 20:11-15, etc.)

(6). *The good angels, on the other hand, are rewarded with everlasting happiness (blessedness) and this consists in being with God, seeing Him "face to face," serving Him and enjoying Him forever: cf. Matt. 18:10.* The good angels are also called the *elect* angels (1 Tim. 5:21). This does not mean, of course, that their remaining faithful was the result of their election; it means, rather, that their election was the natural consequence of their fidelity. The good angels are the executors of God's judgments (Matt. 13:36-43, 16:27, 24:29-31, 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Jude 14), and the ministers of His benevolence toward the redeemed (Heb. 1:14, 12:22; Luke 2:8-15). Accounts of angelic ministrations, both of benevolence and of judgment, occur repeatedly throughout the entire Bible. *E.g.*, Gen. 16:7, 18:2, 22:11-18, 19:1-17, 28:12, 32:1; Exo. 3:2; Gal. 3:19; Exo. 14:19; Judg. 2:1; Num. 22:31; Josh. 5:15; Judg. 6:11-12, 13:2-21; 2 Sam. 25:16; 1 Ki. 19:5; 2 Ki. 6:17; Dan. 6:22, 7:10; Zech. 2:3; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38, 1:11-20; Matt. 2:13-20, 4:11, 28:2-5; Luke 2:8-

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

15; Acts 1:9-11, 5:19, 8:26, 12:6-9, 10:3, 27:23-24; Rev. 1:1, 5:2, etc. Many authorities believe that the "Angel of Jehovah" frequently mentioned in the Old Testament Scriptures was the Logos Himself in pre-incarnate manifestations or theophanies (cf. Mic. 5:2, 1 Cor. 10:1-4).

(7) To summarize: the Bible teaches explicitly as follows: (1) That the source of sin, of the entire burden of sin which the human race has brought on itself (Rom. 3:23), is the Devil (1 John 3:8). (2) That the pedigree of sin, therefore, is Satan, lust, sin, and finally death (Jas. 1:13-15). (3) That the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23), not only *physical* death, the separation of the spirit from the body and the consequent dissolution of the physical frame (Gen. 2:16-17, 3:19, 5:5, 4:33; John 19:30; Heb. 9:27), but also spiritual death, the second death, eternal separation from the Source of Life (2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 20:14, 21:8, 2:11). Whatever else the word "hell" may signify in Scripture, it does signify the loss of God and of all Good (Matt. 25:41). Death, in whatever form it may take, is in the world because sin is in the world (Gen. 3:17-19; Rom. 5:12, 6:23, 7:14; 1 Cor. 15:21-26, 50-57; 2 Cor. 5:4; Heb. 9:27, etc.). (4) That the Son of God was "manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil" (1 John 3:8, 3:5; Matt. 1:21; John 1:29; Heb. 2:14-15, 9:28; 1 Cor. 15:3, 20-26, 50-57). Redemption in Christ Jesus is *complete* redemption, that is, redemption in body and soul and spirit (1 Thess. 5:23), redemption both from the *guilt* of sin (Ezek. 18:19-20) and from the *consequences* of sin (Exo. 20:5-6). (Cf. Luke 1:68; Rom. 2:4-11, 8:18-25; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 9:12; Rev. 5:9, 14:3-4, etc.) As Jesus spoke to the hard-hearted and unbelieving in His own day, so He speaks to the neglectful, disobedient, and wicked of every age, including the present one. "Ye are of your father, the devil," etc. (John 8:44), and "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life" (John

GENESIS

5:40). *There can be only one reason why men keep on living in sin: it is the fact that they will to do so* (2 Pet. 3:9; Matt. 11:28; John 10:10, 11:25-26; Matt. 23:37; Luke 13:34).

I quote here the following statements by H. C. Christopher, from his great work, now long out of print: "A being that *can not err* must be infinite in his attributes. Wherever there is finiteness, there is necessarily and unavoidably the possibility and capability of wrong-thinking and wrong-doing. Absolute perfection inheres only in the Infinite. Imperfection inheres in the finite, *because they are finite. Here lies the potential origin of sin, the possibility of sinning being inseparable from, and inherent in, finite beings.* . . . Angels knew nothing of the innate and undeveloped powers and sentiments of their nature, and were unconscious of the evil lurking deep below the surface, like the germ in the seed, and awaiting only the necessary influences and excitements to arouse the dormant powers into activity. It may seem strange to talk of influences and exciting causes of developing sin in heaven, among beings of whom all our conceptions embrace the ideas of purity and happiness; yet sin first erupted in heaven."¹¹

4. *The Fact of Sin.* It has been said that one might frame an argument of sorts against the Deity of Jesus, against the inspiration of the Scriptures, or against the need for religion, but that *it is impossible for anyone to successfully deny the existence of sin.* The universality of sin is an ever-present fact. The consciousness of guilt breaks forth in the literature of all peoples. Legalists, statesmen, philosophers, and poets alike testify, with Pascal, that accountable persons are unrighteous, "for each one tends to himself, and the bent toward self is the beginning of all disorder." The consequences of sin—sickness, suffering, death—are apparent on every hand. We can escape the *guilt* of sin, through the efficacy of the atoning blood of

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Christ, but none can avoid its *consequences*. Sin is here, there, everywhere, and only the morally blind will deny the fact. Nor do we obviate the fact of sin by resorting to such meretricious terms as "immaturity," "irrationality," "missing the mark," etc., to sugar-coat it.

5. *The Adversary of Souls* (John 8:42-47, Eph. 6:10-18, 1 Pet. 5:8-9). The Bible teaches unequivocally that there is a personal Devil: the doctrine runs throughout Scripture from beginning to end. As the enemy of all Good, Lucifer is presented in Scripture as Satan (Abaddon in Hebrew, Apollyon in Greek) in the Old Testament: (Rev. 9:11; Job 26:6, 28:22; Prov. 15:11; Psalms 88:11); as the Devil, in the New Testament, the chief of the evil spirits (fallen angels, demons, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6). The word "Satan" is of Hebrew origin, meaning "Adversary," "Accuser," "Enemy," etc.

That there is a personal Devil is evident from the following Scriptures: (1) The testimony of Jesus (John 8:44, 12:31; Matt. 13:38-39, 25:41, 22:29-30: these statements are too explicit to allow for the notion that in speaking of angels and demons, Jesus was merely accommodating His language to the Jewish traditions of His time); (2) the testimony of the Apostles (1 John 3:8; Rev. 12:9, 20:2, 7, 10; 1 Pet. 5:8; 2 Pet. 4:4; 2 Cor. 4:4, 11:14; Eph. 2:2; 2 Thess. 2:9; 1 Tim. 1:20); (3) the epithets by which he is described, e.g., "the prince of this world" (John 14:30, 16:11), "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4), "the prince of the powers of the air" (Eph. 2:2), "the prince of demons" (Matt. 12:24), "the tempter" (Matt. 4:3), "the adversary" (1 Pet. 5:8), the "accuser" of the saints (Rev. 12:10, Job 1:6-12), "the old serpent" (Rev. 12:9), the first liar and the first murderer (John 8:44); (4) the terms (similes and metaphors) by which his activities are described, as, e.g., a fowler (Psalms 124:7, 1 Tim. 3:7, 2 Tim. 2:26), a sower of tares (Matt. 13:25, 39), a wolf (John 10:12), a roaring lion (1 Pet. 5:8), a serpent (Rev. 12:9,

GENESIS

20:2), a dragon (Rev. 16:13). These terms all suggest Satan's total depravity, and his diabolical malice and cunning.

The testimony of Scripture that there is a personal Devil is corroborated by human common sense and reason. If there is no personal Devil, then man must be held accountable for all the evil in the world, and such a burden of guilt would be overwhelming. Why is it more "absurd" that a moral being should have sinned against God in past ages, than that moral beings should sin against Him now, as obviously they do? *Belief in a personal devil is far more reasonable than belief in an impersonal spirit of evil:* as a matter of fact, "impersonal spirit" is a contradiction in itself, for spirit essentially is personality. Moreover, in view of the fact that between man and the lowest forms of life there are numberless graduations of being, why is it thought incredible that between God and man there should be ethereal creatures of higher than human intelligence? One of the most ingenious devices the Devil employs in deceiving people is that of "selling" them the lie that he does not actually exist. Let every intelligent being beware this diabolical and totally destructive lie.

According to Biblical teaching, the history of man is but the facade behind which Satan and his rebel host have sought relentlessly, and with venomous hatred, to defeat God's eternal purpose and plan for His Creation. This unceasing conflict, characterized by diabolical vindictiveness, has continued through several phases as follows:

1. *The first phase of a direct frontal attack.* It would seem that, on the specious plea that God, in asserting His sovereignty and establishing moral law, was proving Himself to be a tyrant, Satan persuaded some of the angelic host to enlist under his banner. Their objective, apparently, was to break away from all restraint: they were the first *anarchists*. (*Libertinism*, the notion that every man should be permitted to do just as he pleases, according to the teach-

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

ing of Aristippus of Cyrene in ancient times—to follow his “natural impulses,” according to the more sophisticated version, the credo of Rousseau and his so-called “progressive education” disciples—the confusion of liberty with license, is widespread in our time. But *lawlessness is godlessness*, and vice versa.) Under Satan’s persuasion, his rebellious cohorts had the effrontery to undertake a personal encounter with the celestial forces of good. The immediate result was the expulsion of the rebels from their original estate (“proper habitation”) (Luke 10:18, 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6). Having been unceremoniously cast out of Heaven, Satan became “the god of this world,” that is, of the kingdom of this world (John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2). But—why did not God segregate these rebel spirits in hell at the time of their defection? Why does He even to this day allow them to roam the cosmos at will, seeking whom they may devour (Job 1:6-7, 1 Pet. 5:8)? Of course, we have no clear answer to this question. It would seem, however, that the Divine plan was to permit these devils to demonstrate their true character, their total depravity, that by so doing they would prove themselves fit only for Hell, and in this manner would vindicate the justice of God before all intelligences, both angelic and human, of the entire cosmos (1 Cor. 6:3). This may have been the reason why Satan was permitted to appear in the presence of God to accuse the patriarch Job (Job 1:6-12), and why he is permitted to continue in his Satanic role as Accuser of the saints (Rev. 12:10). It might be well to consider also that there is no evidence that our Heavenly Father had, prior to Satan’s rebellion, ever made any demonstration of His great love for His creatures (that supreme demonstration, Supreme Sacrifice, awaited the death on the Cross of His Only Begotten Son); that only His eternal *power* and divinity (Rom. 1:20, Isa. 57:15) had as yet been revealed. At any rate, we have no complete answer for this question (Deut. 29:29), probably

GENESIS

because it is not our right, as creatures, to have it, or because we could not comprehend the depth of this mystery, even if some attempt were made to reveal it, because of the inadequacy of human language to communicate the ineffable. Be that as it may, we are told expressly that, although cast out of Heaven and doomed to walk up and down in the earth, the ultimate segregation of these rebel angels will take place at the end of our age (aeon), that is, at the termination of the Reign of Messiah (1 Cor. 15:20-28, Phil. 2:5-11, Rev. 20:10).

It would be well at this point to take note of the cases of *demonology* reported in Scripture. That this was something more than insanity is obvious for several reasons, as follows: (a) From such passages as Matt. 4:24, in which "divers diseases" are clearly distinguished from "torments," and "those possessed with demons" from the "epileptic and palsied." (b) From the fact that these evil spirits invariably recognized, and explicitly confessed Jesus for what He was—the Eternal Logos (Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24, 3:11, 5:7; Luke 4:34; Acts 19:15; Jas. 2:19). These evil spirits also confessed the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the personal ministry of the Apostles and their co-laborers: evil cannot remain silent, but must speak out the truth, in the presence of holiness (Acts 13:6-12, 16:16-18, 19:13-19). (c) From the fact that these evil spirits begged to be confined (localized) in physical bodies, even in bodies of swine, to escape some measure of their consuming restlessness ("going to and fro in the earth and . . . walking up and down in it," Job 1:7, 1 Pet. 5:8; cf. Matt. 8:28-33, Mark 5:10-19). (d) From the fact that they obeyed immediately when the Lord commanded, or even just willed, them "to come out," that is, exorcised them (Matt. 4:24, 8:32; Mark 1:25-27, 5:10-19; Luke 4:35). Note that the Apostles, through their possession of the baptismal measure of the Holy Spirit's powers and graces (Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4; Luke 24:45-49; John 20:21-23;

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Heb. 2:3-4), also had this power of exorcism (Luke 9:1; Acts 16:18, 19:12). (e) From the fact of their admission that their ultimate destiny would be eternal segregation in Hell with all their ilk, and their begging at least a temporary respite from the infliction of this just penalty for their sins (Matt. 25:41; Matt. 8:29—"art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Mark 5:7—"torment me not."): *Why should not these evil spirits have recognized Jesus for just who He was? Why should they not have recognized the working of the Spirit's power? Had they not been with Jesus (as the Logos), and with the Spirit, in eternity, prior to the creation of the world? Had they not been cast out of Heaven along with their leader, Satan (Luke 10:18), when they had rebelled against the Divine government? Why, then, should these various Scriptures be interpreted as describing forms of insanity when they clearly indicate diabolism?*

2. *The second phase: the attack on the generic seed of the Woman.* (1). On seeing our first parents living in complete happiness in Eden, Satan, thirsting for revenge, set about to seduce them from their state of innocence, and to mar—and, if possible, to destroy—the image of God in which they had been created. Let us imagine a man who has a neighbor whom he hates—and a hater is always a murderer at heart (1 John 3:15); this man knows he cannot prevail in a personal encounter with this neighbor; but the latter has a faithful old dog, long a protector of the family and a cherished pet; so this would-be murderer proceeds to get revenge by stealing out under cover of darkness and poisoning the animal. In like manner, Satan, who dared not attempt a second frontal encounter with God, made his way stealthily into Eden and exerted his diabolical cunning on Adam and Eve. We all know the sordid story. The Woman yielded to the seductive voice of the tempter, and the Man, apparently out of his love for her, followed her into the transgression (2 Cor. 11:3,

GENESIS

1 Tim. 2:14). Thus did Satan murder the whole human race: by bringing sin into the world, he brought death, "for that all sinned" (Rom. 5:12-13, 3:23, 6:23; John 8:44; Heb. 2:14-15, 9:27; Gen. 3:19, 5:5; Jas. 1:13-15). (2). No doubt the Devil gloated over that apparent victory. Imagine his consternation, then, on hearing the Divine pronouncement that the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Old Serpent's head (Gen. 3:14-15; Rom. 16:20), that is, ultimately bringing to defeat his nefarious schemes. May we not rightly suppose that Satan did not know what, precisely, the word "seed" implied here (although he had superhuman knowledge, he did not have omniscience), and may well have interpreted it to designate the genus that descended from the Woman (Gen. 3:20)? Setting out, then, to frustrate what he thought to be the meaning of this mysterious oracle, his first move was to impel the Woman's firstborn, Cain, to clobber his brother Abel to death, in an act of jealous rage; and so the first crime was committed in the very shadow of Eden, and it was the awful crime of fratricide (Gen. 4:1-8). Still and all, the birth and naming of Seth ("substitute") must have been understood by the Devil to mean that the battle had just been joined and there would be more to come. (3). His next move was a bold one. By fostering the intermarriage of the pious Sethites ("sons of God," that is, as belonging to the Messianic Line) and the irreligious Cainites ("daughters of men," Gen. 6:1-4) He brought about a condition of universal wickedness (Gen. 6:5): it always happens that when the good mingles with the bad, on the level of the bad, the whole becomes bad. Imagine Satan's glee on hearing God say, "I will destroy man," etc. (Gen. 6:7); and then imagine, if possible, his embittered frustration when he heard God commanding Noah, "Make thee an ark of gopher wood" (Gen. 6:14). The Flood came, and the race was not destroyed, as Satan had planned, but was

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

rebuilt through righteous Noah and his progeny (Gen. 6:8-10).

3. *The third phase: Satan's war on the elect of the Old Covenant*, the fleshly seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the Children of Israel (Matt. 8:11-12). (Election is election to responsibilities, not to special privileges, except, of course, only as responsibilities to God are in essence privileges *per se* for all who love Him: Rom. 8:28, Matt. 11:29-30, 1 John 5:3.) (1) It was inevitable that when God called Abraham's fleshly seed to become the temporary custodians of the worship of the living and true God (monotheism), Satan should be stirred again to every conceivable effort to frustrate the fulfillment of the Abrahamic Promise (Gen. 12:1-3, 17:9-14, 17:19, 26:1-5, 28:13-17; Exo. 2:24, 6:4, 19:5-6, 34:27-28; Lev. 26:9; Deut. 5:1-5, 9:9-11, 26:16-19, 29:10-13; Judg. 2-1; 1 Chron. 16:13-19; Jer. 31:31-34; Neh., ch. 9; Luke 1:72-73; Acts 3:25, 7:51-53; Gal. 3:15-19). Hence, under the very shadow of Sinai, while thunders and lightnings bespoke the presence of God in communion with Moses atop the holy mount, the people down below were incited to cast and set up a golden bull (the symbol of the Cult of Fertility, in which ritual prostitution played a leading role) and worship it in the manner of the Egyptian orgies with which they had once been all too familiar; and three thousand paid the price of their idolatrous folly by death on the spot (Exo., chs. 19, 24, 32; cf. Acts 2:37-42, 7:38-41). (2) Again, because of their oft-repeated acts of rebellion against God and His servant Moses, of the entire adult nation that had crossed the Red Sea only two survived the forty years of wandering in the Wilderness, to cross the Jordan under Joshua into the Promised Land. These two were men of great faith, Caleb and Joshua (Num. 13:6, 16, 30; 14:6, 24, 30; Josh. 14:6-15). All the rest left only their bleaching bones behind—mute memorials indeed of their gross unbelief. (3) Later, the

GENESIS

Devil stirred up the people to clamor for a king so that they might ape the practices of their idolatrous neighbors. Against the counsel of God through Samuel (1 Sam., ch. 8), the people crowned Saul, who turned out to be a miserable failure. We all know the tragic accounts of the apostasies, cruelties, wars, orgies, etc., of the royal courts both in Samaria and in Jerusalem. Ultimately, in the very face of God's special messengers, the great Prophets, and their counsels of individual righteousness and social justice, and their warnings of the disaster that would befall the nation for ignoring the God of their fathers and His moral law (Jer. 18:5-12), the whole nation became corrupt, vessels fit only for destruction. Then it was that Jerusalem was trodden down by the Gentiles (Samaria had already fallen to the Assyrians), first by the Chaldeans and finally by the Romans, and God permitted the inhabitants to be carried off into the Captivity and finally dispersed among all peoples of the then known world (Jer., ch. 52; Isa. 63:10-19; Neh., ch. 9; Matt. 23:37-38, ch. 24; Mark, ch. 13; Luke 13:34-35, 19:41-44, ch. 21; 1 Pet. 1:10-12). (Cf. especially Acts 7:51-53, Acts 2:23, 2:36, 3:14-21; Luke 23:13-25, Matt. 27:20-26; esp. the horribly tragic implications—in the light of subsequent history—of Matt. 27:25.) (4) Thus Satan's conflict with the Old Covenant elect came to an end in their Captivity and Dispersion, that is to say, apparently in their forfeiture of their Divine election and apparently in the frustration of God's Eternal Purpose. (Cf. Isa. 46:8-11.) (Review here the gruesome story, as given us by Josephus, of the two-year siege of Jerusalem by the Roman legions under Vespasian and Titus, A.D. 68-70. We are told that the streets of the city were ploughed up, and that literally not one stone of the Temple was left upon another. Cf. the prophetic testimony of Jesus: Matt. 24:1-2, Mark 13:1-2; Luke 19:41-44, 21:5-6.) (5) Apparently Satan's triumph was complete. But only *apparently*! Because it was now

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

dawning on the Devil's understanding that the oracular utterance respecting the Seed of the Woman was to have its fulfilment in a Person, in the Person to be titled Messiah, Christos, Christ, The Anointed One. The numerous declarations of the Prophets of old that the Coming One should be of the Seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gal. 3:16), of the tribal lineage of Judah (Gen. 49:10, Num. 24:17, Psa. 60:7, Rev. 5:5), of the royal lineage of David (Isa. 11:1-5, Ruth 4:21-22; 2 Sam. 7:12-16, 23:1-5; Psa. 89:3-4, 89:34-37, 132:10-18; Isa. 9:6-8, 11:10, 55:3-4; Jer. 23:5-6; Amos 9:11; Matt. 1:1, 9:27, 21:9, 22:41-42; Acts 2:25-36; Rev. 5:5, 33:16); that this Coming One, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting, should be born of a virgin, in Bethlehem of Judea (Mic. 5:2; Isa. 7:13-14; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-35); that He should be the great Prophet "like unto" Moses. (Deut. 18:15-19; Acts 3:19-26, 7:37); that among His numerous other names He should be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace (Isa. 9:6); that He should come from Edom with crimsoned garments (Isa. 63:1), and tread the winepress of the judgment of God *alone* (Isa. 63:3; Matt. 26:36-46, 27:46); that He should be the Supreme Sacrifice for the *sin* of the world (Isa. 53:1-9, John 1:29, 1 Cor. 5:7); that He should be raised up from the dead and crowned King of kings and Lord of lords (Psa. 16:10, 24:7-10; Acts 2:22-32, 13:32-37; 1 Cor. 15:1-20; 1 Tim. 6:13-16; Rev. 19:11-16); that He should be King-Priest forever "after the order of Melchizedek" (Gen. 14:17-20; Psa. 110:1-4; Heb. 6:13-20, 7:1-3, etc.). As this Messianic anthem swelled louder and louder, attaining its full crescendo in the life and work of John the Baptizer, the last of the School of the Prophets, Satan began to realize at long last that God planned, when the fulness of the time should come, to invade the "kingdom of this world" as Incarnate Deity in the Person of The Anointed, and that the destiny of all intelligent crea-

GENESIS

tures of the universe was to be entrusted to the determination of this Coming One, Messiah, Christ. In view of this realization that God's Remedial System was to be entrusted for execution, not to the generic seed, nor to any particular ethnic seed, of the Woman, but to a single Person, the God-Man (Gal. 1:16), the Seed of Woman exclusively (Matt. 1:18-25, Luke 1:26-38, Gal. 4:4), there was but one course for Satan to pursue, and that was to await the appearing of this Redeemer whose defeat he must encompass in some manner or himself suffer eternal segregation in Hell. This was precisely the course that Satan did pursue: hence, the relative silence—the holy hush, one might say—that characterized the interim between the time of Malachi and that of John the Baptizer.

4. *The fourth phase: that of the climactic struggle between Satan and Messiah, Christ Jesus.* (1) The prophet Isaiah had stated explicitly that God Himself would give a sign (special proof) of Messiah's appearance in the world: this identifying sign was to be that a virgin should conceive and bear a Son who should be named Immanuel (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:23; Luke 2:11-12, 2:34). Hence, moved by such mysterious portents as the Star in the heavens, the message of the Angelic Choir (Luke 2:8-15), the gathering at the Manger, the Visit of the Magi, etc., Satan's first act was to incite the cruel Herod to put the infant to death. But God sent His angel to warn Joseph and Mary, and they fled into Egypt with the Child, returning to Nazareth only after Herod's death (Matt. 2:1-23). (2) After some years of silence (Luke 2:52), we see Jesus appearing before John the Baptizer and requiring John to baptize Him. Hence, the profound significance of the events which occurred at the Jordan: after Jesus had come up out of the water, not only did the Holy Spirit anoint Him by descending in a dovelike form upon Him, but the Father Himself broke the stillness of centuries for the first time since Sinai to declare vocally, "This is my beloved Son, in

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11, Luke 3:21-22). By these external acts the Holy Spirit officially anointed (inducted) Jesus into His threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King (Psa. 2:1-9; Acts 4:26, 10:36-42), and the Heavenly Father officially introduced Him to the world as His Only Begotten Son. This anointing (*christ*-ing, from *chrío*, literally, "smear," "rub on," hence, "anoint") by the Spirit and this avouching of His Sonship by the Father left no room for Satan to doubt that this truly was Messiah. (Note also the identifying sign given to the Herald, John, "upon whomsoever ye shall see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon Him," etc., John 1:29-34.) These identifications were a direct challenge to the Devil; as if God were saying to him, "This is He about whom the prophets testified and whose advent the world has long awaited: this is Messiah, my Only Begotten; therefore, do your worst!"

(3) The Devil joined battle at once, but in the Temptation which followed (Matt. 4:1-11), he came out "second best." But—did he give up after this first failure? By no means. Although it was necessary for angels to minister to the well-nigh exhausted Victor, the Devil departed from Him only "for a season" (Luke 4:13). He returned later in the most powerful temptation of all, in the Garden of Gethsemane. This time it was the temptation to yield to the elemental burden of sheer loneliness (aloneness): to the "tragic sense of life" itself. This—Unamuno has called it the supreme example of "the agony of Christianity"—it was necessary for Jesus to experience (Heb. 4:15). This He did experience in the Garden, and the soul agony was so poignant that great drops of His blood mingled with His sweat, to sanctify the ground under the old olive trees (Matt. 26:36-46, Mark 14:32-43, Luke 22:39-46). However, when Jesus emerged from Gethsemane, He had won the victory—over Himself, that is, over His human nature, and over His arch-enemy. Now He was fully prepared for

GENESIS

the Cross. Satan now realized, probably for the first time, that He could never win in a moral conflict with the Source of all good; under great urgency, therefore, he set about preparing the way for the use of his most potent weapon, death (Heb. 2:14-15), that is, to hasten the murder of the Son of God.

(4) The Tragedy of the Ages is now pushed vehemently to its denouement, as Satan's hatred builds up into diabolical rage. The Lord of glory is betrayed by one of His own disciples (Luke 22:3), and denied by another (Matt. 26:69-75). He is rejected by His own people (John 1:11), and sentenced to death by their ecclesiastical bigots, who then pressure Pilate, the Roman governor, albeit against his better judgment, into ratifying the death penalty (Acts 3:13-15, 7:51-53; Matt. 27:15-26; Mark 14:53-65, 15:6-15; Luke 22:66-71, 23:13-25; John 19:1-16; Acts 2:22-24). One cannot help wondering: Why such vindictiveness toward one who—in the eyes of those who were inflicting such cruelties upon Him—was merely an unlearned Galilean peasant? Think of the treacherous kiss, the scourging, the spitting on Him, the crowning (laceration) with thorns, the humiliation of dying between two common criminals, of having ignorant Roman (pagan) soldiers gamble for the few garments that were His sole material possessions; and finally, the death itself, by crucifixion, the most cruel and ignominious form of death that the inhumanity of man ever invented (the driving of spikes through the living quivering flesh of His hands and His feet)! Could all this have been inspired by any other source than sheer diabolical malice? What had this humble Personage done to evoke such fiendish mental and physical cruelties? Did not the Holy Spirit provide the certain answer to this question through the Apostle Peter: He "went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him" (Acts 10:38)? It is an unfailing characteristic of Evil that its hatred of the

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Good assumes diabolical proportions sooner or later. Moreover, is it not ironical that Satan, of course unwittingly, was himself bringing about the literal fulfilment of the prophetic picture of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah (Isa., ch. 53)? Misunderstood, misrepresented, rejected, betrayed, denied, deserted, and seemingly abandoned by the Father Himself, truly this Sacrifice on the Cross—the innocent for the guilty—was treading the winepress *alone*! Even the Heavenly Father, out of sheer empathy, we are constrained to think, turned His face away momentarily from this awful spectacle on Calvary (Matt. 27:46). Satan and his minions must have howled with fiendish glee, when Jesus, on the Cross, said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (John 19:30, Luke 23:46), and then bowed His head and "gave up the ghost." To Satan, this meant that Messiah was dead, that at long last God's redemptive Plan was forever frustrated.

(5) Imagine, then, Satan's utter consternation—imagine how his gloating was turned into cursing—on hearing the pronouncement of the angel at the Empty Tomb, "He is not here, for he is risen, even as he said" (Matt. 28:6-7). Yes, Satan and his rebel host reckoned they had achieved complete victory when Jesus died on the Cross. But they had reckoned without the working of God's almighty Power which he wrought when He raised up Jesus from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, and crowned Him the Acting Sovereign of the universe (Eph. 1:15-23; Matt. 28-18; Col. 1:16-18; Acts 2:22-36; Phil. 2:5-11; 1 Tim. 6:13-16; 1 Cor. 15:20-28). The Empty Tomb was the final and incontrovertible proof to Satan and his minions that, although physical death was the limit of diabolical power, it was but the occasion for a demonstration of the strength of God's Almighty Arm; that the death and resurrection of Jesus—true Messiah—was but an integral part of the Cosmic Plan of God to "bring to nought him that had the power

GENESIS

of death, that is, the devil . . . and deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:9-16). It meant that the ultimate end of the Divine Plan is nothing short of the death of death itself (Gen. 3:19, Isa. 46:8-11, Acts 2:23, Rom. 8:22-23, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, 2 Cor. 5:1-10). (Note also the teaching of Jesus, Matt. 12:38-40. That is to say, as Jonah came forth from the belly of the big fish in due time, so did our Lord come forth from the bowels of the earth: in a word, the one and only divine sign, vouchsafed all subsequent generations, of the ultimate defeat of Evil and the ultimate triumph of the Good, is the resurrection of the Prince of Life from Joseph's tomb. Christianity is the only faith known to mankind that has in it an empty tomb—the Empty Tomb; and this Tomb is empty because death had no dominion over the One whose body occupied it for the brief period of its entombment (Acts 2:22-36). *This Empty Tomb is the crowning glory of Christianity.*) It is significant, is it not, that the affirmation of the Resurrection was the fundamental motif of the apostolic testimony (Acts 2:32, 10:40-42, 17:30-31, 26:19-23; Rom. 1:4, 10:9-10, etc.)?

5. *The fifth and final phase: Satan's last-ditch efforts to bring down to Hell (with the lost of all ages) the spiritual seed of Abraham, God's elect of the New Covenant (Gal. 3:23-29).*

(1) The Resurrection of Jesus, the Advent of the Holy Spirit, and the Incorporation of the Church were the events in the development of the Remedial System which made inevitable the ultimate defeat of Satan and his ilk (1 John 3:8, Rev. 20:7-10). Today with all the desperation of a lost spirit engaged in a hopeless cause, he makes war on the Church. Realizing full well that he faces eternal segregation in Hell (Matt. 25:41), he seeks only to drag down the human race, and especially the Church, into the pit with him. Every true saint of God will realize as he

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

presses on toward the final victory of faith (1 John 5:4-5), that

Satan ever watches round him,
Seeks to find the weakest part,
And in moments most unheeded,
Quickly throws his fiery dart.

Eph. 6:12—"our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers . . . against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places." God's Eternal Purpose, that which He purposed in Christ Jesus, was that "unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:8-12). (2) No doubt all Christians are subject to temptation by these unseen evil personalities who roam our cosmos. No doubt the wicked angels influence us to sinful impulses by the power of suggestion (telepathy) which is inherent in all types of personality, to which we surrender unless we keep ourselves clad in "the whole armor of God" (Eph. 6:1-20). By subtle suggestions, no doubt, they seek to entice us into sin, to cause us to injure ourselves in body and spirit, and finally to plunge us into perdition (Psa. 91:3, Luke 8:12, John 13:2, 1 Cor. 7:5, 2 Cor. 2:9-11, 1 Tim. 4:1, 2 Tim. 2:26, Eph. 4:27, Jas. 4:7, 1 John 3:7-8). *Note what God promises His saints, however, with respect to the wiles of these evil spirits* (1 Cor. 10:13, 2 Pet. 2:9, 1 John 1:8-10). That we may be reminded continually of our Heavenly Father's guidance and protection, Jesus teaches us to pray: "and bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one" (Matt. 6:13). As in the case of Job, diabolical malignity is always circumscribed by the power of the Almighty (Job 1:12, 2:6); the devils could not even plunge into a herd of swine without the Savior's permission (Matt. 8:28-34). (3) *What means shall the saints employ to resist the wiles of the Devil?* The most effec-

GENESIS

tive means of resisting temptation are these: knowledge of the Word of God and the ability to use it with discrimination (it is noteworthy that Jesus, both in the Wilderness and in the Garden, relied on the Word and Will of God: Matt. 4:1-11, 26:34-44; cf. Eph. 6:16, Heb. 4:12, Isa. 49:2, Hos. 6:5); meditation and prayer (Matt. 4:1-2, Luke 22:39-46); the faithful keeping of the Lord's appointments (Acts 2:42, 1 Cor. 11:23-30, Heb. 10:23-25).

6. *The vindication of God's Absolute Justice (including His Love), impugned by the presumptuous lies of Satan and his cohorts, will be the fundamental objective of the Last Judgment.*

What shall be the final outcome of this age-long conflict between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil? The Scripture answer to this question is explicit, positive, and challenging: the outcome will be, through the redemptive work of Christ and the sanctifying activity of the Holy Spirit, nothing short of the complete triumph of God (1 John 3:7-10, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Phil. 2:9-11, Rev. 2:7-10). On this matter the Bible leaves us in no doubt whatever. It teaches expressly as follows: (1) *There will be a final universal Judgment in which all intelligent beings will stand before the Righteous Judge, to render a final accounting of their stewardship* (Matt. 11:20-24, 12:41-42, 25:31-46; Acts 17:30-31; Rom. 2:16; 2 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:27-28; Rev. 20:11-15). Both the just and the unjust (the saved and the lost) shall have part in the general resurrection which must, of course, precede the Judgment (John 5:28-29, 11:24; Acts 24:15; 1 Cor. 15:22; 1 Thess. 4:13-17; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 20:13). This Last Judgment is an event to be expected in the future (Acts 24:25, Heb. 10:27); an event that is to follow physical death (Heb. 9:27), an event that is to be attended by all humanity (Matt. 12:41-42, 16:27, 25:31-32; Acts 17:30-31; 2 Cor. 5:10), an event for which those who are evil are "reserved" (2 Pet. 2:4-10; Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43). (2)

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

At this Last Judgment, the Judge will be the Lord Jesus Christ. At His first Advent, the Only Begotten came as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29, Isa. 53:7, Acts 8:32, 1 Cor. 5:7, 1 Pet. 1:19, Rev. 5:6, 8, 12, 13; Rev. 6:1). At His second Advent, He will come as "the Judge of the living and the dead" (Acts 10:42; Matt. 3:12, 7:22-23; 16:27, 25:31; Luke 22:30; John 5:22-29; Rom. 2:16, 14:9-12; 2 Cor. 5:10). Though God is the Judge of all (Heb. 12:23), yet His judicial activity is exercised through Christ, both in the present state of things and at the Last Day (John 5:22; Matt. 19:28, 25:31-46, 28:18; Acts 17:31; 1 Cor. 15:20-28; 2 Cor. 5:10; Phil. 2:7-11; Rev. 3:21). Christ will appear in the Judgment in His threefold capacity. As Prophet, He will reveal the Father to His saints in glory (John 16:25, 17:24-26); as High Priest, He will present His saints before the Throne as an elect race, a redeemed people, a purchased possession (1 Pet. 2:9); as King, He will judge the world in righteousness (Acts 17:31).

(3) *The subjects of the Last Judgment will be the entire human race, and the evil angels: all humanity, each person possessed of a body reunited with spirit, the dead having been raised, and the living having been changed* (1 Thess. 4:16-17; 1 Cor. 15:51-52; Matt. 25:31-33; Rev. 20:12-13); *the evil angels* (2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6), the good angels appearing only as attendants and ministers of the Righteous Judge (Matt. 13:39-42, 24:31, 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:10). (4) *The design of the Last Judgment, in the Eternal Purpose and Plan of God, is to be "the revelation of the righteous judgment of God."* That is, not the *ascertainment* of the moral character of those appearing for judgment, but the *revelation of God's righteousness, justice, and holiness*. The notion that God will line all men up in rows and look them over, as in a military inspection, to ascertain their moral standing, is absurd. Our moral standing is known to God fully every

GENESIS

moment of our lives (Psa. 139:7-10; Job 26:6, 28:10; Prov. 15:3; Jer. 23:23-24; Acts 17:24-28; Heb. 4:13). Judgment will be, rather, the full and complete revelation of God's righteousness to all intelligent creatures, both angels and men. Thus the saints will be presented in the judgment clad in the fine linen of righteousness (Rev. 19:8-14), their sins having been covered by the atoning blood of Christ, forgiven and forgotten, put away from them forever (Psa. 103:12, Jer. 31:34, Heb. 8:12), that is, clothed in glory and honor and incorruption, the habiliments of eternal redemption (Rom. 2:7, Heb. 9:12). *In their manifestation, the ineffable greatness of God's love, mercy, and salvation will be fully disclosed to all His creatures.* The lost will be presented in the Judgment as they really are, that is, in all the realism of their neglect, rebelliousness, and iniquity. Even their secret sins will be brought to light and revealed to the whole intelligent creation. For the first time, perhaps, in the presence of Infinite Holiness, they will come to realize the enormity of their sinful lives, and the corresponding awfulness of their loss of God and Heaven; and the result will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth (of remorse, despair, and possibly rage occasioned by their utter frustration: Matt. 8:12, 13:42, 13:50, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30; Luke 13:28; Rev. 6:16-17). This final demonstration will be sufficient to prove to all intelligent creatures that Satan's charges against God have, from the beginning, been false and malicious, proceeding from a totally depraved being. *The result will be the complete vindication of God Almighty, which is, in itself, the primary design of the Last Judgment* (1 Cor. 6:2-3). This final demonstration of God's righteousness and of His love, in the salvation of His saints through the Atonement which He Himself provided to sustain the majesty of His law (Rom. 3:21-26), will be sufficient of itself to condemn Satan and all his kind.

(5) *Following the Great Judgment, both the saved and*

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

the lost will enter upon their respective eternal states of being (Matt. 25:34, 41; John 5:29; Rev. 20:11-15, 21:1-8). As Jesus has so clearly stated, between the two classes there will be "a great gulf fixed" (Luke 16:26), that is, the verdict will be final (Rev. 22:11, cf. Job 14:1-4). In all likelihood, this judgment will be one of self-examination and self-determination: individual conscience, confronted by absolute Holiness (Perfection: Matt. 5:48, Heb. 6:1), will send each person to his own proper "place," as in the case of Judas (Acts 1:25)—the "place" determined by his own moral effort in this present probationary life. For the redeemed, this final state will be that of Union with God (the Beatific Vision), the union of the human mind with the Mind of God in knowledge and the union of the human will with the Will of God in love (1 Cor. 13:9-13; 1 John 1:1-4, 4:7-21). For the lost, the final state will be that of the complete loss of God and all Good (2 Thess. 1:7-10), Scripturally designated the second death (Rev. 2:11, 20:6, 14; 21:8; cf. Matt. 10:28, 23:33, 25:30, 25:41; Mark 9:43-48; Rom. 6:23). (Cf. Matt. 25:46. Note the use of the word "eternal" here; *whatever it means with reference to the timeless state of the redeemed, it means the same with reference to the timeless state of the lost.* "Eternity" in Scripture seems to mean, not stretched-out time, but *timelessness*: it is impossible for the mind, in man's present state, to grasp the significance of this term.) It should be noted here, finally, that the success of the Divine Cosmic Plan is to be determined, not by the number who are saved, but by the greatness of the salvation that God will ultimately reveal in His saints. Should only one man appear in the Judgment, clothed in glory and honor and incorruption (Rom. 2:7), redeemed in spirit and soul and body (Rom. 8:23, 1 Thess. 5:23), this one example will prove to be so indescribably glorious as to be sufficient to vindicate Divine Justice and Love (Isa. 46:9-11). (Love is, of course, an essential aspect of justice:

GENESIS

otherwise an Atonement would not have been necessary. As a noted preacher once said, A God who is all love would be an unjust God. This points up the fallacy—and the folly—of the various cults of “Universalism.”)

7. *Diabolism has existed in all ages.* (1) This is evident from the divine anathemas on such practices as idolatry (worship of graven images, of the heavenly bodies—sun, moon, stars); worship of animals and birds and insects, even of the human reproductive organs (phallic worship); sorcery, divination, augury, necromancy, in fact, all kinds of occultism. (These are overlapping terms, of course: cf. “consulting with familiar spirits,” that is, through spirit-mediums, fortune-tellers, etc.) (Exo. 20:4-6, 22:20; Lev. 19:4, 26:1; Deut. 4:15-19, 4:23-24, 7:25-26, 27:15; 2 Chron. 11:15; Psalms 97:7, 115:4; Isa. 42:7; Jer. 10:11; 1 Cor. 8:4, 10:14; 1 John 5:21.) (2) The Cult of Fertility which flourished throughout the pagan world in ancient times, included the worship of the “Earth-Mother” (*Terra Mater*) the essential feature of which was *ritual prostitution* (on the theory of imitative magic, namely, that human physical coition enhanced the fertility of the fields); *phallic worship*, that is veneration of the images of the male reproductive organs (this was practised in Athens in the time of the so-called “Enlightenment,” that is, the age of Socrates and Plato); and the worship of animals noted for their prolificness, such as the bull, the snake, the he-goat, etc. In the days of the Empire, the Roman Saturnalia was a period of complete public sexual promiscuity. (Cf. Exo. 32:7-8, Lev. 17:7, and especially Rom. 1:18-32.) (3) Note also Biblical references to *devil-worship* (Deut. 12:31, 32:17; Psalms 106:37; 2 Ki. 17:17; Ezek. 16:20-22; 1 Cor. 10:20; Rev. 9:20). (4) Note that as a rule these occult practices incurred the death penalty (by stoning) under the Mosaic Law (Exo. 22:18; Lev. 19:31, 20:6, 27; Deut. 18:9-14; Jer. 27:9-10). King Saul’s downfall was complete when he consorted with the

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Witch of Endor (1 Sam. 15:23, also ch. 28). (5) In the New Testament these are sins that will damn the soul (Luke 16:27-31; Acts 15:20, 17:29; 1 Cor. 8:1-6, 10:14, 10:19-22; Gal. 5:20; 1 John 5:21; Rev. 21:8, 22:15). (Note the quacks who tried to emulate the methods of the Apostles: Acts 8:9-13, 18:24, 13:6-12, 19:13-20.) These practices were all manifestations of diabolism in Bible times. It is well-known that devil-worship has been a feature of some kinds of so-called "spiritualism" even in modern times. (Suggestions: Research into the history of the Kabala, and into the history of "black magic" in the Middle Ages. Read the *Pharsalia*, Book VI, by the Latin poet Lucan, for a vivid account of these horrible practices in Thessaly; also the tragedy by Euripides, the *Bacchae*, for a study of "orgiastic religion." Look into contemporary voodooism as practised by West Indian Negroes. "Hexing" belongs in this category: see Hardy's novel, *The Return of the Native*, for the "hexing" of Eustacia Vye, who had acquired the reputation in the community of being a witch.)

8. *Does diabolism exist in our day?* It is difficult to think otherwise, else how could we account for the following: (1) the monstrous inhuman careers of a Hitler, a Goebels, a Stalin, and their ilk; (2) the vicious sex crimes, thrill murders, senseless killings, horrible forms of torture (e.g., flaying a prisoner of war alive and making the skin into a lampshade), the cruelties of concentration camps, racism and attempted genocide, the "brain-washing" of captives taken in battle, etc.; (3) the prevalence of organized cults devoted exclusively to the spread of atheism. (This is something new in the world: ethnic groups—no matter how primitive—have uniformly recognized, in some way, their dependence on a higher Power or Powers.) (4) The rise of the totalitarian state. This also is new. Absolutisms have always existed: that is, systems in which absolute social and political control is exercised by the monarch,

GENESIS

(Matt. 22:30, cf. Acts 23:8). The theory that the doctrine of angels was just a bit of folklore to which Jesus accommodated Himself impugns both His wisdom and His goodness. He spoke so frequently of angels that his contemporaries *did suppose* Him to be accepting it as a matter of fact that angels do exist. If this belief was just a popular superstition without any foundation in fact, and Jesus knew this to be the case, surely His veracity—an essential aspect of His sinlessness—would have impelled Him to correct it. However, if He did not know any better, did not know that this was nothing but folklore, then His wisdom was deficient and He can be rightly accused of propagating error. But Jesus came to bring Truth, not error (John 14:6, 8:31-32). Again, if Paul had known that there are no such beings as angels, he could not have been honest in contenting himself with forbidding the Colossians to worship them (Col. 2:18): he would have been compelled to deny their existence as he denied the existence of heathen gods (1 Cor. 8:4). As Christopher writes: "The Inspired Volume not only assures us that this material world, and the living beings upon it, were created by God; that matter, as also the beings which are formed of it, owe their existence to Him directly; but it also reveals the existence of another order of beings, who inhabit a world invisible to us, who constitute a distinct category of intelligent creatures, and who, as a world, form an integral part of the universe. . . . The generic name of *angel* is given to this order of spirit beings. . . . We conceive of them as beings very high in the scale of creation, possessing powers similar to those of man, but far transcending his in every particular. They are classified in the Christian Scriptures as 'Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers,' names indicative of rank, glory, and majesty."¹²

2. *The doctrine is reasonable.* It is entirely reasonable to believe that there is a class of beings between man and

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

God, celestial, ethereal, unlimited by any sense of space or time, in view of the many gradations that are known to exist between man and the lower forms of life. Again, practically all heathen mythologies have their inferior deities and demigods. Mythology has its origin in tradition, and tradition, as a rule, in some original fact. "Every counterfeit must have its genuine." Hence the existence of lesser deities in all heathen polytheisms, and the disposition of men everywhere to believe in beings superior to themselves and inferior to the Supreme Being, is a presumptive argument in favor of the existence of angels. Again, the entire Christian world accepts the doctrine of immortality. If there is a spiritual entity in man that lives on after the death of the body, why should it be thought unreasonable that God created spirits without physical bodies? While in Scripture angels appear with bodies, it is evident that these were not physical bodies, inasmuch as they could make themselves visible and then vanish from human sight, and it is in the sense that they do not possess *physical* bodies that we speak of them as being *incorporeal*. But this experience does not suggest doubt as to the reality of their bodies: it simply intimates that their bodies are not composed of gross matter (cf. 1 Cor. 15:47-49). Jesus appeared to the Eleven on several occasions after His resurrection and then vanished from their presence (Mark 16:12-14, Luke 24:13-31, 36-43; John 20:19-26, 21:1-14), and though He possessed the same individuality as before His death, it is evident that His body had undergone an important change of texture (Luke 24:39-40). (Indeed on occasion He vanished from human sight even while in His human body: Luke 4:30, John 10:39.) Moreover, the fact that in some cases in the Bible record, angels are represented as appearing in human form is evidence not that they really did have this external form, but, rather, that *men of old thought they did*. Had they actually possessed physical bodies they could hardly

GENESIS

have vanished from human sight as they often did. We must remember that "all flesh is not the same flesh," and that there is not only such a thing as a natural body, but that there is also such a thing as a spiritual body (1 Cor. 15:39-44).

3. *Finally, the doctrine of angels is spiritually constructive*, in that it helps to build us up in the most holy faith.

(1) *It affords a barrier against materialism.* Materialism, indeed secularism of all kinds, deadens spiritual sensibilities. This present world has a charm which the physical nature of man finds hard to resist. It is easy to put wealth, world honor, pleasure, or business first, and to forget the "things that abide," such as faith, hope, love, piety, and spirituality. In the past century our schools have been invaded by a materialistic philosophy which has deadened man's concepts of spiritual realities. We have developed a class of teachers who, like the Sadducees of old, "say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit" (Acts 23:8). They teach that "matter" (or energy) is the irreducible of all forms of being, that when the human body returns to the dust personality is annihilated. Man, they say, is simply an aggregate of protons and electrons; hence, that when the body dies everything human dies with it. This teaching has deadened the convictions of the modern ministry and has all but destroyed the evangelistic spirit of both pulpit and pew. It has rendered people, generally, indifferent to divine things. We need to emphasize anew the ideas of soul, spirit, angel, personal devil, personal God, etc. When the church loses sight of the meditative and the spiritual (call it "mystical" if you wish), the church will die of dry rot. (2) *It strengthens our faith in God's protecting care.* One of the blessings of adoption enjoyed by the Christian is heavenly protection. Knowing that a host of these ethereal creatures are constantly keeping watch over the "heirs of salvation" (Heb. 1:14), he is encouraged to press on "toward the goal unto the prize

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:14). What was written aforetime with reference to the Son of God, applies equally with reference to all the saints: "He will give his angels charge over thee," etc. (Psa. 91:10-12). Jesus tells us expressly that even little children are recipients of angelic care and protection (Matt. 18:10). It is a source of much comfort to the Christian to accept this statement in childlike faith, believing, in the words of John Milton, that

"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth,
Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep."

(3) *Whole-hearted acceptance of this doctrine will help us in the struggle against sin.* It is a constant source of strength to know that these divine messengers—ministering spirits—are ever near at hand to sustain us if we manifest courage to remain true in the face of severe temptations (Matt. 4:11). Truly, in running the Christian race, we are constantly surrounded by "so great a cloud of witnesses" (Heb. 12:1-2), unseen and unheard, yet strong in grace and mighty in power! (Cf. Rom. 8:37-39, Cor. 10:13).

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART ELEVEN

1. What are the two general kinds of evil?
2. Criticize the popular notion that suffering is a direct Divine infliction of punishment for a personal sin or course of sin. What truth does the Book of Job contribute to the evaluation of this notion?
3. Criticize the view that all evil is illusory.
4. Criticize the view that evil is incomplete good.
5. Criticize the notion that evil is needed as a contrast to the good.
6. Discuss the disciplinary character of suffering.
7. What is the teaching of the Bible with regard to the origin of sin?

GENESIS

8. Is sin possible of any other form of being than that that of a person? Explain your answer.
9. Show how ordinary human experience supports the view that sin had to originate in the act of a person.
10. Who, according to Biblical teaching, was the person who committed the first sin? What was his motive?
11. How does the Christian doctrine of Atonement reconcile the antinomy between God's omnipotence and His goodness?
12. Summarize briefly the Biblical teaching about the nature and the work of angels.
13. What is the significance of the Biblical teaching with respect to good and evil angels?
14. Explain what is meant by "the mystery of lawlessness."
15. State the pedigree of sin as given in James 1:13-15?
16. Whom does Jesus explicitly identify as the first liar and the first murderer?
17. What is the proper distinction between *liberty* and *license*?
18. Who were the first anarchists in our cosmos?
19. Can anyone consistently deny the existence of sin in the world?
20. What powers specify the person to be a moral and hence responsible being?
21. Relate immaturity, irrationality, and depravity. To what extent, would you say, do these terms differ in meaning, if they differ at all?
22. What do we mean when we say that angels are incorporeal beings? On the other hand, are they bodiless? Explain your answer.
23. Explain the teaching of Jesus in Matt. 22:23-30 with respect to the nature of angels.
24. Does the Bible support the notion that angels are glorified spirits of deceased saints? Explain.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

25. What Scriptures may be cited to prove that angels are created beings?
26. What Scriptures may be cited to show that angels, though superhuman, are limited in intelligence and power?
27. What does the Bible have to say about their number?
28. List several incidents in which angels are represented as playing important roles in Scripture.
29. What does the Bible specifically state to be the work of angels?
30. What is the essential principle of sin?
31. What was the first phase of the Satanic rebellion against God? What was the result of it?
32. Who was Satan originally and what apparently was his office?
33. In what role does Satan appear in the story of Job?
34. What do we mean when we say that the evil angels are *totally depraved*? What Scripture phrases prove this to be true?
35. What did God permit Satan to do to Job? What restriction did He impose on Satan?
36. Give reasons for believing that Satan is a person.
37. What are some of the names given Satan in the Bible? What are some of the terms used to describe his role as the enemy of all good?
38. Should we hold God responsible for suffering and death? If not, why not?
39. By what specific term does the Apostle Peter describe Satan's activity in human affairs?
40. What is the import of the Apostle Paul's designation of Satan as "prince of the powers of the air," and "the god of this world"?
41. What is the limit of Satan's power?
42. What shall be the ultimate reward enjoyed by the good angels?

GENESIS

43. Distinguish between the *guilt* of sin and the *consequences* of sin. In what two Scriptures do we find this distinction indicated?
44. Show that the Biblical doctrine of Hell is entirely reasonable.
45. What truths are to be derived from the cases of demonology recorded in the Bible?
46. What was the second phase of Satan's war on God?
47. Explain why it was possible for God to extend mercy to the first human sinners, but not possible for Him to extend mercy to Satan and his rebels.
48. What did Satan do to bring about universal wickedness in the age before the Flood?
49. What was the third phase of Satan's war on God?
50. In this connection, what was the special significance of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament?
51. What was the fourth phase of Satan's war on God?
52. In relation to this conflict what was the special significance of the scene at the Jordan immediately following Jesus' baptism?
53. When did the anointing of Jesus take place and what did it signify?
54. What was the direct challenge implicit in the Father's avouching of the Sonship of Jesus immediately following the latter's baptism?
55. In what climactic event did the conflict between Messiah and Satan terminate?
56. What was the significance of the Resurrection of Christ in relation to Satan's ultimate destiny?
57. What special significance has the Resurrection in the Christian System as a whole?
58. How does Jesus relate the Old Testament story of Jonah to the fact of His own resurrection from the dead?
59. What is the fifth and final phase of Satan's war on God?

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

60. By what methods do these evil spirits influence human-kind in our day?
61. What has God promised His saints with respect to the wiles of these evil spirits?
62. What special means shall the saints employ to resist the wiles of the Devil?
63. What is to be the final outcome of this Satanic rebellion against God?
64. State the Biblical doctrine of the Last Judgment. Who will be the Judge at the Last Judgment? What classes will be present for the Judgment?
65. What shall be the essential character of this Last Judgment? What is the apparent import of the Apostle's declaration that the saints shall judge angels (1 Cor. 6:3)?
66. In what sense will the Last Judgment be the vindication of the Justice and Love of God?
67. What shall be the respective destinies of the saved and the lost following the Judgment?
68. What is the significance of the word *eternal* as used by Jesus in Matt. 25:46 with reference to the destinies of *both* the saved and the lost?
69. What are the evidences that diabolism has existed in all ages?
70. What are the evidences that diabolism exists in our day?
71. Give some reasons, aside from Biblical teaching, for accepting the existence and activity of angels as facts.
72. On what grounds do we say that the doctrine of angels is reasonable?
73. On what grounds do we affirm the doctrine to be spiritually constructive?
74. What is meant by heavenly protection and how do angels figure in it?

GENESIS

75. What does Jesus teach about angels and little children?
76. What practical values derive from wholehearted acceptance of Biblical teaching about the work of the angels? And Biblical teaching as well concerning the cosmic conflict between the forces of good and the forces of evil?

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- ¹⁾ Edgar Sheffield Brightman, *A Philosophy of Religion*, p. 259. (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1940).
- ²⁾ Deharbe's *Catechism*, trans. from the German by Fander, p. 94. (Catholic Publication Society, New York, 1876).
- ³⁾ D. Elton Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 237. (Harper, New York, 1957).
- ⁴⁾ L. P. Jacks, *Religious Foundations*, edited by Rufus M. Jones, p. 105. (Macmillan, New York, 1923).
- ⁵⁾ Whittaker Chambers, *Witness*, pp. 797, 798. (Random House, New York, 1952).
- ⁶⁾ Wm. Robinson, *The Devil and God*, pp. 70-72. (Abindgon-Cokesbury, New York and Nashville, 1945).
- ⁷⁾ Samuel M. Thompson, *A Modern Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 507-508. (Regnery, Chicago, 1955).
- ⁸⁾ W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites: Fundamental Institutions*, p. 62. (Appleton, New York, 1889).
- ⁹⁾ Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology*, One-Volume Edition, p. 443. (Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1907).
- ¹⁰⁾ Robert Milligan, *Scheme of Redemption*, Revised Edition, pp. 44-45, fn. (Christian Publishing Company, St. Louis).
- ¹¹⁾ H. C. Christopher, *The Remedial System*, p. 32. A great book, but long out of print.
- ¹²⁾ Christopher, *ibid.*, p. 29.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Samuel M. Thompson (MPR, 507-508): "A world free of evil would have to be a world which contained nothing capable of evil. A world without natural evil would be a world without the use of one thing by another for its existence; and this, it seems, would be a world without change. Considering the problem, however, primarily with respect to moral evil, we can imagine this condition fulfilled in two different ways. A world may contain nothing capable of moral evil because there is nothing in it capable of acting on its own initiative. Such a world would contain nothing which had reached the stage where morally responsible action is possible. The beings existing in such a world would be neither morally good nor morally evil; they would be unmoral [amoral]. The other sense in which we may conceive something incapable of moral evil is in the sense that it is perfectly good. A world which contained moral agents all of whom were incapable of doing wrong, or were able to refrain from doing wrong and did so refrain, would be a world free of evil. These are the two alternatives to the contention, which we are here defending, that a world which contains free agents is a world which contains evil but that the existence of such a world is good. It seems quite plain that a world in which free agents are included is in some significant sense a higher existence than one in which free choice would be impossible. The theistic solution of the problem of evil, as against those who see the very possibility of evil as something itself evil, can be summed up in this: *Not even God can love a puppet*. It goes without saying that no puppet, however complicated may be the motions through which it is put, can love."

* * * *

GENESIS

(The late Dorothy L. Sayers was an Oxford professor, a brilliant literateur, author of the well-known Lord Peter Wimsey (detective) stories, and withal a profound Christian believer. The following excerpt is taken from the text, *Introduction to Religious Philosophy*, pp. 11-12, by Geddes MacGregor. Published by Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1959.)

"The only letter I ever want to address to average people is one that says: Why don't you take the trouble to find out what is Christianity and what isn't? Why, when you can bestir yourself to learn technical terms about electricity, won't you do as much for theology before you begin to argue ?

Why do you never read either the ancient or the modern authorities in the subject, but take your information for the most part from biologists and physicists who have picked it up as inaccurately as yourselves? Why do you accept mildewed old heresies as bold and constructive contributions to modern thought when any handbook on Church History would tell you where they came from?

Why do you complain that the proposition that God is three-in-one is obscure and mystical and yet acquiesce meekly in the physicist's fundamental formula, ' $2P-PQ$ equals IH over 2π where I equals the square root of minus 1,' when you know quite well that the square root of minus 1 is paradoxical and π is incalculable?

What makes you suppose that the expression 'God ordains' is narrow and bigoted whereas the expressions 'nature provides' or 'science demands' are objective statements of fact?

You would be ashamed to know as little about internal combustion as you do about beliefs. I admit that you can practise Christianity without knowing much about theology, just as you can drive a car

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

without understanding internal combustion. But if something breaks down in the car, you humbly go to the man who understands the works, whereas if something goes wrong with religion you merely throw the creed away and tell the theologian he is a liar.

Why do you want a letter from me telling you about God? You will never bother to check up on it and find out whether I am giving you a personal opinion or the Church's doctrine. Go away and do some work. Yours very sincerely, Dorothy L. Sayers."

* * * *

"Just as the account of creation in Genesis has been able to communicate the majesty of God the Creator within every cosmology from Ptolemy to Einstein precisely because it is not a blow-by-blow account of the origin of the cosmos but a dramatic dialogue transcending all world views, so the apocalyptic setting of the Sermon on the Mount and of the call to discipleship, 'Follow me!' grounds the summons of Jesus in the absolute character of God and of his demands upon us. We may answer No to the summons, but answer we must."

—Jaroslav Pelikan, art., "Theologian and Thinker" (tribute to Dr. Schweitzer), *Saturday Review*, Sept. 25, 1965.

PART TWELVE:

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

(Gen. 3:1-8)

1. *The Generations of the Heavens and of the Earth.* We need to recall here briefly the significance of this phrase. The term "generations" (*toledoth*) in the various passages in which it occurs in Genesis (cf. Gen. 5:1, 6:9, 10:1, 11:10, 11:27, 25:12, 25:19, 36:1, 37:2), *refers indisputably*, not to that which precedes it, but to that which follows it, in the text. In a word, it is not recapitulative, but introductory. Hence, there is no reason to assume that the phrase, as used in Gen. 2:4, is any exception to this rule. As Green writes (UBG, 11,12): "Accordingly this title . . . must announce as the subject of the section which it introduces, not an account of the way in which the heaven and the earth were themselves brought into being, but an account of the offspring of heaven and 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 sections proceed regularly." (That is, first, Gen. 1:1, then 2:4, then 5:1, 6:9, etc., each referring uniformly to what follows and not to what goes before.)

2. *The Drama of the Genesis of Sin and Suffering.* (Sin is *moral* evil; suffering is *physical* or "natural" evil.) We have now learned (Part XI) that, according to Biblical teaching, the first sin occurred, not in Paradise, but in Heaven itself, in the insurrection of Satan and his rebel angels against the Sovereignty of God. In the third chapter of Genesis we have the account of the beginning of evil on the earth. From this account we learn the following: (1) that the actors in this supreme Tragedy of Humankind were four, namely, the Man, the Woman, the Serpent, and the Devil; (2) that the Man and the Woman were originally innocent (*i.e.*, prior to the birth of conscience in them), and that in this original state they were surrounded

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

with all things necessary to their growth in holiness and the good life; (3) that they fell from this state of innocence—how long after their creation (attainment of reason?) we are not informed; (4) that they were led to disobey God by the seductive appeals of a creature designated the serpent; (5) that the Woman was the first to take the plunge into sin and its consequences, and that the Man, partially through affection for his fallen bride, deliberately followed her into the transgression (Gen. 3:6, cf. 1 Tim. 2:14). (Let us keep in mind always what is probably the most fundamental rule of Biblical interpretation, namely, that this account, like any other segment of Scripture, can be understood fully only in the light of the *whole* of Biblical teaching.) Undoubtedly the most significant truth for us that is embodied in this narrative is the fact that in the story of Adam and Eve and their encounter with the forces of evil—and the tragic consequences stemming therefrom—we have the prototype of what happens in the life of every human being on attaining the age of responsibility ("accountability," "discretion"). (Cf. Rom. 3:9, 23; also John 1:29—note the import of the singular form, "sin," as used here.)

We surely have here a dramatization of what had to be a historical event, that is, an event that *had to take place in our space-time world*, in the appearance (emergence?) of the first *homo sapiens*. That is to say, there had to be an *awareness of wrong*, originating in practical reason and manifesting itself in the chiding of conscience, somewhere, at some time, in a human pair—male and female; otherwise, man would never have gotten out of the jungle. No evolution theory obviates this truth. Moreover, it seems obvious that some kind of correlation must exist between the awakening of conscience in man and his attainment of holiness, even though the nature and design of this correlation is, and probably always will be, inscrutable.

3. *Human Nature*. It should be noted that we use the

GENESIS

word "Man" here generically, that is, as referring to every individual (both male and female) of the species ("kind") known as *mankind* or *humankind*. (Note the word "kind" as used in Gen. 1:12, 21, 24). What is man? As Alexander Pope has written—

Know then thyself; presume not God to scan;
The proper study of mankind is man.

And the Psalmist exclaims: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" (Psa. 8:4). *What is man? What is human nature?* I read today, in some texts on scientific problems, that *human nature is changing*. Obviously, if human nature changes, it will no longer be *human* nature. What, then, is human nature *per se*? The clearest answer to this question that I have ever come upon is in the great Old Testament commentary of the distinguished Jewish writer, Moses Maimonides (Moses ben Maimon, who lived A.D. 1135-1204). Maimonides writes, concerning Gen. 1:26, "Let us make man in our image" (*tselem*), as follows (GP, 14): "The term signifies 'the specific form' of man, viz., his intellectual perception, and does not refer to his 'figure' or 'shape.' . . . As man's distinction consists in a property which no other creature on earth possesses, viz., intellectual perception, in the exercise of which he does not employ his senses, nor move his hand or his foot, this perception has been compared—though only apparently, not in truth—to the Divine perception, which requires no corporeal organ. On this account, *i.e.*, on account of the Divine intellect with which man has been endowed, he is said to have been made in the form and likeness of the Almighty, but far from it be the notion that the Supreme Being is corporeal, having a material form." As we have noted heretofore, in our study of Genesis 2:7, man is a body-mind or body-spirit unity, that is, in scientific terms, a psychosomatic unity, a "living soul." This is precisely what we mean by *human nature* throughout this text. (See

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

our presentation of the Christian doctrine of immortality, in Volume One of our Textbook on Genesis.) As Maimonides explains so clearly, however, it is only in his interior life, based on his intellection, that man can be said truly to be the "image" and "likeness" of his Creator.

4. *Aspects of Human Nature.* These may be described as follows: (1) *Racial.* The Bible teaches that the entire human race has descended from a single pair (Gen. 1:27, 2:7, 2:22, 3:20, 9:19; Acts 17:26; Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:21-22). This teaching is corroborated by evidence: (a) from *history*, i.e., that the history of the race, of all ethnic groups in both hemispheres, points to a common origin ("cradle") in southwestern Asia; (b) from *philology*, which points up a common origin of all the more important languages of both the past and the present; (c) from *physiology*, namely, the essential identity of all races in cranial, osteological, and dental characteristics; the fertility of unions among individuals of the most diverse human types, and the continued fertility of the offspring of such unions; (d) from *psychology*, that is, the existence of common mental, social, and moral characteristics in all peoples. Graves (HCD, 58): "Men are homogeneous, a genetic bond binds the race, the law of heredity everywhere prevails." Goldenweiser (*Anth.*, 32): "What the anthropologist finds is man to whom nothing human is foreign: *all the fundamental traits of the psychic make-up of man anywhere are present everywhere.*" (Evolutionists are generally agreed, I think, that insofar as it can be determined at present in the development of their theory, there has been only one biological "progression" culminating in *homo sapiens*.) To this I should like to add, some evolutionists to the contrary notwithstanding, that as things now stand there is no available body of evidence at hand sufficient to justify the view that if mankind were to disappear from the face of the earth, there is any process of change now in operation by which another *homo sapiens*

GENESIS

might be "evolved," however long the animal kingdom might continue to exist. In our day, evolutionists are prone to avoid this issue by taking the position that biological evolution has given way to what they call "psychological" evolution as a result of the obtrusion of man's mental powers into the ongoing of the process. (The Scriptures know nothing, of course, of hypothetical "pre-Adamic" families or tribes, nor for that matter do the scientists.)

(2) *Bipartite*. Man's nature is a fusion of the two forms of being known to us, the spiritual and the material. He consists of "body" and "spirit," and the union of the two elements makes of him a "living soul" (Gen. 2:7; Job 27:3, 32:8, 33:4; Eccl. 12:7; Zech. 12:1). Schleiermacher (CG, 2:487): "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." Godet (BS): "From the point of view of Holy Scripture, man is a composite being made up of two elements of opposite nature and origin. He is, as to his body, formed out of the dust of the earth; but in his body there exists a breath of life due to the inspiration of God Himself. 'God,' says the ancient book, Genesis, 'formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' The nature of the being which resulted from the combination of these two elements is described by the expression, 'a living soul'; and thus, continues Genesis, 'man became a living soul'—words which were reproduced by Paul almost literally (1 Cor. 15:45). We see that this expression, 'living soul,' is not applied to the breath of God considered in itself and separate from the body, but that it describes man in his entirety, as the result of the union of the two contrasted elements." Someone has said: "Through my body I am put in relation with nature below me; through my soul, with men, my equals, around me; through my spirit, with God above me." A. A. Hodge

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

(PL, 221): "By soul we mean only one thing, *i.e.*, an incarnate spirit, a spirit with a body. Thus we never speak of the souls of angels. They are pure spirits, having no bodies." (I must reject this last statement. God alone is pure Spirit [John 4:24]. I find no intimation in Scripture that any creatures, either angels or men, are pure spirits. Angels are represented Biblically as presenting themselves to men as ministering spirits [with reference to their function, Heb. 1:14], but in some such attenuated form of energy-matter as makes them sense-perceptible to those to whom they manifest themselves.) Thus it is that when Scripture writers wish to describe the complete constitution of the human being, they place side by side the three terms—body, soul, and spirit; *e.g.*, 1 Thess. 5:23, Heb. 4:12—notwithstanding the essential duality of man's nature.

(3) *Personal*. Man was created "in the image" of God, Gen. 1:26-27. In what sense? (a) In some sort of *physical* or *metaphysical* sense? Surely not, because God is Spirit (John 4:24). It is hardly legitimate to bring in anthropomorphic expressions, as *e.g.*, Gen. 3:8, 6:6, 11:7, 18:1, and Exo. 33:20-23, to prove that God is in some sense corporeal. One of the great problems of revelation has ever been that of clothing divine thought in terms intelligible to man; hence, throughout Scripture, God is represented oftentimes as possessing certain physical features of a man, or of thinking and acting as man would think or act under similar circumstances. These are forms of communication adapted to man's ability to receive and to understand. (b) In a *moral* sense, as indicating *holiness*? Obviously not. Holiness is a state achieved by the exercise of the human will in obedience to God's law (*cf.* Matt. 3:15). God is infinitely holy in the sense that He never deviates from His own Will; being in Himself the Source of all truth, He conforms thereto precisely under all circumstances. Holiness is literally *completeness*, *perfection*.

GENESIS

In his primitive state, man was *innocent* rather than holy, that is, He existed without any actual awareness of the possibility of illicit knowledge and no actual knowledge of sin as a matter of personal experience. Innocence is largely a state of passivity, of untried childhood, we might well say; but holiness is active, not passive; it is the exercise of the human will as God would have it done, in obedience to His will. (c) In a *personal* sense, obviously. When God is said to have created man "in his own image," I understand this to mean that he endowed the creature with the essential properties of personality, viz., *self-consciousness* and *self-determination*. He endowed the corporeal form which was constituted of "the dust of the ground" (energy-matter) with the "breath of life," i.e., the powers, privileges, and responsibilities that attach to a person *solely because he is a person*. That part of the human being which is "dust" (matter) is simply the outer shell, "the earthly house of our tabernacle" (2 Cor. 5:1). The real man, however, the creature who thinks and feels and wills—the inner man (Eph. 3:16, 2 Cor. 4:16), not just the life principle, but the rational as well, hence *rational life*—was inbreathed by the Divine Spirit from His very own essence; hence, as Aristotle has said, reason is the spark of the Divine in man. Through the endowments of personality *man is qualified and divinely ordained to be the lord tenant of the earth* (Gen. 1:28-30, Psa. 8). (Thinking of God in the likeness of our inner selves is not prohibited in Scripture; thinking of God in terms of external things is prohibited (Exo. 20:4-6). Again, the test of the morality and of the nobility of a culture is *how it treats that which is created in the image of God, that is, the person as such*.)

(4) *Social*. Man was intended for society (Gen. 2:18). By ability, inclination, affection, interdependence and actual need, man is a social being; or, as Aristotle put it, "Man is by nature a political animal," that is, a dweller in a *polis* (the name by which the ancient Greek city-state

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

was known). Realizing this inherent characteristic of man's nature, soon after creating the Man, God created the Woman and brought her unto the Man as a helper meet for his needs (Gen. 2:21-25). Thus the conjugal union became, and continues to be, the basis of both domestic and civil society. (5) *Moral*, that is, having the power of choice and hence subject to the Divine law and accountable for every voluntary act that is not in harmony with that law and its ordaining Will. This power of choice is, at the same time, the source of his potentiality of attaining holiness. (6) *In general*, man's nature is clearly indicated by his outreaches as manifested throughout his history. These are the *intellectual* (quest for truth), the *esthetic* (quest for beauty), the *social* (quest for order), and the *religious* (quest for wholeness or holiness). The *moral* outreach is, of course, intrinsic to all these facets of human interest and activity. As Cassirer has written (EOM, 68), man is to be defined specifically, not by any inherent principle which constitutes his metaphysical essence, nor by any empirically discerned set of biological instincts, but by his *works*, that is, the products of his specific impulsion to think and to live in terms of symbols. This specific propensity *to symbolify*, unknown to the lower orders, is the source of his language, art, myth, and ritual, the facets of his culture. Hence, says Cassirer, man is not to be defined precisely as an *animal rationale*, but as an *animal symbolicum* (p. 26).

5. *The Serpent.*

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which Jehovah God had made" (Gen. 3:1a).

(1) Is the serpent mentioned here to be thought of as a creature of myth, allegory, fable, or folklore (of "supra-history," to use the "neo-orthodox" term)? Or was this a literal serpent as we now see and know serpentkind? The etymology of the original Hebrew term (*nachash*) has

GENESIS

been the subject of a great deal of tortuous speculation. The word has been variously translated as signifying such ideas as "hiss," "creep," "pierce," "shine" (with reference probably to its glossy appearance), etc. (Note in Isa. 27:1 the distinction of the "swift" or "fleeing" serpent from the "crooked" or "winding" serpent. Note also that in Eccl. 10:11 the term certainly suggests "babbler.")

(2) Writers of the modern critical school take the position, of course, that this was not an actual serpent at all. One theory is that it was the personification of "the instinct that impels man to emerge from the condition of childhood." Another view is that it symbolizes "the animal principle" in man (cf. the Id of Freudian psychology). Adam Clarke (CG, 44 ff.) pursues the etymology of the word through a maze of possible connotations, finally arriving at the ingenious notion that the creature was a member of the primitive family, possibly an ape or orang-outang. Or, again, was this creature a symbol of sex (again, cf. the Freudian libido)? Not so, says Cornfeld (AtD, 16), because "primitive man did not sublimate his instinct with such symbols." (For various uses of *nachash*, see Exo. 4:3, 7:15; Num. 21:6, 7, 9; Deut. 8:15; 2 Ki. 18:4; Job 26:13; Psa. 58:4, 140:3; Prov. 23:32, 30:19; Eccl. 10:8, 11; Isa. 14:29, 27:1, 65:25; Jer. 8:17, 46:22; Amos 5:19, 9:3; Mic. 7:17). Aldo J. Tos (Roman Catholic) writes (ABOT, 59, 60): "Symbolism and anthropomorphism are the media by which the author teaches the theology of the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve in Gn 3, 1-13." Again: "The 'serpent' is used as a symbol of man's ancient foe. Hebrew writers will later call him Satan, 'the adversary.' Christian belief is that he is a fallen angel: 'And he laid hold on the dragon, the ancient serpent, who is the devil and Satan . . .' (Apocalypse 20, 2). The presentation shows him as a cunning being who exercises his rational powers with a considerable amount of craft. The use of the 'serpent' was probably the author's attempt at

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

attacking the many forms of worship current among the Canaanites in which the image of the serpent appeared as a fertility symbol." (Indeed archaeology has proved in recent years that the Cult of Fertility was widespread throughout the Mediterranean world in ancient times, and that the bull and the snake, because of their reputation for fecundity, were the prevailing symbols of this Cult.) On this problem of the character of the Temptation-and-Fall narrative, Archer remarks (SOTI, 190) that many prefer to regard the story as one "in which the moral downfall of man is described by a fictitious episode designed to illustrate it," and that those who hold this view would generally agree that "insofar as man is a fallen creature, a moral agent with an innate sense of guilt, the 'myth' reflects a sublime truth, even though no such isolated episode actually took place." Archer himself concludes: "No decisive objections, however, have ever been raised against the historicity of Adam and Eve either on historical, scientific or philosophical grounds. The protest has been based essentially upon subjective concepts of probability."

(3) Are we to think, then, of the story of the Woman and the Serpent as a literary form comparable to the New Testament parables? Some have so held. However, not one of these stories in the first few chapters of Genesis has either of the characteristics common to the parable, namely, (a) as teaching one—and only one—specific spiritual lesson in its content, and (b) as following the parabolic introductory formula of pointing up a specific likeness of some kind (analogy). Jesus characteristically introduced His parables with the statement, "The kingdom of God is *like*," etc. Always in the parable some profound spiritual truth is being emphasized by an illustration from the natural world designed to make the point stand out clearly. In these Genesis stories, however, we find no such framework. Again quoting Archer (SOTI, 192): "Nowhere is it stated that the beginning of the world or of mankind was *like*

GENESIS

anything analogous. A parable is never to be explained in terms of itself; it always involves an analogy drawn from something else. Just as it would never have been said, 'The kingdom of God is like the kingdom of God,' so it could never have been intended to imply, 'The beginning of the human race was like the beginning of the human race,' or, 'The universal Flood was like the universal Flood.' The parabolic element is completely lacking here." Moreover, it should be noted that there is not just one fundamental truth, but many such truths, implied in these various narratives of the Book of the Beginnings. This fact we shall note as we proceed with our study.

(4) It is to be granted, of course, that the mention of a talking serpent might suggest a myth. To the contrary, Kaufmann emphasises the vast difference between Biblical references to angels and devils and those of the pagan mythologies. He writes as follows (RI, 66): "What is fundamental and peculiar to Jewish demonology is that its spirits and devils derive, not from a primordial evil root, but from sin. Its Satanic symbol is the land serpent, the tempter of Eden, not the sea serpent (the dragon, or Rahab), the primeval rebel against God . . . Judaism's demons are the offspring of sin *creatures*; their power is only to entice man into sin and thereby bring divine judgment upon him. The same is true of the 'princes of the nations' (cf. Dan. 10:13, 20). . . . They have no mythological features, nor are they sexually differentiated. . . . This absence in the Bible of the pagan conception of the demonic is intrinsically linked with the absence of theogony. It is of the essence of theogony that a given god is but one embodiment of the powers residing in the primordial womb of all being. . . . Biblical religion, having concentrated divinity in one transcendent being, at once did away with theogony and theomachy. Since there was no 'womb' out of which YHWH sprang, he could have no 'brothers' divine or demonic. No antagonist could, there-

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

fore, be on a par with him." Again (RI, 68, 69): "Biblical cosmology lacks also the basic pagan idea of a natural bond between the deity and the universe. Creation is not depicted as a sexual process, nor does it proceed from the seed of the god, his blood, spittle, tears, or the like. The idea of a material emanation from the creator is foreign to the Bible. . . . Whatever celestial beings there are belong to the suite of the one God; only YHWH is active as creator. The monotheism of these stories is, thus, not the outcome of artificial adaptation of pagan materials. It permeates their every aspect and finds expression even in passages of artless naivete."

(5) Perhaps it should be noted at this point again that many persons who put great emphasis on the significance of "folklore" apparently overlook—or ignore—the fact that tradition is often inspired by, and often embodies, profound truth (truth which, of course, usually has become corrupted by diffusion in the course of time). With respect to the Temptation-and-Fall Narrative, it is obvious that we have in it a disclosure of universal truth, that is to say, of what happens in the life of every human being (Rom. 3:23), from the first *homo sapiens* (and even from the evolutionist point of view, the line must have been crossed at some time, somewhere, from the subhuman to the human) to every twentieth-century individual of the same genus. As Murphy, although himself holding fast to the traditional view that it was real creature of serpentkind that acted as the instrumentality of temptation in this Narrative, writes (CG, 112): "The whole is so deeply designed, that the origin and progress of evil in the breast is as nearly as possible such as it might have been had there been no prompter." The pedigree of evil, as stated by James (1:13-15)—Satan, lust, sin, death—is certainly presented clearly in this Narrative. Of course, the Christian is under no obligation to stretch unduly any part of the Biblical text, or to ferret out questionable hidden meanings

GENESIS

therein, in order to bring it into correspondence with contemporary science. One who is familiar with the content of the Bible as a whole knows well that it carries on its pages the positive evidence of its own Divine origin as the Book of the Spirit. However, in all instances in which harmony can be seen to exist without doing violence to Scripture teaching, surely this harmony—or at least the possibility of it—should be pointed up clearly, in order that persons, and especially young men and women, of this and succeeding generations may be strengthened in the most holy faith. To deliberately assume disharmony in cases in which the possibility of harmony is present is *a vicious methodology*.

(6) The Critical (Analytical) Theory of the Temptation-and-Fall Narrative is stated clearly by Skinner (ICCG, 71-73). The serpent, he writes, is simply a creature of Yahweh distinguished from the rest by its superior subtlety. "The serpent, therefore, belongs to the category of 'beasts of the field' . . . at the same time it is a being possessing supernatural knowledge, with the power of speech, and animated by hostility towards God. It is this last feature which causes some perplexity." Again: "All this belongs to the background of heathen mythology from which the materials of the narrative were drawn; and it is the incomplete elimination of the mythological element, under the influence of a monotheistic and ethical religion, which makes the function of the serpent in Gn 3 so difficult to understand. In later Jewish theology the difficulty was solved, as is well known, by the doctrine that the serpent of Eden was the mouthpiece or impersonation of the devil . . . The Jewish and Christian doctrine is a natural and legitimate extension of the teaching of Gn 3, when the problem of evil came to be apprehended in its real magnitude; but it is foreign to the thought of the writer, although it cannot be denied that it may have some affinity with the mythological background of his narrative."

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

The "perplexity" admitted in one of the foregoing statements is due to one fact, and one alone, namely, the fact that the adherents of this school assume that Biblical religion was an invention ("progressively developed") of the human mind; hence, not a revelation by the agency of the Spirit of God. The devotees of the Critical Theory either ignore—or repudiate outright—any and every claim of special inspiration which the Bible makes for itself. They seem to have assumed *arbitrarily* the attitude *mistakenly* held by those "certain disciples" whom Paul found at Ephesus, who, upon interrogation, admitted that they did not so much as know that there is a Holy Spirit or at least that the Holy Spirit "was given" (Acts 19:1-7). Of course, to refuse to accept the Bible as the Book of the Spirit is to refuse to accept the fact of its internal unity—a unity which can reasonably be ascribed only to Divine inspiration. The Critical "analysts" simply brush aside any possibility of Divine inspiration and supervision and proceed to apply the "evolution yardstick" to the development of Biblical teaching. Such an arbitrary *a priori* (purely subjective) assumption (or presumption?) is a notable example of the distortion which occurs from the refusal to follow one of the most important norms of interpretation (one which I have repeatedly emphasized in the present text), namely, that the content of any segment of Scripture can be properly understood only in the light of Bible teaching *as a whole*. As we shall see *infra*, the nature and design of the activity of the serpent of Eden becomes crystal clear when studied in connection with all other Scriptures that bear upon the general subject of man's Temptation and Fall. Finally, if the Bible is not the Book of the Spirit of God (as it claims to be: cf. 1 Pet. 1:10-12, 2 Pet. 1:21; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; Gal. 1:12; 1 Thess. 2:13, etc.), then it is simply and completely a humanly produced book, and one which can no more claim the authority that attaches to Truth than can

GENESIS

a work of Homer, Milton, Dante, Shakespeare, or any other human writer (cf. John 8:31-32, 16:12-14, 17:17).

6. *The Serpent a Real Creature.* That the serpent of Eden was a real creature of the serpent kind seems the most plausible view to take of it. This view is supported, moreover, by the tenor of Biblical teaching as a whole. Note the following matters of fact: (1) It is explicitly stated that this serpent was a "beast of the field," that is, neither a domesticated animal nor a member of some inferior species. (Note that it is not described as a creature *like* unto a beast of the field.) (2) It is described by a power (craftiness) that belongs, or is popularly thought to belong, to real serpents (cf. Matt. 10:16). In antiquity, we are told, the craftiness of serpentkind was proverbial. "The serpent was more *subtle* than any beast of the field which Jehovah God had made." That is, *crafty*: as Whitelaw comments (PCG, 56), the word "can only be used either (1) *metaphorically* for the devil, whose instrument it was; or (2) *proleptically*, with reference to the results of the temptation; for in itself, as one of God's creatures, it must have been originally good." (3) It seems only reasonable that Satan should have used an apparently harmless agent to bring about the seduction of the Woman, thus achieving the added objection of concealing the identity of the real tempter. One of Satan's favorite devices has ever been that of presenting himself to men in the guise of an "angel of light" (2 Cor. 11:14). (4) On any other view, the serpent itself was Eve's superior. But this is not consistent with the dominion God gave to man (Gen. 1:28). (5) The curse pronounced upon the serpent (Gen. 3:14) would be meaningless if the recipient of it had been only an apparition or an unreal creature. Surely this curse pronounced upon serpentkind in general nullifies all attempts to explain the serpent of Eden in terms of symbol, allegory, or poetic imagery.

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

7. *The First Liar and Murderer.* Did the serpent act alone in the transaction, or did it act merely as the agent of a superior intelligence? The language of the New Testament in referring to man's temptation and fall implies its literalness. E.g., cf. 2 Cor. 11:3—surely we are justified from this mention of the Fall in concluding that the Apostle was speaking of it as an actual occurrence. Whitelaw (PCG, 57): "Equally with the theory that the devil was the only agent in man's temptation, and that the serpent is purely the allegorical dress in which the historian clothes him (Eusebius, Cajetan, Quarry, Alford), must the notion be rejected that there was nothing but a serpent (Aben Ezra, Kalisch, Knobel)." It is evident that the serpent was but the *instrument* through which a far more cunning and diabolical agent spoke and acted, for several reasons, as follows: (1) because the power of speech is not a natural endowment of the serpent. Hence, it must have used articulate language, on this occasion, as the mouth-piece of a superhuman intelligence. K-D (BCOTP, 92): "When the serpent, therefore, is introduced as speaking, and that just as if it had been entrusted with the thoughts of God Himself, the speaking must have emanated, not from the serpent, but from a superior spirit, which had taken possession of the serpent for the sake of seducing man." Shook (GB, 61): "We are not to suppose from the account that a literal serpent became the devil. The serpent was simply the agent through which the devil operated in the deception. It seems probable from the account that originally the beast walked upright, and that as a result of the curse (Gen. 3:14) his species crawl upon the ground." Balaam's ass, by a divine impulsion, spoke in articulate words (Num. 22:21-35, 2 Pet. 2:16); so the serpent in tempting Eve must have spoken by diabolical impulse. (2) Because there is no other ground on which we can explain the serpent's diabolical cunning and its murderous intention. "Is it presumable that God could

GENESIS

have endowed the serpent or any other creature with such diabolical and hellish propensities?" (Milligan).

(3) *Because there is no other ground on which we can explain the words of Jesus in John 8:44. Here Jesus tells us that the Devil was the first liar and the first murderer, and we know that the first lie emanated from the mouth of the serpent and that the whole human race was murdered by its seduction of the Woman.* Note the many instances in which our Lord is said to have recognized the real existence of Satan and his rebellious angelic host (Matt. 25:41; Luke 10:17-20, 11:17-26; Matt. 4:10, 12:26, 13:28, 16:23; Mark 3:23, etc.). That these were not just cases of His accommodation of His language to popular "superstitions" is evident (a) from the positive unequivocal character of his statements (no such phrases ever fell from His lips as, e.g., "as you think this to be" or "as in our tradition we hold this to be," etc., etc.); (b) from the instances in which demonic possession is clearly distinguished from disease or insanity (Matt. 4:24, 8:16-17, 10:8; Mark 1:32, 16:17-18; Luke 10:17-20; John 10:19-20); (c) from passages in which Jesus addressed these demons as persons and they answered as such, confessing Him to be the Son of God and their ultimate Judge (Matt. 8:28-33; Mark 1:21-28, 1:32-34, 3:9-12, 5:1-20, 7:24-30, 9:17-29; Luke 4:33-36; cf. also Jas. 2:19; Acts 16:16-18, 19:11-18). Note that these demons were explicitly recognized by Jesus as agents of Satan (Matt. 12:22-32, Luke 10:17-20, 11:15-22), and that they showed superhuman knowledge of Jesus and His Spirit-filled Apostles (Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24, 34; Acts 16:17, 19:15). Had they not been present with Jesus and known Him as the eternal Logos, prior to their rebellion against the Divine government? (Cf. Luke 10:18). The positive identification, by Jesus, of Satan as the first liar and the first murderer, certainly can leave us in no doubt as to the identity of the real Tempter who lurked behind the scene in the

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH
primeval Garden. (Review the account of Satan and his pre-mundane rebellion, his subsequent career and inevitable doom, as outlined in Part Eleven *supra*.)

(4) Because there is no other ground on which we can explain the Scriptures which refer to Satan as the Old Serpent, *e.g.*, Rev. 12:9, 20:2; cf. Rom. 16:20, Num. 21:6-9, Isa. 14:29. (5) Because there is no basis on which we can explain the twofold implication of Gen. 3:14-15, which implies not only literal warfare between all mankind and the serpentkind, but also spiritual warfare between the Seed of the Woman and the Old Serpent, the Devil (Eph. 6:12, 1 Pet. 5:8). (6) Because this view unquestionably is confirmed by the account of the temptation of our Lord (Matt. 4:1-11). K-D (BCOTP, 93): "The temptation of Christ is the counterpart of that of Adam. Christ was tempted by the devil, not only like Adam, but because Adam had been tempted and overcome, in order that by overcoming the tempter He might wrest from the devil that dominion over the whole race which he had secured by his victory over the first human pair. The tempter approached the Savior openly; to the first man he came in disguise. The serpent is not a merely symbolical term applied to Satan; nor was it only the form which Satan assumed; but it was a real serpent, perverted by Satan to be the instrument of his temptation (vers. 1 and 14)." No doubt Satan approached Christ openly because he knew that the latter could penetrate every disguise and uncover every deception. Milligan (SR, 43-44): "On the hypothesis that there was in this first temptation a twofold agency; that Satan spoke through a literal serpent, just as demons, in the time of Christ, spoke through real men and women: on this hypothesis, I say, all is plain, simple, and natural. It is, then, easy to account for all the facts in this eventful case, and especially to see how it was that the woman, being at length *deceived* and overcome by the hellish malice and diabolical cunning and artifice of the

GENESIS

Serpent, stretched forth her hand, and plucked and ate

'Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe.'"

New York Presbyter (RO, 426): "We see no reason to regard this story as a myth or allegory devised by someone to explain how sin first entered the world. The incident described is just such as may have taken place during the primitive life of Eden. It is not to be supposed, however, that the serpent spake as represented, but only that it appeared to do so. The voice was that of the Tempter, whom the woman did not distinguish from the animal of which he had taken possession. Indeed the whole narrative assumes what may be styled a temporary identity of Satan with the serpent. The nature of the event indicates that a crafty, evil spirit, seeking to alienate man from God, chose the serpent as a means of engaging Eve's attention, and then addressed her in well-chosen, deceitful words." The epithet *subtle* seems to be used here in a twofold sense: first, *literally*, as descriptive of certain physical powers which, though good in themselves, were capable of being perverted to an unnatural use through the power and craft of a superior being (cf. Matt. 10:16), and second, *metaphorically*, as descriptive of the cunning and deceitfulness of the Devil, manifested by and through the brute creature in whom he operated. Joseph Parker (PBG): "The serpent itself is the best comment on the text. Look at it: glittering, lithe, cunning, cold, smooth, poisonous—truly it looks as if it *might* have done it! I don't think the lion could, or the elephant, the eagle, or the ox, but the serpent brings with it a high probability of baseness and mischief." "Now of all the beasts of the field the serpent had the most of those qualities which are typical of a tempter—no lion's roar, no horrid dragon's form, but often beautiful in coloring and graceful in motion" (Peloubet). Marcus Dods (EBG, 20): "Temptation comes like a serpent; like the

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

most subtle beast of the field; like that one creature which is said to exert a fascinating influence on its victims, fastening them with its glittering eye, stealing upon them by its noiseless, low and unseen approach, perplexing them by its wide circling folds, seeming to come upon them from all sides at once, and armed not like the other beasts with weapon of offence—horn, or hoof, or teeth—but capable of crushing its victim with every part of its sinuous length. It lies apparently dead for months together, but when roused it can, as the naturalist tells us, ‘outclimb the monkey, outswim the fish, outleap the zebra, outwrestle the athlete, and crush the tiger.’ How naturally in describing temptation do we borrow language from the aspects and movements of this creature.” Matthew Henry (CWB, 8): “It is certain that it was the devil that beguiled Eve. The devil and Satan is the Old Serpent (Rev. 12:9), a malignant spirit, by creation an angel of light and an immediate attendant upon God’s throne, but by sin become an apostate from his first state and a rebel against God’s crown and dignity. He knew he could not destroy man but by debauching him. The game therefore which Satan had to play was to draw our first parents to sin, and so to separate between them and their God. The whole race of mankind had here, as it were, but one neck and at that Satan struck. It was the devil in the likeness of a serpent. (1) Many a dangerous temptation comes to us in gay fine colors that are but skin-deep, and seems to come from above; for Satan can seem an angel of light. And (2) Because it is a subtle creature. Many instances are given of the subtlety of the serpent, both to do mischief and to secure himself in it when it is done. We are directed to be wise as serpents. But this serpent, as actuated by the devil, was no doubt more subtle than any other; for the devil, though he has lost the sanctity, retains the sagacity of an angel, and is wise to do evil. . . . It is remarkable that the Gentile idolaters did many of them worship the devil in the

GENESIS

shape and form of a serpent, thereby avowing their adherence to that apostate spirit, and wearing his colors." Errett (EwB, 24): "To a child, there are few things more attractive than a glittering serpent, with its curving motions, its brilliant colors, and the magnetic charm of its eye, It is a fit symbol of the devil in his sly, insidious approaches, his cunning, and the power to charm that precedes his power to destroy."

The Devil has real personal existence. Modern theological myth-makers would like to have us think the Devil to be a figment of the human imagination and so deny his personality altogether. This view, however, cannot be made to harmonize with Scripture teaching, and opens up greater difficulties than the acceptance of Satan's real existence. We must not forget that personality exists in other entities than the human. Man's body does not make his personality—the person, rather, dwells in the body. We must distinguish between *personality* and *individuality*. It is a well-known empirical fact that more than one personality may occupy the same physical tabernacle. (See *The Dissociation of a Personality*, by Dr. Morton Prince, for the famous case of Sally Beauchamp.) If it is possible for personality to exist clothed in a human form, why not in other forms? Satan is not a *man*; Satan is a fallen *angel*. "We may well say 'personal' devil, for there is no devil but personality." Dummelow (CHB, 636): "The allusions to Satan and his angels are too frequent and emphatic, to make it easy to suppose that our Lord did not believe in their personality; and, moreover, belief in an impersonal devil presents greater difficulties to faith than belief in a personal one. That evil should exist at all, in a world created and governed by a good and all-powerful Being, is a serious moral and intellectual difficulty. But that difficulty is reduced to a minimum if we suppose that it is due to the activity of a hostile personality. Opposition to God's will on the part of a personal, self-determining

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

agent, though mysterious, is conceivable. Opposition to it on the part of any impersonal evil influence or physical force is (to most modern minds) inconceivable." Strong (ST, 447): "We cannot deny the personality of Satan except upon principles which would compel us to deny the existence of good angels, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the personality of God the Father—we may add, even the personality of the human soul. . . . One of the most ingenious devices of Satan is that of persuading men that he has no real existence. Next to this is the device of substituting for belief in a personal devil the belief in a merely impersonal spirit of evil." New York Presbyterian (RO, 440): "There is no ground to believe that Satan does not exist in this twentieth century. It may be through his influence that error, even absurd error, gains adherents among mankind so easily; that false religions maintain their hold on heathen lands; that perversions of moral principle lead to methodical selfishness and inhumanity; that civil governments are often organized for robbery and oppression, and for forcible conquest, and that nations who would live at peace are forced into bloody war. . . . We believe that Christians of today, no less than those of old time, should be 'sober and vigilant because their adversary the Devil goeth about seeking whom he may devour.'" Satan has real existence. When he was before God accusing Job, the Almighty asked "Whence comest thou?" Satan replied, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." He was with Jesus in person on the mount of temptation and in the Garden of Gethsemane. There are times in the life of everyone who is trying to live the life of "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 15:17) when Satan is present with him in person, tempting him to backslide and thus to "crucify the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:6). He has attended every Gospel meeting ever held on this earth and whispered into the ears of

GENESIS

anxious sinners, "You have only one life to live," "Time enough yet," etc. Be not deceived by Satan about Satan!

8. *The Temptation.*

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which Jehovah God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yet, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden? 2 And the woman said unto the serpent, Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; 3 but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. 4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; 5 for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:1-5).

Some hold that, because the Devil is superhuman, though not infinite, in knowledge and in power, he endowed the serpent with the gift of speech for the time being, much as Yahweh once put articulate language in the mouth of Balaam's ass (Num. 22:28-30). Whether this be true, or whether the serpent itself only *appeared* to be speaking, the "Voice" (the communication) was that of the Tempter, the Adversary of souls (1 Pet. 5:8), the Old Serpent, the Devil (Rev. 12:9, 20:2).

1. *Note the Tempter's subtlety in his selection of the woman as the object of his approach:* (1) Because she was the weaker vessel, *i.e.*, possessing a more dependent character. Errett (EwB): "Woman has more generally been injured and ruined through an abuse of that affectionate trust, which is really one of her main characteristics, than by any other means." (2) because he knew that through her the man could be more easily reached and persuaded to commit sin. That this proved to be the case is made clear in 2 Cor. 11:3 and 1 Tim. 2:12-15.

2. *Note the diabolical malice of the Tempter.* Who but

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

the totally depraved Satan—the inveterate enemy of God and all good—could have molested that happy pair who had been created in God's image, and thus have brought wholesale ruin on the whole human race?

3. *Note his diabolical cunning:* (1) in attacking the woman, the weaker of the two human creatures; (2) in attacking her when apparently she was alone and so unsupported by her husband; (3) in selecting such a favorable place for the temptation, namely, near the forbidden tree itself: the context seems to indicate that she was near the tree, when Satan approached her, and was probably gazing upon its fruit, the very existence of which must have whetted her curiosity; (4) in choosing a method of approach that was designed first of all to weaken her faith in God. (Even if a literal serpent, a literal tree, and literal fruit, were not involved here, the essential truth remains unaffected, namely, that the woman was prompted to the doing of some kind of act, with reference to some end, the contemplation of which had power to induce *lust* in her—an act which she knew to be one that God had expressly told her she *must not* do. The manner in which she disobeyed God is not of as much concern to us as is the act itself: the *fact* of her disobedience is the matter of first importance in this narrative. Call the account symbolical or allegorical or sheer "folklore," if you will, still and all the integrity of the Scripture revelation is not impugned, because the facts still remain (a) that somewhere, at some time, on this earth, reason and conscience came into play in the first *homo sapiens*, and (b) that we have in this narrative a clear description of what has happened, and continues to happen, in the life of every human being on attaining the age of accountability. Rom. 3:23—"all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God.")

4. *Note that the woman apparently exhibited no fear on hearing articulate speech from the serpent's mouth.* Why was this? Because she was not yet familiar with the in-

GENESIS

instincts and powers of all the lower animals? (But, had not Adam already become acquainted with the various species of birds and beasts, and their characteristics, as indicated by his naming of them? Cf. Gen. 2:18-20). It seems that Mother Eve was not affrighted by the serpent's speech primarily because *fear had not yet entered Eden*. Errett (EwB): "They had, as yet, no reason to dread any of the creatures over which they had been constituted sovereigns. Nor is there any reason to believe that the *speaking* of a serpent would, in their experience, have been any more wonderful than a thousand other things. As yet, everything was wonderful." *Fear entered the scene, along with suffering, sorrow and death, as a consequence of sin* (1 John 4:18, Jas. 1:13-15, Heb. 2:14-15).

5. *Note the first recorded words of the Tempter*: "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden?" "Yea," that is, Is it really true that God has forbidden you to eat of *any* tree? The question was voiced either in *irony*, as if to insinuate that if God had really issued such a prohibition, it was a very foolish thing to do; or *flip-pantly*, as if to say, "I have heard a bit of news. Pray tell me if it is true. Has God commanded you saying, You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?" Or, perhaps *sarcastically*, as if to say, by innuendo, What kind of God is this who would restrict your personal liberty by such a foolish injunction? It seems obvious that the Tempter's voice in this instance was fairly dripping with insinuations designed to impugn Yahweh's wisdom and goodness. C.H.M. (NBG, 34): "The devil did not openly present himself and say, I am the devil, the enemy of God, and I am come to traduce Him and ruin you. This would not be serpent-like and yet he really did all this *by raising questions* in the mind of the creature." In man's dealings with God, trouble invariably arises for him when an IF comes into the picture. C.H.M. (NBG, 34): "To admit the question, 'Hath God said?' when I know that God

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

hath spoken, is positive infidelity; and the very fact of my admitting it, proves my total incapacity to meet it. Hence, in Eve's case, the form of her reply evidenced the fact that she had admitted to her heart the serpent's crafty inquiry. Instead of adhering strictly to the exact words of God, she, in her reply, actually adds thereto." M. Henry (CWB, 8): "Satan teaches men first to doubt, and then to deny; he makes them sceptics first, and so by degrees makes them atheists."

6. *Why did Satan approach the woman through the instrumentality of an animal?* KD (BCOTP, 93-94): "Notwithstanding his self-willed opposition to God, Satan is still a creature of God, and was created a good spirit; although, in proud self-exaltation, he abused the freedom essential to the nature of a superior spirit to purposes of rebellion against his Maker. He cannot therefore entirely shake off his dependence upon God. And this dependence may possibly explain the reason, why he did not come 'disguised as an angel of light' to tempt our first parents to disobedience, but was obliged to seek the instrument of his wickedness among the beasts of the field. The trial of our first progenitors was ordained by God, because probation was essential to their spiritual development and self-determination. But as He did not desire that they should be tempted to their fall, He would not suffer Satan to tempt them in a way which would surpass their human capacity. The tempted might therefore have resisted the tempter. If instead of approaching them in the form of a celestial being, in the likeness of God, he came in that of a creature, not only far inferior to God, but far below themselves, they could have no excuse for allowing a mere animal to persuade them to break the commandment of God. For they had been made to have dominion over the beasts, and not to take their own law from them. Moreover, the fact that an evil spirit was approaching them in the serpent, could hardly be concealed from them. Its

GENESIS

speaking alone must have suggested that: for Adam had already become acquainted with the nature of the beasts, and had not found one among them resembling himself—not one, therefore, endowed with reason and speech. The substance of the address, too, was enough to prove that it was no good spirit which spake through the serpent, but one at enmity with God. Hence, when they paid attention to what he said, they were altogether without excuse.”

7. *Note that Satan used the name Elohim and not the name Yahweh.* Lange holds that the Tempter could not utter the name Yahweh (Jehovah), and knew that he could not, as his assault was directed against the paradisaical covenant of God with man. Others have held that Satan wished to avoid profaning the name of Yahweh, a view difficult to accept in the light of Satan’s vicious and total depravity. Whitelaw (PCG, 58): “By using the name Elohim instead of Jehovah the covenant relationship of God towards man was obscured, and man’s position in the garden represented as that of a subject rather than a son.”

8. *Note that the Tempter deliberately altered the Divine injunction,* quoting it fallaciously as if it were a prohibition not only of the one tree but of all. Truly, when the occasion demands it, even the Devil can cite Scripture for his own purposes (cf. Matt. 4:5-6). *Misquoting the word of God, adding to it, subtracting from it, or substituting for it—these have ever been among his favorite tactics. And by prompting the professional theologians to employ precisely the same tactics, he has used them throughout Christian history to corrupt Biblical nomenclature and to multiply divisions in Christendom.* Cf. for example our present-day pseudo-theological clowns with their God-is-dead blasphemies and their “demythologizing” stupidities.

9. *Note the skillful innuendo with which the Devil invited conversation and masked his ultimate design.* His question was purposely insinuating. It implied, “God is

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

very good, to be sure, but has He not laid some useless and trying restrictions upon you? Surely this must be a mistake. If He loved you, could He shut you away from the delicious fruit on yonder tree? Are you to live in paradise and not be able to enjoy it?" (Peloubet). Or, Is not this one prohibition a devious and arbitrarily imposed limitation on your personal liberty? Skinner (ICCG, 73): "*Ye shall not eat of any tree*: the range of the prohibition is purposely exaggerated in order to provoke inquiry and criticism." His first effort was, of course, to create doubt in the woman's mind: cf. the "If" used by Satan, in the temptation of Jesus, to introduce his appeals. (Matt. 4:1-11).

10. *Note that the Tempter persistently pointed to the one restriction, but never even mentioned the wide range of privileges which the Woman enjoyed.* Millions of trees, no doubt, and countless varieties of fruit were free to her, yet Satan kept her attention centered on the one act that had been forbidden. M. Henry (CWB, 8): "We are often, in Scripture, told of our danger by the temptations of Satan, his *devices* (2 Cor. 2:11), his *depths* (Rev. 2:24), and his *wiles* (Eph. 6:11). The greatest instances we have of them are in his tempting of the two Adams, here, and in Matt. iv. In this he prevailed, but in that he was baffled. When he spoke *to* them, on whom he had no hold by any corruption in them, he speaks *in* us by our own deceitful hearts and their carnal reasonings; this makes his assaults on us less discernible, but not less dangerous. That which the devil aimed at was to persuade Eve to eat the forbidden fruit; and, to do this, he took the same method that he does still. He questioned whether it was a sin or no, v. 1. He denied there was any danger in it, v. 4. He suggested much advantage by it, v. 5. And these are his common topics."

11. *Note in some detail the woman's response to Satan's approach.* (1) *She made her fatal mistake in temporizing*

GENESIS

with the Devil. Though not afraid of the serpent, since as yet there was no enmity between any of God's creatures, nor astonished at what seemed to be its voice, probably because she was not as yet familiar with all the powers and instincts of the lower animals, still and all, the very words which the Old Serpent addressed to her were of such a character as to have put her on guard. She might have perceived by his innuendo that he had no good end in view, and should have answered, Get thee behind me, etc. (cf. Matt. 16:23). But she temporized regarding the point at issue, and this was all the Devil wanted: he knew that ultimate victory was in his grasp. (2) In replying to the Tempter, *she took notice at first of the liberality of God's gifts.* In substance, she said, "Yes, we may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden; we enjoy both variety and plenty." But she did not expressly associate the name of God with this liberality, though she did recall it in reciting His one restraint. "Eve replies that, We may eat of all, except one, laying emphasis on the liberality of God's gifts and on the danger of disobeying. But, at the same time, she left out three emphatic expressions in her quotation of God's permission—*every* tree, *freely* eat, and *surely* die—which shows that the temptation was beginning to take effect. Whoever parleys with temptation is already on the verge of danger" (Peloubet). (3) *She added to the prohibitory enactment* the clause, "neither shall ye touch it." Surely this was indicative of the initial effect on the woman of the Tempter's insinuations. These had given rise to a sense of personal injury, to justify which she converted what was at most only an implication of the original charge into an express prohibition. *Sin is always present in additions to, subtractions from, or substitutions for, the word of God.* (4) *She used the same name for the Deity that Satan had used: Elohim.* Both referred to God by the name Elohim only. It would seem that in this more general and indefinite name, the per-

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

sonality of the living God is obscured. (5) *She altered the word of God.* She not only added the clause, "neither shall ye touch it," but she omitted the word *surely* which had been explicit in the Divine prohibition. Was this an attempt to represent the penalty in a somewhat softened form, thus indicating she had begun to think it unjust? Surely in modifying God's explicit warning, "Thou shalt die" (2:18) to a less emphatic, "lest ye die," she showed her willingness to trifle with the Divine command. Departure from the "pattern of sound words" (2 Tim. 1:13, 2:2, 3:16-17; John 6:63; 1 Cor. 2:10-16), from calling Bible things by Bible names—the substitution of theological lingo for the language of the Spirit—inevitably leads to confusion, schism, heresy and apostasy. Christians must never forget the Lord's positive declaration: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35). How significant that Jesus resisted Satan's appeals by resorting to the Divine word (Matt. 4:1-11). C.H.M. (NBG, pp. 34-37); "The Lord Jesus, in His conflict with Satan, accurately applied the Word, because He lived upon it, and esteemed it more than His necessary food. He could not misquote or misapply the Word, neither could He be indifferent about it. Not so Eve, She added to what God had said. . . . Obedience is due from us to God's Word, simply because it is His Word. To raise a question, when God has spoken, is blasphemy. We are in the place of a creature. He is the Creator; He may, therefore, justly claim obedience from us. The infidel may call this 'blind obedience,' but the Christian calls it intelligent obedience, inasmuch as it is based upon the knowledge that it is God's Word to which he is obedient. If a man had not God's Word, he might well be said to be in blindness and darkness, for there is not so much as a single ray of divine light within or around us but what emanates from God's pure and eternal Word. All that we want to know is that God has spoken, and

GENESIS

then obedience becomes the very highest order of intelligent acting. When the soul gets up to God, it has reached the very highest source of authority. . . . Eve suffered God to be contradicted by a creature, simply because His Word had lost its proper authority over her heart, her conscience and her understanding."

12. *Note the significance of the location of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* It is said to have been "in the midst of the garden." We have here *the story of the beginning of liberty under the law. This tree was in the midst of the garden.* No restrictions were placed upon our first parents with reference to the fruit of the many other trees of the garden: the one restriction that was placed upon them was with respect to the fruit of this particular tree which was *in the midst of all the others. Whether in heaven or on earth, Law must always be at the very heart and center of all liberty, angelic or human. That is to say, liberty is never enjoyed outside the circumference of the law. This universal truth is true of both the moral and the civil law.* "Why," sneeringly ask the atheists and agnostics, "suspend the destiny of the world on so trivial circumstance as the eating of an apple?" (Of course, as pointed out heretofore, there is no mention of an apple in the Genesis account.) Pfeiffer (BG, 21): "Man was created an upright being with the capacity for obedience. Man was also created a moral being, and as such, he was subjected to a test. The place of man's temptation was the finest imaginable. In the beautiful Garden of Eden, God had placed everything that man could wish for his well-being. Nothing was lacking in man's environment. As a test, however, man was subject to one prohibition. He might 'freely eat' of all the trees of the garden save one, the 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil.'"

Milligan (SR, 38-40): "Observe, 1. That it is a matter of very great importance to know ourselves, and especially

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

to know whether our hearts are strictly loyal to God or not. 2. That it is exceedingly difficult to do this. Millions of the human race are still ignorant of themselves, notwithstanding all that God has done to reveal the secrets of the human heart. 3. That no better test of man's loyalty could have been given than that which, according to Moses, God ordained and appointed for this purpose. For, (1) It was easily understood by all. No rational and accountable being could possibly mistake what was required by this command. (2) Any violation of this precept must, therefore, proceed from a spirit of pure disloyalty. Like every other *positive* ordinance, its binding obligation depended wholly and solely on the command and authority of the Lawgiver. . . . (4) But 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 transgression of any law, whether it be moral or positive. See Matt. 5:22, 28. (5) And 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. It was the means of clearly and unmistakably revealing to Adam and Eve their true and proper character, and standing before God, after they had mentally yielded to the temptation. To know this is always a blessing to any man who is still within the limits of God's pardoning mercy. And hence we conclude that the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, as well as the Tree of Life, was given to man for his good, and in the true spirit of Divine benevolence."

13. *Note the diabolical cunning of Satan as explicit in the suggestions by which he pressed his seduction of the woman.* Observe (1) *How bold he became*, when he sensed that his victim was weakening under his attack. He first questioned whether or not there was any sin involved in eating of the forbidden fruit; then he began to insinuate that there really was no danger in it; and finally, he came

GENESIS

out boldly and declared there was actual advantage to be gained from it. (2) *How he challenged the word of God.* In spite of the fact that God had said, "Thou shalt surely die," the Old Serpent boldly declared, "Ye shall not surely die." (Note that whereas Eve had omitted the word "surely" the Devil did not do so.) Thus the word of the Tempter was pitted directly against the Word of God, and the woman was compelled to make a choice. This is the choice which all accountable human beings must make in passing through this world—none can avoid it (Rom. 3:23). (3) *How he played on the word, "die."* Joseph Parker: "It is used by the serpent in the sense of dropping down dead, or violently departing out of this world; whereas the meaning, as we all know by bitter experience, is infinitely deeper." C.H.M. (NG, 39): "I cannot know God and not have life. The loss of the knowledge of God was death; but the knowledge of God is life." (John 17:3). Peloubet: "This was the most deadly of lies, for it was a half-truth, by far the smallest half. The death did not come at once like a lightning stroke, and the most deadly death was that of the spirit, not of the body. Satan is never so devilish as when he is disguised as an angel of light." (2 Cor. 11:14). As Tennyson has written:

"That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest
of lies,

That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought
with outright,

But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter
to fight."

This is the first lie that is recorded in Scripture, and in John 8:44, Jesus refers it to the Devil as the father of liars. M. Henry (CWB, 8) "It is the subtlety of Satan to blemish the reputation of the divine law as uncertain or unreasonable and so draw people to sin." (4) *How Satan thus openly challenged the veracity of God:* "Ye

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

shall not surely die; for God knoweth that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened," etc. His statement was a downright lie, because it was not only contrary to God's Word, but to his own knowledge as well: he had broken the law of Heaven and had experienced something of the misery of rebellion; and, in encouraging others to disobedience, he said what he knew by woeful experience to be absolutely false. (1 John 2:21, 27). Moreover, his lie was such as to give the lie to God Himself: it was a bold assertion that God was not truthful in His dealings with His creatures. (5) *How he openly challenged God's motives.* His first assertion was that God was not truthful; his next, that God was selfish and envious. "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." Note that He accused God of *envy* (as if to say, Rest assured it is not because of any fear that you will die from eating the fruit of that particular tree that God has declared it "off limits" to you; rather, it is because He knows that your eating of it will make you His rivals); and of *falsehood* (in His affirming to be true, "ye shall surely die," what He knew to be false, and in pretending to be concerned about your welfare, when as a matter of fact He is only jealous of His own sovereignty). Note Satan's growing aggressiveness toward the woman and his sheer audacity toward God: in abject depravity he has now reached the point of viciously impugning the Divine goodness. (6) *How ambiguous He became in his bold assertions.* "Your eyes shall be opened": suggesting to the woman the attainment of higher wisdom, but literally pointing forward to what the Devil knew would occur, namely, their discovery of their own nakedness (finitude?). "And ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil," another admixture of truth and falsehood. Adam and Eve (the human race) did learn to know evil, not as God knows it, *i.e.*, as something

GENESIS

to be hated and summarily rejected, but, as Satan knows it, as a matter of bitter experience. We might ask, Just how does God "know" evil? Certainly not as a matter of His own experience, for He is infinitely *good*; but only as Infinite Holiness can know it, in its utter heinousness, as an inherent anathema of His own Will. This means that God knows evil in a sense that man can never know it, just as the God side of Jesus could abhor sin and could suffer such excruciating agony, both in the Garden and on the Cross (Luke 22:44, Matt. 27:46), as no human being could suffer and go on living. This is a great mystery, to be sure, the mystery designated by Miguel de Unamuno, "The Agony of Christianity," the mystery with depths so profound that no human intellect could ever hope—or even *want*—to plumb its depths. *Hence, such knowledge, were it possible to man, would be illicit knowledge* (cf. Job 11:7, also chs. 38-41; Isa. 40:28, 46:8-11). Throughout all these considerations, the fundamental truth of the Devil's arrogant and ambiguous charges remains unshaken, namely, the results which Satan promised did ensue, but how different were they from what the woman anticipated! The lesson for us, and for all humanity, is crystal clear: Satan constantly deceives us in this manner—by promising so much yet giving so little; and even the little turns to ashes in our human experience.

(7) "*The knowledge of good and evil*"—let us re-examine this phrase here. As stated heretofore, the phrase is viewed by many commentators as conveying the idea of omniscience. Others see in it a possible sexual connotation, on the view that God might have forbidden temporarily the exercise of their sexual powers. This writer is inclined to the former view, for the simple reason that in the final analysis *the good and the true and the beautiful are essentially one and the same*: hence, whatever role may be assigned to sex, that remains but a part of the whole human experiential picture. On this subject, therefore, I

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

commend the following Maimonidean exposition (GP, 14-15): "As man's distinction consists in a property which no other creature on earth possesses, viz., intellectual perception, in the exercise of which he does not employ his senses, nor move his hand or his foot, this perception has been compared—though only apparently, not in truth—to the Divine perception, which requires no corporeal organ." Maimonides then sets forth a criticism which is heard frequently, as follows: "It would at first sight appear from Scripture that man was originally intended to be perfectly equal to the rest of the animal creation, which is not endowed with intellect, reason, or power of distinguishing between good and evil: but that Adam's disobedience to the command of God procured him that great perfection which is the peculiarity of man, viz., the power of distinguishing between good and evil—the noblest of the faculties of our nature, the essential characteristic of the human race. It thus appears strange that the punishment for rebelliousness should be the means of elevating man to a pinnacle of perfection to which he had not attained previously. This is equivalent to saying that a certain man was rebellious and extremely wicked, wherefore his nature was changed for the better, and he was made to shine as a star in the heavens." To this objection (or objector), Maimonides replies as follows: "You appear to have studied the matter superficially, and nevertheless you imagine that you can understand a book which has been the guide of past and present generations, when you for a moment withdraw from your lusts and appetites, and glance over its contents as if you were reading a historical work or some poetical composition. Collect your thoughts and examine the matter carefully, for it is not to be understood as you at first sight think, but as you will find after due deliberation; namely, the intellect which was granted to man was the highest endowment, was bestowed on him before his disobedience. With reference to this gift the

GENESIS

Bible states that 'man was created in the form and likeness of God.' On account of this gift of intellect man was addressed by God, and received His commandments, as it is said, 'And the Lord God commanded Adam' (Gen. 2:16)—for no commandments are given to the brute creation or to those who are devoid of understanding. Through the intellect man distinguishes between the true and the false. This faculty Adam possessed perfectly and completely. The right and wrong are terms employed in the science of apparent truths (morals), not in that of necessary truths, as, *e.g.*, it is not correct to say, in reference to the proposition 'the heavens are spherical,' it is 'good' or to declare the assertion that 'the earth is flat' to be 'bad'; but we say of the one it is true and of the other it is false. . . . Thus it is the function of the intellect to discriminate between the true and the false—a distinction which is applicable to all objects of intellectual perception." Obviously the distinguished Jewish commentator is impressing upon our minds the fact that the true, the beautiful, and the good are *one*; hence, that the phrase, "the knowledge of good and evil," as used in Gen. 2:17 and 3:5, meant with respect to man, the possibility of the acquirement of all knowledge, including even illicit knowledge. This, of course, would mean the potentiality of omniscience. We reason, therefore, as follows: In the case of our first parents, did they "fall" "downward," or did they actually "fall" upward? Was this a case in which God "overruled" the evil to bring about a greater good? On the view that man was originally in a state of untried innocence, it would seem that holiness, which is to be acquired only by active obedience to God, would be much to be preferred above an original innocence. This, no doubt, is true. But what was to prevent Adam and Eve from acquiring holiness by living in unbroken obedience to God, without their having to make the pilgrimage through a world of sin and death? Obviously, nothing—

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

that is, *nothing but their own wills*. The choice, therefore, of the "hard way" *was their choice*, for which they alone were to be held accountable. The remedy provided by God's grace for this adverse tragic choice is the Divine Plan of Redemption.

Moreover, whatever may be the significance of this phrase, there is nothing in it that is intrinsically repugnant to a literal interpretation of the story of this particular tree and its fruit. As stated heretofore, God has certainly provided many trees, plants, herbs, etc., to serve as food for man to maintain his physical vigor; certainly, in this special case, He could have raised up an actual tree bearing a fruit designed to preserve his youth. If the metaphorical interpretation presents itself to us as the most obvious—indeed it is difficult to see any relationship existing between a real tree and knowledge—then the "tree of knowledge" could be only knowledge itself under the symbol of a tree and its fruit.

(8) *How Satan created a false sense of security in the woman's heart.* God had said she would die if she ate of the forbidden fruit. This unequivocal Divine declaration Satan boldly challenged: "Ye shall surely not die." M. Henry (CWB, 8): "Hope of impunity is a great support to all iniquity." (As in our day, perhaps the strongest support that evil has in the world is the widespread notion that there is no hell, no future punishment for unforgiven sin.) Eve's tragic mistake had occurred in her temporizing with the Devil at the outset. M. Henry (CWB, 8): "It is a dangerous thing to treat with a temptation which ought at first to be rejected with disdain and abhorrence. The garrison that sounds a parley is not far from being surrendered."

(9) *How double-dealing the Devil became in his accusations.* It was a most dangerous snare which he set for our first parents, seeking to alienate their affections from God and thus to draw them from their allegiance to Him.

GENESIS

Thus has he always acted not merely content with accusing the saints of unfaithfulness before God (Job 1:6-12, 2:1-6; Rev. 12:10), but also suggesting to them harsh thoughts of Him. (How many persons blame God for their troubles?)

(10) *How artfully he led up to his final and successful appeal.* Skinner (ICCG, 75): "The spiritual part of the temptation is now accomplished, and the serpent is silent, leaving the fascination of sense to do the rest. The woman looks on the tree with new eyes; she observes how attractive to taste and sight its fruit seems, and how desirable *for obtaining insight* (so most) or *to contemplate*." "And ye shall be as God"—this was the fatal appeal. Errett (EB, I, 26): "They will be independent of God—gods to themselves, free from all restraints, and having all the materials of happiness within themselves. It was an appeal to selfhood against Godhood; and the eating of the forbidden fruit was, on the part of Eve and Adam, an attempt to erect selfhood into Godhood. It was a renunciation of Jehovah's sovereignty, the lifting up of a standard of rebellion against their Maker, who had been to them the fountain of life and blessedness." *Was there ever a sin committed that was not, at its root, the choice of self and self's way of doing things (righteousness) above God and God's way of doing things (righteousness)?* (Cf. Rom. 10:6-13). Back of the woman's choice, of course, was the final motivating urge that tipped the scales in the Tempter's favor, namely, the urge for *illicit knowledge* (cf. Deut. 29:29).

9. The Surrender

"6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

1. *Note the threefold appeal.*

(1) "*And when the woman saw*": what did she "see"? —and *how*, or in what sense, did she "see"? Did she see by ordinary physical vision "the eternal loveliness" of a real tree, which made it "a delight to the eyes"? Or, as Milligan suggests (SR, 43): "What could she see but the Serpent eating that same fruit?" According to this view, in order to give weight to his infidel insinuations, the Tempter actually ate some of the fruit himself, and thus presented his own superior knowledge as proof of its marvelous effects. But, the original word used here (*raah*) means not only to "look," "behold," etc., but also to "consider," *i.e.*, to *contemplate*, to *obtain insight*, and in a few instances, to "enjoy" (Eccl. 2:1, 3:13, 5:18). Perhaps the meaning that is intended for us here is that the woman indulged the contemplation of some specific act of disobedience to God, an act necessarily consummated in some visible (overt) manner. Certainly what is being described here is the lustful look: "an impure look, infected with the poison of concupiscence" (Calvin): a look made false by germinating doubt, or perhaps by the enchantment of curiosity. The contemplation, whatever the object may have been, caused the woman to lose sight altogether of the many blessings which she enjoyed in her Edenic environment, and to be consumed with curiosity with regard to just this one restriction. But is not this propensity characteristic of all of us at times? Is it not an essentially human reaction—to chafe at the slightest restriction upon our personal liberty, no matter how lavish the privileges showered upon us? It should be noted too that the charm, the lure, whatever its character, now begins to have its *sensual* side ("good for food") and its *sensuous* side ("delight to the eyes").

(2) "*That the tree was good for food.*" The first attraction or appeal was the *physical*, that is, to the *fleshly* appetites. This is perhaps the most elementary of tempta-

GENESIS

tions. (Note the parallel in Satan's temptation of Jesus, Matt. 4:3—"command that these stones become bread"). Sin has the strange power of investing the object of desire for the time being, whatever its true character, with unrealistic, almost irresistible, attraction. Note the many examples from human history and biography of men who were enslaved to their physical appetites and passions, *e.g.*, Alexander of Macedon (who at the age of 33, killed himself by dissipation), Lord Byron, Shelley, Poe, Oscar Wilde, and many others, all brilliant men, but unable to resist the demands of fleshly appetites. "Take the Cash, and let the Credit go"—the "philosophy" of Omar Khayyam. As someone has parodied one of the most common of clichés: "Eat, drink, and be merry, and tomorrow ye die of locomotor ataxia, cirrhosis of the liver, and delirium tremens." In ancient times, Aristippus of Cyrene was the protagonist of the doctrines of libertinism, *i.e.*, absolute hedonism, living for the satisfaction of the pleasures of the body.

(3) "*And that it was a delight to the eyes,*" *i.e.*, the *aesthetic* appeal. Note that the first attractions were to the senses of *taste* and *sight*, that is, to sense-perception. The charm had first its *sensual* and *sensuous* aspects. The aesthetic (artistic) appeal often accompanies the physical; and, though apparently more refined, it is subtle and powerful. It is the weakness that commonly haunts geniuses, musicians, poets, artists, and eccentrics generally, *e.g.*, the advocates of the "simple life," of the "philosophy" of the "noble savage," etc. Especially do individuals with artistic talents seem to think of themselves as a breed superior to the common herd and hence not to be inhibited by the conventions and laws to which ordinary folk subscribe and to which they must subscribe if they would maintain social order and prevent the race from destroying itself. (Cf. the Brook Farm experiment; Robert Owen's communistic colony at New Harmony, Indiana; Thoreau's

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

doctrine of "civil disobedience," and other "crackpot" illusions of the post-Civil-War era and later). Our present-day offbeat generation seems to be especially prolific of beatles, beatniks, "buggers" and bearded bums and buffoons (all rigid conformists to specific mannerisms and kinds of "dress," etc.). It is a known fact, of course, that certain kinds of "music" and certain forms of the dance tend toward flagrant immorality. Even the old pagan Plato recognized this fact, teaching (*Republic*, III, 398-403) that those strains which arouse the passions, and "relaxed strains" as well ("soft or drinking harmonies"), should be prohibited (censored); the flute, said he, should be banished, for the lyre and the harp. And in the *Bacchae* of Euripides (Bacchus was the Latin name for the Greek Dionysos, the god of wine), that great writer of tragedy exhibited clearly the intimacy between orgiastic frenzies in the name of "religion," and gross forms of sex perversion (notably, homosexuality): Euripides "outFreuded" Freud twenty-four hundred years ago. Incidentally, this same association is well presented in the novel, *Elmer Gantry*, by Sinclair Lewis: indeed this is the only aspect of this novel that is not sheer exaggeration; as a portrayal of true Christian revivalism, the whole thing is a travesty.

(4) "*And that the tree was to be desired to make one wise,*" that is, the *intellectual* appeal. (a) This was the ultimate and most potent attraction presented to the woman by the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge. It was the lure of the possibility of *illicit* knowledge, *i.e.*, to be as God, and to know fully the true and the false, the good and the evil, etc. And what is "illicit" knowledge? It is not insight or wisdom beyond the adequacy of human language to communicate and beyond the ability of the human intellect to understand (knowledge of the "ineffable")? (Cf. Isa. 45:18, 46:9-11, 55:8; Heb. 4:12; Deut. 29:29; 1 Cor. 2:11; Rom. 8:26-27). (b) Note the penetrating psychological process by which the Tempter seduced

GENESIS

the woman. (No doubt he was using the power of suggestion potently). (Should we not realize that he uses the same power on human beings today, and especially on those who seek to achieve the Mind of Christ and to do the Will of Christ? Is it not significant that the Temptation followed immediately the Baptism of Jesus?) First, he caused doubt to be formed in her mind; then he brought in the appeal to physical sense (the means to the raw material of human knowledge); naturally, intellectual thirst, craving for apprehension of the "more beyond," followed. Murphy (MG, 112): "No startling proposal of disobedience was made, no advice, no persuasion to partake of the fruit is employed. The suggestion or assertion of the false only is plainly offered; and the bewildered mind is left to draw its own false inferences, and pursue its misguided course." (c) Again quoting M. Henry: "Satan teaches men first to doubt, then to deny; he makes them skeptics first, and so by degrees makes them atheists." This craving for illicit knowledge has led multitudes to destruction in all ages of man's life on earth. Theologians have found it a most effective weapon for keeping Christians divided into a multiplicity of sects, and unChristian teachers have used it extensively for pushing impressionable young souls over the precipice of agnosticism. (Chesterton (EM, 22) writes pointedly of the "sterile disputations of the too subtle theologians." Cf. the atheistic, agnostic, "existentialist" quasi-theological clowns of our own time, with their "demythologizing" mythology and their "God is dead" fulminations, also the materialistic scientists who consider it a mark of intelligence to eliminate the word "God" from human speech, *ad infinitum*, *ad nauseam*.) "Scholarship" has become in our day a relative much-overworked, and ambiguous term. In most cases the sheer "intellectualist" who prostrates himself in adoration before the human intelligence (usually his own, in preference to all others) is a rather pitiful creature. "Publishing" has

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

become a fetish to college professors. The fact is, however, that if two-thirds of their publications (books, essays, reviews, etc.) were piled high and burned, they would make more literal light in their conflagration than they give spiritual light in their content. In this writer's opinion there is no form of snobbery as obnoxious as intellectual snobbery: the kind of snobbery that is characteristic of our half-baked pseudo-"intellectuals." I recall here a superb example of the case in point, namely, that of the late Gertrude Stein (the "poet"?) whose claim to notoriety rests largely on her well-known insipid line, "A rose is a rose is a rose." In a recently published book, entitled *Gertude Stein: Her Life and Work*, Elizabeth Sprigge, the author, who is not at all an unfriendly critic, portrays Miss Stein as a person fond of calling herself a genius, and quotes some of the statements the "poet" made about herself, as follows: "I know I am the most important writer writing today." "I know I am doing more important things than any of my contemporaries." "I am the only person who has ever known what poetry is." "Einstein was the creative philosophic mind of the century and I have been the creative literary mind of the century." These bold assertions could hardly be cited as examples of modesty, much less of humility. (d) The excess of unbridled intellect often leads to the complete distortion of what is called "academic freedom." The fact remains, however, that no one has any right to substitute vice for virtue, injustice for justice, lying for truth, in a word, license for liberty. Liberty is to be enjoyed only within the circumference of the moral law; when we abandon moral law, we have nothing to guide us but our individual desires. As Jim Casey put it, in Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*, "There aint no sin, there aint no virtue; there's just stuff people do." I have no right to stand before a class and teach that two plus two is equal to five, for the simple reason that the statement is not true. As Professor Hocking writes: "The

GENESIS

right to error in the pursuit of truth does not include a moral right to be deliberately in error." We are reminded here of Plato's famous doctrine of "the lie that is in the soul," that is to say, the error that is perpetrated through ignorance. This, said Plato, is the most deceptive and dangerous of all forms of untruth. Truth, moreover, is never to be determined by a vote: physical truth is written into the structure of the universe and moral truth into the structure of human relationships. (e) When curiosity becomes whetted by desire, the product is *lust*. So it was with Eve—she had reached the stage of actually *lusting for divinity*, that is, to be "as God." But lust "when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is full-grown, bringeth forth death." Such is the pedigree of Satan: Satan, lust, sin, death (Jas. 1:12-17). (f) Note again the three appeals—the physical, the aesthetic, and the intellectual. Cf. 1 John 2:16—"the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life." Note Jas. 1:15 for the decisive act of sin. All too often, the Bible tells us, the human heart follows the eyes rather than the reason (cf. Job 31:7, Eccl. 11:9). Note also Satan's appeals to Christ: to physical appetite (Matt. 4:1-4); to the human desire for note or notoriety (by spectacularism, Matt. 4:5-8); and finally to the human thirst for power (Matt. 4:8-11); then again, in the Garden and on the Cross, to the elemental human dread of sheer loneliness and inevitable excruciating suffering and death (Luke 22:44, Matt. 27:46).

(5) "*She took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.*" (a) "With the eye of soul as well as of body, she found a new charm she had not realized before, as a tree in the setting sun. There follows the cumulative force of the temptation—through bodily pleasure, mental delight, intellectual hunger for wisdom. Her faith in God, unseen and almost unknown, was weakened, and the chief barrier to sin was weakened" (Peloubet). A. Maclaren (EHS, *in loco*):

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

"The confluence of all these streams made such a current as swept the feeble will clean away; and blinded, dazed, and deafened by the rush of the stream, Eve was carried over the falls as a man might be over Niagara." (b) God had said she *would* die, if she ate of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge; Satan said she *would not* die, etc. The choice was the woman's. Had God interfered and kept her from making the wrong choice, consistency would require that He do the same in all such cases, but this would be His burglarizing of the human will and ruling the moral world by coercion. Such Divine overpowering of the human will would simply mean the elimination of all human responsibility; as a result there could be no morality, no righteousness, no holiness, no real democracy, not even any science as free inquiry. Trueblood (PR, 251): "Evil is the price we pay for moral freedom. . . . the presence of evil is due, *not to the nature of things, but to the nature of goodness*. We can take a step further . . . by showing that the limitation is inherent in *the nature of personality*." The sin of Eden was the consequence of a free human decision to disobey God, to become a rebel against His sovereignty, just as the sin of the angel Lucifer had been the consequence of his own free choice to rebel against the Divine government in Heaven. As Gilson puts it (SMP, 113): "It was not the body that made the spirit sin," that is, in Eve's case; rather, "it was the spirit that brought death to the body." We must remember, of course, that Satan and his rebel host sinned by their own free choice and act, uninfluenced from without, and so became totally depraved; our first parents, however, sinned as a result of the seductive appeals of the Devil; hence it was possible for Divine Justice to extend mercy to fallen man and to provide for him a remedy both for the guilt and for the consequences of sin; and so we have the immediate oracular pronouncement which contained implicitly the promise of the gift of human redemption (Gen.

GENESIS

troubles.) It has been rightly said that apparent goods give only the "alcoholic illusion" of well-being. It takes a large measure of moral discernment to "put first things first" (Matt. 6:33). Confusion occasioned by ignorance, by distorted thinking (rationalization, projection, identification, compensation, fantasy, etc.), by undisciplined emotion, by a perverted will, or all of these, has beset all of Eve's posterity (Rom. 3:23).

(d) Did a fall, then, actually take place in Eden? If so, was it a fall downward or upward? Murphy answers this question clearly (MG, 117): "Man has now come to the second step in morals—the practice. Thereby he has 3:15). Again quoting Trueblood (PR, 250): "Here we have the abiding Christian paradox of sin. We are to blame for it, but *we* cannot heal it. God did not cause it, but He can forgive and overcome it."

(c) What essentially happened to the woman in Eden when she ate of the forbidden fruit? I should answer that *her perspicacity became vitiated*: whereas prior to her act of disobedience she had the thought only of the real goods of life (the supreme values, of which God is Himself the Highest Good), now her understanding became darkened by her mental confusion of *apparent* goods with *real* goods. (*Apparent* goods are those which benefit only some human power of appetite *per se*, that is, in isolation, such as desire for narcotic drugs, for intoxicating liquor, indeed for all forms of physical over-indulgence. *Real* goods, however, are those which benefit the whole man, such as vision, health, knowledge, faith, love, etc. Confusion regarding these distinctions is the source of almost all of man's come to the knowledge of good and evil, not merely as an ideal, but as an actual thing. But he has attained this end, not by standing in, but by falling from, his integrity. If he had stood the test of this temptation, as he might have done, he would have come by the knowledge of good and evil equally well, but with a far different result. As he

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

bore the image of God in his higher nature, he would have resembled Him, not only in knowledge thus honorably acquired by resisting temptation, but also in moral good, thus realized in his own act and will. As it is, he has gained some knowledge in an unlawful and disastrous way; but he has also taken in that moral evil which is the image, not of God, but of the tempter, to whom he has yielded." Yes, our first parents did "fall," and they did "fall downward," in the sense that their perspicacity became vitiated, their sense of values distorted, and their moral integrity depreciated. We might add here that no matter how man may have first appeared on the scene, the first man in whom reason flowered (*homo sapiens*) faced this same choice—that of valuing and developing, or that of depreciating and so losing, his potentiality of unbroken moral integrity. What is pictured in the story of Adam and Eve is that which occurs in the life of every human being of accountable age. As Chesterton puts it in his inimitable way (CDD, 89): "Man is an exception, whatever else he is. If he is not the image of God, then he is a disease of the dust. If it is not true that a divine being fell, then we can only say that one of the animals went entirely off its head."

(e) W. R. Bowie (IBG, 503): "The truth of the wonderful old drama of Eden is not that we are accounted evil because somebody before us did evil. The truth dramatized here is this: Human nature, made to go God's way, has an inveterate tendency to listen to the temptation to go its own way, and this rebellious way must have an evil end—evil not only for the individual who has sinned but, in that solidarity of human nature and human destiny which Paul perceived, evil that may involve many generations in its long entail. For there are laws as old as creation which we are meant to obey; and as sure as creation, if we disobey them, we shall be in trouble. No circumstances outside us can outweigh that inner fact. No blessings of environment

GENESIS

or material opportunity can guarantee a happy life, not even though they should be as complete as those of the Garden of Eden. The disobedience of Adam and Eve is the symbol of a fatal truth: We human beings are continually disobeying and rejecting the law of life; only when our wills are kept in accord with the higher will of God can life be blessed."

(f) Maimonides (GP, 15-16): "When Adam was yet in a state of innocence and was guided solely by reflection and reason (Psa. 8:6) . . . he was not at all able to follow or to understand the principles of apparent truths; the most manifest impropriety, viz., to appear in a state of nudity, was nothing unbecoming according to his idea: he could not even comprehend why it should be so. After man's disobedience, however, when he began to give way to desires which had their source in his imagination and to the gratification of his bodily appetites . . . he was punished by the loss of part of that intellectual faculty which he had previously possessed. He therefore transgressed a command with which he had been charged on the score of his reason; and having obtained a knowledge of the apparent truths, he was wholly absorbed in the study of what is proper and what improper. Then he fully understood the magnitude of the loss he had sustained, what he had forfeited, and in what situation he was thereby placed."

(g) Unamuno (AC, 21-23): "People speak of 'the struggle for life': but the struggle for life is life itself, and, in sum, life is struggle. Here is something to reflect upon: this is what the Biblical legend in Genesis means when it relates how death came into the world through the sin of our first parents for that they wished to be like gods, that is, immortal through absorption of the knowledge of good and evil, of the knowledge which vouchsafes immortality. And afterward . . . the first death was a violent one, that of Abel by the hand of his brother Cain. And a fratricide too . . . Life is a struggle; solidarity to

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

produce life is a struggle and manifests itself by means of a struggle. . . . And if this be true of physical or corporeal life, psychical or spiritual life in its turn consists of a struggle against eternal oblivion."

(h) Whitelaw summarizes as follows (PCG, 61): "(1) The assault was commenced before use and practice had confirmed the first pair in obedience. (2) Satan began with the woman who was the weaker of the two. (3) He attacked her when alone—the best time for temptation. Beware of solitude! (4) He selected the best ground for delivering his first blow—when the woman was in full sight of the tree. (5) He was extremely cautious so to moderate his onset as not to excite alarm—beginning with a casual inquiry. (6) He advanced by degrees as he obtained a footing in the woman's heart. (7) He never revealed the proper scope and drift of his observations, but always couched them in obscure and ambiguous language. (8) He never seemed to lead, but always to be following the woman's thoughts. (9) In all he said and did he pretended to be seeking the victim's good. (10) He chose the best of all possible baits to captivate the woman's fancy and excite her cupidity—the hope of gaining knowledge." To read this summary is to realize that the Devil has never changed his tactics. Most of us know from personal experience that he still employs the same suavity, the same cunning, the same deceit, ever promising so much but giving so little. *The best that Satan has to offer men for serving him is the complete loss of God, an endless hell.* (Matt. 25:41-46; John 5:28-29; Rom. 2:4-11; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 20:11-15, 22:10-15).

(6) "And she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." (a) Note that the Woman, instead of turning her eyes away, *saw*; that she then *took* (the devil did not put the fruit into her mouth by force—she took it herself; M. Henry (CWB, 9): "Satan may tempt, but he cannot force; may persuade us to cast ourselves down, but he

GENESIS

cannot cast us down"); then she *did eat* ("the way of sin is down-hill; a man cannot stop himself when he will"; it is always best to "nip mischief in the bud"). But her seeing, taking, and eating did not end the matter,—*she gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat*. Sin's ramifications never terminate with the individual who commits the sin; rather, its influences reach out in all directions, and its consequences follow even into eternity, up to the very throne of God for judgment. (b) "Her husband with her." What does the prepositional phrase, "with her," signify? (-i-) That the man had been present throughout the entire temptation scene? Not likely—else why did he not, as the head of the creation, and surely as the stronger of the two, restrain the woman? It is hardly conceivable that he should have stood by mutely and permitted his companion to sell them both out to sin. (-ii-) That Adam arrived on the scene toward the end of the temptation colloquy, and hence was without knowledge of the real import of what was taking place? This, of course, is conjecture, but this is what could have happened. (-iii-) That it is the idea of conjugal oneness that is emphasized here? (-iv-) Or, as Lange suggests, that we have here an abridgment of language: "after she had eaten, she gave to her husband to eat thereof after her, or to eat with her" (CDHCG, 230). It could be that Adam's participation in the sin occurred after he had time to note that the woman had not actually died and was himself somewhat torn with doubt. (-v-) Or that Adam partook of the forbidden fruit only when finally "overcome by his wife's importunity." This phrase is from M. Henry's commentary: apparently Henry would have us think of Eve as a first edition of Cleopatra or of Theda Bara. He writes (CWB, 9): "She gave it to him, persuading him with the same arguments that the serpent had used with her, adding this to all the rest, that she herself had eaten of it, and found it so far from being deadly that it was

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

extremely pleasant and grateful.” Obviously, however, nothing is reported in the account to indicate that the Woman’s power of persuasion was exercised unduly upon her husband. All these views are conjectural. Then why not accept what has been commonly believed by Jews and Christians in all ages, namely, that Adam sinned with his eyes wide open and out of affection and sympathy for his bride. As a matter of fact, no other view can be harmonized with Paul’s language in 1 Tim. 2:13-15 and in 1 Cor. 11:8-9. (Note again here, one of our first principles of interpretation—that to get the truth of any Scripture text, it must be in harmony with the teaching of the Bible as a whole.) (-vi-) It seems obvious that Adam preferred to part company with God rather than with his wife. In all ages multitudes have chosen Hell with their relatives above Heaven with God and His saints. Adam had the opportunity of parting company with his wife and so remaining obedient to God. Sapphira had the same opportunity, but she, like Adam, preferred her spouse to the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 5:1-11). Men refuse to believe that true religion, salvation, worship, obedience, etc., are individual matters: but there is no such thing as salvation by proxy (Rom. 14:10, 2 Cor. 5:10, Rev. 20:13). Lot seems to be the only Bible personage who exercised good judgment in this respect: when the Divine command came to him and his family to flee from Sodom, and not to look back under any circumstances, Lot obeyed; he did not even look back to see whether his wife was coming—he was too busy working out *his own* salvation (Gen. 19:12-29). Christ’s own teaching on this point is clear and explicit (Matt. 10:34-39, Luke 14:26). (-vii-) Apparently the Apostle’s language in Rom. 5:12 and in 1 Cor. 15:21-22 refers to Adam in a generic sense, that is, as the head of the physical creation. After all, does not Adam become particularly blameworthy in view of his headship of the race, a fact which surely must be regarded

GENESIS

as enhancing his responsibility no matter what may have been the circumstances attending his first sinful act?

10. *The Birth of Conscience*

"7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons."

(1) Their eyes were opened, that is, not a regaining of the physical sense of sight (there is no evidence that this had even been impaired), but the stirring of an inner awareness by which they found things wrong which previously they had not looked upon as wrong. A conflict had set in between the appeal of apparent goods and that of real goods: their moral discernment was beclouded.

(2) Skinner (ICCG, 76): "A connexion between sexual shame and sin is not suggested by the passage, and is besides not true to experience. But to infer from this single effect that the forbidden fruit had aphrodisiac properties is a still greater perversion of the author's meaning."

(3) It is a fact of human experience—one might well say, a law of human character—that when you do another man an injury you become, to some extent, his enemy. He may not feel any animosity toward you, but you certainly will experience the stirring of a sense of hostility toward him; you will discover that somehow, *in you* a feeling of separation, a schism, has arisen. This sense of hostility so engendered thus becomes a kind of compensation for the guilt feeling which your own act has produced in you. This is a perfectly normal human reaction psychologically. So it was with respect to the attitude of our first parents toward God when they had sinned against Him. Whatever the new knowledge was that came about as a consequence of their disobedience, it included an awareness of the fact that they were now separated from their Creator, and this brought with it a sense of guilt and shame, as realized disobedience to God must always bring. This is precisely

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

what we mean by the birth of conscience in Adam and Eve. And it brought forth the attempted concealment, the rationalizations and projections (to use Freudian terms), and the braggadocio which they manifested when confronted with the fact of their sin.

(4) *They knew that they were naked.* Cornfeld (AtD, 16): "This is an answer to the question of why human beings, unlike animals, were ashamed of nudity! obviously, because of man's new knowledge of decency, about which animals and primitive man, in blissful ignorance, knew nothing." (Are not tendencies in dress toward nudity in our time, and the actual practice [and defense of the practice] of nudity, further indications of modern man's desperate attempt to reduce himself to the level of the brute?) C.H.M. (N BG, 43, 44): "The Lord God had so ordered it, that in and by the fall, man should get what previously he had not, and that was, *a conscience*, a knowledge of both good and evil. This, man evidently could not have had before. He could not have known aught about evil, inasmuch as evil was not there to be known. He was in a state of innocence, which is a state of ignorance of evil. Man got a conscience in and by the fall, and we find that the very first effect of that conscience was to make him a coward. Satan had utterly deceived the woman. He had said, 'your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil'; but he had left out a material part of the truth, namely, that they should know good without the power to do it, and that they should know evil without the power to avoid it. Their very attempt to elevate themselves in the scale of moral existence involved the loss of true elevation. They became degraded, powerless, Satan-enslaved, conscience-smitten, terrified creatures. 'The eyes of them both were opened,' no doubt; but alas! to what a sight!—it was only to discover their own nakedness. They opened their eyes upon their own condition, which was 'wretched and miserable

GENESIS

and poor and blind and naked' [Rev. 3:17]. . . . Now, it is well to understand this; well, too, to know how conscience works—to see that it can only make cowards of us, as being the consciousness of what we are. Many are astray as to this; they think that conscience will bring us to God. Did it operate thus in the case of Adam and Eve? Assuredly not. Nor will it in the case of any sinner. How could it? How could the sense of what *I am* ever bring me to God, if not accompanied by the faith of what *God is*? Impossible. It will produce shame, self-reproach, remorse, anguish. It may also give birth to certain efforts on my part to remedy the condition which it discloses; but these very efforts, so far from drawing us to God, rather act as a blind to hide Him from our view."

(5) *Fig-leaves as aprons.* (a) Literally, *girdles*, or perhaps what the anthropologist would call *loincloths*. The common fig-tree abounded, of course, in Western Asia. (b) Granting that nudity indicates here an awakening of the *libido* as a phase of the new knowledge now attained by Adam and Eve, it could be true, as one commentator puts it: "The representation that the awakening of sex consciousness was accomplished by a consciousness of guilt thus contains a recognition of the fact that all human relationships are disordered. Alienation from God has brought with it alienation from man. Loneliness is the specter which haunts unredeemed humanity" (Simpson, IBG, 506). Someone else has written: "Having lost the light of purity which had previously enswathed their bodies, Adam and Eve began to realize that they were no longer innocent. The brilliantly-lighted torch had become a flickering taper!" (c) However, C.H.M. (NBG, 44-46), bares the real moral (religious or spiritual) significance of their act of resorting to an artificial covering, as follows: "Thus, in the case of Adam and Eve, the discovery of their nakedness was followed by an effort of their own to cover it—they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

aprons.' This is the first record we have of man's attempt to remedy, by his own device, his condition, and the attentive consideration thereof will afford us not a little instruction as to the real character of human religiousness in all ages. In the first place, we see, not only in Adam's case, but in every case that man's effort to remedy his condition is based upon the sense of his nakedness. He is confessedly naked, and all his works are the result of his being so. This can never avail. I must know that I am clothed, before I can do anything acceptable in the sight of God. And this, be it observed, is the difference between true Christianity and human religiousness. The former is founded upon the fact of a man's being clothed; the latter, upon the fact of his being naked. The former has for its starting-post what the later has for its goal. All that a true Christian does, is because he is clothed—perfectly clothed; all that a mere religionist does, is in order that he may be clothed. This makes a vast difference. The more we examine the genius of man's religion, in all its phases, the more we shall see its thorough insufficiency to remedy his state, or even to meet his own sense thereof. It may do very well for a time, it may avail so long as death, judgment, and the wrath of God are looked at from a distance, if looked at at all; but when a man comes to look these terrible realities straight in the face, he will find, in good truth, that his religion is a bed too short for him to stretch himself upon, and a covering too narrow for him to wrap himself in." This story teaches us that in the final reckoning, multitudes will awaken to a realization of the fact—but only when it is everlastingly too late—that their religiosity has not been true religion, their piosity has not been piety, their "morality" has not been the "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. 5:22-25), their respectability has never even approximated righteousness. Sinful man will discover—when it is everlastingly too late—that the greatest crime which he has perpetrated upon himself is the fallacy that

GENESIS

he can lift himself up to fellowship with God simply by tugging at his own bootstraps. He will discover—when it is too late to remedy his condition—that like Adam and Eve, he has sold himself to the devil for nothing but a mess of pottage (Rev. 6:16-17; Matt. 8:12, 25:30; Luke 13:28). If the Bible makes anything clear at all, it certainly makes it crystal clear that to attain ultimate union with God one must live the Spiritual Life (Gal. 5:22-25, Rom. 8:1-11), and to live the Spiritual Life the believer must be baptized into Christ and so *put on* Christ (Gal. 3:27), to be clothed upon with Christ, to be wrapped about with the mind and will of Christ (Phil. 2:5; John 14:15; Matt. 7:24-27; Heb. 5:9), to live the life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3, 1:27), to grow in the grace and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18), and so to be changed from glory unto glory (2 Cor. 3:18) until Beatitude is achieved in the putting on of immortality, the redemption of spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23), the Life Everlasting (cf. John 14:6, 5:28-29; Rom. 2:5-7; Rom. 8:18-25; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; 1 Cor. 15:35-58; Rev. 6:16-17, 20:11-15, 21:1-8, 22:1-5, etc.).

(d) Leupold (EG, 154-155): "That the sense of shame should concentrate itself around that portion of the body which is marked by the organs of generation, no doubt has its deeper reason in this, that man instinctively feels that the very fountain and source of human life is contaminated by sin. The very act of generation is tainted by sin. If this scripturally portrayed origin of the sense of shame be accepted as true, then all contentions of anthropologists that shame is rather the outgrowth of inhibitions and custom fall away as secondary and incidental. The scriptural account goes to the root of the matter. The only gleam of light in the verse is the fact that where shame is felt, the evildoer's case is not hopeless. He is at least not past feeling in the matter of doing wrong. God's prevenient grace allows this feeling to arise." (Why is it

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

that the "sex" joke, whether "sophisticated" or downright vulgar, always brings the raucous laugh? Dr. Will Durant has rightly said that "the inhibition of sex is the first principle of civilization," that is, in more familiar terms, the first step out of the barnyard.)

(e) Certainly the fact of conscience in man is conclusive proof of his power of freedom of choice (free will). Illingworth states the case clearly as follows (PHD, 33-35): "Freedom of the will does not mean the ability to act without a motive, as some of its opponents still stupidly seem to suppose. But it does mean the ability to create or co-operate in creating our own motives, or to choose our motive, or to transform a weaker motive into a stronger by adding weights to the scale of our own accord, and thus to determine our conduct by our reason; whence it is now usually called the power of self-determination—a phrase to which St. Thomas very nearly approaches when he says, 'Man is determined by a combination of reason and appetite, that is, by a desire whose object is consciously apprehended by the reason as an end to be attained, and he is therefore self-moved.' For instance, I am hungry, and that is simply an animal appetite; but I am immediately aware of an ability to choose between gratifying my hunger with an unwholesome food because it is pleasant, or with an unpleasant food because it is wholesome, or abstain from its gratification altogether for self-discipline or because the food before me is not my own. That is to say, I can present to my mind, on the occasion of appetite, pleasure, utility, goodness, as objects to be attained, and I can choose between them; nor is to the point to say that I am determined by my character, for my character is only the momentum which I have gained by a number of past acts of choice, that is, by my own past use of my freedom; and even so I am conscious that at the moment I can counter-act my character, though morally certain that I have no intention so to do. This is briefly what we mean by free-

GENESIS

will; and it is a fact of immediate and universal consciousness, that is, of my own consciousness, corroborated by the like experience of all other men. . . . For the sense of freedom is an immediate part of my consciousness. I cannot be conscious without it. I cannot tear it out. It lies at the very root of myself, and claims, with self-evidence, to be something *sui generis*, something unique. So obvious is this, that most even of those who regard it as a delusion are obligated to admit that it is a delusion from which there is no escape. Further, upon this sense of freedom all law and all morality depend. To deny this is to play with words. And law and morality abundantly verify the legitimacy of their basis by the progressive development in which they result. For you cannot gather figs of thistles, or a rational order of society from an irrational disease of mind. And, finally, the sense of freedom has maintained itself, from the dawn of history, against a spirit far more powerful than any which philosophy can raise—the spirit of remorse. What would humanity, age after age, have given to be free from remorse? Yet remorse still stares us in the face, overshadowing our hearts with sadness and driving its countless victims into madness, suicide, despair, and awful forebodings of the after-world. Men would have exorcised it if they could; but they cannot. And remorse is only a darker name for man's conviction of his own free-will." Remorse is, of course, the inevitable concomitant of guilt and shame, such as that experienced by Adam and Eve following their disobedience to God.

11. *The Heavenly Father*

"8 And they heard the voice of Jehovah God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of Jehovah God amongst the trees of the garden."

In this exquisitely beautiful and touching—and tragic—"human interest" story, we have the first appearance in

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

Scripture of the Heavenly Father of the Drama of Redemption. (Cf. Matt. 6:26, John 17:11. See also what is commonly called the Narrative of the Prodigal Son: a comparison of Luke 15:3-7 with verses 18-24 of the same chapter is sufficient to show that this is designedly the Narrative of the Forgiving Father. Cf. also Psalms 103:13-18; 1 Cor. 10:13; John 3:16-17; Rev. 21:1-7, 22:1-5.)

(1) Note the *fatherly* motif which runs throughout this phase of the narrative: vividly *anthropomorphic* as it is, at the same time it is, in every detail, accurately descriptive of personal human experience. Note: "in the cool of the day," that is, toward evening, when cooling breezes usually sprang up: in these Eastern lands the "heat of the day" was so intense that only toward evening could the master come out of his tent and walk about in comfort. Lange (231): "To this we may add: and when also there comes to a man a more quiet and contemplative frame of soul." Moreover, the language here clearly intimates this to have been a daily custom in which the Heavenly Father was accustomed to meet His children and they in turn were wont to look forward with pleasant anticipation to these moments of sweet fellowship. Again, Lange (231): "We must regard the question here as unanswered, in what respect the theophanies (which were mediated in all cases through vision-seeing states of soul) are to be distinguished from real outward appearances in human form."

(2) Not so any longer—this once pleasant anticipation on the part of our first parents of sweet communion with God. No—the guilty pair sought to avoid personal contact with Him; sin had separated them from Him; as the Apostle put it many, many centuries later, they were now alienated from God by their own evil works (Col. 1:21; Eph. 2:1-3, 4:18). As the voice of the Creator became a call—a summons to the inevitable reckoning—they hid themselves somewhere in the densest and darkest recesses of the garden. Note the realistic psychological process

GENESIS

exhibited here: from *sin* to *guilt*, from *guilt* to *shame*, from *shame* to *fear*, and from *fear* to *flight*. The perfect love which casts out fear (1 John 4:18) had, in Adam and Eve, become vitiated.

(3) (a) The basic truth of this narrative is that *the moral problem of Eden is the moral problem of every human life, its law my law, its temptation my temptation, its sin my sin, its Savior my Savior*. This moral issue obtrudes itself on every son and daughter of the human race as the age of discernment or accountability is reached. And the tragedy is that all have followed in the footsteps of Mother Eve (Rom. 3:23). (b) The choice made by our first parents was the choice of self and self's way of doing things above God and God's way of doing things. It was the choice between the tree of life and the tree of death. The tree was central, as the commandment was central—the choice was between self and God. Taking the one was rejecting the other: and this is what sin is essentially. (c) This is the choice which every human being must make. Everyone who has come in contact with the Gospel message is thus brought face to face with this choice—he cannot avoid it. It is the choice between Christ and Satan. It is indeed a *forced option*: he who is not for Christ is against Him (Matt. 6:24, 12:30). Just as the man who says he has decided not to worry about the weeds in his garden has already decided for the weeds (and so is simply fooling himself), so the accountable person who chooses to remain indifferent to the claims of Christ has in truth rejected Him altogether. *There is no middle ground here*. (d) Man's experience in Eden is a true picture of Everyman's experience with sin. This, of course, is the truly significant aspect of the story: all other aspects—historical, allegorical, psychological, or what not—are secondary to this. The lesson is clear: at first Satan's suggestions are subtle and their true import double talk; but once entertained, they develop into crime and vice and sin.

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

Just as the disease germ enters the body, and on finding conditions favorable, germinates disease and death, so the germ of sin entering the interior life of man and finding conditions receptive, will sooner or later breed the lust that flowers in the overt act of sin. We should avoid exposing ourselves to needless temptations, because no human character is strong enough to resist under all circumstances. We should keep our spirits so strong by feeding on the Bread of Life that the germs of sin cannot find a breeding-place in them (Matt. 4:4, 7, 10; John 6:35-59). Bible study, meditation, prayer, service, the ordinances, the worshiping assembly—all these are means whereby the Christian draws spiritual strength to resist the wiles of the Evil One (2 Tim. 2:22; Jas. 4:7; Eph. 6:10-16; 1 Pet. 5:6; 2 Tim. 2:15, 3:14-17; Matt. 6:13; 1 Thess. 5:17; Acts 2:42; Phil. 4:8; Matt. 25:31-40; Heb. 10:25; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 10:16, 11:23-30; Acts 2:43-47, 4:32-35; 1 Cor. 16:1-2; 2 Cor. 9:7; Rom. 12:1-2, etc.).

12. *Pagan Traditions.*

Pagan traditions of the Golden Age of mankind, the role of the woman in the Fall, the human lust for omniscience, the lost chance of immortality, etc., were widespread throughout the Fertile Crescent. Traditions of erect serpents, flying serpents, serpent dragons, and dragons in general, also abounded throughout the ancient world.

(1) The eighth-century B.C. Greek poet, Hesiod, gives us a vivid picture of *the Golden Age* of man on earth, in his poem *Works and Days*, (lines 109-140). (See Loeb Classical Library edition, *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homeric*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.)

(2) *Pandora's Box*. (Note *pan*, "all," and *dora*, "gifts"). As the story goes, when Prometheus ("Forethought") stole fire from heaven, Zeus in revenge ordained Hephaestus to make a woman out of earth who by her beauty should bring misery on the human race. Hermes took her to Epimetheus ("Afterthought") who made her his wife,

GENESIS

forgetting the advice of his brother Prometheus not to accept any gifts from the gods. Pandora brought with her from heaven a box containing all possible human ills; overpowered by her own curiosity, Pandora opened the box and the ills escaped and spread abroad over the whole earth. (See Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 50-105, and Milton, *Paradise Lost*, iv, 714 ff.) (3) *The Golden Apples of the Hesperides*. The Hesperides were nymphs who guarded the Golden Apples which Ge (Earth) gave to Hera at the latter's wedding to Zeus. They were closely watched by a terrible dragon named Ladon. But, in fulfillment of an ancient oracle, Heracles entered the garden by stealth and slew this monster. The garden was supposed to be in the extreme West on the river Oceanus. (4) *Apollo and the Python*. The Python was said to be a serpent bred of the slime after Deucalion's deluge. It was supposed to be living in the caves of Mt. Parnassus. But Apollo, as the bright god of heaven who detested all impurity, physical and spiritual, four days after his birth (according to the legend) slew the serpent with his arrows.

(5) Cf. also the Assyrian-Babylonian great she-dragon, Tiamat, allegedly slain by Marduk, the city-god of Babylon (or by Ashur, the city-god of Nineveh); the Persian Ahriman (also represented as a serpent in some accounts) who is said to have deceived the first human pair and drawn them away from the good god Ormuzd (or the Persian good god Ahura Mazda who was said to exercise a certain restraint upon the bad god, *Angro Mainyu*); the triumph of the Hindu Krishna over the great serpent Kali Naga achieved by tramping on the serpent's head; the Ugaritic flying serpent, Yam; the horrible Egyptian Set, brother and enemy of Osiris; the equally horrible Siva of Hindu mythology; the Biblical Leviathan (Isa. 27:1); the Canaanite sea-dragon Rahab ("arrogance," cf. Job. 26:12, 9:13); the Teutonic Odin (or Woden) and the Midgard serpent; and in more modern times the story of Beowulf

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

and the Fire-dragon, that of St. George and the dragon, or that of St. Patrick and his snakes, etc., probably all later and more corrupt editions of the original.

(6) For versions of the human quest for illicit knowledge (omniscience), we have the theft of fire from heaven by the archrebel Prometheus, also the Biblical account of the attempt of early man to build a tower to heaven—the Tower of Babel (Gen., ch. 11). etc. (7) For traditions of man's "squandered opportunity for gaining immortality," see the Babylonian epics of Adapa and Gilgamesh, especially.

(8) What shall we say, then, of these "traditions," "legends," "myths," or whatever they may be called? Cornfeld (AtD, 17), with reference to the flying serpents, erect serpents, dragons, etc., writes: "There may be, however, a pure coincidence of symbolism with elements in Gen. 3." Were these stories "infiltrations" into surrounding traditions "of religious ideas properly belonging to the Hebrews," as Rawlinson has suggested? Or could they not have been "infiltrations" from a strain of general Semitic culture extending far back beyond the origin of the ethnic group who came to be known as the Hebrews? To my way of thinking, Kitto's explanation is the most satisfactory of all (DBI, 67): "What shall we say, then, to these things? This—that the nations embodied in these traditions their remembrance of paradise, of the fall, and of the promised salvation." *Every counterfeit presupposes a genuine.* Hence, we may reasonably conclude, it seems to me, that the universality of these stories of a Golden Age, of man's fall into evil ways and his consequent loss of the direct attainment of immortality, of the activities of serpents and dragons as instrumentalities of evil, including also the universality of accounts of the Flood and that of the practice of animal sacrifice, all points to an actual common origin in the cradle of the race—the common origin of which we have the facts presented in the opening

GENESIS

chapters of Genesis and *in which the spiritual motif is the essential aspect of each account*—the originals having become corrupted, and greatly debased, by oral transmission, as the human race became diffused over the earth.

13. *Satan's Rebellion in Classic Poetry*

The poetic versions of Satan's pre-mundane rebellion are to be found, of course, in two of the greatest poems of all time, namely, Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Dante makes the creation of the angels simultaneous with that of the universe, whereas Milton puts their creation long ages prior to that of man. Milton has often been criticized for surrounding the Adversary with such awesome associations that our abhorrence of him is diminished; indeed Satan has been called the hero of *Paradise Lost*. Dante's portrayal of the Devil, on the other hand, is fairly true to Scripture teaching. In Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, it is man's thirst for illicit knowledge that is emphasized. Faustus is a "grand figure" in Marlowe's play, "filled with a divine lust for what is more than human and chafing at the boundaries set to man's attainments. . . . a rebel against the Ultimate Authority, willing to pay for knowledge with his soul, but moved by heart-rending misgivings when he reconsiders the dreadful pact" (*The Literature of England*, Vol. I, 501, Woods, Watt, et al, 4th Edition). Goethe, in his great work, *Faust*, recounts Faust's bargain with the Devil, who agrees to claim his (Faust's) soul at the moment he (the Devil) gives Faust something "worth living for." Goethe pictures Mephistopheles as saying to Faust:

"I to thy service here agree to bind me,
To run and never rest at call of thee;
When over yonder thou shalt find me,
Thou shalt do as much for me."

Faust, however, disillusioned in turn by knowledge, power, and sensual pleasure, finds that he is truly happy only when

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

he becomes engaged in useful labor—labor that benefits his fellows—and so it is that God takes his soul at the very moment the Devil is on the verge of claiming it.

A word of caution here: while Satan's personality and his existence are matters of fact, we must not go to the extreme of giving ludicrous designations to him as did theologians of the Middle Ages. In medieval times it was thought actually possible for a man to sell his soul to the Devil and that such compacts were written in blood. As Strong writes (ST, 444): "The cathedrals cultivated and perpetuated this superstition, by the figures of malignant demons which grinned from the gargoyles of their roofs and the capitals of their columns, and popular preaching exalted Satan to the rank of a rival god—a god more feared than was the true and living God. Satan was pictured as having horns and hoofs—an image of the sensual and bestial—which led Cuvier to remark that the adversary could not devour, because horns and hoofs indicated not a carnivorous but a ruminant quadruped." Such misrepresentations of the actual nature and character of the Devil led to gross superstitions and in this manner became as prolific of skepticism about his actual existence as the much-vaunted ultra-intellectualism of our day has been. Satan has existence, *real personal existence*, but, paradoxically, the most effective weapon that he uses to bring human souls into subjection to his will, is the device of deceiving them into thinking that he does not really exist. Never forget—Satan is the implacable enemy of God, of the Son of God, of the Holy Spirit, of all the saints of God, of the Spiritual Life, of all that is good and true and beautiful in the totality of being.

* * * * *

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

Spiritual Blindness

Text: 2 Cor. 4:4. Spiritual blindness seems to have

GENESIS

dominated by far the greater part of the human race from its beginning. (Cf. Luke 8:4-15, Isa. 6:9-10, Matt. 13:14-16, Acts 28:25-28). Men continue to be, in our time, oblivious to the fact of sin and hence utterly indifferent with respect to their personal salvation. These facts raise certain questions, as follows:

1. *Who or what is it that blinds men to the fact of their lost condition* (John 3:16-21, 5:40; Matt. 23:37). (1) Not our Heavenly Father, of course: He would have all men "to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4). (2) Not the Lord Jesus Christ, our Savior, because He is the Lamb of God who sacrificed Himself "to take away the sin of the world" (John 1:29, 3:16; 1 Cor. 5:7; 1 Pet. 2:21-25, 3:18; Rev. 13:8). (3) Not the Spirit of God, because He has revealed to us the Plan of Redemption in which "all things that pertain unto life and godliness" are made so clear that "wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein" (2 Pet. 1:3; Isa. 35:8-10; John 16:7-15; Acts 1:8, 2:1-4, 2:38, 8:26-40; 2 Tim. 3:16-17; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; 2 Pet. 1:21). (4) Our text reveals the fact that man alone is not responsible for this state of things (cf. Eph. 6:10-16, 1 Thess. 5:4-8, 1 Tim. 2:13-15, 1 John 3:7-8). (5) It reveals the fact that man is blinded by the seductive influence of another person, designated "the god of this world" (cf. 1 Pet. 5:8; John 8:44, 12:31; 1 John 3:8; Eph. 6:10-12; Rev. 9:11, 20:10, 12:10-12).

2. *To what facts does Satan cause men to be blind?* (1) To the fact that the world is under Divine condemnation (John 3:17-21; Rom. 3:23, 5:12-21). (2) To the fact of their lost condition in the sight of God (Luke 13:3, Acts 17:30). Sinful man actually *resists* believing that he is under Divine condemnation and in danger of perishing in hell with the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:11-15, 21:8). (3) To the fact of God's immeasurable love as manifested in providing the Atonement for sin (John 3:16, 1 John 3:1). (4) To the fact of Christ's

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

willingness to suffer and die for man's redemption (John 15:13; Phil. 2:5-11; Heb. 9:27-28, 12:1-2). (5) To the commands of the Gospel (Acts 2:38, 16:31; John 3:5; Matt. 10:32-33; Luke 13:3; Rom. 10:9-10; Gal. 3:27). Think how they ridicule the Lord's ordinances, Christian baptism above all others! (6) To the consequences of their own sins (Gal. 6:7-8, Rom. 6:23).

3. *How does Satan go about his diabolical activity of blinding men to their lost state?* (1) Through the allurements of the flesh (Matt. 26:41; John 6:63; Rom. 7:14-25; Rom. 8:1-10; Gal. 5:16-24; 2 Cor. 7:1; Eph. 2:1-10; 2 Pet. 2:18-20). "The lustful thought, the disrelish for heaven, the positive dislike for goodness, the deep despondency, are, with a thousand other infirmities and sins, traceable to the connection of the spirit with the body; and in proportion as that body is subjugated by discipline, the power of these sins will be weakened, and when the spirit will be freed from the present corruptible body, it will be wholly liberated" (Exell). (We must, however, note the distinction made in apostolic teaching, especially in the Pauline Epistles, between the body (*soma*) and the "flesh" (*sarx*), as we shall see (*infra*.) (2) Through mental suggestion. Strong (ST, 435-454): "Recent psychical researches disclose almost unlimited possibilities of influencing other minds by suggestion; slight physical phenomena, as the odor of a violet or the sight in a book of a crumpled roseleaf, may start trains of thought which change the course of a whole life. A word or look may have great power over us. . . . If other men can so powerfully influence us, it is quite possible that spirits which are not subject to limitations of the flesh may influence us yet more." Men seem to be incapable of realizing the full measure of the power of suggestion to which they are constantly being subjected, especially of *subliminal* suggestion, as by the press, radio, television, and all media of mass communication. (3) Through our outward circum-

GENESIS

stances, such as Eve's alluring fascination for her husband, such as Rebekah's deception of Isaac, motivated by her undue preference for Jacob above Esau. Multitudes put allegiance to earthly relatives above allegiance to Christ (Matt. 19:29, Luke 14:25-27). (4) Through sudden and unexpected calamities, through disillusionments, long illnesses, or adversities of many different kinds. How many a mother on losing a baby, will exclaim, "Why did God do this to me?" She overlooks the fact that death is no respecter of persons. The fever, the pestilence, may fall on the best ordered house and the most abstemious body. The Bible is realistic: it never deceives us; it tells us explicitly that in this world we must expect tribulation, that God's rains fall on the just and the unjust alike, that the wheat and the tares must grow up together until the judgment (John 16:33; Matt. 5:45, 13:24-30). We hear professing Christians say, "Why did God take this loved one from me?" *God is not a murderer*, but Satan is—he was the first murderer (John 8:44). Satan, not God, is the one ultimately responsible for death, for all the sin, sickness, suffering, and death in our world (Jas. 1:12-15). (Cf. Heb. 2:14-15, 1 Cor. 16:25-26). Death, the limit of Satan's power, is, however, only the beginning, so to speak, of God's power. Death is Satan's last and most terrible weapon (Job 1:12); however, the resurrection of Christ has disarmed even death of its sting (1 Cor. 15:25, 26; 15:54-56). God, while permitting these things to be, evidently in order that Satan's true character may be made manifest to both angels and men, has "with the temptation made also the way of escape" (1 Cor. 10:13): that Way, of course, is Christ (John 14:6).

4. *What are the weapons that Satan uses in blinding men?*
 (1) *Wealth* (Acts 8:20, 1 Tim. 6:10): Money—wealth in general—is of no value in itself, but is of value only for what it will buy; hence, it can never be an end, but is always a means. Nor can we afford to overlook the fact

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

that one of the things money can buy is power, prestige, etc. (2) *Fame*. For world honor, the satisfaction of personal ambition, Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, each turned our earth into a shambles. Fame, however, does not exist in a person, but only in the opinions of others about him. (3) *Worldly wisdom*. Francis Bacon: "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion." Or, as Alexander Pope writes:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again."

(Cf. 1 Cor. 1:18-25, 2:6-16; Acts 17:16-23; Rom. 1:22; 1 Cor. 3:20; 2 Tim. 3:16). (4) *Personal opinions*—idols of the market place, clichés bandied about by the thoughtless in all ages; also the fulminations of the half-baked academicians. (5) *Substitutes*. The Devil whispers into our ears that there are many institutions as good as the church. Those who substitute the club or the lodge for the church, social service for the preaching of the Gospel, respectability for regeneration, good citizenship for the obedience of faith, are bound to be tragically disillusioned on the final day of accounting (Acts 17:30-31). (6) *Prejudice*. This is one of Satan's most effective weapons; by means of it he bolts church doors, closes the ears of sinners and steels their hearts against the love of God. (7) *Traditionalism*, that is, allegiance to cults, customs, systems, etc., whether or not they are defensible. This is one of the chief factors in maintaining denominationalism. "My daddy was a Democrat, my granddaddy was a Democrat, and I'm a Democrat too." (8) *Self-righteousness*. The man who stays out of the church because "there are hypocrites in it" is like the man who refuses to let the sun shine on him because it has some spots on it. As one of

GENESIS

our oldtime evangelists put it: "You can't hide behind a hypocrite unless you are smaller than he is." The moralist is our modern Pharisee who stands afar off and thanks God he is not like other poor mortals. The self-righteous man is more unlike Jesus Christ than any other man on earth—he stands below the drunkard who wallows in the gutter, who, though too weak to resist temptation, is willing to acknowledge himself a sinner.

"The moral man came to the judgment,
But his self-righteous rags would not do;
The men who had crucified Jesus
Had passed off as moral men, too."

Conclusion: The Christian cannot afford to fondle Satan. One cannot control a rattlesnake with a cream puff. To flirt with temptation is to play with fire: this was Eve's first mistake. The Bible warning is clear: flee temptation, avoid the very appearance of evil (1 Tim. 6:3-11, 2 Tim. 2:22, 1 Thess. 5:22, Jas. 4:7).

The Fall and Restoration of Man

1. There were three distinct developments involved in man's fall, namely, (1) a change of heart, brought about by giving heed to Satan's specious lies; (2) a change of disposition or will, a repentance unto death (2 Cor. 7:10); and finally (3) a change of relationship. The change of relationship did not take place, however, until the overt act of disobedience was performed. Not until they had actually eaten the forbidden fruit did the guilty pair feel their guilt and shame, realizing that the glory of the Lord had departed from them.

2. God, in His infinite wisdom, has ordained that man shall return to fellowship with Him over precisely the same road that he traveled in breaking that fellowship originally. Every conversion to Christ involves three distinct changes, as follows: (1) a change of heart, actualized by *faith* (Heb. 11:6; Acts 16:31; John 20:30-31; Rom. 10:17, 10:9-10;

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

Matt. 10:32-33, etc.); (2) a change of disposition or will, actualized in *repentance* (Luke 13:3; Acts 2:38, 17:30, 26:18), which is repentance unto life (2 Cor. 7:9-10); and (3) a change of *relationship*, actualized in *baptism* (Matt. 28:18-20). The eating of the forbidden fruit in Eden was a violation of *positive* law, the kind of law that is designed to prove or to disprove (to test) one's faith; the kind of law that rests solely on Divine authority, that requires an act to be done *because God commands it*. Hence the penitent believer must actualize his reconciliation with God (2 Cor. 5:18-20, Gal. 3:27) in the *positive* ordinance of Christian baptism (Acts 22:16, 2:38, 8:38; Rom. 6:1-11; Col. 2:12; John 3:5; Heb. 10:22).

We give our hearts to God in *faith* (mental assent to the Christian creedal formula, Matt. 16:16), plus *commitment* to Christ and His word (Rom. 10:9-10, 12:1-2); our lives in *repentance*; our entire being, including our bodies, in *baptism* (Heb. 10:22). We are baptized out of the kingdom of this world, under the rule of the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4), into the authority (sovereignty) of the Absolute Monarch of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself (Acts 2:36, 1 Tim. 1:17, 1 Cor. 15:20-28). Penitent believers are baptized in the *name* of—that is, by the *authority* of—Jesus Christ according to the prescribed formula, “into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (Acts 2:38, Matt. 28:18-20) and so are translated “out of the power of darkness” “into the kingdom of the Son of his love” (Col. 1:13). Baptism in water is the transitional act (1 Pet. 3:18-22).

A. Campbell (CS, 263): “Views of baptism as a mere external and bodily act, exert a very injurious influence on the understanding and practice of men. Hence many ascribe to it so little importance in the Christian economy. ‘Bodily exercise,’ says Paul, ‘profits little.’ We have been taught to regard immersion in water, into the name of the

GENESIS

Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as an act of the whole man—body, soul, and spirit. The soul of the intelligent subject is as fully immersed *into the Lord Jesus*, as his body is immersed *in the water*. His soul rises with the Lord Jesus, as his body rises out of the water; and into one Spirit with all the family of God he is immersed. It is not like circumcising a Hebrew infant or proselyting to Moses a Gentile adult. The candidate, believing in the person, mission, and character of the Son of God, and willing to submit to him, immediately, upon recognizing him, hastens to be buried with the Lord, and to rise with him, not corporeally, but spiritually, with his whole soul. . . . There is no such thing as outward bodily acts in the Christian institution; and less than is all others, is the act of immersion. Then it is that the spirit, soul, and body of man become one with the Lord. Then it is that the power of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit comes upon us. Then it is that we are enrolled among the children of God, and enter the ark, which will, if we abide in it, transport us to the Mount of God."

Sin and Its Cure

1 John 1:7. Sin is lawlessness (1 John 3:4). The essential principle of sin is *selfishness*. There never was a sin committed that was not the choice of self above God. Various remedies for sin have been proposed by cultists and reformers: *e.g.*, education, mental healing, psychoanalysis, "salvation by character," Comte's "religion of humanity," "social regeneration," etc., Mrs. Eddy's followers presume to solve the problem of sin by pronouncing it "illusion of mortal mind"—an explanation that explains nothing. Obviously, an illusion must be an illusion of *something*.

The fact remains that *there is only one remedy for sin—the blood of Christ* by which Divine Atonement was provided for the sin of the world (John 1:29). and there is

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

only one method of presenting and applying this remedy, viz., the preaching of the Gospel for the obedience of faith (1 Cor. 1:21).

1. *Faith* takes away the *love* of sin, by focusing the soul, its affections and aspirations, upon the One Altogether Lovely (John 14:1; Song of Sol. 5:16; Acts 16:31, 15:9, 26:18; Heb. 11:6; Gal. 2:20, 3:2).

2. *Repentance* does away with the practice of sin (Luke 13:3, 15:18-19; Rom. 2:4; 2 Cor. 7:10).

3. *Baptism* transfers the believing penitent out of a state of alienation into a *saved state*, or a state of reconciliation with God (2 Cor. 5:18-20). This formal transfer is implicit in the baptismal formula, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19, Acts 2:38). Baptism is essentially a positive ordinance; it does, however, exemplify the moral virtue of *the obedience of faith* (Rom. 6:17, Jas. 2:26).

"Spiritually, baptism is into Christ (Rom. 6:3), just as the physical act is into the water, Thus we become immersed, submerged, or hidden in Him, and put on Him (Rom. 6:3). While we wear Him, the world looking at us will see, not us, but Christ. The thinner our garment the greater will be the prominence of our sinful selves. Spiritually, too, baptism is a death (Rom. 6:8), not of the body, nor of the mind or faculties, *but of a life of sin*. Following this death is a burial (Rom. 6:8), closing the chapter of our past carnal life just as the burial of the body closes the chapter of our mortal life. In Christ, the fruitful, is a planting (Rom. 6:5), of the seed of a new life (Rom. 6:4), which is ours after having been born again (John 3:5), begotten of the Spirit of God. Whereas we were children of wrath, we are now sons of God, joint-heirs with Jesus Christ, having risen with Him (Col. 2:12) through the faith of the operation of God. Baptism physically is a washing of the body, but spiritually it is a com-

GENESIS

plete cleansing from sin (Tit. 3:5).” (Cecil J. Snow, *The Australian Christian*).

4. *Pardon* removes the *guilt* of sin. A pardon is always issued at the seat of authority. Divine pardon is not something done *in us*, but something done *in heaven for us*. In its legal sense, it is called *justification* (Rom. 5:1; Gal. 3:26-27; Rom. 4:25, 5:18). Pardon takes place *in the mind of God*, and the act of pardon is explicitly associated with the transitional act of baptism (1 Pet. 3:19-22; John 19:34; 1 John 5:5-9; Gal. 3:27; Acts 2:38).

5. *Resurrection*, followed by glorification, will eradicate the *consequences* of sin, the chief of which is death (Rom. 8:11, 1 Cor. 15:20-23, Phil. 3:20-21).

Conclusion. Redemption will not be complete until God's saints are clothed in glory and honor and incorruption (Rom. 2:5-7); redeemed in spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, 2 Cor. 5:1-8). Then, and not until then, will sin be eradicated both in its guilt and in its consequences (Rev. 21:1-4).

“In the land of fadeless day,
Lies the ‘city four-square.’
It shall never pass away,
And there is ‘no night there.’
God shall ‘wipe away all tears,’
There’s no death, no pain, nor fears;
And they count not time by years,
For there is ‘no night there,’”

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWELVE

1. Explain the *contextual* reference of the word *toledoth*, as used in Genesis.
2. Define the two kinds of evil.
3. Who were the four actors in the Tragedy of the Fall?
4. Why do we say that a fall necessarily occurred in the birth of a conscience in man?

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

5. What is *human nature*, according to Gen. 2:7?
6. Explain the racial, bipartite, personal, social, and moral aspects of human nature.
7. What is the essential difference between innocence and holiness?
8. Name and define the two essential properties of personality.
9. What are the four general outreaches which man has manifested throughout his entire history as man?
10. What does Cassirer mean in designating homo sapiens an *animal symbolicum*?
11. State the various symbolic interpretations that have been given to the "serpent" of Gen. 3.
12. What correlation does exist between the account of the serpent in Genesis and the Cult of Fertility that was widespread in the ancient pagan world?
13. Why must we reject the view that the Narrative of the Woman and the Serpent is a parable?
14. What does the phrase "a living soul" (Gen. 2:7) teach us about the nature of a human being?
15. What, according to Kaufmann, are the differences between the pagan concept of the demonic and that of Biblical teaching?
16. How, according to the same writer, does Biblical cosmology, creationism, and monotheism differ from those of the pagan mythologies?
17. Why and how does what is called "folklore" often reveal profound truth?
18. What, according to the Epistle of James, is the pedigree of evil?
19. What is the basic assumption of the critical (analytical) theorists? Explain how this arbitrary assumption creates "perplexity" (as Skinner would have it) with respect to the story of the serpent.

GENESIS

20. State the reasons why we regard the serpent as a real creature.
21. State the reasons why we hold that a superior intelligence was operating through the instrumentality of the serpent?
22. Who was this superior being? How does Jesus describe him (John 8:44)?
23. Explain Luke 10:18 in this connection.
24. Recall the Scriptures in which Jesus recognized the existence of Satan and his rebel host.
25. Who was Satan originally?
26. What is suggested by the word "subtle" in Gen. 3:1?
27. On what grounds do we hold that the Devil has real personal existence?
28. Are there any valid reasons for rejecting the idea of Satan's existence in our day?
29. What details of the Narrative of the Fall demonstrate the Tempter's subtlety?
30. What details demonstrate his diabolical malice?
31. What details demonstrate his diabolical cunning?
32. Why was the Woman not frightened on hearing articulate speech from the serpent's mouth?
33. State probable reasons why Satan chose to approach the Woman through the instrumentality of a brute.
34. What correlation is suggested here with the primitive belief in the kinship of all living things?
35. What probable significance is there in the fact that Satan used the name Elohim instead of the name Yahweh for Deity.
36. What was the element of suggestiveness in the first words of the Tempter?
37. How did Eve reply?
38. What was her first and *fatal* mistake?

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

39. What did she do with the Word of God in her reply?
40. What did Christ do with God's Word in defeating Satan?
41. What should this teach us about faithfulness to the Word?
42. What clause did the Woman add to the prohibitory enactment?
43. What word did she omit in repeating it?
44. What did this omission indicate?
45. What significance is there in the fact that Satan ignored the many privileges of the Edenic environment and pointed up only the one limitation? What weakness in human character does this illustrate?
46. Explain the significance of the location of the forbidden tree "in the midst of the garden." What fundamental truth does this phrase probably symbolize?
47. Explain what we mean in classifying the prohibitory injunction regarding the Tree of Knowledge in the category of *positive* law.
48. Can we rightly hold that this positive precept was the *cause* of the disloyalty of Adam and Eve? What, then, did it elicit?
49. Explain Satan's cunning (1) in his increasing boldness, (2) in his bold challenge of the integrity of God's Word, (3) in his brazen challenge of God's motives, (4) in the ambiguity of his assertions.
50. Show how he played on the meaning of the word "die."
51. Explain how double-dealing he became in his accusations.
52. Explain how artfully he led up to his final and successful appeal.

GENESIS

53. Explain how he created a false sense of security in the woman's heart and the lesson this has for us.
54. Explain the probable full significance of the phrase, "the knowledge of good and evil."
55. What was the basic issue in this whole affair of the Woman and the Old Serpent?
56. What is probably implied in the verb "saw" in Gen. 3:6?
57. What was the first appeal (temptation)?
58. What was the second appeal?
59. What was the third appeal?
60. What special import is there in the fact that it was the intellectual appeal which turned the tide in Satan's favor?
61. Explain fully the implications of the phrase, "the excess of unbridled intellect."
62. Explain the statement: "Evil is the price we pay for moral freedom."
63. Explain: "The presence of evil is due, not to the nature of things, but to the nature of goodness."
64. In what final act was the disobedience of our first parents consummated?
65. What does Gen. 3:6 imply with respect to Adam's part in this transaction?
66. What is the teaching of the New Testament with respect to Adam's part in the affair?
67. Explain: In Eve's case, "it was not the body that made the spirit sin," rather, "it was the spirit that brought death to the body."
68. Did a fall actually take place in Eden, and was it a fall "downward" or "upward"?
69. Explain how the distinction between *apparent* goods and *real* goods has so much to do with human morality.

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

70. Why do we say that the choice faced by Adam and Eve was the choice that the first *homo sapiens* had to face? What is the relation of this fact to the birth of conscience?
71. What universal truths—truths with respect to all mankind—are embodied in this story of the Fall?
72. Re-state Unamuno's view of "the struggle for life."
73. What is the "best" that Satan has to offer men for serving him?
74. What is the probable significance of the clause in v. 7, "the eyes of them both were opened"?
75. What did this new "knowledge" probably include?
76. What is it that invariably separates man from God?
77. What generally follows this sense of separation psychologically?
78. What correlation was there between the new "knowledge" which came to our first parents after their disobedience and their own first realization of their nakedness?
79. What conclusions are justified as to the relation between the role of sex and this new "knowledge"?
80. In what ways did all human relationships become disordered after the Fall?
81. Explain what is probably meant by "aprons" in v. 7.
82. Re-state C.H.M.'s forceful distinction between the "clothing" of the true Christian and that of the mere moralist or "religionist." Does this mean that it is utterly impossible for any man to lift himself up to reconciliation with God simply by tugging at his own bootstraps?
83. Summarize the details which point up the fact of the birth of conscience in our first parents.
84. What psychological relation must exist between human free will and human conscience?

GENESIS

85. Summarize Illingworth's presentation of the fact of freedom of will in man.
86. By what one circumstance is human free will limited?
87. Explain what is meant by the *fatherly motif* in vv. 8-13.
88. Why do we speak of this phase of the narrative as anthropomorphic in character? Does this fact in any sense lessen its spiritual integrity and significance?
89. Explain: "The moral problem of Eden is the moral problem of every human life."
90. Explain what is meant by a "forced option."
91. What lessons especially should we derive from the story of Eden with respect to (1) fleeing from temptation and (2) keeping ourselves spiritually strong?
92. What means are at our disposal for maintaining and increasing our spiritual strength?
93. Recall pagan traditions of the Golden Age of man, the Woman's introduction of sin into our world, and human lust for illicit knowledge.
94. Recall the pagan traditions of man's warfare with serpents, dragons, etc.
95. What is the most reasonable view of the relation of these pagan versions to the Biblical narrative of these matters?
96. In what two great poems do we have the literary versions of Satan's apostasy?
97. What is the common criticism of Milton's presentation of Satan's career?
98. Compare Marlowe's version of Dr. Faustus with that of Goethe.
99. What medieval superstitions flourished with respect to the Devil and demons in general? How were these expressed in medieval architecture?

THE BEGINNING OF MORAL EVIL ON EARTH

100. Who blinds men to the fact of their lost condition?
101. To what facts does he cause them to be blind?
102. How does he go about the diabolical business of blinding men to the facts of their lost state?
103. What are the weapons that he uses in creating and fostering this spiritual blindness?
104. In what respect is worldly wisdom one of the most potent of these weapons?
105. Who is said in Scripture to exercise the power of death (Heb. 2:14)? What do we learn about this from the first two chapters of Job?
106. Correlate the steps in the fall of man with those of his restoration (salvation).
107. What is sin, according to Scripture? What are the various factors (changes, motives, acts) in the remedy for sin and in the application of this remedy to the cleansing of the soul?
108. Is there any possible remedy for sin for Satan and his rebel host?
109. What special aspect of the sin of our first parents makes it possible for God to be just in providing for them the Plan of Salvation?

PART THIRTEEN:

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

(Gen. 3:9-24)

Recapitulation

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

"Work!

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—*Testament of Levi*, xviii."

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

All the evidence available, either from Scripture teaching or from human experience, seems to make it obvious that *man was mortal from the beginning, that is, created mortal; and that as long as he had free access to the Tree of Life, he had the means of counteracting his mortality.* But what was this Tree of Life? Was it an actually existing tree, bearing real fruit, of a kind such as we now apprehend by sense-perception, fruit specifically designed to renew physical youth and vigor? There is nothing incredible in such an interpretation. If God provides food to renew man's physical strength, as we know that He does (Matt. 6:11), why should it be thought incredible that He should have prepared a special kind of food to renew and preserve man's physical youth? According to this view, the means provided for this purpose was the fruit of the Tree of Life, and Adam, though *mortal* by creation, had this means at hand always to counteract his mortality. Thus had he maintained his innocence, and by unswerving obedience to the Will of God had grown into holiness, we may suppose that his body would have been transfigured and translated to Heaven without the intervention of physical death (its resolution into its physical elements). Moreover, when he did transgress the law of God, it became imperative that he should be expelled from the Garden, and that "the way of the tree of life" should be guarded, in order that in his state of rebelliousness, he might not gain access to its fruit and so renew his youth; in a word, that the inherent laws of mortality might work out their course in his physical constitution (Gen. 3:22-24,

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

7. *The Three States of Man*

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

8. "Predestined To Be Free"

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

* * * * *

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

Lessons From the Story of the Fall

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

The Beneficent Curse

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

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

GENESIS

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

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

* * * * *

FROM INNOCENCE TO HOLINESS

THE FALL

Adam
Eden
Innocence
Satan
To Disobedience
Death

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

THE RECOVERY

Christ
"Wilderness"
Holiness
Satan
To Disobedience
Life

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

Sin Conquered
(Matt. 4:1-11)

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

* * * * *

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART THIRTEEN

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

GENESIS

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

THE BEGINNING OF PHYSICAL EVIL ON EARTH

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

PART FOURTEEN:

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

Every branch of human knowledge has what is called its "universe of discourse," in everyday (unflattering, but realistic) language, its "gobbledygook." This term, coined by the late Congressman Maury Maverick of Texas after the gobbling of turkeys, is defined in standard dictionaries as "inflated, involved, and obscure verbiage characteristic of the pronouncements of officialdom."

Of all the areas of human study, speculative ("systematic") theology, it seems, has turned out to be the most prolific of a jargon that appears to reach no bounds. And in the entire gamut of Biblical teaching there is perhaps no area in which this jargon has grown up in such profusion as in connection with the Biblical Narrative of the Fall. In this area especially, a set of closely inter-related dogmas has been developed and embodied in elaborate creeds and confessions (statements) of faith, formulated and imposed on certain denominations of Christendom solely by *human* authority. These are known as the dogmas of "original sin," "total depravity," "unconditional election and reprobation," "miraculous conversion," and "final perseverance." These are all of one piece: together they constitute the theological mosaic which goes under the name of Calvinism: however, as a matter of fact, they had their sources in the "theology" of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who died A.D. 430 in North Africa. (It should be explained here that a *doctrine* is a teaching; that a *dogma* is a doctrine to be accepted on the ground that it has been proclaimed by recognized ecclesiastical authority.) It should be noted that not one of the terms and phrases listed above is to be found in the Bible. It cannot be emphasized too much that they are all the vintage of human authority and presumption.

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

1. "Original Sin."

This dogma is the basis of the whole Calvinistic system. But what is meant by "original sin"? The dogma is popularly, but simply and factually stated, in the well-known couplet: "In Adam's fall, we sinned all." As clearly stated by Calvin himself (*Institutes*, II, ii, 5): "Therefore all of us who have descended from impure seed, are born infected with the contagion of sin. In fact before we saw the light of this life we were soiled and spotted in God's sight." Or, as set forth in *The Confession of Faith* of the Presbyterian Church (Ch. VI, Sections I-IV): "I. Our first parents, being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed it to his own glory. II. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. III. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed, to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation. IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. V. This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated: and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin. VI. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries spiritual, temporal and eternal." (Note especially the phrase, "both original and actual").

GENESIS

1 John 3:4 (A.V.), "Sin is transgression of the law"). (A.S.V.), "Sin is lawlessness." Now the subject of sin involves two facts of primary importance, namely, *guilt* and *consequences*; and carelessness in distinguishing between these two facts has produced the ambiguity which has grown up in the use of the term. For example, traditional "theology" has insisted on perpetuating the notion that sin is of two kinds, what is called "original" (universal) sin, and what is called "actual" (personal or individual) sin. However, the crux of the problem involved here is this: Do these two facts of sin, *guilt* and *consequences*, characterize both "original" and "actual" sin? That actual personal sin involves both guilt and consequences is hardly open to question, from the Biblical point of view. But does so-called "original sin" involve *both* guilt and consequences? Or, is there such a thing as *original guilt*? Or, stated in plainer terms, *Is any person ever born into this world guilty of, and hence accountable for, the sin of any of his forbears, Adam included? That every person does suffer the consequences of the sins of the fathers is a fact of human experience. But does anyone inherit the guilt of the sins of the fathers?* Our answer to this question is an unequivocal, No! Such a doctrine is not found in Scripture.

Consider, first, Exo. 20:5-6, "I Jehovah thy God am a jealous god, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing lovingkindness unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Obviously, we have here an explicit affirmation of the *consequences* of sin: this has rightly been called the first statement of the law of heredity to be found in our literature. As the late Dorothy L. Sayers has written (MM, 19-30): "Much confusion is caused in human affairs by the use of the same word 'law' to describe two very different things: an arbitrary code of behavior based

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

on a consensus of human opinion, and a statement of unalterable fact about the nature of the universe. The confusion is at its worst when we come to talk about the 'moral law'. . . . There is a universal moral law, as distinct from a moral code, which consists of certain statements of fact about the nature of man, and by behaving in conformity with which, man enjoys his true freedom. The more closely the moral code agrees with the natural law, the more it makes for freedom in human behavior; the more widely it departs from the natural law, the more it tends to enslave mankind and to produce the catastrophes called 'judgments of God.' The universal moral *law* (or natural law of humanity) is discoverable, like any other law of nature, by experience. It cannot be promulgated, it can only be ascertained, because it is a question not of opinion but of fact. When it has been ascertained, a moral *code* can be drawn up to direct human behavior and prevent men, as far as possible, from doing violence to their own nature. . . . There is a difference between saying: 'If you hold your finger in the fire you will get burned,' and saying, 'if you whistle at your work I shall beat you, because the noise gets on my nerves.' The God of the Christians is too often looked upon as an old gentleman of irritable nerves who beats people for whistling. This is the result of a confusion between arbitrary 'law' and the 'laws' which are statements of fact. Breach of the first is 'punished' by edict; but breach of the second, by judgment." Quoting then the passage from Exodus cited above, this author concludes: "Here is a statement of fact, observed by the Jews and noted as such. From its phrasing it might appear an arbitrary expression of personal feeling. But today, we understand more about the mechanism of the universe, and are able to reinterpret the pronouncement by the 'laws' of heredity and environment. Defy the commandments of the natural law, and the race will perish in a few

GENESIS

generations; co-operate with them, and the race will flourish for ages to come. That is the fact; whether we like it or not, the universe is made that way. This commandment is interesting because it specifically puts forward the moral *law* as the basis of the moral *code*; *because* God has made the world like this and will not alter it, *therefore* you must not worship your own fantasies, but pay allegiance to the truth." So much for Scripture teaching concerning the consequences of sin; let us keep in mind, however, *that consequences do not constitute guilt*.

Hence we find *the law of guilt* clearly stated elsewhere in Scripture, in Ezek. 18:19-20, as follows: "Yet say ye, Wherefore doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Nothing could be made more explicit than the fact stated in this passage, namely, *that the guilt of sin is a personal matter involving personal responsibility*. A father may go to a gambling den, and, in a single night, gamble away all his material goods, thus reducing his wife and children to poverty. His family would suffer the *consequences* of his act, but there is no court in Heaven or on earth that would hold them guilty of it. This is the very thing that Adam did: He gambled away his whole being—spirit and soul and body—and reduced his posterity to toil, sorrow and death; in a word, he sold himself and them to sin and the Devil. *But, even though all his descendants are suffering from the consequences of his act, this is no evidence that they are to be held accountable for what he did*. Moreover, it was the mission of Christ to remove whatever guilt may have been incurred by the human race, if any at all, as a result

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

of Adam's transgression: to remove this guilt *unconditionally* insofar as the innocent and the irresponsible are concerned (Matt. 18:3, 19:14; Luke 18:16-17), but *conditionally* (upon obedience to the terms of the Gospel covenant) insofar as the responsible are concerned (John 20:30-31, Acts 2:38, Rom. 10:9-10, Gal. 3:27).

Certainly it must be admitted that we inherit a weakened constitution, both physical and moral (a will vitiated by self-assertiveness, as someone has put it) as a consequence of the spread of sin and its effects throughout the human family. This is to say that man *is* spiritually corrupted—depraved—to some extent as a result of the inroads of sin. It seems to be much easier for a person to drift the downward way than to climb the upward: the latter requires persistent effort, the former requires no effort at all. This fact was emphasized by our Lord Himself (Matt. 7:13-14). In a word, the range of man's potential for morality or immorality is nothing short of amazing: he can walk among the stars or wallow in the gutter, depending basically on his own choices. As Aristotle has put it so clearly (*Politics* I, 2, Jowett translation): ". . . 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 there seems to be an indefinable relation existing between *spirit* (or mind) and *body*, between the interior and exterior powers, in man, as a result of which the irascible and concupiscible desires—and in consequence the temptations to sin—are stronger in some persons than in others. Brents (GPS, 132): "There are differences of mental power manifested by different persons, growing

GENESIS

out of a difference in the physical machinery *inherited from our parents*. This we not only admit, but firmly believe: but these do not affect our position in the least. An engine may run a vast amount of well made and properly applied machinery, and thus exhibit great power, but were we to apply the same engine to heavy, cumbersome, unwieldy, unbalanced machinery, it could do but little, though the same man operated it. So a man who has inherited a fine organization, large and well balanced brain, of fine material, will exhibit much more mental power than one who has inherited an imperfect organization of coarse material. But inherited weakness, whether physical or mental, is not sin—no guilt can attach to it—and therefore the differences in mental power spoken of cannot prove the doctrine of total depravity; on the contrary, if they prove anything concerning it, they contradict it, for these differences cannot be the result of total depravity, because all who are totally depraved are, in this respect, exactly alike. There is no comparative degree in *total* depravity.” Certainly we all inherit certain propensities from our parents and ancestors, and in this sense the spiritual potential in any person may be raised or lowered. But let it be repeated for the sake of emphasis *that inherited weakness is not guilt*. Biblical teaching is clear that man is a sinner by virtue of *his own* yielding to the forces of evil. (Cf. Jas. 1:12-15). (Some wag has punned, with reference to the experience of Adam and Eve, that “the fault was not with the apple in the tree but with the *pair* on the ground.” Of course there is no mention of an apple in the Biblical story: that happens to be a Miltonian touch.)

Some would speak of this “inherited weakness” as “derived sinfulness.” Others would try to reduce it to “immaturity,” as, for example, Overstreet in his book, *The Mature Mind*. The “depth” psychologists would have us think of it as “irrationality” having its source in

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

"hidden" or "unconscious" motivation. It is interesting to note that Alexander Campbell (CS, ch. 7) affirms the sinfulness and depravity of all men as a consequence of Adam's fall. "The stream of humanity" is said to be "contaminated at its fountain." "True, indeed it is; our nature was corrupted by the fall of Adam before it was transmitted to us; and hence that hereditary imbecility to do good, and that proneness to evil, so universally apparent in all human beings. Let no man open his mouth against the transmission of a moral distemper, until he satisfactorily explain the fact, that the special characteristic vices of parents appear in their children as much as the color of their skin, their hair, or the contour of their faces. A disease in the moral constitution of man is as clearly transmissible as any physical taint, if there be any truth in history, biography, or human observation." Again: "Condemned to natural death, and greatly fallen and depraved in our whole moral constitution though we certainly are, in consequence of the sin of Adam, still, because of the interposition of the second Adam, none are punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord but those who actually and voluntarily sin against a dispensation of mercy under which they are placed: for this is the 'condemnation of the world that light has come into the world, and men *choose darkness* rather than light, because their deeds are evil.'" A contemporary writer contributes the following pertinent comment (Rushdoony, in *Christian Economics*, July 7, 1964): "Man's basic and original sin is 'to be as God, knowing good and evil.' 'Knowing' here has the force of determining, establishing, so that man's essential sin is to attempt to play God and to legislate creatively and substantively on the nature of morality in terms of his own godhead." The fact still remains, however, that the notion of inherited guilt—which is our problem here—is not implied in any of these terms, phrases, or concepts.

GENESIS

The Bible knows no such thing as inherited guilt. Its teaching, from beginning to end, is that *the person is guilty before God for his own personal transgressions only*. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Nature is individualistic throughout: we come into the kingdom of nature one by one, and we go out of it one by one. The same is true in regeneration: one must be born again, as an individual, into the kingdom of grace (John 3:1-7). Sin is personal (individual), and salvation is personal, and final judgment is personal. The Scriptures know no such thing as either sin or salvation by proxy or en masse. (Matt. 2:23, 20:13; Rom. 2:6, 14:12; 1 Cor. 3:13; 2 Cor. 5:10; Eph. 6:8; Col. 3:25; Rev. 2:23, 20:13, 22:12).

Incidentally, as a corollary of the dogma of "original sin," that of "infant damnation" has arisen. It has been taught and believed, rather extensively, that an infant is born into this state of sin and guilt inherited from Adam and must be received into the New Covenant through the ceremony of patting a few drops of water on its head or face; that, if the baby should die prior to the administration of this "sacrament" (which is generally misnamed a "baptism"), it must surely be regarded as lost, whatever "lost" may mean in such a case. (This is undoubtedly the most meaningless ceremony to which "theology" has ever given birth. It is "baptismal regeneration" pure and simple: whatever efficacy there is in the act must be in the water, because it cannot be in the child's heart: the child does not even know what is going on. In Scripture terms Christian baptism is an immersion—a burial and resurrection, Rom. 6:1-11, Col. 2:12—and hence infant baptism would be infant immersion, as indeed has been practised by the Greek Orthodox denomination from its beginning.) Rom. 5:13—"sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 4:15—"where there is no law, neither is there transgression." Rom. 3:20—"through the law cometh the knowledge of sin," that is, to all who are

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

capable of such knowledge (cf. Rom. 7:7). Surely the babe, and even the young child, has no knowledge of moral right and wrong; it is governed largely by impulse, and its responses are reflexive; it is incapable of faith; and therefore it has no need of "baptism for the remission of original sin," no need of salvation from the guilt of sin, but is by virtue of its innocence (or at least by virtue of the Atonement provided once for all at the end of the ages, and provided unconditionally for the innocent and the irresponsible) is prepared for the Spiritual Life of the Hereafter. (Mark 10:14, Matt. 18:3, Luke 18:16, Rom. 5:18-19, I Cor. 15:22-23). The only redemption which the infant is in need of, is redemption from the *consequences* of sin, that is, redemption of the body from physical dissolution in the putting on of immortality (1 Thess. 5:23). May we not reasonably suppose that the little one who dies in infancy will experience the actualization of its personality in the *celestial* environment?

Let us consider, for a moment, some of the Scripture texts which are usually cited to support the dogma of "original sin," etc. (1) *Psa. 14:1 ff., 53:1 ff., Rom. 3:9-18, etc.* In these passages we have the affirmation of the moral corruption of mankind in general, a fact which no sane person would deny. However, there is nothing in these texts that would indicate *inherited guilt*. On the contrary, *the teaching is that men have corrupted themselves by their own evil thoughts and acts.* "They have all turned aside." "They have done abominable works." Their throats—not Adam's—are full of cursing and bitterness. Why blame Adam, or indeed his collective progeny, for this corruption in view of the fact that both the Psalmist and the Apostle are referring here to the *personal sins* of humankind? (2) *Psa. 58:3.* Again the matter under consideration here is personal sin. The wicked are not said to be born astray, but to *go astray*. They themselves work wickedness: their poison is like the poison of

GENESIS

a serpent. Their poison is not inherited from Adam: it is *their own poison*. (3) *Isa.* 53:6. Note that we have all *gone* astray, not have been *born* astray. (4) *Eph.* 2:1. Note well: through *your* trespasses and sins, not through Adam's sin nor the sins of your parents. (5) *Eph.* 2:3. Those persons who had become Christians at Ephesus had once lived—prior to their conversion—"in the lusts of the flesh," that is, *their own* flesh, and hence were by nature "children of wrath" while in that state of alienation from God (cf. John 3:16-18). Again, the reference is to personal sins, *not to any such thing as inherited guilt*. (6) *Col.* 1:21, 2:13. Note: alienated and enemies in *your* evil works, and dead through *your* trespasses, etc., that is, prior to their conversion to Christ. (7) *Job.* 14:4—"Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." This is explained by the preceding verse: "Dont thou open thine eyes on such a one, And bringest me into judgment with thee?" That is, when the period of probation shall have come to an end, the final decree will be (*Rev.* 22:11): "He that is filthy, let him be made filthy still. . . . and he that is holy, let him be made holy still." That is, then indeed it will be too late: personal destiny having been determined by one's deeds while in the flesh, it will no longer be possible to bring a clean thing out of an unclean. *Luke* 16:26—the "gulf" will have been fixed for ever. (8) *Psa.* 51:5—"Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." It is asserted by some commentators that "the fact of congenital depravity is stated here" and in such similar passages as *Job* 14:4, *Psa.* 58:3, etc. "*Congenital depravity*," *however, is not inherited guilt*. Whatever this obscure passage may mean, it certainly does not signify the imputation of the mother's sin (guilt) to the child. Suppose a woman were to say, "In drunkenness my husband beat me," would that mean that the wife is guilty of her husband's drunkenness? Or, suppose a child were to say, "In anger my

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

father whipped me," would that mean that the child is guilty of the father's anger? Not much indication here of *inherited guilt*, is there? (9) 2 Tim. 3:13—If men are born totally depraved, how could they "wax worse and worse"? (10) Rom. 3:23—"all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God." Note that *they have sinned*: it is not said that *they have been born in sin*. If the original corruption of our human character is the cause of all actual transgressions, how came Adam himself to sin? (11) Rom. 14:1-12, Matt. 16:27, 2 Cor. 5:10, Rev. 20:13, etc. These and many other Scriptures of like import clearly teach that each person will be held accountable in the Judgment for his own sins, not for the sin of Adam, nor for the sins of his ancestors. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:20).

The authors of *The Jerusalem Bible* make a significant admission (19, note "d"), concerning the divine penalties imposed, as related in the third chapter of Genesis, as follows: "These *penalties* are hereditary; the doctrine of hereditary *guilt* is not clearly stated until St. Paul draws his comparison between the solidarity of all in Christ the Savior, and the solidarity of all in the sinner, Adam, Rm. 5." But—why haul the notion of *inherited guilt* into the content of the fifth chapter of Romans? Certainly Adam's guilt was *his own* guilt, just as my guilt is *my own* guilt, just as every man's guilt is *his own* guilt. There is no reason for assuming from the Apostle's teaching here that anything more is implied than the fact that Adam's posterity all suffer the *consequences* of his rebellion against God. We have already noted that the penalties pronounced upon the serpent, the Woman, and the Man, respectively, were pronounced upon serpentkind, womankind, and mankind. Certainly the Apostle has in mind here primarily the death and resurrection of the body. His teaching is explicit, however, that whatever mankind lost through the disobedience of the First Adam has been regained fully by

GENESIS

virtue of the obedience of the Second Adam, regained *unconditionally*, let me repeat, insofar as the innocent and the irresponsible are concerned, but regained *conditionally* (on the obedience of faith) insofar as the morally responsible are concerned. Through the Atonement provided by the Only Begotten, for the burden of the sin of mankind (John 1:29, 1 Pet. 2:21-25), through this "one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life" (Rom. 5:18). But the Gift must be personally accepted and appropriated in order to be enjoyed (John 3:16-17, 5:40; Heb. 5:9; 1 John 5:10-12). There is not the slightest intimation in this fifth chapter of Romans of any such notion as that of inherited guilt. It is quite reasonable to hold that the Kingdom of Christ (Reign of Messiah, literally) is more inclusive than the Church of Christ, in the fact that the former takes in the innocent and irresponsible, and the elect of prior Dispensations, all of whom, in the very nature of the case, cannot belong to the Church. (Cf. again Matt. 19:13-14, Mark 10:13-16, Luke 18:15-17, etc.).

Consider also, in this connection, the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. 15:20-23. Here the reference is again primarily to the destiny of the corporeal part of the human being, which is the subject under consideration throughout this entire chapter. Here we are told that just as physical death is by Divine appointment universal (cf. Heb. 9:27), so, again by Divine appointment, there will be a universal resurrection and a universal Judgment, the proof of which is made explicit in the bodily resurrection of Christ. (Cf. Rom. 1:4, 8:18-25, 10:9-10, 14:10; Acts 17:30-31; John 5:28-29; Matt. 12:39-42, 25:31-46; 2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6; 1 Cor. 15:35-56; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; Rev. 20:11-15, etc.).

We repeat, for emphasis: In the very nature of the case, guilt simply cannot be imputed to any person—in any court, Divine or human—for the sin (or crime) of another person. Imputed or inherited guilt is utterly contrary, not

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

only to Scripture teaching, but to human experience as well. It can hardly be doubted that the human will is vitiated in varying degrees by self-assertiveness; however, it is only when it is personally exercised in disobedience to God that guilt is incurred. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."

2. "Total Depravity."

As the Creed quoted above has it: As a result of the Fall, "our first parents" became "dead in sin, wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body." Again: "From this original corruption whereby we [all their posterity] are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." (Note here the words "wholly" and "utterly"—these admit no qualifications. They mean what they say, or they mean nothing at all. Language could not be plainer.) In the Institutes, the doctrine is affirmed just as positively by Calvin himself. The noblest gifts bestowed upon man at his creation were utterly vitiated by the Fall. Such natural powers as reason and will have been so corrupted that no man is capable of understanding anything aright or willing anything that is good. As a result of his depraved nature, the unregenerated person is wholly unable to bring forth any good spiritual fruit. This corrupt will "cannot strive after the right" (II, ii, 12:271), "cannot move toward good, much less apply itself thereto" (II, iii, 2, 5; 292, 294). "All that proceeds from him is to be imputed to sin" (II, i, 9:253). All alleged "good works" that may have been manifested by human nature simply "deceive us with their vain show" (II, iii, 4; 294). Though natural endowments, they must, nevertheless, arise from unworthy motives, and consequently have no value in acquiring righteousness (justification).

Now we have already conceded that human character is depraved: it is so much easier for a man to drift down-

GENESIS

ward than to struggle upward. It takes a great measure of moral discernment for a person really to put first things first (Matt. 6:33). Such terms as "immaturity," "irrationality," "missing the mark," etc., are too innocuous, too weak, to describe man's moral state accurately. *He is depraved, to be sure, but he is not totally depraved.* Were he totally depraved, he would be in the same moral state as that of the Devil and his angels; these original rebels, we are told, are "committed to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" (2 Pet. 2:4), "kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6). What kind of bonds? Bonds of total moral and spiritual darkness, bonds of total depravity. These bonds, moreover, are "everlasting": for Satan and his rebel host there is no hope: their moral state is such that they are utterly incapable of faith, repentance, hope, love, or anything good.

There is no support in Biblical teaching for this dogma of human total depravity. The tenor of Scripture teaching is entirely to the contrary. (Review here the Scriptures quoted above in refutation of the dogma of "original sin.") The Apostle writes, 2 Tim. 3:13—"But evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse," etc. If men are totally depraved, how could they possibly *wax worse and worse*? As a matter of fact, Jesus Himself completely negates this dogma in His Parable of the Sower (which is, in fact, a Parable of the Soils); cf. Luke 8:4-15. Here He describes the various kinds of soil into which the good seed of the Kingdom—the Word of God—falls: some, He tells us, falls by the wayside only to be trodden under foot or devoured by the birds of the heavens; some falls on rocky ground where it cannot obtain sufficient moisture to put down roots, and hence withers away; and some falls among thorns which grow along with it and choke it to death. But—thanks be to God—some falls on good ground, and brings forth fruit a hundredfold; and the

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

good ground, He tells us expressly, is *an honest and good heart* (e.g. Acts 8:27-38, 10:1-8, 10:24-33, etc.) But, according to the Creed, *no man* has an honest and good heart; on the contrary, all men are wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of mind and body, and hence utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil. It becomes obvious that the creed-makers should revise their theories and bring them into line with the teaching of Christ.

It should be noted here that there can be no degrees in *total* depravity; it must be *total* depravity—or nothing. This is definitely an *either-or* proposition. If the Creed is true, then all men are *equally* depraved because they are *totally* depraved. But neither Scripture, nor logic, nor human experience supports such a position. Total depravity, we repeat, is characteristic only of the Devil and his angels: in every son of man there is "a little spark of celestial fire called conscience," unless he himself stifles it and so commits spiritual suicide.

3. "*Miraculous Conversion.*"

But it will be argued by some that these honest and good hearts of which Jesus speaks, necessarily have been made so, have been specifically prepared for the reception of the spiritual seed, by a special operation of Divine grace. Hence, the dogmas of "original sin" and "total depravity" are necessarily complemented in Calvinistic theology by that of "miraculous conversion," a third integral part of the system. That is to say, man is as dead spiritually as Lazarus was physically, and as a special miracle was necessary to raise Lazarus from the dead, so a special miracle must be wrought in the human heart by the Holy Spirit, to incline it to, and prepare it for, the reception of the Gospel message. Lacking this special extraordinary "work of grace," human nature vitiated by the Fall will continue to be indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil. Moreover, evidence of

GENESIS

this special manifestation of the Spirit will become known to the sinner in the form of a mystical experience: an overwhelming ecstasy, a sign in the heavens, the appearance of an angel, the singing of a choir invisible, or something of the kind. The utmost that the poor sinner can do, under any and all circumstances, to invoke this Divine interposition ("call"), is to pray for it; failing to receive it would mean simply that he is doomed to unconditional reprobation, without hope either in this world or in the world to come. As Minister Jack Cottrell states the case so clearly (*Christian Standard*, January 21, 1967): "What does this aspect of total inability mean? It means that man cannot will to turn to God in faith and repentance until the Holy Spirit works in a special way within him, in a way similar to what we would call 'being born again.' Of course, we all agree that no one can believe until the word of the gospel touches his heart (Romans 10:17). But for Calvin it is much more serious than this. For him, no matter how much external preaching and persuasion are present, all men are blind and deaf to it and no one surrenders to God unless God himself singles him out and bends his heart in a new direction (II, iii, 6: 297f.). Faith is the special gift of God given only to those whom God himself chooses (III, i, 4; 54lf., III, ii, 35:583)." (Eph. 2:8 is usually cited as a proof text for this view. But what is it in this passage that is said to be the "gift of God"? Not faith, of course, except possibly, indirectly, in the sense that faith comes only from some form of contact with the Word which God has given us (Rom. 10:17). It seems obvious, however, that it is the *salvation* about which the Apostle is writing here that is said to be, and is, God's free gift (John 3:16, Rom. 3:4) to those who meet the terms of admission into the New Covenant, the Covenant of Faith: (Rom. 5:1, Heb. 8:10-12). These considerations lead us directly to the next "pillar" of Calvin's theology—

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

4. "*Unconditional Election and Reprobation.*"

Again, Cottrell states the case so clearly that no one could improve on his presentation: "Herein lies the necessity for the predestination of certain individuals to salvation apart from any consideration of their response. All men alike are unable to turn to God, regardless of external circumstances. So if anyone at all is to be saved, God himself must give that one the ability to respond to His call. Who decides which ones are to be given this ability? God alone, from all eternity, and on the basis of reasons known only to himself. (This is the Calvinistic predestination with which most people are familiar.) Thus at appropriate times the Holy Spirit opens the hearts of these chosen ones, and they are then able to turn to God. This does not mean that God merely brings His elect ones to the point where they are free to either accept or reject His offer of salvation. Just as God's choice is sovereign, so is His call irresistible. Those who receive the call invariably come; those who do not receive it are totally unable to come or even to want to do so (II, iii, 10: 303f.)." All this, moreover, is said expressly in the Creed to have been purposed by God—directly or indirectly—"to his own glory."

We shall consider subsequently some of the Scripture passages that are usually cited to support this dogma of unconditional election and reprobation. Suffice it to say here, however, that the dogma is certainly derogatory of God. It is difficult to see how God could arbitrarily elect some persons to salvation and others to reprobation unless He is a respecter of persons, and this the Scripture is positive in affirming *that He is not* (Deut. 10:17, 2 Chron. 19:7, Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, Gal. 2:6, Eph. 6:9, Col. 3:25, 1 Pet. 1:17). Moreover, Biblical teaching uniformly asserts, from beginning to end, that God does not coerce the human will or exert pressure to modify—much less to overpower—man's freedom of choice.

GENESIS

Bible teaching on this subject may best be summarized, it seems to me, as follows: In the first chapter of Genesis, God is introduced to us as the Creator. In the second chapter, man is introduced to us, as he came from the hand of God. In the third chapter, the Devil is introduced to us as the Tempter, the Source of all evil. And so we find man in between God and the Devil; and that is where he has always been, and always will be, in this present world, with the power to choose between the two. There is no doubt, of course, that God *has* power to save each of us *unconditionally* if He wishes to do so. But He does not wish, nor does He choose, to do so. On the other hand God can hardly be considered just should he save man *in his sins*; hence, man must hear, believe, repent and obey, to receive the fulfilment of God's promise to save him. On the other hand, the Devil *does not have* the power to lead any man into ruin unless the latter allows himself to be led to disobey God. God's power (authority) *plus* man's obedience of faith will bring about salvation (election), whereas the Devil's power plus man's yielding to it brings about the latter's condemnation (reprobation). (John 3:16-21; 1 John 3:4-12, 5:10-12, etc.).

An amusing, but very simple and clear explanation of the doctrine of election *as it is given in Scripture* has been preserved for us by one of our pioneer evangelists. As the story goes, Senator Vance of North Carolina was teasing his old colored servant on the subject of religion: the old man had been urging the Senator to become a Christian. The Senator said, "I just don't understand this doctrine of election. I don't know whether I *can* become a Christian because I don't know whether the Lord has elected me or not." "Marse Zeb," answered the old Negro, "I can 'splain dat question ob 'lection. Fust, has yuh 'nounced yo'self as a candidate?" "No, I suppose I haven't," replied the Senator. "Yuh see," said the old servant, "no man eber gwine be 'lected t' office who doan fust 'nounce hisself

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

as a candidate. Now yuh-all 'nounce yo'self as a candidate fo' de Lawd's kingdom; den de Lawd he votes fo' yuh, and de debbil he votes agin yuh; and den yuh vote fo' yo'self, and yo' an' de Lawd make a 'jority, and y'all is 'lected." This is the sum and substance of the whole matter. A great campaign is going on all the time—a campaign for the souls of men. On one side, the Leader is Christ, the Captain of our salvation (Heb. 2:10); on the other side, the leader is Satan, the arch-adversary of all mankind (1 Pet. 5:8). The election has already been held (Eph. 1:4, 1 Pet. 1:18-21, Rev. 13:8). Christ voted to save you so that you might enjoy the bliss of fellowship with God in the Hereafter (1 John 1:3, 3:2). The Devil voted to condemn you to Hell. You, like every other accountable human being, therefore, must cast the deciding vote. As the matter stands now, the vote is a tie; and it takes your vote to break the tie. *You either elect or condemn yourself.* The Gospel of Christ is not a power, nor one of the powers, it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes (Rom. 1:16). God has already sent you a Letter (His Word as revealed in the New Testament) telling you what to do to be saved and what to do to "keep" saved (Acts 2:38, 1 Thess. 2:13, 2 Tim. 3:16-17). Why then should you expect Him to send along a telegram, so to speak, to pressure you into doing what He in His letter commands you to do? The Gospel is a universal amnesty proclamation to all mankind (2 Cor. 5:17-20) offering free pardon to all who will meet the conditions. *But we must meet the conditions if we expect ever to enjoy the free Gift* (John 3:16-17). (Cf. Acts 4:11-12, 2:38; John 10:27-28; 5:40; Rom. 5:1-2, 8:32; Heb. 5:9; 1 John 4:9).

Suffice it to say here, in passing, that Divine election is election to certain *responsibilities*, in the proper discharge of which the corresponding rewards are actualized. Thus to fleshly Israel of old was committed the twofold task of

GENESIS

preserving the knowledge of the living and true God (monotheism) and preparing the way for the Messianic fulfilment; and to the Church (spiritual Israel) is committed the twofold responsibility of preserving God's truth and proclaiming it throughout the world (1 Tim. 3:15; Matt. 24:14, 28:18-20; Luke 24:45-49; Acts 1:8). Moreover, Divine election, as we shall see later, has reference not to individuals as such, but to a class: the elect are the "whosoever-wills," the non-elect the "whosoever-won'ts" (Rev. 22:17).

5. *Foreordination (Predestination), Foreknowledge, and "Fixity."*

The Greek verb *proorizo* occurs in six places in the New Testament. The rendering in the various versions is an excellent example of the manner in which translators can "foul up" the meaning of a single word. This verb in the Greek means literally "to fix beforehand," "to predetermine," etc. It occurs two times in Romans (8:29, 30), two times in Ephesians (1:5, 11), once in Acts (4:28) and once in First Corinthians (2:7). In *all* these passages it should be rendered uniformly as "foreordain" or as "predestinate" ("predestine"). The A.S.V. gives it as "foreordain," as it should, in all of them. The King James Version (A.V.) renders the four passages in Romans and Ephesians as "predestinate"; it then gives Acts 2:48 as "determined before," and 1 Cor. 2:7 as "ordained before." Why all this variation? The R.S.V. gives the texts in Romans and Ephesians and the one in Acts as "predestine." Then it proceeds to render 1 Cor. 2:7 as "decreed before." Again, why this absurd variation: why not use the same English word in all six passages?

The distinction between the English words, "predestinate" and "foreordain" is a matter of etymology. "Predestinate" comes from the *Latin*, *pro*, "before," and *destino*, "fix," "determine," etc. This word reflects the influence of the Latin Vulgate on the King James translators (who,

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

it will be recalled, Anglicized the Latin *baptizo*, which was in turn a transliteration of the original Greek *baptizo*). The A.S.V. is consistent and correct in rendering the word directly from the Greek as "foreordain," in all instances. Just why the R.S.V. goes back to the Latin equivalent, "predestine," instead of adhering to the Greek original, in the passages in Romans, Ephesians, and Acts, is a mystery to this writer. Moreover, it then compounds the problem by rendering 1 Cor. 2:7 as "decreed before." Why not just use "predestinate," "predetermine," or preferably, "foreordain," and be done with this babel of tongues?

What then is Predestination or Foreordination? Calvin defines the word in his *Institutes* as "the eternal decree of God by which he has determined in himself what he would to become of every individual of mankind. For they all are not created with a similar destiny, but eternal life is foreordained to some, and eternal damnation to others." The doctrine is set forth in the Creed as follows: "By the eternal decree of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life and others foreordained to everlasting death. These men and angels thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed and their number is so certain and definite it can neither be increased or diminished." (See note at the end of this part).

It is recognized, of course, that this older version of the dogma has been modified in recent years, as, for example, in the creedal statement (published in 1939) referred to in preceding pages herein. However, there are many "die-hards" who still cling to the original version. Perhaps we should consider briefly here the texts most frequently cited to support the old version, such as the following: (1) *Rom. 9:12-13*. Here are two passages from the Old Testament, but blended together by the Apostle. The first is Gen. 25:21-23, the word of Yahweh to Rebekah prior to the birth of Jacob and Esau. We have here a plain

GENESIS

prophecy and *that it is all it is*: two sons are to be born, namely, Jacob and Esau, and they are to become the progenitors of two nations; moreover, the nation to be sired by the elder is to "serve" the nation to be sired by the younger son. The word of Yahweh has reference here, not to individuals, but to nations. Esau never served Jacob in his entire life—on the contrary, it was Jacob who gave gifts to Esau at the time of their reconciliation (Gen., ch. 33). The over-all meaning of the passage is that God, as He had both perfect right and reason to do, had selected Jacob, and not Esau, to be the ancestor of Messiah. The statement that "the elder shall serve the younger" was simply a prophetic announcement that at a future time the Edomites (descendants of Esau) should become servants of the Israelites (descendants of Jacob): the prophecy is clearly fulfilled in 2 Sam. 8:14. The second quotation in Rom. 9:13, "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated," (from Mal. 1:2-3) was uttered several hundred years after both Jacob and Esau were dead. The statement again refers to the two nations or peoples: it simply points out the fact that the Edomites suffered divine retribution because of their sins. (Gen. 32:3; ch. 36; Num. 20:14-21; Isa. 34:5).

(2) Another oft-quoted passage is *Rom. 9:17-18*. On the face of it, this is a "poser," but it is not necessarily so. The question involved here is this: How did God demonstrate His power through the instrumentality of Pharaoh? He did it by bringing the stiffnecked ruler and his people down to the very edge of destruction. But how did God "harden" Pharaoh's heart (Exo. 4:21, 7:3, 14:4, 17)? He did it, not by directly willing it, not even by *permitting* it, as is often stated (because permission implies a certain measure of acquiescence, whereas God abhors evil and does not will it the least bit); He did it *negatively*, that is, by doing nothing to prevent Pharaoh's hardening of his own heart. "Whom he will he hardeneth." How?

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

By not exerting pressure to prevent evil men from becoming hardened in the practice of their own evil ways: obviously, to interfere under such circumstances would be equivalent to ruling the moral universe by coercion.

(3) *Rom. 9:20-24*. Here we have the homely example of the clay in the hands of the potter. The reference is drawn from *Jer. 18:1-10*. The lesson is clear. It sometimes occurs that when the potter is turning a vessel on the wheel, the vessel breaks. What is the cause of the break? Certainly it is not that the potter foreordained (willed) it to do so. Rather, *the defect is in the clay*; being of inferior quality it becomes marred in the hands of the potter. In such cases, does the potter cast it off as useless? No. The potter, being a thrifty individual, makes it into another kind of vessel, although one of inferior quality. The potter makes a vessel unto dishonor only when he cannot make anything else out of the clay with which he is working. The clay is not poor because the potter foreordained it to be so; it becomes poor only when internal conditions combine to make it so. The lesson is that the divine Potter's reaction toward an individual or a nation is determined, not by His own arbitrary will, but by the good or evil, whichever it may be, that characterizes the individual or national character. The statement in Jeremiah is an affirmation of the Biblical (providential) "philosophy" of history. (Cf. *John 5:40*, *Matt. 23:37-39*).

(4) *Acts 13:48*. Here the difficulty is with the word "ordained," which certainly is not the best translation. Some, including McGarvey, render it "disposed"; others, pointing up the fact that the verb is in the middle or passive voice, hold that it should be rendered "determined themselves" or "were determined," *i.e.*, by personal decisions; A. T. Robertson translates it "appointed." He states expressly: "There is no evidence that Luke had in mind an *absolutum decretum* of personal salvation. . . . It was sav-

GENESIS

ing faith that was exercised by those who were appointed unto eternal life, who were ranged on the side of eternal life, who were thus revealed as the subjects of God's grace by the stand that they took on this day for the Lord" (WPNT, III, 200, 201). Obviously the passage emphasizes the fact that in this case it was Gentiles who were *determining themselves* to eternal life by their acceptance of the Gospel message. (Besides, there is no preposition used here, such as *pro*, to indicate "pre" or "fore" ordain, dispose, or determine. The predetermining took place then and there by those who *disposed or appointed themselves* unto life eternal.) The same general idea is conveyed in Acts 16:14—the Lord opened Lydia's heart, obviously, through the instrumentality of the "eternal good news"; as a result of her "giving heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul" (cf. Luke 24:45). Faith comes only by contact with—by reading or hearing—the word of Christ (Rom. 10:17); the whole missionary and evangelistic enterprise of the church in all ages is predicated on this fact.

(5) *Rom. 8:28-30*. Here we have a clear revelation of one phase of the ultimate design of God's Eternal Purpose, namely, that His elect should ultimately *be conformed to the image of His Son*, that He—the Son—might be the "firstborn among many brethren." The very essence of this Eternal Purpose was that in all things Christ should have the pre-eminence (Col. 1:18, Eph. 1:10), hence that He should be the firstborn from the dead, and that all whom He should purchase with His own precious blood (Acts 20:28) should be redeemed in spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23) and so should ultimately wear the form of His own glorified body (John 17:5; Matt. 17:2; Rom. 2:7, 8:23; Acts 26:13; 1 Tim. 1:17; 2 Cor. 5:1-10). Lard (CR, 283-284): "When the *prothesis* was before God, He foresaw that certain persons would, when the opportunity was presented, become His children. These in

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

purpose He accepted. Moreover, He then determined, which was of course an act of predetermination relative to the thing determined, that in the resurrection their bodies should be of the same form as the glorious body of His Son. As He was predetermined to be like them before He went into the grave, so they were predetermined to be like Him after they come out of it. Thus it will be seen that in the *prothesis* the Father placed before Him, not only the resurrection of Christ, but also the very form He should wear after it. Nor was this all. He there also determined that this form should be the bodily form for all His children." To use this author's terms, nothing is said here of *actuals*; rather, everything is presented as in *prothetic* form, i.e., as *set or determined beforehand*, hence included in God's Eternal Purpose. What then was fore-ordained? The answer is: The class of those who should ultimately be clothed in glory and honor and immortality as distinguished from the class of those who should not (John 5:28-29, Rev. 22:17, Matt. 25:46, Rom. 2:4-11). The foreknowledge, foreordination, calling, justification, and final glorification are considered here only as in God's Purpose (Isa. 46:9-11). "Them also he called," that is, in His Eternal Purpose He called them: "not that He called them in any special sense or special way, or that He called them, and not others: for this is neither asserted nor implied. But He called them, if before Christ, by the preaching of the prophets and other righteous men; or if under Christ, by the gospel; and just as He called them, He called all, the difference being that they voluntarily accepted, while the others wilfully rejected" (*ibid.*, 283). "Upon this acceptance, which consisted in the obedience of belief, God justified them, remitted their sins, and henceforward held them as just. Now what took place here prothetically far back in eternity, is precisely what is now actually taking place every day under Christ" (*ibid.*, 284). (Cf. 2 Thess. 2:14; Rom. 1:16, 10:17; 1 Cor. 4:15, 1 Pet.

GENESIS

1:23; John 5:40, 7:37, 12:44; 2 Cor. 5:20; Rev. 2:5, 3:20, 22:17). Note the phrase, "from the foundation of the world," Matt. 13:35, 25:34; Luke 11:50; John 17:24; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 1 Pet. 1:18-21; Rev. 13:8, 17:8). In a word, it was the *plan* that was foreordained, not the *man* (as our oldtime preachers often put it), the *class* (the whosoever wills), not the *individual*. As others have noted, the key verbs here—called, justified, glorified—are all in the past tense; if "actuals" were thus intended rather than the *potentials* envisioned in the Eternal Purpose, the verb "glorify" would need to be in the future tense, "them he shall glorify." Such statements as that found in Phil. 2:3-13, that God works in His saints "both to will and to work, for his good pleasure," are express declarations that ultimate redemption is to be actualized only through man's conformity to the Plan—the foreordained Gospel—which God's grace has provided through the Atoning blood of Christ (1 Cor. 2:2, Heb. 9:23-28). To summarize: God foreknew this *class as such* (yet to be born), the voluntarily obedient, committed to the Spiritual Life, the whosoever wills, His elect; and He foreordained that these should ultimately be conformed to the image of His Son in the Life Everlasting, that is, clothed in glory and honor and incorruption. (Rom. 2:7-8, 10:16; 2 Thess. 1:8; 1 Pet. 1:22, 4:17; Heb. 5:9; cf. also Matt. 18:3-5, 19:14; Luke 18:15-17, etc.). The passage, Rom. 8:28-30, has no reference whatever to any Divine foreknowledge, foreordination, election, calling, justification, sanctification, or glorification of the *individual* members of this class *as individuals*. (See esp. 1 Tim. 6:13-16).

(6) *Romans, chs. 9, 10, 11.* The same is generally true of this section of the Epistle: it has reference only to the destinies of the progenies of the two children, Jacob and Esau, respectively. JB (281, n.): "Paul's theme of justification by faith led him to speak of the righteousness of Abraham, ch. 4. Similarly here the theme of salvation

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

lovingly bestowed by God through the Spirit makes it necessary for him to speak about Israel's case, chs. 9-11, a people which remains unbelieving though it has received the promise of salvation. The subject of these chapters, therefore, is not the problem of individual predestination to glory, or even to faith, but of Israel's part in the development of salvation history, the only problem raised by the statements in the O.T." In 9:11, we are told expressly that God did choose before their birth which of the two sons of Isaac should carry forward the Messianic Line: hence, election in this case was specifically "not of works, but of him that calleth." Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of subsequent history, it did turn out to be one of works (works of faith), in the sense that their respective acts proved the one ancestor (Jacob) to be more worthy of God's favor than the other (Esau). Hence, in view of the fact that men are *predestined to be free*, surely we can not be far wrong in assuming that this superior quality of Jacob's character was foreknown by God from the beginning. Although it may appear at first glance that the choice was an arbitrary one, our human hindsight certainly supports God's foresight in making it. Of course Jacob's character was not anything to brag about, until after his experience at Peniel (Gen. 32:22-32), from which he emerged a changed man with a changed name (Israel), certainly it was of nobler quality than that of Esau, as proved especially by their different attitudes toward such divine rights—and responsibilities—as those of primogeniture (Exo. 13:11-16, Deut. 21:17). Disregard for positive divine ordinances (such as those of the birthright and the paternal blessing, in patriarchal times) is known in Scripture as *profanity* (from *pro*, "outside" or "before," and *fanum*, "temple"), and hence is the vilest insult that can be perpetrated against God—a fact which the sophisticated, the respectable, the worldly wise of humankind are often too biased to understand or at least to be willing to admit.

GENESIS

This is the charge leveled against Esau: his profanity was such that he blithely and unconcernedly sold his birthright for a bowl of beans (Heb. 12:16—"a mess of meat"). And this general irreligiousness of the paternal character seems to have passed down to his offspring (Num. 20:14-21; Judg. 11:16-17; 2 Sam. 8:14; Psalms 137:7; Ezek. 25:12-14, 35:1-15; Amos 9:11-12, Joel 3:19, Obad. 1-20, etc.).

The Apostle now proceeds to expound the relative destinies of Jews and Gentiles under God's providence. The Jews, his own people, he says, were chosen, not to receive salvation above all others, but to prepare the race for the ministry and work of Messiah, intending that when Messiah came they, and Gentiles as well, should receive salvation by accepting and obeying Him. God did no injustice in choosing the Jews at first to assume their designated tasks in preserving knowledge of the living and true God and in preparing the world for Messiah's advent; neither does He now do any injustice in choosing the Gentiles and rejecting the unbelieving Jews; He has always planned to accept those who should receive His Son and obey Him as their Redeemer, whether Jews or Gentiles, and to reject all who would not do so, as foretold repeatedly by the Old Testament prophets. The Jews made the tragic mistake of seeking justification (and hence of forfeiting their election), not by belief in Christ, but by works of the Law, the one way by which it can never be found. They showed that their zeal was not according to knowledge in their seeking to establish their own doctrine of justification, and this caused them to reject the plan which God had provided. No justification is possible to any person except on the ground of belief in Christ and the benefits of His Atonement; and indeed all may enjoy it, whether Jews or Gentiles, on the same conditions (Rom. 10:1-15, Acts 2:38, Gal. 3:27-29). This is the substance of the Apostle's teaching here, with all its ramifications. There is not the slightest intimation that elec-

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

tion means to the Children of Israel that they were forechosen, individually or collectively, to be saved above all other persons; rather, it was election to responsibilities, namely, those connected with preparing the world for Messiah's advent. No intimation of individual or national predestination to special divine favors is to be found in these chapters. Commenting on ch. 11, v. 15, Lard summarizes as follows (CR, 359): "But the future reception of the Jews will not consist in restoring them, as Jews, to their former national prosperity, but in receiving them into the divine favor in virtue of their obedience to Christ. Their condition and state will then be precisely the same as the present condition and state of Christian Gentiles." (But—did not this reception begin on Pentecost, to continue throughout the present Dispensation, on the terms of the New Covenant? [Cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:1-13; Acts 2:37-38; 1 Cor. 12:13; Rom. 3:22-24; Eph. 2:13-18; Gal. 3:27-29].) (Cf. especially Rom. 11:32—"For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy on all" [cf. Gal. 3:22, Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:15-21.] Does not "all flesh" in these texts [cf. Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:17-21] mean, essentially, without regard to any distinction between Jew and Gentile? Cf. again Eph. 2:13-17).

Professor Donald Nash has summarized so clearly our problem with respect to ch. 9 of Romans and the doctrine of foreordination that this writer could not improve on it. Five principles should be kept in mind, he says, as follows: "(1) If it teaches anything at all about election, it is that those who trust in election shall be lost. (This may sound facetious but it is true. The elect of chapter 9 are the Jews. Paul says they will be lost because they trusted in election of Israel over Esau rather than accepting Christ.) (2) When it speaks of election it is speaking of nations not individuals—the nation of Israel in contrast to the Gentiles. (3) It is dealing with a situation before

GENESIS

the gospel when it speaks of the election of the Jews. (4) God chooses individuals and nations to carry out His purposes but not to be saved above others. (5) Election in this chapter deals with temporal matters of the preparation for Christ through Israel, now with the matter of one's eternal salvation in the Christian dispensation" (art., "Foreordination in the Plan of God," RH, Nov. 16, 1966).

The plain fact is that in these three chapters of Romans there is not the slightest reference to any foreordination to personal, eternal salvation of individuals as individuals.

(7) Finally, in this connection, let us consider the classic case of the betrayer, Judas Iscariot, one that has been belabored throughout the centuries. See *Matt. 27:1-10*; *Acts 1:15-26*; *John 6:70, 71*; *John 13:2, 17:12*. Note *Acts 1:25*—Judas, we are told here, "fell away" from the apostleship. Thus the question arises: Did Judas "fall away" as a result of an arbitrary Divine ordination? Was he the one person specifically foreordained (elected) to be the betrayer of Christ? Was his identity as the betrayer, as well as his dastardly act, foreknown "from the foundation of the world"? Undoubtedly the betrayal was an integral part of the whole Drama of Redemption: how, then, did this particular person and his particular act fit into the Eternal Purpose? To this point the distinguished contemporary philosopher, Maritain, writes (GPE, 95-96): "The occurrence of certain good things presupposes some sin, *taken collectively and indeterminately*. No martyr without some executioner. The Word was made flesh in order to redeem the world by His sacrifice and His immolation, and this presupposes murderers. On the side of the eternal purposes this supreme act of love and obedience, that is, the immolation of Christ according as it is accepted and willed by Him, and the infinite merits with which it is resplendent, and the redemption that it effects—all the good, at once human and divine, of this immolation is *willed* by God. But He wills all this good without willing

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

in any way, either directly or indirectly, the sin committed by the authors of the death of Jesus. This sin remains absolutely outside the field of divine causation—God is absolutely not the cause of it, even the cause *per accidens*." *God is never under any circumstances the cause of sin* (Jas. 1:13-15). How, then, do we account for Judas's defection? (1) In the first place, as Maritain goes on to say, given the contributing circumstances, namely, the distorted notion the Jewish leaders, especially the priests, had of Messiah and His mission, their certain venomous reaction to his utterly revolutionary teaching, including His castigation of their sheer formalism and hypocrisy, and the interrelationship of these factors and the politics the Jewish leaders would be compelled to pursue in dealing with the Roman civil authorities, in a word, "the unbearable scandal that Jesus was for the world of the doctors and the public officials, there would be some among them to send Christ to His death, just as in a town where everyone is bilious there will certainly be a fight. That in one manner or in another Jesus would in the end be immolated—this was certain, inevitable" (*ibid.*, 96-97). The story of mankind demonstrates again and again given a complex of certain contributing circumstances, history inevitably repeats itself. (2) Note also the statement of Jesus in John 6:70, 71. Does not His statement here intimate that He, knowing the character of Judas, deliberately called him to the apostleship for the purpose of effecting His own Atoning Sacrifice for the sin of the world (Heb. 12:2, John 1:29)? Certainly Jesus demonstrated repeatedly that He knew the inner thoughts and intents of those whose lives He touched (cf. John 3:1-6, 4:16-18). (3) Finally, note John 13:2, 27; John 8:44, 17:12. Do not these statements by our Lord Himself affirm explicitly that the motivation in the case of Judas was of *diabolical* origin, that is to say, of Satanic suggestion? Surely the Father's open avouching of the Sonship

GENESIS

of Jesus following the latter's baptism, and the accompanying identification of Him as Messiah by the Spirit's anointing (John 1:30-34, Acts 10:38), was a direct challenge to the Adversary to do his worst. Satan accepted the challenge, and thereby, we might add, unwittingly sealed his own doom forever. After two failures personally to seduce Jesus into the repudiation of His Atoning Mission (Matt. 4:1-11, 26:36-46; Luke 4:1-13), the Devil (whose knowledge, though superhuman, is not infinite), concluding that his only chance of thwarting God's purposes was to bring about the murder of the One whom he now recognized to be the real oracular woman's Seed (Gen. 3:15, Gal. 3:16). This he did by selecting the most likely agency to accomplish his designs: that agency was Judas Iscariot. And the character of Judas, as portrayed in the Gospel narratives, certainly points to him as the one most amenable to do the ugly business. (We now know, of course, that Satan's colossal blunder was his failure to take into account the Resurrection: this was the event which sealed his eternal destiny in Hell: Heb. 2:14-15, 1 Cor. 15:25-26, Rom. 1:4). (4) Incidentally, could not Judas have repented of his sins and enjoyed redemption on the terms of the New Covenant had his character moved him to such a change of heart and life? Evidently the repentance of Judas was a repentance unto death: it was motivated, not by godly sorrow, but by remorse ("the sorrow of the world"); hence, it was but the ultimate proof of his inner depravity. He had not the slightest notion of Divine mercy and grace; therefore he went out and hung himself (Matt. 27:5, 2 Cor. 7:10, Luke 15:17-21, Acts 1:16-25). (Divine foreknowledge of the acts of Judas does not necessarily imply Divine foreordination of those acts, as we shall see *infra*). It was diabolical pressure (Satanic suggestion), plus his own character, and not Divine foreordination, which prompted Judas to betray his Master.

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

Some important questions arise at this point, as follows:

(1) In the first place, does the *omniscience* of God include absolute *foreknowledge* of all events, personal as well as cosmic? If God knows what our acts will be before we do them, can we truly be said to be free? It is held generally, and has been, throughout the Christian era, that omniscience does embrace total foreknowledge even of human acts. But this writer holds that the concept is debatable, to say the least. Tabernacled within every human being is the Breath of God which "giveth to all life, and breath, and all things" (Gen. 2:7, Acts 17:25). The Breath of God is a metaphor of the creating and sustaining activity of the Spirit of God. Surely this means that in every person there is an infinitesimal spark of the very being of God; and to the extent that man has, and can exercise, as the personal image of God, the power of choice, he is of a rank above the strictly finite. *To this extent man is predestined to be free.* Of course Infinity can and does foreknow the consequences of human acts, but whether Omniscience includes foreknowledge of just what a man will choose to do, between or among alternatives, under all circumstances, seems to me to be a moot question. (2) In the second place, granting the probability of Divine foreknowledge of human acts, *does this foreknowledge imply fixity*, as often claimed in the lingo of "systematic theology"? Of course not. Suppose I decide to eat a juicy steak to assuage my physical appetite: but suppose that, after due deliberation, I decide, for the sake of my health, not to eat the steak. If I should carry out the first of these actions, God would foreknow what I do; if I should decide to carry out the alternative, again God would foreknow what I do. In the very nature of the case, whichever act I carry out, that is what God would foreknow. In short, my free acts are the events which constitute Divine foreknowledge. Does it not follow, therefore, that the fixity is set by the human act, not by

GENESIS

God's foreknowledge of it? *It is what I do, that God foreknows.* This brings us to the crux of the problem.

(3) In the third place, then, does Divine *foreknowledge* presuppose Divine *foreordination*? Not necessarily. God may foreknow that I am going to rush out into the street at a certain hour tomorrow and be run over and killed by an automobile driven by a "drunk." But does this mean, necessarily, that God has foreordained my act (or even that He ordained it at the moment of its happening) to which probably my own carelessness has contributed? Does it mean, too, that He has foreordained (or that He ordained at the instant of its occurrence) that the driver of the automobile in question should be intoxicated? It strikes me that it would be silly to answer either of these questions in the affirmative. Moreover, for God to intervene and prevent either my act or this driver's drunkenness and accompanying act would be ruling by coercion; and if He should do this for either or both of us, He would be "duty bound," so to speak, to do the same for all persons under the same circumstances, and this would be ruling the moral universe by force. Had God chosen to exercise His Sovereignty in this arbitrary manner universally, why did He endow man with the power to think, to deliberate, to weigh alternatives, and finally to choose and act. MacIver (STS., 520): "To live is to act; to act is to choose; and to choose is to evaluate." Again I ask: Can choice be made by one who has been created in God's image ever be foreknown, much less foreordained? Akin to this question is another: In the very nature of things, is it possible for God to compel His creatures to love Him? Would such a pressured or coerced response, if possible, ever be love? (Parents know all too well that they cannot compel their own children to love them). And is not the converse true: that it is not possible for God to love a puppet? *Foreknowledge does not necessarily presuppose foreordination. Man is predestined to be free. The same argument presented*

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

here applies not only to predestinarianism, but to all forms of predeterminism and fatalism as well. Within the limits of his acquaintanceship with alternatives, man does have freedom of choice. In every human act, three factors are involved. These are the forces of heredity, the forces of environment, and the *personal reaction*. It is the personal reaction that tips the scales toward one alternative above the other. True it is that "the stronger motive wins" in the end. But why so? Because it is the one which, for personal reasons, appeals to me above all others. That is to say, the "I" casts the deciding vote. The person is characterized by self-determination: this means that it is the self which determines its own acts.

Let us look briefly for a moment at some of the ideas which have been put forward in explanation of the problems of Divine foreordination and human freedom. (Freedom we define as the power to act or not to act, or to act in one way instead of another, in a given situation. Voluntariness is the actual exercise of this freedom.) (1) Augustine attempted to solve the problem by basing man's freedom to exercise his will on God's foreknowledge that he will exercise it. He writes (*De Libero Arbitrio*, Bk. III, translated by Burleigh; see KV, 437-441): "Our will would not be will unless it were in our power. Because it is in our power, it is free. We have nothing that is free which is not in our power, and if we have something it cannot be nothing. Hence it is not necessary to deny that God has foreknowledge of all things, while at the same time our wills are our own. God has foreknowledge of our will, so that of which He has foreknowledge must come to pass. In other words, we shall exercise our wills in the future, because He has foreknowledge that we shall do so; and there can be no will or voluntary action unless it be in our power. Hence God has also foreknowledge of our power to will. My power is not taken from me

GENESIS

by God's foreknowledge. Indeed, I shall be more certainly in possession of my power because He whose foreknowledge is never mistaken, foreknows that I shall have the power."

(2) Thomas Aquinas agrees with Augustine in holding that the man who is guided by his reason is morally and spiritually free. Man, he says, is not governed by instinct as animals are, but is distinguished from them by his power of judgment which is guided by his reason. The reason can determine whether a thing is good or evil and can cause man to act accordingly. The Highest Good (*Summum Bonum*) is Perfect Happiness: this alone can never be considered evil; and for this reason man wills happiness of necessity. (Of course the Scholastics define Perfect Happiness as ultimate union with God, the union of the righteous mind with the Mind of God in knowledge, and of the righteous will with the Will of God in love. Evil they defined as the privation of good, arising from man's failure—or unwillingness—to distinguish between apparent goods and real goods.) Because man's choice is not of the end, but of the means, the choice is not of the Highest Good, but of particular goods; hence, because his choices are in this area, he chooses freely and not of necessity.

(3) William James contends that if God is thought of as providing for possibilities (Bergson called them *novelties*) within the universe (totality of created being), as well as for actualities, chances may exist which even He does not control. The course of the universe would be fortuitous (hence ambiguous) to a degree, yet the ultimate end would be that which is designed from eternity. This is the doctrine known as *telefinalism*. God would not necessarily know all the details, but only the possibilities, until at the moment or moments at which they occur. James sees man as a creative power *per se* in the determination of the flux of things, although God alone determines the consummation (ultimate end). Cf. Isa. 46:9-11, Acts 3:21.

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

(4) The German philosopher, Kant, affirmed the existence of facts lying beyond the bounds of the empirical: these are known by what he called "the ideas of reason"—the concepts necessary to any comprehensive philosophy of life. The exercise of freedom is determined by the law of reason. The will is a cause that belongs only to rational beings and is free in the sense that it is not determined by external causes, but by the autonomous reason alone. It is not necessary, he tells us, to suppose that the category of cause and effect applies beyond the domain of spatio-temporal events. Therefore, since we are bound to believe that the will is free, in order to give reality to the moral life, we can be consistent in holding that the self belongs to the noumenal realm outside the phenomenal order of space and time. Kant endeavors to show on moral grounds that men must believe that they are free members of a rational and spiritual order, and that, as such, they are also immortal. As a practical necessity, he urges, we must believe in a Being (God) who alone can guarantee the fulfilment of our craving for immortality, and so give substance to the moral life. Such beliefs (acts of faith), are necessary postulates of what he calls the "practical reason." (It will be noted that for Kant "immortality" meant only continuance of existence beyond the grave: this, as we have shown on preceding pages herein, is *not* the Biblical doctrine of immortality.)

(5) According to John Locke, the fact that events can be predicted from knowledge of their respective causes does not mean that these causes compel the occurrence of the events. It is true, in theory at least, that a human act can be traced to past causes, if the causes are all fully known. But it is equally true that human actions are, as a rule, unpredictable, because it is impossible to identify all the causal factors involved. When man acts voluntarily, he does what he himself has decided to do. Freedom is abridged only by external forces which can constrain him

GENESIS

to act contrary to his will. (For example, suppose a robber forces a man to hand over his pocketbook: in such cases the victim does so, *but not willingly*: hence his freedom of action is constrained, but his freedom of will is not affected.) Man could not be free if his will were determined by anything but his personal desire under the guidance of his judgment. Again, this all boils down to the fact that the "I" casts the deciding vote.

(6) The tendency today among physicists is to regard the workings of the cosmos as indeed very probable, but not always determinate. As a consequence of the quantum theory and its ramifications, it is fairly well evident that physical laws do hold true, but only statistically. A principle of spontaneity has been found even in the very core of the atom. It is discovered that both the velocity of an elementary particle and its position in space at the same instant cannot be determined: electrons seem to jump from one orbit to another in an unpredictable manner; moreover, because some signal must be transmitted from the particle to the observer, the very act of scrutiny seems to change what is being scrutinized. This is known as the (Heisenberg) Principle of Uncertainty or Indeterminacy. Max Planck, first proponent of the quantum theory, writes ("Where Is Science Going?" in KV, p. 459): "The fact is that there is a point, one single point in the immeasurable world of mind and matter, where science and therefore every causal method of research is inapplicable, not only on practical grounds but also on logical grounds, and will always remain inapplicable. This point is the individual ego. It is a small point in the universal realm of being: but in itself it is a whole world, embracing our emotional life, our will and our thought. This realm of the ego is at once the source of our deepest suffering and at the same time of our highest happiness. Over this realm no outer power of fate can ever have sway, and we lay aside our own control and responsibility

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

over ourselves only with the laying aside of life itself." Sigmund Freud has written in similar vein: "Every psychic association will be strictly determined by the attitudes of the mind, which are unknown to us at the moment they operate . . ." (Quoted by Adler, in *Synopticon*, Vol. II, of the *Great Books* series, p. 1020). Planck concludes (*op. cit.*, pp. 461-462): "Freedom of the will . . . and its independence of the causal chain is a truth that comes from the immediate dictates of the human consciousness. . . . Science thus brings us to the threshold of the ego and there leaves us to ourselves. In the conduct of our lives the causal principle is of little help; for by the iron law of logical consistency we are excluded from laying the causal foundations of our own future or foreseeing the future as definitely resulting from the present. . . . The law of causation is the guiding rule of science, but the Categorical Imperative—that is to say, the dictate of duty—is the guiding rule of life." (Kant's *Categorical Imperative*: "Act in conformity with that maxim, and that maxim only, which you can at the same time will to be a universal law." This, said Kant, is the essence of morality, and from it springs the only true moral motive—obedience to moral law which has no other source than respect for the autonomy of the law itself. This type of action would be the manifestation of the *good will*, and, says Kant, "Nothing in the whole world, or even outside of the world, can possibly be regarded as good without limitation except a good will." His *Practical Imperative*: So act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as a means only.)

(8) The Existentialists, in particular those of an atheistic bent, affirm that man is wholly free and responsible, no matter what internal or external factors may seem to bring about his decision. According to Sartre, in a godless universe (one with "no exit") everything is possible:

GENESIS

hence, man is precisely what he makes of himself; he is "a free and forlorn entity." He cannot put the responsibility for his acts on his passions, nor on circumstances in general, for the simple reason that each person is bound to determine the manner of his reaction and hence is fully responsible for his interpretation of the circumstances involved. "We remind man," Sartre writes, "that there is no lawmaker other than himself, and that in his forlornness he will decide by himself; because we point out that man will fulfill himself as man, not in turning toward himself, but in seeking outside himself a goal which is just this liberation, just this particular fulfilment" (*Exst.*, p. 18). Existentialism of all shades, of course, fairly reeks with *pessimism*.

(9) Maritain, distinguished contemporary philosopher (referred to, *supra*), approaches our problem from an entirely different point of view. God, he contends, does not *foresee*—He *sees*; does not *foreknow*, but *knows*. God's realm is that of *timelessness*: this is essentially what *eternity* is. Hence there is no past, present, or future to God, but only *the everlasting Now*. (Cf. 2 Cor. 6:2; also Exo. 3:14—the Name of Deity, I AM, HE WHO IS). Maritain writes (EE, 87): "God does not foresee things of time, He sees in particular the free options and decisions of the created existent which, in as much as they are free, are absolutely unforeseeable. He sees them at the instant when they take place." Again (GPE, 82): "I have said that the divine purposes are infrustably fixed from all eternity from the fact that God, at the eternal Instant to which all the moments of time are present all together, has freely formed such or such purposes for the world rather than an infinity of other possible purposes, or even no purposes at all, for He was free not to create the world." Again (*ibid.*, 79): "All of this means—and let us mark this well in our minds—that God has the entire course of

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

time physically present to His eternal Instant, and that He has it before His eyes in its entirety when He establishes all things from all eternity." Again he writes of "the physical presence of all the moments of time to divine eternity," "that eternity to which all the instants of the life of a man, the last as well as the first, are present together" (*ibid.*, 90, 106). Although it is utterly impossible for the human intellect to grasp the full meaning of this concept, certainly it is a valid one, and one that opens up celestial vistas radiant with possibilities of hope and fruition. I have been convinced for some time that our "bootlegging" of human notions of time into the realm of God's timelessness has projected into human thought many irrelevant questions, questions that are meaningless insofar as actual human experience is concerned. The tendency to think of eternity as a kind of stretched-out time has been, and still is, a source of great confusion: it seems to me that the Beautiful Vision must be essentially *illumination* from which the time element is removed altogether (Matt. 5:8, 1 Cor. 13:12, 2 Cor. 4:18, 1 John 3:2), an illumination, however, which will carry with it the sense of its own *everlastingness*. Time seems to be of little consequence in God's Cosmic Plan. He is portrayed in Scripture as acting by Divine Fiat: sometimes the decree is actualized at the moment of utterance (as, for example, especially in the miracles wrought by Jesus and the Apostles, cf. Luke 7:2; Matt. 7:29, 8:26-27; John 11:43; Acts 2:22, 3:6; Heb. 2:2-4), and at other times actualized gradually (progressively), that is, by means of what we speak of as "secondary causes," or "laws of nature" (cf. Isa. 28:10, Mark 4:28, Gal. 4:4, Psa. 90:4, 2 Pet. 3:8). On the basis of Maritain's view, the prefixes *fore* and *pre* have little significance, except perhaps in accommodation to man's present spatio-temporal environment (2 Cor. 4:16-18).

GENESIS

(10) To summarize; Predestination or Foreordination in Scripture has reference to the essential factors involved in God's Eternal Purpose; that is, as stated already, to the *plan* rather than to the *man*, to the *class* rather than to the *individual*. We are not surprised, therefore, to note that the Gospel invitations are always clear: they definitely imply that man can come to God by an intelligent response to an intelligent appeal—a procedure that is designated *conversion* (Acts 3:19). This process is essentially *psychological* rather than *mystical*: first the preaching and hearing (1 Cor. 1:21, Rom. 10:17), then, from the hearing to understanding, to believing, to turning and obeying (Isa. 6:9-10; Matt. 13:14-15; Acts 28:26-27; John 1:12-13; Acts 2:38; Luke 13:3; Rom. 10:9-10, 6:4-6; Matt. 10:32-33; Matt. 28:18-20; Gal. 3:27). Note the Lord's own precious invitation in Matt. 11:28. Note also Rev. 22:17—"he that will" (A.V., "whosoever will"), "let him take the water of life freely." The *elect* are the *whosoever wills*; and the non-elect are the *whosoever won'ts*. All that ever stands between the sinner and his salvation is his own stubborn will (John 5:20, Matt. 23:37).

One of our pioneer evangelists was invited on occasion to have dinner in a home in which the wife was a strict adherent of the "Primitive Baptist" faith. Her husband had long been trying to convince her that she was in error on the creedal dogma of election, but had failed. He asked the evangelist to try his hand at it. The evangelist considered it a hopeless task, but decided to make the effort anyway. He went to the house. After the dinner had been prepared, the good woman came to the door and invited her husband and his guest to come to the table. The evangelist went with the husband until he came close enough to see the good things on the table; then he abruptly turned back into the sitting room, saying, "I'm not going to eat." The poor woman did not know what to think. She turned pale. She looked at her husband,

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

he looked at her, and both looked at the preacher. Finally, she asked: "What's the matter?" The preacher replied: "I'm just not going to eat—that's what's the matter!" The woman was very nervous; neither she nor her husband could understand this discourtesy. "Why won't you eat?" asked the woman. "I am not going to eat simply because you do not want me," replied the evangelist. She looked aghast. "If I had not wanted you as a guest, why would I have prepared this meal?" "Yes," replied the preacher, "but how do I know that you want me? You have not told me that you want me. How do I know that you mean it?" "Surely," answered the woman, "you know it from the fact that I prepared the meal and invited you to be our guest." "You mean it, then, and you really want me?" "Certainly," answered the wife. "Then I will eat." After being seated at the table and offering thanks for the food, the evangelist said: "Now, sister, if I had not come back to your table, that would have been an insult, would it not? And your feelings would have been hurt very much." "Yes, indeed," she replied, "and I don't understand yet what made you act as you did." "My sister," said the evangelist, "I was merely acting out your theology, that's all. The Lord has prepared the Marriage Feast. He has given you the invitation to attend and partake of it. All things are ready. He has prepared this Feast at a great sacrifice and He urges you to come to it. Yet your doctrine tells you that you can't come until He has told you in some mysterious way that *He means it*. Why would He have prepared the Feast and invited you through the Gospel—all at such terrible cost—if He did not mean it?" The good woman saw the point, made the Good Confession and was baptized into Christ.

God has told us clearly in the New Testament Scriptures what we must do to be received into covenant relationship with Him. Sinner friend, do you require Him to send along a special "operation" of the Spirit (a telegram, so to

GENESIS

speak) to convince you that He means what He says in His Word? God gave His Son, the Son gave His life (John 3:16), and now the Spirit gives you the Word, the Gospel, telling you to believe, repent, confess, and be baptized into Christ. These are the "musts" by which you can appropriate the Gift: you can come to God only in His way and on His terms. All who reject the Gospel call will die without benefit of Divine promise and hence without hope. Their end is everlasting separation from God and all good. "Whosoever will, may come." As the old song has it, "that means everybody, that means you." Come now, and come "just as you are."

6. "Final Perseverance"

This is the last of the complex of dogmas that go to make up what is generally known as Calvinistic theology. In popular parlance it is the notion of "once in grace, always in grace." It is stated in the *Westminster Confession* (1939 edition) as follows: "Those whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved. The perseverance of the saints depends, not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election . . ." As C. H. Spurgeon has put it: "The believer, like a man on ship-board, may fall again and again on the deck, but he will never fall overboard" (quoted by Strong, ST, 885). It would be difficult to find a clearer example of the fallacy of the circular argument than we have here. Those who hold this notion will affirm that a truly regenerated person simply *cannot* fall away, but if it should turn out that someone who has professed regeneration should, later in life, drop out and never come back to the fold, that would be proof that he was never regenerated. This view is the logical corollary of the dogma of unconditional election, which is stated by Strong (ST, 882) as follows: "Election

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

of certain individuals to salvation is election to bestow upon them such influences of the Spirit as will lead them not only to accept Christ, but to persevere and be saved. Union with Christ is indissoluble; regeneration is the beginning of a work of new creation, which is declared in justification, and completed in sanctification. All these doctrines are parts of a general scheme, which would come to naught if any single Christian were permitted to fall away." That is to say, the path of the elected is mapped out for them; it can lead nowhere but to Heaven, simply because they have been elected to go to Heaven. (Obviously, *the dogma ignores the fact that the saints enjoy election, justification, and sanctification, only as a result of their own co-operation with God, according to His plan and on His terms, in their living the Spiritual Life.* 2 Pet. 3:18.)

(1) Let us note the Scriptures commonly cited in support of this dogma. (a) *John 10:25-30*. But if a man is among the sheep, it is because he hears and obeys the Lord's voice and follows Him voluntarily, not because the Lord builds a barbed wire fence around the sheepfold to keep him inside. Growing in grace involves a man's *abiding* in Christ and in His Word (*John 8:31-32, 14:15, 15:7, 15:14; 2 John 9*). As long as the Christian diligently follows Christ (*Rom. 12:1-2*), no enemy of God or man can snatch him out of the Father's hand. But the person can snatch himself out of God's hands, just as a stubborn old ram (or goat, *Matt. 25:31-33*) can, and often does, jump over the fence only to be devoured by wolves. (b) *John 5:24*. This is one of the numerous Scriptures in which *hearing* means, not just listening, but also *believing* and *obeying*. After a man becomes a Christian he must be nourished on spiritual food and drink (*John 4:10, 6:63; 1 Cor. 3:2; 1 Pet. 2:2*). But—think of the names on church membership rolls of persons who neglect, or ignore altogether, the Lord's Supper, stewardship, the stated

GENESIS

assembly, soul-winning, everything vital to the Spiritual Life! They are starving themselves, and if they persist in this course, they will eventually commit *spiritual suicide*. If God were to employ coercive measures (brain-washing?) to restore them, He would, as a matter of consistency, be compelled to do the same in every case; and so again salvation would be made to depend on God's will, and not on man and God working together. This would be contrary to reason and justice. God is not a respecter of persons (Col. 3:25, 1 Pet. 1:17). This dogma, if logically followed, can lead only to the absurdities of Universalism. (c) *Rom. 11:28-29* (A.V.) "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (A.S.V., "are not repented of"). All such matters as pardon, justification, remission, the indwelling Spirit, eternal life, are the gifts—the *favours*—of God bestowed freely out of the abundance of His grace. Does it mean that these favours are bestowed without repentance and obedience on man's part? Certainly not (Luke 13:3, Acts 17:30); for God to act thus would be His putting a premium on impenitence and rebelliousness! The A.S.V. gives the correct rendering: the favours of God are bestowed on certain conditions (the keys of the kingdom, Matt. 16:19, John 20:22-23), and from these conditions God will not turn (Acts 2:38). God has concluded both Jew and Gentile under sin that He may manifest His grace to all, Jew and Gentile alike, on the same terms: but all alike must comply with the terms (John 15:7): those who fail to do so cannot expect to receive the fulfilment of the Divine promises. (d) *1 Cor. 10:13*. How true these words! The Christian never faces temptation without God's having provided for him the way of escape. Among these helps in resisting temptation are knowledge of the Word (Matt. 4:4, 7, 10; 2 Tim. 2:19, 3:15-16; Rom. 10:8-10); prayer (1 Thess. 5:17); personal confession of sins to God from day to day (1 John 1:9). For every Christian there is the temptation—

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

and there is the way of escape. Two doors are open before him: in one stands the devil of pride, rage, lust, beckoning with strong appeals; in the other stands the angel of mercy with outstretched arms. Which door will he enter?—*the answer depends on him; the decision rests with him.* (c) *1 Pet. 1:4-5.* God's saints are guarded *through faith* unto a salvation to be revealed in the last time. But what is this faith: in its real sense, it is an active, living, ever-deepening commitment in spirit and soul and body to the Will of Christ (Rom. 12:1-3). This does not mean that God pressures His elect—by exercising mystical influence upon them from time to time—into maintaining their vital relationship with Him. Such mystical influences are not necessary, because the Word is always at hand, in their mouths and in their hearts, the Word of the Spirit, which is God's power unto regeneration and sanctification (Rom. 10:6-17, Luke 16:27-31, 1 Pet. 3:15). Heaven will be populated only with Overcomers (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21). But the allurements of the world, the flesh, and the devil are very powerful, so powerful that oftentimes the very elect permit themselves to be deceived and dragged down into the pit. (f) *Rom. 8:38-39.* This is literally true. There is nothing—absolutely nothing—that can separate us from the Love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; that is, *nothing outside ourselves.* But we can separate ourselves from His blessings if we persist in our backsliding: *we can commit spiritual suicide.* Even though our backsliding grieves His Holy Spirit (Eph. 4:30), absolute Justice demands that we suffer the penalty for our impenitence. *The grace of God is indispensable, but it is not irresistible* (Acts 7:51). (g) *1 John 3:9; cf. 1 John 1:9-10.* Concerning 1 John 3:9, Robertson writes (WPNT, VI, 223): "the present active infinitive *hamartanein* can only mean 'and he cannot go on sinning.'" One who has truly been be-

GENESIS

gotten of God simply cannot go on sinning *habitually*: though he may fail at times, and surely does, his *disposition* is to do the Will of God.

(2) *Now let us note the Scriptures which expressly assert, or intimate, the possibility of falling away.* 1 Cor. 10:1-12; Luke 9:62; Luke 8:13—note those who receive the word with joy, and for a time believe, but having no root, in time of temptation fall away; Gal. 5:4; 1 Cor. 9:27; 1 Tim. 1:18-19; 1 Tim. 4:1; Heb. 6:4-6, 10:26-31, 12:15; 2 Pet. 2:20-22. For the erring Christian, the way back to God is through repentance and prayer (Acts 8:22, 1 John 1:8-10). It is to be noted here that one book of the New Testament tells us what to do to be saved, namely, the books of Acts; but there are twenty-one books telling us what to do to continue and to grow in the Spiritual Life (2 Pet. 3:18). Obviously, *if we could not fall away, most of the New Testament Canon would be useless.*

(3) *Note also those Scriptures which either assert or intimate that spiritual life and growth are contingent upon steadfast discipleship throughout one's life.* John 8:31, 15:4-8; 2 Tim. 3:14; Heb. 2:1—Acts 14:22, 1 Cor. 15:58, Col. 1:23, 2 Thess. 3:13—1 Cor. 16:13; 1 Thess. 3:8, 5:21; Tit. 1:9; Heb. 4:14—Heb. 12:1—2 Pet. 1:10-11—Phil. 3:13-16; Heb. 6:1, 10:23; 2 Tim. 4:6-8—Matt. 10:22, Rev. 2:10—2 Pet. 2:5-7, Gal. 5:22-24. Note that the precious and exceeding great promises of God are only for the Overcomers (2 Pet. 1:4; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, etc.). Note Phil. 2:12-13, 1 Cor. 3:9, 2 Cor. 6:1. Spiritual life and growth are achieved by God and man working together, *in God's way*. We as Christians work out our own salvation by continuing steadfastly in His Word; and at the same time God works in us and through us in the sense that His Word directs us and His Spirit sanctifies us. God's part is *sanctification*; man's part is *perseverance*.

(a) There is not a single Scripture which can be cited to support the theory that it is impossible for a Christian

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

to fall away. (b) To be sure, it is improbable that one who has truly been converted will fall away, but not impossible by any means. Even a professing Christian can commit spiritual suicide. (c) The natural tendency of human beings is to follow the lines of least resistance, especially in the realm of the spiritual. This dogma encourages such an attitude: it promotes spiritual indolence. It causes men to think, "If I cannot fall away, why should I exert myself too much in cultivating the Spiritual Life? Why not let the matter rest with God?" Let us, rather, instead of waiting for God to do something for us, get busy doing something for God. Let us be up and doing for God, knowing that the night cometh when no man can work (John 9:4, Rom. 13:12).

A backwoods preacher once summarized the doctrine of perseverance in three terse sentences: (1) take hold, (2) hold on, and (3) never let go. This truly is perseverance (Matt. 10:22).

Some years ago a small town newspaper printed the story of two boys who were making their way along the street with a small wagon loaded with scraps of fuel they had picked up in the railroad yards. One boy was ahead pulling—his hat pushed back, eyes sparkling, and himself whistling cheerfully. The other was behind pushing, and whining repeatedly because he stubbed his toes or stepped on a rock or some gravel, or griping because the work was too hard. Finally the boy in front turned and rebuked him in these words: "Of course there's stones in the road! There's always stones and sticks in the road, and a feller's got to get over 'em the best way he can. It don't help for you to howl every time you strike 'em either. Shut your mouth and keep on pushin' and we'll get there." This rebuke was an eloquent sermon in itself. In any area of life, the crown of victory is reserved only for the Overcomers (2 Tim. 4:6-8).

GENESIS

People fail in this world because they are not firm enough in "stick it out." The same is true, unfortunately, of many who make a profession of Christianity: they do not *will* to continue steadfastly (Acts 2:42, 1 Cor. 15:58). The longer I live, the more I am convinced that most of us are *what we will to be*. "Not failure, but low aim is crime"—and sin.

7. *The Divine Problem*

Following man's temptation and fall, the problem before the Divine government was twofold: (1) *that of satisfying offended and violated Justice (Righteousness)*. The law of God, the supreme law of all being, had been trampled under foot by rebellious man. The majesty of the law had to be sustained, else God would have been humiliated in the sight of all intelligent beings, and would have been guilty of putting a premium on sin. The father who never holds his children responsible for their violations of parental authority will soon see all kinds of disorder prevailing in his home. The state (civil society) which does not hold its citizens accountable for violations of the civil law will soon find itself in a condition of hopeless anarchy. Law must be sustained, or it ceases to be law. But, in the case of our first parents, it was the Divine law which had to be sustained, not human law; hence, no offering that the earth or its inhabitants could make would suffice to accomplish this end. (2) *That of overcoming the rebellion in man's heart*. Sin had entered it and separated him from God. No doubt all intelligent creatures thought that man would go the way of the fallen angels. But not so: God loved man too much to allow him to be lost forever, as are the angels who have been reserved in chains of darkness unto the Last Judgment (2 Pet. 2:4, Jude 6). (Besides, man had been seduced by the Tempter, whereas the angels who left their first estate had been moved to rebellious anarchy solely by their own interior choice.) Yet how could the rebellious creature—that is, mankind

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

in general—ever be won back into reconciliation with God? (2 Cor. 5:17-21). Punishment would not do it, but would only serve to drive him farther and farther away. *There was but one way by which this twofold problem could be resolved, namely, by an offering on the part of Heaven itself, so costly that it would, at the same time, vindicate the majesty of the law violated and fully demonstrate God's immeasurable love for those created in His own image.* Hence, great as the problem was, the solution had already been determined in the councils of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As stated heretofore, the ineffable Gift of God was announced first, in *purpose*, from Adam to Abraham; secondly, in *promise*, from Abraham to Isaiah, thirdly, in *prophecy*, from Isaiah to Malachi, and in *preparation*, from Malachi to Pentecost, A.D. 30; and finally, was actualized in *fact* by the death, burial and resurrection of God's Only Begotten. The sinner who can look on Calvary and not be touched by a feeling of sorrow for his own sins (2 Cor. 7:10) must indeed have put himself beyond the possibility of Divine election. (Gen. 3:15; Gen. 12:3; Rom. 4:13; Gal. 3:16; Acts 3:25; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; Acts 3:18, 26:22-23, 10:43; Matt. 3:2; Luke 24:45-49; John 19:20; Acts 1:1-5; 1 Cor. 15:1-4; Acts 2:22-36). (Note Robertson Smith, RSFI, 62: "To reconcile the forgiving goodness of God with His absolute justice, is one of the highest problems of spiritual religion, which in Christianity is solved by the doctrine of the atonement.")

The Plan by which man is brought back into relationship with God, with accompanying privileges of worship, meditation, prayer, faith, hope, love, obedience, etc., is comprehended in the term *religion*. The process by which the eternal Word became flesh, that is, took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:14-17, Phil. 2:5-11), is expressed by the word *incarnation* (Luke 1:35, John 1:14). The process by which Christ vindicated the majesty of the Divine law which had been violated is

GENESIS

comprehended in the term *atonement* (covering, for the sin of the world, John 1:29; Heb. 9:23-28). The application of this Divine plan to the souls of men, by grace, through faith, includes the processes of *remission*, *justification*, *sanctification*, and *glorification*, all of which taken together, constitute *redemption* (Heb. 9:12). All these processes, moreover, attain fruition in the *Life Everlasting*, Union with God, The Beatific Vision (1 Cor. 13:12, 1 John 3:2).

* * * * *

N.B.—The two quotes in the third paragraph under section 5 above are from an article by Professor Donald Nash, in *The Restoration Herald*, December, 1966. The article is captioned, "Foreordination In The Plan of God." Professor Nash has been kind enough to inform me that the first excerpt was taken from a compendium of Calvin's *Institutes* entitled "John Calvin on the Christian Faith," appearing as part of the Library of Liberal Arts, Oskar Piest, general editor, and John T. McNeill, editor of this particular work. Published by Bobbs Merrill, Indianapolis, 1957. The latter, in his Introduction, states that his text of Calvin's works is from the seventh edition of John Allen's translation published by the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. The quotation is on p. 92 of the work cited and is from ch. 21 of the *Institutes*, entitled "Eternal Election," or "God's Predestination of Some to Salvation and Others to Destruction."

The quotation from the Creed was taken from the book, *What Americans Believe and How They Worship*, by J. Paul Williams, p. 208, (in which he cited the Constitution of the Northern Presbyterian Church), published by Harper and Row, 1952. Although Williams concludes that this position is no longer held by the majority of groups historically in the stream of Calvinistic theology, Professor Nash writes that "Floyd Hamilton in his commentary on Romans published in 1958, commenting on

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

these very verses [Rom. 8:28-29], seemingly holds very dogmatically to this view and could be said to be representative of others." (Nevertheless, it is my conviction that this problem needs to be reviewed thoroughly, at this point in the present text—C.C.C.)

* * * * *

FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

Human Attitudes Toward Suffering

Human attitudes toward suffering are varied, such as the following especially:

1. *Denial*, that is, the outright denial of evil in any form. (1) Oriental mysticisms—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Taoism, etc.—agree in regarding life itself as illusion (*maya*). (2) Absolutists in philosophy—those who define the Absolute as the All-embracing—find themselves impaled on the horns of a dilemma of their own making, namely, (a) they must admit that the Absolute, in the sense in which they use the term, *must embrace evil as well as good*, or (b) they must resort to the view that all evil is *illusion* ("illusion of mortal mind"). As the old limerick goes:

There was once a mind healer named Deal,
Who contended that pain isn't real,
But when he sat on a pin
And it punctured his skin,
He said, "Faith, I don't like what I *fancy* I feel."

Of all the Absolutist philosophers, the best example is Spinoza, in whose philosophy ("ethics geometrically demonstrated") the totality of being is pictured as a completely closed system, God Himself being this totality, in which there is no freedom of will whatsoever. (3) But to treat evil as illusion is simply a proof of blindness to the facts of everyday experience. The idea is utterly unrealistic. Not only so, but it is illogical as well. Even

GENESIS

if a person could convince himself that suffering, for example, is all illusion, that would not make it so. Obviously, an illusion must be an illusion of *something*: an illusion of nothing or nothingness is inconceivable. Moreover, how does this illusion "of mortal mind" originate? And would not the illusion itself partake of the character of evil, in the sense of imperfection or finitude? All that any thinking person needs to do in our time is to read the daily papers with their horrible accounts of murders, riots, vicious sex crimes, kidnappings, violence and lust of every kind, not to mention embezzlements, thefts, robberies, attempted frauds, etc., to realize that all this is *not* illusion: it is stark reality. (4) Closely related to the illusionist attitude is the childish, Pollyanna-like outlook, the ultra-optimistic view which is equally unrealistic. As Browning has put it,

"God's in His heaven,
All's right with the world."

Anyone knows that this is largely sentimentality. True it is that God's in His Heaven, but surely no intelligent person would question the fact that all is *not* right with the world. No—there is evil in the world: there is deceit, treachery, cruelty, suffering, violence, global warfare, etc. But all these things are in the world because *man brought them into the world*. (5) It has been rightly said that man's troubles arise from one or more of three sources: (a) from what a man does to himself, (b) from what others may do to him, and (c) from the physical framework of this temporal world which now is his habitation. From the processes of the physical world around him man is constantly subject to such catastrophic events as droughts, floods, epidemics, earthquakes, volcanoes, tornadoes, tidal waves, hurricanes, etc. But true Christians do not allow themselves to be lured into self-destroying

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

pessimism by these catastrophes; they accept them, rather, as inherently characteristic of this terrestrial sphere; hence, like the saints of old, they confess they are but pilgrims here, as by faith they journey toward "the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11:8-16). (Matt. 6:19-20, 2 Cor. 4:16-18, Rom. 8:24-25).

(2) *Escape*. That is, the cowardly attitude of "getting away from it all," or in the lingo of gangland, "taking a run-out powder." (a) Agnosticism is one form of the escapist attitude. As Bob Ingersoll once put it: "I do not say that there is no God; I simply say that I do not know. I do not say that there is no future life; I simply say that I do not know." Of course, on the pretense of the impossibility of reaching a solution, or even a partial solution, of life's most persistent problems (what am I? whence came I? and, whither am I bound?), one, theoretically at least, disavows all responsibility for making an effort to find these solutions. It is so much easier to profess agnosticism than to defend atheism. Someone has remarked that an agnostic is a man who wants to be an atheist, but lacks the "intestinal fortitude" to openly declare his atheism. (b) Since in Oriental cults life is illusion (*maya*), "salvation" becomes a matter of escape from this illusion, escape achieved by the rigid suppression of all individuality and individual desire, by ultimate absorption into "the ocean of undifferentiated energy" (variously known as Brahma, Tao, Unity, The One, etc.). Note the vast difference here between the Eastern and Western views of life. Whereas in the East, life is regarded as illusion, in the West it is held to be man's greatest good, and its highest ends, love and service for God and for our fellow men (Matt. 22:34-40); and salvation is the perfecting of the person's interior life in preparation for ultimate Union (fellowship) with God (Col. 3:3-4, 1 John 3:2-3). Whereas in the East the destiny of the soul is Nirvana

GENESIS

(absorption into Brahma, Tao, The One, etc.), in the West it is final Union with God—*not absorption* which is essentially the loss of individuality, *but fellowship* of redeemed persons with the personal God, the living and true God, actualized by the living of the Spiritual Life (2 Pet. 3:18)—known Scripturally as the Life Everlasting; or for those who reject God's gift of Redemption, final separation "from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might" (2 Thess. 1:9-10, Matt. 25:31-46). It is difficult to see how these completely opposite views can ever flourish in what is wishfully called in one breath "peaceable co-existence," and in the next, "cold war." Obviously this is one instance in which "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet" (Kipling). (c) Many try to escape frustration or adversity by resort to alcohol ("drowning their sorrows in the flowing bowl"), or to narcotic drugs, including the latest, LSD, by means of which Satan truly fashions himself into an "angel of light" (2 Cor. 11:14). Many resort to the psychiatrist. Tennessee Williams, for example, in an issue of a well-known magazine not so long ago, was reported as confessing that he suffered great periods of depression. What does he do about them? "I now rely mainly on drink and pills," he said. "My intake of liquor is about a fifth a day—half of a fifth of bourbon and half of a fifth of vodka." To combat insomnia, "I take up to four sleeping pills." The dramatist tells us that when he is at home in Manhattan, he treats himself to long periods of adjustments: "My analyst helps me, and without him I'd be sunk. I go to him five times a week." Someone has rightly said that the neurotic builds air castles, the psychotic lives in them, and the psychoanalyst collects the rent. (d) Another form of escape is known as *hedonism*, which is the undisciplined pursuit of the pleasures of the flesh. Biography abounds with the names of literateurs, and other artists, who have

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

spent their lives violating every moral law "in the books," and who manifest no respect for anyone, not even for themselves. For the hedonist, sex is not to be associated with sin—it is to be regarded as a kind of "fun thing." Among devotees of this "persuasion," all kinds of sex perversion are pursued with the avidity that is not to be found even among brutes. The pitiful Oscar Wilde evidently tries to tell us that Dorian Gray, in an attempt to kill his conscience, killed himself. But was not this a fictional treatment of an autobiographical fact? Somerset Maugham's wife had to leave him finally because she could no longer tolerate his homosexuality. The novelist's nephew, Robin Maugham, quotes his uncle as saying: "I've been such a fool. My greatest mistake was this: I tried to persuade myself that I was three-quarters moral and that only a quarter of me was queer—whereas really it was the other way round." (See the nephew's *Somerset and All the Maughams*). Isadora Duncan, the noted dancer, is described as "one of the most libertine, hedonistic American expatriates of the early twentieth century." Theodore Dreiser, one of the first protagonists of what is generally called "realism" in our day, is described as "a complex, evil, deceitful, selfish, pathological liar, a woman-obsessed writer, guilty of all the sins" (see Swanberg's *Dreiser*). The inability of the mentally ill to distinguish between fantasy and reality is one of the ghosts who haunt the characters in Albee's play, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* and, it is well said, "their self-destructive diatribe provides the melodramatic action." The title of this play is derived, obviously, from this same (shall we call it?) tragic frailty which characterized the career of Virginia Woolf herself, who, we are told, suffered from mental illness and intermittent suicide drives, until finally she drowned herself. Albee seems to have patterned much of his literary output along this same quasi-schizophrenic line,

GENESIS

of course with heavy emphasis on sex (geared to the tinkling of coins at the box office). (For an excellent statement of the escapist attitude toward life's vicissitudes, the reader is referred to a letter written by a female character, "Grace Dexter," to her sister, in a book by the late Lloyd Douglas, entitled *Green Light*). (e) Finally, the escapist attitude may take the form of outward (assumed) *non-chalance*, what is called "gay imperturbability." (This is expressed perfectly by "Peter Alden," one of the leading characters in Santayana's novel, *The Last Puritan*). This is the who-cares, what-difference-does-it-make response to life. Everything we do is futile; we may as well take the vicissitudes of life lying down; so why kick against the pricks? If trouble doesn't come in at the back door and strike one down, it is bound to come in, sooner or later, by the front door, to cause one to be carried away in a hearse. So, why not say with Popeye, "I yam what I yam," and let it go at that. Of course nonchalance is just another form of "whistling in the dark." No person can go through life always suppressing the basic problems of the meaning of it all: they obtrude themselves repeatedly despite what men may think or say or do: like Banquo's ghost they will not "down."

3. *Rebellion*. For example, the poetry of Walt Whitman, or Swinburne's "Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things." It is also clearly expressed in Henley's poem, *Invictus*: "I am the master of my fate, I am the captain of my soul." One can almost hear the poet's chest-thumping as he wrote these lines; naturally, he committed suicide. The world owes me a living, shouts the human rebel, and if it does not give me a living (on easy terms, of course), I will become an anarchist, a "Communist," a beatnik, a hippie, or a kook, a hater of mankind. I will grow long hair and let my face become concealed behind a dirty beard, and I will go about the streets, barefoot, greasy and unwashed, hurling impreca-

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

tions at everybody and everything. I will be the "demonstrator" of all "demonstrators," the strictest conformist of all conformists. I insist on being consumed with self-pity on meeting "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" which are hurled at me by that elusive nondescript something called "Fate" or "Destiny." I will project the blame for life's troubles on the hormones, on the Subconscious, on the Unconscious ("hidden motives"), on an unpleasant childhood, even on "the old Adam in me"; or I will even "curse God and die," as old Job was urged to do. *Orgies of self-pity terminate only in personality rot.* The history of the race is replete with the names of those rebels who have walked "in the way of Cain" (Jude 11) who himself cried out in the ignorance of despair: "My punishment is greater than I can bear" (Gen. 4:13). "Papa Hemingway" is reported to have said to his friend, Hotchner, "There won't be another spring. If I can't exist on my own terms, then existence is impossible. That is how I've lived, and that is how I *must* live." And so, suffering with cancer, he "shuffled off this mortal coil." But who ever did, or ever will, "exist on his own terms"? Life is not built that way. (For other rebels who have walked in the way of Cain, read especially Eugene O'Neill's last play, *Long Day's Journey Into Night*, autobiographical in character; or Mark Twain's bitter diatribe against religion, published posthumously; or Jean-Paul Sartre's play, *No Exit*). Truly, "Good understanding giveth favor, But the way of the transgressor is hard" (Prov. 13:15). This no doubt would be the testimony of all the rebels, from Satan or Prometheus or Mother Eve, to Jean-Paul Sartre of our own time.

4. *Pessimism, skepticism, positivism, etc.* Skepticism and pessimism usually go together: the notion that the cosmos is meaningless is almost certain to breed the corollary view that human life is simply an exercise in futility. Positivism

GENESIS

is but a more "sophisticated" form of skepticism: it is the view that knowledge is to be obtained only from "observable and measurable facts"; negatively, it is the denial of the validity of faith. Comte, the founder of Positivism (as a system), who wanted to be remembered as the originator of what he called "the religion of humanity," was in and out of mental institutions at various times. Clarence Darrow was reported as making the statement that "life is not worth living": it is to be noted, however, that he lived out his own life to its natural end. The arch-pessimist (and woman-hater) in the history of philosophy was Arthur Schopenhauer. For him, the world of events (phenomena) was objectified will. This universal will, he affirmed, is simply a blind striving by all living things to keep themselves in existence, but to no purpose whatever except "to keep on keeping on." (Incidentally, Schopenhauer was repudiated by his mother in his childhood: the incident serves to illustrate the fact that pessimism is usually the by-product of some emotional trauma). This notion that the world is meaningless, that life is futility, that we are here just because we are here, has persisted throughout all human history, becoming especially pronounced in periods of declining morality and morale. It finds expression in the numerous representations of human life as but a kind of stage play, a good show, a Vanity Fair; as schoed and re-echoed in the ancient book of Ecclesiastes: "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher; vanity of vanities, all is vanity." (However, it should be noted that the Preacher's deep-seated faith asserted itself in a later passage: see Eccl. 1:2, and 12:7). (Cf. Christian's experience in the town of Vanity Fair on his pilgrimage to the Celestial City, in Bunyan's great allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress*; also the title of Thackeray's greatest novel, *Vanity Fair*). Shakespeare caused the doomed Macbeth to soliloquize in these well-known words:

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

"Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

(Of course, this does not mean necessarily that the foregoing verses expressed Shakespeare's attitude toward life. As a matter of fact, in his various plays he set forth, always in exquisite language, practically all the views of life that men have ever held or ever could hold). James Thomson, a third-rate poet of the nineteenth century, echoed the credo of this Cult of Fertility in these verses:

"The world rolls round for ever like a mill;
It grinds out death and life and good and ill;
It has no purpose, heart or mind or will . . ."
(The City of Dreadful Night)

And about a century ago, Matthew Arnold wrote:

"Most men eddy about
Here and there—eat and drink,
Chatter and love and hate,
Gather and squander, are raised
Aloft, are hurl'd in the dust,
Striving blindly, achieving
Nothing; and then they die."
(From "Rugby Chapel")

Was it not Voltaire who dubbed the Earth "the lunatic asylum of the universe"?

This morbid notion of the meaninglessness of life and the very futility of living, has dominated both fiction and drama for the past half-century, and no doubt accounts

GENESIS

for the fact that contemporary literature, on the whole, has very little humor in it. Both writers and their writings are ponderously earthy, so deadly serious, so intellectually dense, that there is no climate in which the Comic Spirit can find a habitation. This Cult of Futility originated with Ibsen in the drama, and with Thomas Hardy in the novel. It is either explicit or implicit in the plays of O'Neill, Arthur Miller, Albee, Tennessee Williams, and other lesser lights, the playwrights who have dominated Broadway in recent decades. (Williams has done about as good a job of out-Freuding Freud as Euripides did twenty-four hundred years ago). Saturated with the same motif are the novels of Dreiser, Maugham, Lewis, Steinbeck, Faulkner, Hemingway, Caldwell, Farrell, James Jones, Salinger, Mailer and others of like outlook: these are the authors who have produced most of the fiction with which the literary markets of the world have been deluged in our day. (It will be recalled that Cronshaw's carpet, in Maugham's *Of Human Bondage*, is offered as an explicit analogy of the purposelessness of life). I suppose, however, that the last word in pessimism has been spoken by the self-proclaimed atheistic existentialist, Jean-Paul Sartre, in his tragic confession that for him life is only a vacuum with "no exit" signs. What a terrible world this would be if this view were to prevail universally!

To summarize: The literary lights of the first half of our century are certainly not to be distinguished for even moderately high moral standards. Their works reek with obscenity, pornography, homosexuality, sheer human depravity of every kind and description. We are reminded here of the comment attributed to an English professor in one of our universities that most contemporary literature, including the novel as well as the drama, is either neurotic, erotic, or tommyrotic. One is reminded also of the title of an essay by Lin Yutang, published in *Saturday Review* not so long ago, "Do American Writers Shun Happiness?"

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

5. The Christian accepts the vicissitudes of life as *disciplinary*. As a matter of fact, the difference between the *nominal* Christian and the *true* Christian is brought to light at this point: to the nominal Christian, suffering is "a savor from death unto death"; to the true Christian it is "a savor from life unto life" (2 Cor. 2:16). Like the preaching of the Gospel, some persons are hardened by it, others are moved to the godly sorrow that leads them to repentance (2 Cor. 7:10). I am reminded of the mother, a professed church member, who lost her daughter. The daughter was a brilliant girl and an accomplished pianist. The mother, in a spirit of rebellion amounting to sheer petulance, closed the daughter's piano, locked it, and never allowed it to be heard in that home from the day of her daughter's death. This woman acted like a spoiled child: she should have had a spanking. This, however, in all likelihood would be the nominal Christian's reaction to suffering: he would, as Job was importuned by his wife to do, renounce God and die; that is, *really* die, by committing spiritual suicide. Not so the true Christian. He knows that Scripture does not even intimate that the saints shall be spared the adversities of this world simply by virtue of their having espoused the Spiritual Life; hence he does not pray to be relieved of these adversities; rather, he prays for the strength to bear them when they come. He understands that the rains of God fall on the just and the unjust alike, that the wheat and the tares must grow together until the harvest (Matt. 5:45, 13: 24-30). He remembers always those other meaningful words of Jesus: "In the world ye have tribulation; but be of good cheer: I have overcome the world" (John 16:33). He understands that if it was necessary for the Author of his salvation to be made perfect through sufferings (Heb. 2:10), he too must accept the disciplinary service of suffering as a necessary means to his attainment of ultimate holiness (2 Cor. 4:16-18, Heb. 12:1-13). He

GENESIS

utilizes adversity to this very end, and so, in the finality of this temporal life, he achieves the victory of faith that overcomes the world (1 John 5:4, 2 Tim. 4:6-8). Let all Christians, therefore, keep in mind these verses by Ella Wheeler Wilcox, entitled "Gethsemane":

"Down shadowy lanes, across strange streams,
Bridged over by our broken dreams;
Behind the misty cap of years,
Behind the great salt fount of tears,
The garden lies. Strive as you may,
You cannot miss it in your way.
All paths that have been, or shall be,
Pass somewhere through Gethsemane.

"All those who journey, soon or late,
Must pass within the garden's gate,
Must kneel alone in the darkness there,
And battle with some fierce despair.
God pity those who cannot say,
'Not mine, but Thine!'—who only pray,
'Let this cup pass!'—and cannot see
The purpose in Gethsemane."

* * * * *

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART FOURTEEN

1. List the dogmas included in theological jargon about the Fall.
2. Distinguish between a doctrine and a dogma.
3. State the dogma of "original sin."
4. State the Bible definition of sin, and state where it is found.
5. In what Scripture do we find the doctrine of the *consequences* of sin? What is the substance of this doctrine?
6. In what Scripture do we find the doctrine of the *guilt* of sin? State the substance of this doctrine.

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

7. Does the Bible teach anywhere the notion of *inherited guilt*?
8. Explain what is meant by the statement that sin is personal.
9. Give the substance of Dorothy L. Sayers' discussion of moral law, emphasizing the distinction between moral law and moral code.
10. Do consequences ever imply inherited guilt?
11. Explain what Christ's Atoning Sacrifice accomplished *unconditionally*, and for whom? And what it accomplished *conditionally*, and for whom?
12. Summarize Dr. Brents' analysis of "inherited weakness" in man.
13. Summarize Campbell's statements on human depravity.
14. What relations do you see between immaturity, irrationality, and depravity?
15. State Aristotle's analysis of man.
16. What has always been man's predominant sin?
17. Is there any such thing intimated in Scripture as sin or salvation by proxy or en masse?
18. State the theological dogma of "infant damnation."
19. How did so-called "infant baptism" originate?
20. Just what is *de facto* infant baptism?
21. Show why these doctrines and practices are unscriptural.
22. State the Scriptures usually cited to support the dogma of "original sin," and point out the fallacies in these interpretations.
23. Explain why guilt can be the result only of a personal and voluntary act.
24. Is "congenital depravity" in any sense the same as inherited guilt?
25. Explain the Apostle's teaching in the fifth chapter of Romans, and in 1 Cor. 15:20-23, relative to the fall of Adam and the corresponding recovery in Christ.

GENESIS

26. How is the Kingdom of Christ evidently more inclusive than the Church of Christ?
27. In what way specifically is sin necessarily incurred?
28. Explain the Calvinistic dogma of "total depravity."
29. According to Scripture, what creatures only are totally depraved?
30. List and explain the Scriptures which refute the dogma of the total depravity of man.
31. What bearing has the Parable of the Soils on this problem?
32. Explain the dogma of "miraculous conversion."
33. Explain Ephesians 2:8.
34. Explain the dogma of "unconditional election and reprobation."
35. What is declared in Scripture to be the power of God unto salvation to all who believe?
36. How, according to Scripture, are persons made believers?
37. In view of the fact that God has sent us the letter, so to speak, to tell us what to do to be saved, is it reasonable to expect him to follow up with a telegram to convince us that He meant what He has said in the letter?
38. Give examples to show how Divine election is election to *responsibilities*.
39. Distinguish the etymology of the word "foreordain" from that of the word "predestine" or "predestinate."
40. Explain Rom. 9:12-13, Rom. 9:17-18, Rom. 9:20-24, Acts 13:48, Rom. 8:28-30, in relation to the dogma of "unconditional election and reprobation."
41. Explain the Apostle's teaching in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of Romans with reference to the Scripture doctrine of Divine election.
42. Explain what is meant by the statement that foreordination and election have reference to the plan and not to the man, to the class and not to the in-

THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL

dividual. What *Plan* is indicated here? What class is indicated?

43. On what ground do we today adjudge the Divine election of Jacob over Esau to have been the right choice?
44. Discuss thoroughly the doctrine of predestination in relation to Judas' betrayal of Jesus.
45. State Maritain's explanation of this problem.
46. Is it necessarily true that Divine omniscience includes Divine foreknowledge of all events both cosmic and personal? Explain your answer.
47. If man is predestined to be free, what does Divine foreknowledge include.
48. Is it necessarily true that Divine foreknowledge presupposes Divine foreordination? Explain your answer.
49. Give Augustine's explanation of the relation of Divine foreordination to human freedom.
50. How did Thomas Aquinas deal with this problem?
51. What was the explanation suggested by William James?
52. State the views of Kant and of John Locke on the question of human freedom of will.
53. How does Max Planck, the physicist, deal with this problem?
54. What does Freud have to say about it?
55. How do the Existentialists deal with it?
56. Give Maritain's resolution of the problem in relation to the corollary problem of *time*.
57. Show how conversion is presented in Scripture as a *psychological* process rather than a *mystical* process.
58. What is the dogma of "final perseverance"?
59. List the Scriptures usually cited to support this dogma, and point out the interpretative fallacy in each case.
60. Cite the important Scripture passages which assert, or at least intimate, the possibility of falling away.

GENESIS

61. Cite the Scriptures which either affirm or intimate that spiritual life and growth are contingent on steadfast discipleship.
62. Explain: "The grace of God is indispensable, but is not irresistible."
63. What was the twofold problem before the Divine government in respect to man's temptation and fall?
64. Show how the Vicarious Atonement provided by the Son of God was designed to resolve this problem.
65. Explain what is meant by remission, justification, sanctification, glorification, and redemption.
66. Explain what is meant by the Beatific Vision.
67. State and discuss some of the more common human attitudes toward physical evil in its various forms.
68. What is the over-all motif which seems to permeate the literature of our day and time? Give examples.
69. Explain what is meant by the Cult of Futility.
70. What is the attitude of the true Christian toward the fact of physical evil in its various forms?

PART FIFTEEN:

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

In this section we shall treat as briefly as possible the Biblical doctrine of foreordination. That there is such a doctrine in Scripture is evident from numerous passages. We shall examine the doctrine under the following captions:

1. *The God of the Bible is purposeful*, that is, His activity in Creation, Providence, and Redemption, is directed toward specific ends (Isa. 46:8-11, Jer. 4:28, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, Phil. 2:5-11). Hence the profound meaning of the oft-repeated term, "the living God," the God *whose essence is existence (being) and whose being is activity*: in short, He is the God who has only to will a thing to be done and it is done (Psa. 33:6, 9; Psa. 148:5; John 4:24; Matt. 16:16; Luke 7:6-10; Acts 17:24-29; Heb. 11:3).

2. *God's purpose with respect to His Creation is specifically designated His Eternal Purpose*, that is, (1) existing 'from everlasting to everlasting' (Psa. 90:2, Jer. 10:10, Isa. 9:6, John 3:16, Rev. 14:6, etc.), and (2) timeless in its origin and consummation (Exo. 3:14). This Eternal Purpose, we are told, includes the following: to send forth His Only Begotten, in the fulness of the time (Gal. 4:4; John 1:14, 3:16; John 17:5, 24), to make Atonement (Covering) for the sin of the world (Isa. 53:4, 11; John 1:29; 1 Pet. 2:21-25; 1 Cor. 15:3; Heb. 9:28), to publish the Gospel and to unite Jews and Gentiles in the one Body of Christ (Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:16-21; Eph. 2:11-22, 3:3-12; Gal. 3:26-29; 1 Cor. 12:13). The ultimate end of this Divine activity is the conquest of evil in all its forms, the segregation of Satan and his kind in Hell (Matt. 25:41; 2 Pet. 2:4; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev., ch. 20), and the establishment of the saints, all clothed in glory and honor and incorruption (immortality, Rom. 2:6-7), in the "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:8-13; Rev., chs. 21, 22): "that what is mortal

GENESIS

may be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. 5:4). All this is embraced in a single phrase: "to sum up all things in Christ" (Eph. 1:9-11, Phil. 2:5-11, 1 Cor. 15:20-28).

3. *This Eternal Purpose is frequently described in Scripture as the Divine "mystery."* Note the phrases, "the mystery of his will" (Eph. 1:9), "the mystery of the faith" (1 Tim. 3:9), "the mystery of Christ" (Eph. 3:4), "the mystery of the gospel" (Eph. 6:19). This is said to be the "mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal" (Rom. 16:25-27), "which hath been hid from ages and generations" (Col. 1:26-27); the mystery which "in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (Eph. 3:1-7), which was concealed in the testimony of the prophets of old and, in the fulness of time, was announced by those who preached the Gospel "by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven," the mystery which angels have sought to look into from age to age, and from generation to generation (1 Pet. 1:10-12, 2 Pet. 1:19-21); the mystery "which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory" (1 Cor. 2:7), "foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will" (Eph. 1:11). Contrary to a popular notion, the Bible is not a mystery; rather, its content is the *revelation* of the mystery "which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith" (Rom. 16:25-27; Matt. 13:34-35, 24:14, 28:18-20; Psa. 78:2).

4. *This Divine Mystery, this Eternal Purpose, necessarily includes all that God has foreordained with respect to His moral Creation, both angels and men, as follows:*

(1) *Man's nature as a spirit-body (or mind-body psychosomatic) unity.* Man was predestined, by virtue of his

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

nature, to be free (within certain limits already pointed out). Cf. Gen. 2:7, 1:26-28, 2:16-17 (note: "thou mayest *freely* eat," with the sole exception of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil), Psa. 8; Psa. 148:106; Job 32:8, 33:4; Psa. 139:14, etc.

(2) *The essentials of the Plan of Redemption.* Hence, we read that *from the foundation of the world*: (a) the Son of God, our Passover, was the Lamb slain to make Atonement for sin (John 1:29, 17:5, 24; Isa. 53:7; Acts 8:32; 1 Cor. 5:7; Heb. 9:13-14; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Rev. 5:6, 6:1; cf. Exo. 12:43-47, Num. 9:11-12, Psa. 34:20, John 19:36); (b) the elect of God are chosen *in Him* (Eph. 1:4; cf. Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal. 3:26-28); (c) their names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life (Rev. 13:8, 17:8); (d) His Kingdom is prepared for them, that is, for all who live and die *in Christ* (Matt. 25:34; Rev. 14:13; Luke 12:32; 1 Cor. 6:9, 15:24; Gal. 5:21, Jas. 2:5). All these matters, including also the breaking down of the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and the inclusion of both alike, on the terms of the New Covenant, in the Body of Christ (Eph. 3:3-7, 2:11-22; 1 Cor. 12:13; Acts 10:44-48, 11:15-18, 15:7-11), and the twofold mission of the Church, that of preserving the truth of the Gospel and that of proclaiming it to all people (Eph. 3:8-12; 1 Tim. 3:14-15; Acts 1:8; Matt. 28:18-20, 24:14), are included in God's Eternal Purpose and hence determined from before the foundation of the world.

(3) *The privilege of adoption into the Household of the Faith* (Eph. 1:5; Gal. 4:3-7, 6:10; Rom. 8:14-17). The Spirit, through the Word, tells us what to do to be saved (Acts 16:31, 2:38; Matt. 10:32-33; Rom. 6:3-7, 10:9-10; Gal. 3:27, etc.), and our spirits tell us that we have complied with these conditions ("the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 16:19); hence, God's Spirit and our spirits testify to the same fact, namely, that we are children of God by adoption. Jesus is the Only Be-

GENESIS

gotten of God, God's Son by Divine begetting and birth (Luke 1:35; Matt. 16:16; John 3:16, 20:30-31; Gal 4:4; 1 John 5:9-12). This privilege of adoption, of becoming heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, sons and daughters of the Heavenly Father (2 Cor. 6:17-18), is likewise a fundamental part of God's Eternal Purpose, in order that "unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (angels, as well as men) "might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10-12, cf. Eph. 6:12).

(4) *The ultimate glorification of His saints (the Redeemed)*. Note again Rom. 8:28-30. Here the correlation of the doctrine of God's Eternal Purpose with that of foreordination is clearly set forth. Here we read that (a) all souls whom God foreknew to be of His elect, He foreordains—to what end? "To be conformed to the image of His Son," etc.; (b) all whom He so foreordained, them He also called (*i.e.*, in His Eternal Purpose); (c) whom He called, them He also justified (again, in His Eternal Purpose); (d) and whom He justified, them He also glorified (in His Eternal Purpose). To be "glorified," according to New Testament teaching, is to be clothed in "glory and honor and incorruption" (Rom. 2:7). Glorification is the ultimate redemption of the body from the consequences of sin, in the putting on of immortality (2 Tim. 1:10, 2:10; 1 Cor. 15:39-44; 2 Cor. 5:4). To be thus immortalized is to be conformed to the image of God's Son, who, as "the firstfruits of them that are asleep," the firstborn from the dead (1 Cor. 15:20, 23; Acts 26:23; 1 Cor. 15:45-49; Col. 1:18; cf. Matt. 17:1-2, John 7:39), was the first to be raised to immortality (1 Tim. 1:17, 6:13-16; 1 Cor. 15:20-26). Immortalization—the redemption of the body from mortality itself (Rom. 8:23, 2 Cor. 5:4)—is, in Christian teaching, one of the phases of eternal life (Rom. 2:7, 6:23, 8:11, 8:23; Phil. 3:20-21; 1 Cor. 5:1-10; 1 Cor. 15:35-58). It should be understood that

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

redemption of the body is promised only to the righteous; the Scriptures give us no information as to the kind of "body" the lost will inhabit in Hell.

Surely we must conclude from all this Scripture teaching that Redemption (1 Thess. 5:23) is the consummating phase of God's Cosmic Plan, i.e., His Eternal Purpose; that Creation will have been fully actualized only when God's elect stand in the Judgment clothed in glory and honor and immortality.

The practical question involved here is this: *How does God call those whom He foreknows to be His elect?* (Naturally, these are called as *individuals*; Christian doctrine knows no such thing as salvation either by proxy or *en masse*.) (a) By a direct operation of the Spirit on the sinner's "heart," *independent* of the Word? Evidently *not*. Both Scripture and experience confirm the fact that where there is no contact with the Gospel message either by reading it or by hearing it, there is no faith, no conversion, no election (Rom. 10:14-17, 1 Cor. 1:21). (b) By a special mystical operation of the Spirit on the sinner's "heart" *in addition to the Word*? Obviously *not*, for this would mean either that God is a respecter of persons (which He is not), or that He will finally save all humanity (which is equally contrary to Scripture teaching). (Cf. John 5:26-29, Matt. 25:31-46, Rom. 2:4-11, Acts 10:34-35, Rev., chs. 20, 21, 22). (c) Hence, we must conclude that God calls men individually through His Word, either as printed (stereotyped), or as proclaimed by faithful men (2 Thess. 2:14; 1 Cor. 1:9; 2 Tim. 1:13, 2:2; Heb. 9:15; 1 Pet. 2:9; Rom. 10:6-17); that the Spirit operates through the Word (or through by-products of the Word, such as hymns, Gospel songs, doctrinal tracts, and especially the exemplary lives of the saints, Matt. 5:16, 2 Cor. 3:1-3) in the conversion, regeneration, and sanctification of the elect (1 Pet. 1:23, 1 Cor. 4:15, Gal. 4:19). (1 Thess. 1:4-5. Here the Apostle refers to

GENESIS

the *charismata* by which the Gospel was confirmed in the apostolic age (Acts 2:22, Rom. 1:11, Heb. 2:4, 1 Cor. 12:4-11), not to so-called "miraculous conversions." In the plan of God, *demonstration* always accompanies *revelation* (Exo. 4:1-9, John 11:41-42, Mark 16:20). (d) Rom. 1:16. Note that the Gospel is *the* power, not just *a* power or *one of* the powers, of God unto salvation; it is such because the Spirit operates through it (Luke 8:11, 1 Pet. 1:22-25); note also that it is God's power unto salvation to just one class: "everyone that believeth." To those who believe its facts and obey its commands (1 Cor. 15:1-4; Rom. 2:8, 10:16; 2 Thess. 1:8; 1 Pet. 3:1, 4:17), it is the power of God unto salvation, but to those who ignore it or reject it, it is the power of God unto eternal condemnation (John 5:40, Eph. 6:17, Heb. 4:12). To summarize: the called, justified, sanctified, and glorified souls (in God's Eternal Purpose) make up that company of persons who accept the Gospel call and continue steadfastly in the faith (Rom. 12:1-2; 1 Cor. 15:58; 2 Pet. 1:5-8, 3:18; Jude 3; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, etc.): these are God's elect: the "whosoever wills" (Rev. 22:17, John 5:40, Matt. 23:37).

The prerequisite of ultimate Union with God in knowledge and in love, in the Hereafter, is the Life with the Spirit in the here and now (1 Cor. 3:16-17, 6:19-20; Rom. 5:5, 8:11; Eph. 1:13-14, 4:30; 2 Cor. 1:22; Rev. 7). The prerequisite of the Spiritual Life here is Union with Christ, and this, in turn is attained through faith, repentance, confession, and baptism into Christ (John 3:16, 3:5; John 20:30-31; Luke 13:3; Matt. 10:32-33; Acts 2:38, 16:31, 8:36-39, 9:18, 22:16; Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27, etc.). We repeat, for the sake of emphasis, that all persons who accept the Gospel call and commit themselves to the life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3), are predestined, ordained (disposed) to eternal life (Acts 13:48), foreordained to ultimate glorification, re-

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

deemed in spirit and soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23), conformed to the image of God's Son (1 John 3:1-2). This class is the company of God's elect. Foreordination or predestination in Scripture refers to the *class*, not to the *individual*, to the *plan*, not to the *man*. Let us never forget, too, that Divine election is election to responsibilities as well as to benefits and privileges.

5. Finally, We must not omit calling attention to the fact that *the processes and "laws" of the physical world are also "foreordained."* Why do men suppose that the more law that is discovered as descriptive of the processes going on in the physical realm means "the less God." As a matter of fact, the more law presupposes "the more God." Law is the expression of the will of the lawgiver: this is true of any kind or code of law. Therefore, the cosmic laws, generally designated the "laws of nature," must be the ordinations—and in a sense the foreordinations—of the Will of the Universal Lawgiver. His will is indeed the constitution of the whole Creation, both physical and mortal, that which constitutes it to be what it is. (Psa. 33:6, 9; Psa. 148:1-6; Acts 17:24-28; Acts. 14:15; Isa. 42:5; Heb. 1:1-3). Science, in its very use of the word "law," pays tribute, either wittingly or unwittingly, to the Divine Lawgiver. It must be remembered that science borrowed this word from jurisprudence, not jurisprudence from science.

* * * * *

ADDITIONAL INTERESTING COMMENTS

Human wisdom has never been able to produce anything like a satisfactory account of the origin of evil. In view of the fact that sin is transgression of the Divine law, and that only the Divine Lawgiver can give us the facts in the case, the failure of human philosophy to solve the problem is not to be wondered at. (Incidentally, it should be understood that *philosophy is of human origin*

GENESIS

strictly: it is at best but human speculation, which can, and often does, give us interesting clues to the understanding of the mystery of the cosmos and of man's life in it.) This whole problem of evil, which is in fact the problem of good and evil, is not a question of *philosophy*, but of *revelation*.

H. C. Christopher, in his book, *The Remedial System*, one of the most interesting books I have ever read, and which unfortunately has long been out of print, has written of the account of the origin of evil on earth in relation to the pre-mundane rebellion of Satan and his rebel angels, as follows (RS, 45-46): "That the treatment of sin through the Remedial System has a bearing on the question of sin among angels; that the management of this great evil through an atonement, is really and truly a complete and satisfactory solution of the problem of sin in the abstract—as related to both men and angels—is the almost positive and emphatic declaration of the inspired Apostle, when speaking on this subject. Regarding the Remedial System as having an important connection with, and a bearing, in the purposes of God, on the occurrence of sin among angels, he alludes to the connection which the Atonement has with the Principalities and Powers in the heavens, in the following direct and glowing statement: 'To me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Christ*, and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ: *to the intent* (v. 10) *that now* unto the Principalities and Powers in heavenly places [Col. 1:16] might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,' Eph. 3:8-11. A logical connection obtaining between the eruption of sin in the heavens, and the Remedial System in this world, and

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

the latter following the former in the order of time, it is fair to presume that the occurrence of sin among angels was the logical cause of the purpose to establish a Remedial System for men, and this the necessary cause of the creation of the world with all that belongs to it, both celestial and terrestrial; for, without man, the Remedial System could have no existence, and without the material and organic worlds man could not exist. There is, therefore, a logical and necessary connection between the occurrence of sin among angels and the creation of the material and organic worlds."

Again, with reference to this connection between the apostasy of angels and the Remedial System, Christopher has written: "The reason for this connection has its foundation in the fact that the occurrence of sin and the terrible disaster which it brought on angels, gave rise to a problem the importance, grandeur, and magnitude of which have no parallel in the domain of God, which problem, finding no possible solution among angels, made absolutely necessary the creation of another order of spirit-beings whose nature and condition under sin would allow a Remedial System, and afford the necessary data for the solution of the problem. The nature of this new order of spirit-beings allied them, on one side of their being, to the angels among whom sin had originated, and on the other, to the material and organic worlds of which they were, as to their organism, a part, and out of which arose their peculiar condition under sin. It was essentially necessary that they should be so closely allied to angels as to be *virtually* the same as to their *spirit*, in order that every circumstance and condition necessary to the solution might be present, so that the solution, effected through the new order of beings, might be regarded as a true and satisfactory determination of the question as it pertained to angels. It was equally necessary, on the other hand, that the new order of beings should differ from angels in such

GENESIS

respect as to permit the necessary conditions to exist, on which should be grounded the possibility of a Remedial System. This difference is found in the peculiarities of their being, which connect them with the material and organic worlds, and constitute them a new order of beings. This difference is seen to exist in the fact that men, after the first pair, are *derived beings*," that is, by the process of what is called "natural generation."

I have included these excerpts from Christopher's book for what they may be worth to the student in his study of the problem of evil. (The book itself came under my observations for just a few weeks almost fifty years ago. I have never succeeded in finding a copy since that time, and I consider myself fortunate to have preserved the excerpts presented above—C.C.)

To say the least, Christopher's argument is intriguing. We might well ask: If the essential principle of love is sacrifice, as indeed it must be, then just where, when and how could ineffable Divine Love have been demonstrated fully *other than in a world of lost sinners*? And how could it have been demonstrated more effectively than it was demonstrated by the Supreme Sacrifice of God's Only Begotten, on the Cross of Calvary? (John 3:16-17, 1:29, 19:30; 1 John, ch. 4). It might be suggested, too, that as far as we know from Divine revelation, God had not manifested aught but His "everlasting power and divinity" (Rom. 1:20), prior to the angelic apostasy of Lucifer and his rebel host. All of these matters are, of course, facets of that profound, and indeed at its core unfathomable, "mystery of lawlessness," of which the Apostle writes in Second Thessalonians, chapter 2. The Christian must always keep in mind the fact that the secret things belong to God, that only the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children for ever (Deut. 29:29). He understands, therefore, that he must walk by faith, until that ultimate Day of Illumination (of the Beatific Vision) when

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

he shall be privileged to "know fully even as also he was fully known" (1 Cor. 13:11-12). Man must never seek to pry too deeply into the mysteries of the Divine Will (Job. 11:7, 41:1-11, 42:1-6; Rom. 11:33-36).

This final word from the pen of D. Elton Trueblood (PR, 250) is fitting at this point: "If the possibility of goodness involves choice, it also involves the possibility of evil; and, if the possibility is genuine, it will sometimes be realized. Therefore, the conditions of the occurrence of evil are identical with the conditions of the higher aspects of the moral life. It cannot be said that God directly wills sin or evil desire, because it is not *necessary* that we sin. The sin is *our* fault, not God's, though God made us so that we might sin, because otherwise the best in life could not be. . . . Here we have the abiding Christian paradox of sin. We are to blame for it, but *we* cannot heal it. God did not cause it, but He can forgive and overcome it. Heresy has come from supposing either (a) the power to cause implies the power to overcome, or (b) the power to overcome implies responsibility for sin's existence, i.e., heresy comes from any denial of the paradox." Trueblood quotes Lancelot Andrewes as saying in his private prayer:

"Two things I recognize, O Lord, in myself:
nature, which Thou hast made;
sin, which I have added:
I confess that by sin I have depraved nature;
but call to remembrance, that I am a
wind that passeth away,
and returneth not again;
for of myself I cannot return again from sin.
Take away from me that which I have made;
let that which Thou hast made remain in me."

and then comments pointedly: "Perhaps the problem is easier to solve devotionally than philosophically."

* * * * *

GENESIS FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

True Morality

We have heard so much in recent months about ethical positivism, ethical relativism, ethical nihilism, "situationist ethics," the "traditional" morality, the "new" morality, etc., that there is little wonder that confusion in regard to the moral life is world-wide. The thesis of the most radical of these systems is well expressed by Jim Casey, in Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*: "There ain't no sin, there ain't no virtue—there's just stuff people do." We suppose to discuss here the true morality—the only morality that will properly undergird social order as well as provide for ultimate attainment of the Life Everlasting.

A great many persons believe, and have long believed, that man is now in an unnatural state. Believing that he once enjoyed the personal favor of God and fellowship with Him, and that such favor and communion were lost by transgression, with the attendant consequences of sin, sickness and death over the entire earth, to the loss of those original privileges theologians have applied the term, "Fall." It has become fashionable, however, of late, to deny the facts reported by Moses in regard to man's Edenic relation with Yahweh. Again quoting from Christopher (RS, 83): "There are some men who, pretending to believe in the Bible as a revelation from God, do yet, indeed, deny many of the most important facts recorded in it. . . . They deny that man was ever in a state higher, or different from that in which we now find him; and say that the story of the Fall is a myth, and the existence of sin the creature of a superstitious imagination. Hence they do not believe that the actions of men have a *sinful* character. Crime, with these men, is only an offense against the rights of society or of individuals, not a *sin against God*. They do not, indeed, deny that the actions of men have a *moral* character. This they cannot deny.

GENESIS

But *morality* with them has reference only to *men*, none whatever to *God*. In denying the *existence of sin*, they of course deny that the actions of men have a *sinful* character, however criminal the actions may be. They look upon criminal actions as no more than simple violations of moral laws, which men have wrought out and ordained for the government of men." Indeed there are many, many individuals, and even nations, in our day, who repudiate morality altogether: for *morality* they substitute *expediency*. There are many, too, who would eliminate sin from human thought and life by the employment of psychiatric and psycho-analytic devices calculated to remove the sense of guilt. And yet, if press releases are to be relied on, this is an age in which pride, ambition, greed, lust, violence, cruelty, racism, war, and every iniquity known to man, are rampant over the whole earth. Indeed the Biblical description of the state of things in the antediluvian age might well be used to picture our present world: "And the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence" (Gen. 6:11; cf. Matt. 24:37-42).

As usual, the error in this kind of thinking (the "new" morality) lies in the false premise from which it originates, namely, *the meaning of morality*. Morality is described as "conformity to a prescribed rule of conduct," or "conformity to the rule of right." Who, then, has prescribed the rule of conduct for man? To whom shall we go for the rule of right? There is but one answer that will stand the test: *we must go to God*, the Source of perfect wisdom, perfect love, and perfect justice. Every rule of right that mankind has knowledge of has its source in the Will of God. This is precisely what the Apostle means when he says, "Is the law sin? God forbid. Howbeit, I had not known sin, except through the law: for I had not known coveting, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet'" (Rom. 7:7). *Morality*, therefore, in its highest sense, is

GENESIS

conformity to God's prescribed rule of conduct. For many centuries, this rule of conduct existed only in tradition; later, because of the transgressions of the race, it was embodied in *negative* form in the Mosaic Code, which was especially adapted to the Dispensation in which it was first revealed (Gal. 3:19). Later, with the advent and teaching of Messiah and His Apostles, this rule of right was put in *positive* form in "the perfect law of liberty" (Jas. 1:25). Christianity is this "perfect law of liberty," "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2). Christianity came to abrogate and to supersede the law of Moses (John 1:17, Gal. 3:24-25, Col. 2:14-16, Matt. 5:17-18). (The Christian System—the New Testament—incorporates all the moral principles of the Old; hence they are binding on Christians, not because they are in the Old, but because they have been re-enacted in the New. The sole exception is the law of the Sabbath. The Sabbath was a memorial of the deliverance of ancient Israel from Egyptian bondage, and hence has no meaning for Gentiles. All Christian assemblies, from the very beginnings of the Church, are held on the Lord's Day. [Exo. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:12-15; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10; Acts 14:15, 17:24; Eph. 4:6; 1 John 5:21; Matt. 5:34; 1 Cor. 6:9-10, 6:18, 5:9; Rom. 1:26-27; 2 Cor. 12:20-21; Gal. 5:19-21; Col. 3:5; 1 Tim. 1:9-10; Eph. 4:28, 4:25, 5:3; Col. 3:5; Luke 12:15; 1 Cor. 5:11; Rom. 13:1-10; 1 John 2:9, 3:15, 4:20. Cf. Matt. 8:5-13, Luke 7:2-10, Mark 15:39, Acts 10:, Acts 10:1-8, etc.]. Surely these passages prove that a soldier can be a Christian. I find no absolute pacifism in the Bible.) Morality is, therefore, conformity to the rule of conduct prescribed in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, as given us in the New Testament, and includes all of man's duties to God, to his neighbor, and to himself. He who conforms to the Will of Christ is *moral*; he who does not is, to the extent that he does not, *immoral*. Jesus said "Love your enemies, and pray for

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

them that persecute you" (Matt. 5:44). He who conforms to this law is moral; he who refuses to do so is immoral. Jesus commands us to be baptized (buried with Him in baptism and raised to walk in newness of life: Matt. 3:15, 28:19, John 3:3-5, Rom. 6:1-11). He who conforms to the Will of Christ in this matter, in obedience to this Divine ordinance, is moral; he who refuses to do so, is immoral. Morality is far more comprehensive than the totality of one's duties to his fellows: it comprehends our attitude toward, and our treatment of, God. (Matt. 22:34-40). A *crime* is such with respect only to man's (positive) laws; but with respect to the (natural) law of God, it is *sin* (1 John 3:4). Viewed in this light, it is an indisputable fact that man has fallen: sin and crime exist on every hand, throughout the whole world. What, then, is the distinction between *morality* and *religion*? Is there any such distinction, in reality? What is religion, after all, but conformity to the Will of God, the obedience of love for God? What is morality, in the true sense of the term, but conformity to the Will of God, the obedience of love for God? The sum total of Biblical religion is expressed in the word *obedience*, not the obedience of craven fear, not the obedience that envisions mere status (respectability) as a result, but the obedience that is rendered out of one's *pure love for God*. (John 14:15, 15:10). There will be just two classes in the Judgment: those who *have done*, and those who *have not done* God's Will as revealed in Christ Jesus (Matt. 7:24-27, Heb. 5:9, Rev. 22:14).

* * * * *

The Death of Death

1. *According to Biblical teaching life and death are the two Supreme Universals.* Moreover, where there is life, there is bound to be death. Gen. 3:19, 5:5, etc.; Rom. 3:23, 5:12-13, 6:23; John 8:44; Heb. 2:14-15, 9:27; Jas.

GENESIS

1:13-15, etc. (Read the *Phaedo* of Plato, for the Socratic argument for survival on the ground of the doctrine of the opposites).

2. *Death as man's last and bitterest enemy.* (1) All available evidence proves that from the beginning of his existence on earth, man has been haunted by the specter of death, and especially by the fact of the inevitability of death. One cannot live this temporal life without becoming poignantly aware of its brevity (Jas. 4:14; Job 7:7; Psa. 39:4-5, 102:3, 144:4), nor can few reach the "eventide" without becoming sorely grieved by its incompleteness, the sense of more yet to be done which in fact will never be done. The brute lives out its life cycle and dies, apparently without any thought of its origin, nature, or destiny. But man finds it impossible to face the inevitable with sheer unconcern: in his experience, death is the ultimate frustration. Nor does "whistling in the dark" serve to alleviate this deep-seated "tragic sense of life," which is born of the horror of facing death. He may cultivate an outward show of bravado (chest-thumping), when in reality he is internally quaking with fear. Even men of faith—God's saints—find it difficult to avoid the sense of mystery in which death is enshrouded. (2) Literature, of course, is saturated with evidence of this deep-seated concern about man's destiny. For example, Homer, in the *Iliad* (Bk. VI) causes Glaukos to say to Diomedes on the field of battle: "Even as are the generations of leaves such are those likewise of men; the leaves that be, the wind scattereth on the earth, and the forest buddeth and putteth forth more again, when the season of spring is at hand; so of the generations of men, one putteth forth and another ceaseth" (cf. Psa. 103:15-16, 1 Pet. 1:24-25). In one of Ellery Queen's mystery stories, Dr. Dodd, a physician, states the case eloquently as follows: "I don't need watching, Mr. Queen. I'm to die and it won't be a hand that does it. Some things you can't do a

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

biopsy on. With all our sulfas and atomic bombs and electronic microscopes and two-hundred-inch telescope lenses we don't begin to know the powers that fill the universe. Any more than the amoeba in that glass of water knows what's going on in this room. All we can do is wait and try not to be afraid." I repeat Simpson here (IB, 512, 513) as follows: "From the fear of death, man cannot escape. For in the depths of his soul he knows that the structure of relationships which he has erected to protect himself is fundamentally without substance. In the end it will crumble and he will be compelled to face the fact which he has always tried to deny—that he is man and not God. Man's disordered relationships and his fear of death are inextricably bound up together, the consequence of his alienation from God." (3) Cassirer writes (EOM, 83-84): "In primitive thought death is never regarded as a natural phenomenon that obeys general laws. Its occurrence is not necessary but accidental. It always depends upon individual and fortuitous causes. It is the work of witchcraft or magic or some other personal inimical influence. . . . The conception that man is mortal, by his nature and essence, seems to be entirely alien to mythical and primitive religious thought." Primitive man's magic was, of course, designed to stave off death, even when it was employed to preserve life. (4) Mythological translations, quasi-resurrections, transfigurations (metamorphoses), etc., as, for example, of Attis, Adonis, Orpheus, Mithras, Osiris, Krishna, Ganymede, Narcissus, etc., offered no promise, not even the slightest ground for hope, of the conquest of death. These were all discrete events, subject to the whims of the polytheistic gods and goddesses, and were usually ritual aspects, wholly without ethical significance, of the Cult of Fertility which flourished throughout the ancient pagan world. There is not the slightest intimation, in any of these fantastic tales, of such ideas as the resurrection and glorification of righteous

GENESIS

souls, or the operation of the Holy Spirit in actualizing such ends (cf. Rom. 8:11), much less the slightest intimation of the conquest of death itself (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25-26). To try to equate the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection with these mythological fictions is sheer blasphemy. The primary design of the ancient Cult of Fertility was to enhance the fertility of the soil and so preserve man from death as long as possible. The ancient Cult of the Dead sought to achieve the same ends by necromancy, sorcery, consulting with "familiar spirits," augury, witchcraft, divination, diabolism, etc. Many of these practices were geared especially to foretelling the future. But, as someone has rightly said, "no one tries to foretell the future who doesn't have the frantic hope that somehow he can forestall it." (5) Concepts of survival in ancient pagan literature were never of the kind to engender hope or to lure human beings toward a desirable future life. Hades, Sheol, etc., were dark, dank "underworlds" in which the "shades" of departed heroes and heroines roamed about listlessly and hopelessly. (Poetic descriptions of the "underworld" in ancient writings cause one to envision in imagination the misty swamps and jungles of such an area as, for example, that of the Everglades (especially as seen by television). The Lament of Achilles (*Odyssey*, Bk. XI) eloquently portrays the hopelessness of such a future state. On greeting Odysseus, Achilles is made to say: "How didst thou dare to come down to the house of Hades, where dwell the senseless dead, the phantoms of men outworn?" Then, later, the Lament: "Do not, O noble Odysseus, speak to me of death: rather would I live on earth as the hireling of another, of a man of low estate, who had not much livelihood, than to have the rule over this whole kingdom of the departed dead." (6) What modern writers call "the tragic sense of life" has its source largely in the contemplation of the mystery of death. It is this sentiment which underlies present-day Existential-

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

ism. For "theistic existentialists," life, and especially death, means the confrontation of God; for the "atheistic existentialists" it means the confrontation of nothingness. For Heidegger, contemplation of death as the absolute end was the source of *Angst* ("anxiety") which *per se* made this life of great value. For Camus, awareness of death makes us aware of being. This same general motif permeates much of modern literature. Henley who wrote the song of the Stoic had a tragic bout with tuberculosis and committed suicide. Hemingway, with all his bravado, acknowledged he could not accept conquest by death, but admitted his abject surrender to it by committing suicide. As stated heretofore, the works of present-day dramatists, novelists, and often of the poets, express little more than the object pessimism of the Cult of Futility.

3. *There is but one Faith in all the world that envisions ultimately the death of death itself: that is the Christian Faith* (Acts 6:7, 13:8, 14:22; Gal. 1:23; Jude 3, 20). (1) Human reaction to the fact of death has always taken two forms, namely, the sense of ultimate frustration, and the elemental dread of facing the unknown (that is, the inexperienced). The Bible itself recognizes this human bondage to the fear (dread) of death (Heb. 2:14-15). The patriarch Job in days of old uttered the universal cry: "If a man die, shall he live again?" (John 14:14, cf. all of ch. 14). *This question was never answered until it was answered once for all time when the stone was rolled away from the entrance to Joseph's tomb.* (2) The Resurrection of Christ is God's pledge of the resurrection and glorification of His elect (Rom. 2:7, 8:11), and the indwelling Holy Spirit is the seal of their ultimate inheritance of glory and honor and incorruption, Life Everlasting. (Rom. 8:23, 8:28-30; Acts 2:22-36, 10:39-41; 2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5; Eph. 1:11, 13-14; Eph. 4:30; Col. 1:12, 3:24; 1 Pet. 1:3-5; Rom. 1:3-4; Phil. 3:20-21; 1 Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; John 5:28-29, etc.). (3) The resurrection of Christ was

GENESIS

the outstanding theme of all apostolic preaching. The reasons are obvious: If the Resurrection occurred as an event in space and time, it follows: (a) that there is a God, a living God; (b) that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God (Rom. 10:9-10); (c) that the Bible is what it claims to be, God's progressive revelation to mankind of His Plan of Redemption in which He proposes "to sum up all things in Christ" (Eph. 1:10); and (d) that all other so-called "religions," cults, philosophies, etc., having no empty tomb, are false, and without any Divine authentication whatsoever. *Christianity stakes everything on the historicity of the Resurrection.* (Matt. 12:39, Luke 11:29). (4) The Bible explicitly declares that God's Eternal Purpose intends nothing short of the ultimate abolition of death altogether (1 Cor. 15:26), that "what is mortal may be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. 5:4) in the "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13).

M. M. Davis (RMNC, 140) tells of an incident which occurred while Robert Owen, the British Socialist, visited Alexander Campbell, then President of Bethany College, West Virginia, at the Campbell homestead on the College grounds, to make final arrangements for their debate that was held subsequently at Cincinnati. "While at Bethany, the two were strolling together one evening over the farm, when they came to the family burying-ground. Mr. Owen paused and said to Mr. Campbell: 'There is one advantage I have over the Christian—I *am not afraid to die*. Most Christians have fear in death; but if some few items of my business were settled, I should be perfectly willing to die at any moment.' Mr. Campbell replied: 'You say you have no *fear* in death; have you any *hope* in death?' After a solemn pause, Mr. Owen said, 'No.' 'Then,' continued Mr. Campbell, pointing to an ox standing near, 'you are on a level with that brute. He has fed till he is satisfied, and stands in the shade whisking off the flies, and has

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

neither *fear* nor *hope* in death.' Mr. Owen, unable to meet this simple, but crushing, reply, only smiled in his confusion, and made no attempt to do it."

The Christian hope is not simply the hope of continuance in existence. It is infinitely more than this. It is the hope of seeing God face to face, the hope of unbroken fellowship with the Heavenly Father in the Life Everlasting. It is the hope that is inspired by, and will be realized through, the victory of faith (1 John 5:4).

In Eden where everything was life, God spoke of death; in the world at large, where everything is death, God speaks of life. In Eden God said, "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17). The Devil said, through the serpent, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3:4). All this talk of death in the midst of pulsating life (Gen. 2:16)! Now, when everything around us testifies of death, God says, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life" (John 3:36). In all His recorded teaching, Jesus is represented as saying very little about death. *The theme that was repeatedly on His lips was life.* (John 14:6, 1:4, 11:25-26, 5:40, 4:14, 10:10, 6:35, 5:26, 10:17-18). The Overcomers are those who shall have "washed their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life" etc. (Rev. 22:14).

* * * * *

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART FIFTEEN

1. Cite Scriptures showing that God's activity is purposeful.
2. Explain what is meant by God's "Eternal Purpose," and by "the Mystery of His Will."
3. Is the Bible a mystery, or is it the revelation of the Divine Mystery? Explain.
4. Show why God's Eternal Purpose necessarily includes all that He foreordains.

GENESIS

5. List those matters which God foreordains "from the foundation of the world."
6. Explain what is meant by "the privilege of adoption."
7. Explain what is meant by "conformity to the image of God's Son," and show how this is related to the Christian doctrine of immortality.
8. What is the consummating phase of the Eternal Purpose?
9. According to Scripture, does God call His elect by an operation of the Spirit (a) independent of the Word, (b) in addition to the Word, or (c) through the Word *per se* as written or proclaimed? Explain your answers.
10. What was the design of the *charismata* in the early church?
11. What is the relation between process and law in the physical world?
12. Why do we say that the processes and laws of the physical world are Divinely foreordained?
13. On what grounds do we hold that Creation and Redemption are both phases of God's Cosmic Plan?
14. Does more law in the physical world mean less God? Explain.
15. State the substance of Christopher's explanation of the logical connection between the angelic apostasy and God's Remedial System for mankind.
16. Discuss: How could God's ineffable love been demonstrated more effectively than in a world of lost sinners?
17. State Trueblood's presentation of "the Christian paradox of sin."
18. State in substance our definition of *true morality*. How is it related to religion?
19. Distinguish between a *crime* and a *sin*.
20. According to the teaching of Jesus, what two classes will there be in the Judgment?

GOD'S ETERNAL PURPOSE

21. What are the two Supreme Universals of human experience?
22. How has the contemplation of death affected human thought and life generally?
23. Give examples from literature of the effect of the mystery of death on human thinking.
24. What, according to Cassirer, was primitive man's attitude toward death?
25. Show the correlation between the ancient Cult of Fertility and man's attitude toward death.
26. Show the correlation between the ancient Cult of the Dead and man's attitude toward death.
27. Show the correlation between the modern Cult of Futility and man's attitude toward death.
28. What picture has Homer given us of the Underworld?
29. What is the source of modern pessimism as expressed in the phrase, "the tragic sense of life"?
30. Show how this phrase is to be correlated with the cults of present-day Existentialism.
31. What is the only Faith that envisions ultimately the death of death itself?
32. What was Job's question in days of old? Where and when was this question answered once for all time?
33. State the full significance of the Resurrection of Christ, and show how it is related to the existence of God, to the Messiahship of Jesus, to the Divine inspiration of Scripture, and to the false religions and cults which human authority tries to substitute for the Christian Faith.
34. Why was the Resurrection the main theme of the apostolic message?
35. On what event does Christianity stake everything?
36. Explain the phrase, "that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life."
37. What does God in His Eternal Purpose design ultimately about death?

GENESIS

38. What is the true Christian's attitude toward death?
39. Why, then, do we as Christians often make our funerals so pagan in character?
40. What is the Christian hope?
41. Contrast God's main theme in the Garden of Eden with His main theme in the world at large.
42. What is the outstanding theme in the teaching of Jesus? Cite Scriptures for your answer
43. What is the significance of this fact for us?
44. Why is Christianity supremely the religion of *joy*?

PART SIXTEEN

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

The following statements appeared recently in a local church publication: "The Fall runs straight across the path of the theory of evolution. If evolution is true, then the Biblical teaching concerning sin and salvation and the ultimate judgment upon man is *not*. Evolution teaches that man gradually evolves upward; the Bible teaches that man began perfect, sinned, and has devolved downward ever since. One has to take a choice: you can't have it both ways. To hold to an evolutionary concept of man's history one has to get rid of the Fall. This doesn't mean to interpret the book of Genesis as a book of 'myths with spiritual truths.' It means to get rid of Jesus and His teaching which supports the Fall. It means that the Old Testament prophets have to go, with their pronouncements on the subject. Then you have to throw out the New Testament letters which declare the Fall as a reality and explain how it is overcome through Christ," etc.

These are positive "either-or" affirmations. They precipitate certain very significant questions, such as the following: Is there any possible ground of reconciliation of the evolution hypothesis with the Genesis account of the Fall? Furthermore, is there any real necessity for demanding such a reconciliation as a factor in validating "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3)? That is, are the two subjects genuinely relevant to each other, and, if so, how far does this relevance extend? Is to try to find harmony with respect to every detail involved in both the Biblical and "scientific" accounts really necessary, or even justifiable? Finally, is it true that man "began perfect"? Or, did he "begin" innocent with the potentiality of attaining wholeness or perfection? One thing is sure, namely, that *man as we know him historically and experientially, is anything but the epitome of physical, mental, moral or spiritual perfection*. No one but a

GENESIS

person blinded by his own conceits would even question this fact.

In sharp contrast to the view presented above, Dr. A. H. Strong, who can hardly be accused of heresy with respect to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, has written as follows (ST, 465, 466): "The Scriptures, on the one hand, negate 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 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, 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 equally the work of nature and the work of God. . . . Psychology comes to our help in the interpretation of Scripture. The radical differences between man's soul and the principle of intelligence in the lower animals, especially man's possession of self-consciousness, general ideas, the moral sense, and the power of self-determination, show that that which chiefly constitutes

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

him man, could not have been derived, by any natural process of development, from the inferior creatures. We are compelled, then, to believe that God's 'breathing into man's nostrils the 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." Again (466): "Drummond, in his *Ascent of Man*, concedes that man passed through a period when he resembled the ape more than any known animal, but at the same time declares that no anthropoid ape could develop into a man. The brute can be defined in terms of man, but man cannot be defined in terms of the brute. It is significant that in insanity the higher endowments of man disappear in an order precisely the reverse of that in which, according to the development theory, they have been acquired. The highest part of man totters first. The last added is first to suffer." Again, quoting J. M. Bronson (466): "The theist must accept evolution if he would keep his argument for the existence of God from the unity of design in nature. Unless man is an *end*, he is an *anomaly*. The greatest argument for God is the fact that all animate nature is one vast and connected unity. Man has developed not *from* the ape, but *away from* the ape. He was never anything but potential man. He did not, as man, come into being until he became a conscious moral agent." To this Strong adds: "This conscious moral nature, which we call personality, requires a divine Author, because it surpasses all the powers which can be found in the animal creation." But, is the "breathing into man's nostrils" of "the breath of life" to be explained (as in Strong's statement) as a "reinforcement of the process of life" that "turned the animal into a man"?

GENESIS

What kind of "reinforcement"? Or, just what did this "reinforcement" consist of? The word "reinforcement," as used here, strikes me as being exceedingly vague. Surely the texts of Gen. 1:27 and 2:7 leave 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 essence of his interior life. 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 which is that which constitutes him a conscious moral creature. (Cf. Gen. 6:17; Eccl. 12:7; Job 33:4, 32:8; Psalms 139:14; Eccl. 12:7; Acts 17:25). It will be recalled that Lotze, the German philosopher, held that at certain stages of development, God, by direct action, inserted into the creative process new increments of power, namely, the phenomena of energy-matter, life, consciousness, and self-consciousness, respectively, thus accounting for the gaps that still obtain in scientific thought between successively higher levels of being. It will also be recalled, in this connection, that Trueblood (PR, 98-102) contends that what he calls "the fact of evolution" is a positive proof of our theistic God. He quotes Archbishop Temple as saying, "The more completely we include Mind within Nature, the more inexplicable must Nature become except by reference to Mind." Trueblood himself then adds, that if man's life is included in the evolution theory, "we cannot escape the conclusion that mind and nature are akin," that "mind is not accidental in nature," but "a revelation of the nature of nature." The thesis of his argument is that such a unity is a unity of design, one that "arises only from effective operation of purpose." (Cf. Isa. 44:6-8, 46:8-11; Psalms 33:6-9, 148:1-6; Acts 17:23-31).

Let us now examine the facts, as briefly as possible, which have to do with the problem of evolutionism and its bearing on the Genesis narrative of the Fall. (I suggest

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

that the student read again my *Genesis*, Vol. 1, pp. 559-601). In pursuing this study, we must call attention again to the difference in meaning of the terms, "evolution" and "evolutionism." The former designates only the process itself, the process of "continuous progressive change." The latter term designates how the process "proceeds," that is, the methodology of it, the factors which are said to have actualized it. *Evolutionism* is also properly designated the *theory of evolution*.

So much by way of introduction. We shall now summarize those various aspects of the material to be presented here, as follows:

1. *Concerning the evolutionists themselves.* (1) Generally speaking, evolutionists are persons who summarily reject any kind of evidence that cannot be supported by empirical observation and measurement: in their own "universe of discourse," they are known as Positivists. (2) In the main they are men who are either non-religious or positively anti-religious in attitude. Hence, they reject *a priori* any notion of what might be called the "supernatural." In this respect they belong in the same school as the "analytical critics" and "demythologizers" who approach history from the *a priori* assumption that any event described as a "miracle" cannot be material for genuine history, no matter how strong the evidence of eye-witnesses in support of it, and hence must be explained (rather, "explained away") on a naturalistic basis or rejected outright. David F. Strauss, whose *Life of Jesus* attained such great popularity in Germany about a century ago, set the fashion in this area of criticism: accepting the historicity of Jesus, he made a vain effort, however, to explain away His miracles in naturalistic terms. The French writer, Renan, fell into the same error: as someone has said, his *Life of Jesus* "rests on the soft pillow of doubt." (3) Of course, evolutionists generally, like scientists of all persuasions, are influenced by the arbitrary

GENESIS

assumption that lies at the root of all scientific inquiry, namely, that events which cannot be established empirically (that is, by sense-perception, or by sense-perception implemented by proper mechanical devices such as the microscope and the telescope) cannot be accepted as belonging to true science. Notably, in this connection, many scientists scoff at all research in the field of extrasensory perception and psychokinesis, largely because they regard this kind of research as lying beyond the area of scientific investigation in the true sense of that term. Indeed, many of them manifest completely closed minds to all the conclusions reached by the investigators of the phenomena of the subconscious. Again quoting Dr. Jauncey (SRG, 57): "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."

(4) Many evolutionists—indeed, I should say, the great majority of them—are fundamentally ignorant of the teaching of the Bible, in particular of its internal unity, and hence of its basic content and design. It is doubtful that they have even a passing acquaintance with the Holy Spirit, or indeed even know that the Holy Spirit is (cf. Acts 19:2). Over-specialization has much to do with this tragic lacuna in the knowledge of men high in secular academic circles. One of our humorists—Will Rogers, if my memory serves me right—has aptly remarked that "the most ignorant man in the world is the fellow who is highly specialized in one particular field when he ventures outside the field he is specialized in." Years ago, when the first Henry Ford was in his prime, I would have believed almost anything he had to say about the manufacture and marketing of automobiles. But when he ventured into print on matters of religion and politics, as all such gentlemen are prone to do, I could hardly accept anything he said: his statements demonstrated his colossal ignorance of

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

both subjects. The same is true of the fulminations of Edison, Burbank, Clarence Darrow, John Dewey, and all their kind: yet the authority of a great name often leads thousands of gullible persons into egregious fallacies. I recall, in my days in college, certain professors who went out of their way to poke fun at some of the Bible narratives, but their very statements proved that they knew little or nothing about the subjects they ventured to discuss with all the pontifical solemnity of a self-appointed pundit.

(5) It is notoriously true that evolutionists have been addicted to the use of pompous language and to extravagant, if not actually ridiculous, claims in support of their hypothesis. Recall here, for example, Herbert Spencer's grandiose definition of evolution as "continuous change from indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to definite, coherent heterogeneity of structure and function, through successive differentiations and integrations." One is reminded, too, of Haeckel's "Tree of Life" in which he presented the course of evolution under the likeness of a great spreading tree, Haeckel himself supplying the multifarious "missing links" out of his own fantastically fertile imagination. In similar vein, we recall the tendency among historians of our time, as, e.g., the late H. G. Wells in his *Outline of History*, to introduce actual history with chapters on what is obviously prehistory and hence generally conjectural. I can see no justification for this method, especially in view of the fact that the obvious distinction between the character of prehistory and that of history proper is never clearly defined for the reader. One is reminded here also of claims that have been made recently for the antiquity of man, stretching his existence on earth theoretically as far back as 500,000 years. One wonders, if *homo sapiens* has been around that long, *what on earth* has he been doing throughout all these millenia. Surely, there is no evidence from archaeology, or from any other source, that he made much progress, either materially or spiritually, apparently begin-

GENESIS

ning to do so only some 10,000 years ago, in what is called the Neolithic Age. As a matter of fact, history proper had its beginning no farther back than about 5,000 B.C.—and indubitably *history is made by men*.

The late William Jennings Bryan who, from the role he played in the notorious "monkey trial" (a silly term of journalistic coinage, and one that exudes scorn, no doubt designedly) in Tennessee, has been caricatured in scientific publications, in so-called religious periodicals, and even in the daily press, as a kind of nit-wit, *was anything but that*. (Bryan, unfortunately, allowed himself to be put on the defensive in the Scopes trial, and this is something that one must never do in facing an atheist or an agnostic: the believer has nothing to fear by taking the offensive in such situations. Bryan was, of course, a bit naive in some of his statements, but Darrow was downright *ignorant* of the teaching of the Bible and displayed his ignorance in the arguments he presented.) This writer personally heard Bryan speak, on several occasions, including his famed public lecture, "In the Image of God." In the printed version of this speech, he pointed up some of the extravagant claims of the evolutionists in support of their hypothetical brainchild. Because so few persons in our day and age have any real understanding of Bryan's efforts and of the real circumstances of the Scopes trial, I present here a few paragraphs from this lecture, as follows (IHM, 90-106): "Before commenting on the Darwinian hypothesis let me refer you to the language of its author as it applies to man. On page 180 of *Descent of Man* (Hurst and Company, Edition 1874), Darwin says: 'Our most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the Vertebrata, at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals, resembling the larvae of the existing Ascidians.' Then he suggests a line of descent leading to the monkey. And he does not even permit us to indulge in a patriotic pride of ancestry; instead of letting us

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

descend from American monkeys, he connects us with the European branch of the monkey family. It will be noted, first, that he begins the summary with the word 'apparently,' which the Standard Dictionary defines: 'as judged by appearances, without passing upon its reality.' His second sentence (following the sentence quoted) turns upon the word 'probably,' which is defined: 'as far as the evidence shows, presumably, likely.' His works are full of words indicating uncertainty. The phrase, 'we may well suppose,' occurs over eight hundred times in his two principal works. (See *Herald and Presbyterian*, November 22, 1914). The eminent scientist is guessing. . . . If we could divide the human race into two distinct groups we might allow evolutionists to worship brutes as ancestors but they insist on connecting all mankind with the jungle. We have a right to protect our family tree. . . . Darwin is absurd as well as groundless. He announces two laws, which, in his judgment, explain the development of man from the lowest form of animal life, namely, natural selection and sexual selection. The latter has been abandoned by the modern believers in evolution, but two illustrations from Darwin's *Descent of Man*, will show his unreliability as a guide to the young. On page 587 of the 1874 edition, he tries to explain man's superior mental strength (a proposition more difficult to defend today than in Darwin's time). His theory is that, 'the struggle between the males for the possession of the females' helped to develop the male mind and that this superior strength was transmitted by males to their male offspring. After having shown, to his own satisfaction, how sexual selection would account for the (supposed) greater strength of the male mind, he turns his attention to another question, namely, how did man become a hairless animal? This he accounts for also by sexual selection—the females preferred the males with the least hair (page 624). . . . A comment and a question: First, unless the brute females were very different from

GENESIS

females as we know them, they would not have agreed in taste. Some would 'probably' have preferred males with less hair, others, 'we may well suppose,' would have preferred males with more hair. Those with more hair would naturally be the stronger because better able to resist the weather. But, second, how could the males have strengthened their minds by fighting for the females, if, at the same time, the females were breeding the hair off by selecting the males? Or, did the males select for three years and then allow the females to do the selecting during leap year? . . ."

Again: "But how does the evolutionist explain the eye when he leaves God out? Here is the only guess that I have seen—if you find any others I shall be glad to know of them, as I am collecting the guesses of the evolutionists. The evolutionist guesses that there was a time when eyes were unknown—this is a necessary part of the hypothesis. And since eye is a universal possession among living things the evolutionist guesses that it came into being—not by design or by act of God—but just happened, and how did it happen? I will give you the guess—a piece of pigment, or, as some say, a freckle appeared upon the skin of an animal that had no eyes. This piece of pigment or freckle converged the rays of the sun upon that spot and when the animal felt the heat on that spot it turned the spot to the sun to get more heat. The increased heat irritated the skin—so the evolutionists guess, and a nerve came there, and out of the nerve came the eye! Can you beat it? But this only accounts for one eye: there must have been another piece of pigment or freckle soon afterward and just in the right place in order to give the animal two eyes. And, according to evolutionists, there was a time when animals had no legs, and so the leg came by accident. How? Well, the guess is that a little animal without legs was wiggling along on its belly one day when it discovered a wart—it just happened so—and it was in the right place

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

to be used to aid it in locomotion; so, it came to depend upon the wart, and use finally developed it into a leg. And then another wart and another leg, at the proper time—by accident—and accidentally in the proper place. Is it not astonishing that any person intelligent enough to teach school would talk such tommyrot to students and look serious while doing so? And yet I read only a few weeks ago, on page 124 of a little book recently issued by a prominent New York minister, the following: 'Man has grown up in this universe gradually developing his powers and functions as responses to his environment. If he has eyes, so the *biologists* assure us, it is because *light waves played upon the skin* and eyes came out in answer; if he has ears it is because the *air waves* were there first and the ears came out to hear. Man never yet, *according to the evolutionist*, developed any power save as a reality called it into being. There would be no fins if there were no water, no wings if there were no air, no legs if there were no land.' You see I called your attention to only forty per cent of the absurdities; he speaks of eyes, ears, fins, wings and legs—five. I called attention only to eyes and legs—two. The evolutionist guesses himself away from God, but he only makes matters worse. How long did the 'light waves' have to play on the skin before the eyes came out? The evolutionist is very deliberate; he is long on time. He would certainly give the eye thousands of years, if not millions, in which to develop; but how could he be sure that the light waves played all the time in one place or played in the same place generation after generation until the development was complete? And why did the light waves quit playing when two eyes were perfected? Why did they not keep on playing until there were eyes all over the body? Why do they not play today, so that we may see eyes in the process of development? And if the light waves created the eyes, why did they not create them strong enough to bear the light? Why did the light

GENESIS

waves make eyes and then make eyelids to keep the light out of the eyes? And so with the ears. They must have gone *in* 'to hear' instead of *out*, and wasn't it lucky that they happened to go in on opposite sides of the head instead of cater-cornered or at random? . . ."

Again: "Last November I was passing through Philadelphia and read in an afternoon paper a report of an address delivered in that city by a college professor employed in extension work. Here is an extract from the paper's account of the speech: 'Evidence that early men climbed trees with their feet lies in the way we wear the heels of our shoes—more at the outside. A baby can wiggle its big toe without wiggling its other toes—an indication that it once used its big toe in climbing trees.' What a consolation it must be to mothers to know that the baby is not to be blamed for wiggling the big toe without wiggling the other toes. It cannot help it, poor little thing; it is an inheritance from 'the tree man,' so the evolutionists tell us. And here is another extract: 'We often dream of falling. Those who fell out of the trees some fifty thousand years ago and were killed, of course, had no descendants. So those who fell and were *not* hurt, of course, lived, and so we are never hurt in our dreams of falling.' Of course, if we were actually descended from the inhabitants of trees, it would seem quite likely that we descended from those who were *not* killed in falling. But they must have been badly frightened if the impression made upon their feeble minds could have lasted for fifty thousand years and still be vivid enough to scare us. If the Bible said anything so idiotic as these guessers put forth in the name of science, scientists would have a great time ridiculing the sacred pages, but men who scoff at the recorded interpretation of dreams of Joseph and Daniel seem to be able to swallow the amusing interpretations offered by the Pennsylvania professor."

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Finally: "A few months ago the *Sunday School Times* quoted a professor in an Illinois University as saying that the great day in history was the day when a water puppy crawled up on the land and, deciding to be a land animal, became man's progenitor. If these scientific speculators can agree upon the day they will probably insist on our abandoning Washington's Birthday, the Fourth of July, and even Christmas, in order to join with the whole world in celebrating 'Water Puppy Day.'" "Within the last few weeks the papers published a dispatch from Paris to the effect that an 'eminent scientist' announced that he had communicated with the spirit of a dog and learned from the dog that it was happy. Must we believe this, too?" We might go on and on here with excerpts from Mr. Bryan's lecture couched in similar vein; we feel, however, that the foregoing are sufficient to demonstrate the speculative extravagances to which the rabid evolutionists resort in support of their hypothesis—for *evolution is, even down to our day, still a hypothesis.*

(6) Evolutionists reject all attempts that are, or could be, made to show correspondence between the Genesis account of the Creation and their own theory. All the prominent originators of the theory of evolution—Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Haeckel, Wallace, and the rest—were firm opponents of the Biblical view of the world and of man. Generally speaking, the same is equally true of our present-day crop as well. To be sure, there are men—eminent scholars—who have sought to point up a possible correspondence in broad outlines, under the caption of *theistic evolution*, between the theory and the teaching of Genesis; still, the foremost advocates of the evolutionary view in our day look with considerable disdain—and even contempt—on all such efforts and those who would even suggest that such harmony exists or is possible. For example, Goldschmidt, the geneticist writes (art., "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist*, Vol. 40,

GENESIS

January 1952, p. 85): "Another type of evolutionary theory hardly deserves to be mentioned in a scientific paper. This is the mystical approach, which hides its insufficient understanding of the facts behind such empty words as creative evolution, emergent evolution, holism, and psycho-Lamarckism. . . . The biologist does not receive any constructive help from such ideas and is forced to ignore them." (I might interpolate here that the insufficient understanding, of these gentlemen, of Biblical teaching is pitiful; it would be laughable, if it were not so tragic.) G. G. Simpson, the bellwether of the present-day materialistic school, has "delivered himself" on the subject of theistic views of evolution as follows ("Evolutionary Determinism and the Fossil Record," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 71, October 1950, p. 264): "The fossil record definitely does not accord with . . . the concept of orthogenesis or more broadly with overtly or covertly non-materialistic theories like those of Driesch, Bergson, Osborne, Cuenot, du Nuoy, or Vandel." In an important address recently at the Darwinian Centennial Convention and the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at the University of Chicago, Simpson spoke just as positively. Among other things, said he, "Evolution is a fully natural process, inherent in the physical properties of the universe, by which life arose in the first place and by which all living things, past or present, have since developed, divergently and progressively. . . . Life may conceivably be happier for some people in the other worlds of superstition. It is possible that some children are made happy by a belief in Santa Claus, but adults should prefer to live in a world of reality and reason" (cf. Simpson, "The World Into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science*, Vol. 131, April 1, 1960, pp. 969, 973-974). Julian Huxley was quoted in an Associated Press dispatch, November 27, 1959, as saying this, at the same Convocation: "In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

longer need or room for the supernatural. The earth was not created: it evolved. So did all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves, mind and soul, as well as brain and body. So did religion." And C. D. Darlington, Professor of Botany at Oxford, sums up the issue from his point of view in this terse statement ("The Origin of Darwinism," *Scientific American*, Vol. 200, May 1959, p. 66): "We owe to the *Origin of Species* the overthrow of the myth of Creation." The paeans that have been sung to Darwin in the past century have been fantastic, to say the least. We would humbly suggest that they be assembled, and together with those offered up in the worship of Marx and Freud, presented to the world in a volume that would aptly be entitled, "The Hymnody of Scientism." In the statements quoted above the fact stands out as *prima facie* evidence that in each case the wish is father to the thought.

2. *Concerning evolutionism.* (1) The antireligious prejudice of the evolutionists, particularly of those who champion the strictly materialistic version of the theory, prompts them to proclaim vociferously *that evolution is a fact*. They make no bones about asserting dogmatically that their case is proved—*again a case in which the wish is father to the thought*. Whether they choose to be known as "naturalists," "humanists," "positivists," "materialists," or what not, they are all *anti-theistic*: in short, they are *anti-God*, that is, in any sense of the term "God" that is congenial and helpful to mankind. Obviously, then, in their thinking man is not the image of God, for the simple reason that there is no Deity of which he can be the image; hence, as Chesterton has put it, we must conclude that he is "a disease of the dust." In strict truth, however, *evolutionism is not a fact—it is a faith*. No one ever witnessed the emergence of a new species. No one on earth knows how such an emergence takes place (if it does). Moreover, the time element claimed by devotees

GENESIS

of the hypothesis is so vast as to put it forever beyond all possibility of empirical (eye-witness) verification. *The various arguments in support of the theory are matters of inference.* Hence the questions arise, is all this *necessary* inference? Or, how much of it is just *conjectural*? We are reminded here of Mark Twain's comment: "There is something so fascinating about science; one gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investments of fact." Chesterton's statements about the word "evolution" are certainly apropos (EM, 23): "As a matter of fact it is not a very practical word or a very profitable idea. Nobody can imagine how nothing could 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*." In the attitude of the evolutionists that their theory must be accepted *as fact* chiefly because there is no alternative but creation, they commit the fallacy of begging the question: that is, they assume as fact what actually needs to be proved, when it might turn out after all that evolution is God's *method* of creation. If decided *a priori* that the totality of being must be explained "naturally," obviously one would be under the necessity of accepting evolutionism whether or not it is validated by the available evidence. Again, Chesterton (EM, 13): "An iconoclast may be indignant; an iconoclast may be justly indignant; but an

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

iconoclast is not impartial. And it is stark hypocrisy to pretend that nine-tenths of the higher critics and scientific evolutionists and professors of comparative religion are in the least impartial. Why should they be impartial, what is being impartial, when the whole world is at war about whether one thing is a devouring superstition or a divine hope. . . . They are not impartial; they never by any chance hold the historical scales even; and above all they are never impartial upon this point of evolution and transition. They suggest everywhere the grey gradations of twilight, because they believe it is the twilight of the gods. I propose to maintain that whether or no it is the twilight of the gods, it is not the daylight of men."

(2) It is most interesting to note here two Scripture affirmations, Heb. 11:3 and 2 Pet. 3:1-7, which have significant bearing on the subject before us. In the former passage, the inspired author tells us that the things we see with the natural eye ("ages," as in Heb. 1:2; cf. *time* as the Einsteinian fourth dimension) have not been made out of these things which appear to our physical vision (cf. 2 Cor. 4:16-18). Robertson (WPNT, V, 419): "The author denies the eternity of matter, a common theory then and now, and places God before the visible universe as many modern scientists now gladly do" (the physicists in particular). Is it not significant that what the inspired writer states here is now generally accepted as fact by the nuclear physicists, namely, that the forms of matter which are amenable to sense-perception are actually constituted of ultimate forms of energy which are totally inaccessible to man's physical senses. Thus far no man has ever seen an atom, much less any of the growing number of elementary particles or forces which go to make up the constituency of the atom. Today, matter in its ultimate form is apprehensible, not by physical sense-perception, but by mathematical calculation; hence, it is to be regarded truly as *metaphysical* rather than as strictly physical. As Lincoln

GENESIS

Barnett writes (UDE, 114): "Man's inescapable impasse is that he himself is part of the world he seeks to explore; his body and proud brain are mosaics of the same elemental particles that compose the dark, drifting clouds of interstellar space; he is, in the final analysis, merely an ephemeral conformation of the primordial space-time field. Standing midway between macrocosm and microcosm he finds barriers on every side and can perhaps but marvel, as St. Paul did nineteen hundred years ago, that 'the world was created by the word of God so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear.'" (I must dissent from the view stated above that man is "merely an ephemeral conformation of the primordial space-time field." As a matter of fact, man is the one entity in creation who is *not* an ephemeral conformation of any kind: even in the total scheme of relativity envisioned today by the physicists, he is the only "framework of reference" to whom anything else has meaning, and this is by virtue of the fact that he is essentially imperishable spirit, the image of God.)

(3) As for the second Scripture cited above, 2 Pet. 3:1-7, the significance is even more startling. Here we are told that "in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." We go on to read that these mockers "wilfully forget, that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God, by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished," etc. Is not all this precisely what the majority of evolutionists of our time are saying and doing? How could the picture have been drawn more realistically? And thus do these mockers, our antitheistic evolutionists, fulfill Bible prophecy, although, I am sure, they are blissfully

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

unaware of their prophetic identification. True it is today, as always, that "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise," etc. (cf. 1 Cor. 1:20-29).

(4) The excessive devotion of the evolutionists to their brainchild leads them to try to apply the "progressive development" yardstick to every phase of the cosmic process. They would trace chronologically every physical, astronomical, geological, biological, sociological, even theological, development in the totality of being. Hence we now have books with such titles as *Stellar Evolution, From Atoms to Stars, Biography of the Earth, From Molecules to Man*, etc., and innumerable published articles of the same general trend of thinking. We have Herbert Spencer's "cultural evolution" theory, namely, that all cultures have moved "forward" from savagery through barbarism to civilization. This concept 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 held 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 that henotheism developed into *monotheism* (belief in one true God to the exclusion of all other deities). It is held further that monotheism will ultimately give way to *pantheism*, a sophisticated "religion" in which God is identified with nature or with some impersonal creative process in nature, the only system, we are told, which is acceptable to the intelligentsia. It is doubtful that this theory is seriously entertained in our day: there is too much evidence that monotheism has existed along with these other views, somewhere and in some form, from earliest times. Of course, at the outset evolutionism had reference only to biological development,

GENESIS

to *the origin of species*. Implicit in all these theories is the view that *all change takes place from the simple to the more and more complex*: in logic textbooks this is now designated "the genetic fallacy." As stated in one such textbook (ILSM, 389): "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 in complexity." 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 today to minimize, even to disregard, genealogical tables altogether (cf. 1 Tim. 1:4, Tit. 3:9). Again (ILSM, 390): "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."

(5) It has been charged, and that rightly, that evolutionism has, unfortunately, tended to vitiate intellectual integrity throughout the scientific world. Some very interesting statements to this effect appear in the Preface, by W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Canada, to the most recent Everyman's Library edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. "A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the Origin," writes Thompson, "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

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

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 indicate 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*." We are reminded here of the attitude of many scientists toward the conclusions of those men who have been delving into the study of the phenomena of the Subconscious in man. Dr. J. B. Rhine, head of the Department of Parapsychology at Duke University, has some pertinent

GENESIS

remarks to make on this subject. "Fear," comments Rhine, "more than anything else, blocks scientific acceptance. First, there is fear of having to accept as real something that does not harmonize with a physicalistic philosophy. The acceptance of nonphysical action would admit two kinds of reality, and divide the universe. Such a step looks like a throwback to supernaturalism." (The author—of *The Reach of the Mind*—then goes on to show that it is an error to think that ESP and PK lead to dualism. "The very act in which the two systems of mind and body operate upon each other necessarily unifies them to some degree into a single process. No one can conceive of the interaction of two systems, except by supposing that there are properties common to both. Indeed, we can conclude in all safety that the facts do not require one to be a dualist—they do not *allow* one to be.") Rhine continues: "The other fear that retards the scientific acceptance of ESP-PK is a social one: fear of losing caste in one's profession. Many scientists have experimented with ESP and PK in secret. Occasionally we learn of successful and valuable experiments, only to be told that 'for professional reasons' no report will be published. 'My family has to eat,' said one of these experimenters. 'My institution would object,' said another. 'Every member of my department would criticize me, and I am in line for the chairmanship.'" Truly scientists can be very "human" at times! (From condensation of Rhine's book, *The Reach of the Mind*, in *The Reader's Digest*, February, 1948).

3. *Concerning the Inadequacies of Evolutionism* (that is, to explain what it is supposed to explain). *Evolutionism*, let us remember, is the *theory of evolution*, frequently designated the *evolution hypothesis*. In the terminology of science a *hypothesis* ranks below a *theory* in validity, and both hypothesis and theory attain the stature of a *law* only when after a long period of testing their validity is established by apparently incontrovertible evidence. The

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

theory of evolution fails to account adequately for many of the facts of human observation, experience, and general knowledge. Among these are the following: (1) *The origin of life*: spontaneous generation may be considered a possibility *theoretically*, but as yet no direct evidence has been brought to light to prove that it ever actually happened. As Spallanzani (1729-1799) explained, "Even microbes must have parents," and all the thanks he got for his discovery was ostracism by the medical society of Europe. (2) *The life movement itself*: the underlying force, or whatever one may call it, that brings about cell segmentation (and growth) plus differentiation as to structure and specialization as to function. "Protoplasmic irritability" is a grandiose term which reminds us of John Locke's definition of matter as "something-I-know-not-what." (3) *The transmission of modifications*: the process by which a variation in a parent organism becomes embodied in the reproductive cells, the only media (the genes) by which it can be passed on to offspring. Genes are defined as the determiners of heredity; still and all, they are hypothetical in the sense of eluding sense perception. (4) *The vast gap between the intelligence potential of man and that of any known animal species extant or extinct*. This gap has led many scientists to take the position that man's appearance on the scene must have been a mutation. Man is not just animal: he is animal *plus*, and it is the plus that specifies him as man. Hence the folly of trying to explain the person as a biological creature exclusively; as Chesterton says (EM, 17): "It is exactly when we regard man as an animal that we know he is not an animal." (5) *The cause of mutations*: the appearance of new forms as wholes as a result of sudden jumps in the process, forms which continue to "breed true" from the time of their "emergence." As a matter of fact, mutations have all the appearance of special creations, what some have called the insertion of new increments of power into

GENESIS

the Creative Process. (Cosmic rays have been found to produce mutations in fruit flies). Evolutionism simply could not be validated in any form without mutations. And is it not fortunate that these alleged mutations occurred in a sequence which supports the concept of progressive development of species? And does not this fact in itself presuppose direction of the whole process—if it actually occurred—by an intelligent Designer? (cf. Isa. 46:8-11). (6) *The origin of sex differences*. Evolutionism is unable to give us a satisfactory account of this fact on which the preservation and continuance of all living species is based. (It is interesting to note here that the Genesis Narrative of the Creation 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). (7) *The Mendelian laws of heredity*. These "laws," like all the laws of the sciences, are descriptive. They are not in any sense explanatory of the *why* of the inter-relationships of the factors involved.

(8) *The amazing variety of highly developed special organs* which serve the needs of the respective species in which they function, *e.g.*, wings, feathers, fur; eyes, ears and other physical sense organs; tusks, antennae, hooves; fins and gills and electric organs of fishes, poison glands and fangs of snakes; the "radar" mechanism of bats; migratory sense of birds, etc. These are too numerous and too multifarious even to try to list them all here. They are "explained" by evolutionists in terms of adaptation to environment: thus the term "adaptation" has become a kind of linguistic factotum brought in to "explain" the unexplainable. Think of the innumerable possibilities of variations which may take place *retrogressively* as well as *progressively*. So many imponderables (immeasurable factors) are said to be involved, such as so-called natural selection, sexual selection, artificial selection, variable prolificity of

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

species, hereditary processes, mutations, the role of the germ plasm, etc. Regardless of the time element which may be assumed, no one knows the precise *how*, much less the *why*, of these mysteries (not even how the phychical takes hold of the physical and moves it, as happens every time a man takes a walk). The fact is that evolutionists embalm all these mysteries in a crust of academic jargon that explains little or nothing in the concrete, arriving at their pontifical pronouncements by inferences that are unverifiable in fact. (After all, the term "hypothesis" is just a sophisticated term for a fairly respectable guess).

(9) *The fact of instinct*, of the almost inconceivable manifoldness of instinctive responses, in subhuman orders. E.g., the lifetime journey of salmon, the wonderland of ants, the mating dance of the scorpion, cicadian rhythms ("biological clocks"), bird migrations, migratory sense of "homing" pigeons, etc. Some of these are so fantastic as to be almost inconceivable. Indeed 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 an ascending order, it is obvious that the lowly Insecta would stand at the head of the list, and that man, poor man, would be somewhere near the bottom.

I recommend especially a book entitled *Marvels and Mysteries of Our Animal World* (a book put on the market recently by The Reader's Digest Association), also the following statements, which appear in a sketch of the content of the book prepared for advertising purposes, to emphasize the subject under consideration here (the specialized organs and instincts of subhuman species): "The wonderful zoo of our planet is unique. In all of space there is no other giraffe than ours, no aardvark, and no gliding sea-horse, for nature does not repeat her experiments with life. These wonderful creatures are ours. They belong to the earth and we belong to them. Man moves through this parade of life, specialized in brain and

GENESIS

dexterity—but still primitive in many ways. We cannot gnaw down trees or run on one toe. But we can make sense out of seeming chaos. And we can use our eyes to see the beautiful spotted fawn in the glade, the oriole swinging in its basket nest, a thousand spangled butterflies trembling on a tree limb. And, seeing these, we know the miracle of the animals we live with. Here, in this exciting Reader's Digest volume, the miracle comes alive! We learn the methods of the insect magician who invented a baffling trick—light without heat. We get a close-up of that engineering genius, the busy beaver—a good family man and a peaceful chap; we follow the monarch butterfly on an incredible 2000-mile journey, get an intimate view of "the boulder with the built-in pocket," learn why elephants are *almost human* (and why they're not!), look twice at an ostrich (look once, then look out!), and thrill to the story of the friendly sea otter's comeback!" Truly, instinct *is* the Great Sphinx of Nature! Through its magic powers the Divine Intelligence secures the preservation of all species in relation to their respective needs and to human needs in particular.

(10) *The role of the artificial in relation to the "natural."* Simpson (ME, 139, 140): "It is still false to conclude that man is *nothing but* the highest animal, or the most progressive product of organic evolution. He is also a fundamentally new sort of animal, and one in which, although organic evolution continues on its way, a fundamentally new sort of evolution has also appeared. The basis of this new sort of evolution is a new sort of heredity, the inheritance of learning. This sort of heredity appears modestly in other mammals and even lower in the animal kingdom, but in man it has incomparably fuller development and it combines with man's other characteristics unique in degree with a result that cannot be considered unique only in degree but must also be considered unique in kind. . . . This new evolution peculiar to man operates

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

directly by the inheritance of acquired characters, of knowledge and learned activities which arise in and are continually a part of an organismic-environmental system, that of social organization." We must admit our amazement at this concession by the writer of the most recently produced "Bible of the evolutionists." That is to say, generally speaking, artificial selection *plus* societal selection has taken over the future development of the evolutionary process. Yes, *man is unique in kind*—no doubt of it! If he were not, Simpson would never have written his book entitled *The Meaning of Evolution*. Moreover, this uniqueness *in kind* proves our point, namely, that artificial selection is of a different and higher order, and cannot rightly be included in what is generally called "natural" selection. *This certainly leaves the gap between the two kinds to be accounted for, and so destroys the notion of unbroken continuity of the alleged progressive development!* But even though mind and its activities are now considered as elements of what is called "nature," the fact remains that the artificial, and the so-called societal alleged to be resulting from it, is *not* the *per se* natural. Moreover, by definition, and by facts of human experience as well, artificial selection certainly proceeds according to the purposes of directing minds. Indeed, the concept of purposes, designs, ends, is implicit in the very word "selection," in whatever form that "selection" may be hypothesized. Thus mutations (of which man is now frequently said to have been one), resulting in progressively higher (more complex) forms, point unmistakably (as Trueblood, quoted above, insists) to a directing Divine Intelligence.

(11) *The general non-fertility of hybrids.* This fact, it seems, would militate against the evolution hypothesis. Moreover, subhuman 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 pro-

GENESIS

duced by seed or plant in what is called "volunteer" fashion. (12) *The modus operandi of emergence. The simple truth is that no one knows how a new species emerges or could emerge.* As Alfred Russel Wallace once remarked to Darwin: Your theory will account for the *survival* of an existing species, but it does not account for the *arrival* of a new species. This statement is as true today as it was when spoken almost one hundred years ago. As a matter of fact, all the theories of the *method* of evolution taken together still do not bring us any nearer to the solution of the basic problem of emergence. Vociferous and dogmatic affirmations are never substitutes for facts. *Moreover, evolution is largely variation, and variation may occur regressively as well as progressively. Evolution may "roll out" downward as well as upward.*

4. *Concerning Materialistic Evolutionism.* (1) 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 impersonal energy is their "god.") With disarming simplicity they proceed to describe all phenomena of the cosmos, including those of the life processes and the thought processes, in terms of a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" (or sub-atomic forces). 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 invented by some intelligent agent to serve some function, to gain some specific 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*. Evolutionists, as a rule, dislike to be called

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

materialists: they prefer to be known as *naturalists*, that is, essentially, deniers of the supernatural. However, it is obvious from the point of view of human experience itself that the totality of being was never brought into existence by human agency: as a matter of fact, man was the last species to put in appearance. Therefore, "nature," whether supernatural or not, is certainly *superhuman*. Materialistic evolutionists reject theism, the doctrine of a God who is Spirit (personal, John 4:24): the only God who could be responsive to human inclination and need. (2) The Christian cannot, of course, 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. 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. In the second place, materialistic evolutionism cannot be harmonized with the 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 over-all adaptation of nature to human life and its needs. As stated heretofore, the word *cosmos* means *order*; lacking this order, human science would be forever impossible, for the simple reason that science is man's discovery and description of the order which he finds to prevail 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*

GENESIS

around us. To adopt this view requires infinitely more faith than is required to accept the Eternal Purpose of the sovereign God.

5. *Concerning 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 Narratives of the Creation and the Fall? There are many well-informed and sincerely religious persons who hold that theistic evolutionism "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 is advised to consider the following matters of importance:

(1) There is a clear correspondence between the Genesis Cosmogony and present-day scientific thought on many points. (See my *Genesis*, Volume I, Part X, for a list of these harmonies).

(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; Ps. 33:6, 9; Ps. 148:6), but the inspired writer makes no effort whatsoever to inform us as to how it was done. It is 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."

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

(4) In the Genesis narrative itself, the teaching is implicit—if not actually explicit—that in creating the cosmos and all things in it, God operated through “secondary causes” (“laws of nature”) as well as through primary causation (direct action). This is evident from such statements as these: “Let the earth put forth grass,” etc. (v. 11), “Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures,” etc. (v. 20), “Let the earth bring forth living creatures,” etc. (v. 24), and even from the earlier decrees with reference to non-living forms of being, “Let there be light” (v. 3), “Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters” (v. 6), “Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear” (v. 9). In Scripture, God is pictured as exercising His power *directly* in some cases and with immediate results (e.g., Exo. 17:5-7; Lev. 10:1-2; Num. 16:31 ff.; 2 Ki. 4:2-7; 2 Chron. 26:16-21; Matt. 8:24-27, 9:18-26, 12-13; Mark 8:1-10; Luke 17:11-19, 22:50-51; John 2:1-11, 11:38-44; Acts 3:1-10, 8:6-8, 9:32-42, 13:11, 16:16-18, 19:11-12, 20:9-12; 1 Cor. 15:51-52; 1Thess. 4:13-17), and in other instances as achieving His ends gradually or by what is called “progressive development” (Gal. 3:8, Heb. 1:1-3, 1 Pet. 1:10-12, Isa. 28:9-10, Mark 4:26-29, Psal. 90:4, 2 Pet. 3:8). Divine action *by fiat* simply means that God decrees a thing to be done and it is done, but does not necessarily indicate *how* it is done or *how long a time* is involved in the doing of it (Psal. 148:1-6). We must never forget that time means nothing to God, that His realm (eternity) is that of *timelessness*. We always get into difficulties when we drag our concepts of mathematical time into the area of God’s timeless activity (2 Cor. 4:18). 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. All

GENESIS

law presupposes a lawgiver; therefore what we call "laws of nature" presuppose the Mind and Will of the Divine Lawgiver.

(5) Certainly the weight of all the evidence available, as explained in Volume One of this textbook series, is in support of the view that the "days" of the Genesis account were not solar days, but *aeonic* days; that is, indefinite periods of time. Thus it may be conceded that the Genesis narrative of the Creation can be thought of as allowing for all the time the evolutionists may see fit to muster up theoretically in support of their theory.

(6) Evidently Infinity in God has no reference to any kind of magnitude because God is a 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 (Psa. 148:5-6, 33:6, 9). Hence the problem before us is not one of *power*, but one of *method*. What method, then, did the Creator employ? 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 significant 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*. (See again our conclusion in Volume I, p. 595).

6. Concerning Evolutionism and the Narrative of the Fall.

(1) The first question that comes to our attention here is that of *relevance*. With respect to the Genesis narratives any human theory of origins, I should say, is to a large extent irrelevant, for various reasons: (a) because Genesis is pre-scientific chronologically, that is, it came into existence before human science had reached any significant stage of development, (b) because the book was composed for moral and spiritual ends only, (c) because

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

the subject-matter is presented in bold outlines only, designed to give us a panoramic picture of the order of the Creation without regard to details, and (d) hence, is not entirely irreconcilable with evolutionism of a kind which allows for the continuous and directed operation of Divine Power by the Divine Mind and Will. The religious truths emphasized in the book are not affected to any great extent by the scientific theory characteristic of any age. Hence, whether the Genesis account of the Creation, or that of the Fall, is scientific or not, is a false issue. The accounts were not designed to be such; as a matter of fact, no account of origins could be written that would always be in harmony with shifting scientific thought. To attack Genesis from the point of view that it must be in harmony with every detail of present-day scientific theory is to manifest either profound ignorance of the whole subject, and of Scripture especially, or probably a perverted will that raises false issues solely to discount the Biblical record. The astonishing fact is that the correspondence between Bible teaching and present-day scientific theory is greater than at any other time in the entire history of human thought. (This affirmation I am willing to defend at any time anywhere.) It would almost seem that the Holy Spirit looked down through the ages and gave us the facts regarding origins that would ultimately come to be in close harmony with direct human experience and with the most advanced secular science. (See again my *Genesis*, Volume I, Part X.)

(2) No scientific theory, evolutionism included, has ever cast any valid doubt on the facts presented in Genesis *in re* man, his origin, nature, and destiny, as known by means of human experience itself, such as the following: (a) that as to nature, he is a spirit-body (psychosomatic) unity, a corporeal frame vitalized by the Breath of God (Gen. 2:7); (b) that he has advanced far beyond the brute stage; (c) that he had a beginning as the handiwork

GENESIS

of a Creative Process (Intelligence and Will) which antedated him and which had already prepared the natural world and its orders, both non-living and living, for his entrance into it and his sojourn in it (otherwise their existence would have no meaning whatsoever); (d) that, as to his moral state, he is endowed with the power of choice, and hence is inherently capable of both good and evil; (e) that by virtue of this choice, his state is one of moral responsibility; and (f) that he is prone to do evil, to rebel against authority, even to try to play God; (g) that somewhere along the line, and somehow, he acquired a conscience.

(3) Certainly conscience came into being *potentially* when reason was actualized in the first *homo sapiens*. (Is not this power of thought the factor that validates the use of the term *homo sapiens* by the scientists?) Evidently, conscience became *actualized* when that which is designated the *natural moral law*—the law which is promulgated in human nature and in human natural relationships—was first violated by *homo sapiens*. (Cf. Psalms 8:3-9, Genesis 2:18-25, Romans 2:14-16). And certainly in the third chapter of Genesis, we have the account of the birth of conscience in man, whatever else may be implicit in this Narrative of the Fall. It will be recalled that Alexander Campbell describes this tragedy as a fall from man's original *natural* state into his present *unnatural* state. (Evil was never intended to be a part of man's natural state). Strong (ST, 658): "The translation of Enoch and Elijah, and of the saints that remain at Christ's second coming, seems intended to teach that death is not a necessary law of organized being, and to show what would have happened to Adam if he had been obedient. He was created a 'natural,' 'earthly' body, but might have attained a higher being, the 'spiritual,' heavenly, body without the intervention of death. Sin, however, has turned the normal condition of things into the rare exception (cf. 1

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Cor. 15:42-50). Since Christ endured death as the penalty of sin, death to the Christian becomes the gateway through which he enters into full communion with his Lord." That is to say, in Adam the 'natural,' had he continued upright (in unbroken obedience to God), might without death—by the process of transfiguration—have attained the 'spiritual' (cf. Gen. 5:24, 2 Ki. 2:11, Dan. 12:3, Matt. 17:1-3, Acts 26:12-15, 1 Thess. 4:13-17, 1 Cor. 15:50-55, Rom. 2:7, 1 Tim. 6:14-16).

(3) At this point let us heed words of caution from the pen of one of our pioneers, D. R. Dugan (*Herm.*, 47) as follows: "Before any man is ready to say that the Bible and science are not agreed, he should know two things: first, he should know all about the Bible; and second, he should know all about science. In the meantime, the best thing he can do will be to learn all he can of either one or both. It is not to be denied that we may know some things, at least approximately, and that so far as facts have been really introduced and tested, we may be governed by them, just to the extent of our absolute knowledge. But no interpreter should trouble himself to make exegesis keep up with scientific hypotheses. Science has no more right to lord it over religion than religion has to lord it over science. He who made the universe made the Bible, and when we come to understand them both, we will be delighted with their beautiful harmony. And it is, therefore, the privilege and duty of every man to push his investigations as far and as fast as he can." Truth (John 8:31-32, 17:17) may be said to exist in three forms, namely, (a) that which is, by its very nature, forever hidden from man (Deut. 29:29), (b) that which is neither hidden nor revealed, but is embodied in the very structure of the universe, both physical and moral, for man by study and research (science) slowly to spell out through the centuries (Gen. 1:28); and (c) that which is revealed for man's acceptance and ultimate redemption in spirit and

GENESIS

soul and body (Eph. 1:3-14, 3:1-12; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; 1 Thess. 2:13; Heb. 1:1-4; 1 Pet. 1:10-12). *The Bible has no antagonism toward, no fear of, truth in any form.*

(4) *With special reference now to the evolution hypothesis in relation to the Narrative of the Fall,* (a) I must say, in the first place, that I cannot agree with one statement which occurs above (in the excerpt appearing at the beginning of this Part of our text), namely, that "man began perfect." True it is that, as to *nature*, i.e., as a psychosomatic unity, he (Adam) was perfect, in the strict sense of the term as meaning "whole" or "complete" *as a person* (Gen. 1:27, 2:7; cf. what is said of Jesus in Heb. 1:3); as to *character*, however, that is, *morally* speaking, he was created *innocent*, but with the potentiality of achieving perfection (holiness) by his own voluntary steadfastness in obedience to the Will of God. Indeed, this is the *only* way of attaining holiness that is possible to any intelligent being (Matt. 5:8, 5:48, 7:13-14, 7:24-27; Rom. 2:4-11, 14:17; Heb. 10:10, 12:14; 2 Pet. 3:18, etc.). As a consequence of the fall into sin, Adam and his entire posterity (Rom. 3:23) must achieve holiness in the same way, but in what may properly be designated "the hard way" (Eph. 6:12-18, 2 Pet. 2:9-10). (b) It is surely true that the author of this Narrative of the Fall was not concerned with science or with any such problem as that of the correspondence of Biblical teaching and scientific theory. However, the Holy Spirit, as the ultimate Author, could surely have embodied the account in such general terms, such bold outlines, as to make it harmonious with scientific thought, and especially with the science of our own times. This appears to be the case in fact: the sole purpose of the account is religious; hence we have in this Narrative the record of what happens to every human being as he passes from a state of innocence into that of the actual experience of sin in his own life; and this indeed may be all that the Spirit intended to teach us by it.

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Perhaps He left the *how* of the matter for human science to spell out as best it can. But the fact remains that the Fall, as pictured in Genesis, was indeed a fall from an original state of innocence into that of the actual experience of sin and the *guilt* that accompanies that experience. This is about all we can say about it: and in this sense the Fall was *real*, both in itself and in its tragic consequences. Moreover, the very fact, born of universal experience, that man is in sin, prone to evil of all kinds, simply cannot be denied by any intelligently honest person. It is tragically—and often gruesomely—apparent in daily newspaper accounts of rape, incest, sex perversions, devil-worship, thrill murders, deceit, treachery, fraud, lawlessness of all kinds, not to mention genocide, strife, war, and violence that fill the earth in our age as in Noah's time (Gen. 6:5, 11, 12; Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-27). To deny this, and to deny that this is sin, is to be stupid with the worst kind of stupidity—that of a closed mind. This condition must be accounted for, and the most satisfactory account is that which is given us in the Genesis Narrative of the Fall.

(d) This writer's conviction is that the difference between man and the brute is *not one of degree*, but *one of kind*. However Strong's theory of Gen. 2:7 as indicating a "divine reinforcement of the process of life" which "turned the animal into man," 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. Moreover, should Strong's view be the correct one, *homo sapiens* (for obvious reasons I am using the scientific designation here) is no less *homo sapiens*, regardless of how he may have arrived on this terrestrial scene. Moreover, he has no known existing ancestors: those humanoid forms which are supposed to have existed prehistorically are now extinct, hence hypothetically identifiable only by isolated sparse

GENESIS

skeletal remains which have been found in different parts of the world. These remains of alleged prehistoric man 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*. Again, 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 the latter, as stated above, reason also appeared, and along with reason, conscience, which is the voice of practical reason. This means 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.

(e) When man actually first became man, regardless of what his ancestry may have been, hypothetically or actually, if there was any such ancestry of course, there was a change of some kind that could be regarded, I suppose, as a transition from innocence to awareness of moral law and the sense of guilt occasioned by violation of that law, and hence could be designated a "Fall." Again, it is evident that what is pictured as having occurred in Adam's case is precisely what occurs in the life of every human being on reaching the age of discretion: and perhaps this is the most important lesson which the Divine Author would have us learn from this Narrative, in which He is concerned chiefly, it would seem, with accounting for the observed fact of man's rebelliousness and lawlessness. I have no desire to stretch Scripture out of context, or to indulge fantastic interpretations, to force it into conformity with the science of any age, especially in view of this paramount fact that the design of the Narrative is religious

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

and not scientific. I cannot convince myself that man's depravity is simply a hang-over of his so-called "animal heritage": there is too much evidence from human experience that his own self-perverted will has much to do with his fallen state. To summarize: the essence of the Fall was *de facto* the birth of conscience: had Adam continued in unbroken obedience to God he would never have experienced the chiding of conscience and accompanying sense of guilt. This is about as far as anyone can go, or should go, in attempting to get at the heart of the Genesis Narrative: whether this can be harmonized with evolutionism certainly remains a moot question. *But the essential truth is unaffected in any case: that truth is that man is infected with the disease of lawlessness, however he may have caught this infection in the first place.* I shall be content, therefore, to accept by faith what the Bible teaches regarding this tragic state which has befallen the whole human race. *Human depravity is a fact of experience: how it originated may remain an inscrutable mystery to man in his present state. Hence, in view of the fact that science has no adequate explanation of the mystery, and certainly no adequate remedy to offer to alleviate the condition, let us be content to walk by faith and so to accept the Biblical account and with it the redemption which our Lord has provided for all who will meet the terms of covenant relationship by which, and by which alone, we can appropriate to ourselves the eternal verities of this Unspeakable Gift* (John 3:16, 2 Cor. 9:15, Eph. 2:8, 2 Pet. 1:4).

(f) Perhaps we should consider another possibility at this point, one which would seem at first glance to be far-fetched, but which "grows on one," so to speak, as one mulls it over in thought. I put it in the form of a question as follows: Could it be that we have in the story of Adam and Eve the account of a special creation of a Man and a Woman as distinct from the evolutionary origin of

GENESIS

the race as hypothesized by present-day biologists? Could Adam and Eve have been created to head up the physical creation, in a separate strain that was designed to produce the Messianic Line and its fulfilment in the Head of the spiritual creation (Rom. 5:12-15, 1 Cor. 15:45-49)? Could this be intimated in the statements occurring in Gen. 6:1-4, with respect to the intermingling of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men"? The idea is intriguing, to say the least.

(g) Finally, science arbitrarily rejects the "supernatural" and hence has only evolutionism to resort to as a "naturalistic" explanation of Creation. However, even though the complex of causes-and-effects which go to make up "nature" may be said to be "naturalistic," what would the Efficient Cause of this entire complex be designated? Certainly man did not set the cosmos into operation. Shall we not say, then, that the First Cause, the Cause of all causes-and-effects, even though conceived as operating within the framework of what is called "nature," is properly designated *supernatural*? Or shall we be content with the term *superhuman*? It is inconceivable that the Efficient Cause of the Totality of Being could be properly designated "natural" or "naturalistic."

In dealing with impressionable high school and college students who have been brainwashed into uncritical devotion to evolutionism, I try to impress upon them, first of all, that in studying this subject *we are not dealing with fact, but with theory*. I try to impress upon their minds the motivation, the antibiblical, even antireligious, bias which inspires the misplaced zeal manifested by devotees of the theory, pointing up the *a priori* assumptions, the verbose and extravagant, and even dogmatic, statements, and the play on words, all of which characterizes their methodology of promulgation. I try most of all to show them that the arguments which are marshaled to support the theory are basically *inferential*, and that grave doubts

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

exist that the inference is logically or empirically *necessary* inference. I try to show them that my objections to evolutionism, however, are based largely on the unscientific methodology that is used to promote it, and, as a matter of fact, its lack of genuine *scientific* corroboration; that I object to it even more on this score than on the supposition that it is in conflict with Biblical teaching. I emphasize the fact that the Bible, after all, was written in pre-scientific times, and solely for the purpose of presenting to man the *religious* truth with respect to his nature, origin and destiny; and the most amazing fact of all, namely, that its teaching, including especially that of the book of Genesis, corresponds in so many particulars to present-day scientific thinking. I urge them to study the pros and cons of the theory critically, and, even though accepting it provisionally, to await further developments in the area of the life sciences, holding to a sharp distinction especially between *fact* and *inference*, and under no circumstances to allow it to disturb, much less destroy, their confidence in the Bible or their Christian faith. (See my *Genesis*, Volume One, for my own general conclusions (pp. 595, 600, 601), for Dr. James Jauncey's comments on the theory of evolution (pp. 473, 573), and for discussions of the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge (pp. 509ff., and pp. 514ff.), respectively.)

* * * * *

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART SIXTEEN

1. State the problem of the relation of evolutionism and the Genesis account of the Fall.
2. Distinguish between *materialistic* evolution and *theistic* evolution.
3. Summarize the material presented in the first paragraph of this Part on the alleged conflict between evolutionism and the Genesis account of the Fall.
4. Summarize Strong's defense of theistic evolution.

GENESIS

5. State Trueblood's theory of the significance of evolutionism in relation to the doctrine of God.
6. Summarize the general attitude of confirmed evolutionists toward the Bible and toward religion in general.
7. What do we mean when we say that in this attitude "the wish is father to the thought"?
8. What is the arbitrary assumption which underlies all scientific research?
9. How is this problem of the Bible and science affected by "over-specialization" in the various fields of knowledge?
10. Show how excessive zeal leads to extravagant assertions in support of evolutionism, as illustrated in the excerpts from Bryan's lecture.
11. Are confirmed evolutionists willing to accept the views of those who find harmony between evolutionism and the Genesis Narratives?
12. Why do we affirm that evolutionism is a faith rather than a fact?
13. Show how the arguments presented to support evolutionism are *inferential* rather than factual.
14. How is the teaching of Heb. 11:3, and that of 2 Pet. 3:1-7, related to evolutionism?
15. Explain what is meant by the genetic fallacy, and show how it is erroneous.
16. State Thompson's view about the effect of evolutionism on the intellectual integrity of scientists.
17. What does Dr. Rhine have to say on this point?
18. List and explain what we call the "inadequacies" of evolutionism.
19. Discuss the problems of sex difference, mutations, specialized organs, heredity, instinct, artificial selection, and non-fertility of hybrids, in relation to evolutionism.
20. Would you say that anyone can explain *how* a new species can emerge? Explain your answer.

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

21. Why do we reject materialistic evolution?
22. State the facts by which this rejection is substantiated.
23. List the grounds on which theistic evolutionists defend their view.
24. Explain what is meant by *relevance* in dealing with the problem of evolutionism and the Fall.
25. List the facts presented in Genesis about man which are generally accepted by scientists.
26. Explain the relation between the appearance of the first *homo sapiens* and the birth of conscience.
27. What does the term *homo sapiens* mean?
28. Review Campbell's theory of the *natural*, *unnatural*, and *preternatural* states of man.
29. Show how Strong's view coincides with that of Mr. Campbell.
30. State Dungan's word of caution about attempting to make Biblical teaching conform to the scientific theories of any age?
31. Would you say that man could have attained immortality without falling into sin?
32. If your answer is in the affirmative, how—would you say—could he have done this?
33. In what sense was man created perfect?
34. Was he created morally perfect, or only with the potentiality of attaining moral perfection (holiness)? Give reasons for your answer.
35. What do we mean when we say that he was created innocent?
36. Would you say that the change from innocence to one of the activity of conscience could be regarded as the Fall? Explain your answer.
37. State our general conclusions about the relation between the evolution theory and the Genesis Narrative of the Fall.
38. To what extent, would you say, can they (1) be

GENESIS

harmonized, (2) not be harmonized. Explain your answers.

39. What basic truths about man's moral state does the Author of the Genesis Narrative seek to impress upon us?
40. Why do we take the position that the difference between man and the brute is not one of *degree*, but one of *kind*?
41. What essential change took place when man truly became *homo sapiens*?
42. Is it possible to fully explain man's depravity as the hang-over of his so-called "animal heritage"? If not, why not?
43. Can it be said unequivocally that the Cause of all causes-and-effects which go to make up the Totality of Being simply cannot be designated "natural" or "naturalistic"?
44. In view of the fact that science has no adequate explanation of man's rebelliousness, what attitude should the sensible person take with regard to it?
45. What does it mean to *walk by faith* in this present world?

* * * * *

The following summarization of evolutionism and its status in scientific thinking today appeared in an issue of the El Paso *Times* not so long ago. It was written (in answer to a reportorial questionnaire) by Dr. Thomas G. Barnes, Director of the Schellenger Research Laboratory, El Paso. With Dr. Barnes' permission I reproduce it here because I consider it an excellent presentation of the subject.

"1. What is the theory of evolution? It is the theory that all plants, animals, and man have descended from very simple types: roses from algae, peacocks from amoeba, etc.

"2. Has science shown evolution to be a fact? No. It is only theory. No real scientist can honestly classify it as a fact.

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

"3. Do all scientists subscribe to the theory? No. Many scientists do, but thousands of reputable scientists do not. Over a hundred research scientists, representing various fields of successful scientific accomplishment, have recently joined together to re-evaluate science from the viewpoint of creation as opposed to evolution.

"4. Natural selection (survival of the fittest, etc.) is supposed to be the means by which evolution works. Is there any evidence that natural selection has produced evolutionary change in the lifetime of any observer? No.

"5. Can the selection process be speeded up artificially? Yes.

"6. Can artificial selection produce changes? Yes. Variations are observed, but no true evolution has been observed.

"7. What is the difference between variation and evolution? Variation is change within restricted limits. It may include change in size, color, texture, etc. This type of change is common. Evolution, in principle, could cause change without limit. For true evolution to take place, a simple organism would have to change to a more complex organism: fish to land vertebrate, etc. This has never been proved.

"8. Have any experiments with artificial selection been carried to their limits. Yes. There have been many such experiments.

"9. Give an illustration of such experiments. The process of artificial selection in sugar beets was pursued to its limit in an experiment which began in 1800. Only the seeds from the sweetest beets in each crop were planted for the next crop. By 1878 by this selective process the beets had increased in sugar content from 6% to 17%, but this was the ultimate. No further increase in sugar content was attained even though the experiment was continued 40 years more. Variation had been produced, but no evolution.

GENESIS

"10. Does this ultimate limit of variation indicate that there are barriers to true evolution? Yes.

"11. Does the fossil record confirm the limits to the variation on each type of plant or animal? The fossil record indicates barriers, not continuous evolution.

"12. Can evolution be classified as a law? No. We have already mentioned that it is only theory. Laws have to be consistent with all the evidence. Evolution is not supported by satisfactory evidence.

"13. Is evolution consistent with the most accepted physical laws? No. The laws of thermodynamics contradict the theory of evolution. Attempts by evolutionists to show that living matter is not governed by the laws of thermodynamics have not been successful.

"14. Is evolution based on the probable or the improbable? On the improbable. The knowledgeable evolutionist admits that it is based on the improbable, but he says that if it is given enough time the improbable will happen. He uses the time element as an excuse for the failure of all experiments to verify without qualification any phase of evolution (as distinguished from variation)."

* * * * *

It will be recalled that Spinoza, the Jewish philosopher (1632-1677), set out in his *Ethica* to deal with the problems of how an immaterial Being (God) could create a material universe, only to "explain away" the problem at the end, simply by identifying God with the world, nature, the universe, etc. (the totality of being). His system was a rigid pantheism which "explained" little or nothing *in re* the basic problem with which he was trying to deal. In like manner, in recent years, the late French priest-scientist-philosopher, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, in his principal works, *The Divine Milieu* and *The Phenomenon of Man*, created a stir of some proportions in the academic world by undertaking to explain the *modus operandi* of evolution (as did Bergson earlier in his work entitled

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

Creative Evolution). Teilhard envisions evolution through a gradation of forms, from atomic particles up to human beings, in ever increasing complexity of structure, and along with it, the development of consciousness (Bergson uses the term "Spirit"). The result is a kind of *pan-psychism*. Man is the focal point in whom all facets of the evolutionary process converge, and in man reflective thought finally emerges. The unique feature of Teilhard's system is his concept that the ultimate reality of this cosmic development is the Incarnate Christ (not the "Superman" of Nietzsche, nor that of Samuel Butler, nor that of Shaw's *Man and Superman* or his *Back to Methuselah*), but the God-Man, who ultimately gathers all things up into Himself and truly becomes *all in all*. "The only universe," says Teilhard, "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" (PM, 290, 311). Like that of Bergson, Teilhard's system was an honest effort to describe the *modus operandi* of the evolutionary process. However, we are safe in saying that both Bergson and Teilhard have failed to explain how a new species emerges—indeed how novelty of any kind enters into the process—just as Spinoza failed to explain how an immaterial God could have created this material world. *Obviously, these are mysteries which lie beyond the scope of human comprehension* (Job 11:7, Isa. 55:8-9). Nevertheless Teilhard's presentation is sufficiently intriguing to merit an analysis of it, in its main outlines, for whatever it may be worth to the student. One thing can be said in its favor: it has received little but scorn, and even sneers, from the materialistic evolutionists. The following diagram and explanatory matter will suffice, perhaps, to place the Teilhardian view before readers of the present text.

GENESIS

OMEGA: Creation and Creator Become One
Through Christ

Plerome

Socialization

Homo sapiens

N O O G E N E S I S

(from *nous*, "reason," "mind")

Hominisation

Threshold of Reflection

Primates

A N T H R O P O G E N E S I S

(from *anthropos*, "man.")

Mammals, etc.

Animals (Consciousness)

Plants Cellular Processes

Monocellulars Bacteria

B I O G E N E S I S

(from *bios*, "life")

Threshold of Life

Minerals

Molecules Crystals

Atoms

Granules of Energy

C O S M O G E N E S I S

(from *cosmos*, "order"—of the non-living world)

A L P H A

(Read upward, according to what Teilhard
calls the Axis of Ascending Complexity and
Consciousness)

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

EXPLANATORY: Evolution, according to Teilhard, moves along a kind of vertical line which he calls "the axis of ascending complexity and consciousness," each cosmic particle (monad) being composed of a "within" (of psychic or radial energy, also called psychism, which is not amenable to physical sense), and a "without" (physical or "tangential" which is measurable): both form an indivisible "spirit-matter" entity. (Hence this must not be thought of as a dualism.) 1. *Period of "Cosmogogenesis."* The more complex the matter becomes, the more consciousness (psyche) it gains. Evolution is simply the continuous intensification of the psychical or radial energy. Cosmogogenesis is the process of *becoming*, on an evolutionary line between a past and a future. The point of departure from the axis is designated ALPHA, or the Alpha Point. Through "granulation" of energy the first elementary particles took form, and over an unimaginable stretch of time assumed the status of what present-day science calls atomic nuclei, atoms, or molecules (these are simply tools of explanation in physics). The birth of our planet probably occurred about five million years ago. 2. *Period of "Biogenesis."* When the "corpuscular number" in a particle reached a certain level matter "came alive." This "vitalisation" occurred when matter crossed the threshold of life and marked the beginning of the age of biogenesis. As physical matter became more and more complex, the psychism of the individual monad increased proportionately. 3. *Period of "Anthropogenesis."* At the point when the brain reaches the necessary degree of complexity, the threshold of reflection was crossed and man was born. This power of thought made man a being distinct from all other species. This was "not a matter of change of degree, but of a change of nature, resulting from a change of state" (PM, 166). The hominisation of the species introduced the age of anthropogenesis. This occurred probably at some point within the last million years. Concerning *instinct* in animals, Teilhard writes: "We realise better in our minds the fact and the reason for the *diversity* of animal behavior. From the moment we regard evolution as primarily psychical transformation, we see there is not *one* instinct in nature, but a multitude of forms of instincts each corresponding to a particular solution of the problem of life. The 'psychical' make-up of an insect is not and cannot be that of a vertebrate; nor can the instinct of a squirrel be that of a cat or an elephant: this is in virtue of the position of each on the tree of life" (PM, 167). "The individual and instantaneous leap from instinct to thought" marked the beginning of "hominisation," which then advanced by means of "the progressive phyletic spiritualisation in human civilisation of all the forces contained in the animal world" (PM, 180). As Julian Huxley puts it, in his Introduction: "The intensification of mind, the raising of mental potential" is regarded "as being the necessary consequence of complexification" (PM, 11-16). 4. *The Period of Noogenesis.* (From the Greek *noesis*, from *noein*, "to perceive," from *nous*, "mind": hence, *noesis* in English, which, in philosophy, means purely intellectual apprehension.) This phase began as a result of the gradual evolution of mental powers, with the appearance of the first *homo sapiens*. (There are different races, Teilhard emphasizes, but only *one homo sapiens*.) Evolution has now reached the stage at which major physical development has lost significance. Science holds that man is unique in nature because of his brain processes, not because his brain is the biggest in capacity but because it is more complex. According to Teilhard, "the noosphere (and more generally the world) represents a whole that is not only closed but also *centred*. Because it contains and engenders consciousness, space-time is necessarily of a *convergent* nature. Accordingly, its enormous layers, followed in the right direction, must

GENESIS

somewhere ahead become involuted to a point which we might call *Omega*, which fuses and consumes them integrally in itself" (PM, 259). At the present time we are in the period of socialisation in which, according to Teilhard, mankind becomes more and more united and integrated. This will come about as a consensus of mankind will gradually replace the growing capacity of the individual intellect because the human brain will cease to grow. This common consciousness will lift humanity to a higher level. Man inevitably continues to socialize: it is his nature to do so; hence all things will converge at one center, Omega, the point where humanity and the universe is bound to converge in the cosmic Christ.

What roles are played by God and Christ in the Teilhardian system? He puts the totality of being in the hands of the omnipresent God. He places man in the Divine Milieu, yet in such a way that man is not depersonalized in spite of ever increasing socialization. On the contrary, it is this personal link which connects each of us to God, who is the center, and the motor, so to speak, of the evolutionary process. We become God's partner in leading the world forward to the Omega point. For some persons, man is the center, the only point of adoration in the totality of being; for others, man is little or nothing in this grandiose universe—he is lost in it. Neither position is right. Referring to Paul's sermon on the Areopagus, Teilhard writes (DM, 25): "God who has made man in order that he may find him—God whom we try to grasp through the experiment of our lives—this God is as tangible and present as the atmosphere in which we are submerged. He surrounds us from all sides like the world itself." Man cannot escape the Divine Milieu. Each right action brings him into closer communion with Christ. "Whatsoever ye do," writes the Apostle, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3:17). This means we should always act in close fellowship with our Lord. The totality of man's life, even in its most "natural" aspects, is sanctifiable. From this point of beginning, the Christian life receives its content and direction, how and where to go. How does man enter upon this path? By purifying his intentions and acting according to the Will of God. As man adheres to the creative power of God, he becomes its instrument, or even more, its living extension. Man is thus united with God and in God on this earth in a common love to create. And in spite of the individual's failures and sins the world as a whole will achieve victory over evil, because God is on man's side. Mankind is assured that the universe, all creation, will rejoin the One when all evolution shall have converged in the point Omega. This will be the mysterious Plerome, where Creator and Creation will be one totality, without, however, adding anything essential to God. The active center of the Plerome in which everything is united, the creative Soul in whom everything is consummated, is Jesus Christ. "Religion and science are the two conjugated faces or phases of one and the same act of complete knowledge—the only one which can embrace the past and the future of evolution so as to contemplate, measure, and fulfill them (DM, 284, 285). Note well the following concluding statements (PM, 293, 294): "Is the Kingdom of God a big family? Yes, in a sense it is. But in another sense it is a prodigious biological operation—that of the Redeeming Incarnation. As early as in St. Paul and St. John, we read that to create, to fulfill and to purify the world is, for God, to unify it by uniting it organically with himself. How does He unify it? By partially immersing himself in things, by becoming 'element,' and then, from this point of vantage in the heart of the matter, assuming the control and leadership of what we now call evolution. Christ, principle of universal vitality because sprung up as man among men, put himself in the

EVOLUTIONISM AND THE FALL

position (maintained ever since) to subdue under himself, to purify, to direct, and superanimate the general ascent of consciousness into which he inserted himself. By a perennial act of communion and sublimation, he aggregates to himself the total psychism of the earth. And when he has gathered everything together and transformed everything, he will close in upon himself and his conquests, thereby rejoining, in a final gesture, the divine focus he has never left. Then, as St. Paul tells us, *God shall be all in all*. . . . The universe fulfilling itself in a synthesis of centres in perfect conformity with the laws of union. God, the Centre of centres. In that final vision the Christian dogma culminates." (Cf. Eph. 1:5-12, I Cor. 15:20-28, Col. 1:9-23, Rev. 1:8, 1:17-18).

It will thus be seen that Teilhard's God is essentially *theistic* rather than pantheistic: He is presented as the Eternal Being, in Himself separate from the creation, and as immersing Himself into all created being as the "center" and "motor" of the evolutionary process. His portrayal of the Omega Point as the ultimate fusion of Creation and Redemption in the Beatific Vision (Union with God) is hardly a variation from the Apostle Peter's description of the "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13; cf. Matt. 5:8, 1 Cor. 13:12, 1 John 3:2, Rev. 21:1-8, 22:1-5). It strikes this writer that the most obvious weakness in the Teilhardian exposition is his failure to recognize the juridical aspect of the totality of being, and his consequent failure to deal adequately with the fact of evil and its consequences, including the Scripture doctrines of judgment, rewards, and punishments. (See Psa. 89:14, John 5:28-29, Matt. 25:31-46, Rom. 2:1-16, 2 Thess. 1:7-10, Acts 17:30-31, Rev. 20:11-15, etc.) This, of course, is a tragic lacuna in all the branches of human knowledge in our day.