

# Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

## Questions and Considerations to Clarify Views on the Creation Account

1.) Genre: What is the key question(s) Genesis seeks to answer or address? Is there a different goal or literary style between chapters 1 and 2; or chapters 1-11 and the remaining book?

a. “**Why?**” (Why do we and our earth exist? Why did God create that which exists?) appears to be primary line of questioning with the goal of articulating God as Creator of an ordered cosmos which He fills with life of which humanity is the pinnacle of creation for His good pleasure. The genre is a combination of prose and historical narrative. Genesis is not poetry, yet it also does not seek to answer the ‘how’ of God’s creation. Therefore, we should avoid presuming it should be written to accommodate our modern Western scientific perspectives. Nevertheless, reason and Scripture are not mutually exclusive. Note, also, that God, in the Bible, is presumed to exist.

i. Answers to “**why**” questions typically have significant Gospel-centered implications and will likely contribute to key Biblical doctrines.

2.) Science: What is the place of Science for the Christian and its relationship to Scripture? (**Romans 1:19-20**; Copernicus- a contemporary to Thomas Cranmer, followed by Galileo). How will this relate to our understanding of a literal and true Historical Adam later on in our study of Genesis (ref. Lennox, p. 61)?

a. “Modern man makes assumptions about the world that are completely different from those of the second millennium B.C. Consequently when we read Genesis, we tend to grab hold of points that were of quite peripheral interest to the author of Genesis and we overlook points that are fundamental. By looking at the oriental background and the place of Gen. 1-11 within the whole book, we hope to escape this particular pitfall and understand Genesis as it was originally intended. Gen. 1-11 is a tract for the times, challenging ancient assumptions about the nature of God, the world, and mankind. The balance of material in Genesis shows where ...interest lies, with the patriarchs rather than with the primeval history. But we modern readers with a world-view molded by modern science find it hard to relate Genesis to the rest of our thinking. It is my conviction that many of our problems are caused by misunderstanding the original intentions of Genesis. When the...major points are grasped, many of the clashes between [the author’s] world-view and ours are eliminated. The ancient oriental background to Gen. 1-11 shows it to be concerned with rather different issues from those that tend to preoccupy modern readers. It is affirming the unity of God in the face of polytheism, his justice rather than his caprice, his power as opposed to his impotence, his concern for mankind rather than his exploitation. And whereas Mesopotamia clung to the wisdom of primeval man, Genesis records his sinful disobedience” (Wenham, pp. xlv-lliii).

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

3.) Literal Sense: What does 'literal' mean and how does it depend on genre and authorial intent (cf. The Revelation combines the Apocalyptic, Epistolary, and Prophetic genres, and this is key for how we interpret it). What is the different between 'literal' and 'literalistic' understandings? What is the role of phenomenological language in our understanding (or misunderstanding) of Scripture (e.g. **Psalm 50:1** in comparison or contrast to Copernicus and Galileo who advanced that it is the Earth that revolves around the Sun)? How do we understand metaphorical language in our day-to-day usage and in the Bible (e.g. "That car was flying down the road." Jesus says of Himself, "I am the door."). We also must remember that it is what the text actually says (keeping in mind authorial intent, genre, historical context, and original language, etc.) that is authoritative and inspired; not what we interpret it to mean (this is also the difference between a fallen human 'grid'/hermeneutic that may eclipse the gospel in contrast to a Gospel-Centered lens/hermeneutic). This should place us in humility, submission and dependence upon God's grace for understanding; avoiding dogmatizing things that are not dogmatically articulated.

a. **verse 5 yom** – (Hebrew) = English 'day' with and without definite article **ha** – (Hebrew) = English 'the'. First five days there is no definite article: Literally, 'day 1', 'day 2'... The Sixth and Seventh Days with the definite article are distinct in some way (Basil the Great).

i. **Genesis 1:1-2:4** use 'day' in three ways (both in English and Hebrew)  
1. - 12 hour daytime; daylight 2. – 24 hour day 3. – an epoch; period of time

ii. Wenham (contra Poythress and others) commenting on verse 5 writes, "There can be little doubt that here 'day' has its basic sense of a 24-hour period. The mention of morning and evening [probably the mention of the evening before the morning reflects the Jewish concept that the day begins and dusk, not at dawn], the enumeration of the days, and the divine rest on the seventh show that a week of divine activity is being described here" (p. 19).

\*see Wenham's further discussion on this below under Overview of Genesis and Review of Creation

b. Three Views of Creation Account: 1. – 24 hour view of (7 24 hour days of one earth week about 6,000 years ago; 2. – Day-Age view (days are chronological but unspecified in period of length); 3. – Framework view (logical as opposed to chronological order; genre is literary or artistic and breaks off in triads)

c. **verses 1-3** Note that the initial creation act is distinct/separated from the six days of creation that follow it. Therefore, 'the beginning' did not necessarily take place on day 1, but Genesis does not tell us how long before. The narrative tense begins in verse 3 with 'yom.' In commenting on the four possible understandings of the syntax of verses 1-3, Wenham advocates for the more traditional view stating, verse 1 "is a main clause describing the first act of creation. [Verses] 2 and 3 describe subsequent phases in God's creative activity. [Verse 1] implies that God is the sovereign creator of the whole universe, not just Israel's personal God. [Verse 2] therefore describes the state of the earth before the first divine command in v. 3 (pp. 11-15). "Logically, one could believe

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

that Genesis is depicting the 24 hour days of creation *and* a very ancient universe” (Lennox).

- i. Could each day, representing a 24-hour-day one day per earth week, be separated from one another by an unspecified period of time?

“What we are now suggesting in addition is that the individual days might well have been separated from one another by unspecified periods of time. On this view, therefore, the six creation days themselves could well have been days of normal length, spaced out at intervals over the entire period of time that God took to complete his work. The outworking of the potential of each creative fiat would occupy an unspecified period of time after that particular creation day. One consequence of this is that we would expect to find what geologists tell us we do find – fossil evidence revealing the sudden appearance of new levels of complexity. ...this view contains elements of each of the three dominant interpretations, but differs from each of them at particular points. It sees no difficulty with the six creation days being normal days as in the twenty-four-hour view, but it does not agree that they form a single earth week. It accepts the common day-age and framework view of the seventh day as a long period of time, but differs from those views for the first six days, in holding that each of the creation days *inaugurates* a period of outworking but is not coterminous with that period” (pp. 54-55 of Lennox).

What about the notion of parenthetical remarks for each of the first six days of creation?

A variant of the aforementioned approach and present in Genesis 1:3-5 as an example “is ‘basically an account of the great creative fiats which were uttered upon the six (presumably literal, consecutive) days. Inserted into this primary narrative is a whole series of parentheses which describe the subsequent fulfillment of the fiats. The outworkings of these fiats, of course, could have taken any amount of time to occur. The fiats of God are uttered swiftly, but his mills grind slowly” (Lennox, p. 56).

1. How are we to understand the ‘problematic’ Day 4 (pp. 58-60 of Lennox)?

Sun, stars, moon *appeared* behind the clouds of a heated atmosphere cooling down with the result of dissipating steam/smoke **or** God *appointed* their proper functions of these luminaries which already existed as

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

indicated in margin of ESV. Note how phenomenological language (how things appears to the human eye or experience) may be important as well in **Genesis 1:14**

4.) Sabbath: (cf. **John 5:17**) – the seventh, as well as the sixth, day is unique with the definite article ‘ha’. “God is resting from creation activity; and he is still resting up to this present day. That is, we are still today in God’s Sabbath rest. God, however, is not resting from all activity. In particular, he does not rest from the work of upholding the universe and the work of salvation and redemption...” (Lennox, pp. 50-51).

### 5.) Resources:

- A. David Jackman sermon on Genesis 1:1-25 from Proclamation Trust which is linked on St. Patrick’s website on the resource page.
- B. Lennox, John C., “Seven Days that Divide the World” (Zondervan)
- C. Vern S. Poythress, “Redeeming Science: *A God-Centered Approach*.”
- D. Gordon J. Wenham, “World Biblical Commentary: *Genesis 1-15*.”
- E. *Secondary Resources to be considered after the aforementioned*
  - 1. Keller’s Biologos (aka: Theistic Evolution or Evolutionary Creationism) view that contributes to an affirmation of an Historical Adam that can be supported by both Scientific discovery and Biblical evidence
  - 2. Heiser’s Biblical Theology of the Divine Council that contributes to a comprehensive cosmological redemptive-historical narrative and addresses the issues of **Genesis 6:4**

> With these, as with the other primary resources and various views of the creation account (e.g. three views previously mentioned regarding the Six Creation Days), one does not have to agree with the author. Key questions to ask are “Can their views be supported biblically?”; “Can their views remain valid when seen through the Gospel-lens?”; “Do they maintain a high view of Scripture as the inerrant, inspired, and authoritative Word of God?” If the answer is ‘yes’ to these questions, we should avoid being too quick to dismiss, much more condemn, their views but, rather, we should be gracious and humble in allowing God’s Word to do His work in His People by His Spirit over time, including us. If something threatens our understanding of Scripture, such as that which may surface from the scientific world, do not panic! God is sovereign and true, even over our scientific (mis-)understanding and our (mis-) interpretations of Scripture.

# Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

## Considerations to Affirm the Biblical Attestation of An Historical Adam and God's Special Purpose for Humanity

### Faith and Reason:

#### Reference **Acts 17:1-9**

Article from Ligonier Ministries, "...we briefly noted how the work of Galileo helped further our understanding of the Bible and nature. In his day, however, Galileo was placed under house arrest for advocating Copernicus' theory that the earth revolves around the sun and not vice versa. It was a misunderstanding of Scripture's use of phenomenological language that contributed to the conflict with Galileo [cf. Psalm 50:1]. Since the Enlightenment, many have viewed faith and reason as opposed to one another, with theology in the realm of faith and natural science in the realm of reason. This fails to recognize that faith and reason operate in both. Many theologians neglect deductive logic and inductive reasoning, preferring an irrational faith. But scientists can ignore logic and make irrational conclusions."

### \*Overview of Genesis and Review of Creation:

"It has been unfortunate that one device which our narrative uses to express the coherence and purposiveness of the creator's work, namely, the distribution of the various creative acts to six days, has been seized on and interpreted over-literally, with the result that science and Scripture have been pitted against each other instead of being seen as complementary. Properly understood, Genesis justifies the scientific experience of unity and order in nature. Finally, at best, all language about God is analogical. Words used to describe him and his acts must inevitably be human words [aka: 'divine accommodation'], but they do not have quite the same meaning when applied to him as when they refer to men. In speaking of God as father, we do not assign him all the attributes of human fatherhood, Similarly, in speaking of his creating the world in six days, we do not identify his mode of creation with human creativity nor need we assume his week's work was necessarily accomplished in 144 hours. By speaking of six days of work followed by one day's rest, Gen. 1 draws attention to the correspondence between God's work and man's and God's rest as a model for the Sabbath, but that does not necessarily imply that the six days of creation are the same as human days. The Bible-verses-science debate has, most regrettably, sidetracked readers of Gen 1. Instead of reading the chapter as a triumphant affirmation of the power and wisdom of God and the wonder of his creation, we have been too often bogged down in attempting to squeeze Scripture into the mold of the latest scientific hypothesis or distorting scientific facts to fit a particular interpretation. When allowed to speak for itself, Gen. 1 looks beyond such minutiae. Its proclamation of the God of grace and power who undergirds the world and gives it purpose justifies the scientific approach to nature. Gen 1., by further affirming the unique status of man, his place in the divine program, and God's care for him, gives hope to mankind that atheistic philosophies can never legitimately supply" (Wenham, pp. 39-40).

"It is one thing to wrestle with the meaning of the days of Genesis; it is another to understand, apply, and live the whole message of Genesis. And if we are not doing the latter, I am not sure that the former will profit us much. What, therefore, should our attitude be to others who do not agree with us, whatever view we hold? Surely the old adage has got it more or less right: 'In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; and in all things, charity'" (Lennox, pp. 116).

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

The diverse views and interpretations of the creation of the cosmos fall into the same category of non-divisive (e.g., one's view is not a litmus test for one's biblical orthodoxy and affirmation of the Gospel) doctrinal issues such as differing views on baptism (credo- or paedobaptism), Lord's Supper (discerning the 'body'), eschatology (pre-, a-, post-millennium), church polity (congregational, presbyteral, episcopal), etc. This is where confessional statements or formularies may help shape our views (The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, Heidelberg Catechism, Westminster Confession and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, all of which have Anglican (Reformed English) Divines represented). Nevertheless, confessional statements are always secondary to biblical authority and the perspicuity (clarity) of Scripture for that which is necessary for salvation.

The primary message of Genesis 1-2:4 centers upon God and Who is presumed to exist outside and apart from that which He creates. "The assertion that God created the physical universe is of paramount importance. It answers the question, why is there something rather than nothing? It implies that this universe cannot explain itself... It tells us that this material universe is not the ultimate reality. God is. [God is the eternal creator of all things.] Genesis 1:1 anticipates the fuller revelation given to us by John at the beginning of his gospel in the New Testament...(John 1:1-3; cf. Hebrews 11:3, Revelation 4:11). God is eternal and uncreated; he did not come to be; he always was. The universe, on the other hand, did 'come to be.' It was not always there – another strong confirmation, by the way, of ex nihilo [out of nothing] creation. [God is distinct from His creation.] Matter is made out of nothing, not out of God. Nor is God the remote deistic 'god of the scientists'... Indeed, the main bulk of the Genesis narrative is devoted to relationships between human beings and God – and, of course, relationships among human beings themselves [cf. The Summary of the Law; Mark 12:28-34]. God is personal...not a force. God is a fellowship [Who] creates by His Word [and] has a goal in creation. Planet Earth is special. It was created with an ultimate purpose – that of having human beings on it. So, both Genesis and science say that the universe is geared to supporting human life. But Genesis says more. It says that you, as a human being, bear the image of God. That makes you unique. It gives you incalculable value" (Lennox, pp. 93-99).

### Genesis 1:26-31

Wenham on verse 26:

**Plural "us"/"our"** – "Jewish commentators have generally held that the plural is used because God is addressing his heavenly court, i.e., the angels (cf. Isa. 6:8). ...the use of the singular verb 'create' in 1:27 does, in fact, suggest that God worked alone in the creation of mankind. 'Let us create man' should therefore be regarded as a divine announcement to the heavenly court, drawing the angelic host's attention to the master stroke of creation, man. As Job 38:4, 7 puts it: 'When I laid the foundation of the earth...all the sons of God shouted for joy' (cf. Luke 2:13-14). Some scholars...have suggested that this is an example of a plural of majesty. Jöüson's observation...that 'we' as a plural of majesty is not used with verbs has led to the rejection of this interpretation. It is now universally admitted that [adumbrating the Trinity] was not what the plural meant to the original author. If the writer of Genesis saw in the plural only an allusion to the angels, this is not to exclude [the interpretation of the Trinity]

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

entirely as [the fuller meaning] of the passage. Certainly, the NT sees Christ as active in creation with the Father, and this provided the foundation for the early Church to develop a Trinitarian interpretation. But such insights were certainly beyond the horizon [of original authorial intent]" (pp. 27-28).

This insight will be critical in how Genesis 6:4 "sons of God" is interpreted.

Reference Heiser's work on The Divine Council

**Prepositions "in"/"like"** – 'according to/after the pattern of'

**"Image" and "Likeness"** – "The image of God must characterize man's whole being, not simply his mind or his soul on the one hand or his body on the other. ...the OT does not sharply distinguish the spiritual and material realms in this way. The image makes God's representative on earth. That man is made in the divine image and is thus God's representative on earth was a common oriental view of the king. Furthermore, man is here bidden to rule and subdue the rest of creation, an obviously royal task..., and Psalm 8 speaks of man as having been created a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and made to rule the works of God's hands. The allusions and functions of royalty are quite clear in Psalm 8. ...the divine image makes man God's vice-regent on earth. Because man is God's representative, his life is sacred. " (pp. 30-32).

Heiser = human's are God's "imagers" here on earth

The Son of God in the Person of Jesus fulfills: Priest, King and Prophet;  
the Only Mediator and the Father's eternal Co-regent of the Divine Council

Wenham on verse 28:

"Like the animals, man is to 'be fruitful and multiply.' But whereas v. 22 simply gives a command, this verse adds 'and God said to them,' thus drawing attention to the personal relationship between God and man. Furthermore, man is told to 'subdue and rule' the earth and its animal inhabitants, thereby fulfilling his role as God's image-bearer on earth (cf. v. 26). But the focus in Genesis is on the fulfillment of the blessing of fruitfulness. This command, like others in Scripture, carries with it an implicit promise that God will enable man to fulfill it. It is repeated to Noah after the flood (9:1), and the patriarchs are reminded of this divine promise (17:2, 20: 28:3; 35:11). The genealogies of Gen. 5, 9, 11, 25, 36, 46 bear silent testimony to its fulfillment, and on his deathbed Jacob publicly notes the fulfillment of the divine word (48:4; cf. 47:27). Here, then, we have a clear statement of the divine purpose of marriage: positively, it is for the procreation of children; negatively, it is a rejection of the ancient oriental fertility cults. God desires his people to be fruitful. Because man is created in God's image, he is king over nature. He rules the world on God's behalf. Similarly, mankind is here commissioned to rule nature as a benevolent king, acting as God's representative over them and therefore treating them in the same way as God who created them" (p. 33).

Wenham on verses 29-30:

"God's provision of food for newly created man stands in sharp contrast to Mesopotamian views which held that man was created to supply the gods with food."

### Genesis 2:1-3:

Wenham on the Sabbath:

"The seventh day is the very first thing to be hallowed in Scripture, to acquire that special status that properly belongs to God alone. In this way Genesis emphasizes the sacredness of the Sabbath. Coupled with the threefold reference to God resting from all

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

his work on that day, these verses give the clearest of hints of how man created in the divine image should conduct himself on the seventh day” (p. 36).

Lennox on the Sabbath:

In Hebrews 4:9-10, we have another example of the writer of this letter using the Sabbath “concept from Genesis as a metaphor for something real at a deeper level. In this passage, the expression ‘God’s works’ refers to the work of creation from which God rested on the seventh day. God did the creating, and then he rested from it. We inherit a universe we did not create. ‘The earth is not ours, but God’s... The Sabbath is a weekly reminder of the integrity of nature and the boundaries of human striving...’ with which the passage of Hebrews is concerned. All of us long for rest...from the constant pressure to achieve. We are restless beings [but] Jesus’ invitation is clear [in Matthew 11:28-30]. And that, says the letter to Hebrews, is where the Sabbath can help us. Not now at the level of resting one day in seven, but in understanding the principle that is involved. We inherit a creation that we didn’t work for, merit, or earn. In that sense, we rest in the work God has done. Entering into God’s spiritual rest – receiving his forgiveness, salvation and peace – proceeds in exactly in the same way. God has completed the work on which salvation rests: the death of Christ for human sin on the cross. In order to enter God’s rest, we must rest on the work Christ has done – not on the work we do. Paul makes this principle crystal clear [in Romans 4:4-5]” (pp. 112-115).

### Considerations on Science, Evolution, Death before the Fall, and The Historical Adam (Lennox pp. 69-89 and 160-186)

“...in saying that God made man of the dust of the ground, Genesis seems to be going out of its way to imply a direct special creation act, rather than suggesting that humans arose, either by natural processes or by God’s special activity, out of preexisting hominids or, indeed, Neolithic farmers.

[*Personal Reflection*: Therefore, Lennox, a renowned mathematician, disagrees with the conclusions drawn by several Reformed/Evangelical biblical scholars (e.g., Timothy Keller) who support the possibility of Theistic Evolution (aka: Biologos or Creational Evolution). Furthermore, Lennox touches on something that is also important; the categorizations of nature into kinds, or types (inanimate objects, vegetation, animals not in the image of God, humans, angels, etc.), that seems to be distinct and are intended, because of God’s created orderliness, to maintain their own status and not to *cross boundaries*. This is important when we look further into the Pentateuch/Torah such as in Genesis 6:4 and Leviticus. This understanding can be used to deny **macro**evolution (trans-species evolvment; theory/worldview of evolution, such as Darwinism which has fallen into disrepute, even in the atheistic scientific community) yet believe in aspects of **micro**evolution (intra-species/intraspecific evolvment and development; such as physiological and psychological adaptations to natural or social environments). Conclusively, we must avoid being too quick to fall into unnecessary exclusivist and overly dichotomized thinking with such issues.]

“..according to Genesis, you cross neither the gulf between nonlife and life nor the gulf between animals and human beings by unguided natural processes. God has to speak his creative Word in both instances. Without God speaking there is an unbridgeable discontinuity. The image of God in man was not produced as a result of blind matter fumbling its unguided way through myriad different permutations. Thus Genesis challenges atheism’s fundamental assertion that human

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

life has appeared without the activity of God's mind [like that of a painter with his own paints], so that there is nothing special about human beings.

[*Personal Reflection*: This is the Gospel!!! When we were still dead in our trespasses and unable to do anything to save ourselves, God saves us through His Word and makes us a New Creation!] WOW!

"[If there were other 'people', such as more evolved Neolithic farmers (which already contradicts Genesis 2:5)...it is hard to imagine that there was neither human sin nor human death in the world in the time before God chose to reveal himself to a particular pair [namely two selected individuals called 'Adam' and 'Eve']. It then becomes difficult to make sense of the biblical teaching that 'sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men' (Rom. 5:12). How, for example, could the sin of the chosen farmer, Adam, cause the death of those humans who had lived before him? Surely it is crucial to the theology of salvation that Adam was the first actual member of a human race physically distinct from all creatures that preceded him? Furthermore, in one of the curious ironies of evolutionary theory, Alexander argues that human evolution has stopped. Might not the true situation be that it never got started in the first place – that human beings were a direct creation of God?

[*Personal Reflection*: A Real Physical Historical Adam **must** be affirmed, and this is, in my opinion, a Gospel issue. Jesus and Paul both affirmed a real historical Adam, and the reality of an historical Adam is an essential and underlying premise of the Apostle's deep, soteriology (knowledge, or understanding, of salvation) outlined in Romans 5-8.]

[Paul] says that death passed upon all *human beings* as a result of Adam's sin; he does not say [however] that death passed upon *all living things*. That is, what Scripture actually says is that *human* death is a consequence of sin. That makes sense. Humans are moral beings, and human death is the ultimate wages of moral transgression. We do not think of plants and animals in terms of moral categories. We do not accuse the lion of sinning when he kills an antelope or even a human being. Paul's careful and deliberate statement would appear to leave open the question of death at levels other than human. Indeed, since fruit and vegetables are explicitly mentioned as (God-given) diet in Genesis, plant life can scarcely be an issue here. Plant death cannot therefore have been a consequence of the first human sin, even though plant death is death. What about the animals? Whales, for instance, are mammals, and they do not live on green vegetation. Their food is living sea-food; and, so, by eating, whales cause death. The same is true of many sea and land creatures. Had they some alternative source of food before Adam sinned? Hardly. Now, the question will at once arise as to what Paul then means by his later statement: 'For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to corruption and obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God' (Romans 8:20-21). Surely, it will be said, this must mean that all death is a result of human sin? Once more we need to observe exactly what is being said. Paul speaks of decay and corruption. Think of what happens to flowers. Daffodils can get disease. However, daffodils, whether diseased or not, die down in the early summer. Only the bulbs are left, which then grow again the following year. Is that process of dying down the same thing as disease? Surely not. It is part of what we call the cycle of nature. Is this a good thing, part of the original creation, or is it a result of sin? Similarly, salmon can be diseased. But that is not the same thing as salmon dying after they have spawned. Once more, this strange phenomenon is part of the cycle of nature. Again, is this a good thing, or is it a result of sin? Is it therefore possible that corruption, disease, and human death may well be a consequence of sin, but that plant and animal death, as part of the cycle of nature, are not? One might then reasonably argue that Romans 8:20-21 is carefully written to refer to decay and

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

corruption [maybe even perceived, scientifically, as natural entropy] as distinct from death. Once more the key is to observe exactly what Scripture says. Whatever the answers are to these questions, it would seem that Scripture itself leaves open the possibility that animals died before sin entered the world without affecting the fact that human death was a consequence of that sin.

[*Personal Reflection*: What is the difference between physical and spiritual death; both as a result of being separated from the life-giving presence of God? Paul, in Romans, appears to speak of the totality of death: involving both spiritual and physical death. Could physical death have been present among early 'humans' (e.g., *homo faber*) without the accompaniment of eternal conscious consequences; because, they lacked souls and, thus, had no capacity for a conscious awareness of their Creator? Could such 'animal beings' be excluded from the continuity of a reunification of glorified body and soul (much like our domesticated animals) until, through His Word, God decreed/created what we now call 'human beings,' *homo sapiens* (thinking man) who, by God's grace, become enlightened to possess a different and deeper level of consciousness; an understanding that he is the product of the Creator God, that he bears his creator God's image (*homo divinus*), and that he is called to serve and worship his God (*homo adoran*)? Could this created divine awareness indwelling man that accompanied being made in his Creator's image and likeness have been combined with the *potential* of eternal life (body and soul; via The Tree of Life) as long as he trusted and remained in close communion with The Creator God to serve in the Edenic protective sanctuary for its growth and expansion over the earth? Then, upon rebelling against God, evidenced in the Fall, we notice there is not immediate physical death, but there is, indeed, a sense of spiritual death in fearing and hiding from the Creator God Whom Adam and Eve knew as their Source of Life. Is not spiritual death, as evidenced throughout Scripture, the greater death with eternal consequences (*something pre-'humans' or Neolithic man, if there was such a thing, would not have been conscious of and would not, therefore, have an eternal conscious awareness of such an existence, and would also, therefore, not be included in eternal resurrection life*)? Is not our spiritual alienation from God the greater death that must first be rectified by grace through faith being regenerated by the Spirit in the human heart unto eternal life which begins at one's conversion? Additionally, the Hebrew worldview did not distinguish between body and soul, spirit and matter, in the same way Greek thinkers did at a later time. Our understanding today of the holistic human reflects much more a Greek philosophical view that bifurcates body and soul, spirit and matter, in a way that the Bible does not. This is also the tragedy of human physical death, which is the result of the greater spiritual death of being alienated from and in rebellion against our Life Creating and Sustaining God; that body and soul become unnaturally torn apart (separated) at physical death, with the soul, upon death, taking its place before God in a predetermined eternal state (heaven/life/grace or hell/death/condemnation), yet both saved and condemned souls await the General Resurrection of the body when their souls will be reunited with it unto either eternal condemnation or eternal life.

Understand, I am not advocating this potential theistic evolutionary theory and position! I am simply wanting to illustrate my own thought processes openly for others to interact with and who are free to disregard it or consider it further. We are free to think these things through, as long as we submit our thinking and understanding to the authority of God's Word. Not to submit to His Authority for our understanding is the sin of the Fall which we recapitulate when we

## Genesis 1-2:4 Notes

desire to determine that which is good and evil (true and false) apart from, and outside of, God's good, perfect, and authoritative Word!]

Lennox even states, "I begin to think that Occam's Razor [attributed to the 14<sup>th</sup>-century English Franciscan William of Ockham's general principal that we should adopt the hypothesis or theory that makes the fewest assumptions with other competing hypotheses or theories that are equal in other respects] may need to be applied at this point – that is, if the theological problem arises from going beyond what Paul actually says."

"In light of the miracle of the incarnation, I find no difficulty in believing that the human race itself began – indeed, had to begin – with a supernatural intervention. Science cannot rule out that possibility either. What science can tell about human beings, though, is what it can tell us about the universe: that they also had a beginning. What the incarnation tells us is that human beings are unique – they are also so created that God himself could become one."

*[Personal Reflection: I can't think of a better place to stop and rest!]*