

Gen. 1: 26

SUBJECT: Pro Re Money  
7 pl

D  
Wey  
2/88

68

## The Image of God

Gen. 1:26 "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..."

1. There is no doubt but that God made man a dust creature with a body of earth.

Gen. 2:7 "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground"

3:19 "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

3:23 "Therefore Jehovah God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."

18:27 "And Abraham <sup>answered and said</sup> said, Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who art but dust and ashes: forasmuch as thou shalt bid..."

Job. 33:6 Eliphaz says to Job "Behold, I am toward God even as thou art: I also am formed out of the clay."

Psalm. 103:14-15 "Like as a father pitieth his children,  
So Jehovah pitieth them that fear him.  
For He knoweth our frame;  
He remembereth that we are dust."

Our experience, looking upon what we call "death." Back to the soil.

2. BUT: This is not all, there is something else - a mighty "something else."

I Cor. 15: 47 "The first man is of the earth, earthly: the second man is of heaven."

II Cor. 4: 16 "Though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day."

Eph. 3: 14-16 "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father . . . . that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; . . ." 4. 18. 3: 1-4

Rom. 7: 18, 22, 24 "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. . . . I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see a different law in my members warring. . . . Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? . . ."

I Peter 1: 13, 14 "And I think it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up . . . knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly. . ."

Here are two men - an outward, made of dirt, and an inward, the real me, you. Turning to the story of creation, we find it even so.

Gen. 2: 7 "And Jehovah formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Job. 12: 1 "Jehovah . . . frameth the spirit of man within him." A created act.

Lk. 23: 46 "And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the spirit."

Acts 7: 59 "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."

3. Which man, the one of dirt or the one of spirit, is in the image of God? Or both?

(1) The outward man, the body of dirt, is not in the image of God.

Gen. 1: 26 "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

Ten thousand things in nature have a decided ascendancy over our bodies. Any bull has ten times as strong a neck as the best pack on the best foot ball team in America; any deer is many times as fleet as the fastest runner in the Olympic; any bird can rise to the height of a mt. many times quicker than the most agile alpine climber. An ordinary ape can crush in his arms the mightiest wrestler that ever lived.

BUT: nothing that has ascendancy over our spirits - <sup>conceptions - inventions</sup> thoughts - <sup>the means</sup> discoveries - <sup>ideas</sup> ideas - <sup>great</sup> great glories as of the sun, it cannot check their thoughts.

Isa. 40: 18, 19 "To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?" An image [an idol]! (?) a workman hath cast it and the goldsmith overlayeth it with gold."

You can make an image of man, but God in Isa. 40 shows the heathen thought of making an image like unto Him. (The 2nd commandment).

Romans 1: 18-23 Paul's indictment against the pagan world which "changed the glory of the incomprehensible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."

Acts 17: 29. To the Athenians, "Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, fashioned by art and device of man."

Phil. 2: 6-8. The classic passage. God changing form. "Christ Jesus, who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

(2) The inward man, the man of spirit, is in the image of God.

John 4:24 "God is (a) Spirit" (and they that worship him must worship him in spirit & in truth)

Lk. 24:36-40 "... [Jesus] himself stood in the midst of them and said unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do questionings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet."

Dead bodies have flesh and bones; spirits do not, therefore spirits are not in the form of dead bodies.

Romans 8:16 "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God." Our relationship with God is ~~not~~ not physical, but spiritual. Later on something to say about Mary Magdalene who sought to put her hands upon Jesus' risen from the dead, and forbidden.

4. Which man died in Eden in the day of transgression?

Gen. 2:16-17 "And Jehovah God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The physical death of man caused by his sin. Yes. But in some sense another man died that day in Eden. Ezek. 18:4 "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." This hands that took, this feet that walked, this mouth that ate - but this will, conscience, mind, a part in the transgression. It was herein that man first died. He did not die then as to his body, but he died morally, spiritually; he broke the image of God, he separated himself from God. He knew it immediately - something came in between. He was naked, he was ashamed, he hid himself from the presence of Lord Jehovah.

It is in this sense that a man can be alive and dead at the same time: alive as to his body, dead as to his spirit - broken the image of God.

I Tim. 5:6 "But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth."  
Eph. 2:1-2 "ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein ye once walked according to the course of this world ... doing the desires of the flesh..."

(as) Spillman, the first who drew his spirits down toward him from the center

It is in this sense that a man can live forever, tho the body of death waste away.

John 11:25 "he that believeth in me, tho he were dead, yet shall he live, and who so ever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

In Christ, the man dead in trespasses and sins, becomes a new creature. The image of God restored, made perfect, complete. A new creature.

Col. 3:10 "ye have put off the old man with his doings and have put on the new man that is being renewed ... after the image of him that created him..."

Col. 2:13 "and ye, being dead through your trespasses ... did he make alive ... having forgiven us all our trespasses."

(as) Ordinance of Baptism Rom. 6:3 Administration, what are ye doing? Burial of the old man. Raising the new.

Chis  
2/39

# Creationist Views On Human Origin

JAMES O. BUSWELL III

**B**elievers in God's creation of mankind have developed a wondrous variety of interpretations through the years. For brevity we can divide them into two major positions: (1) those who hold that God created mankind comparatively recently, say, a few thousands of years ago, and (2) those who find acceptable an earlier date for Adam's creation, say, hundreds of thousands of years ago.

The first group, those who maintain that Adam must have been created within, say, the last ten thousand years, may themselves be divided into two main branches according to how they interpret the geology and the fossil remains: (a) those who accept the geological antiquity of the earth and who therefore interpret the ancient fossil types as pre-Adamic forms: (b) those who do not accept the geological antiquity of the earth and who therefore interpret the fossil types as the descendants of a recent Adam.

Those of category 1a, who accept geological antiquity but insist upon a comparatively recent Adam, have developed quite a wide variety of interpretations. Let us begin with the most unorthodox. J. M. Clark claims that "when Adam was created and placed in Eden, the human race was already long established. . . ." ("Genesis and Its Underlying Realities," *Faith and Thought*, Vol. 93, No. 3, p. 146). To arrive at this position Clark distinguishes between the creation of the first men (Gen. 1:26) and the creation of Adam (Gen. 5:2). His entire thesis rests essentially on this distinction. He examines all the Genesis references to Adam and concludes that separate meanings are necessary, "Adam" as "mankind" and "Adam" as the man put into Eden. Both of these he finds in Genesis 5:1, 2, holding that since God called the name of the first created men "Adam" they shared the nature of the later "Adam" of Eden. Clark concludes: "We may therefore take Gen. 5:1 and following, as applying to the couple in Eden without in any way committing ourselves to the view that they were the first human beings on earth, from whom all others are

descended" (p. 152). As for the first or original man, for Clark, "the expression 'called their name Adam' indicates that the original man, like ourselves, was reckoned to share in the nature of Adam, and therefore to share in his sin and in his condemnation to spiritual and physical death" (p. 153). Clark must assume, however, that "the results of Adam's sin may operate backwards in time as well as forwards, in the same way as the saving work of Christ. Thus men who lived long before Adam would be under the same dominion of sin and death as those who have lived since" (p. 154). After examining the New Testament references to Adam, Clark concludes that "we cannot anywhere find a clear and definite statement to indicate conclusively that Adam was the first man on earth, nor can we find a clear and definite statement that all men now living are descended from him" (p. 151).

Another example is the explanation offered by J. Stafford Wright, writing in *Faith and Thought* (Vol. 90, No. 1): because he cannot see any evidence of religion in the prehistoric fossil sites, he questions the "spiritual capacities" of "man-like creatures" before about 6000 B.C. and calls all fossil men before Neolithic times "pre-Adamic" creatures that "do not have the status of men in the Biblical sense."

A third example is the view of T. C. Mitchell (*Faith and Thought*, Vol. 91, No. 1), who tentatively holds that "only the fossil remains which have been unequivocally described as *Homo sapiens* [modern men], men of the upper Palaeolithic period," are "to be called 'man' in the Biblical sense." Non-*sapiens* fossil forms "would not be pre-Adamic men, for they would not be men." A very similar position is espoused by Gleason Archer, professor of Old Testament studies at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, who cannot accept the extension of the genealogical records of Genesis 5 and 11 over any longer period of time (*A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*). James Murk also takes essentially this position, basing it upon a thesis held by some anthropologists that previous forms did not have true language and therefore were not truly human (*Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, Vol. 17, No. 2).

Summing up these positions, we find that all but Clark hold that Adam must be considered the first human being for theological reasons. All, however, put

*James O. Buswell III is professor of sociology and anthropology at Trinity College, Deerfield, Illinois, and visiting professor of missionary anthropology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He has the B.A. from Wheaton and the Ph.D. from St. Louis University.*

Adam at such a position in time that the pre-Adamic forms must be at least accounted for because of Adam's relation to all mankind in the Fall. Clark does this by assuming their humanity by an exegetical and theological device; Wright demotes them from humanity by discounting their religious capacity, Murk by discounting their linguistic capacity, and Mitchell and Archer by simply being forced to assign them a non-human status by reason of their assumed pre-Adamic existence. Here, too, we could insert the extreme position of Robert Brow, author of an article in CHRISTIANITY TODAY entitled "The Late-Date Genesis Man," who holds that Adam's creation was about "3900 B.C." and who demotes all previous beings to animal status (Sept. 15, 1972, issue).

Now those in category 1b, who do not accept the geological antiquity of earth or mankind, also hold firmly to the orthodox position that Adam was the first man. However, in assigning not only Adam but all of Creation otherwise a very recent date, they must treat the fossil remains of ancient man either (a) as non-human animals, (b) as largely fraudulent or fictitious, or (c) as appearing morphologically very very modern and entirely within the scope of the present human races.

Perhaps the best-known representatives of this position are Arthur Custance, a Canadian who is the author of the series called "The Doorway Papers"; members of the British Evolution Protest Movement; and members of the American-based Bible-Science Association, Creation Research Society, and Institute for Creation Research. John C. Whitcomb and Henry Morris have stated the position most plainly:

We say, on the basis of overwhelming Biblical evidence, that every fossil man that has ever been discovered, or ever will be discovered, is a descendant of the supernaturally created Adam and Eve. This is absolutely essential to the entire edifice of Christian theology, and there can simply be no true Christianity without it [*The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1961, p. 457].

But Morris insists that "the Biblical record indicates creation to have taken place only a few thousand years ago." He admits a "possible range of uncertainty" of "about 15,000 years ago," but considers "a more likely limit to be "not more than 10,000 years ago." In fact, he concludes, "there is nothing really impossible or unreasonable about the traditional date of 4004 B.C." (*Evolution and the Modern Christian*).

Turning now to position two, the acceptance of a geologically ancient creation of man, we may first point out, as William Kornfield did in his CHRISTIANITY TODAY article "The Early-Date Genesis Man" (June 8, 1973), that those who are familiar with the abundant data, both anatomical and cultural, strenuously resist the idea of assigning these types to a pre-Adamic position. They object to this on the grounds of the very evident humanity of these remains, as inferred by modern primitive parallels. Kornfield says, "The concept of a pre-Adamic

creature looking like man but not being man appears to be a way of avoiding the implications of all the fossil and cultural evidence for the existence of man early in time."

Those who hold this position—and I am among them—therefore insist that Adam must have been created before the earliest of those forms that, by both anatomical and cultural evidence, may be interpreted unequivocally as human and as geologically ancient, according to the findings of human paleontology. With very few exceptions, anthropologists who are creationists hold this position. And although the American Scientific Affiliation does not have an official position on human antiquity, nor can it be said that there is a consensus on the matter among its members, it appears that a great many of them are in substantial agreement with this position.

There are many cultural and anatomical remains that are both clearly ancient and clearly human, with continuous-occupation sites well back beyond ten thousand years in both hemispheres. The question may be asked, why are these remains objected to? Why do those of the late-date Adam position feel it is necessary to compress them, debunk them, or omit them from the ranks of progeny? So many of the doctrinal fundamentals of the Christian faith are held in common by those of both these creationist positions that many find it perplexing that the issue of the antiquity of the creation of mankind should so divide the testimony before the Christian and scientific worlds.

Let us briefly review the beliefs we hold in common. First, parties on both sides of this great debate believe that God created the first man as an individual human being by supernatural means. The historicity of an individual Adam is a fundamental doctrine of each position. This, in turn, is directly tied to the second fundamental belief held in common, that man was created as a creature unique from all other creatures not only in his discontinuity from them genetically but also in his distinction from them spiritually and culturally after the image of God. Paul A. Zimmerman in his chapter in the Baker *Symposium on Creation* and John C. Whitcomb in his book *The Early Earth* describe most effectively and fully the arguments for the distinctiveness and historicity of Adam, with excellent presentations of the biblical data that undermine the position of theistic evolution. And R. J. Rushdoony in *The Mythology of Science* points out correctly that "when the historicity of the first Adam is undercut, then the historicity of Christ—and the validity of all history—is also destroyed."

These three authors hold the position of a recent or late-date Adam. The essential nature of the historicity of Adam is also subscribed to wholeheartedly by those of us whose interpretations of Scripture allow for a much earlier date for Adam's creation. Among these are Cora Reno, S. Maxwell Coder, George F. Howe, Donald England, and Francis Schaeffer.

These doctrinal base lines are tied also to the third doctrine held in common, the doctrine of the Fall, and



in turn to the New Testament passages in First Corinthians 1 and Romans 5 that make the supernatural creation of a perfect man and his subsequent fall a necessary condition for the role of Christ in redemption.

Here the early-Adam creationist would insist as strenuously as his late-Adam counterpart that, in the words of Emil Brunner,

The surrender of the idea of the Fall . . . would mean nothing less than the shattering of the foundations of the whole Biblical doctrine of man, and indeed, the whole Biblical doctrine of revelation and salvation. . . . Apart from the doctrine of the Fall it is impossible to understand Sin as the presupposition of the New Testament message of Redemption. Only a fallen humanity needs a Redeemer [*Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, Westminster, 1952, pp. 50, 90].

Since these crucial doctrinal issues are agreed to, we return to the question, Why is there such decided rejection of an early or ancient date for the creation of Adam, which seems to fit the scientific date with the fewest problems? The answer lies in the interpretation of one set of biblical data, the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11. This is virtually the sole unresolved scriptural issue over which the remaining confrontation exists.

The late or recent-date Adam creationists insist (a) that the great age of the earth understood by conventional geology constitutes an "evolutionary chronology" and therefore invalidates any attempt to articulate a creationist position within its scope; and (b) that it partakes of extra-biblical perspectives and data not provided for within the text, and that the text of Scripture should be the *only* source for our interpretation of human origin. Henry Morris is most explicit on this: He writes, "In the Bible which is the word of God, He has told us everything we need to know about the Creation and earth's primeval history" (*Evolution and the Modern Christian*, Baker, 1967, p. 54). He further claims that "within the framework of . . . three great events of history—Creation, the Fall, and the Flood—can be explained all the data of true science and history" (p. 66). And, with specific reference to the genealogies, he says:

The general method of Ussher—that of relying on the Biblical data alone—is the only proper approach to determining the date of creation. The genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 provide the most strategic data in this connection. If these are taken at face value, they indicate that Ussher must have been correct at least in order of magnitude [p. 63].

The early-date Adam creationists, on the other hand, claim to stand with some of the classic stalwarts of the faith—William Henry Green, B. B. Warfield, and others—whose contributions on the inspiration of Scripture constitute some of the most revered and scholarly documents of fundamentalism, but who at the same time argued just as cogently that the genealogies were not intended to be considered as chronological devices for counting the years between Adam and Noah and between Noah and the time of Abraham, and that the matter of how long ago Adam was created is theolog-

ically irrelevant. Furthermore, Green points out in his "Primeval Chronology" that when the Bible is silent on a matter one should search for extra-biblical evidence for enlightenment. Cora Reno has put this into perspective for the modern creationist position:

Since the Bible is not specific about a date for Adam, most scholars are willing to look to science for help in determining man's antiquity. In no way is science being set above the Bible for we know that harmony exists between God's created world and His written word. It was God who set into operation the various laws that govern the dating methods [*Evolution on Trial*, Moody, 1970, p. 127].

S. Maxwell Coder and George F. Howe also point out that "in Genesis God does not reveal the date of creation" and that "there is nothing incongruous in the biblical account of creation when we consider the existence of fossils in various strata of the earth's crust, apparently of great antiquity" (*The Bible, Science, and Creation*).

Kenneth Taylor, the paraphraser of *The Living Bible*, writes:

From the Creationist viewpoint at this time, the picture is this: All fossil men and women are descendants of Adam and Eve, who were created directly by God, so Adam and Eve are older than the earliest human fossils. The Bible gives no evidence upon which we can draw to determine the time of Adam's creation [Kenneth Taylor, ed., *Evolution and the High School Student*, Tyndale, 1974, p. 37].

Francis Schaeffer, after a detailed consideration of the arguments, concludes that "prior to the time of Abraham, there is no possible way to date the history of what we find in scripture" (*Genesis in Space and Time*).

Finally, Donald England points out:

To get a value of 6,000 years for the age of the earth one would have to assume an error of 99.9998 percent for each of the major radioactive methods. Inasmuch as the different methods employ different techniques, and . . . different assumptions, an error of such magnitude as this is quite incredible. [*A Christian View of Origins*, Baker, 1972, p. 105].

We find then, a continuing and, in the opinion of many, unnecessary breach between those holding the two major creationist positions. Their doctrinal orthodoxy is sound and largely shared, their activities in evangelism and Christian education and scholarship are fruitful and effective, their personal testimony and devotion to Christ are unquestioned, but they oppose each other. The early-origin creationists consider their opponents to be far too conservative and unrealistically defensive; the late or recent-date creationists see their opponents' position only through their own premises, which cancel out any appreciation of their opponents' claims to Christian orthodoxy.

May we creationists in each position work and pray for increased empathy and communication as we are led by the Holy Spirit, to the strengthening of our testimony for the faith we hold in common. □