

Creation: A Theology of Origin

Gene L. Jeffries, Th.D.

Everyone is biased. I am; and you are. Those who claim not to be biased show bias in their very claim. Bias is the unwavering belief that one is correct in his thinking or position. Thus, it behoves me to admit bias at the outset of this essay. *Creation* bespeaks bias; so does *theology*. Origin, perhaps, depicts less of a bias than either of the other words in this title. Even *a* and *of*, though the lesser biased, are somewhat suggestive if sufficiently pondered.

In her doctoral dissertation, *Exploring Biology: Examining Biogenesis*,¹ the late Dr. Jan Mercer quotes Solomon and Davis, who, in *World of Biology*, provide a succinct explanation of two broad possible choices, or two possible biases with regard to creation or evolution.

Among all the cultures of human beings known to anthropologists there is some explanation for the origin of the world, of humankind, or other organisms, or of what we would call the universe. Our curiosity about our origins has demanded explanations, and these explanations continue to be modified today. Such explanations tend to fall into one or the other of two broad categories: **special creation** or **evolution**. Various admixtures and modifications of these two concepts exist, but it seems impossible to imagine an explanation of origins that lies completely outside the two ideas.

Both views are as old as Western Civilization, or older. It is well known, for example, that the book of Genesis in the Bible describes the creation of the animate and the inanimate world in six days, with emphasis upon the personal intervention of God in the creation of a single ancestral pair of human beings. Less well known to us today are the evolutionary speculations of the Greek philosophers which co-existed with their ideas of supernatural creationism. At first their ideas had little impact. They re-entered the mainstream of philosophy only during the Renaissance. Creationism, for its part, has persisted to this day but has, since Darwin's time, become a minority view.¹

In an evangelistic crusade on the South Coast of New South Wales, Australia, various speakers were sharing testimonies with respect to the LORD and His power that changed their lives! Dr. Garth W. Hastings, of the United Kingdom and, at that time, a professor at New South Wales University in Sydney, was one of those speakers. A graduate of the University of Birmingham, Dr. Hastings held the prestigious Ph.D. in Polymer Science. He has authored, co-authored, and edited numerous books related to his discipline, and is considered a world

¹J. Jan Mercer, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge Graduate School, 1995, quoting P. William Davis & Eldra Pearl Solomon, *The World of Biology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), p. 587.

authority within his field.² *He was also a Christian and headed the Men's Society of the Anglican Church in Cronulla, a Sydney suburb. With the Sydney diocese of the Anglican Communion being the most evangelical in the world, it was appropriate that he share his faith in Christ with the congregation. His witness at that gathering stated in part,*

So, what do I teach my children? I could teach them science. I'm qualified to do that. But, the science I would teach them today has changed from the science I was taught at university. And that science was then different from what I was taught in high school. Science is ever changing. So what do I teach my children?

Then, holding high the Bible in his hand, he said, "I will teach them the Bible, the eternal, infallible Word of God. It never changes!" Bias? Yes, but born out of careful, studied, measurable examination.

Contrast Dr. Hastings' testimony with that of my university professor of anthropology. He cited for us a Darwinian "gap" of a mere "50 million years." The professor was both likeable and approachable; thus, following that lecture, I asked him, "Sir, can you conceive of the entirety of a single year in your mind?"

"If you mean the major events of that year, I believe I can," he replied.

I accepted that premise and proceeded to ask if he could conceive of the entirety of the major events of five years. "No," he replied quite firmly, "I cannot."

"Could you do it for ten years?" I pressed him.

"Certainly not!" he retorted. "If I could not hold in my mind the major occurrences for five years, how do you suppose I could do it for ten?"

He admission made my point. "Yet," I responded, "you are asking us as students to accept a mere gap of 50 million years! Is that credible?" His slight smile bore the sign of understanding, but he did not respond. Bias? Yes, but with the stretch of incredulity.

I am not a scientist. Although I have read extensively in various scientific areas, my disciplines are languages, the social sciences, and Biblical theology. By what measure of right, then, do I endeavor to engage in a debate on creationism? Every deliberation on the subject of origins must arise from one of two perspectives. One comes to the issue either from a Biblical

²Garth W. Hastings and Paul Ducheyne, *Natural and Living Biomaterials; Metal and Ceramic Biomaterials: Strength and Surface; Metal and Ceramic Biomaterials: Structure; Cardiovascular Biomaterials, and Macromolecular Biomaterials.*

worldview or from a humanist worldview. Since I am an advocate of the Biblical worldview, and competent to address the question of origins from that perspective, I heartily enter into the discussion.

My argument is simple, though not simplistic. Why do some, who purport to hold to a Biblical worldview of origins, compromise their position with those who hold to the humanistic worldview? And, why do some hold tenaciously to the humanistic worldview, despite the plethora of scientific evidence contradictory of that view?

Answers to questions such as these are never without difficulty. It is my belief, nevertheless, and born out of many, personal encounters, that men hold to what they allow their spiritual natures to permit. Observably, man is physical, mental, and spiritual. The bitterness of a man toward railroads may arise from his having lost an arm due to a railroad accident. The physical has affected the mental, and his bitterness persists despite irrefutable evidence that the railroad was totally without fault.

In much the same way, men often refuse to accept the Biblical concept of origins because to do so requires the recognition of Deity to whom they would then be forced to recognize their moral and spiritual accountability.

As for the compromise of some who profess a Biblical worldview, I submit that the compromise arises either from a lack of understanding of Biblical and/or scientific truth, or a personal unwillingness to submit to the ridicule of humanist worldviewers. Thus, we have “theistic evolution,” sometimes euphemistically labeled “progressive creationism,” the depiction of which is: God initiated life, but the progression of all life forms have come through evolution. It is from an uncompromising, Biblical worldview that I take my stand.

In the beginning God...³ What a marvelously foundational statement with which to introduce the greatest of all books! Additionally, the phrase introduces the most basicly foundational book in all of the Bible. Genesis has been called the “seed-plot of the Bible.”⁴ It is also the seed-plot of life. To understand Genesis is to understand the principles of life that have emanated from a Life-giving Creator. On the other hand, to misunderstand Genesis is to be left desolately alone on the plateau of uncertainty.

Genesis means “beginning.” It is the beginning of the Bible, the beginning of civilization, the beginning of history, and of creation. It is the beginning of theology, of psychology, of anthropology, of archeology, of pure science. One of the world’s foremost Old Testament scholars has said,

Although Genesis does not purport to be a textbook on science, nevertheless, when it touches upon scientific subjects, it is accurate. Science has never

³Genesis 1:1a

⁴Alfred Martin, *Beginning with Genesis*, Moody Bible Institute, 1956, p. 11.

discovered any facts which are in conflict with the statements of *Genesis one*.⁵

“In the beginning God...” This opening sentence of the Bible repudiates *atheism*, for it postulates the *existence* of God. It refutes *materialism*, for it *distinguishes between* God and His material creation. It abolishes *pantheism*, for it predicates that which necessitates a *personal* God.⁶

Interestingly, there is no argument in Scripture that seeks to prove the existence of God; rather, His existence is affirmed as fact—fact that is accepted by faith. Such a postulate establishes the foundation for the Apostle Paul’s declaration that “we walk by faith, not by sight.”⁷

If we Christians are to accept by faith the doctrines of the Virgin Birth of Jesus, His Blood Atonement for Our Sins, His Vicarious Sufferings, His Sacrificial Death, His Bodily Resurrection from the Dead, His Ascension into Heaven, and His Personal, Visible, Imminent Return, we must foundation such an acceptance upon the belief in the God of Genesis one.

In that primary inscription of the initial canonical book, we observe God’s perfect creation. Our English word, create, is a translation of of the Hebrew word bara (ar'B').⁸ Views of the word’s interpretation vary somewhat with regard to the context in which the word appears, but one scholar wrote,

“Created” is a word that is used only of God’s activity, never that of man. It may bear the significance, therefore, of “making without the use of pre-existing materials.”⁹

McCrossan is in close agreement, stating that “the word bara (create) always means ‘to create something out of nothing,’ or ‘to bring into existence, by the direct command of God, that which had no previous existence.’¹⁰

⁵Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Tyndale Press, 1958, p. 53.

⁶Arthur W. Pink, *Gleanings In Genesis*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1922, p. 9.

⁷II Corinthians 5:7

⁸Gesenius gives the maning, “to cut, to carve out, to form by cutting”; “to create, to produce”; “used of the creation of Heaven and Earth, Gen. 1:1; of men, Gen. 1:27,” *et al.* Gesenius’ *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, tr. By Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957, pp. 138-139.

The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament states: “The root *bara* has the basic meaning ‘to create.’ It differs from *yasar* ‘to fashion’ in that the latter primarily emphasizes the shaping of an object while *bara* emphasizes the initiation of the object” (I:127a). “The use of *bara*’ in the opening statement of the account of creation seems to carry the implication that the physical phenomena came into existence at that time and had no previous existence in the form in which they were created by divine fiat. The use of *asa* may simply connote the act of fashioning the objects involved in the whole creative process” (II:701b).

⁹Clyde T. Francisco, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1957, p. 21.

¹⁰T. J. McCrossan, *The Bible: Its Christ and Modernism*, Wheaton, IL: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1929, p. 79.

These two views vary only slightly and with regard to emphasis. The one allows that the word “may bear the significance,” and the other affirming that the word bara “always means” creation from nothing.

Creation, *ex nihilo* (*out of nothing*) is a theological phrase which most theologians (both liberal and conservative) have adopted. It is linked to the word *bara*, “to create, to produce.” There is no substantiation in Gesenius¹¹, however, to the thesis that *bara, per se*, means “creation *ex nihilo*.”

The Old Testament Scriptures are among the most ancient writings extant today, and they are replete with indications of the creative act. Forms of the the word *create* (create, creates, created) are found 57 times in the Bible. Sixty-eight percent of these appearances are in the Old Testament; and while it must be admitted that not every mentions of *create* refers to the act of the creation of the world and the universe around it, still, the vast majority of usages support the act of God in creation as this essay affirms.

Having mentioned creation six times, the Book of Genesis then summarizes all to that point in time by saying, “This is the account of the heavens and the Earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made Earth and Heaven” (Genesis 2:4). Genesis will mention creation and the LORD God as Creator four more times before closing its pages.¹²

The Book of Deuteronomy states, “...God created man on the Earth...” (4:32).

The Psalmist says, “The north and the south, Thou hast created them... (89:12); “Thou hast created all the sons of men!” (89:47); “Thou dost send forth Thy Spirit, they are created (104:30); and, “Let them praise the name of the LORD, For He commanded and they were created” (148:5).

The prophet Isaiah offers powerful witness to God’s act of creation. Isaiah says,

Lift up your eyes on high And see who has created these stars, The One who leads forth their host by number, He calls them all by name; Because of the greatness of His might and the strength of His power Not one of them is missing.¹³

Again, the prophet writes,

Thus says God the LORD, Who created the heavens and stretched them out, Who spread out the Earth and its offspring, Who gives breath to the people on it, And spirit to those who walk in it.¹⁴

¹¹Gesenius, *op. cit.*

¹²Creation is cited in the following verses of the Genesis record: 1:1, 21, 27; 2:3-4; 5:1-2; and 6:7.

¹³Isaiah 40:26

¹⁴Isaiah 42:5. Other Isaiah passages that cite the LORD’s act of creation are: 43:7; 45:8, 12, 18; 48:7; 54:16; and 65:17-18.

*Ezekiel informs us that Lucifer, the archangel, was himself the LORD's creation.*¹⁵

The prophet Amos speaks of God as Creator, when he states,

*For behold, He who forms mountains and creates the wind And declares to man what are His thoughts, He who makes dawn into darkness And treads on the high places of the Earth, The LORD God of hosts is His name.*¹⁶

The prophet Malachi is chastizing the Hebrew people when he calls attention to the LORD as their Creator: "Do we not all have one father? Has not one God created us?" (Malachi 2:10).

Moving nearer to our own time, another writer provides a scientific basis for creation ex nihilo:

*Since the advent of the atomic age, we know that matter is not eternal; matter is a form of energy.*¹⁷

James Lindsay admits that nothing in the Scriptures renders matter as eternal:

*The Old Testament and the New Testament, in their doctrine of creation, recognize no eternal matter before creation. We cannot say that the origin of matter is excluded from the Genesis account of creation....*¹⁸

*Accepting, then, Meldau's thesis as an axiom of science, Hebrews 1:3 takes on new meaning when it says, "...upholding all things by the word of His power." The Greek word for "word" in the verse is **ῥῆμα** (*rhema*), meaning here the "spoken word." The Greek word for "power" here is **δυναμις** (*dunamis*), meaning "physical power" or "energy." The logical conclusion, therefore, is that God created the world *ex nihilo*, as viewed from the human standpoint; but from the divine position, it was the powerful, innate energy of the Creator Himself that produced the universe!¹⁹*

¹⁵Ezekiel 28:12-15. Though the LORD is Lucifer's Creator, the LORD is neither complicit in Lucifer's rebellion nor compliant with his subsequent sins. Many Godly parents have borne children who themselves failed to embrace the ways of their parents.

¹⁶Amos 4:13. Note also that the designation, "Lord of hosts," in the Old Testament is a signification of the Messiah, the LORD Jesus Christ of the New Testament.

¹⁷Fred John Meldau, *Why We Believe In Creation, Not In Evolution*, Denver: Christian Victory Publishing Co., 1961, p. 273.

¹⁸James Lindsay, "Creation," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1939, *in locus*.

¹⁹Gesenius cites **הִפְ[' (āssā)** as meaning "to make any thing, i.e., to produce it from oneself," *in locus*.

If one would argue that God's pouring out "of Himself" supports the view of pantheism, then let it be rebutted that any view which affirms that creation is from other than God is patently atheistic. Lindsay also supports the power of God in creation when he states,

The dynamic ubiquity of God, as efficient energy, is to be affirmed. God is still All and in All, but this in a way sharply distinguished from pantheistic views, whether of the universe as God, or of God as the universe.²⁰

From the New Testament it is postulated that creation occurred through the agency of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The Apostle John stated it most clearly:

All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made (John 1:3).

"Him" in the verse has as its antecedent, "the Word" (lo,goj)²¹ of verse one, and that "Word" in this context is Jesus!²²

The Apostle Paul, writing to the Colossian Christians, declared that

...by Him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things are created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist (Colossians 1:16-17).

*The word consist in this verse is **sune,sthken** (sunest ken), meaning "to hold together." It has long been reported that scientists, researching in the area of atomic energy, have observed that the atom contains a nucleus, encircled by protons and neutrons, and various sub-microscopic particles, all of which entities whirl about as if in a frenzied effort to escape their invisible moorings. Yet, there is a force –an unseen force– that mysteriously restrains them and holds them in check. Although they can neither see this force, nor understand the mystery surrounding its origin, scientists have named it "the Colossian force," after the words of the Apostle Paul, "By Him all things consist" (Colossians 1:17b).*

I had concluded speaking in a church in Hawaii, and was greeting members of the congregation at the door, when a man whom I greeted identified himself as one of those very scientists. When I inquired of him as to whether I had stated the case correctly, he replied, "Yes, it is exactly as you stated it."

Hebrews 1:2 adds weight to that argument when it affirms that God has given us His son, "Whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by Whom also He made the worlds..." (emphasis

²⁰Lindsay, *op. cit.*

²¹*Logos (lo,goj)* is the "Living Word" as contrasted with *rhema (r`h,ma)*, the "spoken word."

²²A careful comparison of verses in John 1:4 through 34, shows that Jesus is the subject of the entire passage.

mine).

True science demands that something be recognized as *fact* only when it has shown consistency in repeatable laboratory experiences.²³ *Since no one but God was present when He created the universe, His Word, relating the creation in Scripture must be believed by faith.* Yet, the same is true of those in the scientific community, who insist that humanity and all its surroundings are the product of evolution from some “primordial slime.” Were those advocates present at the initiation of their “evolutionary process?” How then can they advocate such except *by faith*?

A number of years ago and subsequent to my university training, I revisited my old school and engaged two my former professors in a discussion of “fact versus theory.” It was hardly a debate; rather, I was inquiring into some matters that had come to mind but without resolution.

“When I was a student here,” I reminded them, “you taught me that electricity was a *theory*, not a *fact*. Can you now, with some years intervening, tell me unequivocally that electricity is now a fact?”

The two learned men eyed one another, each with the obvious intent to defer the question. Having apparently resolved who would reply, one of them said: “Despite the years intervening, I cannot honestly tell you that electricity is a fact. It must still be considered a theory.” The other man concurred.

In other words, with all of us having been reared without the denial of electricity, and having known and utilized it all of our lives, these credentialized and qualified professors of science could not without equivocation scientifically state it to be *factual!* Yet, others, possessing the similar training and holding the similar academic credentials, insist that events far less comprehensible than electricity occurred through a random-chance process. No, they may openly insist that the world around us came into being through random process, but they cannot base their insistence upon factual science. They base their instances upon personal belief. And it must be that way because they were not present when the world began.

Thus, with the argument reduced to a lower, common denominator, the question becomes: “Did the world come about through a creative act of God or through random chance?” And whatever answer one elects to believe, he is forced to admit that his belief is itself an act of faith. For he cannot **prove** *random chance* with science, the very discipline that purports to examine evidence conclusively.

High on the evolutionary “proof-list” is the dynamic-decay theory that evolutionists relates to the electro-magnetic field of the Earth. It was my privilege to be in attendance at a professional theological meeting when the late Dr. Thomas G. Barnes was the speaker. Dr.

²³The sequence is: first, a guess; then, a probability; then, a hypothesis, then, a theory; finally, a fact. A condition cannot be called “factual” until all of the known evidence is in and none of it points against postulate.

Barnes served for 43 years as Professor of Physics at the University of Texas (El Paso), and for 12 years as Director of the Schellenger Research Laboratories. His lecture that day dealt with his life-long study of the electro-magnetic field of the Earth. His thesis was that the monitored strength of the magnetic field was decaying, and that by reverse extrapolation it could easily be shown that man could have not existed on the Earth for more than 10,000 years because the magnetic strength would not have allowed him to lift his foot to walk. Barnes' words were later published.

According to the dynamic-decay theory, the "energy" in the field has always decreased rapidly. In fact, the energy loss during reversals and fluctuations would have been even faster than today's rate. This information allows us to estimate the age of the field.

The data and the dynamic-decay theory imply that, ever since creation, the field has always lost at least half its energy every 700 years... The maximum energy... comes from another theory I proposed about the nature of the field when God created the Earth, a theory which successfully predicted space probe measurements of planetary magnetic fields. Extrapolating today's energy decay rate back...to that limit yields a maximum age of 8700 years. According to the dynamic-decay theory, the true age would be less than that because of extra losses during the reversals and fluctuations. The..."dynamic decay" shows that with a significant loss of energy during the Genesis flood, the age of the field would be about 6000 years.²⁴

The very Earth upon which we live stands as witness to God's creative act. The Book of Genesis records, "And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." The word yom (~Ay) is the word for "day," and here it is accompanied with the adjective "one." While yom may sometimes be translated as simply an undesignated period of time, when it is appendaged with a numerical modifier, such as "one" or "first," it always retains the natural meaning of "day" as the opposite of "evening" or "night."

Evolutionists who desperately need millions (or billions) of years for the out-working of their "random-chance" process, have insisted on the meaning of *yom* that their system requires. Some Christians, who willing compromise their hermeneutic with evolutionary theories, have cited the Apostle Peter's statement: "...with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (II Peter 3:8) in the attempt to prove that each of the six days of creation were equal to 1,000 years. Careful inspection into the context of Peter's words, however, demonstrate clearly that he is speaking of the LORD Jesus' return to Earth, not His act of creation. Furthermore, Peter's so-called "equality" reference merely identifies the

²⁴T. G. Barnes, "Decay of the Earth's magnetic moment and the geochronological implications," *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 8 (June 1971) 24-29.

timelessness of God. Any argument related to creation that is based upon the “thousand years” statement of Peter is, therefore, baseless and faulty.

The phrase “evening and morning” in Genesis demonstrates an equal division of the time involved. Supposing that each of the six “periods” (~ymiy) of creation were equal to 1,000 years, what kind of known botanical life could exist in 500 years of sunlight and/or 500 years of darkness? Scientifically, we know that the Earth is held in careful balance through the electro-magnetic pull of the sun on the one hand and the centrifugal force of the Earth’s rotation on the other. Were the Earth to rotate more slowly, it would be eventually pulled into the sun by the sun’s gravitational field. Were it to rotate more swiftly, it would be eventually thrust further into outer space. In either event, human life could not survive.²⁵

*Sir Fred Hoyle is one of Britain’s most distinguished academics. Dr. Hoyle founded the Cambridge Institute of Theoretical Astronomy and holds numerous memberships in and awards from prestigious groups both British and American. Hoyle is an avowed evolutionists. In his book, *The Intelligent Universe*, he says, “I am not a Christian, nor am I likely to become one as far as I can tell.”²⁶ Yet, Hoyle offers one of the most compelling criticisms of evolution when he states “Life cannot have arisen by chance.”²⁷ He goes on to say that the probability of life’s appearing spontaneously on Earth is so small that it is very difficult to grasp without comparing it with something more familiar. He illustrates by using the example of a blindfolded person trying to solve the familiar Rubik cube.²⁸*

...since the blindfolded person cannot see the results of his moves, the moves must all be at random. He has no way of knowing whether he is getting nearer the solution or whether he is scrambling the cube still further. Hoyle goes on to say that one would be inclined to say that moving the faces at random would “never” achieve a solution, but that, strictly speaking, “never” is wrong. If the blindfolded subject were to make one random move every second, it would take him on average 1,350 billion years to solve the cube. Hoyle has determined that the chance against each move producing perfect color matching for all the cube’s faces is about 50,000,000,000,000,000,000 to 1. According to Hoyle, these odds

²⁵See Harry Rimmer, *Modern Science and the Genesis Record*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co.), pp. 135ff.

²⁶Mercer, *op. cit.*, p. 20, quoting Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston), 1984, p. 251.

²⁷*Ibid.*, quoting Hoyle, p. 12

²⁸Mercer describes the Rubik Cube: “The Rubik cube has nine colored cubes on each of its six sides. The nine cubes on any side can be rotated so that the colors are mixed. Once the colors are mixed in a somewhat random fashion, solution of the puzzle requires rotating each of the sides so that each of the six sides of the cube has nine cubes of the same color, although of a different color from the other five sides.”

are roughly the same as could be given to the idea of just one of the body's proteins having evolved randomly, by chance. However, the human body uses about 200,000 types of proteins in its cells. In Hoyle's words,

If the odds against the random creation of one protein are similar to those against a random solution of the Rubik Cube, then the odds against the random creation of all 200,000 are almost unimaginably vast.²⁹

One of the great, unanswered philosophical questions of man is “Why am I here?” The resolution of that dilemma may be answered in several ways, but none is more applicable to our discussion here than to ask, “Why did God create the universe?” and “Why in particular did He create and place man on the Earth?” To put it another way, “Why does man have an origin?”

Some things our finite minds cannot grasp; some things are not meant for us to know in this life; and some things we simply overlook. Whatever the case, the most probable answer to the two questions lies in the heart of God Himself and has much to do with His great Love! His Love is meted out toward man, His highest creation. The Earth and the universe surrounding it are but man's habitat. Man himself is the object of God's Love!

For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life (John 3:16).

This verse is nucleus to the Gospel; furthermore, it is supported by the inspired words of the great Apostle Paul, who said,

But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us (Romans 5:8).

Could it truly be that the Creator of this entire universe –a fathomless, inscrutable universe that has yet to be spanned or mapped in its entirety by the Hubble or NASA's deep-space probes– sprang into being from the loving heart of the Creator Himself?

Once again, Lindsay speaks to that question as he summarizes for us the conclusion of God's masterful creation:

²⁹Mercer, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

Such a Deity, as causa sui, creatively bringing forth the world out of His own potency, cannot be allowed to be an arbitrary resting-place, but a truly rational Ground, of thought. Nor can His Creation be allowed to be an aimless and mechanical universe: it is shot through with end or purpose that tends to reflect the glory of the eternal and personal God, who is its Creator in a full and real sense. But the Divine. action is not dramatic: of His working we can truly say, with Isaiah 45:15, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." As creation becomes progressively disclosed to us, its glory, as revealing God, ought to excite within us an always deeper sense of the sentiment of Psalm 8:1, 9, "O Yahweh our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the Earth!"³⁰

*Oh, what love! That He should die for me!
Saving grace thus to supply for me;
Oh, what love! Oh what love!
Evermore I'll sing it-- Oh, what love!*³¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Francisco, Clyde T. *Introducing the Old Testament*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1957.
- Gesenius, William. *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (eds.) *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Vols. I & II. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Kittel, Rudolf(ed.). *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart, Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Martin, Alfred. *Beginning With Genesis*. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1960.
- Meldau, Fred J. *Why We Believe In Creation Not In Evolution*. Denver: Christian Victory Publishing Company, 1961.
- McCrossan, T. J. *The Bible: Its Christ and Modernism*. Wheaton: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1929.
- Rimmer, Harry. *Modern Science and the Genesis Record*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Young, Edward J. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1958.

³⁰Lindsay, *op. cit.*

³¹Weldell P. Loveless, *Oh! What Love!* © Loveless and Runyan, 1934.

OTHER READINGS

Reno, Cora A. *Evolution, Fact or Theory?* Chicago: Moody Press, 1953.

Rimmer, Harry. *The Harmony of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1944.
