

August 23, 2009

IN SIX DAYS: DAY SIX, PART 2

Jeffery D. Woodhams

Did you love Lucy? I used to watch re-runs of *I Love Lucy* when I was growing up. Oh, how she could get into trouble! Talking about Lucy to people of my generation and those that came before conjures up the idea of a fiesty, spunky red head; but Lucy to the younger generation brings up an entirely different idea. You see, Lucy is the name of a fossilized specimen that has been portrayed as an ancestor of modern humans. In fact, Lucy is offered as *absolute proof* of the decent of man from chimpanzee-like creatures. What is Lucy?

Lucy is a 40% complete skeleton of an animal that would have originally been about 3.5 feet high. It was originally unearthed in 1974, and has been studied extensively since then. Many of the bones are fragmented, including a partial pelvis and partial skull. There are no hand or feet bones, but other similar fossils give us a more complete picture of those features. Lucy is portrayed as a precursor of humans because her reconstructed hip shows that she “could” have walked upright; however, the best evidence from her own remains and those like her is that she generally walked with the aid of her knuckles. Her wrists have the feature of other primates which allows them to “lock” the wrist in place for walking. Also, the hands and feet, as informed by other fossils like Lucy, are shown to have long, curved fingers *and* toes, which are nothing like human toes. The ribs have the formation of primate ribs, not human ribs. Studies on the inner ear show nothing in common with humans, and show that she was not an upright walker.¹ Listen to this:

Evolutionist Professor Charles Oxnard of the University of Western Australia used objective “un-biased” computerized multivariate analysis of many measurements on australopithecine [Lucy and those like her] bones. He (and an increasing number of other researchers who are not associated with the discovery of any of these creatures) found that all of the australopithecines, grouped together anatomically, are *further away from both apes and humans than these two groups are from each other*. They conclude that the australopithecines were a unique group of extinct creatures, not anatomically intermediate between apes and humans, so were not evolutionary “links” at all [emphasis added].²

So a creature that is objectively classified as less like humans or apes than humans and apes are like each other is purported to be the link between the two! The evolutionary bias in the case of Lucy is simply overwhelming. She is drawn with great artistic license as a chimpanzee with human-like eyes. She is sculpted and put on display at the St. Louis Zoo as standing upright and having human hands and feet, even though it is well-recognized that these are distortions of the truth. She is purported to our children to be their ancestor, a scientifically-established “fact” of evolutionary development of humans. It is reported that there is scientific consensus regarding Lucy’s status. Nothing could be further from the truth.

1 Brad Harrub, “Lunatics, Lucy, and a Little Book for the School Library.” *Technical Journal* 18(3): 35-40. Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0825lawrence.asp>.

2 Ibid.

We need to examine the Word of God carefully. Consider Genesis 1:26-27:

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 fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

This is without a doubt one of the most interesting passages in Scripture. The Hebrew word *God* here is *Elohim*, which is plural; but the verb *said* is singular! We should also note that the Hebrew form here rules out a plurality of just two; the word construction demands a plurality of *three or more*. However, the verb *said*, as we mentioned, is singular. We have here something unique, a uni-plurality. In the very first page of Scripture, we have a hint of the doctrine of God in three Persons.

It is remarkable that this uni-plurality appears on the first page of Scripture; but it appears really throughout the Scriptures. We will not divert into a discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity, but we should note that all of the major doctrines of the Bible make their first appearance in the book of Genesis. Genesis is the foundation of the entire Bible; throw it away or discredit it, and you seriously and irreparably damage the rest of Scripture. Again, we aren't going to divert into a defense of this statement today, but keep it in mind: Genesis *is* the foundation of the Bible.

In the verses leading up to this, we have those words *And God said* followed by the words *Let there be...* Verse 26 is different: God says, *Let us make*. Again we have the plurality expressed in the word *us*. Some suggest, as Jews have for centuries, that God is here bringing angels into the conversation; but as we examine the passage, and we see that man is created "in our image," we have to realize that He cannot be speaking to angels. Angels were not made in the image of God. No, God is speaking to Himself, the great Three in One. Jesus, the living Word of God, is present here with the Father and the Holy Spirit. The speech is different: *Let there be* implies utility and practical work; *Let us make* speaks of a labor of love. There is affection. There is the idea of anticipation--the time has finally arrived to do the one work for which all the other work was done in preparation: *Let us make man!*

It should also be noted that God has the ability to communicate. The significance is that, with humans, the ability to communicate is something that we are born with but must be developed by interaction with other humans who already communicate. The potential is there in human babies, but the ability is acquired from those who already communicate. This sets us apart from animals, who, even when they can be taught to communicate in one fashion or other can never form words or communicate beyond the concrete, the here and now, such as a chimp that may manipulate objects to say, "I want an apple." Humans are the only living creatures who communicate, but only when taught to do so! There must be a First Source of this communication.

The word *make* here is the word we discussed in a previous sermon which means to fashion from existing material. God fashions the body of man in the same manner in which He had already fashioned animals, and of the same materials. It should not be surprising then that man has some design features in common with animals, and that animals have certain design features in common with other animals. We have a common Designer who fashioned every part of every living creature, and yet there is great variety among living creatures. God made the animals and God made man.

The statement doesn't end there, though. God made man, as He says, "in our image, after our likeness." This is something He did not do for plants or for animals. There is something different, something special, in this creative act that sets it apart from all that have come before. Man is to be set apart from the animals: he is to be made in the image and likeness of God!

What is the image of God or the likeness of God? The words *image* and *likeness* are basically synonyms and are therefore used together for emphasis: *man is special!* Does this mean we "look" like God? Well, no, because God doesn't have a body like you or I have. According to the scriptural record, He does however see (Gen. 16:13), hear (Ps. 94:9), smell (Gen. 8:21), touch (Gen. 32:32), and speak (II Pet. 1:18).³ Man has a body which can also perform these functions. Additionally, when God has appeared to man, He has appeared in a human body. Jesus came to us in human form.

There is a profound truth here which has been the cause of much speculation. We know that both plants and animals have a body, formed from the same elements as man. We know that animals have a *nephesh*, a soul, in common with man; but man is different. We see it more fully in Genesis chapter 2, but for now let me refer to a very clear Scripture from the New Testament:

Now may the God of peace Himself sanctify you entirely; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved complete, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess 5:23).

There is a great body of Scripture from both the Old and New Testaments that speak to this issue, but this one is very concise: man has a body, a soul, and a spirit. We have a third dimension to our being that nothing else in creation has. We have a spirit which allows us to communicate with God; it allows us to reason, to understand abstract concepts like love, beauty, wisdom, truth, and justice. It allows us to communicate symbolically. That is why the next verse uses that word *bara'* again, which means to create from nothing: *So God created man in his own image.* The spirit of man is something that God created from nothing.

This is the third use of this special word *bara'* in Genesis chapter 1. God created from nothing the heavens and the earth in verse one; then we found that He created the *nephesh*, the conscious life, with which He endowed animals and man. The third instance of creation from nothing is unique to man. Man is a three-part being consisting of body, soul, and spirit. God, a triune Being, fashioned man as a three part being. Although He is infinite and we are finite, we share with Him certain traits and attributes that animals do not possess.

We see then that man is both *made* in the image of God and *created* in the image of God; his body is fashioned from already existing materials in a way that gives him a certain commonality with animals and yet sets him apart from animals, and his spirit is a special creation of God which does not exist in animals. God's spiritual gifts to man include language, creativity, love, holiness, immortality and freedom. The atheist cannot account for these six attributes!

We see also that both male and female humans were made on the same day. "Wait a minute, Brother Jeff, wasn't Adam made first, then Eve later?" Yes, and we'll look at that in more detail when we get to chapter 2 and see the creation story unfold through the eyes of Adam; but they were both created on the sixth day. There is a difference in scope between the accounts in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. In Genesis

3 Henry Morris, *The Genesis Record* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), p. 74.

one, the scope is “zoomed out,” as it were, to capture the whole of the creation process. In Genesis 2, the scope is “zoomed in” to give a closer account of a particular part of creation, specifically, creation as it applied to man. Genesis 1 is told from God’s viewpoint; Genesis 2 is told from Adam’s viewpoint.

You know what? I’m really glad God made males and females. They are created the same day, equal in their standing before God, but different in physical and emotional makeup. Two things happened here in this church this week which I thought would highlight some of the differences humorously. First, we gave the men a chance to look at some fabric samples for new window coverings in their Sunday School room. The old ones are in there, all torn and tattered, and they’ve been like that for years. Barbara has been the driving force in getting them replaced because it’s a real eye sore. Well, one we I talked to the men last week, one of them remarked, “I didn’t even notice those ones were in such bad shape.” You know, if it had been a women’s classroom, it would have been taken care of long ago; but we men--well, we just don’t pay as much attention to such things.

One more story before I move on, though. Barbara asked me to help her take down the curtains in the hallway between the kitchen and sanctuary. She was disturbed because they were so dirty, even describing them as “black.” I went and looked at them, ladder in hand, ready to assist, and I said, “But these aren’t dirty.” She assured me over and over that they were, and we took them down. When she held them in front of the white door, I could finally see that they were rather dingy.

None of this is to say that men are stupid, and I absolutely hate that TV dads are portrayed as stupid in sitcoms and in commercials. Men and women just see things differently and have different priorities about certain things. Aren’t you glad that God made male *and* female?

This whole conversation brings up a great problem for evolution. If evolution be true, how in the world are we to account for male and female *at all*? Evolutionists speculate and postulate, but they can offer no really satisfactory reason at all. To put it bluntly, the evolutionary model does not predict male/female difference, cannot account for them, and in fact must explain them away. Sir Richard Dawkins, one of the main promoters of evolution today (who also stated that teaching children about God is child abuse), suggests that since individual genes within the DNA are “selfish” in that they want to reproduce themselves, “that is sufficient explanation for the existence of sexual reproduction.”⁴ He admits that this is “close” to circular reasoning, but in fact it is absolutely circular: genes for sexual reproduction sustained the replication of the genes for sexual reproduction. Where did those genes come from in the first place? They formed on their own with no intelligent guidance but their own.

We would be remiss to overlook God’s intention for man as stated in this passage. Man is to have dominion over the animals and over the earth itself. In the act of creation, God placed man as His personal representative on earth. All of creation was to be subject to man, as God’s vizier on earth. The author of Hebrews points out something that we also observe:

Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him (Heb. 2:8).

The earth and the animals are no longer entirely subject to man. Some animals can *never* be tamed at present; but in the beginning, it was not so. There are remnants of this system still in place, but man no

4 Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 44.

longer has sovereignty under God over the earth. The effects of the Curse in Genesis 3 have altered the original arrangement, and we will discuss this at length in another sermon.

We turn next to verses 28 and 29 of Genesis 1:

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.

After the creation of the man and woman, God pronounces His blessing on them, signaling His special affection for them. Then He gave them a two-fold commission: they were to reproduce and fill the earth, and they were to subdue the earth and have dominion over it. The word *replenish* in our King James Version does not suggest to refill the earth, as if it had been filled once and needed refilling. The original English understanding simply meant *to fill*, and that is why the translators used it. The meaning has shifted over time to suggest to us today that it means *to refill*. The Hebrew word means *to fill*, and newer translations capture this meaning. While words conveying swarms and abundance of animals are used, God created just two humans and He intended them to reproduce to fill the earth. The command has not been rescinded and the earth is not yet filled (despite the dire warning of a number of lunatic scientists such as John Holdren, President Obama's science adviser).⁵

Finally, the commands to "subdue" and "have dominion" must be examined. They are military terms, but the world was perfect. There was nothing to subdue by force. The meaning must be understood as figurative language. Some commentators believe that the commands here mean that man was to explore the natural world, discover the laws by which it operated, and harness them for his use. In other words, man was to use his God-given intellect and curiosity to develop science and technology. By technology I do not mean computers and cell phones *per se*, although those things have developed as a consequence of thousands upon thousands of scientific discoveries. Technology simply means putting scientific knowledge to work, and includes simple machines like the wheel, the lever, and the pulley.

God made man in His own image, blessed him with a special blessing, and directed him with two special commissions. Man was created by a special counsel of the Godhead and endowed with a spirit so that man may communicate with God. According to evolution, man is not and cannot be special; but according to God's testimony, man is the most special creation of God, the very epitome of the creation process. The testimony that you believe will have an impact on all areas of your life.

⁵ See John Tierney, "Flawed Science Advice for Obama?" in the *New York Times*, December 18, 2008. Available at <http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/12/19/flawed-science-advice-for-obama/>. See also Tierney's column "Science Adviser's Unsustainable Bet (and Mine)" in the *New York Times*, Dec. 23, 2008. Available at <http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/12/23/science-advisors-unsustainable-bet-and-mine/>