

# THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

February 1997

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: [Jrob1517@aol.com](mailto:Jrob1517@aol.com)

Website: [www.trinityfoundation.org](http://www.trinityfoundation.org)

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

## The Days of Creation

W. Gary Crampton

In the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (4:1) we read:

It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create, or make of nothing, the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.<sup>1</sup>

This is as precise a statement with regard to the creation account of *Genesis* 1 as one could hope to find. In the beginning, God created the entire universe, out of no pre-existent material (*ex nihilo*), in a period of six days. And as A. A. Hodge pointed out, at the time of the writing of the Confession "modern science" had not yet challenged the solar day view of creation. Hence, there is little question that when the divines spoke of six creation days they had in mind twenty-four hour days. Hodge is correct. But long before "modern science" challenged Bible believers, there were Christian scholars (for example, Augustine), who have not held to a solar day view. Yet the divergence from a twenty-four hour day theory of creation did not seriously begin until the late 18th and early 19th centuries with the onslaught of evolutionary thinking. Sadly, the church has played the role of

the sycophant; she has been all too quick to adapt to the teachings of modern scientists.

All too frequently orthodox Christians are heard to parrot the well-worn cliché "the Bible is not a textbook on science." As John Robbins maintains, if what is meant by this statement is that the Bible is not exclusively about or especially for the study of science, then it is correct. But this is all too obvious, and it is not the normal meaning of this cliché. Usually when we hear "the Bible is not a textbook" what is meant is that we must study the Bible and then we must study science, and then we must compare notes to see what we are to believe.<sup>2</sup> This form of thinking is well described by John Whitcomb:

Whenever there is an apparent conflict between the conclusions of the scientist and the conclusions of the theologian . . . the theologian must rethink his interpretation of the Scriptures . . . in such a way as to bring it into harmony with the general consensus of scientific opinion on these matters, since the Bible is not a textbook on science.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. A. Hodge, *The Confession of Faith* (Banner of Truth Trust, 1983 [1869]), 82, 83.

<sup>2</sup> John W. Robbins, "Is the Bible a Textbook?" *The Trinity Review*, June 1979.

<sup>3</sup> Cited in Edward J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One* (Presbyterian and Reformed, n.d.), 52.

But this is a low view of Scripture. As Paul writes in *2 Timothy* 3:16-17, the Bible is a textbook; or better, it is *the* textbook. And all other books are to conform: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work." And since the Bible has a monopoly on truth, whatever is true about creation must be learned from the Bible.

What does the Bible say about the creation days? It says that God created the universe in six ordinary days. Even as some of the critics admit, the most natural reading of *Genesis* 1 supports the solar day view. In fact, the context demands six literal days, in that God defines the Hebrew word day (*yom*) in the chapter. In verse 5 we read: "God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. So the evening and the morning were the first day." What could be clearer than this? Moses defines the first day as a period of time consisting of evening and morning. Henry Morris writes:

In the first chapter of *Genesis*, the termination of each day's work is noted by the formula: "And the evening and the morning were the first [or second, etc.] day." Thus, each "day" had distinct boundaries and was one in a series of days, both of which criteria are never present in the Old Testament writings unless literal days are intended. The writer of *Genesis* was trying to guard in every way possible against any of his readers deriving the notion of non-literal days from his record.<sup>4</sup>

Then in verse 14 we read: "Then God said, 'Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years.'" Again, we have a clear statement regarding a twenty-four hour day, and a distinguishing between days and years. *Exodus* 20:11 confirms this, declaring that God performed his creative work in six days: "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the

Earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day."

But the fact that God created the universe in six literal days does not negate the fact that he created it with the appearance of age. In *John* 2, for example, we read of Jesus "creating" wine from water. But the wine appeared as if it had undergone the natural, lengthy, process of fermentation. In a similar way, Adam was formed out of the dust of the Earth (*Genesis* 2:7). But even though he was only seconds old, he did not appear as an infant. Too, we are told in *Genesis* 1:12 that God created full grown trees; they appeared to be several years old.

## *Various Views of the Creation Days*

Otherwise orthodox scholars have attempted to explain away the natural reading of *Genesis* 1 in various ways.

1. *Literary framework or double symmetry theory.* This view maintains that God created the world *ex nihilo*, but that the days of *Genesis* 1 are not to be considered literal days. Rather, they are used as a semi-poetic device by which God is conveying a picture of his power in creation. The phrase found in verses 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, and 31: "and there was evening and there was morning . . ." is a poetic refrain.

Further, the advocates of this view argue, there is a balanced literary structure found in the parallel between the first group of three days and the second group. For example, the first day speaks of light and darkness, and the fourth day of the sun, moon, and stars. The second day speaks of waters above and below the heavens, and the fifth day of fish in the waters and birds in the heavens. The third day speaks of the separation of the land and the sea, and plants, fruits, and vegetation, and the sixth day of animals and mankind that live on the land and eat the food.

But this misses the point. As E. J. Young observed, even though there is a parallelism regarding the interrelationships that exist among the six days, this does not change the fact that the Bible speaks of these events as occurring within a normal week, *i.e.*,

---

<sup>4</sup> Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Record* (Baker, 1976), 56.

there is a certain amount of chronology involved.<sup>5</sup> Second, the parallelism or poetic form that is found in *Genesis* 1 is unlike the parallelism found in other parts of Old Testament poetic literature. And to build a case for the literary framework theory from this form of poetry is exegetically unsound. In the words of Buswell, it is "like seeing faces in the clouds. . .the faces are really there and can be seen by others to whom they are pointed out; but the question is whether they were intended."<sup>6</sup>

Third, the parallelism that is found in *Genesis* 1 says too much to support the double symmetry view. Young insightfully reduced this theory to absurdity when he wrote:

As soon as one examines the text carefully, however, it becomes apparent that such a simple arrangement is not actually present. We may note that the light-bearers of the fourth day are placed in the firmament of heaven (1:14, 17). The firmament, however, was made on the second day (1:6, 7). Inasmuch as the fourth day is said to parallel the first, it follows that the work of the second day (making the firmament) must precede that of the first and fourth days (*i.e.*, placing the light-bearers in the firmament). If the first and fourth days are really parallel in the sense that they represent two aspects of the same thing, and if part of the work of the fourth day is the placing of the luminaries in the firmament, it follows that the firmament must be present to receive the luminaries. The firmament, therefore, existed not only before the fourth day, but, inasmuch as it is a parallel to the fourth, before the first day also. This is an impossible conclusion, for verse three is connected with verse two grammatically, in that the three circumstantial clauses of verse two modify the main verb of verse three. At the same time by the use of its introductory words ["And the Earth"], verse two clearly introduces the detailed

account of which a general statement is given in verse one. Verse two is the beginning of the section or unit, the first action of which is expressed by the main verb of verse three. To hold that the days two-five precede days one-four is simply to abandon all grammatical considerations.<sup>7</sup>

It seems, then, that the literary framework hypothesis is false.

2. *The day-age theory.* This view, which came into prominence after the evolutionary hypothesis became popular, avers that the days of *Genesis* 1 are to be understood as ages or epochs of time in chronological sequence. In other words, the word *yom* is used in a figurative sense. This theory is employed to insert long periods of geological time into the Biblical account of creation in order to make room for the views of modern science.

Day-age advocates maintain that the Bible does not always use the word day (*yom*) as a solar day (for example, *Genesis* 2:4; *Zechariah* 4:10; *2 Peter* 3:8). Schaeffer states it this way: "The simple fact is that *day* in Hebrew (just as in English) is used in three separate senses, to mean: (1) twenty-four hours; (2) the period of light during the twenty-four hours; (3) an indeterminate period of time. Therefore, we must leave open the exact length of time indicated by *day* in *Genesis*."<sup>8</sup>

Day-age protagonists claim that the genealogies found in *Genesis* 5 and 11 may not be used to support the solar day view because there are gaps in the genealogies. They also argue that the scientific methods of dating the Earth, and the uniformitarian theory of geological processes, posit a world of great antiquity.

---

<sup>7</sup> Young, 69.

<sup>8</sup> Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer* (Crossway Books, 1982), II:39. It should be noted that Schaeffer himself is not dogmatically teaching a day-age view; he is merely leaving this open as a possibility. For example, he writes: "If anyone wonders what my own position is, I really am not sure whether the days in *Genesis* 1 should be taken as twenty-four hours or as periods. It seems to me that from a study of the Bible itself, one could hold either position" (II:134).

---

<sup>5</sup> Young, 69.

<sup>6</sup> J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Zondervan, 1962), I:143.

But there are problems here. First, as we have seen, the context of *Genesis* 1 demands a six-day creation. Second, even through it is true that *yom* is not always used to denote a period of twenty-four hours, it is also true that when *yom* is not used in this sense, it is abundantly obvious (compare 2 *Peter* 3:8). Certainly it is not obvious in the first chapter of the Bible. Then, too, whenever *yom* is used in the non-prophetic Old Testament literature (as we find in *Genesis* 1), preceded by a numerical adjective, it always indicates a literal day. If Moses had meant ages instead of days he could have easily used the Hebrew words *dor* or *olam*, both of which mean "age." And as noted above, the Sabbath day command found in *Exodus* 20:8-11, which clearly refers to the days of creation, can be properly understood only when the days of the creation and work weeks are considered to be literal days.

There is also an error in arguing for the day-age theory from the gaps found in the genealogies of *Genesis* 5 and 11, because even if there are genealogical gaps, there are no chronological gaps. The issue at hand has to do with chronology, not genealogy. Moreover, the uniformitarian view of fossil records is negated by *Romans* 5:12, where Paul states that there was no death prior to the Fall. There could be no fossilization without death, and there could be no death without Adam's sin. If Adam were created ages after the rest of creation, then the other creatures would not have died to give us fossil records. In fact, the idea of Adam's being created ages after the rest of creation conflicts with the words of Jesus, who said that "from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female" (*Mark* 10:6). It is also noteworthy that out of the scores of scientific methods of dating the Earth, a large number of them posit a very young Earth.<sup>9</sup> Bert Thompson writes: "There are over seventy-five scientific methods which indicate that the earth is relatively young."<sup>10</sup> Many of the dating techniques which scientists have previously used to "prove" that the Earth is very old have of late either been discarded altogether, or show that the Earth

could have been created by God with the appearance of age.<sup>11</sup>

Herman Hoeksema has said it well: "The attempt to *explain* *Genesis* 1 in such a way that it presents the world as having been created in a six-fold period of thousands or millions of years is from an exegetical point of view to be considered as a total failure."<sup>12</sup>

3. *The gap theory.* The attempt to prove an ancient Earth from the Scriptures can only be accomplished in one of three ways. Geological time must be inserted before the creation week, during the creation week, or after the creation week. The third alternative is virtually ruled out because it does nothing to support the evolutionary thought of modern science. If the days are ordinary days and man is created only a few days after the other creatures, then evolution is ruled out altogether. Not only this, but the chronological records of *Genesis* 5 and 11, along with the genealogy of *Luke* 3, militate against the insertion of time after the creation week.

The attempt to insert geological time during the week of creation is the attempt of the day-age theorist. We have seen that this theory is unwarranted. The gap theory, or the ruin and reconstruction theory, is the only other alternative. It attempts to insert geological time prior to the week of creation. This view claims that God originally created the universe, including man, billions of years ago. This creation is recorded for us in *Genesis* 1:1. But due to Satanic rebellion God had to destroy the entirety of his original creation, leaving it in the state described in verse 2, which gap theorists translate: "The Earth became [not was] without form and void." In this theory, billions of years of uniformitarian geology are found in an alleged gap between the first two verses of *Genesis*—time which accounts for the ice age, ape-men, dinosaur fossils, and a host of other extinct forms of life. Then in *Genesis* 1:3-31 we have the account of the second creation of the universe in six twenty-four hour days.

<sup>9</sup> Morris, Henry M., and Gary E. Parker, *What Is Creation Science?* (Creation-Life Publishers, 1982), 250-257.

<sup>10</sup> Bert Thompson, "The Age of the Earth," *Essays in Apologetics*, edited by Bert Thompson and Wayne Jackson (Apologetics Press, 1984), I:67.

<sup>11</sup> E. H. Andrews, *God, Science & Evolution* (Evangelical Press, 1980), 107-127.

<sup>12</sup> Herman Hoeksema, *Reformed Dogmatics* (Reformed Free Publishing Association, 1966), 179.

The gap theory has serious difficulties. First, the present writer agrees with Schaeffer when he writes: "The weakness of this idea [the gap theory] . . . is that there are no supporting verses for it in the rest of the Bible"<sup>13</sup> Second, although it is possible to translate the Hebrew verb *hayetha* in *Genesis* 1:2 as "became," rather than "was," it is without justification to do so. Thompson correctly says: "The verb *hayetha* of *Genesis* 1:2 is translated 'was' in all the standard translations because that is its meaning. Surely it is significant that none of the Old Testament linguists felt compelled to translate *hayetha* to suggest that the Earth became waste and void, as gap theorists propose."<sup>14</sup> Not only this, but the phrase "waste and void" of *Genesis* 1:2 does not refer to something that has been ruined and is in need of repair. Rather, it refers to the fact that the Earth was "empty and formless." It was without living things and all of the features that it would later possess. That this is the meaning of the verse is confirmed by *Isaiah* 45:18, which states that God "did not create it [the world] in vain, [but] who formed it to be inhabited."<sup>15</sup>

Third, the gap theory is false when it avers that there was human life on this Earth prior to Adam. In *I Corinthians* 14:45-47, the apostle Paul states that Adam was the "first man," i.e., the first human being. Luke confirms this in his Gospel (*Luke* 3:38). And fourth, it is highly unlikely that God would pronounce all that He had created as "very good" (*Genesis* 1:31), with Adam and Even looking out over a virtual graveyard of the remnants of a previous creation.

4. *The revelation day or tutorial day view:* This theory maintains that the days of *Genesis* 1 are not to be considered as days in which God created the universe. Rather, they are days in which God revealed the story of creation to Moses; they are revelational days, not creation days. In this approach, as Garry Brantley says, we have an attempt to have the best of both worlds: "It does not deny a literal understanding of the days of *Genesis*

1, and it allows for the time needed to accommodate the evolution model or an ancient universe."<sup>16</sup>

In this theory, heavy emphasis is given to extra-Biblical evidence, where parallels are drawn with ancient Near Eastern creation myths that refer to pagan gods instructing certain rulers over a period of days. Since there is a similarity in vocabulary and literary style between *Genesis* 1 and these mythical accounts of creation, say the advocates of the revelational day view, there is at least a strong likelihood that the *Genesis* account is also given in a tutorial day fashion. Some protagonists of this theory offer alternative translations for portions of *Genesis* 1, to make the text "fit" the tutorial day concept.

But this is faulty exegesis. First, it is improper and silly to adapt Biblical revelation to the mythical writings of other Near Eastern cultures. As the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1:9) says: "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly."

Second, the translations which "play with" the text of Scripture to make it fit the revelational day viewpoint are as guilty as those who attempt to make the text fit the gap theory. *Exodus* 20:11 is most explicit: "For in six days the Lord *made* [not revealed his creative activities] the heavens and the Earth, the sea, and all that is in them." Brantley's comment is apropos: "Theories of this kind demonstrate how much the Biblical text must be bent to accommodate evolutionary time scales."

## Conclusion

The ordinary day theory is the only one that is exegetically sound. God created all things within a period of six literal days, and he created with the appearance of age. This theory is the one that gives us the most natural reading of *Genesis* 1. In fact, as we have seen, the context of *Genesis* 1 demands six

---

<sup>13</sup> Schaeffer, II:132.

<sup>14</sup> Bert Thompson, "Popular Compromises of Creation—The Gap Theory," *Reason & Revelation* (Apologetics Press, Vol. XIV, No. 7, 1994), 54.

<sup>15</sup> Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (Eerdmans, 1972), III:211.

---

<sup>16</sup> Garry K. Brantley, "Six Days of Creation, or Revelation," *Reason & Revelation* (Vol. XIV, No. 6, 1994), 45.

twenty-four hour days. Jack Scott asserts that the Hebrew grammatical construction of *Genesis* 1 "excludes every possibility of interpreting the meaning of 'day' in any other sense than the most obvious; namely, a day as experienced by the original recipients of this revelation—the twenty-four hour day."<sup>17</sup>

The present writer agrees with Williamson, who, after summarizing the various theories, concludes by saying: "For our part we can see no good reason to doubt that God did create the world in six twenty-four hour days, with the appearance of age."<sup>18</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that the matter of the days of creation is not a minor issue. It is not just a subject of controversy between academicians. It's a matter of whether we are going to believe God as he has revealed himself to us in his Word, or whether we are going to believe the latest findings of modern science. Douglas Kelly summarizes:

[T]his is not just an academic nicety or a question that can easily be sidestepped. Surely the teaching of God on the original creation is terribly important. If we cannot trust his [God's] Word at the first creation, . . . how can we trust it anywhere else? How can we trust what it says about Christ in the new creation, if we can't trust what it says about the original creation? The whole Bible stands or falls together as one piece.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Jack Scott, *Adult Biblical Education Series* (Committee for Christian Education and Publications, 1978), II:1:20.

<sup>18</sup> G. I. Williamson, *The Westminster Confession of Faith for Study Classes* (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1964), 42-43.

<sup>19</sup> Douglas F. Kelly, *The Creation* (an unpublished sermon series, 1976, 1977), 37-38.

# THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

November, December 1984

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: [Jrob1517@aol.com](mailto:Jrob1517@aol.com)

Website: [www.trinityfoundation.org](http://www.trinityfoundation.org)

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

## In the Beginning

Gordon H. Clark

By your gracious invitation I am here this morning to lecture, as it was suggested to me, on the first verse of John's Gospel, where Christ is called the *Logos*. In 1972 I published a small book on *The Johannine Logos*, and if anything in this short lecture interests you, you will find amore complete exposition in that book.

Statistics may not provide the most interesting type of introduction, but it does not burden the brain nor injure the intellect to know that John's Gospel uses the term *logos* forty times. What is more surprising, indeed disconcerting, is that the Greek term *logos* can be translated by forty different English words. Liddell and Scott's great lexicon has more than five columns, each 90 lines long, of its various meanings. The word word is hardly ever the correct translation. Liddell and Scott say explicitly that it "rarely means a single word."

The reason our Bibles translate *logos* as *word* is that Jerome, a monk of the early fifth century, mistranslated it as *verbum*. Jerome's *Vulgate*, as it is called, became the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, and the texts Jerome used became the mainstay of contemporary liberal versions. The Latin term *verbum* became *word* in English, though I do not know why it did not become *verb*, as it actually is in a new Catholic French version, *La Bible de Jerusalem*. At any rate, *logos* hardly ever means a single word. But it has forty or more other meanings.

I have not listed all the meanings, nor shall I read you my abbreviated list. Just survey it from your seats.

Computation rule narrative

Reckoning pretext story

Accounts reason speech

Measures case oration

Sum theory phrase

Total argument message

Esteem principle tradition

Consideration law dialogue

Value thesis oracle

Reputation hypothesis proverb

Relation formula language

Fashion definition sentence

Ratio debate Wisdom (of God)

Proportion reflection

## *The Philosophic Background*

The particular interest in the *Logos* as used in John's first verse derives from its philosophic background. Heraclitus, a Greek philosopher about 500 B.C., used the term to designate the Supreme Intelligence who rules the universe. Neither Plato nor Aristotle had a *Logos*-doctrine; but the Stoics, the most vigorous of all schools from 300 B.C. to A.D. 200, adopted the view of Heraclitus. Then Philo Judaeus, a contemporary of Christ, used the Stoic *Logos*-doctrine to interpret the Old Testament. Some Christians in the third century, and some others in the nineteenth century, thought that Philo had anticipated the doctrine of the Trinity. This was far from Philo's intention, though no one can deny that he influenced the early church in that direction.

In addition to the Greek Stoics and the Jewish Philo, there is another source that seems to have influenced John more directly. At an unknown date, possibly in the early second century, an unknown author wrote the tractate *Poimander*. This became the first of a series of eighteen that were collected and published, perhaps in the fourth century, under the name of *Hermes Trismegistus*. The whole was supposed to be a revelation from the Egyptian god Tot or Toth. The tractates are not consistent with one another, and one or two of them seem to be a form of Christianity.

Now, *Poimander*, by which Reitzenstein tried to explain away Paul's doctrine of redemption, bears a striking resemblance—or, better, a striking non-resemblance—to the Prologue to John's Gospel. *Poimander* says that the *Logos* was not in the beginning, the *Logos* was not God, not all things were made by him, and therefore the darkness could comprehend it. The contrast is so definite that one can hardly refrain from concluding that John wrote his Prologue for the express purpose of refuting *Poimander*.

This may seem to conflict with a second century date for *Poimander*. However, two considerations preserve the possibility. First, the tractates were written at different times and were collected later. Second, even if *Poimander* was not written before A. D. 125, its religion was more ancient and could

have had a deleterious effect on first century evangelization.

We today are not much interested in the religion of *Poimander*; but we should be interested in Christ as the *Logos*, despite the fact that even the members of conservative churches mainly react negatively.

## *The Doctrine of Creation*

A study of the person of Christ could hardly begin more appropriately than with *John* 1:1. Echoing the Septuagint, John uses *Genesis* 1:1, "In the beginning." Not only is deity asserted in these two words, but also John repeats the idea at the end of the verse: "the *Logos* was God."

Jehovah's Witnesses try to evade the force of this verse. They translate it, or rather mistranslate it, as "the *Logos* was a god." They thus adopt polytheism. More to the point, they do not know the Greek rules on the use of the article; and they mistakenly assume that there is no indefinite article in Greek. But let us proceed.

If John begins with the first word of *Genesis*, the second word of *Genesis* comes in John's third verse: the *Logos* created all things. John of course is not the only apostle who tells us this. In *Ephesians* 3:9, Paul says, "God created all things through Jesus Christ." Then in *Colossians* 1:16, 17, Paul not only says that Christ created all things, but more explicitly that Christ "organized the universe." It should be remembered that *ta panta* in Greek, though usually translated "all things," is the regular designation for the universe. Christ, the *Logos*, the Intelligent Deity, organized the universe.

The doctrine of creation, asserting that the universe is not an everlasting mechanism but a teleological construction of Intelligence, needs great emphasis today because it is so widely denied in the public schools. Purposeless differential equations have replaced an omnipotent and omniscient Mind. Nor does this theology affect the subject of physics only. Its implications are even more easily seen in its effects on morality, extending from Sodom on the Hudson to Gomorra across the Golden Gate. However, before going into these derivative



subjects, we must yet awhile continue with the basic theology. For theology is basic.

## *The Wisdom of God*

Associated with logic, intelligence, and mind, is the concept of wisdom. Before congratulating himself in 1 *Corinthians* 2:16, where Paul says that he has the mind of Christ, he had declared that Christ is "the power of God and the wisdom of God" (*1 Corinthians* 1:24). *Jude* 25 acknowledges Christ by referring to "the only wise God our Saviour." *Psalms* 104:24 connects wisdom with creation by asserting, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works; in wisdom thou hast made them all." The subject is vast. A lecture like this can give only a few indications of it. For example, *Ephesians* 3:10 speaks of "the manifold wisdom of God." This wisdom is Christ, for Paul had just said in *Ephesians* 1:7-8 that in Christ's redeeming work God "abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence."

The Gnostics had made wisdom or *Sophia* the lowest eon in God's mind, and by her sin the lower world came into being. The New Testament mentions *sophia* or wisdom fifty-one times, but it is not the *Sophia* of the Gnostics. *James* 1:5 admonishes us that "if any one of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God ... and it shall be given him." We often pray for health, and this is not improper, but how often do we pray for knowledge and wisdom?

Christ is the wisdom of God. Nevertheless Christ is also something else, something basic and more fundamental than wisdom. The New Testament uses the word 110 times, of which 25 occur in John's Gospel. The scholarly existentialists or neo-orthodox, such as Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, and the totally unscholarly Pentecostals unite in stressing emotion and ecstatic experience. But nowhere does Christ say, I am the Emotion. What he says is, I am the Truth. Many good Christians, indeed all *good* Christians, say that God is love; and so he is. But if it were not *true*, he would not be love. Truth is basic. Listen to what the apostle said.

## *Truth Is God*

*John* 1:14. "The Word [or *Logos*] was ... full of grace and truth." Three verses below, we read, "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." The third chapter of *John*, whose sixteenth verse is so well known, in verses 20-21 teaches that morality depends on truth. In his profound theological conversation with the Samaritan woman, who had five husbands and was then living with a man who was not her husband, Christ insisted that one must worship God in spirit and in truth. To some Jewish believers Jesus promised, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"(8:32). Later in the same chapter, negatively, Jesus denounces the devil because he did not abide in the truth, because there is no truth in him (8:44). The next two verses continue the emphasis. Then there is the well-known verse, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (14:6); and one may comment that if it were not true that Christ is the way, there would be no reason for walking that way. The Holy Spirit, sometimes called the Spirit of Christ, is three times called the Spirit of truth (*John* 14:17; 15:26, and 16:13), verses bearing directly on the doctrine of the Trinity. Christ also says that he himself is sanctified through the truth, as we too are sanctified through the truth (17:17, 19). If any Christians wish to increase in sanctification, they must learn more truth. The verses quoted are most of John's verses that identify Christ as the Truth. Anyone interested can search out the remainder of the 110 verses in the New Testament and meditate on their truth.

## *The Evangelical Churches*

No one should be surprised that the *Logos*, the logic, the reason, the wisdom, the message, the language, the reflection of God is truth. What is surprising and depressing is the fact that the churches called evangelical have almost totally eliminated this intellectualism from their thoughts. If they have not become ecstatic Pentecostals, speaking charismatic gibberish, and if they have not become existentialists who find little or no truth in the Bible, they have nonetheless repudiated theology in favor of a comfortably blank mind. Permit me to ask you, When did you last hear a sermon on the Trinity? I remember one by Clarence Edward Macartney in 1924, and another really

excellent one by a Greek Catholic priest in 1979. But even references to the Trinity, let alone complete sermons, have been few in number. References to Christ are frequent, but too often meaningless. Many times evangelists have stressed "a personal relationship to Christ." This makes no sense. Even Satan has a personal relationship to Christ. He hates him, and hatred is very personal. What people need is a statement of the proper personal relationship, and that depends on who Christ is. One can sympathize with humble people of low I.Q. who cannot understand. But one can only upbraid people of higher intelligence who refuse to understand.

### *Truth and Virtue*

A few paragraphs back made mention of morality. Let us ask, Why do so many women murder their own babies, or at least pay a hired assassin to kill—or half-kill—the child and throw his quivering body into a garbage can? Few people give the basic answer. A woman kills her baby because she rejects the doctrine of the Trinity. The Ten Commandments forbid murder. But why should anyone pay attention to the Ten Commandments? The answer to this *Why?* is found in the introduction: "I am the Lord thy God." If that statement were not true, then abortion, child abuse, torture, drug addiction, and anything else are matters only of personal preference. The basic question is not what is right or wrong, though this question has its derivative status. But the basic question is, What is true?

For a good 1,500 years, Christian theologians have described human nature as intellectual and volitional. Jonathan Edwards, for example, wrote, "God has endued the soul with two principal faculties: the one, that by which it is capable of perception and speculation, or by which it discerns and judges of things, which is called the understanding. The other, that by which the soul is some way inclined with respect to things it views or considers: or it is the faculty by which the soul beholds things,.. either as liking, disliking, ... approving or rejecting. This faculty is called ... inclination, will, ... mind, ... often called the heart."

The Lutherans too, at least those who, like the Missouri Synod, have preserved their orthodoxy, pay little or no attention to the emotions. Even in this decadent century their notable theologian, Pieper, in his *Christian Dogmatics* (519) very briefly, but twice, states the Lutheran position that the image consists of intellect and will. There is no mention of emotions.

This emphasis on the will has almost totally disappeared from what now passes as Christian preaching. Freudianism has replaced it with the emotions. Most pew-warmers do not realize that this emphasis is a very modern development. If one goes back to the Westminster divines, to Calvin, even to Aquinas, and especially to Augustine, he will find that human nature is regularly divided into will and intellect. The point is important because faith in Christ is not an emotion but a volition. One does not feel for Christ, he decides for Christ. The Scripture says, Jesus himself said, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (*Luke* 13:3). Note very carefully that repentance is a change of *mind*. Its root is the word *noeo*, to think. The noun *nous* is the intellect. And faith, by which one is justified, is a belief, a voluntary assent to an understood proposition. Begging your pardon, and with what modicum of modesty I can muster, may I remark that this month The Trinity Foundation has completed the publication of my book on *The Biblical Doctrine of Man*.

Now today, in contrast with the Christianity of the past, Freudian emotionalism has replaced intellectualism, and volition seems to have been totally forgotten. Finney reduced evangelism to psychological brainwashing. A contemporary evangelistic, but non-ecclesiastical, group boasted that it could convert almost anybody in twenty minutes. They were astounded to discover that in England they needed thirty-five minutes. This was not the attitude of Jonathan Edwards, nor of Whitefield, nor of Calvin, nor of Luther, nor of Augustine and Athanasius. These men emphasized the truth and urged people to believe the truth. Faith is no emotion. Faith is intellectual understanding with volitional assent.

### *Knowledge and Salvation*

To prepare for a short concluding paragraph, may I here include a few more Scripture verses. They are the words of God's prophet Hosea. "The Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, no mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land" (4:1). "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee" (4:6). "For I desired mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings" (6:6).

Permit me to repeat and emphasize that the *Logos* was full of grace and truth. He said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Christ was sanctified, and if we are also, we are sanctified by the truth.

O God of truth, whose living Word  
 Upholds whate'er has breath,  
 Look down on thy creation, Lord,  
 Enslaved by sin and death.  
 Set up thy standard, Lord, that we  
 Who claim a heavenly birth,  
 May march with thee to smite the lies  
 That vex the groaning Earth.  
 Then, God of Truth, for whom we long,  
 Thou who wilt hear our prayer,  
 Do thine own battle in our hearts  
 And slay the falsehood there.

## From the Horror File

A few years ago I wrote a short essay titled "The Trouble with Conservatives," the trouble being, of course, that they are not Christians. Now *Policy Review*, a journal of opinion published by the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C., has published an article entitled "Sex and God in American Politics—What Conservatives Really

Think" (Summer 1984). The editors interviewed 13 conservatives—Irving Kristol, Midge Decter, Ronald Godwin, R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr., Howard Phillips, Milton Friedman, Paul Weyrich, M. Stanton Evans, Jerry Falwell, Orrin Hatch, Jack Kemp, Phyllis Schlafly, and Seymour Siegal—on various moral issues, and here are a few of their responses:

**Question:** Why are so many marriages ending in divorce these days?

**Milton Friedman** (Nobel Prize-winning economist): "And I am not even sure that this development is a bad thing.... So I am not prepared to judge whether on balance the greater frequency and ease of divorce has been a good or a bad thing."

**Question:** Should mothers of young children stay at home rather than work?

**R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr.** (syndicated columnist): "Mothers' first commitment, I think, should be to their children and to their husbands. If that sounds Biblical, well it is an old book full of foolishness, but there are some good things in it."

**Question:** Under what circumstances should the state intervene in the treatment of handicapped infants?

**Milton Friedman:** "I think the state should keep out of the Baby Doe kind of case."

**Question:** Is abortion always wrong? Is abortion permissible in cases of rape or incest? If the life of the mother is endangered?

**Milton Friedman:** "It is an issue on which there is an enormous difference of views and moral values among the populace as a whole. It is, therefore, utterly inappropriate for the government to try to impose the views of one large section of the population on the other.... The fundamental principle justifying the use of the state is unanimity among its citizens."

**Question:** What explains the sudden prevalence of overt homosexuality?

**Jerry Falwell** (president of the Moral Majority): "I don't believe that state punishment of homosexuals provides any answer whatever. I personally believe that homosexuals should be afforded total civil rights like all other Americans. Equal access to housing accommodations and job opportunities is guaranteed to all Americans in the Constitution. The problem with homosexuality is that most people look on this sin in a different way than all other sins. Most Americans look with great contempt on the homosexual. That is why we cannot help homosexuals. They immediately perceive this contempt and realize there is no love or reaching out there."

"As long as the homosexual is not flaunting his or her behavior as an acceptable lifestyle, and is not recruiting students, there is no supportable reason for not allowing him to teach in public school."

**Question:** How do you interpret the establishment clause of the First Amendment?

**Milton Friedman:** "I am opposed to the tax exemption of universities, churches, etc. All of that is an indirect way of subsidizing religious establishments, and ought to be in violation of the First Amendment."

**Question:** Would you like to see prayers said in the public schools?

**Howard Phillips:** (national director of the Conservative Caucus): "If everyone has good will, I believe it should be possible to formulate a prayer that would not be offensive to any religious groups, such as the Regents prayer in New York. We could have what I would call an equal time system—some time to Christians, some time to Jews, or whatever other significant religious groups are present."

**Irving Kristol:** (coeditor of *The Public Interest*; member of the board of contributors of *The Wall Street Journal*): "It is good for students to learn to stand in silence for a few minutes in an attitude of deference to something or someone."

**Milton Friedman:** "I am opposed to requiring or permitting prayers in public schools."

**Paul Weyrich** (executive director, Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress): "I favor whatever prayers the local community wants.... The U.S. Senate provides a perfect example of what could be done. Everyday it opens with a prayer, sometimes by a rabbi, sometimes a Catholic priest, sometimes a Mormon. No one takes any offense."

**Orrin Hatch** (senator from Utah): "An intellectually sound argument—though I disagree with it—can be made against vocal prayer. There are very few intellectually sound arguments against silent prayer or meditation."

**Question:** Would you call America a Christian country?

**Midge Decter** (executive director of the Committee for the Free World): "I am fiercely loyal to the public school system, which is dreadful and in very bad shape and a failure and everything else you want to say against it.... I am against tuition tax credits, and I am against all those things that will undermine the public school system."

**Editor's note:** Both the secular and religious Right are intellectually and morally overdrawn. The Bible and the Bible alone furnishes the wisdom that informs a civilized society. Unlike conservatives, who are old windbags full of foolishness, Christians must defend the Bible, private education, and tax exemption; and oppose abortion, infanticide, divorce-on-demand, sodomy, and impious public prayer. --*John W. Robbins*

# THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

June 1994

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: [Jrob1517@aol.com](mailto:Jrob1517@aol.com)

Website: [www.trinityfoundation.org](http://www.trinityfoundation.org)

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

## Man as Created in God's Image

W. Gary Crampton

The Psalmist posed the question nearly three millennia ago: "What is man that You [God] are mindful of him, and the son of man that You visit him?" (*Psalms* 8:4). There have been numerous attempts to answer to this question.

### *Some Non-Christian Views of Man*

Behaviorists such as J. B. Watson and B. F. Skinner view man as little more than a higher form of the animal kingdom. Man is entirely physical or corporeal; there are no souls or spirits. Man is the result of an evolutionary process and can be "conditioned" like other animals (such as Pavlov's dogs).

Sigmund Freud regarded man primarily as a sexual being. The human personality, said Freud, is tripartite. There is the animal desire of man (the Id), which is the source of man's sexual drive (the libido) ; there is man with his higher motivations, his rational awareness (the Ego) ; and there is also the umpiring factor in man: the Superego. Psychological maladjustments take place when man's sexual drives are unduly checked. The key, then, to understanding and governing human behavior is found in properly directing his sex drive.

Karl Marx, who also believed man to be a higher form of the animal kingdom, taught that man is an economic being. Economic forces motivate man and move history. This movement occurs through a

process known as dialectical materialism. The final phase of this movement, and the ultimate destiny of man, will be realized with the achievement of a "classless" society.

Existentialists, such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, see man as only a pawn in the universe. The blind forces of nature, over which man has no control, govern man's destiny. The world is indifferent to the welfare and needs of man. Ultimately, man's life is one of despair, a meaningless existence to which he must resign himself.

Some existentialists view man as "a free being." To be himself man must be left alone; he who is without restraint is able to realize his true potential, his essential nature. True man, as expressed in William Ernest Henley's "Invictus," can boldly state: "I am the master of my fate; I am the captain of my soul."

In stark contrast to these non-Christian concepts of man is that of the Psalmist. His view is the highest view. He describes man as one whom God made "a little lower than the angels," one whom God had "crowned with glory and honor." God has created man "to have dominion over the works of [His] hands." He has "put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen—even the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea that pass through the paths of the seas" (*Psalms* 8:5-8).

## *The Christian View of Man*

In agreement with the Psalmist is the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. According to the *Confession* (4:2):

After God had made all other creatures, He created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after His own image, having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it: and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change. Beside this law written in their hearts, they received a command, not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; which while they kept, they were happy in their communion with God, and had dominion over the creatures.

Among other things which may be taught in this section of the *Confession*, at least four are either explicitly or implicitly evident:

1. Man was created as a direct act of God, in His image. Man is a "living soul," composed of a physical (body) and a non-physical (spirit) element.
2. The image of God in man resides in the spiritual element.
3. Being God's image-bearer somehow involves "dominion over the earthly creatures."
4. The image is two-fold: there is a broader and narrower aspect the image. The former is intrinsic and inalienable, the latter is not—it was lost in the Fall.

### *Man the Image of God*

The *Confession* begins by stating that man was created "after God had made all other creatures." Here we see two things. First, man was created as a direct act of God. As Robert Reymond says: "There

is not a hint that he is the product of either naturalistic or theistic evolution."<sup>1</sup>

The *Genesis* 1 passage is to be viewed as progressive in the sense that there is an ascending order in creation; the more significant creatures were made after the less significant. Man was created on the sixth day as God's crowning creational act. In the words of John Calvin, man "is the noblest and most remarkable example of His justice, wisdom, and goodness." As such, man is set apart from all other creatures.<sup>2</sup> This is particularly noticeable when we read that only after the creation of man did God pronounce His creation "very good" (v. 31).

This second point, of course, is not meant in any sense to demean any other part of the creation. On the contrary, in *Genesis* 1:31 we read that the entirety of the created order is "very good." Nevertheless, man is God's image-bearer. Interestingly, in verses 11, 12, 21, 24, and 25 of *Genesis* 1, we read that God created certain plants and living creatures "after their kind." Not so with man (vv. 26-28); he is created "after the kind" of God, *i.e.*, in His image.

The special relationship that man has with God is further expressed in *Genesis* 2:5-25 where we read, not a second account of creation, but a more detailed account of the sixth day creation of man. Here God enters into a unique covenantal relationship with Adam (2:16,17; Hosea 6:7).

The Old Testament speaks of man being made in God's image and/or likeness in *Genesis* 1:26,27; 5:1-3; and 9:6.<sup>3</sup> The New Testament teaches the same in *Colossians* 3:10; *Ephesians* 4:24; *James* 3:9; and *I Corinthians* 11:7. This latter verse goes so far as to say that man does not merely possess the image of God, but that "he is the image." Hence,

<sup>1</sup> Robert L. Reymond, *God and Man in Holy Scripture* (unpublished syllabus, Covenant Theological Seminary, 1990), 155.

<sup>2</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vols. I & II, edited by John T. McNeill, translated by Ford Lewis Battles (Westminster, 1960), I:15:1,3.

<sup>3</sup> The Apocryphal books of *Wisdom of Solomon* (2:23) and *Ecclesiasticus* (17:3) also teach that man is God's image-bearer.

John Murray concludes that "man's origin is not only the unique subject of God's counsel; man is from the outset the recipient of unique endowment and dignity."<sup>4</sup>

The *Westminster Confession* maintains that the words "image" (*tselem*) and "likeness" (*demuth*), in *Genesis* 1:26,27, are used synonymously; it is an instance of the Hebrew practice of parallelism. A comparison of *Genesis* 1:26, 27 with 5:1 reveals the interchangeable use of the terms. Douglas Kelly notes that the Hebrew word *tselem* means "to carve out" or "to pattern after." Thus, we can see that God has created man to be like Himself, i.e., after His pattern or likeness."<sup>5</sup>

In *Genesis* 2:7 we read that "the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The Bible defines man as "a living soul," consisting of a physical and a non-physical element. Animals consist of a non-physical as well as a physical element (*Ecclesiastes* 3:19-21; *Psalms* 104:29,30; *Genesis* 1:20, 21, 24 [literally, "living souls"]). But their non-physical entity is different from that of man's, in that man has a "rational soul." Man can reason (*Isaiah* 1:18), whereas the earthly creatures cannot (see *Psalms* 32:9; *Jude* 10; *2 Peter* 2:12).<sup>6</sup> This, says Calvin, is what sets man

apart from the rest of creation: He has been "endued with reason."<sup>7</sup>

Not only did this divine "inbreathing" give life to Adam (and all mankind following him; *Job* 33:4), but it also gave (pre-Fall) man the capacity to relate spiritually to God (*Job* 32:8). The law of God was written in his heart (*Romans* 2:14, 15); thus man (even post-Fall man, according to *Romans* 2:14, 15) has a conscience (*Proverbs* 20:27), which is not the case with the animals.

The view of the Westminster divines that man is "a living soul" composed of a physical and a non-physical element is referred as the dichotomistic view of man. This is opposed to monism and trichotomy. The latter theory asserts that man consists of three parts: body, soul, and spirit;<sup>8</sup> the former, of one.

Trichotomists lean heavily on two particular verses: *1 Thessalonians* 5:23 and *Hebrews* 4:12. An examination of these verses will show that they do not teach trichotomy. In the former verse, Paul is not teaching about man's constitutional makeup. Rather, he is praying that God would sanctify the whole man. (Jesus makes a somewhat similar statement in *Matthew* 22:37.) In *Hebrews* 4:12, on the other hand, the author is using hyperbole; he is stating that the Word of God is so powerful that it is able to divide that which is indivisible: the soul and spirit. The Word of God, says the author of *Hebrews*, is powerful enough to penetrate into the inner recesses of man.

Moreover, the Bible frequently uses the words *spirit and soul* as synonyms. For example, in *Matthew* 6:25 and 10:28, man is said to consist of body and soul. But in *Ecclesiastes* 12:7 and *1 Corinthians* 5:3,5, he is said to be body and spirit. Likewise, in *Genesis* 35:18 and *1 Kings* 17:21, death is described as a giving up of the soul. But in *Psalms* 31:5 and *Luke* 23:46, it is a giving up of the spirit. A very

<sup>4</sup> John Murray, *Collected Writings*, Vol. II (Banner of Truth Trust, 1977), 5.

<sup>5</sup> Douglas F. Kelly, *The Creation* (Dillon: unpublished manuscript, 1977), 113; see also John Calvin, *Commentaries*, (Baker, 1981), on *Genesis* 1:26. Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, differentiates between "image" and "likeness." Rome maintains that the former is that which belongs to man as created morally neutral. "Likeness" is the "superadded gift" (*donum superadditum*) of righteousness which God gave to Adam. In the Roman Catholic view, the Fall cost man original righteousness ("likeness"), but not the state of moral neutrality ("image") in which he was created. Thus, redeemed man, with the superadded gift of righteousness restored, is able to supererogate, i.e., do works over and above that which God requires (Gordon H. Clark, *The Biblical Doctrine of Man* [Trinity Foundation, 1984], 12, 13). The Christian church has roundly denounced this heretical teaching. For example, the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (16:4) states that: "Those who in their obedience attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do."

<sup>6</sup> Gordon H. Clark, *Man*, 6; Augustine, *City of God*, 7:29.

<sup>7</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaries*, (Baker, 1981), on *John* 1:4.

<sup>8</sup> Trichotomy, which originated in the fourth century with Apollinarius (or Apollinaris) the Younger was denounced by the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. It is espoused today by some dispensationalists and charismatics. See, for example, *The Scofield Reference Bible*, note on *1 Thessalonians* 5:23.

strong case for dichotomy can be found in *Philippians* 1:27, where Paul clearly uses the words *spirit* (*pneuma*) and *soul* or *mind* (*psuche*) synonymously. And another strong case is found in *Luke* 1:46, 47, where Mary, in biblical parallelism, uses *spirit* and *soul* as functionally equivalent terms. Of course, *Genesis* 2:7 mentions only two parts: the body made of dust and the God-breathed spirit.

The other faulty view mentioned above is monism. Monists teach that man is a radical unity, rather than a composite unity of two elements. J. A. T. Robinson, for example, asserts that the New Testament views man as "the whole man," and the words "body" and "soul" are virtual synonyms. Man is just "a self."<sup>9</sup> G. C. Berkouwer is another monist, although he is not nearly so radical as Robinson. Nevertheless, he overstates the "whole man" theory, to the point where the distinction between the body and the soul or spirit is blurred.<sup>10</sup> This view is sometimes erroneously expressed as the "Hebrew view" of man as opposed to the "Greek view," which distinguishes between body and spirit.

Biblical dichotomy teaches that man is a bipartite unity. He was created as a living soul with a physical and a non-physical element. Man's final state will be the same. As the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (32:2) says: "At the last day . . . all the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies, and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls for ever."

## *The Image is Spiritual*

The *Confession* also teaches that the person himself is the spiritual element of man. God created man with "reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after His own image, having the law of God written in their hearts." Most obviously, rationality, knowledge, righteousness, holiness, and the internalized law of God are all spiritual or mental characteristics. To be sure, the whole of man is to

manifest righteousness and holiness, but, as Augustine stated, it is the soul that "rules the body"; the body is the instrument which the soul uses.<sup>11</sup>

Calvin agrees. Even though there is "no part of him [man] in which some scintillations of it [God's image] did not shine forth," nevertheless, "the chief seat of the divine image was in his mind and heart [i.e., the non-physical element] where it was eminent."<sup>12</sup> It is in the soul, says Calvin, that "the powers" of the image are located.<sup>13</sup>

The body of man, then, is neither the person nor the image. The body is the place where the soul, i.e., the image of God, the person himself dwells. It is the soul, writes Charles Hodge, which "is the man himself, that in which his identity and personality reside. It is the Ego. Higher than the soul there is nothing in man. Therefore it is often used as a synonym for self. Every soul is every man; my soul is I; his soul is he."<sup>14</sup> Or as John Gerstner says: "Man is a soul. Man has a body."<sup>15</sup>

Biblical confirmation of this is found in *Proverbs* 23:7, where we read that, "as he [a man] reckons in his soul, so he is." Then too, in *Mark* 7:21-23, the Lord Jesus teaches that the outward deeds of men are driven by the inward desires. Why? Because it is "from it [the heart, i.e., the mind or spirit] that flow the springs of life" (*Proverbs* 4:23). It is the soul that drives the body.

Further, there are (at least) four particular New Testament passages which teach that the image of God is to be found in the spiritual element of man. First, *John* 4:24 teaches us that God is pure Spirit; He does not have a body (*Luke* 24:39). This alone should guard us against believing that the body of man is in any way the image.<sup>16</sup> And since the

<sup>11</sup> Augustine, *On the Magnitude of the Soul* 12.22; *City of God* 10.30. For an excellent discussion of how the body and soul function together, see Clark, *Man*, 88-95.

<sup>12</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaries*, on *Genesis* 1:26.

<sup>13</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes* I:15:3.

<sup>14</sup> Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II (Eerdmans, 1977), 48.

<sup>15</sup> John H. Gerstner, *Tabletalk*, edited by Robert F. Ingram (Ligonier Ministries, December 1992), 11.

<sup>16</sup> To assert that the image is somehow physical would apparently lead to the conclusion of the Mormons and the

<sup>9</sup> John A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, as cited in Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Baker, 1983-85), 525.

<sup>10</sup> G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God* (Eerdmans, 1962), 194-233.



constitutional makeup of man is body and spirit, man must be God's image-bearer in a spiritual sense.

Second, in *2 Corinthians* 12:2 we read that there was a time when Paul did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body. Obviously, if he was out of the body, it was still the same person: Paul, the image-bearer of God. Then in *2 Corinthians* 5:11 and *Philippians* 1:21-24, Paul writes that he, as God's image-bearer, will continue to exist, even after he dies and leaves the body behind.

It is the soul or the person himself that is immortal, says the apostle, not the body. It is the "immortal soul," says the Confession, along with Paul, that is the seat of the divine image. When man dies, the body dies; the person, God's image-bearer, does not die. Man remains man—God's image-bearer—whether in the body or out of the body.

It is, of course, true that the Second Person of the Trinity took upon Himself a human nature (*John* 1:14). The Bible also teaches that He is the image of God (*Colossians* 1:15; *2 Corinthians* 4:4).<sup>17</sup> But this does not support the theory that the whole man is the image. First, Christ took upon Himself a human nature that He might become like man, and not vice-versa (*Hebrews* 2:14-18). And second, as Reymond points out, "Christ is the 'image of God' because He is deity and because as such in His incarnation He took our flesh."<sup>18</sup>

---

ancient Anthropomorphites. They believe that God Himself has a body, *i.e.*, a physical element in His nature.

<sup>17</sup> Karl Barth used the biblical teaching that Christ is the image of God to support His Christomonism theology. According to Barth, man *qua* man is not the image of God, because God does not enter into such relationships with natural man. Christ, then, is the true man and His humanity is the original. The natural man's humanity is merely a derivative of Christ's. Natural man must therefore participate in His humanity, not He in ours. This kind of thinking led Barth to see the image, as it is found in *Genesis* 1:26, 27, as referring to the male-female (I-Thou) relationship, which is analogous to the inter-Trinitarian (I-Thou) relationship and the relationship which Christ has with man (Reymond, *God and Man*, 163; Sinclair B. Ferguson, "Image of God," *New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 328, 329.

<sup>18</sup> Reymond, *God and Man*, 163.

The fact that the image resides in the spiritual element of man does not demean the physical aspect. As Calvin has stated, this image is to "shine forth" from every part of man. Man, body and soul, was created "very good" (*Genesis* 1:31).

## *Dominion over Earthly Creatures*

Being God's image-bearer somehow involves "dominion over the creatures." In *Genesis* 1 we read: Let Us make man in our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the Earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the Earth . . . and God said to them [mankind], 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the Earth and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky, and over every living thing that moves on the Earth' (26, 28).

This mandate, so far as we are told, was given only to man. As God's vice-gerent, man is to rule over all the earthly creation for the glory of God. As stated in Psalm 8, even post-Fall man is to keep this command. Of course, only redeemed man can do so for the glory of God.

According to some theologians (*e.g.*, Buswell, Berkhof), this mandate is part and parcel of the image, as a functional aspect. Other scholars (*e.g.*, Calvin, Murray) concur with Reymond that "*Genesis* 1:26 implies that dominion was to be a bestowment, an investiture grounded in and contingent upon the fact that man is God's image"<sup>19</sup> In other words, man's dominion investiture is not part of the image, but is given to him in light of the fact that he is God's image-bearer. The concept of dominion itself is the same: As the Confession says, man is God's vice-gerent and has God's "law written in [his] heart" with which to exercise dominion.

*Genesis* 2:15 teaches about the dominion aspect of the image. Here we read that man is to cultivate the Earth; he is to labor in his God-given calling of life (businessman, farmer, homemaker, etc.). Man is to see his occupational calling as an area to be brought under the righteous standards of Almighty God. The

---

<sup>19</sup> Reymond, *God and Man*, 163.

dominion mandate given to man by God "intends to affect his entire life-pattern."<sup>20</sup>

This is further supported by the fact that Jesus Christ, the God-man, came to exercise dominion over each and every facet of life, i.e., universal dominion (*Hebrews 2:5-9; 1 Corinthians 15:20-28*). In the words of Hodge: "This universal dominion, as we learn from the Scriptures, has been realized and attained only by the incarnation and exaltation of the Son of God. But as God sees the end from the beginning, as His plan is immutable and all comprehending, this supreme exaltation of humanity was designed from the beginning and included in the dominion with which man was invested."<sup>21</sup>

### *The Two-Fold Image*

Reformed theology generally acknowledges that there is a two-fold image of God in man: the metaphysical (or epistemological) and the ethical.<sup>22</sup> The former is broader in scope: man is a personal, rational, immortal, spiritual being. The broader image was defaced by the Fall, but not erased. The fact that the broader image remains basically intact, but marred, is that which allows non-believers to achieve a certain level of excellence in law, medicine, philosophy, and so forth.

<sup>20</sup> O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980), 80; compare Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 102, 103. The dominion mandate does not give man the authority to exercise dominion over his fellow man. Jesus makes this very clear in Matthew 20:25-28. Man is only a vice-gerent, and his dominion must always be viewed in light of Scripture. Scripture, being God's Word, is the authority by which the various God ordained institutions are to be governed: family (*Genesis 2:18-25; Ephesians 5:22-33*), church (*Matthew 16:13-20; 1 Timothy 3:1-13; Titus 1:5-9*); civil magistrate (*Romans 13:1-7; 1 Peter 2:13-17*); and the employer-employee relationship (*Ephesians 6:5-9; Colossians 3:22-4:1*). Each institution is different in function, but not in the source of authority. All are to be ordered

<sup>21</sup> Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 102, 103.

<sup>22</sup> John Murray, *Collected Writings*, II, 40. A reading of Calvin's *Institutes* (I:15:4; II:1:5; 2:4,12,17; III:3:9; 7:6) and his *Commentary on Genesis* 1:26, 7, will show that although he did not use this exact wording, Calvin did hold, at least basically, to the concept of a two-fold image of God in man. See also Augustine, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, 48.

Man did not stop being man after *Genesis 3:1-7*; he is still a human being. As Clark points out, if this were not the case, man could no longer sin, because "sinning presupposes rationality and voluntary decision. Animals cannot sin. Sin therefore requires God's image because man is responsible for his sins."<sup>23</sup> Thus, post-Fall man still possesses the metaphysical image of God (*Genesis 9:6; 1 Corinthians 11:7; James 3:9*).

Speaking of the broader image, Abraham Kuyper, Jr., writes:

This image of God cannot be lost since, if man can lose it, he would at the moment of losing it, cease to be a human being. The image of God in the wider sense . . . has reference to the human in man, to that whereby man, in distinction from all other creatures, is man and not an angel or an animal or a plant.<sup>24</sup>

The ethical image is more restricted. Man was created with true holiness, righteousness, and (ethical) knowledge (*Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10*). Adam possessed original righteousness. This more narrow, ethical image was erased at the Fall, leaving man in a state of "total depravity," i.e., incapable of doing anything that pleases God (*Romans 3:1-18; 8:7,8*). Kuyper states: "The image of God in the narrower sense . . . was lost, and in its place there came blindness, guilt, and sinfulness."<sup>25</sup>

While both believers and non-believers continue to bear the image metaphysically, only the former have the ethical image restored. This, of course, is accomplished through the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. Only redeemed man can do "good works" (*Ephesians 2:8-10*): those works which are properly motivated out of love for God (Matthew 22:37-39), have as their goal the glory of God (*1 Corinthians 10:31*), and have as their standard the Word of God

<sup>23</sup> Clark, 73.

<sup>24</sup> Abraham Kuyper, Jr., *The Image of God*, 123, as cited in W. Gary Crampton and Kenneth G. Talbot, *Toward a Creedal Theology* (Lakeland: unpublished manuscript, 1991), 29.

<sup>25</sup> Kuyper, 126, as cited in Crampton and Talbot, 30.

(John 14:15, 21).<sup>26</sup> Biblical good works are "Godworks."

## *Conclusion*

In summary, it may be said that man, as the image-bearer of God, is the crown of God's earthly creation. He is a bipartite unity, consisting of both a physical and non-physical element. Further, the image resides in the "immortal" spiritual, or non-physical element, even though the image "shines forth" in every part of man, both body and soul. Of the earthly creatures, man alone is able to reason, and to enter into a spiritual relationship with his Creator.

As God's image-bearer on earth man is given the dominion mandate. He is God's vice-gerent, and he bears the responsibility of subduing the Earth for his Creator's glory. Although the Fall left man in God's image metaphysically, the ethical image was altogether erased. The latter is only restored through Jesus Christ. Only redeemed man can truly carry out this mandate as service to his God.

---

<sup>26</sup> See the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (16:1, 2).

# THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

*July, August 1982*

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: [Jrob1517@aol.com](mailto:Jrob1517@aol.com)

Website: [www.trinityfoundation.org](http://www.trinityfoundation.org)

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

## Traducianism

Gordon H. Clark

The various theological doctrines are so interwoven that it is sometimes difficult to know in what order to discuss them. As a professor once said of a work on philosophy (and no doubt of all works on philosophy, so also with theology) one cannot understand the first chapter until after he has understood the last chapter. The nineteenth-century theologian, W. G. T. Shedd, had prepared for the subjects just discussed in our previous section by a long passage on the origin of individual souls. He put it in his chapter on "Creation." A. A. Hodge might well have done so, for he holds to the immediate creation of every soul at the moment of conception. But Shedd holds that the souls of the children are as much derived from their parents as their bodies are. The plan of the present treatise is to connect the origin of souls with federal headship and the imputation of guilt from Adam. The origin of souls was mentioned in that section, but its discussion was deferred.

### *A. A. Hodge*

A. A. Hodge is a creationist. He teaches that each successive human soul is immediately created by God in billions of cases, billions of separate acts of creation. But his defense of this position and his arguments against traducianism are both beset with difficulties. In the first place, he acknowledges that "without going the length of Realism, it appears probable that the divinely ordained representative...is conditioned on the generic unity

of men as constituting a race propagated by generation." Note the term *propagated*. This means that traducianism is at least plausible. But Hodge does not want to go "the length of Realism." But if not, then what? Everyone who has had an introductory course in philosophy knows, or should know, that Aristotle and John Locke proposed an empirical method by which sensory observation could be transmuted into abstract concepts, which in turn form the basis for universal propositions. But Aristotle never spelled out the method; he depended on an illustration of an army in rout. Locke was more specific, but Berkeley demolished his argument. Hence the more philosophical readers may here wish to consider whether the generic unity Hodge suggests can be produced without adopting the Realism he detests. As for Christ himself—though traducianism, operating through Mary alone, can account for his human soul—his federal headship cannot be accounted for, either by creationism or by traducianism. Not by creationism, because even if his human soul had been a special creation, it is the Person and not just the human nature that is the federal head. Not by traducianism, because Christ had no descendants. But this is not the case with Adam.

One reason why A. A. Hodge makes such a poor case for creationism is his imperious urge to refute Realism. Thus he says, "The doctrine that each soul is severally and immediately created by God at the

instant of conception<sup>1</sup> is obviously and absolutely inconsistent with the Realistic view of human nature. *No Creationist can be a Realist.*" I am not sure that this emphatic statement is altogether correct. For one thing, it may be possible for a Creationist and a Realist to agree on the constitution of human nature without agreeing on the immediate origin of each soul. Nor is it true that every Realist agrees with Plato. Shedd certainly believed that God created the world, and he did not believe in the pre-existence of souls; whereas Plato had no place for any strictly creative Deity. After all, Augustine was a Realist, and he argued strongly against Plotinus in favor of creation.

Since Hodge is so strongly opposed to Realism, one may oppose Hodge on that basis. For example, the theory of imagination by which Aristotle aimed to produce concepts which in turn would make universal judgments possible is open to devastating attack.<sup>2</sup> Then if Aristotelian Conceptualism be rejected, only Realism and Nominalism remain; and the latter must reduce the Trinity to tritheism or atheism. But the more immediate rebuttal, and the one more appropriate to the present treatise, is the Scriptural material.

Hodge seems to think that traducianism is inconsistent with the federal headship of Adam: "Calvin ...[et al.] unite in affirming that we were in Adam representatively; that we really and truly sinned in him because his sin is our sin, really and truly our sin as to its federal responsibility." But far from denying federal headship, traducianism offers a possible, even a probable explanation of why God chose Adam to be our federal head. Creationism allows only a physical or corporeal, not a spiritual, connection between Adam and us.

Yet Hodge wants "hereditary corruption." But how can corruption be hereditary if every new soul is an immediate creation? Hodge surely does not help himself by his incomplete disjunctions. On two successive pages he argues, "these men [Calvin,

Beza, Turretin] were not Realists ...they specifically explain ... that we were in Adam *representatively*." Hodge's disguised premises are (1) that federal representation is impossible in Realism, and (2) that Adam's being our representative cannot be harmonized with traducianism. These two premises are clearly untrue, for traducianism not only aims at but also succeeds in making representationism more easily understandable. The two do not form an exclusive disjunction as Hodge maintains.

Another poor argument shortly appears. "If the entire genus was in Adam, the entire antediluvian race was, in the same sense, in Noah. If we were guilty co-agents in the first sin of the one...we must be... guilty of every one of the sins of Noah." This paragraph teems with confusion. First, we are indeed descendants of Noah. Second, the entire genus was in Noah, and is in us too. Otherwise we would not be human beings. As Plato so clearly said in his *Parmenides*, the Idea, or genus, is not like a canopy or tent in which each man is directly under only a part of the covering. The Idea or definition must be complete in every individual case, or—in better Platonic language—every man must participate in the whole Idea.

But this in no way implies that we are guilty of any—let alone every one—of the sins of Noah. In fact we are not guilty even of Adam's sins, that is, his second, third, and fourth sin. We are guilty only of his first sin. Just because the federal head of the whole human race must be, or most appropriately is, its ancestor, it by no means follows that every ancestor must be a federal head. Hodge's logic is bad, very bad. Actually he is applying simple conversion to a universal affirmative. The point is that God chose Adam as federal head of the race; he did not so choose Noah. Had he chosen Noah and not Adam, then the antediluvians would not have been guilty of Adam's sin. Traducianism is a plausible explanation of federal headship, but it does not require two or more federal heads to make the race guilty.

Hodge's failure to refute traducianism, and realism, does not *prove* that these two theories are true. There may be better objections than those Hodge has made. I do not happen to know any. However,

<sup>1</sup> Note well that these words absolve from the charge of misrepresentation everyone who reports that creationism teaches the *immediate* creation of each and every soul.

<sup>2</sup> Compare my *Three Types of Religious Philosophy*, chapter 3. See also several other of my books.

one's decision must be based on Scripture. And there are indeed Scriptural passages which, to put it modestly, seem to favor Shedd rather than Hodge.

## *The Scriptural Evidence*

Shedd divides his argument for traducianism into three parts: (1) Scripture, (2) Systematic Theology, (3) Physiology. The third part may be interesting, but it is useless. The first and second parts are the same thing. The second simply organizes the first. Therefore Shedd and the present treatise base the case on Scripture.

Shedd begins, "the Bible teaches that man is a species, and the idea [or definition] of a species implies the propagation of the entire individual out of it." This was what was meant a page ago in the reference to a covering tent in Plato's *Parmenides*. That the human race is a species, Shedd defends by the use of the term *man* in *Genesis* 1:26-27. Note that God said, "Let us make man in our image, and let *them* have dominion...male and female created he them." *Man* or *Adam* did not become a proper masculine noun until *Genesis* 2:19. Note too that *Genesis* 46:26 speaks of "the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins." Shedd also quotes a half a dozen verses from the New Testament. When Eve was taken from Adam's side, there is no mention of the creation of a second soul. Eve totally came out of Adam (*I Corinthians* 11:8). This supports the view that any child of Adam and Eve was born totally a member of the species. The entire person, not just his body, is propagated.

One may object that the new soul was immediately created, but that its creation is just not mentioned. Reply: Doctrines should not be based on silence.

It is not my desire to summarize Shedd's fifty or sixty pages of Scriptural argument. His work is easily obtainable and the student is urged to study it. However, whether found in Shedd or elsewhere, more Scriptural references than two or three in *Genesis* are needed.

That the propagation of the race is only corporeal, and not spiritual or mental also, that only the child's body and not his soul comes from the parents seems

to be denied in *John* 3:6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." The Greek verb—occurring twice in this verse, and five times in the context—is *gennaō*, beget. It is the same verb that one finds in *Matthew* 1:1-16. In *John* 3:6 Christ is speaking to Nicodemus, and "that which is born of flesh" is Nicodemus' unregenerated soul rather than his physical body. The verb indicates that Nicodemus received his unregenerated soul from his parents. This prevents the interpretation that *sarx* (flesh) means simply man's corporeal nature. Nor does the Nicodemus usage stand alone. *Matthew* 24:22 may look as if only the body were meant, but the shortening of the evil days preserved life and soul too. *Luke* 3:6, "And all flesh shall see God," cannot possibly refer to a physical body. Nor must *sarx* always refer to a sinful soul: To return to *John* again, 1:14 says that the Word was made flesh (*sarx*). Consider: The Word did not merely take to himself a physical body; he also took a reasonable or rational soul. He got them both through Mary. Similarly, *sarx* in *John* 17:2 does not mean the body, certainly not the body alone, but rather Jesus gives eternal life to souls. *Sarx* sometimes means man's depraved nature, but this only enforces the point that it means the soul. A body cannot sin. Therefore the soul of Nicodemus came from his parents.

*John* 1:14 has already been mentioned, but one should also notice that the preceding verse denies that spiritual birth depends on heredity ("not of bloods"); but though natural birth is not explicitly mentioned, the verse implies that natural birth does so depend. Hence both soul and body come from parents. The soul, as well as the body, is born (compare again 3:6).

*Acts* 17:26 does not say that God hath made of one blood all nations with respect to their bodies alone. The following verse, with its phrase "seek the Lord," clearly includes man's mind or soul. Shedd and others cite other verses that interested students can search out. The accumulation of verses is important because some Creationists give the

impression that traducianism has only a few verses in its favor,<sup>3</sup> whereas the number is considerable.

The most important argument for traducianism is based on *Genesis* 2:2-3. "God ended all his work." "In six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth...and rested on the seventh day" (*Exodus* 20:11). "God rested...from all his works [*apo pan to ton ergon*]" (*Hebrews* 4:4).

Perhaps the reader will permit a paragraph on Charles Hodge also. In Volume II of his *Systematic Theology*, 68ff., he discusses traducianism and creationism. Most of the section on the former depends on the alleged silence of Scripture on the subject: The various passages that traducianists use, he claims, are inconclusive. He even asserts, "The more enlightened and candid advocates of traducianism admit that the Scriptures are silent on the subject" (68). This means, of course, that Shedd, who used Scripture passages, was either not enlightened or not candid. Hodge understands the word *flesh*, in those passages already cited, to mean precisely the body in contrast with the soul. Then when he comes to the transmission of inborn depravity, and the difficulty of thinking that God immediately creates sinful souls, he appeals to secondary and mediate causes, thus abandoning the idea of immediate creation: "We do not know how the agency of God is connected with the operation of second causes, how far that agency is mediate, and how far it is immediate" (69). Certainly this is a surrender of creationism. Traducianists are willing to say that the souls of men are "created" mediately, *i.e.*, by the mediation of parents, just as we may also speak of trees and animals as created objects. But these created objects on my front lawn were mediately created through the seeds or slips from earlier plants.

Charles Hodge at this point refers to his later chapter on original sin as a more explicit defense of creationism and the difficulty with God's immediate creation of sinful souls. This reference I take to be pages 222ff., and perhaps also page 253. But none

of this relieves him of his duplicity. On the latter page he allows, "It is moreover a historical fact universally admitted, that character, within certain limits, is transmissible from parents to children. Every nation, separate tribe, and even every extended family of men, has its physical, mental, social, and moral peculiarities which are propagated from generation to generation." But if God *immediately* creates the soul of the child, no mental or moral characteristics can be *propagated*.

The earlier section is equally unsatisfactory. His subhead was "Realism No Solution of the Problem of Original Sin." The main deficiency in his argument is that traducianism, as a theory of the origin of the soul, never claims to explain original sin. It is a view of the origin of the souls of Adam and Eve's descendants. Beyond that, it may add that the derivation of the children's souls from their parents ties in nicely with God's choice of Adam as their federal head. This would have been so even if Adam had not sinned. But while traducianism and original sin are related, for all doctrines are in some way related in one system, the latter must receive its own explanation. Or, as another example, the atonement as such is not an explanation of our sanctification. Nor do the sacraments explain our resurrection at Christ's return. Hence Hodge's attempt to refute traducianism, or realism, on the ground that it does not solve the problem of original sin is worthless.

All the less do these pages (222ff.) refute traducianism. The main reason is that Hodge is ardently opposed to Realism. In fact, his argument against Realism begins two pages back. A few paragraphs ago I urged several objections against Hodge's arguments. Maybe one more is allowable and sufficient. "Realism ... subverts the doctrine of the Trinity in so far that it makes the Father, Son, and Spirit one God only in the sense in which all men are one man. The persons of the Trinity are one God, because they are one in essence or substance; and all men are one man because they are one in essence. The answers which Trinitarian realists give to this objection are unsatisfactory, because they assume the divisibility, and consequently the materiality of Spirit" (222).

<sup>3</sup> Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 200, "The few scriptural passages...", "no clear teaching of scripture..." At least Berkhof is honest enough to apply these remarks to both views.

This quotation consists of three sentences. The first sentence is doubtful. Hodge does not cite any author. Naturally, the Persons of the Trinity are one in the sense that all men are one and all horses are one; but it does not follow that the three Persons are one *only* in that sense. For example, three human beings have three wills; but the three Persons have but one will. Hence the diversification of human beings is not identical to the diversification of the Persons, for which reason we cannot assert that the two unities are completely identical. The second sentence seems to me to be quite true and therefore no objection. Sentence three takes it as an objection and offers an alleged reply. Realists, says Hodge, assume the divisibility of essence and the materiality of Spirit. Hodge capitalizes the S. Now if pagan Plato was worse than Christian Realists, he must have all the more asserted the divisibility of the essence. Actually he ridiculed it. Did Hodge never read Plato's *Parmenides*? And to suppose that Christian Traducianists or Christian Realists teach the materiality of Spirit, either the Holy Spirit or the human spirit, is ridiculous. Traducianists are traducianists because they believe that not only are the children's bodies derived from their parents' bodies, but also that their immaterial souls are equally derived from their parents' immaterial souls.

Kind reader, permit me to add a personal remark. I consider Charles Hodge by far the best of all American theologians. But his Scottish common sense *philosophy* was fortified with too much usquebaugh before he imbibed it.

### *Buswell and Berkhof*

J. Oliver Buswell, Jr. defends creationism in a most unfortunate way. In his *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Zondervan, 1962, Vol. I, 250-252) he speaks three times of Christ having been born with a sinless body: "The body of Christ was perfectly sinless." Nothing is said about a sinless soul. This is peculiarly strange, for, contrary to orthodox doctrine, Buswell teaches, "He, that is, his personal eternal being, his soul, became a human person, a human soul, without in any way ceasing to be a divine person, a divine Soul" (251). But this seems to be Nestorianism unless Buswell

means to annihilate the divine Person, and other creationists would not be pleased with this defense of their doctrine.

This section will now conclude with a review of the objections raised against traducianism by Louis Berkhof (*Systematic Theology*, 197-201). Berkhof begins with a short but very fair statement of traducianism, including some of its Scriptural support. He refers to only one verse in favor of creationism, namely, *Psalm* 104:30. But if this verse teaches creationism, it follows that the souls of all animals and all plants are also immediately created. Now, it is true that the Old Testament assigns both souls and spirits to animals, and if a creationist wishes to accept the point, he is consistent. Those who oppose the theory of traducianism in the case of human beings, but deny it of animals, are inconsistent. An interesting, if inconclusive, point. But it certainly keeps God busy creating.

Berkhof's first objection is only half an objection. He begins by appealing to the simplicity and indivisibility of the soul, and concludes that the souls of the parents cannot divide to make a new soul. He offers no Scriptural support for this; and, as previously noted, the soul of Eve seems to be a contrary example. The second part of the first objection is a question: Does the new soul originate from the father or from the mother, or from both? Medieval theologians, as I have heard, held that the body comes from the mother and the soul from the father. That it comes from both is more plausible. Eve's soul was surely a special case; Christ's human soul could have come only from Mary. This was also a special, miraculous case. But inability to answer this question is no refutation of traducianism, especially if Scripture favors the fact.

Berkhof presses this question in his second objection by asserting that if the new soul is potentially in the souls of the parents, traducianism must be a form of materialism. This is utter nonsense. He also adds that it would make the parents *creators*. But since he cannot deny that the bodies of babies come from their parents, he must, if consistent, acknowledge that parents are indeed *creators* of bodies. It is strange how a truly intelligent theologian can be so irrational. The third



objection is not an objection at all: It is something that traducianists admit, indeed assert, and use as an objection against creationism. Berkhof says, "(3) It proceeds on the assumption that, after the original creation, God works only mediately"(198). This, however, is not precisely an assumption: It is an exegesis of Scripture.

Berkhof also argues that God in regeneration does not act mediately but immediately creates a new soul. Now, it is true that the apostle speaks about a new man and even a "new creature" (2 *Corinthians* 5:17; *Galatians* 6:15). But if the Greek word in these two verses be understood as *bara* as used in Genesis, there would have come into being, *ex nihilo*, another person; and in such a case the sinner himself would not be that person. One must remember that *regeneration*, in the epistles, is usually called a *resurrection*. Resurrection allows the individual sinner to remain himself. Well, *re-generation* does so too. Creation *ex nihilo* produces someone else.

The fourth objection is one that has become all too familiar with us through the Hodges. Traducianism is Realism, and Realism is bad. Without repeating the philosophic arguments about species, universal propositions, and nonexistent images, we deny—on the basis of arguments already given—that traducianism "fails to give a satisfactory answer to the question why men are held responsible only for the first sin of Adam, and not for his later sins, nor for the sins of the rest of their forebearers [*sic*]." This matter will appear again in the discussion on sovereignty.

Berkhof's fifth and last objection is equally faulty. Briefly, it is that traducianism would result in Christ's having a depraved human soul. But this assumes that Adam was Christ's representative and federal head. This, however, is not the case; and the *Westminster Confession* explicitly rules it out: "...the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them *by ordinary generation*" (VI, 3). Incidentally, the verb *conveyed* suggests traducianism. The birth of Christ was miraculous and is not to be subsumed under the otherwise universal rule.

Berkhof then argues for Creationism, first on an exegetical basis. *Ecclesiastes* 12:7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it," indicates "different origins" for soul and body. This is not surprising: *Genesis* 2:7 says so. But neither verse specifies the mode of propagation. God immediately formed earth into a body for Adam; does that mean that God immediately does the same for every individual? How *Isaiah* 42:5 fits into Berkhof's theory is difficult to say. *Zechariah* 12:1 says that God "formeth the spirit of man within him." But *Amos* 4:13, with the same Hebrew verb, says that "God formed the mountains also; and createth the wind." Does God immediately create every wind that blows down from Canada to chill us each winter? Did not God form a mountain in a Mexican cornfield a few years ago? It took him about a year to do it. *Hebrews* 12:9, which Berkhof next cites, speaks of God as "the Father of spirits." How can one get creationism out of this? He quotes "Delitzsch, though a traducianist [as saying], 'There can hardly be a more classical proof text for creationism.'" One cannot but wonder whether Delitzsch was speaking sarcastically, for if this is the best text creationists can find, traducianists need have no fear. In ancient Jewish society, and sometimes in American English, the term *father* does not mean a boy's immediate parent. Abraham Lincoln said, "Four score and seven years ago, our fathers...." The Jews regularly referred to Abraham as their father (*John* 8:39). If the verse has any reference at all to the origin of souls, it suggests traducianism, not creationism. Berkhof really gives his case away by adding to the verse in *Hebrews* 12:9, *Numbers* 16:22, which says merely that God is the God of the spirits of all flesh. Well, of course; God is the God of all the universe.

The second argument is the philosophical point that while creationism recognizes "the immaterial and spiritual and therefore indivisible nature of the soul of man.... The traducian theory on the other hand posits a derivation of essence, which, as is generally admitted, necessarily implies separation or division of essence." This is a misunderstanding of Realism, one that the *Parmenides* ridiculed. Perhaps Berkhof is thinking of Tertullian. But Tertullian—though a Christian, and an important person in the

development of the doctrine of the Trinity—was, strangely enough, a materialist. Very few Christians have been materialists. The next one I can think of was Thomas Hobbes in the seventeenth century. More recently, behaviorism has been making headway in Christian colleges; but clearly this is not Christianity. At any rate, Shedd and others were not materialists.

The third and last argument concerns Christology and argues that traducianism must make Jesus guilty of Adam's first sin. This was refuted earlier, and some elucidation will follow in the next section, *Sovereignty*.