



Endnotes for: *The Hermeneutical Problem of Genesis 1 – 11*

Fall 2020 *Bible and Spade*

Notes

¹ For the classic statement of the viewpoint that underlies this paper see B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1964).

² E.g. M. A. Jeeves 'Towards the Recovery of Harmony Between Science and Christian Faith', *Theolog Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 15–23; D. M. McKay (ed.), *Christianity in a Mechanistic Universe* (IVP, 1965).

³ Lest this strike the reader as fundamentalist rhetoric I would draw attention to the very important symposium, *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*, ed. P. S. Moorhead and M. M. Kaplan (Philadelphia: Wistar Institute Press, 1967). On page 79 C. H. Waddington answers M. P. Schutzenberger's argument that evolution according to Neo-Darwinian principles is statistically impossible by arguing that it must be possible because the only alternative would be special creation.

⁴ As well as the symposium referred to in the preceding note see G. A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1960).

⁵ E.g. J. A. Thompson, 'Genesis 1–3. Science? History? Theology?' *Theolog Review* 3/3, p. 16.

⁶ This is far from being a new situation. Many techniques of literary and form criticism were used first in the OT field and later created much greater opposition when consistently applied in the NT. Gunkel himself was moved to the OT field from NT when it was realized that his methodology could be applied there and incur less opposition.

⁷ To use a trivial example, Philadelphia University Museum used to caption the well-known offering-stand from Early-Dynastic Ur which shows a billy-goat standing with its forelegs on the branches of a tree. (H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* [Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1954], p. 31 and pl. 28) as the 'ram caught in a thicket'. Saner minds seem to have prevailed and this caption has been removed.

⁸ Similarly the tendency of research is often to emphasize the discontinuity rather than the relatedness of animal groups (Kerkut, op. cit., p. 149).

⁹ See J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 67 for translation of this text.

¹⁰ For discussion see H. Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals* (London: Macmillan, 1939), pp. 205ff. He argues that on Assyrian seals it is a symbol of the god Assur. It is hard to see any connection between this symbol and the trees of Eden.

¹¹ It is possible that the Mesopotamian parallels are the results of distortions of the original creation narrative to fit a polytheistic system. If that is the case they would then belong to the same category as the flood account. The argument is often used that the Mesopotamian accounts must be the originals because the Mesopotamian versions are older than the biblical texts (E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964], p. 10). That is by no means certain. The text which is generally used as the supposed original on which Genesis 1 is based is the "Babylonian Creation Account", also referred to as *Enuma Elish*. The consensus is now to date it in the late second millennium BC. (W.G. Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar 1: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion" in *The Seed of Wisdom, Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek*, [Toronto: Toronto U, 1964], pp. 3–13; W. Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks, Kevelaer, Butzon, and Bercker*, 1982 [=AOAT 213], pp.174ff.) If, as the Bible says, Moses wrote the Pentateuch, Genesis 1 may be older.

¹² It is significant that Speiser who is convinced that the biblical story was derived from Mesopotamian prototypes (ibid., p. lv) cannot find a better parallel than the 'Civilization' of Enkidu by a prostitute (ibid., pp. 26f. For translation of this supposed parallel see Pritchard, op. cit., p. 75).

¹³ For discussion of the philosophical presuppositions of physics, old and new, see M. Capek, *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1961).

¹⁴ T. S. Kuhn, *The Copernican Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).

¹⁵ Thompson, op. cit., pp. 17ff. kings.... The waters that you saw, where the harlot is seated, are peoples and multitudes....

And the woman that you saw is the great city which has dominion over the kings of the earth' (17:5–18). It is the lack of a similar interpretation of the 'symbolism' of Genesis which so sharply distinguishes Genesis and

Revelation.

¹⁶ The attempt to explain these parallel incidents in terms of the documentary hypothesis is shown to be ridiculous if an attempt is made to assign each parallel to a different source in every case in which a parallel exists. The cases of both Abraham and Isaac lying concerning their wives is often used as proof of the documentary hypothesis. However, inconsistently, the theory attributes both barrenness accounts and both famine accounts to J. The inconsistencies become more evident if the parallels in the life of Jacob are also considered. Basically the documentary hypothesis is able to make a plausible case by ignoring most of the incidents of ‘duplicate’ narratives. When all are taken into account then it is clear that the ‘duplicate’ narratives and the other ‘criteria’ for dividing documents come into conflict.

¹⁷ [PDF version only; article download available on ABR website [here](#)] John Murray (in *Principles of Conduct* [London: IVP; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957], p. 30) claims that Gn. 2:2 refers to “the seventh day in the sphere of God’s action, not the seventh day in our weekly cycle” (emphasis his). Consideration of this question would involve a lengthy treatment of the meaning of God’s seventh-day rest. The frequent affirmation that the seventh day of Genesis 2:2 is still continuing needs to be proven. Murray unfortunately omits such proof. Briefly it may be argued that the text gives no indication of such a sphere distinction. The text is not concerned with God as he is in himself but with God’s activity in a temporally conditioned creation. Even the seventh day refers not to God in himself but to God in relation to his creation. At this point I can agree with Murray (*ibid.*, p. 31): “God’s rest is the rest of delight in the work of creation accomplished, ‘And God saw all that which he made, and behold, it was very good’ (Gn. 1:31).” This is expressly alluded to in Exodus 31: 17 in connection with God’s sabbath rest, “On the seventh day he rested and refreshed himself” and means surely the rest of satisfaction and delight in the completed work of creation.

18 J. I. Packer, “*Fundamentalism*” and the Word of God (London: IVP, 1958), pp. 59–61. I [have] always been under pressure to allegorize Genesis so that it may conform with Plotinus or Aristotle or some other human philosophy. We have treated the problem as though it were a modern one, as though we alone have had to face the onerous task of holding to a view of cosmic and human origins which is out of sympathy with the philosophical premises of our culture. The second sense in which we have lost our historical perspective is that we have forgotten that until our Lord returns we face strife and conflict in this world. We have sought to avoid that conflict in the intellectual realms. We have accepted the claim of humanistic thought that its scholarship is religiously neutral when the Bible teaches us that no man is religiously neutral. Man either seeks to suppress the truth in unrighteousness or to live all his life to the glory of God. In that total warfare scholarship is no mutually declared truce.