6/01/19 Genesis 2:18-25 “Through faith we believe that God created”

Genesis 2:18 – And the Lord God said, *[It is]* not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.

not good – not (good; pleasant; agreeable) “good” has been used 11 times until now.

alone – alone; apart; bar; besides; except; only

Translated “only” in Deuteronomy 8:3 – And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every *[word]* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live.

help – *‘ezer* (help; helper; succour) Forms part of Ebenezer in 1 Samuel 7:12 – Then Samuel took a stone, and set *[it]* between Mizpeh and Shen, and called the name of it Eben–ezer, saying, Hitherto hath the Lord helped us.

help meet for him – help that is suitable for him. This doesn’t signify merely one who helps, but one who is suitable for Adam as a man. That is, one who is like man in shape, temperament, feelings etc, one who complements the man. Man has been created a social creature; therefore God has created the beginnings of the society in which man would live.

Genesis 1:27 says that God created man both male and female, so woman was created as well as man on the 6th day. This narrative in Genesis 2 is mostly filling in the gaps of narrative left out of the bare outline of creation in Genesis 1. Also note that man could not have been told to be fruitful and multiply (Genesis 1:28) without woman having been created as well.

Genesis 2:19 – And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought *[them]* unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that *[was]* the name thereof.

While Adam was created from the dust (*‘aphar* – dry earth; ground) of the ground (Genesis 2:7), beasts and fowls (may have included all living creatures – see below) were created from *‘adamah* (ground; land), a word which derives from *‘adam* (red); *‘adam* (translated man) is also derived from *‘adam* (red). Note that Edom is derived from *‘adom* (red) which is in turn derived from *‘adam* (red). What this means is that “adam”, “ground”/”earth”, “Edom”, are all derived from the Hebrew word for “red”.

Putting all this together to make sense means that while Adam was created from dry dust, the other living creatures were created from the earth that was somehow connected to Adam. Ellicott says: The adâmâh; thus the physical constituents of the animals are the same as those of the body of man. Cambridge says: The animals also are “formed,” or “moulded,” out of the ground, like man. The idea seems to be that, just as man was created, so were the rest of living creatures. In some way, these creatures are like Adam, the one who had dominion over them, would subdue them, and would also name them. This may be symbolic in that the animals are created according to the same pattern of man’s creation.

It is probable that those creatures which most closely resembled the physiology of man (beasts and birds) were included here. These living creatures follow a similar pattern to man; most of their bodily parts may be equated with the bodily parts of man. “beast of the field” here means “life of the land (as opposed to sea)” or land animals. Thus we have land animals and flying birds (which probably included non-flying varieties).

Adam gave them all names, not necessarily so that we would have to call them the same names, for once many languages happened at Babel, what we call them would bear little or no resemblance to the Hebrew name. (If indeed Hebrew was the actual language Adam spoke, anyway!) I think it is more important to see this as evidence of the dominion that God gave to Adam. Naming rights is something that goes with owning or controlling the territory.

The birds and beasts were created before man was created, so we should read this as God bringing to Adam the birds and beasts He had created, but also noting how these creatures had come into being in the first place. That is, while Adam has naming rights, God is the creator and ultimately the creator must have dominion over Adam (who has dominion over the creatures of God by God’s will.

Genesis 2:20 – And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.

Here Adam gives names to all cattle (livestock; domesticated animals) as well as the afore-mentioned birds and land animals. But there is no created help suitable for Adam yet. In Vs 18 above God said He would create a helper suitable for Adam, and it is likely that the naming of the other creatures may be seen as emphasising this fact: that while all the other creatures must have had their own kind with them, Adam seems to be the only one who yet lacks any creature that he can call his own kind.

Genesis 2:21-22 – **21** And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; **22**And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.

caused …. to fall – cause to fall; knock out; lay prostrate; overthrow; let drop.

a deep sleep – or trance

took – or take out of; take from (Adam)

rib – side; rib; beam; flank. It is translated “rib” only in this verse and the next, vs 22. Out of 41 occurrences of this word in the OT, it is translated “side” 19 times.

Effectively God must have caused Adam to be anaesthetised so that this operation could take place. There is no indication that the process caused pain, yet the closing of the flesh at the end does mean that the flesh was opened up to remove the rib. Clearly God could have taken the rib out without opening Adam up, or He could have created Eve from anything else He desired. The effect of this process is that Eve is a part of Adam, therefore a suitable help (meet or fit; suitable to provide companionship for Adam). She is of the very nature of Adam and therefore suitable.

The word “rib” could have been translated “side’ in which case it could be seen as Eve being a side (or aspect) of Adam’s nature. But it doesn’t really matter if it is rib or side; the important thing is that Eve is somehow of the very nature of Adam just as Christ is of the very nature of God. Eve isn’t made like Adam; she is part of Adam!

And it seems that Eve is brought to Adam just as a baby is brought to the mother after birth.

made – to build; rebuild; build a house as in establish a family) The woman is built up from the rib or side removed from Adam.

woman – *‘ishshah* [female (in contrast to male); woman; wife] This is the first use of this word in the OT. On the other hand, “man” (2 times in this Vs) is still *‘adam*.

Genesis 2:23 – And Adam said, This *[is]* now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.

Man – *‘iysh* [man; male (in contrast to female); husband; mankind]

Until now man (or Adam) has been *‘adam*, translated as “man”, “Adam”, or probably more correctly, “the adam”. Here in this verse (and the next 2 verses) “man” is now *‘iysh* (male) as opposed to *‘ishshah* [female (in contrast to male); woman; wife].

In Genesis 3:20 “Adam called his wife’s (*‘ishshah*) name Eve (*Chavvah*)”

Eve – *Chavvah* (life; living; the first woman; wife of Adam)

And in Genesis 1:27 – “male and female” here are another two words again.

male – *zakar* [male (of humans but can mean of animals if used as a noun)]

female – *nᵉqebah* [female; woman; female child; female animal)

Therefore, because God created man as both male and female on day 6 (Genesis 1:27), this is still filling out the details of the creation week (or 6 days) of Ch.1.

(is) now – stroke; beat; foot; anvil; occurrence; hoofbeat; footstep; one time; at this repetition; this once; at one time … at another.

This (is) now – or This time, or at last; finally; here at last. That is, at this stroke or beat of time it has come. Adam must have seen the male and female of the other creatures, and with his intelligence must have wondered why he didn’t have a female counterpart as well. But now that suitable companion had come.

This companion was literally bone of Adam’s bone and flesh of Adam’s flesh, for she had been built up from Adam’s bone and flesh. She shall be called *‘ishshah* because she was taken out of ‘*iysh*.

In the Hebrew, both sexes could be called man (as representing humankind). But man was man, while woman was female-man.

Genesis 2:24 – Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Therefore (Because of this) a man shall leave (depart from; leave behind; abandon; forsake) his parents (or the family in which he grew up) and shall cleave to (cling to; stay with) his wife (*‘ishshah*) and they shall be one flesh (emphasising the unity or one-ness of marriage, not polygamy). Man and woman are one in marriage in the same way that Adam and Eve were considered to be of the same bone, flesh and nature. The man and woman are a single unit – a married couple. Even today we use the term “married’ to signify two items being put together to form one unity, such as a man married to his work.

What it does mean is that both parties should be of one mind, one nature, one belief etc, or else they are not agreed. Biblical consistency requires that marriage be more than just a physical union, but to be as one, agreed, on matters of belief etc.

Amos 3:3 – Can two walk together, except they be agreed?

2 Corinthians 6:14-18 – **14** Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? **15**And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? **16**And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *[them];* and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. **17**Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *[thing];* and I will receive you, **18**And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

Genesis 2:25 – And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

naked – *‘arowm* (naked; bare) from the root word *‘aram* (to be subtle; be shrewd; be crafty; beware; take crafty counsel; be prudent) from which is derived *‘aruwm* (subtle; shrewd; crafty; sly; sensible) used of the serpent in Genesis 3:1. Ellicott says: Man is arom = naked; the serpent is arum=crafty. Thus in guileless simplicity our first parents fell in with the tempting serpent, who, in obvious contrast with their untried innocence, is described as a being of especial subtilty.

They were both naked yet unashamed. Nudists often claim that this therefore is the ideal state of man, that he should be able to walk around with no clothes on and that it is only the connotations we associate with nudity that makes it a social taboo. However, this cannot be so, since once Adam and Eve sinned, they knew they were naked and God made clothes for them, thus demonstrating that once sin entered the world, there was to be no more innocence. (And thus nudity can only be seen as a refusal to accept God’s condemnation of the sin that caused the downfall of mankind!) With sin came the knowledge of good and evil, something they clearly hadn’t experienced before the eating of the fruit.

If the tree of life gave life, then the tree of the knowledge of good and evil gave exactly that: the knowledge of good and evil. Man now knows what he didn’t know before. Man knows more than is good for him to know. Man has destroyed his innocence by this knowledge. Man is no longer innocent of the charges that God now lays before man: that on the day that he eats of this fruit, he will surely die.

But, until such time as man knew evil, he was innocent and couldn’t know evil. He could not be ashamed because only the knowledge that nakedness was evil could make him ashamed, and it only became evil once man was no longer innocent!

It is interesting that so-called scientists should claim that that the biblical account of creation cannot stand up to scientific scrutiny. For, if the truth be really known, their beloved evolution cannot stand up to scientific scrutiny! If evolution were in any way a viable hypothesis, then there would have to be a significant amount of fossil evidence that would verify this. The hypothesis (it cannot be called a theory because it has never been proven!) of evolution requires that creatures evolve via beneficial mutations from a “lower order” species into a “higher order” species. (Or else it would be negative or backward evolution.) Most mutations are not beneficial, and those that are beneficial do not often replicate in the next generation. The evolutionists would then claim that even if a very small percentage of mutations cause development into a higher order species, then evolution is still demonstrated. However, for every beneficial mutation, there are many non-beneficial mutations.

Also, creatures do not suddenly mutate into the next species. Even evolution scientists have to admit that there has to be a series of beneficial mutations, each complementing the other, until a species becomes literally another species. This rapidly decreases the probability of a new species evolving. A coin can be tossed and come down heads half the time. You have a 50% chance of predicting the outcome. But a prediction of 2 heads in a row has only 25% chance of success, 3 heads in a row 12.5%, 4 heads in a row 6.25% and so on. So, the chances of having a relatively unbroken series of mutations, all beneficial, all complementing each other, has a probability approaching zero.

But, say the evolutionists, even if only one in a million series mutates into another species, then it’s still very scientific. However, this preponderance of failed mutation series is their nemesis, for it means that there should be fossil evidence for the mutation series. For every species that “evolves” into another species, there has to be the fossil evidence of the mutation series that caused the evolution. And, for every beneficial mutation series, there would have to be the overwhelming fossil evidence of so many non-beneficial mutation series.

And yet, to date, not one allegedly eminent evolution scientist has clearly demonstrated the fossil evidence for just one single mutation series. To date there is not one single species where fossil evidence demonstrates the beneficial mutation series necessary for such a change. Not one!

There are hundreds of thousands of species of creatures on earth. If you include plants, algae and insects, there are around 1.7 million species on earth. There are 66,000 species of vertebrate animals on earth. Even mammals allegedly have over 5500 species in their small group. (These numbers may vary according to the way they are collated.) And if all life started with one small amoeba (single-celled organism in the “primordial swamp, soup or ooze”), then we should see fossil evidence for the evolution of at least those 66,000 species of vertebrate animals, and many more if we included non-vertebrates (including insects). Therefore evolution is impossible because it requires fossil evidence for the mutation series, and those fossils just do not exist.

What a disaster for those illogical supporters of an impossible evolution! Their problem is that there is abundant fossil evidence for so many of the species on earth. If only the truth were that fossils could not be found for the actual species, then they could blame the lack of inter-species fossil evidence on the lack of fossils in general. But while abundant fossil evidence does exist, none of it demonstrates the evolution from one species into another. None of it! These scientists are unable to explain just why this should be so. They grasp at straws but the facts are so clear: there just isn’t the fossil evidence to support their false hypothesis of evolution of the species. It is impossible for one species to evolve into another species leaving no fossil evidence of such, especially when there is abundant fossil evidence of the actual 2 species involved.

So those scientists put their heads together and decided that there had to be some way out of this mess. Evolution just had to be true, for if it weren’t true, then that could mean that all species on earth happened to appear independently of each other. This would clearly support biblical creation, and this is one thing those scientists just cannot allow. They claim to be teaching the truth of the origins of the species, yet if that truth might actually support the fact that God exists, then that truth must be altered (suppressed?) somewhat until it leaves God out of the equation. The real truth of evolution is that people wanted to have a world without having to acknowledge God as creator of it. They wanted a world that conveniently ignored God, left Him out of the equation. The equation of these scientists is, therefore, one that is not permitted to have God in any of its workings.

So scientists set about trying to put a patch on this disastrous problem, coming up with an idea they called punctuated equilibrium (plural *equilibria*). That is, there are long periods of time where no change occurs (*stasis*), no mutation series exist. Punctuated equilibrium (also called punctuated equilibria) is a theory in evolutionary biology which proposes that once species appear in the fossil record the population will become stable, showing little evolutionary change for most of its geological history. This state of little or no morphological change is called *stasis*. (Wikipedia)

These long periods of stasis are then punctuated by short-lived periods of rapid change where either the species evolves into another, or splits into 2 sub-species, one of which may then develop into a new species. This, while pure unverifiable speculation, was their way of explaining that total lack of beneficial mutational series.

In 1972, paleontologists Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould published a landmark paper developing their theory and called it *punctuated equilibria.* …. Eldredge and Gould proposed that the degree of gradualism commonly attributed to Charles Darwin is virtually nonexistent in the fossil record, and that stasis dominates the history of most fossil species. (Wikipedia)

This effort to state a belief in what must have happened (as opposed to documented evidence of what actually did happen) redefines evolution as a belief system, not truth, for if it were truth, then it would have a logical solution for the lack of intermediate fossil evidence. But the truth is that this lack of evidence actually points toward an all-at-once- creation without the evolution of species.

The Bible says that even a belief in God’s creation is an act of faith.

Hebrews 11:3 – Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

The evolutionist bible says: Through faith we believe that all the species in the world came about by pure chance, and amazingly developed into highly intricate creatures without the assistance of any intelligence whatsoever.

Whatever we believe about this is therefore a matter of what we want to believe.

While I was principal of the Christian school in Echuca, the government officials (the VRQA) tried to shut down my school on the basis that we taught both creation and evolution, with an emphasis on biblical creation being correct. In fact, at one stage we were given just 30 days to shut the school down because our Science curriculum taught creation. (Of course, we did teach about evolution but not necessarily favourably!) However, when I reminded them that just a few months earlier I had asked the VRQA what Science curriculum they would recommend, they had named one from another Christian school as acceptable, and we had already commenced the changeover to this new curriculum, and this is what rescued us from closure. When they came again soon after that to reassess us, they noted that our Science curriculum was still completely unacceptable because it continued to mention creation. I told them that we had their official recommendation to use this curriculum. They mumbled a few things, said they’d check it out, and that we’d hear from them. The next time we heard from them it was by letter to tell us that they’d decided to permit us a conditional school registration to continue.

If the Bible is correct, then Adam’s fall was about 1650 years before the flood. (Noah may have been born not long after Adam died.) The earth was created 100% fertile, 100% productive. The growth of animal (and plant) populations would have been incredibly rapid. 1650 years of such fertile conditions (and an abundance of space) would have produced huge populations in a very short time.

Add to this the biblical fact that no death existed on earth until the fall. During this time, no animal ate another animal, and the food was abundant and wholesome. We have no idea how long after the creation week that Adam fell. So, when the flood came on the scene around 2350, and all animals (other than those in the Ark) were drowned, there would have been colossal piles of fossil evidence left behind for us to dig up today. In fact, if a world-wide flood were entered into the equation, it would explain a lot of things that so-called educated people try to “explain” otherwise because they just cannot believe in something that requires God to be included in the equation.

This is what it’s all about: that anything that requires God to be in the equation has been systematically removed from our belief systems until we are left with a world uncontaminated by “God”. The world has been effectively sanitised against a belief in God. Anything that requires belief in God has been replaced (or will be soon!) so that more and more we can believe in the world that we want to believe in without being in any way obligated to acknowledge the existence of God. This includes evolution, marriage and sexuality, worship, rules and laws, in fact, everything that tries to force man to acknowledge the existence of God.

Romans 1:22, 28 – Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, ….. And even as they did not like to retain God in *[their]* knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;