

## Day 6

Now it's time to fill the land. Notice that the closer God gets to man, the more complex.

### Land Animals

When God fills something, He really fills it. We saw that with the stars. It's even more true on earth.

There are more ants on earth than stars in the Galaxy - 10,000 times as many! One colony can have 100 million.

In stark contrast to everything else we have been able to observe in the universe, which is completely dead without any trace of life, the earth is exploding with such mind-boggling profusion of life that it defies description.

One 2.5 acre section of forest in Panama contains 18,000 different species of beetles.

One square yard of soil in Denmark was examined and revealed 400,000 fungi, 50,000 algae, 48,000 small insects, 10 million roundworms, and billions of bacteria.

And the fossil record is one of mass-extinction. So imagine what it was like at the creation!

**24 And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds:**

- **livestock**
- **creatures that move along the ground, and**
- **wild animals,**
- each according to its kind." And it was so. 25 God made**
- **the wild animals according to their kinds,**
- **the livestock according to their kinds,**
- **and all the creatures that move along the ground according to their kinds.**

Three categories are mentioned. First is livestock, which is significant. There is a reason why livestock animals are so different from wild animals.

There are some animals that seem to have been designed for man – like cattle and sheep.

Animals with 4-chambered stomachs can eat grass (which we could not live on, because our stomachs can't make use of cellulose).

It would pass right through us without giving us any nutrition, but one cow can eat just grass and produce 5000 quarts of milk per year (which means one cow can supply over 50 people).

That same cow in that same year will produce 10 tons of manure, which fertilizes the pasture and is often used as fuel for fires.

God made them so they are suited to almost any climate. They thrive in the cold of Canada as well in the heat of Florida. And almost every part of the cow is useful. It seems obvious that cows were designed to meet the needs of humanity.

The same goes for camels, sheep, and all the other domesticated animals.

One question I have had for evolutionists is how did the sheep survive before there were shepherds?

They have to be the most defenseless creatures on the planet. They can't fight, they don't kick or scratch or bite, they certainly can't hide – they don't blend into anything, and it's obvious just by looking at them that they are not built for speed.

They can't find their own food. They can't find their own water. They get lost. They are utterly helpless and vulnerable.

It's very difficult for me to understand how natural selection could possibly favor the sheep.

They continue to exist not because of natural selection but because of human protection. They are made for man, and man cares for them.

## - **creatures that move along the ground**

This is just one word that probably refers to animals that are close to the ground.

### **wild animals**

The point of all three of those being used together is to describe all land animals.

As we saw last week the **and it was so** formula indicates that these became fixed categories. One kind hasn't morphed into another kind, and no new kinds have arisen.

People always ask where the dinosaurs fit in to the Bible, and the answer is very, very easy: Day 6 (except for sea-going dinosaurs and flying dinosaurs, which were made on day 5).

The creation scientists and old-earth scientists have argued about the meaning of the evidence we have from dinosaur bones. I'm not a scientist, but I can tell you that when I watch a 2 hour program devoted to a single Allosaurus skeleton that is so well-preserved that they could give a detailed description of all its various injuries and how they healed.

And then they ask me to believe that those bones have been lying there undisturbed for the last 150 million years, I have to admit it sounds fishy.

It is now well established in secular scientific literature that unmineralized dinosaur bone still containing recognizable bone protein exists in many locations around the world. G. Muyzer, P. Sandberg, M.H.J. Knapen, C. Vermeer, M. Collins, and P. Westbroek, "Preservation of the Bone Protein Osteocalcin in Dinosaurs," *Geology*, 20, 1992, 871-874.

Not even the evolutionists have disputed the presence of the dinosaur proteins in these bones. Their response has just been, "Wow, I guess proteins can survive much longer than we thought!"

Dr. John Baumgardner, a geophysicist at Los Alamos who was the chief developer of the TERRA code has studied those bones first hand and says, "It is inconceivable that bone containing such well-preserved protein could possibly have survived for more than a few thousand years in the geological settings in which they are found." In *Six Days*, p.236

So science can point to recent dinosaur bones.

The data from thousands of years ago is obscured enough to where there will always be arguments on both sides, but one thing I can assure you of is that all the land animals were created on the same day as man, day 6.

BTW, some evolutionists have criticized creationism as being non-scientific because it's not falsifiable (it can't be proven wrong – how do you disprove a miracle?)

I would like to suggest that the Genesis account is falsifiable. We believe the Genesis account based on our confidence in the authority of Jesus, who also believed it. And we regard Him as a reliable authority because of the resurrection.

Want me to give up my belief in Genesis one? All you have to do is disprove the resurrection of Jesus as a real historical event. If you do that, I will drop not only my belief in Genesis one but all the rest of Christianity.

So it is falsifiable. All you have to do is demonstrate historically that we do not have adequate evidence to prove Jesus rose from the dead.

On the other hand, I wonder if evolution is falsifiable. Given all the gigantic problems with the theory that already exist, what scientific discovery could possibly convince the evolutionists that it is not true?

I don't think there is anything they could discover that would do that.

## **Animals**

What is the biblical significance of animals? Why did God make them, and what role do they play in God's plan?

They are similar to man (far closer than anything else). And God did that purposely, because they become very significant in the sacrificial system.

The sacrifices are a picture of substitutionary death (someone else dying in our place for our sin). For that picture to have any value, they had to bleed, feel pain, etc.

They have no significance outside of temporal, earthly existence. Ecclesiastes teaches us that life under the sun is futile - like that of an animal.

**Ecc.3:18-21 I also thought, "As for men, God tests them so that they may see that they are like the animals. 19 Man's fate is like that of the animals; the same fate awaits them both: As one dies, so dies the other. All have the same breath; man has no advantage over the animal. Everything is meaningless. 20 All go to the same place; all come from dust, and to dust all return. 21 Who knows if the spirit of man rises upward and if the spirit of the animal goes down into the earth?"**

That's life under the sun. But if a man fears God, his life is very different from the animals. It now has spiritual meaning.

Secondly, they are an illustration of God's provision and care (Ps.104). That's important, because Jesus made a point of it. He wanted us to understand God's provision for us in light of the way He provides for the animals. (Mt.7)

Christians debate about how God provides for the animals. Because of the influence of the world, which wants to give naturalistic explanations for everything, many Christians think that nature is on autopilot.

God just set up certain possibilities and it's up to the animals to make the best of it.

If that's the case – if that's Jesus' great example of how God takes care of us, it's not all that encouraging.

So let's stop and give some thought to exactly how God provides for the animals. What does that mean?

Does it mean when they go hunting they will always succeed? No.

Does it mean no animal ever starves? No.

Lots of animals have a very tough time getting food. Yet God's provision for the animals must be something dramatic, or Jesus wouldn't have used it as an illustration to comfort us regarding God's provision in our lives.

Is there some striking, amazing way in which God provides food for the animals?

Yes. Scientists have summed it up with one word: instinct.

So according to what Jesus said in Mt.7, the way you think about instinct will have important implications on the way you live the Christian life.

#### INSTINCT:

The most important doctrine in the religion of scientism is that since science can explain everything, it is no longer necessary to believe in a God.

The problem with that is science can't explain everything - in fact, it can't ultimately explain *anything*. Just because you observe, name and measure something doesn't mean you have explained it.

A great illustration of that is gravity. Scientists have observed it, measured it, named it, and they can predict it and use it. But science can't possible tell you where all that energy comes from or why it's there.

The fact that science can describe something doesn't explain the origin.

It's like if I said, "I don't believe in auto makers. Years ago, primitive people used to believe that there were auto makers in some factory in Detroit that made every car. We don't have to believe this anymore, because science can explain the car."

"For example, the steering wheel. Science can explain that. The purpose of the steering wheel is to steer the car (connected to the wheels). Science can also explain the windshield. It's made of glass, it blocks the wind, etc. See, science can explain everything in the car - we don't need to believe in some auto-maker."

How to respond? Each time you say, "the purpose" you are implying an automaker.

So you haven't ultimately explained something until you have explained it's meaning and purpose, which is determined by its creator.

Another great example of something the naturalist can't even begin to explain is instinct.

If you ever want some good entertainment, listen to a naturalist explain instinct.

Here's what my dictionary said:

“the innate programming characteristic of a particular animal species that organizes complex patterns of unlearned behavior, enabling members of a species to respond appropriately to a wide range of situations in the natural world” (Encarta)

“What enables animals to be able to do these unlearned behaviors?”

“You don't need God to explain that - we know the answer! What enables animals to perform those unlearned behaviors? INSTINCT!”

“What is instinct?”

“the innate programming characteristic that organizes complex patterns of unlearned behavior”

I found one encyclopedia that admitted they are just blowing smoke:

“it is an animal's "innate predisposition" to perceive a stimulus in a particular manner and respond with a particular behavior. Essentially, the term serves as a convenient label for aspects of animal functioning that are not yet understood other than to state that they are genetically programmed.

(Grolier)

And I'm sure the writer of that article didn't mean to, but he just implied... a Programmer.

EXAMPLES:

Jesus commanded us to consider the birds of the air. So let's obey that command and consider them for a moment.

How does God feed the birds?

- For one thing, He gave them incredible eyesight. Some birds of prey can see a rodent from 3 mi. up (we can't even see cars from that height).
- And not only can they see well, they can hunt. A Falcon can dive at 180 mph. That's something the best fighter pilot in the most high tech plane couldn't do.

Imagine the complex calculations and skill involved in doing that - diving straight toward the ground at 180 mph while trying to concentrate on a split-second grab, coming centimeters from the ground. Miscalculate by a few inches and he becomes a meal for the other birds of prey.

But that never seems to happen – not even to the dumbest, most absent minded Falcons. It doesn't happen because God is controlling the dive.

That's how God feeds the birds.

\* A worker bee may fly a quarter of a mile to find a food source.

The sun usually serves as an indicator of direction, but the bee can navigate accurately, even in a moderate breeze, when the sun is hidden by a cloud. When it finds a good source of food, the bee has the capacity to calculate a true course back to the hive, allowing for wind and for apparent movement of the sun.

It then performs a “dance” that conveys information about distance and direction to the other bees.

\* Homing pigeons, are now known to use the sun as their compass; they compensate for its apparent movement, see both ultraviolet and polarized light, and employ a backup compass for cloudy days.

The backup compass is magnetic. Pigeons surpass bees in having a map sense as well as a compass as part of their navigational system. A pigeon taken hundreds of miles from its loft in total darkness will depart almost directly for home when it is released. The nature of this map sense remains one of ethology's most intriguing mysteries.

There is no present theory that fully explains the unerring maiden migrations of animals.

**Consider the birds...they do not sow or reap, they have no storeroom or barn; yet God feeds them. And how much more valuable you are than birds (Lk 12:23-24)**

\* There are other birds that navigate by the stars. In one experiment one of those birds was hatched and raised indoors, so it never saw the sky. Then they painted the ceiling of the room with a view of the stars.

But it was a view of the stars from the perspective of a place on the earth where that specie of bird had never existed. And the bird was able to orient itself for it's migration direction by means of those stars.

\* The arctic Tern spends summers at the North Pole, then flies south for the winter - way south - to the South Pole. They spend their winters in the Antarctic!

\* Atlantic golden plovers fly over water 2,500 mi without a landfall.

- A woodpecker slams its beak into wood as fast as 8 times per second, each time impacting the wood at 13 mph (That would be like you riding your bike into a tree and stopping with your head, and doing that 8 times a second until there was a hole in the tree).

- The red-cocked woodpecker circles its nest entrance with the resins of pine trees. These substances contain materials toxic to the woodpecker's major predator, the gray rat snake. (good thinking...for a bird brain)

\* In a number of nectar-feeding birds, measurements have been made on the calories expended to defend a territory containing the flowers. Results have shown that sunbirds and hummingbirds are territorial only when the calories gained exceed the calories expended in defense.

\* Monarchs - Only live 2 yr, and migrate hundreds of mi. twice. One was tagged and tracked and they discovered the migration was 1800 mi. from Mex. up to Canada.

They come down to Mexico where the temperature is perfect for them, they lay eggs on the underside of milkweed leaves. As the larvae grow, they absorb poison from the milkweed. They do that so birds will leave them alone. (The poison doesn't hurt them, but it's lethal for the birds)

Pretty clever for an insect with a pinhead-sized brain - spend half your life traveling 1800 mi. to lay eggs on a poisonous leaf so the birds won't bother the next generation. And you really have to hand it to those eggs for having the foresight to absorb the poison.

My encyclopedia said the birds *learn* not to eat them(!) How do they learn? A bird eats a poisonous butterfly and dies - I guess he learned his lesson.

Several other butterflies that predators consider very tasty impersonate the monarch butterflies, which are notorious among predators for tasting bad.

Insects do a lot of amazing things. They build bridges and apartment houses. Some raise crops, and others keep the equivalent of cattle that they "milk." There are also insect carpenters, papermakers, guards, soldiers, nurses, slaves, hunters, trappers, thieves, and undertakers.

#### FISH, CREATURES OF THE SEA

\* After hatching, pink salmon journey from the rivers of Canada and Alaska into the Pacific and may spend most of their lives along the coasts of North Korea, 5,600 km (3,500 mi) away. Upon reaching sexual maturity, however, they return to the exact stream of their birth.

\* Every year the humpback whales travel from Alaska to Maui. When they arrive at the islands each year, they always go to the same place - a territory staked out for their families. They calve in sheltered cove away from the sharks. Babies are born breech so that they will immediately head for the surface to get their first breath of air. (Whales can hold their breath for an hour, but born w/o any air). The baby really doesn't have the capacity to get to the surface fast enough, but it is OK because there is always another humpback that is a midwife, and that whale pushes the baby - all 9 tons of it - up to its air supply.

They have a unique song that can be heard 50 mi. away under water. Every humpback sings the same song, and every year the song changes slightly. The modified version is sung uniformly by all humpbacks whether in the Atlantic or Pacific. After a few years it is an entirely new song.

There are ants that have some kind of homing device, so they can find their way back home, and it's somehow connected to the queen. If the queen is killed they become agitated and die.

\* Slave-making species raid other colonies and steal worker pupae that they enslave to carry out the work of their colonies. Some species, such as the Amazon ants of the genus *Polyergus*, are so specialized for capturing slaves that they can neither forage for themselves nor care for their young. Without slaves they quickly perish.

\* In ant and termite colonies, members of a soldier caste may employ elaborate communication systems (including alarm pheromones) for alerting one another when danger

threatens. Groups of defenders converge on the intruders and dispatch them with crushing jaws or chemical sprays or in one case by hurling themselves at the enemy while bursting open their bodies and spilling entangling glue from a ruptured abdominal gland on their foe. Cases in which individuals commit suicide pose a special problem for evolutionary theorists because such behavior would appear to eliminate the very genes that contribute to the development of the behavior. One fascinating aspect of some animal societies is the selfless way one animal seems to render its services to others. In the beehive, for instance, workers labor unceasingly in the hive for three weeks after they emerge and then forage outside for food until they wear out two or three weeks later. Yet the workers leave no offspring. How could natural selection favor such self-sacrifice? This question presents itself in almost every social species

In some species, certain workers are extremely specialized. For example, in some harvester ants, soldier ants do virtually nothing but crack open seeds for other ants to eat  
not just instincts - also other abilities.

in the retina of the leopard frog's eye are cells that produce many impulses when a small, dark, rounded object passes erratically through the visual field of the frog. Since bugs have such properties, these cells have been labeled bug detectors.

When a bat's ultrasonic cries strongly stimulate the ear of a noctuid moth, signals are sent that block the activity of the wing muscles of the insect. It stops flying and falls downward, sometimes reaching protective vegetation before the bat can snatch it.

TT Ps.104

There are Christians who have been so brainwashed by the world that they believe all those things are driven by "natural processes" and that God is not directly involved.

Those people will completely miss Jesus' point about considering the birds.

Listen to this Psalm and you tell me if God's control is direct or indirect

Who gives animals something to drink each day? Mother Nature or God the Father?

Ps.104:10 **He makes springs pour water into the ravines; it flows between the mountains. 11 They give water to all the beasts of the field; the wild donkeys quench their thirst.**

Who takes care of the birds?

**12 The birds of the air nest by the waters; they sing among the branches. 13 He waters the mountains from his upper chambers; the earth is satisfied by the fruit of his work.**

Do animals provide their own food by hunting?

**21 The lions roar for their prey and seek their food from God.**

Ps.104 doesn't leave us much room for questioning whether or not God is in direct control of everything.

Neither does Jesus. "**Look at the birds of the air...your heavenly Father feeds them...see how the lilies of the field grow...your heavenly Father clothes them.**" (Mt.6:25-26)

The birds are able to get food because of instinct, Jesus said they get food because of God's direct activity, therefore instinct is God's direct activity.

And the marvel of instinct is an illustration of the way God will provide for you if a far greater way.

**And God saw that it was good.**

Animals are good. Everything God made is good, but animals are especially good - God blesses them. I think every Christian should be an animal lover. If you can't appreciate the beauty and majesty of the bird, fish and animals, you aren't paying attention.

## **Man**

**26 Then God said, "Let us make man in our image**

This is the pinnacle of creation. Everything we have looked at up to now has been amazing, but nothing God created comes anywhere close to the wonder of the creation of human beings. And the uniqueness of human beings is highlighted by a dramatic shift in terminology.

## “us” and “our”

The first thing that jumps out at you is the fact that God refers to Himself with plural pronouns.

**26 Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness,**

**us...our..our**

What does the plural mean? The critics say it's polytheism. Others have said God is addressing the creation. Problem with both views – If the plural indicates God working with someone else in the creation, how can we explain all the singulars throughout the chapter? Look at the very next verse: **27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male & female he created them.**

Another view is that it is a reference to the Trinity. The doctrine of what we call the Trinity is very simple. It is this: the Bible presents the Father as God, the Son (Jesus) as God, and the Holy Spirit as God, and yet there is only one God. Nevertheless, they are three distinct persons who exist simultaneously and who interact with each other, love each other and respond to each other. Problem – There is no way the original readers would have understood it that way, because the Trinity had not been revealed yet.

Others have suggested it's a plural of majesty. Sometimes kings referred to themselves in the plural to illustrate their greatness. Problem – The plural of majesty appears with nouns, but never pronouns. Besides, it misses the point of the passage. The point is not the majesty of God, but rather the unique relationship between God and man.

A fifth view is that God is speaking to a heavenly court of angels. Problem – This would mean that we were created in the image and likeness of the angels, which is one in the same with the image of God. The Bible doesn't say the angels are in His image, but even if they are, it's still His image (not their image). We can't elevate the angels to a level where the image can be said to be God's and theirs. Besides, v.27, along with passages like Isa.40:13,14, 44:24 are clear that God created by Himself, and that He consulted with no one. So if God was talking about involving someone else in v.26, He must have changed His mind by v.27, because when it happens it is God alone who does it.

**CORRECT VIEW:** The mixing of plural and singular pronouns indicate a plurality within a unity in the Godhead. It is true that the people then did not know all the details of the Trinity. But there are some pretty good clues in the context that point to the fact that God is both a unity & a plurality.

This verse is the first time in the chapter a person is spoken to. If we want to know who that person is, it seems to me the Spirit, who was mentioned in v.2 would be the most likely candidate (since we have no evidence that any other persons were in existence yet). We know the people in the OT understood that the Holy Spirit was a person. Throughout the OT the Spirit of God was spoken of in personal terms (as a “He” rather than an “it”). In Neh.9:20 the Spirit instructs. In Isa.63:10 He is grieved, and He becomes their enemy and fights against them.

So they knew He was a person. And they knew He was God. The one part that wasn't clearly revealed until the NT was the fact that the Holy Spirit was a distinct person. That is, He is not the Father.

They probably thought of the Spirit of God as being similar to a man's spirit. You have a spirit, but it's not a separate person from you. You are just one, single person. So when they read about God's Spirit in the OT, they probably thought the same way they did when they talked about some man or woman's spirit – as just another way to refer to the same person.

However, they must have realized that there was some difference when they read things like this, where God is talking to His spirit. That would seem to me to imply a little more of a distinction between God and His Spirit than there is between us and our spirits.

On top of that, there is another clue in the context that hints at a plurality within a unity. When God makes someone in His image, He refers to what He has made as a man (singular), and yet a moment later we find that it is two persons – a male and a female.

So when God says, “Here, let me show you what I'm like. Let me show you my image.” He

creates two persons.

Now the image is not a perfect picture of what God is like, because Adam and Eve were not only distinct persons, but they were two separate beings.

God and the Spirit are only one being. There are not two Gods - just one.

But the language that is used is of a unity that is a plurality, and that describes what God is like. If the image of God is a plurality, it's not a stretch to think of God as a plurality as well.

I don't think it's unreasonable to think that the ancient people understood that God was a much more complex being than a human.

How far did their understanding go? We don't know. The Bible writers wrote in order to be understood by the original readers, and most things are very clear. But once in a while there are statements in Scripture that are intended to have a degree of mystery.

I think the readers would have understood this to mean that God is a complex Being - One & yet a plurality in some way. In what way? It's not clear, but definitely in some way that doesn't destroy His unity.

Yes, it is true that the Trinity was not yet fully revealed at that time, but it is not fully revealed now either. There is no verse that explains that God is 3 distinct persons & one essence. All we have are hints - just like this statement - that bring us to that conclusion.

This adds to the drama of the book (Von Rad). It makes you want to keep reading this story about God.

-----

Whichever interpretation you take to explain the plural pronouns, I think the point is clear. There is a very dramatic contrast with the rest of the chapter:

**let it be...let it be...let it be...let it be...let it be...*Let Us make***

Suddenly the language becomes very personal. It moves from what could be interpreted as a distant, mechanical approach to making *things*, to a very personal action of bringing man into existence. The feel becomes intimate. God's statements go from being formal announcements of what is to be, to a face-to-face conference, a personal discussion in which a Person speaks to another Person about bringing into existence another person.

The point is that everything else is just set-up. It's all preparation for the event of real significance. Until now, everything was for the man, but the man is for God. Man was created for the purpose of having an intimate, personal relationship & communion with God - & everything else that was made was made to make that possible.

I have had a wonderful time the last couple months reading all about the creation and the wonders of what God has made, but alongside the joy of seeing all that is the constant irritation of the never ending insanity of people trying to attribute all those wonders to evolution.

And priority number one is to make God non-existent and man and animal. In the words of the founder of PETA, "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy." - Ingrid Newkirk

-Alex Pacheco, Director, PETA "We feel that animals have the same rights as retarded children."

A boy is not the equivalent of a rat or a pig. Man is not one of the animals. We are nothing like the animals. One thing that came out in my reading is the extraordinary intelligence of dolphins. To read the literature you would think they are little Einsteins swimming around. The truth is, the most intelligent of all the animals, in some select areas, may approach the intelligence of a 2-year-old child. But by the time your child is three he has left far behind him the most intelligent adult animals.

There is an immaterial component to man that is not present in animals, and that has no naturalistic explanation. The eye is an amazing enough "irreducible complexity" but even more amazing is perception. Even if evolutionists could figure a way to explain how an eye could evolve, how would they explain perception - the ability to interpret meaning? Even if they could explain the brain, what about the mind? Even if they could explain speech, what about language - the ability to have an abstract thought in your mind and transfer it into the mind another person.



Dr. David Premack, Professor Emeritus at University of Pennsylvania, is an evolutionist who is one of the most recognized experts in the fields of language and animal intelligence. He is known for the Premack principle (the use of desirable things to motivate you to do undesirable things). He is also known for a statement that has become universally accepted among evolutionist language scientists: “Human language is an embarrassment to evolutionary theory.”

Read just about any work on the origin of language and you will see this quotation. I found it in many, many sources and not once did I find an author who disagreed with it. The closest I came was one who said he believed eventually the day would come when it was no longer true.

I was finally able to find one technical paper that posited a theory regarding how language evolved. The theory is that a long time ago a boy was born with an unusual Y chromosome that enabled the evolution of language by causing him to have a completely different kind of brain than his parents. There is zero evidence for that. It’s just the best they could come up with.

The more we learn about language the more devastating it is to evolutionary theory. There is no precursor. There is nothing in between the grunts of the primates and a speech or poem or love letter or book. There is no language in the animal kingdom, and yet everywhere where there are human beings there is language – everywhere without exception.

In fact, Alder and Amdal have studied the remarkable ability children have to learn language, and have demonstrated that the connections the brain has to make for words, grammar and syntax are already substantially in place at birth. As a human being begins to develop, there is something happening in the abstract reasoning capability of the mind that actually demands the acquisition of language to satisfy it.

Noam Chomsky is the leading linguist of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. He has shown that even the higher primates are unable to understand a system of numbers or the abstract properties of space or in general any abstract properties of expression. Chomsky has also discovered that there is a universal grammar that is invariant among human beings. That’s why any language can be translated into any other language.

His research in this area has resulted in him not being welcome in evolutionist circles. They have accused him of being a creationist, which he denies(!) Chomsky is hostile to the idea of creationism, but is continually labeled a creationist nonetheless, because his opponents can see that his conclusions about language can be explained no other way.

All languages, as to their basic structure, and very, very similar. This holds true for new languages that develop even now. The structural components of language are part of the very fabric of the image of God, who is a relational being.

I was reading about dolphins on the Internet. People get pretty excited about how advanced they are. Are the advanced? Down the hall there are a group of very young children who are nowhere close to being fully developed adults, who nevertheless are learning abstract principles about their Creator. And in a few moments they will be praying – skillfully using language to communicate abstract ideas to God. When is the last time you went to Sea World and the show was delayed because the dolphins were in a prayer meeting? That doesn’t happen. You never see a dolphin leading 100 other dolphins in a time of worship or prayer or contemplation of their Creator.

They don’t do that, because they can’t have a personal relationship with Him or even each other, because they are not persons. Even if they were capable of speech they wouldn’t speak, because they are not capable of language. Even if they had the ability to pray they wouldn’t because they wouldn’t have anything to say. We are persons, not because we happen to have had a random genetic mutation. We are persons because we are made in the image of God.

### GOD IS PERSONAL!

We hear the phrase “personal relationship with God” so often we forget its significance. Think about it. God is personal. We were made as persons so that we could do something the animals can’t do – have a *personal* relationship with God.

We can use language to communicate with Him, and He with us. There is something

wonderful about being listened to – we can speak and He listens! And we can attend to His words.

This is the basis for all ethics and morality. Evolution still hasn't come up with an explanation for ethics. They may say that it's just a convention produced by meaningless electrical signals in our brains, but if you walk into his house and begin walking away with his stereo, or strangling his children, suddenly he becomes a big time moralist.

Morals and ethics exist because we are persons who are in a personal relationship to God, who is a person. That's why there are no morals for animals.

That's one reason why it seems like it's almost a necessity for God to be more than one person. If God were only a single person, then before the creation – for all of eternity past, it would mean that God never communicated, God never loved, God never gave, God never expressed anything to anyone until the creation. I suppose that would be theoretically possible, but it's not what actually happened. The truth is God was expressing all of those things throughout eternity past. God is by nature loving, and He had a way to express love even before the creation within the Trinity.

Scripture gives us several glimpses into that interaction.

Jn.17:24 "**Father, I want those you have given me to be with me where I am, and to see my glory, the glory you have given me because you loved me before the creation of the world.**

Tit 1:2 says that God made a promise about us being saved, and He made that promise **before the beginning of time**

That promise was made to Someone.

People into New Age philosophy want to believe that God is an impersonal force – which would make Him like the animals – impersonal, incapable of love, incapable of language, incapable of relationship. A god like that is less than the animals; He doesn't have a spirit or a mind or even a body.

Satan always pushes that idea so people won't have the sense that it is possible to relate to God.

This is one of the most basic truths there is about God. I have been a Christian as long as can remember and still sometimes I'll be praying or just thinking about prayer, & the reality hits me that I am talking to a *Person* who is *listening* & it just amazes me. One of the greatest questions you can ask yourself is this: When you pray, are you talking to a Person? Or are you just saying a prayer?

What else does it mean to be in God's image? Does the image of God include our bodies? Are unbelievers in God's image?

We will explore all that next Lord's Day.

For now, let's close with this thought:

Do you realize how important people are? Think of the awesomeness of the stars and the galaxies and the clouds and mountains, etc. – did you know the person sitting next to you in the pew is far greater? The sun and moon and fixed in the heavens, and the Milky Way galaxy has been established and is an astonishing thing, but the person sitting right in front of you will outlive them.

The oceans and mountains and rivers are great, but the little developing person inside Holly's womb right now is greater and will live infinitely longer.

People are at the center of God's purpose for the creation.

The heavens and the earth will someday be uncreated and go out of existence. But the bum on the street, your next door neighbor, the person in the car in front of you on the highway, the guy in the ambulance fighting for his life – all of them will still be in conscious existence somewhere 10 million years from now.

**in our image, in (according to) our likeness**

What is the image of God?

Whatever it is, one thing we can say for sure is it must be something inexpressibly high and lofty. *The image of God Himself!*

I can tell you right now that is not something that can evolve. You don't evolve into the image of God. It's not something that is in chemical form somewhere in your DNA.

Benediction: Ps 20:1-5 **May the LORD answer you when you are in distress; may the name of the God of Jacob protect you. 2 May he send you help from the sanctuary and grant**

**you support from Zion. 4 May he give you the desire of your heart and make all your plans succeed. 5 May the LORD grant all your requests.**

Review Questions;

1. Which of the following is the Christian world view?
  - God wound up the creation like a clock, and now it is running on its own by means of the natural laws, and God intervenes by means of miracles whenever He chooses.
  - Every detail of the creation is being directly controlled and driven by God, and every single thing that happens is the result of either God's providence or miraculous power.
2. What is the best explanation for the plural **let us make man in our image**?
  - a. Moses was describing the Trinity
  - b. Moses momentarily lapsed into believing in polytheism
  - c. Moses was revealing God to be both a plurality and a unity.