

THE FIRST BOOK OF MOSES

CALLED, GENESIS.

GENESIS CHAPTER 2 : 11- 20

¹¹ The name of the first is Pison: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold;

¹² And the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium and the onyx stone.

¹³ And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia.

¹⁴ And the name of the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates.

¹⁵ And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.

¹⁶ And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:

¹⁷ But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

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.

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.

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.

(Genesis 2: 11-20)

Verse 11 is included with the interpretation of verse 10.

2:12 “is good”.....The present tense in which this description is written indicates it to be an eyewitness account, and thus most likely a record originally from Adam himself. However, the past tense in **Genesis 2:10 (went”)** may suggest that, at the time when Adam actually wrote it, the Garden of Eden was no longer there.

2:12 “is good”.....The “**bdellium**” was evidently a precious gum, likened to the bread from heaven sent to the Israelites in the wilderness. (**Number 11:7**)

2:13-14.....*See notes from verse 10. Noah’s Flood would have changed the location of all 4 of these rivers.*

2:15 “keep it”.....The ideal world, both before the entrance of sin and after the removal of sin, (**Revelation 22:3**) is not one of idleness and frolic but, one of serious activity and service. Adam was placed in an ideal environment and circumstances, so he had no excuse for rejecting God’s love and authority.

2:16 “thou mayest freely eat”.....Adam was free to eat of any tree in the garden. However, freedom comes with responsibility, and with that freedom came the right to choose. Thus, free will.

2:17 “not eat of it”.....For true fellowship with God, (**having been created in His image**) man must be free to reject that fellowship. This restriction imposed by God is the simplest, most straightforward test that could be devised for determining man’s volitional response to God’s love. There was only one minor restraint placed on Adam’s freedom and, with an abundance of delicious fruit of all types available, there was no justification for his desiring the one forbidden fruit. Nevertheless, he did have a choice, and so was a free moral agent, capable of accepting or rejecting God’s will.

2:17 “die”.....”**Thou shalt surely die**” could be rendered, “**Dying, thou shalt die!**” In the very day that he would experimentally come to “**know evil,**” through disobeying God’s Word, he would die spiritually, being separated from God’s direct fellowship. Adam would also begin to die physically, with the initiation of decay processes in his body which would ultimately cause his physical death.

2:18 “meet for him”.....The events described here all took place on the sixth day of the creation week, after which God pronounced all things “**very good.**” All the animals had been created “**male and female**” (**Genesis 6:19**) and instructed to “**multiply in the earth**” (**Genesis 1:22**) but, man still needed a “**helper like him.**” (*literal meaning*)

2:19 “God formed”.....A better, and quite legitimate translation is **“had formed.”** Thus there is no contradiction with the order of creation in Genesis 1. (**animals before man**) The first chapter of Genesis gives a summary of the events on all six days of creation, the second chapter provides more details of certain events of the sixth day.

2:19 “the name thereof”.....According to Dr. Henry Morris, considered **“The Father of Modern Creationism”** The animals named by Adam included only bird, domesticable animals, and the smaller wild animals that would live near him. It would be possible for him to name about 3,000 of the basic kinds of these animals in about 5 hours, (**one every six seconds**) and this would be adequate both to acquaint Adam with those animals and also to show clearly that there were none who were sufficiently like him to provide companionship for him. This is still further proof that man did not evolve from any of the animals, even those that were most directly associated with him.

2:20 “not found”.....As far as fossil evidence is concerned, many fossils of true men have been found (**Neanderthal, Cro-Magnon, etc.**) as well as fossils of true apes. The so-called **“hominids”** (**Australopithecus, Homo erectus, etc.**) are fragmentary and controversial, even among evolutionists, and can all be interpreted either as extinct apes or degenerated men.

DID HUMANS REALLY EVOLVE FROM APE-LIKE CREATURES?

by Dr. David Menton Featured in [The New Answers Book 2](#)

Perhaps the most bitter pill to swallow for any Christian who attempts to **“make peace”** with Darwin is the presumed ape ancestry of man. Even many Christians who uncritically accept evolution as **“God’s way of creating”** try to somehow elevate the origin of man, or at least his soul, above that of the beasts. Evolutionists attempt to soften the blow by assuring us that man didn’t exactly evolve from apes

(*tailless monkeys*) but rather from **apelike creatures**. This is mere semantics, however, as many of the presumed apelike ancestors of man are apes and have scientific names, which include the word *pithecus* (*derived from the Greek meaning “ape”*). The much-touted “*human ancestor*” commonly known as “*Lucy*,” for example, has the scientific name **Australopithecus afarensis** (meaning “**southern ape from the Afar triangle of Ethiopia**”). But what does the [Bible](#) say about the origin of man, and what exactly is the scientific evidence that evolutionists claim for our ape ancestry?

BIBLICAL STARTING ASSUMPTIONS

God tells us that on the same day He made all animals that walk on the earth (*the sixth day*), He created man separately in His own image with the intent that man would have dominion over every other living thing on earth ([Genesis 1:26–28](#)). From this it is clear that there is no animal that is man’s equal, and certainly none his ancestor.

Thus, when God paraded the animals by Adam for him to name, He observed that “*for Adam there was not found an help meet for him*” ([Genesis 2:20](#)). Jesus confirmed this uniqueness of men and women when He declared that marriage is to be between a man and a woman because “*from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female*” ([Mark 10:6](#)). This leaves no room for prehuman’s or for billions of years of cosmic evolution prior to man’s appearance on the earth. Adam chose the very name “*Eve*” for his wife because he recognized that she would be “*the mother of all living*” ([Genesis 3:20](#)). The apostle Paul stated clearly that man is not an animal: “*All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of*

flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds” ([1 Corinthians 15:39](#)).

EVOLUTIONARY STARTING ASSUMPTIONS

While Bible-believing Christians begin with the assumption that God’s Word is true and that man’s ancestry goes back only to a fully human Adam and Eve, evolutionists begin with the assumption that man has, in fact, evolved from apes. No paleoanthropologists (*those who study the fossil evidence for man’s origin*) would dare to seriously raise the question, “*Did man evolve from apes?*” The only permissible question is, “*From which apes did man evolve?*”

Since evolutionists generally do not believe that man evolved from any ape that is now living, they look to fossils of humans and apes to provide them with their desired evidence. Specifically, they look for any anatomical feature that looks “*intermediate*” (*between that of apes and man*). Fossil apes having such features are declared to be ancestral to man (*or at least collateral relatives*) and are called *hominids*. Living apes, on the other hand, are not considered to be hominids, but rather are called *hominoids* because they are only similar to humans but did not evolve into them. Nonetheless, evolutionists are willing to accept mere similarities between the fossilized bones of extinct apes and the bones of living men as “*proof*” of our ape ancestry.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE FOR HUMAN EVOLUTION?

Though many similarities may be cited between living apes and humans, the only historical evidence that could support the ape ancestry of man must come from fossils. Unfortunately, the fossil record of man and apes is very sparse.

Approximately 95 percent of all known fossils are marine invertebrates, about 4.7 percent are algae and plants, about 0.2 percent are insects and other invertebrates, and only about 0.1 percent are vertebrates (animals with bones). Finally, only the smallest imaginable fraction of vertebrate fossils consists of primates (humans, apes, monkeys, and lemurs).

Because of the rarity of fossil hominids, even many of those who specialize in the [evolution](#) of man have never actually seen an original hominid fossil, and far fewer have ever had the opportunity to handle or study one. Most scientific papers on human evolution are based on casts of original specimens (*or even on published photos, measurements, and descriptions of them*). Access to original fossil hominids is strictly limited by those who discovered them and is often confined to a few favored evolutionists who agree with the discoverers' interpretation of the fossil.

Since there is much more prestige in finding an ancestor of man than an ancestor of living apes (*or worse yet, merely an extinct ape*), *there is immense pressure on paleoanthropologists to declare almost any ape fossil to be a "hominid."* As a result, the living apes have pretty much been left to find their own ancestors.

Many students in our schools are taught human evolution (*often in the social studies class!*) by teachers having little knowledge of human anatomy, to say nothing of ape anatomy. But it is useless to consider the fossil evidence for the evolution of man from apes without first understanding the basic anatomical and functional differences between human and ape skeletons.

ONLY THREE WAYS TO MAKE AN "APE-MAN"

Knowing from Scripture that [God](#) didn't create any ape-men, there are only three ways for the evolutionist to create one:



1. Combine ape fossil bones with human fossil bones and declare the two to be one individual—a real “ape-man.”
2. Emphasize certain humanlike qualities of fossilized ape bones, and with imagination upgrade apes to be more humanlike.
3. Emphasize certain apelike qualities of fossilized human bones, and with imagination downgrade humans to be more apelike.

These three approaches account for *all* of the attempts by evolutionists to fill the unbridgeable gap between apes and men with fossil ape-men.

CONCLUSION

Why then are there continued efforts to make apes out of man and man out of apes? In one of the most remarkably frank and candid assessments of the whole subject and the methodology of paleoanthropology, *Dr. David Pilbeam (a distinguished professor of anthropology)* suggested the following:

Perhaps generations of students of human evolution, including myself, have been flailing about in the dark; that our data base is too sparse, too slippery, for it to be able to mold our theories. Rather the theories are more statements about us and ideology than about the past. Paleoanthropology reveals more about how humans view themselves than it does about how humans came about. But that is heresy.

Oh, that these heretical words were printed as a warning on every textbook, magazine, newspaper article, and statue that presumes to deal with the bestial origin of man!

No, we are not descended from apes. Rather, God created man as the crown of His [creation](#) on Day 6. We are a special creation of God, made in His image, to bring Him glory. What a revolution this truth would make if our evolutionized culture truly understood it!