

He had all this division coming from top to bottom. Every species is distinct and separate. No species ever develops into another species. That's what Laneaus said. The Bible doesn't say that.

If the Bible used the word species, we have no right to say when Moses used the word species he means what Laneaus means. 3700 years later when Laneaus talks about his species. When Moses says "king" it's a matter for our study. What does he mean by "king"?

He says there are different kinds. Shall we say these are exactly what Laneaus means by "species"? Now we have hundreds of thousands of various divisions we call species. Every now and then somebody thinks he has proved that one of these species developed into another. And he says, Look. Here's evolutions' proof!

Suppose you had 10,000 cases proven where you had one species develop into another, and I'm not sure there's one. But suppose there were 10,000 that wouldn't prove that one genus developed into another. It wouldn't prove one family developed into another. It wouldn't prove that all species developed one from another.

You see you've gotten to a tremendous thing when you say that everything has developed ~~from/one/ta~~ by natural process from one simple beginning. The vital thing is that God created all things.

The second vital things is that whatever the Bible tells us about it is true and that we can stand on because this is God's Word. There are a number of people today who wish to believe in Christ, who wish to stand on the teachings of the Bible but think that every scientist believes in evolution, and so we can't believe in Gen. one and two. So they think this must be poetry. This must be legend. But you cannot think that and interpret the Bible as a unit. Because the NT refers to Adam as the first man. As in Adam all sinned so in hrist shall all be made alive. It is referred to as historic fact in the Bible. Doctrine is based upon it. If you accept the Bible you must accept Gen. 1 and 2 as fact.

If we accept them as fact, that's one thing. But we must read them carefully and not read into them more than they say. We must see what they say. So we look at Gen. 1 and 2.

When I was in college there were those who said, Oh, you believe in the Biblical sotry of creation? Which story do you believe? The one in Gen. 1, or the one in Gen. 2? There are people who try to make it sound as if we have two stories of creation. When I entered seminary the professor of OT gave a fairly good explanation. He said it's like the first two maps in an atlas of which the first might be a map of the world, and the second a map of N. America. One is more detailed than the other. They overlap, but they are separate.

I don't say that is quite a correct comparrison. I would say it is like a map of the world followed by a map of NJ. That is to say, one of them covers a tremendous area, and it gives a whole picture of the whole area. The other takes a little bit of an end of the area and gives it in much more detail, than the first. Gen. 1:1-2:4 gives us the story of the creation week. On the 6th day of the creation week, we have a brief description of man's creation.