World History
Dr. Hoeh

9-11-68
Wed. A.M.

GENESIS AND GEOLOGY (II)

Having completed Genesis one in the last class, we now come to chapter two which orients us geographically.

From the point of view of history or geology we would not, at this point, be directly concerned with the Sabbath. But we would deal with the question of the area of the world where human life first began.

Ideas About Where Man Originated

It has generally been denied that there is any way of knowing where man originated. There are a number of conjectured ideas. Carleton Coon is of the opinion that the three races of man had to originate in different areas. He promotes this concept because there certainly isn't, even in terms of geology, enough time once man starts to account for the diverse racial characteristics that we see. Most anthropologists would not agree that human beings are inter-fertile and yet arose from pre-human, diverse elements. So Carleton Coon's idea is not generally accepted though he himself postulates it in the remarkable and very interesting book, The Origin of Races.

There used to a general consensus among scholars that man originated somewhere in Asia. When they didn't want to get involved in endless controversy they would say this came about in the heart of Central Asia where there are deserts so nobody could find any proof!

And then there are those who now follow in the footsteps of Leakey's logic and go to the Olduvai gorge in Tanganyika to find the oldest human remains on earth!

The best summary of what modern scholars have come to accept in this field if probably to be found in the book by Ruth Moore, Man, Time and Fossils. Her writing is very interesting because she is a journalist rather than a scholar.

(Note:The 1963 Britannica Book of the Year under the article "Anthropology" has the following: "Carleton S. Coon's The Origin of Races, which became controversial almost immediately, took the unconventional position that five geographic races must have separated in remote Pleistocene times from a common hominid stem and evolved independently. Because they occupied favourable territories, Caucasoids and Mongoloids achieved early dominance. However, Coon prophesied that other races would challenge their position." In 1962 "Carleton S. Coon served his second year as head of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists....")

Eden

Then the other major topic confronting us in Genesis 2 is the relative position of the Garden of Eden. How might we determine its location?

Certainly from the point of view of the fulfillment in Ezekiel and certain prophecies in the last of Zechariah of the waters going out from the Temple, from Mount Zion, eastward and westward; and the general principle of restoring all things, that Zion will be lifted up above all others; and we see here that this particular stream of "four heads" watered the rest of the world—one could hardly come up with any other conclusion but that the Garden of Eden could not be Babylon, it couldn't be any other area, but must have been Palestine itself. And apparently Eden must have been an extensive area of which the Garden was a small part.

So verse 10 tells us that the "river went out of Eden to water the garden"—the Garden apparently being on the eastern slopes of Eden. This would be the direction one would conclude. And verse 8 says that "God planted a garden eastward in Eden." Later one the term "Eden" may have spread to other areas, but certainly at this time one we think, in principle, that it was basically the region of Palestine and the Garden was in the eastern section that faced east in the morning sun.

Four Vast Channels

The "rivers" of verses 10-14 are also described in Josephus. Certainly this description gives an implication that they originate west of the area of Mesopotamia because they go toward Assyria (v. 14, check margin)--that's the Euphrates. And the Hiddekel is the Tigris. The river Hiddekel is the Tigris of history—that is the Hebrew word for Tigris. There isn't any question about it. And the river Euphrates has retained the same name. The first two rivers have changed names, the one being understood by Josephus to be the Ganges (Pison, v. 11), ultimately, that circled the land of Havilah, an eastern area; and the other he identifies as the Nile (Gihon, v. 13).

Certainly the present-day rivers must be quite a bit different, and the direction of flow was certainly from the center or originating point outward. What the direction of flow might have been at one time in terms of the Nile is a geological question. Whether these were rivers in our narrow sense of the word, or whether they were actually vast channels—I think it would be much better to view them as the latter to start with. This presumes that the present structure of the Nile and Ganges reflect a subsequent period of mountain-building. There is no known historical period of time in which these rivers were in the form pictured here in Genesis 2. If you were to go back to geology, before the archaeological sequence of man takes up, then you will find something like this.

This brings up the serious question of whether or not we should expect after the Cretaceous a very great amount of mountain building which has altered the pattern of the earth. Thus prior to this time there were undoubtedly areas of greater or lesser rain over a vast land mass—that which was nearer the sea would have the greatest amount; but deserts in the modern sense of years with no rain, like the desert of Peru that averages rain once in 19 years, or the Sahara (maybe we should call it the "Saharas" because there is actually more than one desert within the region--not all in between is desert) did not exist originally in the Adamic world. So we find that after the Cretaceous and after the beginning of the Tertiary, there was a period of relatively flat earth; and you have a period of significant channels, some of which may indeed be directly related in earliest Tertiary to directions that criss-cross in the Middle East. Ultimately this resulted, after mountain-building, in the four modern rivers as we know them today (Tigris, Euphrates, Nile, Ganges) which come down mountain sides. Prior to this time rivers did not follow this pattern.

Today there is only one known river that starts as one stream and divides into two. Otherwise, all others originate as small streams which gather into one main channel in highland areas. We have a picture from King Leopold's finds--it is one of those strange things--they found in the flat Amazon the only known river like this of its kind. This would clearly indicate that to have a river that started as one stream and divided into four parts was a characteristic of a fundamentally flat earth—an earth devoid of mountains! This was an earth that did not have the vast mountain chains as we know them where this phenomenon is not characteristic. Always today you find many feeders into one major stream.

The only conclusion that one could generally come to is that in the early Tertiary is where we will find some kind of sequence that will match the description in Genesis. And I think that, in analyzing it, the best illustration is provided by the area of the Middle East of these rivers, one going into Africa, one eastward toward the Ganges, one north--and it is a question whether we should call the Mediterranean a "sea" or whether it was also one of them (that is, a part of it--I suppose that is really a sea). And that there were really two divisions going up north which is also indicated.

When this phase was over when the mountains began to occur, the names of the four rivers became applied and limited to these smaller streams as we have them today. This is something that is not clearly susceptible of proof because I doubt that geologists have all the evidence. But it is remarkable that above the Cretaceous you see this phenomenon of low-lying flatness. And after this came the mountain-building. And also bear in mind that there is almost nothing but marine life to start with even during this period.

This conclusion is predicated on the concept that the definition of Cretaceous, which underlies the Tertiary, is essentially valid as given by geology--which it gives every evidence of being. And that the Tertiary is the earliest world in which--and Josephus, and a-a-l-l-l ancient tradition, imply that there were four gigantic rivers that, in a sense, encompassed most of the earth. And these streams did. That is, they were vast channels that ran all through Asia to the Ganges, all through much of Africa to the south--in which case there may have been little direction of flow other than vast channels, and this is what was first meant. And then mountain-building changed this pattern.

Early Tertiary

I would conclude certainly from the fact that when God comes down on earth certain things do happen--that when God came down and punished man and sent our original physical father out of the Garden of Eden, that all of this changed. And suddenly, you see, he's told at this very time in the Garden of Eden that "cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. 3:17)....And there are almost no fossils of the modern type, by the way, in this geologic level. In fact, the earliest Tertiary is categorized as having a fossil percentage of the modern type of fauna equivalent to zero. This is by definition --which really means probably that most of this is just skeletal remains of the previous pre-Adamic world which they really haven't understood the significance of, before the new types of re-created life had spread to any great extent.

Anyway, within this week of creation--presumably when God intervened after Creation Week and determined to expel man from the Garden, He cursed the ground saying, "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth..."(Gen. 3:17) which is the same as saying "Mountains are going to come forth" because mountains make possible the desert so you can have this kind of thing developing. Not that all thorns and thistles grow in deserts, but certainly that is an implication geographically of the punishment botanically that is recorded.

And from this time forth we have a sudden transformation of the Jordan Valley. Instead of being a vast channel, it becomes smaller and smaller; finally there is a vast amount of volcanic activity in the Lebanon, which is to the north that cuts it off; and instead of flowing north as it once did (if "flow" is a proper term), it ceases and now becomes a river moving in the other direction--slowly forming a true river as we now see it today. Because the Lebanon is building up and building up volcanically until it's a vast mountain area; and then the Dead Sea area drops down--the point is that it is generally considered that all of these things took place in the early Tertiary.

Of course there are no human remains attributed to any of this period. I would suspect from the Biblical record, frankly, that the bulk of all of this had taken place before—while none of the animals or man had ever reproduced (other than what fish might be reproducing, and that takes more time—maybe some creatures in the sea, unicellular types, could have). There is no indication man was in the Garden of Eden for very long. God didn't explain everything to him—the idea that Adam sat there for seven sermons on seven days is not Biblically supported! He probably was there for a good talk with God in the evening, and then in the morning and afternoon of the Sabbath. And I rather suspect that Adam and Eve were quite tired at the end of the day. And there is little doubt that, in principle, by the next morning—Sunday morning—that they went out and the Devil did his work on that day! See, God was going to reveal to Adam and Eve the fundamental basic knowledge; and that doesn't mean it all had been revealed. There was undoubtedly more to come—next Sabbath, if you please. But, in this case, knowing the Devil, he wasn't going to wait for months or years. The only reason he waited till the next day is that he wasn't allowed to do anything on the Sabbath!

On this basis, if the curse of Genesis 3:17 came in the cool of the evening (Gen. 3:8) at the end of that day, why then that's the same as saying there just wouldn't be any archaeological remains. There wouldn't even be any geological remains of the animal family as a whole by this time when God comes down, intervenes, punishes the earth, curses the animals, and all of these things which happened immediately after the re-creation of the earth!

And then what we find, in most cases, in the <u>early Tertiary</u> is <u>fossilless</u> material! You don't find fossils except mostly marine life. And I really suspect from the story that we have now a <u>sequence</u> of events. The first remains undoubtedly give every characteristic of being <u>not</u> Adamic—many of these early remains don't show any relationship to modern fossils. I think this is a factor which has been overlooked, and a reason why, in some cases, there is strong evidence, especially in India, of pre-Cretaceous and Cretaceous life <u>associated with the Tertiary</u> and they don't know how to account for it. <u>Or</u> the other way around, which is the best way to put it: There is life in the earliest Tertiary that is found in India <u>in the pre-Tertiary</u> and they don't know how to account for it, see? This is the same as saying that some things <u>called</u> "Tertiary" <u>were</u> in the world before Adam in actuality and were wrongly assigned to the world <u>after</u> the Cretaceous when it really belongs before! And undoubtedly many of these fossils have been, shall we say, <u>re-eroded</u> in the mountain building so that the Cretaceous will contain fossils of a previous world as the result of erosion. I think this is a factor that in many cases has been overlooked. But most Tertiary at the beginning doesn't have any fossils. <u>Fossils are not common</u>! But <u>each area</u> must be understood <u>on its own</u>. We do not conclude—Mr. Herrmann has not concluded—that the definition of a given geologic period is always valid. But the biggest enigma has been in the Himalayas where so-called Tertiary fossils have been found percolated all the way down through. And if they had <u>begun</u> their geologic study there, they never would have concluded that most of the earliest Tertiary was anything but a pre-Adamic pattern. (But that's a separate area we can come to later.)

What I am getting at is that <u>we can account for major geological events after the Cretaceous</u>--let's say after the Lower Cretaceous, at least. The first was the destruction of the world that is normally recorded in the Cretaceous but may be reflected--listen carefully--<u>on the surface of Pre-Cambrian</u> where Pre-Cambrian in Siberia, Australia and Canada is <u>the top</u>! In other words, that's where it would be. It isn't that Pre-Cambrian areas like that existed with no later deposits. This is what that world was left with --sometimes a world of bare rock in vast regions of the world, and you have to analyze it. Any geology book will explain to what extent some areas of the world have all soil and anything that must have lived on it, completely washed away except in little pock...

All of that was the surface on to which the Tertiary has, in pockets here and there (never universally like an onion coat!), been deposited.

Greenland as an Example

So in Chapter One of Genesis, we have the rising of the continental structures; then the complete change during the early Tertiary (when rightly labelled) of the surface of the earth resulting in the vast mountain areas, the development of deserts, the change of climate, and the remarkable fluctuations back and forth of climate during this period and succeeding periods so that it just shades off into the much cooler last half of the Tertiary which suddenly becomes Quaternary with vast amounts of Arctic snow similar to what we observe in present-day Greenland.

When Mr. Armstrong and others of us travel by jet over Greenland, it never ceases to be remarkable how Greenland is a gigantic island that is just covered with snow--not like ordinary glaciers. And over vast regions of the north there are extensive snow packs that have come no doubt as the result of a great deal water in the air that has fallen as snow because of the temperature being just right, neither too cold (as in the Arctic today) nor too hot or it would have fallen as rain. And these packs moved back and forth, hence the problem of the "Ice Ages" that we'll get into later, etc.

Earliest Culture

In Genesis 4 we find that man starts out as a creature capable of farming. It would not be possible to discern the earliest plowed ground; you might discern the first, most primitive tools man used.

We use the word "primitive" commonly in all this literature. It might be better to get rid of that term and use the word "elementary" which is far less an expression that would prejudice the idea! Man began initially with just simple ideas. I am sure that the first man didn't think of the mole board and a John Deere! He instead recognized his muscles, he recognized that he could tie a stick to a certain kind of stone and do a job. There are many nations today that don't even use plows. There are various peoples on earth that still have what we would call a "hoe culture" in which the women hoe with these very short hoes. So they spend most of the day bent forward. This is in Africa. The women conduct the agriculture and the men stand guard for wild animals--that aren't there!! This hoe culture also exists in Latin America and Asia--because, in the first place, a lot of areas wouldn't allow a plow; and a hoe is equally satisfactory.

We might begin, in other words, to note certain tools that could be used in this manner in earliest cultural remains. Also the use of domesticated stock. But earliest man in the Bible (Gen. 4) is pictured as an agriculturalist.

Animals Before and After the Flood

Now we are not going to prove it here today, but we want to ask ourselves whether or not, when we investigate earliest human tools, we are dealing with men who had the capacity to strictly be hunters and live on animals that were wild.

Now we learn later that there were wild animals after the Flood that had the fear of man placed on them. The implication is that they might have been savage in the sense of "wild" before the Flood. "Cursed," you know, "was the serpent ABOVE all other beasts of the field" (Gen. 3:14), implying that the other creatures had a curse too. That's the implication of it. Not that it alone is cursed, but that it is cursed more than the others. "The whole creation groans and travails in pain"--there is no statement

that the animals suddenly began to become meat-eating strictly at a certain time after the Flood. This was going to be changed, it occurred at a certain time—the fear of man came on animals after the Flood (Gen. 9:2). But there is every evidence that this is a characteristic of animals before as a result of the curse that God put on Adam (Ger 3:17). But there is absolutely no indication—absolutely no indication—that pre-Fl animals had the fear of man. And this may well indicate why you have the unique quantity of animal bones in the pre-Flood world where animals were often driven into traps and slaughtered—that is, vast areas where they could be driven into, and then they were trapped in there and killed. But we'll discuss that later.

Our big question is, Was man capable of being a hunter in the same sense that Nimrod was? Who was the first hunter? Was Cain the first hunter? Or was it Nimrod? What do we really mean by hunting? In the sense of the use of the arrow—a man who could go out and pursue animals that were fleeing from him? This is absolutely a post-Flood characteristic never alluded to in the prior Bible account. And we shall discover that the use of the arrow was something quite late—not the earliest instrument used.

We shall analyze further whether most tools to start with were agricultural in nature and presumed the use of stock or whether men were hunting as is normally pictured. The earliest men are always assumed to be hunters, but were they really in the modern sense? Or were they dealing with animals that did not have the fear of man on them? This would help explain the nature of the tools that were used.

The Pre- Flood World

Then we have the building of a city (Gen. 4:17). Cain wandered widely; then he finally built a city. Then we have the beginning of metal and musical instruments, the utilization of brass and iron (21-22). We want to find out how early iron might have been used; and we have clear evidence that it was used before the Flood (despite the fact that after the Flood the prescribed archaeological sequence is Chalcolithic, th Early, Middle and Late Bronze before we get to the so-called "Iron Age.") Yet, last year, for those of you who remember, it was admitted by our outside speaker on archaeology that the use of iron certainly does precede the Iron Age. The original scheme the scholars set down was based on Scandinavia that was so devoid of iron there was none there to find! It just wasn't used very early in that more remote part of the globe.

The Bible gives us the further implication that human skeletons should not appear among the earliest cultural remains as a whole. That is, death comes when men are much more advanced in age. Thus centuries might go by of human remains before burials would appear as part of those remains. There might indeed be murders; and hence the question will be whether earliest man was religious or not, because most murdered people are just discarded in some way with no religious rites. And therefore when they find that, the assumption might be, among archaeologists, that earliest man had not yet acquired religion—you know, this kind of nonsense. But we want to keep all these things in mind on the basis of some of the statements found in Genesis 4, 5 and 6.

Then we recognize from the Bible account that the world comes into a period of strife and sin, hence the possibility of criminally attacked people whose skeletons will show some kind of injury. Then we will have the indication of the emphasis on sex because people were getting involved in racial intermarriage, adultery, polygamy. The whole emphasis was on sex before the story ended—just like our modern society has a very great emphasis on this same thing.

The Flood

Then we find the resources are present to build a very large boat (Gen. 6). But I want you to notice that the characteristics of this boat are extremely primitive or elementary. We don't find that Noah is using rivets; we find he is using pitch! I want you to consider to what extent a boat like this is described to him and he is told how to make it; and he makes it out of the most primitive substances available—that is, pitch to hold it together to keep the water out, and timbers. Here is nothing of the sophisticated sense, as we think of it, of ocean-going vessels today. And we should bear that in mind.

Then the destruction of life in chapter 7--"all that was in the dry land died" (v. 22)--birds in the air that survive on the dry land, creatures of any variety surviving on the dry land that must avoid continuous exposure to water. "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life...." This does not mean that every tree would perish. There are some trees that clearly will, and many plants. But afterall, the seeds would not; they'd merely come back after this very long, wet year! But there are trees that could indeed survive. And there may be some extant today; some of the bristle-cone pine may be, indeed, some centuries older than the Flood (if their counting is correct, back to about 4600 years before the present which was about 1950).

So we have a question there in relation to the Flood of whether or not there is a possibility of checking to see if there was a sudden decline of life. Now we'll ask ourselves, After the Tertiary, is there a sudden decline of forms of life—a sudden decline of human habitation; and a repopulation of a different fauna that will be called "Modern?" Now when we go through the story we will discover just this. Vast areas depopulated of human beings, an attempt by writers to assume the survival of human beings in the area to account for the later arrival of culture. And otherwise a recognition that a vast quantity of varieties or species have suddenly died out, either in the late Quaternary (that is, the late "Ice Ages" as they are called)--and it depends on how we define the Quaternary—at the end of or, in many instances, after it. And undoubtedly this difficulty in being precise is due to the fact that the definition of the Quaternary varies from the Arctic to the Tropics. There is no reason to assume these men have arrived at a right definition of a lot of these terms, because they first assume a lot of things and then give the definition. We should then expect the presence of new kinds of balances in nature because some things survived while others did not.

The Significance of Babel

Then we come to the story of the Tower of Babel. And when we come to the Tower of Babel we should be able to pick up written history. Now if we once locate the Tower of Babel, not necessarily as a geographic place but in regard to the whole story of what surrounds that great symbol and the building of Babylon; and the whole region where man first settled after the Flood. If we once locate that, and we can come to our time archaeologically, then we can take this as guide point and go back, notice the sudden change.

And even Albright admitted that, clearly, the Biblical traditions and other traditions of the Flood, as he said, must have been at the end of the "Ice Ages" or the Quaternary. And then the other remains during that period would represent the pre-Flood world. That's what we are getting to and want to examine when looking at the archaeology.

- - - - -

Note: The material on the next page (p. 8) is from the afternoon lecture of this same date and serves to supplement Dr. Hoeh's remarks in the morning lecture just completed above.

No Pre-Flood Habitation of Off-shore Islands

Then God tells Noah to make an ark. And, in this case, the ark is quite primitive if you stop to consider that there are no rivets. You have here only the tar or bitumen that was used to join the various timbers of the boat. There is no indication that the first man immediately knew how to build a ship.

In the first place, there is clear archaeological evidence that many of the big islands off shore were not inhabited during the earliest period. This indicates that the matter of traveling by boat was limited. Ireland was inhabited only shortly before the end of the Flood. In fact, Irish tradition clearly says that was Noah's own children who did not pass through the Flood but were the first to arrive—it was the close of the pre-Flood world. Areas like Sardinia and Corsica and Crete and Cyprus were only inhabited very late. So the fact that God had to give Noah elaborate instructions implies knowledge of this kind was still very limited in the pre-Flood world.

Animals Before and After the Flood

Certainly the implication that I would derive from the Biblical record is that before the Flood animals did not have the fear of man, but I have no indication that animals did not prey on one another. In other words, the idea that there is going to be the grass-eating lion or ox, the dust-eating serpent—this kind of thing for the Millennium does not indicate that this was totally the characteristic of the pre-Flood world. Certainly the types of life that you see—the sabre-toothed tiger and other things—give the strong implication that when God put the fear of man on animals, it was the fear of man and not a change of digestion at all. There is no direct indication in my estimation for that. I know this has been mentioned both ways.

What <u>is</u> defined is that the serpent was cursed in the days of Adam above all the beasts of the field, implying that the beasts were also cursed. So the picture would seem to be that were are dealing basically with—and Josephus would tend to confirm that, that animals were wild in the sense of savage but not necessarily that animals were afraid of man as most of them have come to be. That's why Cain was fearful that the animals would get ahold of him, but God said that He would see to it that they didn't.

This gives you, at least, a general picture of the nature that we would be looking for—the story that we would be looking for when we study a bit of archaeology and geology