

“Let My outcasts tarry with you, Moab. Be a hiding-place to them from the face of the destroyer. For the exactor has ceased, destruction has failed; the trampler is ended out of the land” (Green’s literal translation).

Isaiah 16:1 says that Moab should pay tribute to the Jews and submit to the King of Judah. This follows the pattern of David’s conquest (2 Sam. 8:2). (Incidentally, 2 Kings 3:4 provides historical background to the command to bring a lamb.) A second piece of counsel is then given to Moab in verses 3 and 4, to take in the Jewish refugees. It would make no sense if suddenly the Jews were addressed in verse 4 and told to take in the Moabites, with Moab again being addressed from verse 6 onwards.

Michael Jenner
Mumbles

As Brother Jenner has shown in his article and reply, there is strong Scriptural evidence to support the traditional interpretation that the Jews will find refuge in Jordan at the time of the end. Furthermore, signs continue to point towards Israel and Jordan developing their relationship. For example, Israel-Jordan Chamber of Commerce data reportedly show that trade between Israel and Jordan increased by over twenty per cent during 2001. Significantly, Jordan responded favourably to President Bush when he referred to Iran, Iraq and North Korea as an “axis of evil”, with King Abdullah stating that he endorsed “tremendously that view and that position” (BBC News online). The Watchman section will, it is hoped, continue to endeavour to move beyond debate and provide a clear view of world events based on the sound interpretation of Scripture.—N.B.

Was the creation cursed?

I have read the above-mentioned article ([Jan. 2002, p. 23](#)), and I am not sure how the article can be seen to be in harmony with *The Testimony’s* aim of being “for the study and defence of the Holy Scripture”, as stated on the front cover.

For example, the author writes: “There is no hint in Genesis 3 that the sin of Adam and Eve brought animal death into the world”. However, the Bible says: “Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD [Yahweh] God make coats of skins, and clothed them” (Gen. 3:21). An animal must have died to provide those skins, “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev. 13:8). This is the first recorded animal death in

Scripture, and any theory which says that mortality was part of the creation prior to this assumes that all things have continued as they now are.

The article further states: “There is therefore no imperative to believe that the original plant kingdom was changed because of Adam’s sin”. Yet the Bible says, “cursed is the ground for thy sake . . . thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread” (Gen. 3:17-19). The article continues: “And there is certainly no evidence in Genesis that the fall in Eden involved radical changes in the animal kingdom”; but the Bible records: “And the LORD [Yahweh] God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life” (v. 14).

To these could be added those many Scriptures which demonstrate that there are ecological consequences to man’s sin. Here is one from Hosea: “Hear the word of the LORD [Yahweh], ye children of Israel: for the LORD [Yahweh] hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood. Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth therein shall languish, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven; yea, the fishes of the sea also shall be taken away” (4:1-3).

The article’s description of the extent of predation and how “Death is an integral part of the economy of nature” is most interesting, but these conditions apply in the current era, there is no Scriptural evidence that they pertained before sin entered the world. As the author concedes, “It is, of course, accepted that with God nothing is impossible, and that God could have brought about the radical changes required for the introduction of death as we see it today, in the twinkling of an eye”. That is exactly what happened when sin was introduced into the world—there was a radical change.

Whilst the author speaks of animals, prior to the introduction of sin, as being dependent on vegetation either directly or indirectly—carnivores eating prey which had eaten vegetation—the Bible says nothing about the latter, but only that God gave “to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air . . . every green herb for

meat” (Gen. 1:30). In the coming Kingdom of God predatory animals will revert to a vegetarian diet: “The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain” (Isa. 11:6-9).

Under the heading “Theories of Creation” the article concludes with three ‘models’ of Creation, with the third appearing to be the author’s preferred choice. Here it is propounded that “the literal days of Genesis 1 are human time frames during which God revealed His creative work occurring over millions of years”, and that “Death is seen as an integral part of God’s creation from the beginning of the natural world”.

But the Bible says: “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD [Yahweh] thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the LORD [Yahweh] made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD [Yahweh] blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Ex. 20:8-11). Here we have the time frame during which Creation took place simply defined: six days, and not “millions of years”. Certainly that is how the Israelites who heard the Ten Commandments would have understood it.

May I suggest that the author has not based his thesis upon Scriptural revelation but upon the shifting sands of scientific theory. The danger of such is that we might cease understanding Genesis (chapter 1 in particular) as literal and that a foundation may be laid for unsound exposition on the atonement involving a premise that death preceded sin in the world and that mortal flesh is now therefore neither clean nor unclean (*cf.* Rom. 7:18; 8:3).

Russell Ebbs
Colchester

[Brother Fowler failed to explain in his article the words, “cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee” \(Gen. 3:17,18\). Adam was not simply forced to leave a weed-free garden to cultivate an already cursed field. There was a change to creation as dramatic as the change to Adam’s nature, of which the thistles were a permanent and vexa-](#)

tious reminder. Speaking typically of the removal of this curse in the Kingdom, Isaiah wrote: “Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree” (55:13).

It is untrue that most young-earth creationists believe that carnivores were created after the Fall, and I know of none who do. We believe that all animals were created in the beginning, and surmise that carnivorous behaviour began after the Fall amongst various land animals, birds and reptiles that were originally herbivorous. Invertebrates and marine animals were not included (Gen. 1:30). Imagine Adam’s dismay as he witnessed the peaceful creation descend into violence and predation! Scripture indicates a reversal of this calamity in the Kingdom when these animal groups revert to vegetarianism: “the lion shall eat straw like the ox” (Isa. 11:7).

Because carnivores are perfectly designed for their present way of life they must have been prepared for it like the dormant thistles and diseases. The anatomy of serpents was definitely changed at the Fall (Gen. 3:14), and they will not be restored to their original form in the Kingdom (Isa. 65:25), although their ‘sting’ will be removed so that children may safely handle them (11:8).

Animals were never undying, and will still die from natural causes and in sacrifices (Ezek. 40:42). Before the Fall, animals died for much the same reasons as they die today; the elephant crushes a lizard underfoot or the wind blows a chick from the nest. The largest dinosaurs were, and the largest mammals still are, herbivores. Most land vertebrates are herbivores, and many captive carnivores, such as lions, can thrive on a vegetarian diet. Menacing teeth do not necessarily denote a meat eater.

Brother Fowler overstates the number of extinct species—for example, 150 elephant and 200 rhino species—and it is unclear how this serves his proposal. A superabundance of genetic variety is compatible with the “very good” state of the Creation, and a tribute to the amazing intelligence and power of the Creator. Such figures are usually presented to discredit the possibility of fitting all the necessary animal species in Noah’s Ark. The definition of a species is ‘a group of animals that can interbreed and produce fertile offspring’. As it is impossible to test-breed extinct animals, it cannot be claimed that two extinct rhinos, for example, are from different species. Physical differences do not necessarily