

THE FALL OF MAN

by Paul Wigowsky

The following facts are basic: God created man in his own image, meaning that man had mind, soul, and will. The soul belonged completely to God since it was God that breathed into man a living soul. But the mind and the will was left at man's disposal. But since he was a perfect man, the first man's mind and will were in harmony with God. When it is mentioned that God created man, it is meant both man and his counterpart, woman.

Now, it is recorded that God blessed man and said unto him: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." As to how this was fulfilled in the Garden of Eden, it is not certain; but it is most evident that throughout their life in Eden there was not one child born unto them. Could it have been that God did not create man in the first place for procreation? because it is written that God created man to have dominion over all of God's creation. Nothing is mentioned of bringing more men into the world. But for the sake of Adam, God created him an help answering to him or assistant for company. Therefore, there is no sign of it being God's purpose for man to procreate himself, since God created man for dominion and for fellowship with God, also.

The scripture also records: "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." When both sexes were in this state they had not as yet been initiated into the relationship that occurs between the opposite sexes. The reason why it is said that man and woman were made one flesh is precisely because woman was made from man, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, and not because of the sexual relationship.

Furthermore, after the forbidden act was committed the sub-

sequent incident occurred: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.

In the former verse where neither were ashamed of their nakedness, their innocence is quite evident. Since as of yet they had not experienced the meaning of love through intimate relationship, which at that time was unknown, they also did not quite comprehend the meaning of each other. Knowing himself could only be accomplished by knowing that which was made of him; and this could be done only through penetration into the other's innermost being, or into the soul. Usually, understanding of the soul can come solely through carnal experiences. What a man actually wants to find in a woman is himself, and the same is true with the woman. Therefore, this must be an intimate and a mutual relationship. And nakedness brings shame only after the man has found himself in the woman and vice versa. Did God intend to keep this secret hidden from man? Was man to remain an individual or was he to cohere to woman?

As seen before it is most probably that man was to remain an individual character. This would mean that there would not be any future generations. Yet we would want to deny that we were not meant to exist on this earth, even though we often cry in agony, "Why was I born?"

The actual nature of the fruit of the tree which was in the midst of the garden is not known. Still it can not be denied any significance, since the Bible places extreme emphasis on the fact that through the eating of the fruit would man come in ---contact not only with the concept and reality of death, but ---also with the position of being as God, knowing good and evil.

Most people stress the point that it was not the actual eating of the fruit that caused the downfall of man, but it was the rebellion with antagonistic spirit against the command of God. But the Bible account does not project man's rebellion, but rather indicates the curiosity that engendered within the mind of man. Curiosity does not evolve just for the mysterious and the forbidden and unknown, but also for the lovely and desireable.

The Bible often states that the desire of the eyes is usually the opposite sex. But in the incident of the garden episode it cannot be authentically endorsed that the fruit was a symbol for the opposite sex, and that when Eve desired Adam then Adam also desired Eve.

But doesn't all knowledge stem from God for and through man? Therefore, how could knowledge come from a fruit, instead of coming through the means of man and woman? It should also be remembered that this knowledge was of good and evil. Man knows that which is good and evil only by coming in contact with it. But as of that time both the woman and man were perfect, without any blemish of sin and impeccable. Yet the capacity to sin was present but not evident, else there would have been no serpent or devil to tempt them.

When the Bible further records the result of the eating of the fruit by saying: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked," it could only mean that they had committed some mutual act. It would be important to notice that "the erotic experiences of a young woman are not simply an extension of her former sexual activities; very often they are unexpected and disagreeable; and they are always in the nature of a new event

that makes a break with the past." So says Mme. de Beauvoir.

Furthermore she says: "Psychiatrists all agree on the extreme importance of a woman's first erotic experiences: their repercussions are felt throughout the rest of her life. The truth is that virginal desire is not expressed as a precise need: the virgin does not know exactly what she wants. She is divided against herself; she longs for a strong embrace that will make of her a quivering thing, but roughness and force are also disagreeable deterrents that offend her. Still, the young woman needs a man to reveal her own body to her: she is much more deeply dependent.

"Men and women all feel the shame of their flesh; in its pure, inactive presence, its unjustified immanence, the flesh exists, under the gaze of others, in its absurd contingency, and yet it is oneself: oh, to prevent it from existing for others, oh, to deny it!"

Concerning their relationship she says: "To make the other feel pleasure means to dominate the other; to give oneself to someone is to abdicate one's will. The erotic experience is one that most poignantly discloses to human beings the ambiguity of their condition; in it they are aware of themselves as flesh and as spirit, as the other and as subject."

Thus the relationship is both at once very intimate and also very revealing. Both natures are revealed to each other at the same time. This is only because they revealed each other and thus produced a union of mind, soul and spirit. Man always sees himself more clearly and lucidly through the eyes or perception of another personality. One's own opinion of himself is not always frank, since there will always be a portion of prejudice within a person's decision. But the greatest problem exists in the questionable reason for man's attempt for such a relationship.

The question germane to man's desire for a relationship is: What is God's role or position in such a relationship? Before this question can be solved there must be a basic explanation of the essence of God. First, God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. Second, God is the ultimate reality, beyond which there is no other Being or existence. Third, that which may be known about God is revealed in humanity. As the Bible says: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." These attributes were limited to God and were in no manner transmitted to man. The only attribute that man possessed was the result of God's creation of man: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." But fourth and most important, God is a creative being.

When God told man to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it;" there certainly must have been a creative attribute within man's power, this making him like God. But in examining the meaning of the words, it is discovered that the meaning is quite shaded. The word fruitful is an adjective, which means that a modified noun or pronoun is necessary to complete the sentence. The Bible provides both a noun, earth, and a pronoun, it. Another similar word is consequence or result; the word fruit means "to profit, to enjoy and have the use of"; if the word fruit was used as a verb it would mean "to bear or cause to bear fruit." The word multiply, used as a verb, means "to increase in number(as by breeding or propagating)." The word replenish, also used as a verb, means

"to fill or build up again." And then the word subdue, another verb, means "to bring into subjection; to bring under control; to vanquish or conquer; and to reduce the intensity of." So without overemphasizing the meaning of the words, but also not under-estimating their value, it can be unsacreligiously stated that God did not command man to proliferate or to multiply himself, but to progenerate or to bring into existence the production of the earth. Actually God was explaining to man: "Take a look at all that I have created. I have not created it for myself, but especially for you. See all the birds, the fish, and the animals? You are to govern with authority the entire creation, so that everything will be in order. Make use of that which is given to you, and don't waste any of it, but systematize each unit and give each particular object an objective to perform. And don't worry about feeding the animals for there is plenty of fruit and herbs for them and also for you. So it's all yours; take good care of it." That's exactly what Adam did: "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field."

Yet in spite of this explanation the question still remains: "Did Adam have the power to create?" If he did have this ultimate creative ability, then he would have the power of a God, thus making him equal with God. This was exactly what God wanted to prevent from occurring. Therefore He proscribed man from the process of creation, namely knowing good and evil, thus differentiating what is useful and not useful for existence; the process of creation has perpetually been "each after his kind." Knowing the process of creation naturally results in continual exercise of it.

If man had the infinite and unending power to create and perpetuate his own production, then there would be no conclusive impetus to restrain him from totalitarian control of that which he had created, thus placing man's superiority over God. This would have happened had man been permitted to partake and assimilate the nature of the tree of life as he had done with the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

So lest man should create and rule forever, God proscribed any future attempt at an immortal existence by barring man's right to access of the tree of life. Thus this signified the end of man's work in that he would not indefinitely control that which was rightfully his. From the entrance into the world until his death there is a continual decadence in the body of man that absolutely no energy can eliminate from total devastation. Even though man gains more knowledge, strength, life, and power as his existence progresses, yet he is dying a slow death as if there was a slow poison within the very nature of man that inevitably annihilates the existence of man from off the earth.

Everything is lost just because man gains everything. So that because man lives, he also has to die. Because he can create, he has to be destroyed. Therefore the Bible saying comes to pass: "It is appointed unto man once to die." Since man brought about a creation of his own, his own blood and flesh, so also man brought about his own death by intruding upon forbidden territory. And so the Bible says: "The wages (or the consequence) of sin is death." Of this torturous consequence Paul, the apostle, cried: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

God had forewarned man: "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." God had forbidden the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but the scripture does not record any prohibition of the tree of life, which was in the midst of the garden. When the woman reported the case to the tempter she shyly stated: "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." Was she lying when she said that the tree was in the midst of the garden, for that position was inherent to the tree of life? The woman is also condemned by arbitrary decision for adding to God's original words by adding the phrase 'neither shall ye touch it.' Was she confusing the trees or was she trying to argue her way out of the precarious position? Was she only having an internal psychological confusion which she was belligerently determining by mobilization ^{of which} that was uncertain to her? Could the hardly noticeable, delicate, refined, clever 'serpent' have pertinence to the intricate conscience of the mind of man? This similar battle continues within the minds of all mankind as it is faced with jeopardy as to the ultimate decision that is enforced.

But what significance did the tree of life have as to its relationship with the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and as to whether it would be partaken of before or after the involvement with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? Whereas man's contact with man produced knowledge of good and evil, contact with

the source of life, God Himself, produced constant life. Therefore, man was not prohibited contact with Life, since that life sustained man's life. So when God drives and excludes man from Paradise, He does it in view of the Biblical principle: 'What agreement hath evil with good?' Evil could not partake of that which was good. That is why God attempted to reconcile man to man, through the proper relationship, by sending the God-man Christ Jesus. Thus when there is a proper adherence to the man Jesus, there is also a reciprocal contact with God simultaneously.

Further the Bible states: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when ^{he} is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Could Apostle James (Js. 1:13-15) have specifically meant that it was solely the delusive fault of man's erroneous display of action by aberrating from the truth? Sin has a drastic effect both on the producer and the consumer.

But who is to blame for the perpetuation of sin? Could some villain who rudely interrupts a peaceful relationship without any permission from the Almighty Creator be indicted with the fault of bringing condemnation upon man and also even on the seed of man? The traditional moral code damns man as an evil creature, but simultaneously demands that he produce a good which the code argues is impossible for man to produce. Without any ample proof, man is to accept his own depravity as that which he is to live with. Man can desperately hope for the good but is unable to reach it.

Original sin is defined as that act which man could but didn't prevent because it was forced upon him from some extrinsic power that man couldn't overcome. But that sin which allows no volition literally condemns morality: that which provides no choice has no moral principle in it. Whether someone preaches that a human will is free and he has a choice, that evident fact is that his birth is not of choice, neither is his death. There is no choice in that which is inevitable.

The first aspect of external nature that vividly depicts man's wrong doing is guilt. Guilt is that pricking contortion that paralyzes the moral veracity of man. It ruins any honesty or integrity of a logically sound mind; it perverts any good that he has and makes it mysterious so that he is always confused as to the exact reality of anything. Guilt is not passed on from generation; it is individually recognized when a person differentiates between good and evil and his reaction to either. A negative reaction to good, that which is most valued in life, namely life itself, produces guilt; a positive reaction to good produces happiness. A negative reaction to evil reflects upon the ability to choose that which is most beneficial to life, which is life itself; a positive reaction to evil, which is the actual decisive performance, produces a derogatory evil, depravity. No person is depraved because of personal commitment; depravity is always the product that adheres to the product of a previous commitment, a commitment by mutual consent.

The Psalmist David earnestly cried: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." (Ps. 51:4) He propounded this statement after he had willingly gone in to

Bathsheba. His sin was not against himself nor against the docile fair lady that he desired; through this act he ~~he~~^{sought} to elevate his own superiority. Within this act he discovered the creation of all that is evil. He affirms this by saying: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." (Ps. 51:5). He was referring to the bloody, nauseating affair that was concealed under nocturnal activities. Even his own mother was accused of the obnoxious deed. The despairing Job exclaimed: "Yet man is born unto trouble." (Job 5:7). From trouble proceeds trouble. Evil begets evil.

There is no valid justification of an evil that produces another evil. God himself did not justify the act but cursed it: "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." Sin would be paid by more sin. Tragedy would be replaced by more tragedy. God did not prevent the reaping of that which was sown: "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord." This was the result of that treacherous transgression, and it was fulfilled according to the word of the Lord.

Is there any conclusion to this which man dreads, abhors, and yet indulges in? Jesus said: "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." Though earth may bring misery, fear, shame, and sin, nothing of the kind will exist in heaven.

But as for this life the common thing for man and woman to do is to marry. Marriage is as archaic as existence itself, and

to forbid an archaic and traditional institution would be far more than absurd. God himself did not prohibit man from having a wife, but neither did He sanction the idea of marriage in the sense that it is used today. By marriage is meant to become one flesh man with woman through sexual intercourse. Even though God meant it in the beginning for marriage to be only for companionship, man perverted the idea and has not changed it since then. What God does sanction is the right kind of marriage: not to commit adultery nor fornication nor to put a wife away by divorce except for those things. Great men like Christ and Paul, who remained unmarried, knew the consequences of marriage. They knew that perfect purity would mean complete abstinence from marriage. Paul knew that the desire for sex was prevalent within a human body. He arbitrarily stated: "it is good for a man not to touch a woman" (is this what Eve was thinking of when she said 'neither shall ye touch it'?). Being aware of this evil Paul further advised: "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." Paul even wished "that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." But he did conclude: "if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." Paul wanted souls to be saved, and he knew that "every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body."

Christ Jesus was also faced with this problem. His enemies

Paul W.

often ridiculed him concerning marriage and divorce by asking such foolish questions as: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" Jesus would answer: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But one day the disciples themselves were perplexed concerning the ambiguous issue of marriage and divorce. (Matt. 19:10-12).

"His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

The conclusion, therefore, is: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

The Fall of Man

Written by Paul J. Wigowsky

Jan. 1, 1965