

## Animal Rights and The Image of God

### Part II: A Biblical Response to Animal Rights

(Part I appeared in Volume 5, Number 1, Winter, 1991)

T. Stuart Walker, Ph.D.

*Dr. Walker is Associate Professor of Medical Education in the Indiana University School of Medicine at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana.*

In Part I of this article, we examined the philosophical bases of the animal rights movement. Animal rightists stake their claim for animal rights using an ontological argument, claiming that humans and animals are identical in essence and cannot be ethically distinguished. This argument for ontologic unity among all sentient creatures is based upon their insistence that humans and animals are essentially interrelated in at least one of three categories: (1) we are interrelated by a mutual phylogeny (phylogenetic unity), (2) we share in the same spiritual essence and our lives are interwoven with theirs (spiritual unity), and/or (3) we are all the experiencing subjects of a life, a life that has intrinsic value (existential unity). Having established ontologic equality among all sentient creatures, animal rightists then insist that all creatures of equal essence must be treated identically and must possess equal rights of life and self determination. This deontic ethic forbids all human use of animals unless that use specifically benefits the animal being used and the animal in use is a willing participant (analogous to human "informed consent").

Does the Scripture agree with this assessment? Are we and the world of animals essentially equivalent with equal moral claims? The Bible does point to certain similarities, but none of these are related to the similarities which underlie animal rights arguments. In fact, Scripture tends to repudiate all three principal presuppositions which undergird the claim for animal rights.

First, Genesis 1:26-30 and 2:7, 21-25 clearly states that man was a special creation with no phylogenetic

relationship to any other creature. Thus, there is a phylogenetic discontinuity between man and animals - we are not physically interrelated. Moses emphasized the uniqueness of man's creation in the text when he uses here the Hebrew verb "bara" (create) only twice - in Gen. 1:1 to refer to the beginning of creation, and in verse 27 when he describes the creation of man. This likely emphasizes both the uniqueness of man as a special creation and that the creation of man was the culmination of creation; creation was begun with the purpose of creating man. Man was made for the earth and the earth for man.

Second, we are not spiritually related. This argument of spiritual relatedness is drawn from Eastern mysticism and has more analogy with Greek dualism than it does Biblical revelation. Man was formed as a distinct unit with individual identity. Unlike the animals, man was animated with the breath of God (Gen. 2:7); this may indicate an essential difference between the life of man and that of animals. Keil and Delitzsch insist that when God breathed life into man, He made man a uniquely "living soul." This argument may be weakened somewhat by the Mosaic references to animals as "living souls" (Heb. "nephesh chayim"; Gen. 1:21,24; 2:7; 9:12ff) and by Moses speaking of animals in Genesis 7:15 & 22 as having "the breath (ruwach) of life." Nevertheless, God formed the whole man - body and spirit - as a unit with individual relationship with and responsibility to Him. This persistent individuality of identity permeates Scripture ("The soul who sins is the one who will die... The righteousness of the righteous man will be credited to him, and the wickedness of the

wicked will be charged to him." Ezekiel 18:20, NIV); the concept of shared essence among individuals with loss of personal identity is completely foreign to the Bible. Rather, Scripture shows us as creatures created to be corporeal - not as spirits temporarily confined in bodies - with an ultimate destiny to live forever in glorified bodies on the new earth (Job 19:25-27; Phil. 3:21; Rev. 21:1 and others).

Finally, although the Scripture reminds us of several creaturely characteristics which are shared by men and animals and which are significant, experiencing is not one of these. Rather, the significant points of creaturely continuity seem to be that all of us as creatures share in the breath of life (Hebrew: "ruwach") and that we are all living souls (Hebrew: "nephesh chayim"; Gen. 1:21, 24; 2:7; 9:12ff) with the life principle centered in the blood (Gen. 9:4&5). Thus, we share in the life principle, but it is not the life principle itself that is precious. Rather, Genesis 9 in a single stroke demonstrates a sharp discontinuity between human and animal life by simultaneously prohibiting manslaughter (9:5-6) and establishing God's approval of humans killing animals for food (9:3-4). This discontinuity was first evident in Gen. 2:18-20 where Adam searched through the entire animal world to find a creature which corresponded to him (Hebrew: "ezer k negdo"). Adam named each animal brought before him, signifying its function in doing so; not one animal satisfactorily corresponded to him - not one removed him from his personal isolation (Gen. 2:18). Thus, ontological continuity between human and animal life cannot be established upon the experiences of life, the intrinsic value of life itself, or physical parallels between animals and humans; rather, we are separated from the animal world by an impassable gulf - a chasm of essential difference in who we are.

If the putative parallels either do not exist or are insignificant before God, what then is the critical essence of man that distinguishes him from all of creation, and what are the ramifications of this distinction? The key is found in Genesis 1:26-28, 2:18-25, and 9:5-7; it is that only man is created in the image of God.

What does it mean to be created in God's image?

Theologians have long wrestled with this concept and have proposed a variety of models which Anthony Hoekema and P.E. Hughes have thoroughly discussed; a brief overview is presented here for perspective. These overviews are largely based on the descriptions given by Hoekema and Hughes.

Irenaeus (c. 130 - c. 200) argued that the image of God is "man's nature as a rational and free being, a nature which was not lost at the Fall." Irenaeus considered "image" and "likeness" to refer to separate aspects of man's essence, with "likeness" being the possession of a spirit; he believed that the natural man lacked a spirit, and that regeneration resulted in the return of the spirit (and, thus, God's likeness) to man.

Thomas Aquinas (1225 - 1274), who was heavily influenced by Plato and Aristotle, proposed that man imaged God in possessing intellect or reason. He rejected Irenaeus' division of image and likeness, but believed that man exhibited God's image in three stages:

"The first stage is man's natural aptitude for understanding and loving God, an aptitude which consists in the very nature of the mind, which is common to all men. The next stage is where a man is actually or dispositively (or habitually; Lat. actu vel habitu) knowing and loving God, but still imperfectly; and here we have the image by conformity of grace. The third stage is where a man is actually knowing and loving God perfectly; and this is the image by likeness of glory ... The first stage of the image is found in all men, the second only in the just, and the third only in the blessed."

John Calvin (1509 - 1564) saw God's image not in man's mind, but in his soul. Like Aquinas, he rejected the dichotomy of likeness and image, but he saw image as only a distorted relic in the unregenerate man. Calvin saw God's image in the "true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness" in which Adam was created, a state lost due to the Fall, and restored by sanctification after the new birth. As such, the concept of "dominion" held little importance to Calvin in his assessment of the meaning

of "the image of God." The significance of this "weak" position on the role of "dominion" will be discussed later.

Karl Barth (1886-1968) looked in a completely new direction for his definition of image. Barth focused on the phrase in Gen. 1:27 that "male and female created he them." From this, Barth derived his theological anthropology of confrontation:

"Could anything be more obvious than to conclude from this clear indication that the image and likeness of the being created by God signifies existence in confrontation, i.e., in this confrontation, in the juxtaposition and conjunction of man and man, which is that of male and female ...?"

Thus, to Barth, being in the image of God involves not an analogy of being, but an analogy of relation. It involves a capacity for relationship between man and God, and man to man as pictured in the man/woman relationship - a capacity for confrontation and encounter.

Emil Brunner (1889 - 1966) took the next step away from the early views of what constituted image. Brunner believed image to be man's relation to God, his responsibility to God, and the possibility of fellowship with God. Like Irenaeus, Brunner saw a dichotomy in image, but he described them as the "formal" and "material" aspects of image. The formal aspect he presented as being typical of the Old Testament, and involving freedom, reason, conscience and language. He believed the New Testament taught a "material" aspect which centered on love of God and neighbor.

Finally, G.C. Berkouwer (b. 1903), in his classic work *Man: the Image of God* described the image as man's inescapable relatedness to God in the totality of his (man's) existence. To Berkouwer, image was a verb rather than a noun (we are to image God), and is an analogy of love rather than an analogy of being or relation.

Each of these views has its deficiencies, and both Hoekema and Hughes have described these deficiencies

in detail. Hoekema quotes Herman Bavinck in his assertion that all these historic positions miss the mark in recognizing that man's unique position as image bearer is essential to being human:

"Man does not simply bear or have the image of God; he is the image of God.

"From the doctrine that man has been created in the image of God flows the clear implication that the image extends to man in his entirety. Nothing in man is excluded from the image of God. All creatures reveal traces of God, but only man is the image of God. And he is that image totally, in soul and body, in all conditions and relationships. Man is the image of God because and insofar as he is true man, and he is man, true and real man, because and insofar as he is the image of God."

To both Hoekema and Hughes, it is not what we can do, what capacities we possess or what relationships we have that make us image; rather, image is what we are, and understanding the implications of being created in God's image is central to making sense of why man exists. For example, Hughes stated:

"Only of man is it said that God created him in his image. It is in this charter of his constitution that man's uniqueness is specifically affirmed as a creature radically distinguished from all other creatures. In this respect a line is defined which links man directly and responsibly to God in a way that is unknown to any other creature. Nothing is more basic than the recognition that being constituted in the image of God is of the very essence of and absolutely central to the humanness of man. It is the key that unlocks the meaning of his authentic humanity. Apart from this reality he cannot exist truly as man, since for man to deny God and the divine image stamped upon his being and to assert his own independent self-sufficiency is to deny his own constitution and thus to dehumanize

himself."

What, then, is it to be created in God's image? The clues to this must certainly lie in the passages which directly describe man as being in God's image. First, the totality of man is created in His image. When God formed man, He formed the entire man in response to His proposal in Gen. 1:26 to make man in His image. Second, fallen man must still bear the image of God, since Gen. 9 forbids the killing of any man on the basis that man is created in His image; if image were lost due to the Fall of man, only the killing of regenerate men could be forbidden under this proviso. This does not preclude the possibility that fallen men may not image God accurately in all aspects. Third, the image-related tasks to subdue the earth and have dominion over the created order must be central to a proper understanding of what it means to be created in God's image, since dominion of man over the earth is directly linked to God's creative purpose statement in Gen. 1:26, and this linkage is repeated in verse 28 to Adam as God gives him his image-related mandate. Fourth, those who are in God's image must bear some special identification with God that causes the wanton taking of human life to be tantamount to attacking God, as only human life is protected by God under penalty of death (Gen. 9:5-6). Finally, it is Jesus Christ that we image, because only He is the true image of God (Col. 1:15, Heb. 1:3).

Using these guidelines, I believe that when God made us in His image, He made us like Himself in characteristics and character so that we could be his vice-regents over the earth. Thus, unlike Calvin who believed that dominion was a side-issue, I believe, with Hughes that dominion is the central issue. The Scriptures tell us that Jesus Christ is the Creator (John 1:3, 10; Heb. 1:2), that when He was on this earth the cosmos was subject to Him as he calmed the sea, fed the multitudes, healed the sick, and raised the dead, and that one day He will be revealed as the sovereign King of kings (Phil. 2:8-11; Eph. 1:200-23; I Pet. 3:22; Rev. 19 - 22). In being created in His image, we are to be sovereign over the earth as He is over all that exists; of course, our sovereignty is derivative from and subject to His preeminent sovereignty. In order to carry out this task of vice-regency, He has given us God-like characteristics to enable us to subdue the earth and

have dominion. Hughes has listed six principle God-like characteristics given us by God:

1. **Personality:** God is in eternal I-Thou relationship within the Godhead. We too are relational beings. As beings with personality, we are never alone, as we exist in perpetual I-Thou relationship with God. Compare this with the animal; although they may congregate, mate, and cooperate, there is no meeting of the minds for them, no interpersonal communion, no response to God. This difference is highlighted in the way in which God dealt differently with Noah and his family as compared with the animals; God saved specific persons and representatives of the kinds of non-persons.
2. **Spirituality:** Man is a religious being. In fact, the meaning of a man's life is wrapped up in knowing and glorifying God and being obedient to His will. In contrast, animals have no awareness of God, of His goodness, holiness or majesty, and cannot worship Him. Solomon reminded us of this gulf when he mused "Who knows the spirit of a man, which rises upward, or the spirit of the animal, which goes down into the earth." (Ecclesiastes 3:21; NIV, alt. trans.)
3. **Rationality:** Man is a thinking being. Aquinas believed this to be the key of "image" because he was influenced by the Greeks who taught that the divine spark was in the intellect. Rather, God is infinitely rational, and He has made us rational so as to be able to properly function within and have dominion over a rationally systematic cosmos.
4. **Morality:** Man is a moral being. God is holy, and He created us and demands from us holiness in all we do (Lev. 11:44; 19:2; 20:7; I Peter 1:15). He can demand this from us because He gave us an awareness of right and wrong, and a will by which we could choose either. Animals are not moral agents and are incapable of sin because they are unable to discern between right and wrong actions or motives. We are reminded of this distinction in the use of animals in the Old Testament sacrificial system; animals are analogous to us in having life ("nephesh") in the blood, allowing them to act as man's temporary substitute, they are appropriate as a substitute because they cannot sin and thus have no sins of their own to pay for, but they are ineffective as a

propitiatory substitute because they are essentially different from man; only the sinless God-Man who is the true image of God and took upon Himself human form, becoming a man, could be our effective propitiatory substitute (Hebrews 11). Because every man is in God's image, every man is culpable before God.

5. Authority: Man is an authoritative being. God has given us the capability and a mandate to wield authority over the created order (Gen. 1:26-28; Ps. 8:6). This authority, which is derivative of and subject to the authority of God, has resulted in the domestication of animals, the development of agriculture and science, and the very existence of civilization.

6. Creativity: Man is an aesthetic being. God recognized man's aesthetic nature in Gen. 2:9 when He accounted for man's aesthetic needs in the creation, and in Gen. 2:15 when He gave man a cultural mandate to "dress" (or serve) the garden; this mandate was given before the Fall, and was a command for Adam to interpret that which was in the perfect Garden, transforming it to reveal the imprint of man's creativeness.

These characteristics were like God, and they equipped Adam and his descendants for the cultural tasks which lay before them. Governing these tasks was another aspect of God's image -- His character. As Adam carried out his task of dominion, all his activities were to mirror the character of Him in whose image he was created. Thus, dominion would be exerted in perfect righteousness, holiness, justice, mercy, love, etc. When Adam rebelled against God, he did not lose the image of God (although Romans 1:21ff demonstrates that there was significant distortion of the image) in function, but he lost the perfect image of His character. To be sure men could still be kind, and love one another in a limited sense under common grace, but it was necessary for the second Adam, Jesus Christ, to restore man's ability to image His character through regeneration and sanctification.

If man acts as God's vice-regent, what are his tasks? Genesis 1:28 describes these as to fill the earth, subdue the earth, and have dominion over the created order.

The command to fill the earth (Gen. 1:28) is often ignored, but it is not without significance. Adam's cultural task was enormous -- to have dominion over the entire created order and to subdue the earth according to the needs and dreams of man. Soon, the Fall would further complicate these tasks immeasurably. Thus, dominion and subduing the earth were tasks which could not be carried out by Adam alone; he must have task-oriented progeny to assist him in carrying out these tasks. Conversely, if man were to fill the earth, the cultural tasks given him must be taken seriously in the post-Fall world to bring the world into conformity with man's needs. To fail could mean the demise of man.

Adam was commanded to subdue the earth. The Hebrew word translated "subdue" (*kabash*) is variously described by Strong as "to tread down," "to bring under subjection" and other similar phrases. This word is used in two other Pentateuchal or near-Pentateuchal references: Numbers 32:22,29 and Joshua 18:1. In each case, "*kabash*" is used to denote the pacifying of Canaan, subduing all the enemies of Israel so that Israel no longer would experience strife or opposition from those outside, so that they could fully enjoy the promises of God within a peaceful land. Thus, to "*kabash*" is to face that which opposes us and is inimicable in its present state to our goals and well-being, and bring it into conformity with our needs -- completely pacifying it.

Adam was also commanded to exert dominion. In fact, David reminds us in Psalm 8:6 that God has brought the entire created order under man's dominion. The Hebrew word translated "dominion" is "*radah*". There is some overlap between "*radah*" and "*kabash*," but Strong describes "*radah*" as "to crumble," "to have dominion," and "to tread down." "*Radah*" is also used in Numbers 24:19 to speak of the absolute sovereignty of the Messiah, and in Judges 5:13 to emphasize the preemptive authority Deborah wielded over the Jewish nobility of her day. Thus, it can be inferred that when God gave Adam dominion over the created order, He was describing a preemptive authority which man would wield over the creation as he interpreted the cosmos and manipulated its functions to man's benefit, to reflect the man's presence and activity, and to glorify God.

What are the implications of these activities? First, as we subdue the earth, we face a world which, because of the Fall, is hostile to us. Our task is to conform the earth to the legitimate self-interests of man. When we squander resources, waste, and pollute, we not only fail to image God's character, but we violate the command to pacify the earth. Adam was told to "dress" (Hebrew: "abad" -- to serve, to work, to compel the garden and to "keep" it (Hebrew: "shamar" -- to hedge about, to guard, to protect. "Abad" is used in one other Mosaic passage (Deut. 28:39) where it is used to describe the cultivation of a vineyard. Thus, Adam was told to manipulate and cultivate the earth for his benefit (like a vineyard) while protecting it and guarding it from any who would destroy or damage it.

God's second command was to have dominion over the created order. Our model for dominion must be the dominion that God wields. We stand in covenant relationship with God, and although we have legitimate self-interests, these are subject to and secondary to those of God, so are the self-interests and prerogatives of the creatures of this world to us. The animals are not inanimate machina, they are not without significance, but their signification and meaning occur when they stand in proper relation to us as God's vice-regents, and we are given the task to interpret their significance and meaning.

The performance of these tasks, then, are subject to two constraints:

1. Accountability. We are representing God. Scripture repeatedly points out that we are accountable to God for the ways in which we represent Him. This message of accountability for opportunities, motives and actions permeates the message of the Bible (some examples: I Cor. 3:10-15; 4:1-5; II Cor. 5:10; Jas. 4:17). It cannot be possible that God would assign us with so great a task and not hold us accountable for the way in which we carry it out.

2. Character. It is God's plan that we be like Jesus Christ in His character (Romans 8:29; II Cor. 3:18 and many others). This means that all our attitudes, thoughts, motives, desires, plans, actions, and relationships image Jesus Christ -- we are to image Him in the totality of

our being. Our standard is always Jesus Christ, who is the True Image (Colossians). Fallen man destroys as he carries out his cultural mandate because he so incompletely images God in his character. Thus, Jesus, the True Image, became the second Adam (I Cor. 15) to make it possible for us to be like Him.

Let's now return to the central issue; how are we to interact with the animals with whom we share this world? We know that we are to have dominion over them and we are to subdue the cosmos. Are there certain interactions with animals that have God's specific imprimatur? All actions which reflect the character of God and involve man's legitimate self-interest and are central to man carrying out his cultural mandate are legitimate. For example, Gen. 9:2-3 demonstrates to us that animals can be legitimately used for food by humans. This point was reiterated when God sent the Israelites quail in the wilderness, when he commanded Peter to kill and eat the "unclean" animals in his vision, when He established eating the lamb as part of the Passover, and when Paul taught that eating meat itself was not sinful unless doing so tempted a believer with a weak conscience to violate his conscience (Romans 14, I Cor. 8,10). In fact, Paul warned against those who inject dietary laws, such as forbidding to eat meat, into their Christian walk (Col. 2:16; I Tim. 4:3). Other Scriptural examples of animal use are the provision of skins by God to clothe Adam and Eve (Gen. 3:21), and the demand of an animal sacrifice to picture His redemptive work and atone for the sins of the repentant. God allows animals to work for us but cautions us to reward their work appropriately (Deut. 24:4).

We can also look to the sinless life of the Lord Jesus to example for us appropriate treatment of animals. Jesus rode into Jerusalem on a colt. As a Jew, He partook of the Passover. He fed the multitudes with fish, and caused fish to jump into the disciples' nets. He caught a fish to provide Himself with a coin to pay His taxes. In Gen. 18, we find the preincarnate Christ in the tent of Abraham eating meat. All of these were sinless and blameless acts for Him; can they be any less to us? The key is that these acts are to be done unto the Lord (Romans 14:6-8).

But what about animal use in experimentation? Experimentation as we know it is a fairly late methodological addition to our cultural activity. It is largely responsible (along with our increased communication and information storage capacities) for the incredible explosion of knowledge during the twentieth century. Research is part of our cultural mandate to subdue the earth. R.J. Rushdoony has pointed out that science has replaced mythology as man's means to control the cosmos; it is the new "magic." This does not seem to be illegitimate in the Scriptural framework, for the concept of subduing the earth certainly involves understanding the created order in order to control it appropriately so as to make the earth more habitable for us. Noah performed an early series of experiments in Gen. 8 when he sent out first a raven and then a series of doves from the ark. This involved significant risk to the life and well-being of the birds released, and was performed to establish the current state of the earth and to determine a time appropriate for disembarking so as to maximize the survival of all on board the ark. As we seek to understand disease, the body or the cosmos, we are given the prerogative to use animals when necessary to this process. But, in our dealing with them, we are called to image His character. This means we must be committed to the humane care of the animals entrusted to us.

When considering the effects of men on animals, one must consider our environmental impact on species survival. We eschew the pantheistic philosophy that seems to permeate the environmental movement, but we must also recall our mandate to keep and dress the earth. This involves preserving the earth in our stewardship to God. God was concerned to preserve the genetic diversity of the earth through the flood (Gen. 6 - 8); I believe that we should support measures to conserve the species unless to do so would render the earth hostile to human survival. A hostile earth has not been properly subdued; it remains outside the dominion of our cultural mandate.

Finally, what about animal rights? Do animals have rights? We have seen that animal rightists have typically argued that animals are at least parallel with human infants and the mentally retarded in their capacities and

awareness, and that animals and humans are of one essence, so that if any humans have rights, so should animals. Ryder has proposed a system of graded rights based on each creature's phylogenetic position. But we have also seen that the Scripture denies any sort of essential interrelatedness between man and animals, so no comparisons based on ontology can be drawn to establish rights for animals. In fact, it should be stated that no created creature has inherent rights, that all rights belong to and emanate from God, and that any rights possessed by man are wholly derivative. The focus of Scripture is not upon the "rights" of man but on the supreme worth of God (Rev. 4:11). Because we are created in His image, we have dignity and worth conferred upon us because of our association with God. Thus, to strike a fatal blow upon a man is to attack God through His representative and incur God's demand that the murderer pay with his own life. Animals represent an entirely different category, and being non-image they lack the privilege and position given man as God's vice-regents. Because we (humans) are all "sons of Adam and daughters of Eve," as put by C.S. Lewis, we are all created in God's image no matter what our individual capabilities; the anthropological and sociological implications of this position are immense. Rather than possessing rights, animals fall under our dominion (Ps. 8:6) where they are to be participants in man's task to subdue the earth; it falls to man to interpret the appropriate role of each animal in this enterprise. When they become part of the world of man, whether as food, clothing, scientific subject or fond companion, they should be cared for in a manner consistent with the character of God, who we image.

### Endnotes

21. Keil, C.F. and Delitzsch, F., *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Vol. I, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1983, pp. 79 - 80. Delitzsch states, "The beasts arose at the creative word of God, and no communication of the spirit is mentioned even in ch. ii. 19; the origin of their soul was coincident with that of their corporeality, and their life was merely the individualization of the universal life, with which all matter was filled in the beginning by the Spirit of God. On the other hand, the human spirit is not a mere individualization of the divine breath which breathed upon the material of the world, or of the universal spirit of nature; nor is his body merely a production of the earth when stimulated by the creative word of God. The earth

does not bring forth his body, but God Himself puts His hand to the work and forms him; nor does the life already imparted to the world by the Spirit of God individualize itself in him, but God breathes directly into the nostrils of the one man, in the whole fulness of His personality, the breath of life, that in a manner corresponding to the personality of God he may become a living soul."

22. Hoekema, Anthony A., *Created in God's Image*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1986.

23. Hughes, Philip Edgecumbe, *The True Image*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1989.

24. Brunner, Emil, *Man in Revolt*, translated by Olive Wyon, Charles B. Scribner Co., New York, NY, 1939, p. 93.

25. Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, I. 93.4.

26. Aquinas, op. cit.

27. Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, III/2, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1960, p. 195.

28. Berkouwer, G.C., *Man: The Image of God*, translated by Dirk W. Jellema, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, MI, 1962.

29. Bavinck, Herman, *Dogmatiek*, 2:595 - 596, cited in Hoekema, op. cit., p. 65.

30. Hughes, P.E., op. cit., pp. 3 - 4.

31. Hughes, P.E., *ibid*, Chapters 1 and 5.

32. Hughes, P.E., *ibid.*, pp. 51 - 64.

33. Strong, James, *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, Riverside Book and Bible House, Iowa Falls, IA.

34. Strong, James, *ibid*.

35. Strong, James, *ibid*.

36. Although the primary purpose of this passage was to

prepare Peter to present the Gospel to the gentile Cornelius, the secondary implications of the abolition of the dominion of the Old Testament dietary laws over the Christian and the permission to eat meats of all sorts should not be passed over.

37. Rushdoony, Rousas John, *The Mythology of Science*, The Craig Press, Nutley, NJ, 1979, pp. 1 - 2.

38. Ryder, *ibid*, p. 332.