

MARBLE SOUP

Pure chance produced the marble soup. Then an anomaly produced the marble amoeba which begat the marble fish, which begat the marble snake, which begat the marble bird, which begat the marble mammal, which begat the marble lion which begat the marble sphinx which begat the marble “masterpiece” statue of a man which was dug up in Athens by archeologists this year. *The Washington Post* carried a story announcing the triumph of discovering a statue, which “appears to be another masterpiece by an acclaimed—but anonymous—ancient artist” (Associated Press, Saturday, May 11, 2002; 2:48 AM).

This statue “bears the stylistic hallmarks of works attributed to a sculptor known only as Dipylos.” The new statue was discovered with two lion sculptures and a sphinx. The article in which this discovery is told confidently declares, “similarities in facial features, hair and body type among all the finds have led experts to believe they were created by the same artist or workshop.”

A sphinx is a mythical creature with the body of a lion and the head of a man. This sounds strangely like a “linking creature” or “transitory form.” Typically, in archeology when you find things with similarity in design you presuppose a common ancestor not a common creator or designer. We are told that is simple and bad science. Every evolutionary scientist wants what these men have dug up, the link between two different forms. I am curious why the archeologists did not stick with their principles and interpret this as a finding of an evolved statue form.

The fact of the matter is, that “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Psa. 14:1). They realize when it comes to art taken out of the ground that the evidence of design demands a designer. “Every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God” (Heb. 3:4). They understand how utterly foolish it would be to come out saying that the marble “just happened” and then evolved into the precise reflection of the human form. They know how much of a leap it would be to suppose that just because there is similarity, then the items have come from one another. Instead they see that the common design demands a common designer.

It is a gross understatement to say that the true human form is more complex. David said, “I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made” (Psa. 139:14). In the face of these facts, year in and year out the archeologists face one inconsistency after another. They pull **replicas** of man out of the ground and praise the creator. However, they pull the remains of real men out of the ground and are amazed at what pure chance could do. They find similarities in the bodies of man and his surroundings and conclude that he came from them, yet without one single transitory form? Were someone to dig up a real sphinx they might gain some clout for their arguments, but there never was, and never will be any transitory forms, because in the beginning God made them “male and female” (Mat. 19:4). That male and that female were created by a special act of God (Gen. 1:26; 2:21–23). This man and woman were none other than Adam and Eve (1 Tim. 2:13).

God created all things according to His will (Gen. 1:1; John 1:1–3). Denying this is denying the obvious (Psa. 19:1). If these things were not so, then Jesus and the apostles were confused or misinformed and in either case the conclusion would be that the message is not from God, Christ is not our Redeemer, and we are yet in our sins. How great it is to behold all creation and know that God has made all things. There is no excuse for believing otherwise (Rom. 1:20–21).

—Geoff Litke
Spring, TX