

<sup>4</sup>Carol A. Hill, "Making Sense of the Numbers of Genesis," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 55, no. 4 (2003): 239–51.

<sup>5</sup>I have taken as independent the age at which a patriarch's named son was born and the remaining years of his life.

P. G. Nelson  
25 Duesbery Street  
Hull HU5 3QE  
England  
p.g.nelson@hull.ac.uk

## Adam and Eve

Peter Rüst suggests that Adam and Eve in Genesis 2–4 came later than the first humans in Genesis 1 (PSCF 59, no. 3 [2007]: 182–93).

A problem with this suggestion is that these chapters are closely linked. The same word is used to describe Adam in Gen. 2:7 (*ha'adam*, "the man") as the first human in Gen. 1:27. The name Adam (*'adam*) is only used later on (the article is retained, except after *le*, until Gen. 4:25). Further, the story of the creation of Eve out of Adam's rib in Gen. 2:21–23 explains the transition from singular to plural in Gen. 1:27: "God created the man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." Genesis 2:7ff thus amplifies Genesis 1, as its introduction (Gen. 2:4–6) suggests.

P. G. Nelson  
25 Duesbery Street  
Hull HU5 3QE  
England  
p.g.nelson@hull.ac.uk

## Prudence and the Redeeming of Technology: A Response to Ken Funk

Ken Funk gives sound advice when he concludes his article (PSCF 59, no. 3 [2007]: 201–11) by calling us to "learn prudent technological innovation and practice" and to "think critically and Christianly about technology" (p. 209). However, the arguments for this conclusion would be strengthened and would gain greater coherence if he would abandon what appears to be Platonic presuppositions regarding the nature of created reality, human life, and therefore of technology.

Funk rightly sees and describes the ambivalence in technology. But he cannot quite take the next logical step of admitting that the question, "Is technology good or evil?" is simplistic and ultimately invalid—this in spite of his admission that "technology may be intrinsically value-neutral" (p. 201). This apparent contradiction appears to be caused by Funk's division of reality into a values-neutral physical realm (including technology) and a spiritual realm (which includes "values" and "religion") and his often cited belief in the hierarchical ordering of each realm. While I applaud his discussions of "the ambivalence of technology" (p. 204), "the promotion of subsidiary goods" (p. 204), and "the illusion of human sovereignty" (p. 205), I fear they are weakened by his weddedness to axiological hierarchy and ontological dualism. That hierarchy and dualism resonate more with the world of Platonic philosophy than with the world of the Bible.

When I read the Bible, I learn of a Creator who brought into being all things and who originally delighted in all things (Genesis 1). I learn that the purpose of all things is to serve the Creator (Ps. 119:89–91). I learn that humankind was created in the image of the Creator and called to serve in a particular way: to care for and enable the rest of creation (Psalm 8). I learn that despite humankind's rebellion and the curse wrought upon the whole of creation as a consequence of that rebellion, the Creator has promised to redeem the whole of creation (Col. 1:20). All this suggests that technology is one of many kinds of human activities, all of which are characterized as "service to the Creator" and all of which can be performed in a multiplicity of obedient and disobedient ways. Hence technology cannot be characterized as good or evil in itself (inherently) because it does not exist "in itself." Technology is just one way in which we as the Creator's image bearers, along with the nonhuman creation, relate to the Creator (or as Funk writes, "commune" with the Creator). As such, engaging in technology is no more or less a "spiritual" activity than is attending a church service. For one biblical affirmation of that claim, read the account of Bezalel and Oholiab in Exod. 35:30–36:5. To engage in technology obediently we need, like Bezalel and Oholiab, to be filled with the Spirit of God.

The Platonic notion that there is a hierarchy of human activities ranging from the base, through the mundane, to the noble is often read into the story of Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38–42), as Funk does in his article. For a convincing refutation of that interpretation (which includes arguments made by John Calvin in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*), read Lee Hardy's *The Fabric of This World* (Eerdmans [1990], 54–8).

Earlier in this letter, I wrote that "humankind was created in the image of the Creator and called to serve in a particular way: to care for and enable the rest of creation." Technology is one of the chief ways in which we "enable" the rest of the creation to be what the Creator intends for it to be as it unfolds in history. There is a relationship that exists between the human and nonhuman creation that is wonderfully described in Ezekiel 36 (particularly verses 8–12) and that is the foundation for our work in technology. To fully realize that relationship (and to fully acknowledge Ken Funk's call for prudence and critical thinking about technology) we need to see all things holistically, casting off the dualistic and hierarchical glasses fashioned for us by the ancient Greeks.

Finally, thanks to Ken Funk for a most interesting article. The Dordt College Engineering Department read it and spent a delightful afternoon discussing it.

Charles C. Adams  
ASA Member  
Dean of the Natural Sciences and Professor of Engineering  
Dordt College  
Sioux Center, IA 51250  
cadams@dordt.edu

## A Response to Ken Funk

Many ASA members share feelings of guilt associated with "technology," triggered by modern doctrinaire