

Behemoth and Batrachians in the Eye of God: Responsibility to Other Kinds in Biblical Perspective

Calvin B. DeWitt

My paper's title is designed to catch your eye and raise your curiosity. I am a zoologist, with a deep interest in animals. My early work in this field—grade school through college—was focused largely on reptiles and amphibians. Hence my use of the word, "Batrachians" in the title. This is the name zoologists have given to the order of frogs and toads,¹ and these along with turtles, lizards, and snakes, are among the creatures that first held my interest. Batrachians are animals not often loved or shown affection by people. This became apparent to me in my youth, as I saw how people behold frogs and toads. People's lack of love and affection for these creatures made me wonder about what made some creatures lovable and others not. Sharing with Batrachians a lack of love and affection by people is Behemoth (from Hebrew, *bēhēmōth*, plural of *bēhēmāh*), a creature of a different order.

While I identify Behemoth with the Hippopotamus, its name was not available to us until the seventeenth century. The Hippopotamus was reliably reported, according to zoologist F. S. Bodenheimer, from the Orontes river in Syria around 1500 B.C.E., and was in the lower Nile until the twelfth century C.E. It was hunted using harpoons with barbed hooks and was well known in biblical times. In Egypt, the Romans reduced its population greatly to eliminate the damage it was doing to crops.² The name by which this creature has been known in these last few centuries literally means, "river horse", even though it is an even-toed hoofed mammal that is anatomically nearer to pigs.³ Bible translators have chosen not to use the name Hippopotamus, perhaps because it comes so late in usage, because they are not zoologists, and because some scholars including Bodenheimer have preferred to use the name Behemoth for beasts generally.⁴ In any case, Bible translators have decided not to translate the Hebrew word, but simply to transliterate it "Behemoth." However, as I behold Behemoth with you in this paper, I join with most other zoologists, and with Job scholar Robert Gordis,⁵ to behold the Hippopotamus.⁶

It is clear from the Creation story that the creatures are of many kinds and that each one of them as individuals and kinds has its own context. This context includes the habitats of its individual members as well as the larger Creation of which these habitats are part. The context of every creature also includes those of kinds other than their own. From the perspective of any kind of creature, all those besides their own can be referred to as "other kinds." From the perspective of a zoologist "other kinds" thus refer to other than human, and that is the perspective I take here. I also use the word, "otherkind," but do so sparingly: only when all other kinds have more in common among themselves than with humankind on a given point being considered. This restricts the use of "otherkind" to situations in which humankind's distinctiveness is empirically evident. I also use the words "other creatures" in order to recognize that "other kinds" are comprised of individual creatures. In so doing I indicate that I am not restricting my consideration to taxa higher than the individual, but include individuals as well. I also use the words "human creatures" in order to recognize that "humankind" is comprised of individual human beings. In this paper I also restrict my usage of "other kinds" to biotic kinds, and thus exclude for my purposes things that are more exclusively physical such as rocks and machines. I also will be thinking here largely of animal kinds, although not to the exclusion of other biotic kinds.

There is, of course, more than biophysical context here to be considered here: there also is Scriptural context. As a student of the Bible, I not only am interested in passages dealing with living creatures, but also with the context of these, particularly as this context relates to their

Creator. More specifically, I am working in this paper to see the creatures through the eye of their Maker. I do so because of my conviction that insights on how the creatures might be viewed by their Creator may have profound implications for human relationship with living creatures. I know of no better place to begin than Job 40:15-14. I represent it here with a preface and running commentary designed to slow us in our reading, to elicit reflection on the text, and to build wonder. God's speech to Job on Behemoth:

Behold Behemoth!

We human beings seem to have some natural affinity to some creaturely kinds: the soft furry ones with big round eyes, the flashy feathery ones with docile beaks, the colorful scaly ones with whiskery fins. But those with flabby flesh and oozing pores (Hippos), with bulging throats and acrid warts (Batrachians), are "horses of a different color." In the eye of individuals of **our** kind there is likely to be an asymmetry in the affection we bestow across the creatured spectrum. In parallel with this spectrum of affection also come differential awareness, dissimilar appreciation, divergent respect, divagating consideration, and varying treatment. Koalas and Cockatiels are more likely to be loved, cuddled, and cared for. Toads and Hippopotami are not.

Perhaps it is for this reason that God praises the unlovely, uncuddled, and little cared for kinds in the presence of Job. God's psalm to the Hippopotamus is a wondrous example. From it we gain insight into respecting creatures that may not attract us. From it we are helped to understand our proper relationship with kinds other than our own. Here we see what people may see as monstrous and ugly through the appreciative eye of God.

*"Behold Behemoth which I made along with you
and which feeds on grass like an ox."*

This giant herbivore is my Creation! I who created you with all of your remarkable qualities, I also made this great beast! Behold! Open your eyes! And see!

*"What strength he has in his loins,
what power in the muscle of his belly!"*

My marvelous Hippo is strong and powerful! Look at those flanks! See its massive frame, woven with powerful muscles. Admire its capacity to contain its massive bulk.

*"His tail sways like a cedar
the sinews of his stones are close knit."*

While you may not want to admire the perfection and wonder of this creature's reproductive organs, I—their Creator—am proud of my wonderful provision for their reproduction and fruitfulness. Do you see the problem female and male could have in joining their germ cells together to continue their kind? See my provisions for their procreation!

*"His bones are tubes of bronze
his limbs like rods of iron."*

What architecture! Look how those "pillars and beams" are harmonized with the mass to which they give support and provide articulated strength. They do so even while subtracting and adding bone here and there to counter new and changing strains and stresses. Osteoclasts and

osteoblasts dynamically reforming these tubes and rods to meet challenges of life and growth, while never weakening! Dynamic support for dynamic mass. Beautiful!

"He ranks first among the works of God."

Not that you people are not important, of course! But my Hippo ranks first among my works. Why do you think I would I tell that I rate my Hippo "number one." You know! It is to crack you out of your anthropocentrism for a moment to get you to see my creations as I do. I want you to know the importance of this creature in my sight. I rate my Hippo number one so that you will take notice, and that you will be inspired to wonder!

"Only I, the Maker of this beast can approach it with a sword."

Only I have the *author-ity* to destroy this work of art, and I alone. I say this not to tell you I am going to destroy it. I say this to tell you: Put down your arrow and gun. Don't be so foolish as to think that you are powerful if you destroy what through my power I have made. Real power, after all, belongs to the Maker, not the destroyer. This work of art belongs to its Creator alone. Only I have the right to destroy what I have made.

*"The hills bring him their produce,
and all the wild animals play nearby."*

The Hippo in my view is not one with its flesh spread out over a concrete slab one of your zoos. Neither is it one who works at dusk to raise its bulk to the top of the wall to graze on Kentucky Blue Grass in the National Zoo. Nor is it one confined to a pen on Noah's Ark. I see my Hippo in its proper habitat, where it lives in concord with the other creatures, plants and animals, reeds and Batrachians; where at dusk it grazes on the vegetation that borders the wetlands and rivers and extends to the hills.

*"Under the lotus plants he lies,
hidden among the reeds in the marsh."*

Its wetland habitat, while not very well suited for people, is nicely suited for the Hippo. And the Hippo is nicely suited for its aquatic habitat. It is fully integrated into the dynamic fabric of its lush and watery world. Great floating and emerging leaves attend the water surface. Batrachians sing their nocturnes there under cover of darkness. Herons collect their dinner there conspicuous at water's edge. And the Hippo?

*"The lotuses conceal him in their shadow;
the poplars by the stream surround him."*

Giant as it is, this great creature can be inconspicuous. It fits into its habitat in a marvelous beastly harmony. The wetland vegetation embraces Hippo habitat with spreading boughs and concealing leaves. Moored in its marsh, even great currents do not sweep it away.

*"When the river rages, he is not alarmed;
he is secure, though the Jordan
should surge against his mouth."*

And so, as the Hippo's ecological relations maintained with integrity within the framework of its habitat, so is its psyche. The Hippo is secure in its wetland habitat. It is at home in the marsh and the river torrent!

*"Can anyone capture him by the eyes,
or trap him and pierce his nose?"*

This is a creature that might not respond to your beckoning! It is not one you could put on a leash and show it off around town! It is God's creature and praises God in its being; it is not yours. It is not even yours in the sense that some of your pets are. My Hippo has strength and a will that can overwhelm you. Respect it!

A Tree-Party Relationship

"Only a great poet could paint the vivid picture of the Hippopotamus, lying at his ease in the Nile among the lotus leaves, swallowing an entire river in one mouthful (40:24)!"⁷ writes Robert Gordis. My representation of the text here, therefore, should not substitute for reading the uninterrupted text. Instead, it should be seen as preparatory for its reading. It also is preparatory for introducing two basic ways in humankind can view other kinds.

The first is as a two-party human creatures-other creatures relationship. Much can be derived from such a visualization, as we have learned from the many who have seriously worked to do this. Such work recognizes benefits conveyed by other kinds to humankind such as provision of (1) oxygen and consumption of carbon dioxide through photosynthesis; (2) food for human use by plants and animals and their fruits; (3) materials for clothing and construction; (4) medicines and pharmaceuticals; (5) companionship; and (6) esthetic benefits in human environments. It also recognizes detriments to humankind such as (1) disease, parasitism, and predation; (2) degradation of human clothing and structures; (3) consumption of food produced for human use; and (4) human discomforts. There are benefits and detriments conveyed by humankind to other kinds as well. Among the benefits are (1) seed and organism dispersal (sometimes a benefit); (2) habitat creation and protection; and (3) land restoration. Among the detriments are (1) seed and organism dispersal (sometimes detrimental); (2) habitat degradation and destruction; and (3) land degradation.

The two-party relationship can be represented thus:

Other Creatures — Human Creatures

When the Creator of the creatures is recognized and incorporated, however, a three-party human-creature-Creator relationship can be visualized.⁸ It is one in which human beings and other beings are coordinated with their Creator, the importance of which is illumined by hearing and studying God's speech to Job. This three party relationship can be represented thus:

Creator
/ \
Other Creatures — Human Creatures

Incorporating this third dimension brings greater robustness to the human creatures-other creatures and the humankind-other kinds relationship. It co-orders both human and other creatures to their Creator.⁹ As we have seen for Job, viewing other creatures through the eye of their Creator can transform our perspective. In beholding Behemoth—in the manner God would have us—we can

discover the beauty, integrity, and habitat-fitness for what at first glance we might have considered monstrous and repulsive. We can see what we first thought to be ugly as beautiful. We can come to view a wetland no longer as wasteland but as home and habitat for God's creatures. We can transform our belief that power is measured by one's capacity to kill or to tame into one that sees real power as one's demonstrated capacity to create and sustain. We can discover that the real power in relation to God's creatures is not in the human capacity to extinguish its life with arrow, bullet or barbed harpoon, but in God's creating it and sustaining it as something marvelous and wonderful. We can find that authority over things belongs to the Author of those things: that we have no authority to destroy what we ourselves did not create, that destruction of a grand master's work by its onlooker, beholder, or curator is a disgrace to their Creator.

Reading the broader context within which the Hippopotamus is described, we gain even more of the force of Scriptural teaching here. Before describing the Hippopotamus and Crocodile, God's first speech describes the Mountain Goat, Ostrich, and Hawk. "To be sure, they were not created for man's use," writes Robert Gordis, "yet they do possess a beauty and a grace that man can appreciate." And then, observes Gordis, "The poet goes one step further. The Hippopotamus and the Crocodile can lay no claim to beauty, but on the contrary, are physically repulsive. When the poet glorifies these beasts he is calling us to rise completely above the anthropocentric point of view which, however natural for man, distorts his comprehension of the world."¹⁰ God's second speech "represents a higher level in the argument, an ascent from God's creative power as manifested in creatures that are independent of man, to God's creative joy in creatures that are positively dangerous and repugnant to man."¹¹

In biblical Christianity, the value of creatures derives ultimately not from their utility, market price, cuteness, or charm. Instead their value derives from their Creator. All things owe their life and breath to their Creator who not only has created them and declared them good but also sustains them through divine love and power. Basing their understanding on the teachings of the Bible, people of the Christian faith acknowledge God's gift of life (*zoe*) and breath (*pnoe*) to all things (Ps. 104:27-30; Acts 17:24-25); God's repeated declaration of the goodness of Creation and all the creatures (Genesis 1 and Genesis 1:31; I Timothy 4:4); and God's caring and sustaining of all things (Ps. 104; Col. 1:15-20; Hebrews 1:3).

Incorporation of the divine dimension in a three-part model illumines humankind's relationship with other kinds. It also illumines the relation of other kinds with God and God's relationship with us. But there is much more that this small part of the book of Job that is available to us in the Bible. We now must turn to the rich biblical heritage of which God's speech to Job is a small part.

Heritage and Prejudice

A geneticist and counselor in human genetics some years ago helped me and my students with understanding and addressing the problem of prejudice. And it is this that has given me permission to begin this paper with a passage of Scripture, rather than zoology. My colleague explained how understanding genetics helps one to discover that it is no one's fault that they look ugly or beautiful, are tall or short, male or female, yellow or black. It is impossible to blame people for their looks and form and we can simply appreciate and respect them for what they are. Our cultural heritage is similar in that each of us come with a cultural heritage we have not initially chosen. We enter the stream of life when and where we enter. None need to feel responsible for being born into a family that is religious or irreligious, Hindu or Christian, bond or free.

And so I began this paper with the Bible, because that is my cultural heritage. Even though the Bible, Christianity, and even "religion," have come into disfavor in many quarters, and can be associated with murderous cults, bigotry, brutal warfare, oppression, and doctrinaire imposition,

this does not change the circumstances of my birth and my growing up in a Christian community that nurtured me in a cultural matrix of story, song, and exposition. This matrix respected science heartily, yet did not hold up science as arbiter of absolute truth. It promulgated a system of ethics, yet continuously reformed this system as knowledge from the Word and the world increased and was clarified.¹² It sought to bring goodness and integrity to human life, yet did not pursue happiness or other by-products of goodness and integrity for their own sakes. It sought wholeness and care for creation, yet was not afraid to take from creation what was needed to sustain human life and achieve contentment as this was biblically defined in I Timothy 6:6-21.

The exposition of these stories and songs was brought me by disciplined and highly educated scholars who taught us in sanctuary, classroom, laboratory, and field. The practical exposition of these stories and songs was published in the lives of people around me, many of whom were exemplary in upgrading the poor, visiting the sick, rehabilitating prostitutes, singing in prisons, doing daily labor, and tending the land and its creatures.¹³

My love for plants and animals, and my love for creation derives from this matrix of story, song, and exposition. It is out of this love that I became a zoologist. The Behemoth speech with which I began is an exceedingly small part of this matrix, yet it opens one window to it. Another window can be opened by looking at a distillate of this matrix of story, song and exposition. However, I do this with great reservation and caution, because is impossible to do so adequately. In some ways, to do so as an abbreviation is also disrespectful.¹⁴ Nevertheless it is helpful for our topic. This distillation, to whose numbered distillates I refer, is found at the end of this essay.¹⁵

Human Besings in Relation to Other Kinds

In Christian perspective, the value of creatures derives ultimately not from their utility, market price, cuteness, or charm. Instead their value derives from their Creator. The biblical passage on Behemoth given in Job 40:15-24 is but one illustration. A Christian matrix of story, songs, and exposition, brings one further to understand that the worth of the creatures is not so much in the eye of the human beholder as in the eye of the divine Beholder. The Beholder is also the Author and Owner of all things (distillates 1&2).

Creator-based value has profound consequences. It makes it necessary to see other creatures and other kinds through the eye of their Creator. It brings us to ascribe intrinsic value to the creatures and to creation (distillate 3). The primary relationship is that between the Creator and the creatures, which for our purposes I have resolved along two lines: the Creator in relation with Human Creatures, and the Creator in relation with other creatures.¹⁶ In this primary relationship, the creatures--human and other--owe their being to their Creator. They bring glory and praise to their Creator by being the dynamic beings they have been created to be.

It is the relationship between Creator and creature that establishes the human relationship of humankind with other kinds. Response of a human being in this view does not first ask concerning the Hippo, Can I eat it? How can I shoot it? How can I market it? How can I get it out of my way? Instead the question is, What does the Creator think of this creature? How in my relationship to it should I honor its Owner? How might I learn to live with it? How does it fit into the larger system of which it is part?¹⁷ Even if a person has the opportunity to buy a Hippo, thereby to gain legal title to it, their responsibility to its Owner remains. They may have bought the privilege of having a Hippo under their care, but it must be care under the eye of its Owner and Creator. There would be little doubt about this would require keeping this creature in its native habitat, *"Under the lotus plants, hidden among the reeds in the marsh."*

This of course strongly affects a human being's relationship with other kinds. The Creator-creature relationship controls the Humankind-Other Kinds relationship. Among other things, we

come to discover the beauty, integrity, and habitat fitness for a creature that at first glance we might have declared ugly.

Clearly, human beings in this view are themselves creatures (distillate 4). But they are distinctively different from otherkind. Humans differ greatly at least in this: humans have the capacity to destroy their own kind, otherkind, and the creation on a grand scale. No texts are needed to support this statement.¹⁸ It is apparent from empirical observation in the present. And it has been apparent from empirical observation over recorded human history and on to the present. Human beings are distinctive in this: they are the only kind that has the capacity to destroy the earth. Moreover this capacity appears to be joined with a proclivity and even a will to do so.¹⁹ Even in our time, when human beings know what environmental integrity means they still degrade the Earth. This is the human predicament distillate 12). In seeking a solution to this problem, historian of science Colin Russell evaluates the prospects for addressing the human predicament by the conventional reductionist view and the postmodern organismic view of Earth, but finds that alone, or in combination, they fall short. In seeking a third way, Russell finds that the Scriptures provide an answer, and it is to this he points our attention. It is a way that comes from perceiving Earth unified with the universe under its orderly Creator, as God's footstool; the Earth is not the center of all things (distillate 1).²⁰

The capacity and proclivity to destroy the earth has a correlative distinction. Human beings are also distinctive in this: they are the only kind that can make the decision not to exercise their capacity to destroy their own kind, other kinds, otherkind, and the earth. While having the capacity for domination and destruction, human beings can recognize this capacity and prevent its actualization. Human beings have the capacity to take care of the earth and its creatures (distillates 4 and 5). Again no texts are needed here; we know this from empirical observation. Human beings have the capacity to mirror God's love for the world (distillate 5).

While it is interesting to probe the Christian tradition for reasons for this capacity, proclivity, and will, it is for our purposes more pressing to probe it for solutions. This brings a text from the matrix, Genesis 2:15. Here are five English translations from the Hebrew:²¹

The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it. (NIV)

And Jehovah Elohim took Man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to till it and to guard it. (DBY)

The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it. (RSV)

And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. (KJV)

And Jehovah God taketh the man, and causeth him to rest in the garden of Eden, to serve it, and to keep it. (YLT)

Lest we get distracted by concern for inclusion of women and children here, the Hebrew word translated in the King's English here as *man* is the word '*adam*-- the word for humankind; it is '*adam* of *adamah*. As these translations do not convey this well, neither do four of the five for another important word in this well-known biblical text: the word translated "to work it," "to till it," "to dress it." For present-day gardeners, of course, "dressing" is not far from what we actually do--and it is not far from its Hebrew meaning. The Hebrew here is '*abad*, perhaps best known from the book of Daniel: "Choose ye this day whom you shall serve (*'abad*). As for me and my house, we will serve (*'abad*) Jehovah." Wherever this word is used outside of agriculture in the Bible it is

translated "to serve." When it is used for gardens and agriculture it is translated "dress," "till," "tend," or "cultivate," except here in Young's Literal Translation. Nevertheless, human beings are expected to serve the garden. (distillate 4).²²

Beyond our service to the garden, expected in this text, we also can discover that the garden in many ways also serves human beings and the rest of creation. If we acknowledge that the garden and the wider creation serves us with its fruit, esthetic beauty, reciprocating exchange oxygen and carbon dioxide, etc., we can come to the conclusion that the garden through the eye of God might be seen as engaging in reciprocal service with its gardeners.

Thus, whatever we do in company with the various individuals and kinds of creatures in the garden, and in some sense also the wider creation, we do as acts of con-service. The Latin prefix, *con-*, applied to the word, "serve," can convey this. "Con-service" can be used to indicate *service with*. It appears that the biblical expectation-- or if we will, the expectation of the garden in the eye of God-- is that people, its many creatures, and its many kinds of creatures are expected to be about the business of reciprocal service or con-servancy. We creatures, human and other are creatures in relationship in which we reciprocally serve each other. (distillate 4).

People are expected not only to con-serve in the garden but also to *keep* it. The Hebrew word for *keep* used in Genesis 2:15 is not *natsar*-- a word that describes the "keeping" of pickles in a jar, but it is the Hebrew word, *shamar*, a word used in another a well-known passage, Numbers 6:24, "The Lord bless you and **keep** you."²³ When this blessing is invoked, it is expected not merely that God would keep us in a kind of preserved, inactive, uninteresting state. Instead, it is that God would keep us in all of our vitality, with all our energy and beauty. Our expectation is that God's keeping will be keeping that nurtures all of our life-staining and life-fulfilling relationships--physiologically, psychologically, socially, ecologically. Our internal functioning, our relationship with family and community, and our interfacing with the land and creatures would be sustained in ways that we would be kept in all integrity.

When people "keep" the creation in this deep, full, and dynamic sense, they confess in deed that the creatures being kept must be able to maintain their proper connections--with members of their own kind, with the many other kinds with which they interact, with the soil, air and water upon which they depend for their life and fruitfulness. The rich and full keeping invoked in the Aaronic blessing is the kind of keeping that should be confessed by keepers of God's garden, the keepers of God's creation. As God keeps us, so should we keep God's earth (distillate 5).

This brings us to the confession of the con-server. As beholder of the creatures, the con-server mostly needs do no more but join the creatures in bringing praise to their God. There is, however, a principal task: in beholding the con-server must also name what is beheld (distillate 5). The Hippo or Batrachian must not just be called "beast" but must be given a name by its human beholder. And it interests God what names we give. Naming is necessary for becoming aware of the numbers and qualities of the myriad of kinds; it is necessary when human actions threaten to degrade or destroy the creatures or creation. These things we know from experience. And should we have to counter the pain and destruction inflicted by people upon individual creatures, kinds of creatures and all creation, the con-server will have to know more than their taxonomy. The con-server will also have to know the creature--its individuals and its kind, its dynamics and its niche requirements, all in order that their flourishing can be re-established in the wake of their abuse, degradation, and destruction.²⁴ The con-server/keeper must not be satisfied with existing ignorance of the needs and requirements of creatures, their various kinds, and of creation; neither must the keeper participate in the efforts to create, promote, and preserve such ignorance.

The con-server (human or other) is a creature in relationship with other creatures and in relationship to all creation. It is relationship for which the entities have contributions and responsibilities to others, beyond self, including such things as production or consumption of oxygen and reciprocal provision of food and habitat.²⁵ It is relationship that necessarily transcends the grammar of atomistic individualism and atomistic justice. It is relationship that is not one of independent peers, and thus not limited by the grammar and principles of atomism.²⁶ When we

consider others of our kind and other kinds, we see ourselves in relationship rather than as independent entities, peers or not. This means that we address others within the relationship of reciprocal service, however direct or indirect that service might be. For creatures under domestication this means reciprocal provision of needs between con-servers, based upon knowledge and seeking God's will on earth by the human keeper. For the wild creatures this may mean a benign beholding by human onlookers.²⁷ For threatened creatures and kinds it will involve rescue work, considered incomplete until the rescued are liberated from human keeping into self-sustaining habitats.²⁸ The con-server is not satisfied until the domestic animals on the ark are restored to full con-serving relationship, and wild creatures are restored to natural habitats where they can flourish once again (distillates 7 and 12).²⁹ In all of this the keeper-server sees the creatures not as strangers but creatures in relationship.³⁰

Keepers or con-servers must also guard against greed and arrogance and their degrading effects on creatures, other kinds, and creation. Caring for these is a humble privilege, not pursuit of one's own security or reputation (distillate 8). And in this faithful con-service—in this imaging of God's love for the world—con-servers make others aware not only of the creatures and our caring,³¹ but also warns them that without responsible con-service and keeping of creation and its creatures, human beings themselves are threatened with destruction (distillate 6). The goal for people in creation is to achieve for contentment rather than maximization, as they seek to do God's will and sustain God's economy of creation (distillate 9).

The keeper/con-server must be on guard, ready to sound the alarm, ready to confront establishment of ignorance. The keeper/con-server must be a persistent, diligent, and discerning truth-seeker. The keeper/con-server must be fully aware of the human predicament and the need to fight and overcome evil that is manifest in the abuse of creatures, of other kinds, and of creation. The keeper must pray for deliverance from evil (distillates 10 and 12).

The scriptures tell us that all creation and every creature praises God. Every creature reflects back something of the love God pours out through all creation. The heavens and all creatures declare the glory of God. The chief end of each creature, the communities of creatures, and all creation is to glorify God and enjoy God's blessings.³² And the Scriptures further tell us that this praise, testimony, and witness to God leaves no one without excuse for not knowing God's divinity and everlasting power. And the keeper/con-server of creation, mirroring God's love for the world, confesses this love in deed. The keeper/con-server of creation admires and sustains the world in beauty.³³ Praise, testimony, and witness come through to the world loud and clear from human beings and all other creatures. It publication goes out across the earth. God's love for the world is published in life and landscape. And the keeper/con-servers sing: Praise God from whom all blessings flow! Praise God all creatures here below!

Conclusion

How ought human beings regard Behemoth and other kinds? In the Christian and biblical view, they must be regarded as the works of the Lord. To so regard God's creatures identifies a person more with the biblical Noah than with the destroyers of the earth. To so regard Behemoth places one among those who respect God's command and blessing to the creatures to be fruitful and multiply; those who would provide the conditions for a fruitful and flourishing biosphere; those who would be sensitive and responsive to any dangers facing other kinds; those who would join in with other creatures in praising their Maker. Such respectful people behold the Batrachians and Behemoth, con-serve and keep the creatures, and, confessing creation's integrity in word and deed, hold them and their habitats together, assure their periodic self-enjoyment and rest, rescue them from human onslaughts, and restore the rescued to full and fruitful life. In so doing, they mirror the one the Scripture tells us is the namesake of Christians, the One by and for whom all

things were created, in whom all things hold together, and through whom all things are reconciled to God.³⁴ As they image God and behold the creatures through God's eye, they not only are better able to behold the creatures; they are better able to behold the beauty of the Beholder.

Distillates from a Christian Cultural Matrix

1. Authorship and Integrity of the Cosmos

There is but a single just and loving Author of all-that-is, including temporality and chance, who creates all creatures good and declares all creatures good, who holds all things together, and who reconciles all things.³⁵ This means that (1) all things are consistent, justly ordered, and have integrity, whether apparent or not. This is captured by Einstein, for example, in his exclamation, "Raffiniert ist der Herrgott, aber boshaft ist er nicht!"³⁶ This also means that (2) the just and discoverable consistency within the world and universe makes science possible, including discovery of principles and laws.

2. The Creation and all the Creatures Belong their Creator

Neither the creation, nor any of its creatures belong to human beings, but to their Creator, who cares for all of it. The earth (*ge*) and its fullness is the Lord's, the biosphere (*oikomene*) and everything that lives in it.³⁷ God has established a covenant with the earth, with every living creature, with all living creatures of every kind on the earth.³⁸ Thus, (3) God respects and sustains the creatures and the earth,³⁹ we hold these things in trust, and they must be treated with respect and cared for. Beyond the other creatures, we too belong to God,⁴⁰ who cares for us⁴¹ and thus; (4) we need not be anxious about our lives or sustenance.

3. Intrinsic Worth of the Creatures

The divine authorship of all things means that (5) creation and all its constituents have intrinsic worth apart from their utility or perceived pleasantness, and thus the whole creation and every creature must be respected.⁴² God loves the world and cares for it,⁴³ and imaging God,⁴⁴ (6) we must love the world and take care of it.⁴⁵ This also means that (7) while we may make responsible use of the fruits of creation we may not destroy its fruitfulness.⁴⁶ Thus, (8) the prerogative of destruction and extinction lies only with the Creator, not with people.⁴⁷ And, (9) while we may employ creatures in responsible ways, we must not press them relentlessly;⁴⁸ (10) we must assure repeated opportunity for the creatures of earth to enjoy their rest and creation's blessings.⁴⁹

4. Human Beings as Part of Creation

Because we also are creatures, (11) we human beings do not stand apart from "environment" but are part and parcel of the whole.⁵⁰ Neither are we the center of things nor is our dwelling place—the Creator's footstool we call Earth.⁵¹ The biosphere and the earth, together with everything in the universe is identified as the creation and its totality is beyond our comprehension.⁵² The integrity of the whole creation must be confessed in word and deed, cherished in whole and in part. Furthermore, (12) as the rest of creation serves us so should we serve the rest of creation.⁵³ Con-service and con-servation is the rule.

5. *Human Beings as Imagers of God*

Yet, (13) as con-servants with creation, human beings have a special honor of imaging God's love to the world.⁵⁴ It is a special honor with special responsibility. God is love; and we should image God's love. Imaging the Creator's love and care for the creatures sustains us as their appreciative beholders, prevents us from abusing them or their kind, compels us to have compassion for the biosphere, and brings us to con-serve creation. Thus, (14) human beings are responsible to God as earth keepers.⁵⁵ Earthkeeping is an important way of imaging God's love for the world. And human beings must give names to the creatures.⁵⁶ And describing and teaching about plants and animals is honorable and wise.⁵⁷

6. *Penalty for Eschewing our Reflection of God's love*

While expected to image God's love for the world out of love and gratitude to God, (15) people who destroy the earth, themselves will be destroyed.⁵⁸ Yet (16) people who believingly practice God's love for the world will live on everlastingly.⁵⁹

7. *Creation is a Powerful Teacher*

The just and discoverable consistency of creation is rooted in God's order and thus (17) for those who study the works of creation, creation is a powerful teacher⁶⁰. Thus, (18) having been created justly and rightly by God, the creation is in many ways normative, and its normativity should be *observed* in ways that inform its *ob-servers* how it works and (for correcting human degradation of creation) how it ought to work.⁶¹ For example, creation teaches that biological death is basic to life, contrary to what might be assumed by people who failed to *ob-serve* natural ecosystem function.

8. *Mindless Selection Should be Constrained in Mindful Society*

Darwinian principles may operate creatively and thoughtlessly in the biotic world. However, (19) when thoughtless Darwinian principles are found to operate in the thoughtful world of human beings, they must be constrained and even countered in order to assure sustainability of human society and the creation.⁶² Thus, (20) fitness of human culture comes not from seeking the supremacy of the individual, race, nationality, sex, or economic status but from con-service in God's creation, including God's other creatures and their kinds, and other people and their community. Self-interest is always secondary to seeking God's rule. Therefore (21) whatever benefits accrue to one's self come as by-products of confessing in word and deed the integrity of creatures and the whole of creation.⁶³

9. *Contentment Rather than Maximization is a Worthy Goal*

Given God's ownership of all things, and human responsibility to God, (22) the aim of human beings and human societies should be contentment, not the maximization of things, or pleasure, or accomplishments.⁶⁴ Thus, (23) whatever things we hold in trust, whatever joy we experience, and whatever accomplishments we achieve should come as by-products of our loving and self-giving con-service. Contentment is worth far more than money, possessions, wealth, or fame-- to us and to the rest of creation.

10. *Truth Must Always be Sought*

In whatever human beings do or say, in whatever they learn and teach about the world and how things ought to be, and in whatever actions they take in the world, (24) human beings must consistently be truthful and seek the truth, never misrepresenting the world nor what is happening within and to the world.⁶⁵ Thus, (25) when there is danger people must sound the alarm;⁶⁶ when there is no danger they must not be alarmist. When there is need for prophets they should prophesy; (26) when corrective actions result from the warning of prophets, the prophets should rejoice and not grumble.⁶⁷ Moreover, (27) when there is need to know people should seek to find out. And, (28) when there is confusion people should seek to clarify. Thus, (29) truth must be defended and consistently be sought.

11. *The Whole Creation Praises its Creator*

In understanding God's world human beings should know that (30) the whole creation gives testimony to God's divinity and everlasting power.⁶⁸ Thus, (31) in our life and work we should help others share in receiving creation's testimony and (32) we should assure that the testimony of the creatures and of creation to their Creator is not diminished or extinguished.

12. *Humankind must Recognize the Human Predicament and may Commune in Dialogue with the Creator*

Human beings must acknowledge and deal with the problem that (33) the good we want to do we often fail to do and the evil we do not want to do, we often do. This is the human predicament, and one of our primary reasons for seeking dialogue with God in prayer. When we do, (34) we model this on the prayer of our Lord, that God's name be revered, that God's economy be established and God's will be done on Earth, that God provide for our modest daily needs, that God forgive us as we forgive our friends and enemies, and that God deliver us from evil. This is a prayer that (35) we put our belief into practice on Earth in our daily lives, God helping us.

Notes

A popular version of this paper has been published as "The Beauty of the Beast: Behemoths and Batrachians in the Eye of God," *Green Cross* 4, no. 1: 8-9.

1. Batrachia is the "leaping order" of the Class Amphibia, an order more commonly known as the Order Salientia. Thus members of this order may be called Batrachians. See G. K. Noble *The Biology of the Amphibia* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931; reprint, New York: Dover, 1954), 485 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

2. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animals and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), 101.

3. George S. Cansdale, *Animals of Bible Lands* (Exeter Devon, England: Paternoster Press, 1970), 101.

4. *Ibid.*, 101.

5. Robert Gordis, *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 119-122.

6. Behemoth and Leviathan as treated here in God's second speech to Job are sometimes considered to be mythological. Robert Gordis, however, tells us that the writer "is not interested in imaginary creatures from the dim mythological past—he is concerned with the actual present, with the vast universe as it is governed by its Maker. The hippopotamus and the crocodile are real beasts and their choice for inclusion in the paeons of praise is by no means accidental" (*ibid.*, 120).

7. *Ibid.*, 122.

8. This three-party diagram addresses Griffiths' criticism of Linzey. Andrew Linzey writes that "Perhaps I deserved the trenchant criticism of Richard Griffiths to the effect that the 'search for an adequate secular basis for animal rights is bound to fail because of the overriding difficulty in establishing any rights at all (even human rights) on a purely two-dimensional plane, without including some notion of God.'" (Andrew Linzey, *Christianity and the Rights of Animals* (New York: Crossroads Press, 1987), 71.

9. Note should be made here of the fact that I use "other creatures" and "human creatures" in this diagram. Thus, based upon my earlier discussion of how I am using these terms, the reference here is to individual creatures. With due consideration to the fact that all creatures are individuals, these terms can be replaced with the terms "other kinds" and "humankind" respectively when one wishes to reference the relationships of taxa higher than the individual. However, I would not support their replacement with the terms "otherkind" and "humankind" respectively because it diminishes the particularity to such an extent that its practical outcomes no longer are evident and because the anthropocentrism that comes from this overwhelms careful and reflective thought on creatures other than those of our own kind.

10. Gordis, *The Book of God and Man*, 120.

11. *Ibid.*, 123.

12. A phrase I learned in my youth that expresses this is *Ecclesia reformata semper refermandum est* -- "the reformed church is ever reforming."

13. See for example C. B. DeWitt, "Life as a Psalm to the Lord: Thanking God for Holsteins and Coyotes," *Reformed Worship* 35 (1995): 24-25.

14. I am reminded to put things this way by a Navajo graduate student in my laboratory whose doctoral research is based upon understanding the wisdom of his own culture. He too has the problem of being sacrilegious by attempting to distill the teachings of his tradition devoid of sacrament, ritual, customary reflection, and praxis. For him, this is compounded by his tradition's not conveying some of the heritage to him until he will have gained understanding as an elder. Both he and I risk being sacrilegious toward our heritage by having to reprocess and "box" cultural knowledge and wisdom for rapid consumption. This of course, is a problem for all cultures, not just Navajo and Christian ones.

15. A good way to begin to understand the tradition to which I refer is to read and study each of the texts cited and read them directly in their contexts in one or more versions of the Bible, and then perhaps also to read or sing the psalms and hymns of the "blue" *Psalter Hymnal* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: CRC Publishing House, 1959).

16. Clearly here we can have more than two lines between Creator and creatures, even as many as there are kinds or as many as there are individual creatures. However, our purpose here is to deal with the relationship between human and other creatures, and thus the two lines create the space for relating us to other kinds,

shown by the basal horizontal line in the triangular diagram.

17. C. Dean Freudenberger tells the story of his experience in Africa during which soldiers engaged in Cold War activities shot Hippos for food in the river where his family swam and bathed. Removal of the Hippos eliminated grazing on the marsh grasses, reeds and sedges. Growing tall, these plants captured silt and slowed water flow at the river margins, creating habitat suitable for snails, and with the snails also Schistosomiasis (Liver Fluke). The Hippo was eliminated and schistosomiasis established. A member of their community died from schisto and their community no longer could swim and bathe in the river. (Freudenberger, personal communication, 17 April, 1998).

18. However, Rev. 11:18 recognizes this: "The time has come for... destroying those who destroy the earth."

19. Abraham Joshua Heschel puts it this way: "Man rarely comprehends how dangerously mighty he is... The realization of the dangerous greatness of man, of his immense power and ability to destroy all life on earth, must completely change our conception of man's place and role in the divine scheme." Heschel, *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1955), 171. This is the human capacity recognized in Rev. 11:18.

20. Colin A. Russell, *The Earth, Humanity, and God: The Templeton Lectures*, Cambridge 1993. (London: UCL Press, 1994).

21. Abbreviations here for various Bible translations are: NIV, New International version; DBY, Darby Version; RSV, Revised Standard Version; KJV, King James Version; and YLT, Young's Literal Translation.

22. The verb "con-serve" as compared with "serve" better indicates the relational connections between creatures and human beings. Use of "serve" can allow for the possibility of an "us-them" administration that conceivably can lead to "humble arrogance"—an arrogance of unidirectional service. If we use instead the word and concept of "con-service" we are continually reminded of the reciprocal service among the creatures that recognizes that otherkind also serves humankind. Thus, as human beings we never achieve the status of "lords of creation," not even "servant-lords," but affirm only Jesus Christ or God triune as Lord of Creation, under whose eye we both behold the creatures and engage in cons-service in creation. This differs somewhat from Andrew Linzey who, in responding to Keith Ward, writes "given our God-given power and lordship over Creation it is we who should *serve creation*. The inner logic of Christ's lordship is the sacrifice of the higher for the lower; not the reverse. If the humility of God in Christ is costly and essential, why should ours be less so?" (Andrew Linzey. 1995. *Animal Theology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, p. 71). This appears to be a development from an earlier work in which he writes, "Slowly but surely, having grasped that the notion of dominion means stewardship, we are now for the first time capable of seeing how demanding our lordship over creation is really meant to be. ...our power cannot be understood as legitimate except as service, which is necessarily costly and sacrificial. Lordship without service is indeed tyranny." (Linzey, *Christianity and the Rights of Animals*, 29).

23. Harvard Hebrew scholar, Prof. Krister Stendahl, notes that the use of the Hebrew word, *shamar*, is largely used in relating God's keeping, not as much the keeping of things by human beings (personal communication, April 17, 1998). This, linked with consideration of human beings as made in the image of God may have significance in Gen. 2:15 in the sense that this keeping by human beings reflects God's keeping.

24. See Rolf Bouma, "Creation's Persistent Voice: Critiquing the Secondary Status of Creation as Revelation," *J. Faith & Science Exchange*, 1977:1-6. He asks "what the result would be if the Christian community allowed creation to be taken out of the children's section and off the secondary reference shelf and moved to a place of genuine engagement. What if the natural sciences were truly allowed a dialogue with theology, and Christian theology were to resist the impulse to cut the conversation short?"

25. "The kinship relationship suggests a reciprocity rather than a competition. ...competition is not the basic social dynamic of the environment. ...If this is our home, then measuring costs and benefits is not the basic moral logic. Rather, it is a concern for the health of all the creatures belonging to a given place, from the creatures of the soil and water to the humans and other creatures of the land surface to the birds of the air." L. Shannon Jung, "Animals in Christian Perspective: Strangers, Friends, or Kin?" in *Good News for Animals?*

Christian Approaches to Animal Well-Being, ed. Charles Pinches and Jay B. McDaniel (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993), 59.

26. Here I am reflecting the thought of Elizabeth H. Wolgast (*The Grammar of Justice* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987]) who deals with the “inadequacies in the atomistic model of human society derived from Hobbes and Locke and embodied in the U. S. Constitution.” She “demonstrates that traditional liberal theory, with its emphasis on individual rights and self-defined interest, cannot by itself give an adequate picture of community, morality, or justice. (Quotes from outside back cover.) This accords with Jung, for whom rights language can be seen, at best, as... “the lowest secular common denominator of gracious love” (“Animals in Perspective,” 57), and with Hauerwas and Berkman for whom “the use of the language of rights embodies the very anthropocentrism that is antithetical to the goals of those who participate in the movement known as ‘Animal Rights’” and who conclude “that to ascribe rights to an animal may in the short run be a strategy for its survival, but in the long run this language will simply maintain the current understandings of and practices in relation to other animals that continually bring about their destruction.” (Stanley was and John Berkman, “A Trinitarian Theology of the ‘Chief End’ of ‘All Flesh, in *Good News for Animals? Christian Approaches to Animal Well-Being*, ed. Charles Pinches and Jay B. McDaniel (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1993), 66. In his *Animal Theology* Andrew Linzey makes some concession the direction of these other authors by writing, “The concept of rights, I suggest is fully compatible with moral theology and should be properly extended to include animals. At the same time, I resist the idea that rights language is exhaustive of everything that should be said from a theological perspective about animals. In my view, there are good theological grounds for respecting the worth of animals, accepting responsibility *and* recognizing their God-given rights.” (Linzey, *Animal Theology*, 19).

27. See Exod. 20:10; Deut. 25:4; Prov. 12:10; Luke 13:5, 14:5.

28. Liberation from human keeping does not mean animal liberation in the sense that animals are given freedom to overcome their human companions in creation, as is becoming the situation for people in the village of Banpukele at the edge of the Réserve de Fauna à Okapi (RFO) in northern Congo. Here, one of the village elders, reflecting on the new RFO regulations against killing animals, observed, “...now the animals are oppressing us. If it was still like it was in the past, they would kill them. Now, the animals—elephants, every type of animal, baboons—they have made their way even all the way into our houses!” Another elder added, “Elephants were people who would go way off into the forest... But now, at this time, elephants are right here in the village. In the village!” And others: “You see, the animals have gotten their independence.” “Now the animals are simply destroying our food. And you can look at them, but you better not kill them.” “Now... Just like people in the village, they have begun eating all the foods that people are planting in addition to their foods of the forest...” (Richard B. Peterson, personal communication, April 21, 1998.)

29. As Noah did, for example. On the ark each creature needed their individual needs attended, but Noah’s purpose was not to supply all of these needs from then on; instead it was his purpose ultimately to free these animals into habitats that would sustain these creatures without additional human help.

30. It is this consideration that brings Jung (op. cit.) to say that “The approach to right relations which invokes animal rights is, at best, inappropriate. It operates on the basic perspective of seeing animals as strangers, and short-circuits its own manifest intent to encourage humane treatment for animals. It basically undermines relationality.” (Jung, “Animals in Christian Perspective,” 55-56.) Shannon does concede, however, that “In defense of rights language, it does seem necessary in those situations in which basic human regard for the other has been grievously violated. Rights tend to get expressed in law, and there is a genuine place in law to establish minimum standards of right conduct among equals” (56).

31. This can be given the name, stewardship. And if this is properly understood as con-service and earth-keeping that includes beholding of named creatures and creatures to be named, then stewardship is a good descriptive term. It is in this sense, I believe that Colin Russell employs stewardship. Russell (op. cit.), concludes that stewardship offers both the best practical understanding and the best prospects for our world. He tells us that, at the conceptual level, stewardship makes the great effort to understand the complex systems of the planet and biosphere. It recognizes that in times of environmental degradation the need for public understanding of science is greater than ever. At the perceptual level, stewardship leads people to value the Earth highly as a treasure held in trust. This includes development of empathy with nature and

sympathy with those who work for environmental integrity. At the relational level, stewardship elicits practical strategies for relating people to the Earth as responsible members who are obedient to the dictates of conscience.

32. See H. Richard Niebuhr's supplementary essay entitled, "The Center of Value" in H. Richard Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1943), 100-113. In it he writes, "...vitalistic or evolutionary value systems beginning with life of the community of living beings can make rational judgements about what is good for life—the fitness of an environment, the mutual limitations of living beings in right relations of the struggle for existence—but it cannot or does not raise the question what the community of the living is good for."

33. Stephen R. L. Clark concludes his book, "Our duty is to admire and to sustain the world in beauty, and not to impose on others pains and penalties we could not bear ourselves. ...We ought to live by those laws that an ideal observer or Creator-God would make (maybe has made) for the world: to respect the integrity of every creature, and not to seize more for ourselves and our immediate kin than would be granted under such a dispensation. (Stephen R. L. Clark, *Animals and Their Moral Standing* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 168.

34. Andrew Linzey, identifies six main ethical theories of the status of animals: Humanocentric, Contractualist, Humanitarian, Welfare, Rights, and Generosity theories. In Paul Barry Clarke and Andrew Linzey, *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 29-33. The theory presented in this paper does not fall into any of these categories neatly. This is due largely to the three-party Creator-creature-human construct that characterizes the present work. However, it has some of the character of the Generosity theory espoused by Linzey in that it has generous costly service at its heart.

35. Gen. 1; Col. 1:15-20; Apostles' Creed; Nicene Creed; Athanasian Creed; Belgic Confession, Article II. See *The Creeds of Christendom*, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1931).

36. "Subtle is the Lord, but malicious is he not." For further insight on this, see the frontispiece in Abraham Pais, *"Subtle is the Lord": The Science and Life of Albert Einstein* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

37. Ps. 24:1; Our World Belongs to God: A Contemporary Testimony (pp. 1019-1038), "This is My Father's World" (no. 374) and "The Earth and the Fullness with Which it is Stored" (no. 41) in the *Psalter Hymnal* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: CRC Publications, 1987).

38. See Gen. 9:8-17.

39. See Job 38-40; Ps. 104.

40. I Cor. 3:23 and Titus 2:14.

41. Matt. 10:29-31.

42. See Job 38-40; Ps. 104. "Hallelujah, Praise Jehovah" *Psalter Hymnal* (1959), no. 304.

43. John 3:16; Ps. 104; "My Soul, Bless the Lord!"(no. 206), "Hallelujah, Praise Jehovah" (no. 301), and "Joy to the World" (no. 337) in the *Psalter Hymnal* (1959).

44. See Gen. 1:26-27, 9:6,

45. "Of course not in its sinful strivings and unholy motions" writes Abraham Kuyper of God's love for the world—the love for the world that we human beings are to mirror (Abraham Kuyper, "God So Loved the World!" chap. 7 of his "Keep Thy Solemn Feasts" Meditations, trans. John Hendrik deVries [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1928], 70-71.

46. Ezek. 34:18; Deut. 20:19-20, 22:6-7.

47. See Job 40:19.
48. See Exod. 20:10; Deut. 5:14.
49. See Exod. 20:10; Deut. 5:14.
50. Gen. 2:7. "The Tender Love a Father Has" (no. 205) *Psalter Hymnal* (1959).
51. Isa. 66:1; Acts 7:49; Matt. 5:34-35.
52. Job 38:4-40:2.
53. Gen. 2:15.
54. Gen. 1:27.
55. Gen. 2:15.
56. Gen. 2:19.
57. I Kings 4:33.
58. Rev. 11:18; see Isa. 33; I Cor. 15:24.
59. John 3:16; I Cor. 15:22.
60. See Ps. 112:2; Job 12:7-10.
61. Gordon J. Spykman, *Reformational Theology: A New Paradigm for Doing Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992).
62. See Matt. 6:33.
63. The word sometimes used for the wholeness and integrity that should be sought is "the Kingdom of God," and has its expression, for example, in Matt. 6:33.
64. I Timothy 6:6-21. "On the Good and Faithful," *Psalter Hymnal*.(1959), no. 7.
65. Prov. 14:5; John 8:31ff.; and "Who, O Lord, with Thee Abiding" (no. 20), "Grace and Truth Shall Mark the Way" (no. 45), and "Be Thou My Judge" (no. 47), *Psalter Hymnal* (1959).
66. Ezek. 33:1-6.
67. Jonah 3-4.
68. Ps. 19:1; Acts 14:17; Rom. 1:20. "O Lord, Our Lord, in All the Earth" (no. 12), "The Spacious Heavens Declare" (no. 28), "The Heavens Declare Thy Glory" (no. 31), "Sing a New Song to Jehovah" (no. 190), "Unto Go Our Savior" (no. 192), "Exalt the Lord, His Praise Proclaim" (no. 282), "Give Thanks to God for Good is He" (no. 284, and "Great is Thy Faithfulness" (no. 408), *Psalter Hymnal* (1959).