

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

C1017 – May 12, 2010 – Framework Hypothesis & Old Gap Theory

Now, we don't have much time for introduction because we want to cover another accommodation view. This one is held quite commonly in our circles so I'll put off the Framework Hypothesis until next time. Just remember we're learning about presuppositions and how your presuppositions are motivated by your ethical orientation to God and this controls how you set up experiments, what you look for and how you interpret the data. What I'm trying to show you is that the Bible is a coherent whole and you can't rip and tear verses this way and that way to make it fit what you want to believe. Either we will let the world interpret the word of God or we will let the word of God interpret the world around us. Accommodation attempts, to some degree allow the world to interpret the word of God.

5. Old Earth Gap Theory

Alright, let's turn to the Gap Theory. There are three Gap Theories. Two are young earth and one is old earth. The early gap theory held to a young earth. It did not come as a reaction to uniformitarian geology. We want to emphasize that it came before the rise of modern uniformitarian geology in the 1800's. It's a view held by some Jews after Christ. We have to be honest about this. It doesn't do any good to try and cover things up. Arthur Custance cites the *Targum of Onkelos* and the *Sefer HaZohar* as two early 2nd century AD works which see a judgment on the Gen 1:1 earth and a re-creation in 6-literal 24-hour days of Gen 1:3-2:4. Many others in church history since that time have held that Gen 1:1 is an original earth, Gen 1:2 is a judgment on the original earth and Gen 1:3-2:4 is a re-creation. They insert only enough time in the gap between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 for the angels to be created, fallen and judged. So the early gap view adherents did not put animal creation or

geological ages or the fossil record in this period. They just thought it was the best place to put the creation of angels, the fall of angels and the judgment of angels. So that's the early gap theory where certain Jews were trying to answer when the angels were created and when they fell. Some thought the best place was Gen 1:1 and 1:2.

Then the Old Earth Gap Theory was developed in 1814, long after the Early Gap Theory. Since we're dealing with Old Earth Accommodation Strategies we're just going to look tonight at this Old Earth Gap Theory. The other two we'll handle when we deal with the Young Earth positions next week.

The Old Earth Gap Theory was first proposed in 1814 by Thomas Chalmers, a Scottish Presbyterian pastor and theologian. This occurred right on the heels of the works of another Scottish man, James Hutton, known as the Founder of Modern Geology. So Chalmers was right in the backyard of Hutton and Hutton was proposing the doctrine of uniformitarianism, that presents geological processes were uniform in space and time and it became apparent to him that this would require great lengths of time.ⁱ So in response to Hutton, Chalmers attempted to harmonize Gen 1 with the idea of long ages that Hutton was proposing. To do this Chalmers said that Gen 1:1 is an original creation when God created angels, a pre-Adamic humanity and animals, dinosaurs and so forth. Between this original creation in Gen 1:1 and Gen 1:2 there is a gap of unknown length of time. Then in Gen 1:2 the original creation was judged with the consequent sedimentary strata encasing the fossil record. Then in Gen 1:3-2:4 God re-creates in six, literal 24-hour days. Part and parcel of this view is a local flood.

This view was popularized by the Scofield Reference Bible in 1917 and was held by theologians such as C. I. Scofield, Arthur Pink, Donald Grey Barnhouse and Clarence Larkin. The Scofield Reference Bible says on Gen 1:1, "The first creative act refers to the dateless past, and gives scope for all the geologic ages." So notice we're accommodating here, we're accepting the geologic ages as fact and cramming them into this gap. Then he says, "Jer. 4.23-26, Isa 24.1 and 45.18, clearly indicate that the earth had undergone a cataclysmic change as the result of a divine judgment. The face of the earth bears everywhere the marks of such a catastrophe. There are not wanting intimations which connect it with a previous testing and fall of angels. See Ezk. 28.12-15 and Isa. 14.9-14, which certainly go beyond the kings of Tyre

and Babylon.”ⁱⁱ He then goes on to say that the sun and the moon were created in Gen 1:1 and not on the fourth day in Gen 1:14-19. He says it only appeared on that day. This view became the dominant accommodation theory as Bernard Ramm wrote in 1954, “The gap theory has become the standard interpretation throughout hyper-orthodoxy, appearing in an endless stream of books, booklets, Bible studies, and periodical articles. In fact, it has become so sacrosanct with some that to question it is equivalent to tampering with Sacred Scripture or to manifest modernistic leanings.”ⁱⁱⁱ So the Old Earth Gap Theory is what virtually every conservative theologian held to in the 1950’s and 1960’s. It’s still mainstream today. Lots of Christians believe this and we want to see if it holds up to exegetical scrutiny. Can a Gap between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 accounting for all the geological ages, sedimentary strata and fossils be justified?

Now, the first thing we want to do is just look at Gen 1:1 and 1:2. Looking at those verses do you see a Gap between those verses? Do you see anything? You know why you don’t see anything? Because there isn’t anything there. That’s very serious. Now Gap adherents will tell you that if we translate the beginning of verse 2 correctly then we will see there is a Gap of time between vv 1 and 2. And we’ll look at that. But even if that is the case, how long is the Gap of time? Do you see any indication whatsoever of how long that Gap of time might be? That’s why we have disagreements among Gap Theorists. Some are young earth and some are old earth. The old earth are obviously getting the time from the conclusions of modern uniformitarian geologists, the young earth reject such vast amounts of time. So there are some serious problems already.

The second problem is one we’ve seen before. If you believe in a pre-Adamic race and dinosaurs all in this Gap then you have death, evil and suffering long before Adam’s sin when Rom 5:12 says death, evil and suffering come after Adam’s sin. That’s a huge theological problem.

Third, turn to Exod 20:9, 11 and read carefully with me. People read through these verses too quickly and they miss things. That’s why it’s dangerous to simply read the Bible and say, oh, well, I’ve done my devotion today, and it just becomes ritual reading. God’s not interested in ritual reading. God is interested in you studying what He says and thinking about what He says, if you don’t you’ll miss very important things, even things right on the surface,

you'll miss. In Exod 20:9 the command is given. This is in the Ten Words or the Ten Commandments, "Six days you shall labor and do all your work," why? Verse 11 explains, "For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day;" Now, I want you to underline the things the Lord made. First, "the heavens" above, second, "the earth" beneath, third, "the sea" below. Heavens, earth and sea, is that all? No, it also says, "and all that is in them." Now does all mean some or does all mean all? All means all. "All that is in them." All that is in the heavens? What is in the heavens? Celestial bodies, sun, moon and stars; angels, they dwell in the heavens, they are heavenly hosts, so you can't get angels outside of the six days. That's a very serious problem if we take God's word at face value. Do you know why God has the heavens and all that are in them, inclusive of angels, written in the Mosaic Treaty? Because the angels were the witnesses to the treaty being formed here. So you can't get angels before the six days of creation. It's impossible based on this verse, and there are others. He also says, "the earth...and all that is in them", that includes all plants, all land animals and man. And he also says "the sea...and all that is in them," that includes all the fish, all the sea creatures, all of them. God says, in six days I created the heavens and the earth and the sea and all that is in them and I rested on the seventh day." That is I worked for six, literal 24-hour days creating these domains and filling these domains with everything that I created and then on the seventh, literal 24-hour day I stopped creating domains and filling domains. This is God's commentary on Gen 1:1-2:4. Now, are we going to believe God? Or are we going to believe Old Earth Gap Theorists which say God created a pre-Adamic race before those six days, God created the angels before those six days and God created dinosaurs and other animals before those six days? It's quite clear who we have to go along with.

Fifth, when does the first day begin? All Gap Theorists believe in six, literal 24-hour day re-creation with the first re-creation day beginning in Gen 1:3. So let's look at the first day according to the Gap Theory. Gen 1:3, "Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light. ⁴God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness. ⁵God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day." Look at verse 3 again and ask yourself, what was the first thing that appeared on day one? Light. But what does verse 5 say came first? "Evening." "There was evening and there was morning, day one." Which is

why the Jews to this day start the day in the evening. The day starts when the sun sets, not when the sun rises. And you know where they got this? Genesis 1, evening and morning, evening and morning. But Gap theorists have morning and then evening. You can't start day one with verse 3. Day one has to start before verse 3 which means it at least has to include verse 2 and if it includes verse 2 then all of verses 2-5 have to occur in the same 24-hour period. See, it's very straightforward that in verse 4 the "darkness" was already present. God didn't say let there be darkness in verse 3. The darkness was already there. Where did the darkness come from? It was already there in verse 2. Look at verse 2. "The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep," see the darkness was already there. Which came first? Darkness or light? Darkness. And which came first on day one, evening or morning? Evening. So what does that tell you? That God saw the darkness of verse 2 as the evening and the light of verse 3 as the morning. That's why He says at the end of day one, "There was evening and there was morning." Evening verse 2, morning verse 3. Verse 2 has to be connected with verse 3 as a part of day one.

Fifth, I want to look at the grammar and vocabulary of Gen 1:2. A few weeks ago I was at a conference and Dr John Whitcomb and the Gap Theory came up and he said, "Look, the grammar will not support a Gap." And he didn't say anything else. And I'm sure there were people there who were saying, well, could you explain why the grammar will not support a Gap? But you'll understand why he didn't explain it when I get through. So this is for those of you who want to know why.

Gap Theorists say that verse 2 should be translated, "But the earth became..." disconnecting verse 1 from verse 2 so that a space of time exists between those verses. Then they say that the vocabulary of verse 2 is used in other passages describing judgment and therefore Gen 1:2 is describing a judgment on the original earth of verse 1 with the result that the earth in verse 2 became a dark, watery chaos. In verse 3 they say God begins the first day of re-creation. That's the view, let's see how it holds up.

First let's deal with the grammar. The grammatical issue is right at the beginning of Gen 1:2. Is this to be translated "But the earth became..." or "And the earth was..."

“And the earth was”
waw + *ha* + *eretz* + *haya*
CC + da + noun + verb

There are two things in this construction that we have to look at. One is the *waw* + noun and the other is the verb *haya*. First the *waw* + noun. This structure is a disjunctive *waw*. This is established beyond question from the grammar. But how the *waw* should be translated is up to the interpreter. The truth of the matter is that it could be translated “now” “and” or “but.”^{iv} There is no way to conclude one preference over the other except by the context. But this context doesn’t help in that regard. If one holds to the Gap he will be influenced to translate the *waw* with the contrastive “But.” If one rejects the Gap he will be influenced to translate the *waw* with the circumstantial “And.” This is purely an interpretive preference. It cannot be established from the grammar.

Second, should the verb *haya* be translated “was” or “became?” To translate it “became” indicates a change in the state of the earth from verse 1 to verse 2 (by judgment). To translate it “was” indicates no change in the state of the earth from verse 1 to verse 2 (no judgment). The verb itself means “to be, to exist.” It is not the Hebrew verb “to become,” which would be the verb *haphak* or the related word *hawa*. “To be” something and “to become” something are two different things. As Harris, Archer and Waltke say, to conclude “that the basic meaning of “to be” in the Bible is “to become” seems to be unwarranted.”^v *Haya* in Gen 1:2 is used with the predicate adjective and when used this way it simply describes “a past situation which no longer exists.”^{vi} The example given by Harris, Archer and Waltke in the *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* is Gen 1:2. It does nothing more than describe a past situation which no longer exists. It cannot be construed to say that it became something other than it was previously. So the verb should be translated “was” not “became.”

In conclusion, Waltke said, The construction of *waw* plus a noun does not convey sequence but rather introduces a disjunctive clause. The clause thus must be circumstantial to verse 1 or 3. It cannot be viewed as an independent clause (“And the earth became”) as held by the supporters of the gap theory.^{vii} For those of you who are interested, Bob Thieme agreed with Waltke that this was a disjunctive clause but then he translated it as an independent

clause, “But the earth became.” I don’t know why, if he agreed with Waltke, he still translated it “became,” because that would mean it was an independent clause. And I can’t figure why he did that. But it’s all on page 10 of his little book in the most recent version, the 1995 edition. About Bob Thieme let me also say that I talked to one of his writers. He wrote a lot of pamphlets and he had writers for some of that and I tried to track down what he believed toward the end of his life and one of his writers told me that he was in transition on the Gap theory and that he was gradually on his way to a young earth position. Though in the 1995 version he opens the possibility for an “unknown” amount of “time” in verse 2 and he says that the Bible does not provide precise data for determining the age of the earth.^{viii} So he allowed for an old earth in 1995. I’m not critiquing his view in particular here; I’m just dealing in general with the Gap Theory, but I know some of you would want to know what he said and what those closest to him knew about his thinking toward the end of his life.^{ix}

In conclusion, verse 2 begins with *waw* + the noun and this is a disjunctive *waw*. How you translate the *waw* is really up to the interpreter. It could be “and,” “but” or “now.” It really makes no difference because it is not an independent clause and the verb cannot be translated “became” as held by supporters of the Gap theory.

That’s the grammar, let’s look at the vocabulary. Gap theorists say the vocabulary describes an earth that has been judged and is in a chaotic state. They base this on vocabulary usage in other passages^x like Jer 4:23; Isa 34:11 and Isa 45:18. The verse reads, “And the earth was without form and void.” Let’s deal with the vocabulary, “without form and void.” Remember, this is describing the state of the earth in v 1 and 2, not a state of the earth that has changed from v 1 to v 2. The earth in verse 1 and the earth in verse 2 are in the same state. Now there are two words, “without form” or “formless” “and void,” *tohu wabohu* that Gap adherent’s say describe the chaotic state of the earth after the judgment. Tsumara gives the most comprehensive discussion of the phrase. “Hebrew *tōhū* is based on a Semitic root **thw* and means “desert.” The term *bōhū* is also a Semitic term based on the root **bhw*, “to be empty.” ...The Hebrew term *bōhū* means (1) “desert,” (2) “a desert-like place,” i.e. “a desolate or empty place” or “an uninhabited place” or (3) “emptiness.” The phrase *tōhū wabōhū* refers to a state of “aridness or unproductiveness” (Jer 4:23) or “desolation” (Isa 34:11) and to a state of “unproductiveness and

emptiness” in Genesis 1:2.”^{xi} The etymological and contextual usage fail to support the view that Gen 1:2 is a chaotic, unorganized universe. What is there is simply an unfinished product. This is evident from the following creation narrative where God finishes His creation work in the six days. Evidence that this is describing chaos is null.

But what about the evidence of Isa 45:18? Let’s turn there. Isa 45:18 is one passage that uses *tohu*. Does Isa 45:18 show that God’s judgment is responsible for the chaotic state of the earth in Gen 1:2? Isa 45:18 says, “For thus says the LORD, who created the heavens (He is the God who formed the earth and made it, He established it *and* did not create [*bara*] it a waste place [*tohu*], *but* formed it to be inhabited [*yatsar*]), “I am the LORD, and there is none else.” “It could be argued from the context that God created the earth to be inhabited,²¹ not to leave it in a desolate *tohu* condition. Rather than contradicting the initial chaos theory, Isaiah 45:18 actually helps clarify the meaning of *tohu* in Genesis 1:2. Since *tohu* is contrasted with *לְיִשְׁבָּתָהּ*, “to inhabit,”²² one should conclude that *tohu* is an antonym of “inhabiting.”²³ The earth, immediately after God’s initial creative act was in a condition that was not habitable for mankind.”²⁴ ^{xii}

Tsumara summarizes, “There is nothing in this passage that would suggest a chaotic state of the earth “which is opposed to and precedes creation.” Thus, the term *tōhū* here too signifies “a desert-like place” and refers to “an uninhabited place.” ...It should be noted that *lō-tōhū* here is a resultative object, referring to the purpose of God’s creative action. In other words, this verse explains that God did not create the earth so that it may stay desert-like, but to be inhabited.”^{xiii} So the vocabulary does not support a judgment, chaos like condition of the earth.

As for Jer 4:23, it simply describes the land of Judah after the judgment of the Babylonian Exile as an unproductive and uninhabited place. No one lived there and the land was unproductive. God didn’t create the land of Judah for that purpose. He created it to be productive and inhabited. But just because the land was *tohu wabohu* after that judgment does not in any way imply that the original creation became *tohu wabohu* because of a judgment. There is no statement in the entire Bible that supports the idea that God judged the world when Satan fell. It states that God judged the world when man fell. All the words mean in Gen 1:2 is that the earth at that time was in an

unproductive and uninhabited state. The earth in Gen 1:2 was unfinished but not chaotic or imperfect in any way.

As for Isa 34:11 it describes the land of Edom in the future Millennial Kingdom. It will be a place that is unproductive and uninhabited. Only two places on the earth in the Millennium will be unproductive and uninhabited, Edom and Babylon. Again, Isa 34:11 in no way implies that because this future state is brought about because of a judgment, that the state described in Gen 1:2 was brought about because of a judgment on the first earth. There is no statement in the entire word of God that supports the idea that God judged the world when Satan fell. The word of God teaches that God judged the world when man fell.

Waltke also rejects the proposal that the occurrence of “formless and void” in Jeremiah 4:23 and Isaiah 34:11 proves that Genesis 1:2 is the result of God’s judgment. Scripture nowhere states that God judged the world when Satan fell.^{xiv}

Alright, we’ve handled “formless and void” now let’s handle the “darkness,” “And the earth was unproductive and uninhabited, and darkness [*hophek*] was over the surface of the deep.” Does darkness symbolize evil in Gen 1:2 so that it must be describing the results of a judgment on the earth? Problem. If darkness is intrinsically evil then every evening of creation week is evil. Obviously that’s not right; evil associated with darkness is a post-Fall association. For as long as Adam and Eve lived on the earth before the Fall they had darkness every evening, but that had no association with evil. God said that the darkness was “very good.” Besides, who created the darkness? Isa 45:7, “The one forming light and creating [*bara*] darkness [*hophek*].” (same word for darkness used in Gen 1:2 and 1:3). Further, Isaiah puts them together and this association shows you that both light and darkness were created on the same day. Darkness first, then light as explained at the end of day one when God said, and there was evening and morning, day one.

In conclusion, “formless and void” do not describe a chaos. They describe an unfinished, uninhabited state. During creation week God would finish it and inhabit it. The “darkness” does not denote or connote evil or judgment in the context of Gen 1-2. It was rather the direct creation of God and was “very

good.” Its denotations and connotations of evil only occur in the post-Fall world.

Lastly, this raises some questions about when the angels were created and when Satan fell. There have been two suggestions. One, they were created before the six days and Satan fell between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. And two, they were created during the six days and Satan fell between Gen 2 and Gen 3. To answer this we turn to what we already said. First, God already said in Exod 20:11, in six days I created the heavens and the earth and the sea and all that is in them. Since God created the heavens and all that is in them in six days the angels dwell in the heavens then the angels were created during the six days of Gen 1. Since God said at the end of creation week that “God saw all that He had made and it was very good,” then Satan fell after creation week (Gen 1:31). This would mean that Satan fell sometime between Gen 2 and Gen 3 (an unknown period of time).

If God created the angels during the six days of creation, what day did He create them on? People have suggested, day one, day two, day four and day five. The Scriptures do not explicitly say. One passage often brought into the discussion is Job 38:7. This is God to Job. Job and his friends have been having a discussion over whether God was righteous in light of Job’s suffering situation and God is about fed up with it at this point. Starting in verse 4 He says, “Where were you [Job] when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell *Me*, if you have understanding, ⁵Who set its measurements? Since you know.” Got says, alright smarty pants, if you know so much, why not answer *Me* these questions. “Or who stretched the line on it [the earth]? ⁶“On what were its bases sunk? Or who laid its cornerstone, ⁷When the morning stars sang together And all the sons of God shouted for joy?” See right there we have a reference to the angels. See the morning stars singing and in parallel the sons of God shouting for joy. Stars are a metaphor for the angels and the Hebrew parallel is the sons of God. Sons of God are the *benei elohim* and always refer to the angels in the OT. So this is the angels singing. The question is when did the angels sing for joy? Answer, verse 4 when God laid the foundation of the earth. So they have to be created before God laid the foundation of the earth. When was that? I’m not sure exactly. I’m sure it refers to Creation, but I’m not exactly sure when during Creation week.

It could refer to either day one or day three. On day one the rocky earth was created in an encasement of water (Gen 1:2). And if that's the case then the angels would have been created in Gen 1:1. On day three the rocky earth was uplifted out of the waters causing massive runoff and erosion causing sedimentation to form on the new ocean basins. If that's the case then the angels would be created before Gen 1:9-10. It's difficult to say either way. Both days deal with the foundation of the earth. And in neither case was Job present. If the angels were made on day one then the reference to "heavens" in Gen 1:1 would refer to their dwelling place. If they were created on the second day then when God separated the waters below from the waters above and called the expanse...heaven, then that too gives credence to the dwelling place of the angels (and the angels themselves) on the second day. Or they could have been created on the third day and placed in the heavenly dwelling created on the second day. In any of these scenarios the angels would be created before the foundation of the earth was laid in one sense or another. In any case the angels were created before man as the question to Job implies. Some Jewish rabbi's said that day one concludes with an ordinal number rather than a cardinal number. Remember I said, first, second, third day and so forth, a counting measure. I held one thing back for this moment. The first day is not a cardinal number; it actually says day one, *yom echad*. Every other day follows the counting measure, second, third, fourth. This oddity in the text led many Jews to think that the reason it's that way is because day one emphasizes God's aloneness, His sole existence. And so they said God could not have created angels until the second day.^{xv} By the evidence the strongest case looks to be the second day but a first or third day creation of the angels also seems plausible. In any case, you can't be dogmatic on the issue other than to say the angels were created somewhere inside the six days of creation week as per Exod 20:11. And notice Gen 2:1, "Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts." Angels are heavenly hosts (cf Neh 9:6; Jer 19:13; Luke 2:13) so again, they had to be created inside creation week. This places the fall of Satan after creation week, sometime between Gen 2 and Gen 3.

Conclusion, The Framework Hypothesis has not proven that Genesis 1 must be taken figuratively. Literary parallels between the days does not prove a non-sequential narrative. It only shows that the Creator's work occurs in an ordered process of creating domains and then filling those domains. They're interpretation of Gen 2:5 also fails to prove a non-sequential narrative since

Gen 1-2 are a familiar ancient near eastern literary style called “doublet” that focuses on a chronological account followed by an account that goes back and amplifies certain details.

The Old Earth Gap Theory fails first, because if there is a pre-Adamic race, dinosaurs and animals dying before Adam’s fall then we have death, evil and suffering in the world before Adam’s sin when the Bible teaches that all death, evil and suffering came in the world after Adam’s sin. Second, it also fails to meet the criteria of Exod 20:11 which says that all that God created was created in the span of the six days of Genesis. Since that includes angels, angels could not have been created before the first day of creation. Third, day one cannot begin in verse 3 because evening preceded morning, meaning darkness preceded light. Since both darkness and light were created by God day one must include at least verse 2 and as we’ll show, also verse 1. Fourth, the Gap Theory does not meet the grammatical criteria. The Grammar cannot be translated, “But the earth became...” Nor does the vocabulary “without form and void” describe an imperfect, chaotic state caused by a judgment. Neither does “darkness” denote or connote evil in the pre-Fall world. God made the darkness and the light on day one and God saw all that He made on day one and said it was “good.” Darkness only comes to denote or connote evil after the Fall of man. Finally, there is no statement anywhere in the word of God that states that when Satan fell God judged the world. The Bible states that when man fell God judged the world.

ⁱ http://www.amnh.org/education/resources/rfl/web/essaybooks/earth/p_hutton.html

ⁱⁱ *The Scofield Reference Bible*, note 2 on Gen 1:1, note 3 on Gen 1:2 and note 4 on Gen 1:3.

ⁱⁱⁱ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gap_creationism

^{iv} The Disjunctive Waw can be 1) Parenthetical (Now), e.g. Gen 42:23, 2) Circumstantial (And), e.g. Gen 39:11, 3) Contrastive, (But), e.g. Gen 4:4b-5a), or 4) Introductory, (Now), e.g. Gen 3:1. The four uses of the disjunctive waw will often overlap and are often difficult to discern (Gary D Pratico and Miles Van Pelt, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew*) pp 281-282.

^v Harris, R. Laird, Robert Laird Harris, Gleason Leonard Archer and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999, c1980.

^{vi} Harris, R. Laird, Robert Laird Harris, Gleason Leonard Archer and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. electronic ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999, c1980.

^{vii} Mark F. Rooker, *Part 1: Gen 1:1-3: Creation or Re-Creation?* (Bibliotheca Sacra, 149:595 (July 92), p. 317.)

^{viii} See Robert Thieme, Jr., *Creation, Chaos, & Restoration*, (R.B. Thieme, Jr., Bible Ministries, Houston, TX, 1995), p 39. That’s a very unlikely conclusion considering the chronology of Gen 5 and the genealogy of Gen 11. It seems very apparent that one of the aims of the author of Genesis is to, in fact, do just that.

^{ix} Theologians and pastors change their views over time and this is well-known in the theological community. It can be good or bad. When it's good it's a function of growth over time and humility, willingness to conform to the text.

^x An exegetical error called "illegitimate semantic transfer." You cannot take a meaning of one word from one context and transfer it to another. D. A. Carson covers this kind of mistake in his famous work, *Exegetical Fallacies*.

^{xi} David Toshio Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*, JSOT Supplement Series 83 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 155–56.

^{xii} Dallas Theological Seminary, *Bibliotheca Sacra Volume 149* (Dallas Theological Seminary, 1992; 2002), 149:321. 21. John Peter Lange, "Genesis," in *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 499; Edward J. Young, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2," *Westminster Theological Journal* 23 (1960–61): 154; R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, New Century Bible (Greenwood, SC: Attic, 1975), 110–11; Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled: A Critique of the Gap Theory of Genesis 1:1, 2*, 123–24. This text thus corresponds to the account in Genesis 1, which indicates that God did not leave the earth in this state. Thus John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, 4 vols., trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), 3:418; Delitzsch, "Genesis," 227; and John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 83. Waltke's contention that Isaiah 45:18 refers to the completed creation at the end of the six days does not undermine this view that Isaiah 45:18 is concerned with the purpose of creation. For Waltke's view, see "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3. Part II: The Restitution Theory," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (1975): 144. 22. J. Skinner, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters XL-LXVI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898), 65; and Sailhamer, "Genesis," 24–25. 23. For discussion of the use of antonyms or binary opposites in delimiting and clarifying the meaning of terms in context see John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 460–70; and John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 109–12. 24. Young, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2," 170; s.v. "תהו ובהו," *Encyclopedia Miqra'it*, 8:436.

^{xiii} Mark F. Rooker, *Part 1: Gen 1:1-3: Creation or Re-Creation?* (Bibliotheca Sacra, 149:595 (July 92)), p. 321.

^{xiv} Bruce K. Waltke, *The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1-3; Part II: The Restitution Theory*, (Bibliotheca Sacra, 132:526 (Apr 75) p.143.

^{xv} Midrash Rabbah Genesis 1:3; 3:8.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010