

VOLUME 16

NUMBER 117

**THE
BIBLICAL
ASTRONOMER**

SUMMER 2006



RENEWED ITEMS

The following items have been unavailable for some time and are now available again.

Vital Questions by Philip Stott. (Second edition) Tackles just how flimsy the evidence is for such well-established ideas as the Big Bang, Relativity, and evolution. 155 pages. \$20

Where in the Universe Are We? by Philip Stott. **DVD video.** This is the same video we sold in VHS format some years back, but now reissued in DVD format. \$25

Problems in Astronomy by Philip Stott. VHS video \$15

Foreign orders, please read pricing policies
on the back cover of this issue.

Subscriptions to the *Biblical Astronomer* are \$15 per year (\$25 outside the USA). Membership is \$20 per year, (\$30 outside the USA) and members are allowed a 15% discount on all materials published by the *Biblical Astronomer*. Offerings to make possible additional publishing and research projects are gratefully accepted. Foreign orders please send either cash or cheques drawn on a United States bank. Credit cards are acceptable only on the Internet through PayPal's secure payment service. The product list, including items not listed in this issue, is at <http://www.geocentricity.com/geoshop/index.html>.

Editor: Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D.
4527 Wetzel Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44109
U.S.A.

E-mail address: gbouw@bw.edu
<http://www.geocentricity.com/>

Front Cover: An Atlas V rocket sends the New Horizons satellite aloft. In about a decade, the satellite is expected to reach its destination, Pluto. The detection of two new satellites for Pluto earlier this year and the discovery of many more bodies in the Kuiper Belt beyond Pluto has sparked interest in this dark, frozen, obscure region of the Solar System.

THE BIBLICAL ASTRONOMER

Volume 16, Number 117
SUMMER 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Galileo Was Wrong: A Book Report</i> Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D.	59
<i>Geocentricity: A Case Study in Bibliology</i> Dr. Thomas A. Strouse	61
<i>Gap Theories of Creation</i> Hercules Cemitara & Gerardus D. Bouw	77
<i>Readers' Forum</i>	99

GALILEO WAS WRONG

A CD review by Gerardus D. Bouw, Ph.D.

This is a review of the CD, *Galileo was Wrong: The Scientific, Scriptural, Ecclesiastical and Patristic Evidence for Geocentrism*, Volume 1, “Scientific Evidence,” (Catholic Apologetics International Publishing, Box 278, State Line, PA 17263), by Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D. and Robert J. Bennett, Ph.D. The book, which is a PDF file, runs 1147 pages including a bibliography, 9 appendices, and almost 1400 footnotes. The book contains 12 chapters entitled

1. The Real Galileo and the Truth about Copernicanism
2. Science and its problems
3. Evidence of Geocentrism in the Cosmos
4. Answering Common Objections
5. Albert Einstein and the Interferometers: The Frightening Possibility of a Motionless Earth
6. What Did Michelson-Morley Actually Demonstrate?
7. What is Space?
8. The Physical Cause of Gravity
9. How Old and How Big is the Universe?
10. Mathematical Models of a Geocentric Universe
11. Hidegardian Geocentrism: Aristotelian Cosmology Meets Modern Science
12. Technical and Summary Analysis of Geocentric Cosmology

The book is available only on CD, which contains the book as a PDF file. It may be ordered from www.galileowaswrong.com for \$23 plus \$4 shipping in the USA and \$7 elsewhere. The CD is PC-based only.

I admit it; so far I have only skimmed the book, reading selective portions of it, but I have read enough to know that these two gentlemen have done a stupendous work. I can only allocate two pages for this review, so there is no way I can do it justice. Its honesty, depth, perspectives, and insights have convinced me that I have to print out a hard copy. Sungenis even proposes a new theory for gravity on page 513: “[T]he less dense ether inside the atom will attempt to draw in the denser ether outside the atom.... The vacuum force will continue until equilibrium is reached, but, in fact, equilibrium is never reached...”¹

¹ An aside to the handful of readers who will understand this: If one views the firmament’s temperature (10^{32} K) as black-body radiation, the B-B curve peaks at a wavelength equal to the size of a proton, meaning it is probably the fundamental nuclear particle.

The waters above the firmament are treated in chapter 11 from the perspective of the 11th century mystic, Hildegard von Bingen's six-layer cosmos. Protestants and *sola scriptura* types may blanch at this kind of treatment, but it is based on bringing an Aristotelian perspective to bear on the creation psalm, Psalm 104:1-6. The treatment is nowhere near as far-fetched as some of the canopy theories. The authors apparently prefer Aristotelian philosophy over the modern Platonic philosophy. I would, too, if those were the only two choices. This is the place where plasma physics, water, the creation week, and rotation of the firmament are covered, and it is the chapter most heavily laced with scripture verses.

The last chapter, written by Dr. Bennett, analyzes the various proofs and disproofs of geocentricity. These are described in detail, with all the equations necessary for scientists to understand them, and are subsequently summarized in tables. To do this, the authors have divided them into three sections:

1. Does the Earth Rotate?
2. Does the Earth Revolve Around the Sun?
3. Does the Solar System Move Through Space?

Finally, the appendices are these:

1. Anomalies concerning the speed of light
2. The stars and the speed of light in Genesis 1.
3. The origin of the equation $E = mc^2$
4. Do the 1919 eclipse photographs prove General Relativity?
5. Does Mercury's residual perihelion prove General Relativity?
6. Does the Hafele-Keating experiment prove General Relativity?
7. Do global positioning satellites prove General Relativity?
8. The De Broglie wavelength
9. The personal lives of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Einstein.

The animations on the CD are excellent. They demonstrate the yearly and daily motions of the modified Tychonic model, the seasons, retrograde motion, and parallax in a comparative way. The illustrations are in the form of executable files, which makes it hard to browse them. The authors have done an admirable job all around. For the scientific and historic aspects of geocentricity, this book has no equal. Very highly recommended.

Geocentricity: A Case Study in Bibliology

Dr. Thomas M. Strouse
Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary

Introduction

The Lord Jesus Christ, Savior and Creator, undeniably wrote His words of Scripture, including the first chapter of Genesis (cf. 1:15-16), from a geocentric perspective.¹ This perspective requires the exegete of Scripture to respond in one of several ways. For instance, one response is that of the liberal exegete who rejects the Bible as scientifically erroneous in many instances. Another response is that of the neo-evangelical exegete who, to show his knowledge of and “respect” for secular scholarship of the scientific community, interjects evolutionary-based accommodations into the Bible. An example is Gleason Archer, who has been heavily influenced by evolution, and posits the unbiblical theological presupposition of a pre-Adamic race made up of “soul-less” anthropoids.² A third but not final response is that of the fundamentalist exegete who, if consistent with historic fundamentalism, rejects selectively any perspective that has not been accepted by the fathers of fundamentalism. The predominate approach among Fundamentalists is to insist that all geocentric expressions must be understood phenomenologically, or from the vantage point of the observer.

A recent example of this latter response has surfaced with its obvious predicable outcome. The fundamentalist Hebrew scholar, par excellence, Dr. Robert McCabe, registrar and professor of Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, has honored this writer with “A Critique of Dr. Thomas M. Strouse’s ‘The Geocentric Cosmology of Genesis 1:1-19.’” This critique appeared on <www.sharperiron.org> on June 26,

¹Geocentric expressions such as “*the sun went down*” (Gen. 15:17), “*the sun stood still, and the moon stayed*” (Josh. 10:13), and “*at the rising of the sun*” (Mk. 16:2), permeate the Old and New Testaments. Commentator Mathews observes this truth, stating “The six days of creation (vv. 3-31) are told from the perspective of one who is standing on the earth’s surface observing the universe with the naked eye. The account is geocentric in its telling.” Kenneth Mathews, *The New American Commentary: Genesis 1-11:26* (Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman Publ., 1996), p. 144. One must ask this Beeson Divinity School professor whose perspective it was, since neither Adam nor Moses was standing on the earth’s surface through the first five days of creation!

²Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994), pp. 210, 212.

2006,³ culminating an orchestrated attack upon *Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary*.⁴ In general, Dr. McCabe has the unenviable task of proving that just because God declares that the Bible perspective is geocentric, He does not really mean that it is geocentric, since the scientific world has verified that the earth both rotates around its axis and revolves around the sun. Specifically, the good doctor rejects this author's aforementioned essay with four criticisms. This paper is a biblical response to Dr. McCabe's criticisms, attempting to demonstrate Scripturally that the earth is the fixed point around which the heavens revolve, that there is no biblical defense (for lack of verses) of heliocentricity, and that fundamentalism⁵ is not biblical since it has a weak bibliology. In addition, this author offers a summary of the salient points in defense of biblical geocentricity.

Responses to Criticisms

General Comments

Dr. McCabe rightly observes that the discussion on biblical cosmology is actually a case study in bibliology. After all, one's commentary on the Bible is at the same time one's commentary on his own bibliology, including one's text/translation, hermeneutic, and employment of *analogia Scripturae*, or the comparison of Scripture with Scripture. First, Professor McCabe correctly sees this author as one who defends

³Presumably the critique and all blog statements may still be viewed on the site.

⁴This author has privy information as to the pastor in Massachusetts who initiated these attacks, and his self-proclaimed motive for such an attack upon a ministry of one of the Lord's assemblies. The blog site, employing the Nicolaitane tactics of ridicule and fear, attempted to mock this writer with name-calling (village idiot) and slander (Strouse lied). David declared, "*The proud have had me greatly in derision: yet have I not declined from thy law*" (Ps. 119:51).

The blog site has piqued international interest, at least in Europe, in the exegesis Gen. 1 (praise the Lord!), and has raised up defenders for this Christ-honoring interpretation of Scripture as well as for *EBTS*. (cf. Phil. 1:14).

⁵Fundamentalism is a historical, transdenominational, and American movement arising from the 1920's to combat modernism in American Christianity. It has embraced so-called fundamental, cardinal doctrines as essential for defense. Although Dr. Beale assures that fundamentalists "attempt to unite around 'the whole counsel of God,'" David Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850* (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1986) p. 7, the movement is doomed for failure since it is a man-made, extra-biblical movement, over and above the Lord's only New Testament movement—that of His local Baptist assemblies.

It should be observed that fundamentalism, always one step to the right of neo-evangelicalism, evinces "a friendly attitude toward science" (cf. Beale, p. 266), as per some of the bloggers on the aforementioned fundamentalist web site, promoting scientific notions over the Bible.

the translation of the KJV and maintains that it is “the only acceptable translation” (p. 3).⁶ To the Detroit registrar’s credit he does not broad brush this author as a Ruckmanite, but it does seem that his attack upon geocentricity serves as an oblique attack upon the KJV. Second, Dr. McCabe recognizes that the paper in question taught that “special revelation takes precedence over so-called scientific truth” (p. 2).⁷ Hence, this author did not discuss such things as the center of gravity, weather satellites, stellar parallax, Foucault pendulum, etc. This author dealt with special revelation! This leads to the third consideration, the employment of *analogia Scripturae*. Dr. McCabe diagnosed this present author with the condition of “myopia,” or shortsightedness. This means that the paper did not list human authorities as sources for verifiable insights,⁸ but merely looked within the Scripture itself for interpretation, i.e. *analogia Scripturae*. But this Doctor would like to offer a counter diagnosis to his critic. Dr. McCabe is suffering from the condition of “hyperopia” or long-sightedness. For linguistic and interpretative “verification of truth,” he looks far beyond the Bible to extrabiblical authorities, such as DeYoung, Brown, Driver, Briggs, Waltke, O’Conner, Faulkner, Rooker, *et al.*, i.e., and consequently employs the *analogia fidei* (the comparison of one’s presuppositions with Scripture).⁹ The Apostle Paul instructed Timothy to “study to shew thyself approved unto God” (II Tim. 2:15), and that the Scripture alone would make the man of God “perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (II Tim. 3:16-17). From which of these two conditions was Paul suffering?¹⁰

Additionally, Dr. McCabe offers some strange statements in his introduction, such as the notion that “scientifically verifiable realities” give “some form of truth, though not on the same level of truth...there

⁶Of course Dr. McCabe does not fail to condemn this writer because “his paper is slavishly tied to the KJV” (p. 2). In response, this writer embraces the Authorized Version because of the superiority of its underlying texts, and because the modern versions cannot improve upon it.

⁷Although Professor McCabe concedes this truth, he apparently does not believe it since he constantly appeals to science for his arguments against geocentricity and for heliocentricity. For instance, he appeals to “telescopes” (p. 2), “time-lapse photographs of the earth” (p. 2), “our weatherman” (p. 7), etc.

⁸The Detroit professor encourages interaction “with someone who has done genuine exegetical work on Genesis 1 and whose work has received some level of recognition by his peers” (p. 8). This academic requirement for peer approval is in direct opposition to the believer’s divine requirement to seek God’s approval (II Tim. 2:15).

⁹The fundamental flaw of many fundamentalist Bible colleges and theological seminaries is that they train men to study to show themselves approved unto “fundamental scholarship.”

¹⁰Paul’s use of human authorities was very sparse and always secondary (cf. Acts 17:28).

is truth in the physical world” (p. 2).¹¹ It would be interesting to see Dr. McCabe’s exegetical interpretation of God’s query to Job: “*Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?*” (Job 38:33). Furthermore, the good professor McCabe is guilty of *petitio principii*; he assumes what he needs to prove. He assumes both heliocentricity (p. 2),¹² and a rotating earth, stating for the latter that “the Earth was rotating on its axis” during the first three days of creation (p. 7). How does he know the earth was rotating when the only verb of relative motion during the first three days of creation was the Spirit of God moving “upon the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:2-13)? What verse in the whole Bible describes the earth’s rotation on its axis?¹³

Specific Arguments

I. The Paper is Methodologically Flawed

Dr. McCabe condemns the author’s work because it is “methodologically flawed” (p. 2). By this he means that the paper does not quote Old Testament exegetes and Hebrew grammarians as “sources.” However, this author was not interested in what these limited “authorities” had to say since his professed purpose was to give a “Biblical demonstration of geocentricity” that “should challenge Christians to return to the authority of the Bible in all areas including cosmology.” Instead of using abundant quotes from penultimate authorities as Professor McCabe has done (thirteen different “scholarly” works but only four different Bible passages), this author employed over fifty footnotes, referencing supporting passages, and exercising Hebrew exegesis.

The Detroit professor then excoriates this author’s handling of two Hebrew words, thus only briefly engaging in any meaningful exegetical discussion. This disappointment in valuable engagement with one of fundamentalism’s best Hebraists is the result of his contrived “problems.” For example, Dr. McCabe’s first criticism focuses on the translation of the word *raqia* as “firmament.” The DBTS professor rebukes the author of the paper at hand for not considering “current

¹¹The Lord Jesus Christ said “*Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth*” (Jn. 17:17).

¹²Since there was no sun on the first three days, what was the earth revolving around? And was the earth put in the heavens along with the sun, moon, and stars on Day Four? Where does the Bible even hint at these assumptions espoused by Dr. McCabe?

¹³Certainly an appeal to the cryptic reference in Job 38:13-14 would not be attempted, to prove that the earth is rotating on its axis and spinning around the sun on its supposed yearly voyage?

lexical” sources which translate the word as “expanse.” However, he does state that the translation “firmament” is “possible” (p. 3). He tries to make the translation of this word a KJV issue, which issue is really part of the bigger reason for the critique.¹⁴ To demonstrate the nature of this factitive criticism from Detroit’s scholar, all one needs to realize is that the word “firmament” occurs in a variety of translations. The Vulgate originated the reading so it is not new. The Geneva Bible (1599) employed the reading so it is not exclusively KJV. The Douay-Rheims (1899) rendered the word “firmament” so it is not exclusively Protestant sectarian. The Jewish Publication Society translation (1917) used it so it is not exclusively anti-Semitic. Twentieth century translations, such as the 1901 ASV, the 1982 NKJV, and even the liberal 1952 RSV, translated the Hebrew word as “firmament,” and so the translation is not outdated. In conclusion, the word “firmament” has a long history of acceptance up to the present through diverse theological perspectives, but more importantly, it has been received by the Lord’s assemblies as a valid rendering. This author stayed with the KJV rendering of “firmament,” not because of some alleged need to defend “inspired KJV” words, but because “it is a good translation.”

Dr. McCabe’s second criticism revolves around the dual ending on the Hebrew word *hashshamayim* (heaven[s]). This criticism is even more disappointing. He denies that the dual ending on nouns represents any semantical meaning for the word. Of course most dual endings occur on words like “eyes,” “hands,” “feet,” etc., where a pair of objects are included. In these cases the dual use, rather than the plural, is obvious and contributes to the semantics of the word. The Detroit Hebraist continues, calling this author’s effort to notice the distinction between the plural ending and dual ending on nouns as “absurd.” Most theologians recognize, for instance, the plural ending on the third word of the Hebrew Old Testament (OT), *’elohim* (God), allows for what develops later into the doctrine of the triune Godhead. In reading Gen. 1:1, the Hebrew reader would not only have noticed the plural ending for God, but also the dual ending for heaven. If words have meaning, and if it is legitimate to find couched in *’elohim* the triune doctrine, why not allow Scripture to refer to the heavens as the two physical heavens, including the atmosphere and stellar space, since this is exactly what the context of Gen. 1 does state (Gen. 1:15, 20), and since Paul adds that there are three heavens (II Cor. 12:1-3)? Furthermore,

¹⁴At least four times Dr. McCabe derides this author’s use of the KJV, stating that the paper “is slavishly tied to the KJV” (p. 2), that it cites the Vulgate and LXX use of firmament “to support the KJV” (p. 3), that “the KJV is the only acceptable translation” (p. 3), and that methodologically, “even for someone who is King James Only,” interaction with other sources is required (p. 3).

the good doctor remonstrates Strouse's "nonsense" by introducing two additional words into the fray. He acknowledges that the Hebrew "water" (*mayim*) is a dual, cynically asking, "are we to understand that there are two waters?" As a matter of fact, there is the earth water (Gen. 1:7) and the water above the heavens (Ps. 148:4). The second word he throws into the mix is the dual word Jerusalem, suggesting, "Does Jerusalem have two levels." Surely the scholar from Detroit has not forgotten the biblical teaching that there is the heavenly Jerusalem as well as the earthly city (cf. Heb. 12:22; Rev. 21:2, et al). Another interesting dual noun, which Dr. McCabe does not mention, is *Mizraim*, the Hebrew word usually translated Egypt. The Lord God chose the man *Mizraim* (dual ending) to settle eventually in Egypt, the land of "two straits." How did that happen?

Because Dr. McCabe pays lip service to the Scriptures by not allowing the Lord to speak except through scholars, his critique is superficial, contrived, and exegetically flawed. His approach is fallacious because his bibliology is weak.

II. The Paper Employs a Straw Man argument

This second criticism, a historical one, is so convoluted it is baffling to know how to respond. The seminary professor's lengthy lecture on the ins and outs of the history and positions of ancient cosmology is specious. This writer attempted to give a simple historical overview, since the paper focuses on biblical exegesis and not on history, observing that Copernicus overturned the prevailing Christian view of geocentricity with his philosophical assumptions stemming from pagan philosophers. Theologian McCabe levels two charges against the paper, namely improper documentation and a straw man setup. For instance, he asks who these early Christians were. The writer thought that it was unnecessary to document the obvious truth that since the Bible was written from a geocentric perspective, and since the telescope was not invented until *circa* 1608, that all Bible believing Christians would hold to a basic geocentric understanding. Certainly James, who wrote to the scattered Jews (Jam. 1:1), asserted astronomical terms such as *planasthe*, (wandering like a planet), *photon* (lights), *parallage* (parallax), and *tropes* (tropic) from a geocentric perspective (Jam. 1:16-17).¹⁵ Those who suffer from *hyperopia* seem to be biblically challenged at this point.

¹⁵The Bible teaches that believers, having the indwelling Author of Scripture with the words of God and in the Lord's assemblies, have the potential of knowing absolutely (*oida*) all revelatory truth (I Jn. 2:20, 27; cf. also II Tim. 3:16-17), including cosmogony and cosmology.

The Detroit doctor is absolutely wrong in his second charge. He states, “Strouse’s straw man clouds the issue for he pits the geocentrism of ‘early Christians,’ (*sic*) religious faith, against Copernicus’s Greek philosophically based heliocentrism, pagan science. The truth is that the issue in Copernicus’s day was science versus science, rather than Strouse’s prejudicial religious faith versus pagan science” (p. 4). A straw man argument would be the construction of something patently false and then the destruction of it. This author erected no straw man. At the risk of being perceived as healed of his *myopia*, this writer will, with great disdain, cite several secondary authorities to show both the premiere influence of and religious presuppositions from Copernicus. For instance, the eminent astronomical scholar, George Abell declares the influence of Copernicus, stating:

Copernicus’ great contribution to science was a critical reappraisal of the existing theories of cosmology and the development of a new model of the solar system. His unorthodox idea that the sun, not the earth, is the center of the solar system had become known by 1530, chiefly through an early manuscript circulated by him and his friends.¹⁶

Copernicus’ appeal to the deity of the sun was certainly not, as Dr. McCabe attempts to argue, “science versus science.” The Roman Catholic Canon from Poland wrote:

In this most beautiful temple of God how could the sun be given a better place to illuminate the whole all at once? Rightly he is called the Lamp, Soul and Ruler of the Universe. Hermes Trismegistus calls him the Visible God while Sophocles’s Electra calls him the All-seeing One. Let us place it upon a royal throne, let it truly guide the circling family of planets, earth included. Such a picture--so simple, clear and beautiful.¹⁷

Professor McCabe’s contrived and consequently fallacious assertions only pave the way for the further deterioration of his critique.

III. The Paper Begg the Question

Dr. McCabe condemns this writer’s assumption that Gen. 1:1-19 teaches geocentrism. The assumption comes from the fact that the account is written from a geocentric perspective by God who is outside

¹⁶ George O. Abell, *Exploration of the Universe* (NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), p. 37.

¹⁷Nicholas Copernicus. *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, Book I (n.p.: N.P., 1542), chapter 10, folio 9v.

of His creation, and knows what is absolute and what moves relative to the absolute. Manifesting his *hyperopia* once again, the good professor cites Dr. Danny Faulkner, stating the outlandish claim that “the truth is that there is no biblical text that explicitly affirms either geocentricism or heliocentricism, nor can a synthesis of clear texts be used to support either model” (p. 4). The reader is encouraged to read footnote 1 again for just a few of the many biblical sources for the geocentric perspective of Scripture. In addition, the reader may want to check the sixty-seven times the Bible teaches that the sun rises, goes down, etc. (from Gen. 15:12 to Jam. 1:11), and the two exceptional cases when the sun stopped (Josh. 10:12-13) or went backwards (Isa. 38:7-8). Perhaps the Hebrew professor from Detroit would like to exegete Habakkuk’s analysis of Joshua 10:12-13. The prophet stated, “*The sun and moon stood still in their habitation...*” (Hab. 3:11). The exegete will notice in Habakkuk’s text that the conjunction “*and*” is not in the Hebrew text, and the verb “stood” is third masculine singular, lumping the sun and moon together in their respective “standing.” All concede that the moon is geocentric, and if, according to this verse, it stood still along with the sun, then this verse teaches geocentricity.

It is a shame that hyperopics must go to such lengths to deny Scripture. In addition to Professor McCabe’s previous denials, he struggles to express the apparent geocentricity of Gen. 1 by stating, “this indicates that the Earth is not heliocentric...” (p. 5). He cannot even say that the description of the creation in Gen. 1:1-19 was from geocentric perspective. Furthermore, the seminary professor attempts to argue for a theological and redemptive geocentricity while denying a physical geocentricity. The humanist Burgess stated, “The story of Christianity tells about a plan of salvation centered upon a particular people and a particular man. As long as someone is thinking in terms of a geocentric universe and an earth-deity, the story has a certain plausibility.”¹⁸ Furthermore, the reader should realize that philosophically, but not biblically, heliocentricity is the rationalistic bridge from biblical geocentricity to atheistic a-centricity.¹⁹

IV. The Paper is Myopic

Dr. McCabe has already used this criticism that the paper lacks sufficient documentation, and hence it is myopic. Actually, his four criticisms are really only three. But since he does introduce new attacks upon the text of Scripture because of his predictable interaction

¹⁸A. J. Burgess, *Christian Century*, December 1976: 1100.

¹⁹Carl Sagan has eliminated all significance for the earth in his recent work *The Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space* (NY: Ballantine Books, 1997), 384 pp.

with scholarly, albeit secondary, authorities, including Waltke and Rooker, his criticism will be analyzed. First, Dr. McCabe demonstrates his thorough infection of *hyperopia* by listing numerous articles that have appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* journal, of which articles this author is aware. Second, the professor suggests that this author holds to a poetic and therefore figurative interpretation of Gen. 1., since he refers to a series of three couplets in the narrative (p. 6). The Detroit theologian's attempt to identify this writer, who obviously takes the Gen. 1 account literally, with the liberal figurative hermeneutic, is not only unconscionable but also contrived.

The critique raises two exegetical issues that must be answered biblically. The Hebraist from Detroit makes an unbiblical assumption. He assumes that Gen. 1:1 records the creation of the heavens during Day One. Instead, Gen. 1:1 is the title of Moses' literary *inclusio* culminating with Gen. 2:1-3.²⁰ There are several irrefragable arguments for this assertion. 1) The expression "heaven and the earth" consistently refers to a completed entity (Gen. 2:1, 4; 14:19, 22; Mt. 24:35; *et al*). 2) Since Gen. 1:2-19 describes an incomplete entity, the two cannot exist contemporaneously and thus verse one is the title. 3) This argument is clinched by the fact that the conjunction in verse two is a disjunctive *waw*.²¹ In other words, since the conjunction "and" is attached to the noun "earth," and not to the next verb, verse two is non-sequential to verse one. Moses absolutely did not describe the activity of verse two as following that of verse one. The activity of verse two was the beginning of God's creation during the creation week, and started the creative events of Day One. 4) The verb "created" (*bara*) always refers to a completed product. Consequently, the heavens were not created until Day Two, coming from the division of the earth waters (Gen. 1:6-8; cf. 2:4).

The second exegetical issue that needs biblical clarity is Dr. McCabe's confusion concerning Gen. 1:2. He rejects the biblical teaching that the Spirit of God was the light source until the sun, moon, and stars were created on Day Four. He questions whether verse two is even referring to the Spirit of God, even though most English translations render it thus.²² He fails to see how Ps. 104:2 is connected with Gen. 1:3 (p. 7). Of course the connection becomes obvious as one practices *myopia* and examines the context of this great creation psalm.

²⁰Gen. 1:1 is the title and verse 2:1 is the summary of Moses' *inclusio*.

²¹"The disjunctive *Waw* is *prefixed to a non-verbal form* and is **non-sequential** (bold mine), that is, it introduces some kind of a break or interruption in the narrative." Gary D. Pratico and Miles V. Van Pelt, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), p. 281. *Vide* also Gen. 3:1 and 4:5.

²²Even the new "darling" of fundamentalism, the *ESV*, translates *ruach 'elohim* as Spirit of God.

The psalmist acknowledged the blessed LORD as the One Who created the heavens and earth (vv. 1-9), Who prepared the earth for habitation (vv. 10-23), Who rules over His creation (vv. 24-32), and consequently Who is worthy of praise (vv. 33-35). During the Lord's initial creation, Ps. 104:2 states that He clothed Himself with light.²³ That He did this on Day One is confirmed by the fact that Ps. 84:11 metaphorically states that "*the LORD God is a sun,*" and Rev. 21:23 states concerning the New Jerusalem: "*And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.*" However, the good doctor from Detroit manifests his eisegesis by declaring that "the Earth was rotating" and that these texts do not teach "that light emanated from the Spirit." Again, it must be stressed that neither Gen. 1 nor any other text in Scripture teaches that the earth rotates on its axis.²⁴ The only movement on Day One was the Spirit of God moving (as a light source according to Ps. 104:2) on the face of the waters of the earth.

Finally, Dr. McCabe gets to his real argument against the apparent geocentric passages of Scripture, including Josh. 10:12²⁵ and Eccl. 1:5-7. He claims these passages must be explained because the writers used "phenomenological language," or expressions from their vantage point. Apparently, the best example that the hyperopic perspective can claim is the "weatherman." Professor McCabe goes on to explain that just because the Bible gives a geocentric perspective, that planetariums are geocentric, and that God's theological purposes are geocentric, one cannot claim that the earth is physically geocentric.²⁶ He then contradicts himself by asserting "that the passages used by Strouse are not explicitly describing either a geocentric or heliocentric nature of the universe." If the passages are not describing geocentricity, why is it necessary to use the phenomenological hermeneutic?

²³Psalm 104:2 also declares that the Lord stretched out the heavens when He created them during the creation week (cf. Isa. 42:5). Is the Hebrew professor from Detroit attempting to deny that Psalm 104 is teaching that the LORD covered Himself with light during the creation week?

²⁴It should be noted as well, that no Bible verse ever puts the earth *in* the heavens (as are the sun, moon, and stars [Gen. 1:14-19]), and therefore the earth could *not* possibly revolve around the sun every 365 days since it is *not* in the heavens *with* the sun. Furthermore, since the earth is not in the firmament (heavens), it is not wandering around, and consequently it is not a "planet."

²⁵Of course v. 13 is the divine commentary on what happened that day--the sun and moon stood still! When will man allow the Lord God to speak?

²⁶Maybe God's declaration of geocentricity confirmed by man's experience of geocentricity occurs because the earth actually is the immobile center of the cosmos. Maybe it does not feel like the earth is moving because in actuality it is not moving! Maybe the emperor wasn't wearing clothes after all.

Dr. McCabe, professor and theologian from Detroit, has a conundrum. Should he critique the paper and thus honor a discussion of it, or ignore the paper. He opts to give his hyperopic notions. He then asks for interaction with someone who has academic credentials, such as Dr. John Whitcomb, to discuss Gen. 1. He suggests, “Better yet, why not get a young Earth creationist with academic credentials to provide an academic defense of heliocentrism?” But here is even a better suggestion, even a challenge, to Dr. McCabe and all hyperopic fundamentalists: pick your very best exegete and present the *biblical* defense for heliocentricity. Examine the Greek and Hebrew of every verse in the Bible teaching heliocentricity and present the evidences. Better yet, why not replace your *hyperopia* with *myopia* and get serious with the biblical text?

Conclusion of Response

In short, the critique of Dr. Robert V. McCabe, registrar and professor of Old Testament at Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, is an example of how not to write an exegetical critique, especially when he denies the grammatical context of the central creation passage of Scripture along with numerous supporting passages, and flees to man’s wisdom as the presiding authority on the Bible. His contrived arguments loom over the critique. Hebraist McCabe does not really engage in exegetical discussion, but instead denies any legitimacy for the paper because of the lack of documentation. He does not attempt to give explanatory exegesis on the points of contention but merely offers a superficial summary. His “critique” is symptomatic of the bigger issue of bibliology. Fundamentalism, by its very nature of selectivism, takes a weak position on Scripture and denies or rejects any biblical teaching not found within the history of the movement.²⁷ Nonetheless, the geocentric interpretation of Gen. 1:1-19 will not be contained by the “green withs” (cf. Judg. 16:7-9) of the *hyperopia* of pseudo-science, rationalism, and empiricism.

A Review of Biblical Geocentricity

The following outline lists the salient points of Scripture which teach physical geocentricity of the earth as the immobile center of the heavens:

²⁷Apparently, “fundamentalist scholars” must treat the biblical geocentric framework of the cosmos as a non-essential, and ignore the early “voices” in “proto-fundamentalism,” such as Luther, Calvin, M. Henry, Poole, Owen, etc.

- I. The Bible teaches consistently a geocentric frame of reference (the earth is the absolute fixed point around which all else turns)
 - A. The Creation account teaches geocentricity exclusively (Gen. 1:1-19)
 1. The earth was created first on Day One and the heavens (dual) were created from the earth on Day Two (Gen. 1:2-6).
 2. The earth was completely distinct from the heavens and never placed in the heavens to revolve around the sun (Gen. 1:14 ff.).
 3. The Spirit of God (according to Ps. 104:2 clothed with light during the creation week) was the moving source of light around the stationary earth for Days One, Two, and Three.
 - B. The biblically recorded structure of the universe is geocentric.
 1. The spherical earth (Isa. 40:22) was separated from the waters by the firmament (=heavens).²⁸
 2. The created heavens and earth contained the earth, the first heaven (face of the firmament), the second heaven, and the outer layer of water or a crystal sea (Ps. 148:4; Rev. 4:6).
 - C. The movements are geocentric.
 1. The earth is stationary (Ps. 93:1, I Chron. 16:30).
 2. The sun, as a light bearer for the earth, has a circuit (Ps. 19:6; Eccl. 1:5).
 3. The heaven has a circuit (Job 22:14).
 4. The stars have their courses (Judg. 5:20).
 - D. The Bible phraseology is geocentric.
 1. Sixty-seven times the Bible expresses that the sun rises, goes down, etc. (Gen. 15:12 to Jam. 1:11).
 2. The Bible teaches in two exceptional cases that the sun stopped or went backwards (Josh. 10:12-13; Isa. 38:7-8).
 - E. The Bible analogies are geocentric.
 1. The earth hangs on nothing--it is not moving, it is hanging (Job 26:7).
 2. The earth has a place (Isa. 13:13).
 3. The earth is at rest as God's footstool (Isa. 66:1).

²⁸Although Isaiah refers to "*the four corners of the earth*" (Isa. 11:12), he obviously means the four directions from Jerusalem, as the context dictates (cf. v. 11; Rev. 7:1). The word *canaph* could be translated wings, edges, etc. The Hebrew word refers to "extremities." On birds these would be wings, and on geographical settings these would be edges, boundaries, or even corners. The Bible does not teach a flat earth since it clearly teaches that the earth is a sphere.

F. Earth and Heaven are two distinct worlds (Heb. 11:3)

1. They are distinguished (“*heaven and earth*”) over 100 times from Gen. 1:1 to Rev. 21:1
2. They have their own respective ordinances or laws (Job 38:33; I Cor. 15:40-41).

G. Alleged heliocentric Scriptures

1. Isa. 24:1--the earth will be turned upside down (this deals with the Tribulation judgment by the massive, worldwide earthquake activity, and not with a daily rotation on its axis).
2. Job 38:14--the earth will be turned in judgment (again, as its context dictates this predicts God’s judgment on earth and certainly does not teach a rotation on its axis).

II. Science can only teach relative motion.

A. Observationally, man has only three options.

1. The earth moves relative to the sun and moon.
2. The earth moves relative to the stellar background.
3. The heavens, containing the sun, moon, and stars, move relative to the earth.

B. Scientifically, physics and mathematics can prove either.

1. Sir Fred Hoyle: “We know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance.”²⁹
2. Agnostic Bertrand Russell: “Before Copernicus, people thought that the earth stood still and that the heavens revolved about it once a day. Copernicus taught that ‘really’ the earth revolves once a day, and the daily rotation of sun and stars is only ‘apparent’...But in the modern theory the question between Copernicus and his predecessors is merely one of convenience; all motion is relative, and there is no difference between the two... Astronomy is easier if we take the sun as fixed than if we take the earth...but to say more for Copernicus is to assume absolute motion, which is a fiction. It is a mere convention to take one body as at rest. All such conventions are equally legitimate, though not all are equally convenient.”³⁰

²⁹Hoyle, Sir. Fred, *Astronomy and Cosmology--A Modern Course* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1975), p. 416.

³⁰Bertrand Russell, *The ABC of Relativity* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1958), p. 13.

III. Common Objections to Geocentricity

A. So-called Physical Proofs

1. The Equatorial Bulge

- a. The “spin” of the earth causes the earth to bulge at the equator.
- b. But, the force of the heavens revolving around the earth pulls the equator out.

2. The Geostationary Satellite

- a. The satellite hovers over the same point on the equator because the force of gravity balances out the centrifugal force pushing the satellite away.
- b. But the satellite hovers in one spot because the force of gravity balances out the centrifugal pull of the rotating heavens.

B. The speed of light

1. Objection: “The geocentric alternative leads to a fundamental problem: the nearest night star is Alpha Centauri, 4.3 light years away. If this star actually circles the earth every 24 hours, then its speed must be nearly 10,000 times faster than the speed of light! Such motion is clearly impossible in our physical universe. The earth’s motion is clearly shown by the graceful movement of the sun, moon, and stars through the sky.”³¹

2. Response:

- a. Physical answer: The speed of light (186,000 miles per second.) is measured against the background space of the heavens. The heavens, likened unto a spinning top, moves as a unit. The face of the heavens moves about 1040 m.p.h. relative to the immobile earth at the equator. The embedded sun, moon, stars, galaxies, etc. move relative to each other as a unit around the earth daily.
- b. Scriptural answer: The Lord told Job he did not know the laws of the heavens, and that they could not be superimposed on the earth (Job 38:33).

³¹Donald DeYoung, “Does the Earth Really Move? A Look at Geocentrism,” *Creation* 10 (June-August, 1988): 11.

IV. The History of Geocentrism

A. The historical summary of the demise of Geocentricism

1. Moses: revelationally geocentric.
2. Ancient Greeks: observationally geocentric.
3. Early Christians: biblically geocentric.
4. Medieval RCC: geocentric.
5. Renaissance: Qualified geocentric/observationally heliocentric.
6. Scientific Awakening: observationally heliocentric.
7. Evolution: philosophically and observationally heliocentric.
8. Einstein: philosophically heliocentric.
9. Sagan: philosophically a-centric.

B. Human Responses to the fact of the historical demise of geocentricity.

1. Martin Luther (16th century): “This is what that fellow (Copernicus) does who wishes to turn the whole of astronomy upside down. Even in these that are thrown into disorder I believe the holy Scriptures, for Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and not the earth.”³²
2. John Calvin (16th century): “The heavens revolve daily; immense as is their fabric, and inconceivable the rapidity of their revolutions, we experience no concussion--no disturbance in the harmony of their motion.”³³
3. Matthew Henry (17th century) on Josh. 10:12-13: “Israel’s help came from above the clouds, the sun itself, who by his constant motion serves the whole earth, by halting...”³⁴
4. Matthew Poole (17th century) on Eccl. 1:5: “The sun is in perpetual motion, sometimes arising, and sometimes setting, and then arising again, and so constantly repeating its course in all succeeding days, and years, and ages; and the like he observes concerning the winds and rivers, ver. 6,7.”³⁵

³²Helmut T. Lehmann and Theodore G. Tappert, *Luther's Works Table Talk* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Publ., 1967), pp. 358-359.

³³F. N. Lee, *Calvin on the Sciences* (Foxton, England: Burlingame Press, 1969), p. 41.

³⁴*Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible: Genesis to Joshua*, Vol. I (NY: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), loc. cit.

³⁵Matthew Poole, *A Commentary on the Holy Bible: Psalms-Malachi*, Vol. II (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publ., reprint), p. 279.

5. John Owen (17th century) on Ps. 19: “The visible heavens are thus a revelation of God, the sun bringing by His circlings successive day and night in turn.”³⁶

Summary and Conclusion

The Lord wrote the Bible from a geocentric perspective. Christians may be influenced by secular science and reject this teaching through sophisticated hermeneutics such as poetic expressions or as “phenomenology.” Or Bible believers may allow the Lord God to speak and teach the truth about His creation.

There is a place for biblical seminaries to teach students research procedures and proper documentation. However, when the exegesis of Scripture is subjugated to the wisdom of man, whether through the influence of lexical and grammatical helps or commentaries, the seminary has failed and the seminarian becomes a weak student of Scripture. *EBTS* seminarians are being prepared to study the Scriptures, and are being encouraged to exhibit manly courage in the face of the pseudo-science of the world and of the peer pressure of biblically anemic fundamentalism.

QUOTABLE QUOTES

If we could merit our own salvation, Christ would never have died to provide it.

—George Whitfield

He who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants.

—William Penn

Worry is the darkroom in which negatives are developed.

—Unknown

Moral life belongs to all men. Spiritual life belongs only to those who are born from above.

—George Whitefield

³⁶John Owen, *Biblical Theology: The Nature, Origin, Development, and Study of Theological Truth* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publ., 1994 reprint of 1661 edition), p. 38.

THE GAP THEORIES OF CREATION

Hercules B. Cemitara and Gerardus D. Bouw

Introduction

We all know of the debate between creationists and evolutionists, and of the legal battle that rages between them. Creationists try to force through legislation requiring the teaching of *both* models and the evolutionists are hell-bent on legislation declaring evolution the *only* model allowed to be presented, taught, and believed. Of course, the creationists' venture was doomed from the start since theirs left no room for compromise. They might have had better success attempting to force the creationist model to be the *only* one allowed by law; at least then there was room for middle-ground compromise, namely the two model approach.

What is not widely recognized among Christians and atheists alike is that besides atheistic evolution, there are in the Christian community three rival theories about the creation. Each believes itself the only true theory, and each believes itself conformed to the Holy Scriptures. The three theories are Theistic Evolution, Special Creation, and the Gap Theory, also called the Ruin-Reconstruction Theory. Each of the three theories has several "flavors" to satisfy those groups that want to blend the authorities of Scripture and science to their own tastes. Theistic evolution denies that the days in Genesis chapter one are literal days. That way theistic evolutionists can fit into the Bible the supposed geologic ages that evolution requires. Special creationists take the days literally but will balk at statements like Joshua 10:13 which says the sun stood still. Most special creationists will reject that as literal. Most advocates of the Gap Theory will take the days of Genesis chapter one as literal, and many will accept the literality of Joshua 10:13, but they will balk about the translation of some words, such as "created" in Genesis one, where they prefer instead a more obscure translation such as "recreated." This paper deals with the Gap Theory, the least renowned of the three among Christians.

What Is the Gap Theory?

Though its adherents will vehemently deny it, in the strictest sense, the Gap Theory is a form of theistic evolution. Whereas most theistic evolutionists insert time for evolution into the Holy Bible by assuming that the six days of creation are six arbitrarily long periods of time, the gap advocates put the time needed for evolution into a pre-

Adamic world before the creation recounted in Genesis chapter one. In both cases, evolutionary time is inserted into the Biblical account with no direct evidence. Thus the Gap Theory is a subtle form of theistic evolution.

There are several forms of Gap Theory. Some insist that there is no gap, others freely admit to a gap, and still others will even accept the notion that the days need not be taken literally in Genesis one. Among the latter was C. I. Scofield, popularizer of the Gap Theory in the early twentieth century.¹ Scofield based his theory on words and phrases extracted from Genesis 1, Jeremiah 4, Isaiah 14, 24, 45, and Ezekiel 28, 35. Building upon Scofield's model, modern gap advocates have added pieces from Genesis 6, II Peter 2, 3, II Corinthians 4, and Matthew 13.

All forms of the Gap Theory believe that an indefinitely long time span exists somewhere in the first two verses of Genesis. There are two major opinions for the location of that period of time. The first opinion places the time *before* the Bible begins, before Genesis 1:1. Advocates of this theory claim that there is no gap, and, in a trivial sense, this is so. The second opinion inserts the time between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. Advocates of this theory believe that Genesis 1:1 speaks of an original earth that existed over an indefinite period of time. Verse 2 is then taken to speak of the destruction of that earth and the rest of the chapter to speak of its reconstruction. This is properly called the Gap Theory because it proposes a gap in the narrative of Scripture between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis. Again, the supposed time period is designed to reconcile the Bible's creation account with the modern theories of geology and biology.

Regardless of where the time interval is placed, the Gap Theory posits that the world that then existed ended with a war between the angels of God and the angels of Satan. The ensuing war supposedly ended when God expelled Satan's angels from heaven, chained them in hell, and then for some inexplicable reason, sent a flood that destroyed the surface of the earth and killed all animals and men who resided in that ideal, sinless world. Many among the gap advocates assign the fossil record to the flood that destroyed that world. Others invoke the evolutionists' Uniformitarian Principle to consign part or all of the fossil record to the eons that the ideal pre-Adamic world existed. Just how death entered into that world is not explained.

¹ Scofield's note to "evening" in Gen. 1:5 says: "The use of 'evening' and 'morning' may be held to limit 'day' to the solar day; but the frequent parabolic use of the natural phenomena may warrant the conclusion that the creative 'day' was a period of time marked off by a beginning and ending." Scofield gave no example of such parabolic usage, and the authors of this paper cannot think of any. Scofield, Rev. C. I., 1917. *The Scofield Reference Bible*, (New York: Oxford University Press).

History of the Theory

Setting the debate of what the Scriptures state aside for the moment, let us look at when and where the various gap theories originated.

The Cabala is a body of mystical teachings of rabbinical origin. Apparently the priests, who were the authority in religious matters did not think much of it. The rabbis emerged as the supreme class of Judaism after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. They accused the priests of sin and blamed their sin for the city's fall. Thus they usurped the priestly office. So a rabbinical origin means after A.D. 70, and in the case of the Cabala that means from the seventh through the eighteenth centuries. The Cabala is largely based on an esoteric interpretation of the Hebrew Old Testament. It is strongly tied to Gnosticism, the first Christian heresy against which speaks the entire book of First John.

Rabbi Lewis Jacobs, while a lecturer in Talmud at Leo Black College, London, had this to say about the *Shemmitot*, the ancient theory of cosmic cycles:

[It] won much support in the early *Kabbalah* but was eventually repudiated. The theory, as it appears in the *Kabbalah*, runs that there are time cycles each lasting six thousand years followed by a thousand year Sabbath. There are seven of these cycles in all culminating in the great Jubilee after 49,000 years have passed. In one version the whole process begins afresh after the Jubilee. Again in some versions the daring view was put forward that each cycle has its own *Torah*. Thus we are now living in the cycle governed by the *Sefirah*² "Judgment" and the *Torah* we now have is one that is adjusted to such a situation. But in the cycle of "Lovingkindness" a different *Torah* prevails containing only positive precepts. It was this idea, in flat contradiction to the dogma (*sic*) of the immutability of the *Torah*, that caused the later Kabbalists to reject the whole doctrine. **But the doctrine was resurrected by more recent post-Darwinian thinkers in a somewhat forlorn attempt at coping with the problems raised for believers by the evolutionary theories and the new picture of the great age of the earth.**³ (*Emphasis added.*)

² The *Sefirot* is the creative powers or potencies in the Godhead.

³ Jacobs, Rabbi Louis, "Jewish Cosmology" in *Ancient Cosmologies*, edited by C. Blacker and M. Loewe, (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.), p. 66. Quote is from pages 79-80. Also see I. Weinstock, 1969. *Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Mysticism* (Heb.) (Jerusalem), pp. 230-241.

In short, the Gap Theory stems from a pre-cabala theory that proposes that the universe is “reincarnated” again and again until it is purified seven times as silver in a refiner’s fire.⁴

The English poet and scholar John Milton (1608-1674), has some elements of the Gap Theory in his epic poem, *Paradise Lost*, which is an account of the fall of man. Though Milton recounts a war in heaven and speaks of the fiery demise of Satan’s angels, he does not relate that to the destruction of a pre-Adamic world, nor does he speak of a flood of water; he puts future events (e.g., Revelation 12) into the past:

Who first seduc’d them to that fowl revolt?
Th’ infernal Serpent; he it was, whose guile
Stir’d up with Envy and Revenge, deceiv’d
The Mother of Mankind, what time his Pride
Had cast him out from Heav’n, with all his Host
Of Rebel Angels, by whose aid aspiring
To set himself in Glory above his Peers,
He trusted to have equal’d the most High,
If he oppos’d; and with ambitious aim
Against the Throne and Monarchy of God
Rais’d impious War in Heav’n and Battel proud
With vain attempt. Him the Almighty Power
Hurl’d headlong flaming from th’ Ethereal Skie
With hideous ruine and combustion down
To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
In Adamantine Chains and penal Fire,
Who durst defie th’ Omnipotent to Arms.⁵

The fall of Satan is future, *tu wit* Revelation 12 was written long after his fall in Luke 10:18.⁶ Gappists, however, associate it with the war of the giants mentioned in both Babylonian and Greek mythology. A pre-Adamic world is also found in the *Midrash*, which is a collection of Jewish commentaries written between the A.D. 400 to 1200.

Despite this historical background, most people still believe that the Gap Theory originated with Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847) in the early 1800s. Indeed, the theory did greatly gain in popularity in the 1830s because of Charles Lyell’s political treatise, *The Principles of Geology*, a book which was a ruse designed to overthrow the crown of

⁴ Reflecting the words in Psalm 12:6-7: The words of the LORD *are* pure words: *as* silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

⁵ Milton, John, 1667. *Paradise Lost*, Book 1, paragraph 2.

⁶ And [Jesus] said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.

England.⁷ Specifically, it was written against William Paley's (1743-1805) arguments, drawn from natural philosophy, in favor of the divine right of kings. Theologians were not prepared to deal with the subtle deception of Lyell's book, and they were certainly not ready to handle any scientific arguments. The result was that the Gap Theory was adopted as the answer to Lyell.

Why were the theologians so incapable of countering Lyell's "science," in particular the Uniformitarian Principle? The reason is found in the Copernican Revolution. In 1542 Nicolaus Copernicus published his book that proposed the earth rotates on its axis once a day and revolves around the sun once a year. Copernicus knew it was a Christian heresy, but the insistence of its advocates that the new theory be accepted or proven wrong—a violation of all rules of evidence—held sway so that by 1650 the scriptural claims that the earth neither revolves nor rotates were relegated to mythology. "The Bible tells us how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go!" was the rallying cry, and one either went along or had no future in either theology or the sciences. Thus it was that a veil was drawn between science and the Bible, and that veil kept theologians in the dark about what the Holy Scripture says about science and natural phenomena. After all, if the Bible cannot be believed in its scientific pronouncements, why learn science if one deals with theology? Thus theologians in the nineteenth century, and even today, could not counter the evolutionary onslaught, built on Lyell's treatise, when it came. It was their capitulation to a humanist science on the matter of the motions of the earth that stripped the theologians of any effective arguments.

Troubled Christians turned to the Gap Theory for their reconciliation with science. After all, how else were they to handle the vast ages required by the Uniformitarian Principle (a principle now known to be totally false even as Lyell knew it was when he wrote his book).⁸ The clear teaching of Scripture is that the universe is only about 6,000 years old. To stretch that into hundreds of thousands, let alone billions of years, required some force-fitting of Scripture. Clearly, the least damaging is to insert it where Scripture is essentially silent.

After 1859, the year Charles Darwin (1809-1882) published his theory of biological evolution, theologians also had to contend with biological evolution. In general, they preferred to ignore it, though when pressed, they could fit evolution into the unspecified eons of the

⁷ To learn more about Lyell's attempt, see Bouw, G. D., 1998. "A Brief Introduction to the History of Evolution," *B.A.* 8(85):9.

⁸ The Uniformitarian Principle is phrased as, "The present is key to the past." This echoes 2 Peter 3:4, "...all things continue as *they were* from the beginning of the creation."

gap. The theory received a big boost with the publication of C. I. Scofield's notes in 1909 and its revision in 1917. The theory has particular appeal to those who are mostly ignorant of science and who feel the Biblical record of origins should be held as authoritative and yet at the same time accommodate science, too.

The Gap Theory and the geologic column

Originally, the Gap Theory only had to account for the geologic column. The geologic column is composed of a hypothetical sequence of rock layers that were allegedly laid down over billions of years. (There are only two areas in earth where the sequence exists, elsewhere, the layers are out of order.) That said, let us examine how the geologic column fits the Gap Theory.

The modern Gap Theory consigns the fossil "record" to the processes going on in the pre-Adamic earth or the result of the war between the angels of God and the rebellious angels of Satan.

The first problem we encounter is that if the fossils were buried in the flood that allegedly destroyed the pre-world, why is there a fossil record at all? If the fossils were deposited during the time the old world existed, then the flood that destroyed that world could not have done much damage. Indeed, it is doubtful that the word formless could have been applied to the resulting earth. On the other hand, if the fossils were deposited during the flood that ended the war, and that war resulted in a formless earth as Genesis 1:2 says, then any fossils in the rocks would have lost their form, too.

The second problem is that the fossil record starts right at the surface of the current earth and extends down hundreds to thousands of feet. So how many feet down did the earth become formless and void? If the surface was formless and void for thousands of feet down, could the fossils have remained in suspension until the earth was reconsolidated when they were embedded in the rocks? The problem with such a theory is that the earth was formless and void until the third day, at least 24 hours during which time turbulence would have to keep rocks in suspension, grinding any animal bodies to mush. If we assume no turbulence, then the rocks would have sunk but the corpses of animals would have risen towards the top. There would not have been any fossils.

The third problem involves evidence for Noah's Flood. We should expect to find two sets of sedimentary layers. A deeper set that resulted from the pre-world's destruction and a secondary, less violent

remnant of the Noachic flood. Yet we see no such fossil record. Nothing in the fossil record shows evidence for two floods. Since Noah's is the only flood unequivocally mentioned in Scripture, it follows that the evidence supports one flood, not two.

Then there is the fourth problem, that some fossils, such as sharks, are identical to the pre-world form and the current world. Why would God recreate some species and not others?

Finally, some who have recognized that the Gap Theory offers no solution to the fossil problem have proposed that God formed the fossils into the rocks to fool the evolutionists. That proposition violates both science and Scripture by virtue of the fact that Scripture teaches that the creation is reasonable because it was performed by a reasonable God (Isaiah 1:18).

Scofield expressed his faith in the Gap Theory to account for the fossil record with these words:

Relegate fossils to the primitive creation, and no conflict of science with the Genesis cosmogony remains.⁹

If this is true, why have evolutionists not discovered it? They persist in insisting that there is a conflict between their molecules to man theory and the accommodation afforded by the Gap Theory. They claim that the layers are of different ages. A layer in the geologic column has its age determined by the kind of fossil found in that layer. A fossil is said to be "older" if it is judged to be simpler or more primitive; less evolved. Thus animals without backbones (invertebrates) are felt to be oldest. Fish are deemed younger, followed by amphibians, reptiles, and finally by mammals as the youngest. This runs full into the face of Scofield's claim. Thus the Gap Theory is inconsistent in that it denounces evolution yet accepts the geologic column and its ages.

If the gap reconciles the Bible with the geologic column, modern geologists do not recognize it. They reject any notion that a worldwide catastrophe formed the rock and fossils making up the geologic column. Such violence violates the Uniformitarian Principle, and that principle is sacrosanct to geology to this very day. If the judgment upon the rebellious angels was responsible for formation of the fossil record, then the geologic column formed rapidly, contrary to the opinion of modern geology.

⁹ The last sentence of the note to Genesis 1:11. In the same note he supposes that animal life only is to be found in the fossil record, but that is not the case; there exist a great many plant fossils, too.

Contrary to the claims of Gap Theory advocates, the ruin-reconstruction theory explains nothing about what we see in the rocks and fossils today. If the earth became formless as Genesis 1:2 says it does, then there could be layers but no fossils in the rocks. For this reason Jack Sofield calls the Gap Theory a “suicidal concept.” By that he means:

Regardless of what tack the Gap Theory sets out on, in regard to the judgmental catastrophe used to punish “Lucifer” prior to or subsequent to the geologic ages, the gap is self-negating. That is, the very concept that spawned it is done away by it. This might be referred to as a “suicidal” concept. In spite of this impasse in logic and the presence of such an imposing dilemma, the Gap Theory is believed to be supported by Scriptural references. This seems contradictory to the very nature and character of the God who says, “...let us reason together...”¹⁰

The Gap Theory and the Fourth Day of Creation

Scofield allows three creative acts. The creation of (1) the heavens and the earth, (2) animal life, and (3) man. The first he relegates to the dateless past and the other two he relegates to the creation of this earth.¹¹ He places the creation of light, the firmament, the sun, moon, and stars, and the plants in the pre-world, rejecting the clear statement of Exodus 20:11¹² that God created everything in the heavens and the earth during the six days of the creation week. His claim is that the destruction was so complete that no light could reach the surface of the earth. Thus it is assumed that the vapor canopy shrouded the earth keeping the light from the sun, moon, and stars from penetrating it until the fourth day. In other words, God neither created nor made anything on the Fourth Day.

However, IIPeter 3:5, which modern gap advocates claim refers to the pre-Adamic world, says the old heavens were destroyed, too, in verse seven. It follows that the sun, moon, and stars must have been destroyed, too, if the Gap Theory is correct. Thus stellar evolution theory (the aging of stars) runs contrary to the Gap Theory for God

¹⁰ Sofield, Jack C. “The Gap theory of Genesis Chapter One: (A Layman’s Critical Appraisal), preface, last paragraph under the heading of “Scientific Dilemmas.” www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=36.

¹¹ Scofield’s note to the word “created” in Genesis 1:1.

¹² Ex. 20:11— For *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*.

must have recreated the astronomical bodies on the fourth day after all. Again we see the suicidal nature of the Gap Theory.

Some Questions That Arise

The Gap Theory invites some questions; ones that call into question God's omniscience and omnipotence.

1. Why would the Creator spend billions upon billions of years developing a physical universe into perfection and then suddenly allow it to be destroyed in a shattering catastrophe, especially if he knew it was coming?

2. Why would God allow such total destruction of the earth, which presumably annihilated all forms of life including pre-Adamic cave(?) men and afterwards restore it and refill with the same basic forms of life? Why did he not preserve them in the first place, as he did in this creation? Was his hand shortened?

3. Related to that, since sin was the downfall of the first creation, why would God allow sin to enter the second creation? Why did he not introduce grace into the first creation?

4. In the absence of any statement from Scripture, we cannot automatically assume that the fossils were formed during a gap or indefinite period. Genesis 1 indicates that plants, animals and man were not created until the third, fifth, and sixth days, not before that.

5. If the sedimentary rocks containing the various fossils of all forms of life in the supposed "first creation" is real, then this witnesses of suffering and death in the past eons of time. Since the wages of sin is death, who sinned early on in the first creation to introduce death into that world? Why did billions of years pass before Lucifer's rebellion precipitated the punishment, and for whom, Lucifer's rebellion, or the anonymous first sinner?

The Gap Theory and the Scriptures

Earlier we mentioned that the Gap Theory drew scriptural support from passages in Genesis 1, 6, Jeremiah 4, Isaiah 14, 24, 45, Ezekiel 28, II Peter 2 and 3, II Corinthians 4, and Matthew 13. Before we tackle each group of passages individually, it behooves us to look at the use of English words that are commonly abused by Gap Theory advocates. Two immediately come to mind: *world* and *replenish*.

The word *world* has changed significantly in meaning in the last 200 years. The primary definition in the Old Oxford English Dictionary of 1933 is "Human existence; a period of this." The second definition is "The earth or a region of it; the universe or a part of it." The third and last group is "The inhabitants of the earth or a section of

them.” The first definition runs four columns, the second three and two-thirds columns, and the third runs eight columns. That was the state of affairs in 1933. Today the first definition is “The earth.” That is because modern dictionaries no longer say what a word means but merely chart the most common usage. Such practice was started in the 1960s when the primary definition was still the order of man on the face of the earth. Now that definition is allocated to last place. Significantly, the first usage of *world* in Scripture is found in I Samuel 2:8,

He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, *and* lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set *them* among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory: for the pillars of the earth *are* the Lord’s, and he hath set the world upon them.

Clearly, the scriptural definition is the order of man on the face, or pillars, of the earth. Although Scripture does broaden the definition to *the order of man in the earth and creation*, it never is a synonym for earth or heaven.

To claim a pre-Adamic world thus implies an earth peopled by men. It would be more correct to speak of a pre-Adamic earth, especially if there were not men on it. The Gap Theory is thus guilty of building a case by twisting the meaning of a scriptural world.

Something similar is done with the verb *replenish* in Genesis 1:28.¹³ The primary meaning in the O.E.D. is, “Fully or abundantly stocked with things or animals...[or] persons.” It adds that this definition was “very common” between 1533-1660, the time when the A. V. was translated. Until the pre-Adamic world advocates started using it to mean “refill” back in the late 1700s, the word *replenish* was rarely a synonym for *refill*. In the case of Genesis 1:28, the backdrop is the environment which the Lord created prior to man, for man. We see an identical usage of the word in Genesis 9:1¹⁴ There, too, the plants had been restored in preparation for the occupants of the ark as attested to by the olive leaf returned by the dove in Genesis 8:11. Because the primary and most ancient of meanings for *replenish* is to fill an environment prepared for its occupants, Gap advocates cannot insist on using it as a proof for the recreation of a pre-Adamic earth.

We shall now look in some detail at the proof texts offered for the Gap Theory.

¹³ And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

¹⁴ And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.

Genesis 1:1

As is usually the case for men with a pet theory that they want to read into Scripture, the reason the pet theory is not *clear* in the Bible is because a text was either incorrectly translated or else corrupted by some scoundrel who replaced all then-extant copies with his corrupt version. For the advocates of the Gap Theory, the claim is applied to the translation of the entire first chapter, especially the first two verses of Genesis 1. Take the first verse, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” for example. Linguist, anthropologist, and Gap advocate Arthur Custance says of this verse, “As it stands, this cannot properly be translated ‘in the beginning.’”¹⁵ To support his claim, Custance claims that the Hebrew pointings were not in the “originals,” even though Jesus said they were.¹⁶ Custance claims the proper translation is “In first” or “To begin with,” but he freely admits that no early translation or authority goes along with his speculation:

But no authority can be given for any change in the present text [i.e., “In the beginning” —*Ed.*] other than the *feeling* that it does not make good sense.¹⁷ [Emphasis mine.]

The bottom line is that the criticism of Genesis 1:1-2 rests on a feeling.

After 26 pages of “could be” and “maybe,” Custance cautiously proposes that Genesis 1:1-2 should be translated:

In a former state God perfected the heavens and the earth. But the earth had become a ruin and a desolation, and the darkness of judgment was upon the face of it.

Throughout his paper Arthur Custance freely admits that support for his opinions is lacking in the past literature. So the proposed error of translation in Genesis 1:1 must be rejected since it not only lacks support but also violates the continuity implied by the Biblical doctrine of preservation of Scripture (Psalm 12:7).⁴

¹⁵ Custance, Arthur C., 1957. “Doorway Papers: Analysis of Genesis 1:1-2,” Paper no. 11, pg. 1.

¹⁶ Matthew 5:18 “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” The Old Testament is indicated by context (“law”), so the jot refers to the least Hebrew letter, *yod*. The tittle is the least accent mark and so refers to the vowel points, that is, to the Old Testament pointing.

¹⁷ Custance, *loc. cit.*, p. 2.

Genesis 1:2—*vau*¹⁸

Most who claim there is evidence for a pre-Adamic world in Scripture make two major points of the *vau* connective that starts verse 2 in the Hebrew. Now *vau* may be either conjunctive or disjunctive; it may mean “and” or it may mean “but.” *Vau* is the sixth letter of the Hebrew alphabet. It occurs about 28,000 times in the Old Testament of which 25,000 times it is used as a connective (and) and 3,000 as a disjunctive (but). It seems about eight times more likely that *vau* is conjunctive than it is disjunctive by sheer chance alone. But the majority of Hebrew scholars consulted for this paper agree that the correct translation is “and,” not “but.” Ditto for all ancient translations except Origen’s *Septuagint*.¹⁹ The LXX’s *de* disjunctive at the start of verse 2 echoes Origen’s preferred pre-world model. He preferred it because it reflected Greek mythology which he deemed superior to Scripture.

Genesis 1:2—Was or Became?

Of course, whether the first word of Genesis 1:2 is and or but is small potatoes compared to the fourth word of the verse: “And the earth was without form, and void.” The preferred reading for most gap advocates is “But the earth *became* without form and void.” They claim that the word, *hayah* in that verse should be translated “became” instead of “was.”²⁰ The problem with that claim is that there is no *hayah* in the Hebrew of verse 2. Even though “was” is not in italics in the A.V., there is nothing there in the Hebrew.

The rule for italics in the A.V. is that words in italics are intended to communicate the sense of the original, although the words themselves are not in the Greek or Hebrew texts. Contrary to modern mythology, the italicized words cannot be ignored or removed without damage to the translation. The translators included them precisely to clarify the meaning in the original, so that there could be no chance of a misunderstanding. This is exactly the opposite of what is taught today, which is that the words in italics may safely be ignored. The first italicized word in the A.V. is the second “was” of verse 2, but the translators deemed the first “was” so nascent to the text that they did not itali-

¹⁸ In this paper we will maintain the A.V. spelling of this letter as found at Psalm 119:41.

¹⁹ Although the *Septuagint* is claimed to be a pre-Christian translation of the Hebrew *Tenach* into Greek, the preponderance of evidence dictates that such a claim is sheer fiction. The LXX is Origen’s sixth column of his *Hexapla*, a parallel Bible. Origen was the author of that version having collated it from several second-century translations of the Hebrew to Greek, which drew from the Greek New Testament where passages overlapped the Hebrew.

²⁰ For instance, see the tract by Arlen L. Chitwood entitled: “Genesis 1:2, ‘And the Earth was...’ or ‘But the Earth Became...’” The Lamp Broadcast, Inc., Norman, OK, p. 4.

cize it. David Lifschultz, once in line to be the high priest, summarizes the debate this way: “If *hayah* were there, it would mean, ‘was.’”²¹

Genesis 1—Created Versus Made

Gap Theory advocates spend a lot of time and paper forcing the Hebrew word *bara* to only mean create out of nothing and to restrict the Hebrew word, *asah* to only mean “make” or “form.” Of course, they are two different words and so cannot have identical meanings. One could point out all the instances where the two words appear interchanged, such as when God says “Let us *make* man in our own image” in Genesis 1:26 and in the next verse it says, “So God *created* man in his own image,” but that is not necessary. If God used the material of the ruined pre-earth to make the present one, then the creation of the heaven and the earth was not a creation but a reformation from existing matter and so should always be used with make, not create. Thus those who place the gap before Genesis 1:1 run into trouble with the use of “create” in the first verse. If they are right, it should read, “made.” Indeed, if the entire first chapter of Genesis describes a recreation or a restoration, why did it not say so? Revelation 10:6²² lumps everything together under the word, “created.” The predominant spirit of the Gap Theory’s advocates is a passion to correct the “errors” in not just the A.V., but all Reformation translations, not to mention the “originals.”

Genesis 1—Sun, Moon, and Stars

Then there is the issue of the sun, moon, and stars. Since these are presumed to exist before the ruin of the pre-Adamic earth, it follows that they were neither created nor made, nor formed on the fourth day (Genesis 1:14-19). The text says that these were made on the fourth day; the word *created* is not applied to them, even as it was not applied to the beasts in verse 25 and man in verse 26.

The claim is that a water canopy or a cloud hid these bodies from the surface of the earth and that God removed that obstruction on the fourth day. Some claim that the firmament of Day Two refers to the recreation of the atmosphere, and that the obscuration was due to the waters above the firmament. Gap advocates who want to continue with a vapor or ice canopy from creation to the flood may claim that the canopy was made transparent or translucent on the fourth day, but the

²¹ Lifschultz, David, 2006. Private communication.

²² And swear by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein.

matter of extinction of starlight passing through the canopy to give light on the earth is not considered. The simple fact is that “God set them in the firmament” (v. 17), not above the firmament. Furthermore, the definition of “made” (*asah*) must now be “corrected” to include “revealed.”

Without Form, and Void

The phrase, “without form, and void” in Genesis 1:2²³ occurs in two other places in Scripture, too. Although Isaiah 24:1²⁴ is sometimes thrown into this mix, the Hebrew *tohuw* and *bohuw* do not occur there and neither does “without form, and void.” Instead, *baqaq* and *balaq* are there translated “empty” and “waste” respectively. The broad context of Isaiah 24:1 is a future event, not a flashback to a pre-Adamic earth. Besides Genesis 1:2, *tohuw* and *bohuw* do occur together in Jeremiah 4:23,²⁵ and Isaiah 34:11.²⁶ Of these two, only Jeremiah 4:23 reads “without form, and void”; the Isaiah passage reads, “confusion” and “emptiness.”

Since all but Genesis 1:2 speak of judgment and destruction, Gap advocates insist that Genesis 1:2 must also be the result of judgment. The problem is that in the greater context, the other verses are future events. Jeremiah 4:23 is closest to Genesis 1:2, and the A.V. 1611 even cross-references the two, but the destruction described in Jeremiah is not the destruction envisioned by Gap advocates. The latter is total, while the former involves a flood, not seen in Jeremiah, and a complete erasure of all cities and lands inhabited by pre-Adamic man. Jeremiah 4:23, like the events in Isaiah 24, refers to a future judgment, *viz.* the events described in Revelation, rather than what happened long ago. The subjects of the judgments are Israel and Edom, not the entire world and certainly not a pre-Adamic race. The judgments spoken of are limited to specific peoples and specific places. Jeremiah speaks of survivors on the land that is “without form and void.” Indeed, the Lord even says, “Yet will I not make a full end” in verse 27. Clearly, these verses have nothing to do with a pre-creation world and to read these back into 1:2 is nonsense.

²³ And the earth was **without form, and void**; and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

²⁴ Behold, the LORD maketh the earth **empty**, and maketh it **waste**, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof.

²⁵ I beheld the earth, and, lo, *it was* **without form, and void**; and the heavens, and they *had* no light.

²⁶ But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of **confusion**, and the stones of **emptiness**.

Gap advocates also extract an argument from Isaiah 45:18.²⁷ Gappists claim that “created it not in vain” refers to the pre-world and that to assume otherwise violates Genesis 1:2. But to do this they must refer to the “original Hebrew” and ignore the word “formed,” which, instead of pointing to Genesis 1:2 points to Genesis 1:9-13; the events of the third day, namely the formation of the dry land and the plants, not the formation of the earth on the first day. The simple fact is that this is a statement of intent. God here tells us that he did not create the earth for no reason (in vain) but created it so the finished product could be inhabited to suit his purposes.

Matthew 13:35²⁸

At issue here is the foundation of the world. Gap advocates claim on the grounds that the Greek is *katabole*, that the correct translation is “casting down of the world” instead of “foundation of the world.” *Katabole* is never translated as cast down, being a noun. It occurs eleven times in the New Testament and in ten of these times it is translated as “foundation.” The exception is found in Hebrews 11:11²⁹ where it is translated “to conceive.” One may argue that Isaac, the fruit of that conception was a foundation of sorts. Just because the verb *ballo* is usually translated as “cast,” does not mean that the noun expresses an action. Consider those who feel “cast down.” We do cast or pour foundations even in modern times. This argument is hardly conclusive, especially when to embrace it we must surrender the inerrancy and preservation of the words of God.

Besides, consider the implications of Luke 11:50-51 if the foundations of the world refer to the destruction of the pre-world. Luke 11:50-51 says, “That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation.” The generation Jesus is referring to is, in this particular case, the generation that saw his miracles and signs and rejected him. If the Gappists are right, then the sins of the pre-Adamic

²⁷ For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I *am* the LORD; and *there is* none else.

²⁸ That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.

²⁹ Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.

world, including the sins of the fallen angels, are required of that generation, too. Clearly, this borders on the ridiculous.

II Corinthians 4:6³⁰

This is a rather subtle argument. To a gap advocate, this means that the light of the sun, moon, and stars was revealed on the fourth day. It also solves a dilemma for those who insist that the light created on the first day had to be God's light, which light is eternal and thus uncreated. The interpretation brought to bear is that just as the sinful pre-Adamic world was engulfed in darkness and the new world came to light, so the Adamic nature of the natural man is confined to darkness until the light of the gospel comes in.

The first problem is that the light God created on the first day is not the same as his light. His light is so bright that it would vaporize us in an instant. Instead, he created a light that was weak enough to avoid that problem. Only a spiritual body can survive in God's unadulterated light. The verse means that the light shining in our hearts is spiritually perceived and, as verse seven notes, kept in an earthen vessel "that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

This item relates to a claim made by a faction of Gap advocates that the darkness of Genesis 1:2 describes an evil, anti-God condition. Nevertheless, God makes darkness (Psalm 104:20³¹) and it, too, is proclaimed good in Genesis 1:31.³² The whole argument boils down to reading something back into the first verses of Genesis that is not there to begin with.

Fallen Angels

Pretty much all we have examined so far involves criticism of the word of God; changing the words of God to read one's own views back into the text. For those who believe in both the inerrancy of Scripture and the preservation thereof by divine interventions, as taught in Psalm 12:7,³³ and those who know what it means to "keep" his words (i.e., to defend and protect them), the critical comments roll off like water on a

³⁰ For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

³¹ Thou makest darkness, and it is night: wherein all the beasts of the forest do creep forth.

³² And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was* very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

³³ Thou shalt keep [thy words], O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

duck's back. For those who do not believe in the preservation of God's words, the critical issues serve only to dull the faith and vex the spirit.

In this section we look at the fallen angels. According to Gap advocates, the fallen angels are those who sided with Lucifer and were thrown out of heaven to earth, destroying it in the process. They are now bound in darkness awaiting their fate at the Great White Throne judgment. This is by far the most interesting section. In it we will draw from Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28 & 35, Genesis 6, and II Peter 2.

Isaiah 14

We start with Isaiah 14:1-27. The chapter begins with a restored Israel taking up a proverb against the king of Babylon:

1 For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob.

2 And the people shall take them, and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the LORD for servants and handmaids: and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors.

3 And it shall come to pass in the day that the LORD shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve.

4 That thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!

It is important to realize that this is not the Babylon of the exile. By the time Israel reentered the land under Darius the Mede, Babylon no longer had a king but was an occupied city. The verses after this contrast a troubled Babylon with a peaceful, serene Israel. It is clear from Nehemiah and Ezra, who led the people and priests back into the Promised Land, that such a condition did not exist in their days. In other words, this awaits a future fulfillment.

The crux of the Gap argument starts at verse 12:

12 How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! *how* art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!

13 For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north:

14 I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.

15 Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

16 They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, *and* consider thee, *saying*, *Is* this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms;

17 *That* made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; *that* opened not the house of his prisoners?

18 All the kings of the nations, *even* all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house.

19 But thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable branch, *and as* the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcase trodden under feet.

The reference has shifted from the king of Babylon to Lucifer, Satan. We have dealt with the Lucifer issue elsewhere and shall not repeat those arguments here.³⁴ Suffice it to say that in verse 12 nearly all modern versions ascribe an attribute of Christ to Satan.³⁵

Having looked at the context and the principle characters, it is clear that Isaiah 14 has no bearing on the fall of Lucifer from heaven. Indeed, in Job 1:s and 2:1 we see that Satan still had free access to heaven, even as he will until his time is short in Revelation 12. There is no support here for a pre-Adamic world nor, it seems, for bound angels, let alone a bound Satan.

Ezekiel 35

Ezekiel 35 is another situation like Isaiah 14. In this case, the king against whom the proverb is taken is Mount Seir, the land of Esau, Idumea. The chapter ends with a passage that is reminiscent of Satan's desire in Isaiah 14:13-15 (see above):

13 Thus with your mouth ye have boasted against me, and have multiplied your words against me: I have heard *them*.

14 Thus saith the Lord GOD; When the whole earth rejoiceth, I will make thee desolate.

15 As thou didst rejoice at the inheritance of the house of Israel, because it was desolate, so will I do unto thee: thou shalt be desolate, O mount Seir, and all Idumea, *even* all of it: and they shall know that I *am* the LORD.

Because of the similarity, Gap advocates believe that this, too, refers to Satan before the destruction of the pre-Adamic earth. Still, the context is Idumea and mount Seir looking to a future fulfillment. That this reflects back to before the creation is a further stretch than Isaiah 14, which, as we saw, is a tremendous stretch to begin with.

³⁴ Bouw, G. D., 2001. "The Morning Stars," *B. A.* 11(97):69-95.

³⁵ Day star refers to Christ in II Peter 1:19 and morning star in Revelation 22:16.

Ezekiel 28

Ezekiel 28, of all the references we've checked so far, is the only one that actually harkens back to the time of creation; but like Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 35, a third party is addressed. This time it is the prince of Tyre:

- 1 The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying,
- 2 Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart *is* lifted up, and thou hast said, *I am* a God, I sit *in* the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou *art* a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God:
- 3 Behold, thou *art* wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee:
- 4 With thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures:
- 5 By thy great wisdom *and* by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches:
- 6 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God;
- 7 Behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness.

Again, there is pride in the prince and the pride reflects back on that of Satan.

In verse 12 the person addressed changes from the prince of Tyrus to the king of Tyrus. This time the allusion to Satan is direct:

- 12 Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.
- 13 Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone *was* thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.
- 14 Thou *art* the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee *so*: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.
- 15 Thou *wast* perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.
- 16 By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

17 Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.

We learn here that Satan is the anointed cherub that covereth, that he was in the garden of Eden, that he was covered with precious stones, that he is musical, and that he was created in a day—probably the second or the morning of the third. But there is no reference to a pre-world, nor is there any evidence that he was in charge of a mountain of precious stones. We do come to understand from this passage why some young believers lament, “Why does the Devil have all the good music.” He is an expert musician is why, and that ability was created in him. Indeed, it might be more correct to say that his realm was one of music instead of precious stones. He has used both to tempt the covetousness of men, however, with good success.

But there is nothing here that requires a pre-Adamic earth. Everything could have existed in this present creation. The only evidence we have for a pre-Adamic earth is the Babylonian and Greek tales of the gods and their battle with the giants. In the Babylonian account, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, the battle of the giants is found in the context of the tower of Babel. The epic mentions the giants shooting arrows into heaven from atop the tower and blood of the gods dripping from the clouds. So, when it comes to Ezekiel 28, there, too, we look to a future fulfillment of Satan’s demise, even as we saw in the previous two chapters we have examined.

Of Giants and Angels

In this section we examine the last two passages in our list, namely Genesis 6 and II Peter 2 and 3. We start with II Peter 2:4-5:

4 For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast *them* down to hell, and delivered *them* into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;

5 And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth *person*, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.

We see that the old world mentioned here is the pre-flood world. “World” still refers to the realm of man, the definition derived from first usage. We also see that the angels that sinned were not cast down to hell until that flood. These are the same angels mentioned in Jude 6:

6 And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.

Pre-Adamic world advocates claim the reference is to the garden of Eden, (e.g, Satan in Ezekiel 28:13). But if Satan was the leader of

the fallen angels, how did he get into the position Ezekiel mentions if, they were cast and bound before the “recreation”? How can the rebellious angels be bound and yet still have access to heaven and earth as seen in Job 1 and 2?

On the other hand, this is exactly what the sons of God did. These sons are mentioned in Job 38:7³⁶ where they were present at the laying of the cornerstone of the foundations of the earth, that is, in the third day of creation. These cannot be the godly line of Seth, as is often claimed, since the earth was 130 years old before Seth was even born (Genesis 5:3). So these are either some spiritual creatures not identified in any other way in Scripture, or they are angels. Since Jude 6’s only mate is Genesis 6:2, it seems most likely that the sons of God are angels created to minister to men who, by their close association are enticed by their lusts and thus left their first estate, that is, the ministry and office.

Genesis 6:2 and 4 say:

2 That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they *were* fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.

4 There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare *children* to them, the same *became* mighty men which *were* of old, men of renown.

We see that the sons of God sired mighty men of renown. The giants appear to be associated with these children, and we know the problems that Israel had with giants. Significantly, histories of Ireland and Scotland start with clearing the lands of the giants who had settled there.

The final reference is found in II Peter 3:5-7 where it says:

5 For this they [the scoffers of v. 4] willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water:

6 Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:

7 But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

Pre-Adamic earth advocates take verse 6 to refer to the condition of the earth before its destruction and subsequent recreation. Certainly verse 5 does not describe the situation in Genesis 1:2, though it could

³⁶ When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

describe the state of the earth in Genesis 1:9.³⁷ That situation persisted until the Noachic flood. The world that then was, called the “old world” in II Peter 2:5 and referring to the order of man on the antediluvian earth, perished in the overflow of water. Note that the heavens mentioned in verse 5 are not said to be destroyed in verse 6. They persist to this day, even as stated in verse 7. Some assume that they were destroyed and so claim, correctly so, that since there is no mention of the destruction of the heavens in Noah’s flood, then this cannot refer to Noah’s flood. But clearly, that reasoning is based on the assumption that the old heavens, too, were destroyed which is nowhere mentioned in Scripture. Besides, heavens is plural which means the flood must have destroyed the universe which is the second heaven, also.

Conclusion

We have examined the most important claims of the pre-Adamic earth advocates and found them lacking in both scientific and Scriptural support. Although tales of battles between the gods and giants exist in ancient literature, these are generally associated with a war centered on the tower of Babel. In recent times, the inability of theologians to handle science correctly caused them to turn to the Gap Theory to accommodate evolutionary times. In so doing, they ended up unwittingly accepting evolution.

When it comes to the Scriptures, most of the verses invoked in support of the Gap turn out, in the greater context, to refer to future times of judgment. We saw that Satan is not yet cast down to earth and still has access to heaven. Certainly this was so Job’s day, and that was after Noah’s flood when the angels that left their first estate were chained under darkness.

We conclude that the Gap advocates must critically alter the words God gave to men if they are to fit their speculations and must invoke a myopic view of context when claiming proof texts. Scripturally and even scientifically, the pre-Adamic Ruin and Reconstruction Theory has no foundation to stand on.

³⁷ And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry *land* appear: and it was so.

READERS' FORUM

George Soros and astronomy as a model for economics

George Soros's message is essentially that an open society allows the freedom he loves. But that is a delusion, for he manipulates it to skim profits from markets (thus denying freedom and closing it to others). In his books he does not admit that for him to do so, the economy needs to be controlled lest it collapse and the closed society of National Socialism in which he grew up arise. It is his point of reference. Now, seeing that he is an expert in the system and how to manipulate it, he realizes that the neo-classical economic models of economic analysis, which use astronomical principles are rubbish, though he will not go so far to admit that they were merely a ruse used by operators as the Rothschilds to provide a smoke-screen for their manipulative operations. This, his Rothschild facilitator Dr. Franz Pick explained to me. Thus, Soros's very interesting books caused a fuss among the free market advocates who considered his ideas statist, or dirigist, and therefore irrelevant, even though not one faced the issue that in western financial systems, central banks manipulate and control through the issuance and contraction of credit, and that there is consequently no freedom here at all. Thus, the free market advocates are useful idiots to the financial manipulators, at least those who are deluded and not hired whores.

You have to understand that Soros is a Rothschild protégé, and that he is an expert in what he says. He was one of the leaders of the wolf packs that collapsed the Asian currencies, severely damaging their economies and subsequently nearly plunging them into an absolute depression. The packs also shorted the pound with insider information. That Asian collapse, in turn, could have triggered a world economic collapse as in the 1930s. It was resolved by concerted central bank intervention fostering demand in the west to resuscitate the Asian economies.

Soros has written a number of books out of concern that actions such as his, when conducted by others without the proper central bank and economic controls, could lead to an economic meltdown. (This was also noted by Warren Buffett.) Their action could trigger an implosion in the derivative markets, which is equivalent of detonating weapons of mass destruction. That, in turn, would collapse the world economy, and plunge the west into a depression, overturning the western political systems and their open societies. At that point, concentration camps could be set up for Jews, perhaps destroying Soros' family unless he is as agile as was his father when he did not conform to the thought-patterns of the Hungarian society that he was raised in more than 60 years ago. The so-called self-correcting mechanism may come too late to save those that are crushed by this juggernaut.

While his books do not admit his wrong doing, they do recognize that free, unregulated markets can self-destruct, and that theoretical models with self-correcting mechanisms—as in an astronomical model where the play of different gravitational forces balance out in predictable patterns—may not do so as they are subject to the (Heisenberg) indeterminacy principle of physics [entropy—*Ed.*]. That is, there is the influence of free will (which Soros calls *reflexivity*) as in the Heisenberg Quantum experiments where it was found to be impossible to both see a nuclear particle and determine its trajectory at the same time. This happens because the action of observing it affects the particle's motion by the light used in the observation. In other words, markets are subject to reflexivity, or free will, and their wobbles may not self-correct as the market participants send these markets into uncorrectable tailspins.

I would consider the claim that Heisenberg's indeterminacy principle is responsible for creating (in the words of Eddington, and more recently, Dr. Edward Teller quoted in his obituary) the permissibility of religion, which, in turn, opens the scientific path for free will, as ridiculous and fallacious. For even though we cannot measure both the trajectory of the particle and its position at the same time because we influence it by the act of observation, it does not follow that its path is anything less than predictable. This, Albert Einstein correctly pointed out when he said God does not play dice with the Universe. We may not be able to precisely predict its trajectory because of the limitation of our measuring instrument, or even ourselves, but that does not mean it cannot be predicted.

This is merely a manifestation of the age-old argument of whether man has free will or is merely the subject of predestination. It is an argument that finite man cannot resolve except through faith. God is infinite, and can predict the future, which we know by faith, while man is finite, and has free will to act, which we know by observation. The two principles cannot be reconciled by man as his finite mind cannot understand the difference, for one side requires infinite capacity, that is, God's, and the other finite capacity.

We can, however, predict the future in general terms in that if we observe the Bible we will be blessed and if we do not, then we will suffer. That Biblical principle Mr. Soros does not understand. The blessings he seeks cannot be found in an open society, but in the closed Biblical system delivered to his ancestors on Mount Sinai. Mr. Soros recently asked a friend of mine why she was religious, and she said that the Hampton Society in which they were, in comparison to a holy society of the Bible, was tawdry and vile with their multiple divorces, mistresses, and other forms of moral disorder. Mr. Soros listened raptly, and then moved on to the next of his friends to socialize.

Best regards, David

CREDO

The Biblical Astronomer was founded in 1971 as the Tychonian Society. It is based on the premise that the only absolutely trustworthy information about the origin and purpose of all that exists and happens is given by God, our Creator and Redeemer, in his infallible, preserved word, the Holy Bible commonly called the King James Bible. All scientific endeavor which does not accept this revelation from on high without any reservations, literary, philosophical or whatever, we reject as already condemned in its unfounded first assumptions.

We believe that the creation was completed in six twenty-four hour days and that the world is not older than about six thousand years. We maintain that the Bible teaches us of an earth that neither rotates daily nor revolves yearly about the sun; that it is at rest with respect to the throne of him who called it into existence; and that hence it is absolutely at rest in the universe.

We affirm that no man is righteous and so all are in need of salvation, which is the free gift of God, given by the grace of God, and not to be obtained through any merit or works of our own. We affirm that salvation is available only through faith in the shed blood and finished work of our risen LORD and saviour, Jesus Christ.

Lastly, the reason why we deem a return to a geocentric astronomy a first apologetic necessity is that its rejection at the beginning of our Modern Age constitutes one very important, if not the most important, cause of the historical development of Bible criticism, now resulting in an increasingly anti-Christian world in which atheistic existentialism preaches a life that is really meaningless.

If you agree with the above, please consider becoming a member. Membership dues are \$20 per year. Members receive a 15% discount on all items offered for sale by the *Biblical Astronomer*.

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.

– Isaiah 8:20

TITLES AVAILABLE FROM THE B.A.

Orders can be honored only if accompanied by payment in United States currency either by cheque drawn on a U.S. bank or cash. All orders add 15% postage. Orders outside North America please add an additional \$5 per item **Videotape are NTSC VHS.**

BOOKS DVDs AND TAPES

The Bible and Geocentricity, by Prof. James N. Hanson. A collection of articles, most of which made up the “Bible and Geocentricity” column in the early 1990s. Prof. Hanson has added numerous illustrations. (145 pages, 5.5x8.5 format.) \$8

The Book of Bible Problems. The most difficult “contradictions” in the Bible are answered without compromise. “A classic,” writes Gail Riplinger. 266 pages, indexed. \$12

The Geocentric Papers, A collection of papers, most of which appeared in the *Bulletin of the Tychonian Society*. A technical supplement to *Geocentricity*, including articles on geocentricity, creationism, and the Bible itself. (120 pages, 8.5x11 gluebound.) \$15

New-Age Bible Versions, by Gail Riplinger. The critics love to attack the author, but they never, ever address the **real** issue, *viz.* the occult influence in the modern versions. A real eye-opener. 600+ pages. \$15

Geocentricity Videotape. Martin Selbrede gives a first rate presentation of geocentricity. Good quality tape. \$20

Geocentricity: the Scriptural Cosmology narrated by Dr. Bouw explains the seasons, retrograde motion and other phenomena using the Norwalt Tychonic Orrery. \$15

The Earth: Our Home by Philip Stott. The wise men, philosophers, and scientists of the world have repeatedly changed their minds about such things as space and our position in it. This book provides and historical look at the topic of geocentricity and offers evidence for it. 32 pp. \$4.50

For a complete list of items available, visit
<http://www.geocentricity.com>

(Continued on inside front cover.)