

The Genesis Gap Sidetrack

Is There a Gap Between
Genesis 1:1 & 1:2?

Timothy S. Morton

PreservedWords.com

The Genesis Gap Sidetrack

Is There a "Gap" Between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2?

Timothy S. Morton

© Copyright 2019
Timothy S. Morton
All Rights Reserved

Second Edition
Revised and Expanded, September, 2019

Published By
PreservedWords.com

All Scripture references and quotations are from the
Authorized King James Bible

This work takes an critical and analytical look at the Genesis Gap Theory from a King James Bible Believing perspective. Is belief in the Gap necessary to be a true Bible Believer as many insinuate? Is there really a "Gap Fact"?

Chapters

[Preface](#)

1 - Can You Find It?	1
2 - Bringing in the Hebrew?	4
3 - How Many Creations?	12
4 - Created In Vain?	20
5 - Who's Afraid of the Dark?	24
6 - Is It Really Re-plenish?	29
7 - What Did Peter Say?	36
8 - The Host of Heaven	42
9 - Overview and Summary	50
10 - Final Considerations	55

Appendices

1 - Questions For Gap Theorists	61
2 - The Verse That Nullifies The Gap Theory	65
3 - The Darkness In Genesis 1:2	74

Preface

The "Genesis Gap" is a belief your author has been familiar with for over 40 years. Even before he was saved he would see Clarence Larkin charts that showed a destruction of the earth before Genesis 1:2 and a "re-creation" starting with Genesis 1:3. During this time Lucifer is said to have rebelled against heaven and as punishment the Lord destroyed the whole earth (and even the heavens) with water and expelled Lucifer and like-minded "angels." At the time your author deemed this claim as "interesting," but never thought much more about it until he became a Christian in 1980. After receiving the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior your author became much more interested in "Bible things" and read all he could find on scriptural topics. Since he was a new believer, he did not have the discernment he has today as to what is sound doctrine and fit to read, but the Lord got him through.

After a couple years of wading through the mire of Charismatic goofiness and Methodist deadness (he was raised a Methodist), your author obtained a *Scofield Reference Bible* and also Clarence Larkin's book *Dispensational Truth*. With these books he was exposed to the Genesis Gap again. Both authors treated it as fact. A couple years later your author was introduced to Peter Ruckman and "lo and behold" he promoted it, too. By this time your author had been saved a few years and was able to study things for himself somewhat and he looked into this Genesis Gap idea, but to his dismay he could never reconcile it with the Scriptures. To him it looked like the "Gapper's" ideas were being *read into the text* instead of being taken from it. He thought to himself, "These notable Bible teachers who are right on so many other things believe and promote this doctrine, so there must be something to it I'm missing," and let it go for a while.

Over the subsequent years your author looked into the Genesis Gap with fresh eyes more than once, then in the last 10 years or so he saw where some Gap Proponents were now calling their theory the "Gap Fact." "Hum..." he thought, "maybe they can prove it now?" So over the last couple years he looked into it again. He is quite a bit older now, hopefully a little wiser and more knowledgeable of the Bible, human nature, and the peculiar manner of some Bible Believing brethren, and *he diligently examined their*

"proof" to see if they actually can prove it...and found they can "prove" nothing. Their claim is either intentional deception (not likely) or a failure to understand what actually constitutes facts and proof (most likely). In spite of all their high-sounding rhetoric and lofty claims, your author is no more convinced there is any kind of "Gap" between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 than he was 35 years ago. Below he will detail why.

1 - Can You Find It?

Your author has never read from or talked to any individual who admitted to discovering the Genesis Gap himself while reading the Bible. He is not saying it is impossible, but he has yet to find someone who has done it. All those he has encountered were *introduced* to the idea from someone else who usually referred to Scofield or Larkin. This in itself is significant. If this doctrine is so hidden and esoteric that it cannot be found apart from detailed "explanation" from others who deem themselves "more informed," it must not be a very important doctrine...if a sound Bible doctrine at all.

Furthermore, your author found out early on there are certain "political" ramifications among some Bible Believers and Fundamentalists depending on their position on the Genesis Gap. Some of the Bible Believing brethren see believing the Gap as a sort of "right of passage" into being a "true Bible Believer." They insinuate only those who "really believe the KJB" can see it, while all the doubters are "blinded" by unbelief or ignorance.

If you want to see this type of "brow beating" in action just read a page or two of *The Gap Fact* by Perry Demopoulos. He is constantly berating the reader for not seeing "the truth" or "fact" as he sees it. The barrage of bombastic rhetoric is so constant and tiring, and his arguments so contrived, that his book is hard to finish. Nevertheless, your author read it *twice*.

As we mentioned, Dr. Peter Ruckman is a major promoter of the Genesis Gap. Although he rails on "Gap Deniers" in other places, in his commentary on the General Epistles, he candidly states that the Genesis Gap is an "inferred" doctrine that is not explained in the initial verses of Genesis 1,

"Now, all of this has to do with what is known as the "gap theory." The "gap theory" is the teaching that something took place between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2 that is not explained there but can be inferred from other places in the Scriptures such as Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28." (Ruckman General Epistles Vol. 1, 1Pe 3:5)

To "infer" means, "deduce or conclude (information) from evidence and reasoning rather than from explicit statements." So according to one of its most notable recent proponents, the Genesis Gap idea can only be developed piecemeal, inferred from various passages in the Bible. It is not explicitly stated. Interesting. How many other significant Bible doctrines like that come to mind?

Some may try to claim the *Pre-Tribulation Rapture* and similar doctrines are in the same category, but that is not correct. That there is a rapture at some time is easily seen in the Bible (1Th 4). The dispute is *when* it occurs. With the Genesis Gap there is not even a clear passage that states a gap even exists.

Where Did It Come From?

The first person to ever really promote a gap in Genesis was a fellow named Thomas Chalmers of Edinburg University. The idea of a gap was pretty much unknown to Christianity until Chalmers conjured it up nearly 1800 years after Christ. One can find no mention of it in the older commentaries or writings of the early Christians.

Some will claim certain "Early Church Fathers" did speak of it but they hardly ever produce an actual quote...and when they do, the quote is often as vague as one of Nostradamus's "prophecies."

Why did Chalmers propose a gap was there? As another said,

"[Chalmers] felt that he could make room for the vast expanse of time which the geologists of his day were demanding, and at the same time maintain a literal interpretation of the creation account. His views were further elaborated by George H. Pember (*Earth's Earliest Ages*) in 1876, and enormously popularized by a footnote in the *Scofield Reference Bible* (first edition, 1917)."

Chalmers had a problem dealing with the newly proposed "geologic ages" science was (and still is) touting at the time and devised the Genesis Gap to deal with it. Although some Bible Believing proponents of the Genesis Gap today deny it is necessary to reconcile the Bible with geologic ages, there are still many Gap proponents who yet appeal to it for that reason. Finis Dake in his reference Bible being one,

"When men finally agree on the age of the Earth, then place the many years (over the historical 6,000) between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, there will be no conflict between the Book of Genesis and science."

Bible Believing Gap proponents today for the most part don't use the Gap as an explanation for the geologic ages but instead use it as a fanciful way to explain the creation and fall of Satan and the existence of the "Sons of God" before the earth's "re-creation." To get away from the charge of compromising with science by adhering to a Genesis Gap, some now claim the gap may have only been a few thousand (or even hundred) years long.

2 - Bringing in the Hebrew?

Back to the Originals?

Even though most Bible Believers today will not use original language arguments, the Genesis Gap gap was first "proven" by changing the word "was" in Gen 1:2 to "became" by appealing to the "original Hebrew." Chalmers based his argument for a gap on the supposed mistranslation of the Hebrew word "hayah" in the KJB as "was." He insisted the word should be translated "became" so the verse would read "...*became* without form and void." But this is just typical Scripture wresting tactics. If the Bible doesn't say what you want, just force it to comply using Hebrew or Greek as an excuse.

Arthur C. Custance in his book "WITHOUT FORM AND VOID" spent several hundred pages quoting certain "ancient authorities" and Hebrew scholars trying to prove the King James Bible translated Genesis 1:2 wrong. In an attempt to get the Bible to line up with "modern geologic theory" he says the verse should be rendered, "*but the earth had become a ruin and a desolation.*" Yet in spite of all his words he can only say,

"...it is my conviction that the issue ['was' should be 'became'] is still an open one, that all the objections raised against it thus far are not really valid, that the rules of Hebrew syntax and grammar not only allow this alternative rendering but positively favour it."

Even though he believes Hebrew syntax and grammar favors his reading, he admits he can prove nothing and the matter is "open." This is often the way Bible correctors work; even though they cannot prove their claims, they often do succeed in introducing doubt.

Regardless of the contentions of Chalmers, Custance, and other Bible correctors, not one English Bible translation of any significance agrees with them. Essentially all the modern translations read with the KJB and earlier translations translating "hayah" as "was." This includes the ASV, ESV, NIV, RSV, HCSB, NASB, WEB, NLT, ISV, etc., etc. So despite all their many words and arguments, essentially no Bible translator or translating committee agrees with them.

Another appeal to Hebrew is often made in the same verse dealing with the words "*without form and void.*" These Hebrew words "tohu vabohu" are said to imply a previous judgment or destruction. Even Dr. Ruckman makes this claim in his Genesis commentary,

The Hebrew verb reads "tohu vabohu" and implies a previous catastrophe and then a "remaking."

Is Dr. Ruckman claiming the Hebrew verb reveals more than its English translation? Evidently because the English words "*without form and void*" do not suggest in any way a catastrophe or remaking. They simply state something is formless and empty.

Note: *Dr. Ruckman wrote his Genesis commentary in the late 1950s and published it around 1970. The statement he made above about the Hebrew verb is not likely a statement he would have made later in his ministry. His previous statement in chapter 1 where he said there is no explanation of a gap in Genesis 1:1-2 text indicates this.*

Furthermore, the words "without form and void" *are not to be taken in an absolute sense.* If something exists it has a basic form even if it's not its final form.

What Does "Without Form and Void" Really Mean?

The Gap Theorists base a lot of their claims on their peculiar reading of Gen 1:2 where it says, "...the earth was without form, and void...." They simply cannot fathom why the earth was "without form and void" without some vast destruction making it that way. Before they were exposed to the Genesis Gap idea they read Genesis chapter 1 as a clear narrative of God creating the "heaven and the earth," but once they hear of the Genesis Gap theory and put their *Genesis Gap Goggles* on, Genesis 1 takes on a whole new "meaning."

To a typical reader of the Bible, saying the earth was "without form" simply means it has not been formed yet. That is the obvious reading, but to the Gappers there must have been a world of trouble between verses 1 and 2 to cause it to be "without form." They emphasize the negative aspects of the verse while ignoring its

overall positive thrust. They see the components of *formlessness, voidness, and darkness while ignoring the fact that before God created any of it there was nothing!* The thrust and emphasis of the verse is *God is starting to create, which is very positive.* Plus, the Spirit of God being there is also a good thing.

What does it mean to "form" something and to say it is "without form"? Let's look at something else God formed—Adam.

Adam and His Garden

Genesis 2:7 says,

And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

So the Lord "formed" Adam from the ground. Where was Adam before he was formed? No where and everywhere. The physical components he was formed from were in the ground, thus when he was "without form" he didn't exist. Also, even after it was "formed," Adam's body was "void" of life until the breath of life was placed in him. Thus God brought Adam about in a process of at least two stages.

Moreover, keep in mind Gen 1:26-27 states the Lord said He was going to create or form "man" before He actually did it.

Another event concerning Adam deals with the garden of Eden. Gen 2:8 says, "*And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden...*" then in vs 2:15 it says,

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

To "dress" a garden means to "*put in good order; to prepare for use...to render suitable for an intended purpose*" (Web 1913) . Thus when the Lord planted the garden He didn't make it a complete or finished state (see Deut 28:39). Adam had to dress it and put it in order and then afterwards "keep it" that way so it would grow and produce. The Lord started the planting and forming, and then Adam was to finish it.

The obvious implication of this is if Adam was told to dress or put the garden in order, *the Lord must have planted and created it*

NOT completely dressed or in complete order! It was in that sense not in complete form. Thus before we get through the first two chapters of Genesis the Lord gives us *two examples* of Him creating via a process (Adam) and creating something not yet completely formed (garden).

The Unformed Earth

Likewise, as with the forming of Adam and Eden "the earth," being formless in Gen 1:2 does not have to mean it was rendered that way because of judgment. Furthermore, actual earth or land didn't exist until God formed it as it popped out from under the waters in Gen 1:9!

Here we need to explain a little about the "presuppositions" people bring with them when studying the Bible. One big presupposition, especially when studying natural things concerning the earth and universe, is people come to Genesis thinking it presents "the earth" as a planet or globe. The Bible never describes the earth in this way. When people today think of the earth, they think of a spinning planet within a vast universe surrounded by the sun, moon, other planets, and stars (well, most think of it this way). Again, the Bible never presents the earth and the heavens this way at all. For more on this see our book ([King James Cosmology](#)).

In the Bible the earth and heaven(s) are distinctly separate. The earth is never said to be in the sky, heaven(s), or surrounded by them like we now understand the universe surrounding a planet. The heavens are always spoken of as ABOVE the earth (Gen 1:20, 23:39; Exo 20:4; Act 2:16; etc.) and separate from it.

Here you may ask, "Is not the earth a planet that IS surrounded by the universe?" Yes, it is, but you didn't learn that from the Bible. You (mankind) learned that by the progressive revelation of nature to man (Psa 19:1). God did not let that truth be fully known until just a few hundred years ago, and He let Japeth find it. Not the Hebrews from Shem.

The Bible tells us what it means when it says "earth" in Genesis 1:9 — "dry land."

When the Scriptures says "the earth" was "without form," it means just that, it doesn't exist yet as earth much the same as Adam didn't exist before he was formed! Just as Adam was called "man" (Heb. *adam*) before he was formed (Gen 1:26), the earth is called "earth" before it was formed. The components the earth was to be

made from may have been under the "waters" of 1:2, mixed in the water as a slurry, or they may have been actually created as it was emerging from the water, but which ever way, it did not yet exist.

This is little different from someone talking about "My new house" while the components of the house are sitting at the building site in a pile not yet formed or assembled into a home. The same with someone saying "My birthday cake" while it is still unformed liquid batter in a bowl. They could correctly say their house or cake was "without form" or unfinished.

Genesis chapter 1 defines its own terms and it defines "earth" in vs 9-10,

9, 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.

10, And **God called the dry land Earth;** and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas: and God saw that it was good.

All is clear. "Earth" first appeared in vs 9 and was named such in vs 10. It is not a "planet earth" surrounded by a universe; *it is a landmass.*

The primary definition of "earth" in any standard dictionary agrees with the Scripture definition; it is "*soil," "ground," or "areas of land as distinguished from sea and air"* (Merriam/Webster), and since none of these existed until Gen 1:9, there was no tangible "earth" until then. Insisting the Bible speaks of the earth as a planet only confuses the matter.

An Empty Void

Concerning the earth being "void" in Genesis 1:2, what should one expect before anything is created to fill it? That is self-evident; it would naturally be void. Yes, the Lord could have spoken it all into existence in an instant, but as we mentioned above He chose to create it in stages as a process like He later did with Adam. Adam was actually a sub-process of the sixth day of the creation week. He simply created water first (without mentioning it), then heaven, and then earth.

At this point Gap Theorists often interject that there are other gaps in the Scriptures that are unseen until more revelation reveals

them. Daniel 9:24-27 and Isaiah 61:1-2 are used as examples where both comings of Christ are mentioned. The difference is in those cases Scripture has it made very clear that Jesus Christ will return. These passages have first and second coming elements mingled together, and we know Christ will return to fulfill the yet unfulfilled parts. On the contrary, the Genesis Gap Theory is by no means clearly revealed in Scripture. We can show you many clear references to Christ's second coming, *but the references the Gap Theorists produce for their Gap are as clear as mud.*

As for true Bible gaps, the Scriptures most often identify them their self as in Genesis 38:12, Exodus 2:23, Judges 11:4, and 2 Chronicles 21:19.

Is It "Create," "Made," or "Formed"

Some Gap Theorists make a big deal of two or three Bible terms used when God creates or makes something. They insist "create" speaks of only an "ex nihilo" creation out of nothing and "made," "make" or "form" speaks of making something from something already existing. Some claim this is one of the strongest evidences for the Gap Theory. (This already sounds similar to the false "Greek Nugget" argument between "Agapao" (deep, godly love) and "phileo" (friendly love), some get into in John 21:15-17.)

The Gap Theorists feel compelled to say the terms are distinctly different because Exodus 20:11 just ruins their day without it (also Exo 31:17),

For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea,
and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day:

Here the Lord is speaking Himself (while giving the ten commandments) clearly stating He made everything in six days. This is a doctrinal statement within a doctrinal discourse. The Gap Theorists have to "clarify" the Lord's words, though, and insist He only *remade* the heaven and earth. They insist there is a distinction between "create" and "made." Thus God didn't really make the earth in six days as the verse states, He remade or reformed it from the rubble of a previous earth! What a mighty claim, but how does it stack up to examination?

While it is true that the words in question *can* have distinct meanings, they also are often used synonymously throughout the

Scriptures. In fact "create" ("bara") is not always used to describe a creation from nothing. It is used in Isaiah 65:18 in reference to Jerusalem being merely restored; not to its original creation. That these words are used to express the same concept in regard to God creating can be seen by comparing Genesis 1:1, which uses "create" with the following verses which use "made,"

Genesis 1:31; 2:2-4;
Exodus 20:11;
2 Kings 19:15;
2 Chronicles 2:12;
Nehemiah 9:6;
Psalms 33:6; 96:5; 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136:5;
146:6;
Proverbs 8:26;
Ecclesiastes 3:11;
Isaiah 37:16; 44:24; 45:12, 18;
Jeremiah 10:12; 27:5; 32:17; 51:15

Obviously, the Gappers are making a false distinction. The two words can be used interchangeably when describing God creating. Genesis 1:16 states God only "made" the great lights in the sky (sun and moon) and stars. Did He not create them as well? In Gen 1:7 it says He "made" the "firmament." Apparently He didn't create it either according to the Gap Theorists.

Want more proof? Look at these verses where the Lord is said to "make," "create," and "form" man,

And God said, Let Us make [asah] man in Our image, after Our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. (Genesis 1:26)

So God created [bara] man in His own image, in the image of God created [bara] He him; male and female created [bara] He them." (Genesis 1:27)

"And the LORD God formed [yatsar] man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Genesis 2:7)

"... for I have created [bara] him for My glory, I have formed [yatsar] him; yea, I have made [asah] him." (Isaiah 43:6,7)

As we saw above the same can be said about animals, and it is also true of the whole heaven and earth,

"For thus saith the LORD that created [bara] the heavens; God himself that formed [yatsar] the earth and made [asah] it; he hath established it, he created [bara] it not in vain, he formed [yatsar] it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else." (Isaiah 45:18)

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made [asah]; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made [asah]. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made [bara and asah]. These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created [bara], in the day that the LORD God made [asah] the earth and the heavens." (Genesis 2:2-4)

To put the final nail in the coffin of their silly claim, look at what Neh 9:6 does to it,

Thou, even thou, art LORD alone; thou hast made [asah] heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth thee.

See the "heaven of heavens" and "their host" in there? *That is, the heaven above all heavens: the "third heaven" plus all the angels, cherubim, and other heavenly creatures that dwell there!* The text says he "made" them, so to be consistent the Gap Theorists would have to claim God must have destroyed His own dwelling place in the third heaven with all its angels and creatures and then remade it all from existing material...but none of them believe that nonsense. The simple fact is "made" can also refer to an act of direct creation.

Enough said. The Gap Theorists *create vs make* claims are just so much "bunk."

3 - How Many Creations?

Where Does Genesis 1:1 Fit In?

For centuries there has been debate as to what Gen 1:1 is actually referring to. Today there are basically three positions,

1. It refers to a completed previous creation separate from the rest of the chapter.
2. It refers to the beginning of the present and only creation which continues throughout the chapter.
3. It is an overview or summary of the entire creation account.

Of course, the Gapists hold to the first position. They demand that an entire and complete universe was created in Gen 1:1. They insist there was a fully functioning pre-Adamic earth with a civilization containing "cities," "birds," "kings," "nations," "mountains," etc. (Isa 14; Jer 4) in that one verse. One of the many problems with their contention is the very first word of the next verse—"And." Of course, "and" is a conjunction and a conjunction joins related passages together expressing continuity. However, the Gapists cannot have continuity between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 since they contend the verses refer to completely separate time periods and events.

The Gap Theorists try to use various "literary techniques" to get around the continuity expressed by "And." One is a figure of speech called a *polysyndeton*. A polysyndeton is *"the deliberate insertion of conjunctions into a sentence for the purpose of slowing up the rhythm of the prose so as to produce an impressively solemn note."* Or in other words it is the adding of conjunctions for effect. These are found in the Bible with Joshua 7:24 being a prime example,

And Joshua, **and** all Israel with him, took Achan the son of Zerah, **and** the silver, **and** the garment, **and** the wedge of gold, **and** his sons, **and** his daughters, **and** his oxen, **and** his asses, **and** his sheep, **and** his tent, **and** all that he had: **and** they brought them unto the valley of Achor. Jos 7:24

All the occurrences of "and" are there for emphasis. However, even if a passage is marked by polysyndetons (as Genesis 1 may

well be), that does not mean there is still not close continuity as Jos 7:24 obviously testifies! Polysyndetons and continuity are not mutually exclusive as the Gapists insinuate. They try to cloud the issue by claiming this figure of speech, but the figure of speech does not verify their claims.

The above second point that states Gen 1:1 refers to *the beginning of the present and only creation* is one that today is widely held. It does not require any wild theories or conjecture. It just basically states the Lord began creating the basic elements of the universe in Gen 1:1, made a comment about the current formlessness in 1:2, and then formed these elements into the specific items mentioned in the remainder of the chapter. This is a reasonable explanation.

The third above point contends Gen 1:1 is a summary or actually one of the *bookends* of the creation account along with Gen 2:4. Here it is in outline form,

- A. *God created* (Gen. 1:1a)
- B. God (Gen. 1:1b)
- C. heavens and earth (Gen. 1:1b)
- D. Creating, Forming, and Filling the Earth (Gen. 1:2-31)
- C.' heavens and earth (Gen.2:1)
- B.' God (Gen. 2:2-3)
- A.' *God created* (Gen. 2:4)

In both Gen 1:1 and 2:4, it says that God "created." Between these two bookends is when all actually was "created" by God (Gen. 1:2-2:3). Thus, these texts are grammatically connected and could viewed as one unit.

Furthermore, Gen 2:4 refers to the creation account as the "*generations of the heavens and of the earth,*" and other generation accounts in the Scriptures lead off with a summary (Gen 5:1, 6:9; 10:1; 11:10).

Obviously, your author rejects point #1. It is based on assumption, conjecture and completely severs Gen 1:1 from the rest of the chapter. Either of the remaining two points are plausible and do not violate the Bible text. Your author leans towards point #3 because of the definitions of "heaven" in 1:8 and "earth" in 1:10, however, point #2 also has merit. Nevertheless, for this study it doesn't really matter, either one fits the "one beginning" viewpoint without issue.

Some may ask here, "What about *earth* as found in Gen 1:1? According to your point #2 the earth would not have existed then." The word "earth" there is part of the phrase, "the heaven and the earth" which the Jewish Encyclopedia states is the Hebrew way of referring to the universe,

In Hebrew, "heaven and earth" together constitute the universe. The earth has foundations and pillars (I Sam. 2:8; Ps. 75:4, civ. 5; Job 9:6, 38:6); it rests on the ocean, out of which it rises (Ps. 24:2, 136:6); it is suspended in space (Job 26:7)...Like most peoples of antiquity, the Hebrews conceived of the earth as a disk (Prov. 8:27; Job 26:10; Isa. 40:22); and they spoke, therefore, of peoples like the Assyrians, Egyptians, Persians, and Medes as living at the ends of the earth (see Gesenius, Commentary on Isaiah, i. 247).

Another source agrees and says the phrase is a "merism" and "the words cannot be understood separately but must be taken as a unity." So primarily when "earth" is joined with "heaven" it speaks of the whole universal environment of existence (land, air, sea, heavens) as being part of the universe (Gen 2:1; Jer 32:7, 51:48; Joe, 3:16; 2Pe 3:7, etc.). As we have repeatedly shown, when used by itself "earth" essentially means land or soil.

Those who adhere to point #2 say the basic elements of the earth were created in Gen 1:1 but not formed into what we know as earth until later in the creation week. Many who follow point #3 say since it is a summary, there was no earth until Gen 1:9-10 where "earth" is specifically formed and defined. As we mentioned, the "earth" of 1:2 is spoken of like one would speak of a cake that has not yet been baked. It is like one saying, "I am ready to eat my birthday cake," when there actually is no cake, only unformed cake batter in a bowl.

The Creation Before "Creation"

One component of the physical world is present in Gen 1:2 without its creation being specifically mentioned, that is "water." One can hear the Gapists saying now, "You say the earth did not show up until Gen 1:9-10, but there is water in vs 2. Where did the water come from and what is it resting on? God must have created it earlier and destroyed the previous earth with it." They do have an

imagination, don't they? The answer is simple, the Lord didn't mention His act of creating water just like He didn't mention a whole bunch of other things He already created, like the *very building-blocks of physical reality—the matter/space/time continuum* if you will!

When the Bible speaks of God creating or making something it usually emphasizes the end result. In Genesis 1 it says he created (after water) *heaven, earth, plants, sun, moon, stars, fish, birds, land animals, and finally man*. (Notice in vs 20 that the first life mentioned come from *water*. Water "bring[s] forth" the life of fish and fowl. Interesting.) These are all the end result of creation. However, all these physical objects and creatures are made from smaller and smaller physical matter that God silently created first.

For the water to exist in vs 1:2 God had to create what we know as *material or physical reality*. Since He is a spirit and dwells in that realm, there was no such thing as space, matter or the laws that govern them until He created the entire concept of physical existence. He created *atoms, molecules, energy, matter, space, elements, and a whole host of other physical things man yet knows nothing about*. The Lord developed this physical reality with all its intricate balances and laws before He made the first drop of water. Water is made of hydrogen and oxygen. The Lord had to develop those elements and then put them together to form the water. He may have done all this preliminary creating in a instant, we don't know, but common reasoning of our linear way of thinking demands that He must create the principles of reality before the actual reality, even if it is just a millisecond earlier.

Furthermore, if Gen 1:1 is the act of creation of the basic elements of the universe as some hold, then water could have been created then. If 1:1 is a summary, then the basic elements plus water still would have been created before Gen 1:2, only silently.

Thus, according to Genesis chapter 1, the first "end result" physical substance the Lord created was water. *The creation of the whole material reality that is required for water to exist is therefore implied*. So, as we mentioned, that the time of the specific creation of water is not mentioned in no way implies or even suggests it was created for an earlier Pre-Adamic creation.

Creation Commenced

The order of creation is the *physical reality, then water, light*

(from which night and day arise), a firmament called "Heaven" (to divide the waters), then the gathering of waters to "let" land appear. The conventional thought is the land was already there from vs 1 and only *revealed* in vs 9. Sounds nice, but can you prove it? Psalms 95:5 indicates otherwise,

The sea is his, and he made it: and his hands formed the dry land.

Take note of the order again, first the sea was made and His very hands formed the "dry land" afterwards! This is the creation of "earth." For another example see Jonah 1:9,

I fear the LORD, the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land.

Again, the sea (of water) first and earth or land second.

Genesis chapter 1 and these two verses make three witnesses that fully establish the fact that water was created first and then the "dry land" called "Earth." This fact alone throws a monkey wrench the size of the earth into the Genesis Gap theory.

Notice in vs 9 how the Lord said "let the dry land appear." This matches "Let there be light..." (vs 3), "Let there be a firmament..." (vs 6), "Let the earth bring forth grass..." (vs 11), etc. Even if the land was not created as it emerged and the elements it was formed from were earlier under or in the water, there it still no "dry land" or "Earth" until it emerged out of the water in vs 9. "Land" under the water (like a sea bed) is not "dry land" and cannot be considered "earth" by the Bible definition.

Again, some may still try to claim "the earth" in vs 1 speaks of earth as a planet of "earth" flooded with water, but as we said, the Bible knows nothing about "the earth" being a planet. Again, the Scriptures are clear "the earth" refers to "dry land." Look at Gen 1:11-12 for another example,

And God said, Let **the earth** bring forth grass...upon **the earth**: and it was so....And **the earth** brought forth grass,

Grass grows on "land." "The earth" in 1:11 speaks *only* of the "dry land." Still not convinced? Why are you being so incorrigible? In Psa 65:5 David makes a clear distinction between "the earth" and "the sea,"

By terrible things in righteousness wilt thou answer us, O God of our salvation; who art the confidence of **all the ends of the earth, and of them that are afar off upon the sea:**

Surely you notice that "all the ends of the earth," which refers to the whole earth, does not include those "upon the sea." "All the ends" includes the whole earth or landmass, but earth does not include anything but "dry land." They are kept distinctly separate.

Even Psalms 24:1-2 shows this distinction,

1, The earth is the LORD'S, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. 2, For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.

Here also the earth is said to be founded or established upon the seas. Many quote verse 1 as if it refers to a "planet earth." Verse 2 makes it clear it doesn't.

Are you still dragging your feet? Alright, let's nail it to the wall right here and now in Genesis 1. Look at 1:26,

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of **the sea**, and over the fowl of **the air**, and over the cattle, and over all **the earth**, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon **the earth**.

Gen 1:28 actually applies the decree,

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**.

If the earth is the whole "planet" of land, sea and sky, why does God have to even mention the sea and air? He is not being redundant because "the earth" ONLY refers to "dry land" throughout the entire chapter! If all these many scriptural witnesses do not convince you, nothing will. There are three parts to physical reality in the Bible, earth, sea, and sky (which includes the heavens). They are not the same and neither does one encompass or include the other.

Note: Brethren, why is it that your Genesis Gap buddies didn't show you these things? Could it possibly be they swallowed the Genesis Gap claims without studying it out and adhere to it mainly because of their admiration of someone else? Every last one of them when they talk of "the earth" in Gen 1:1 they are talking about a planet of solid earth (more or less) covered with water. Why did they not show you how earth really means "dry land," that water was created first, the second heaven created next, and no "earth" appears in the Bible until Gen 1:9! These facts don't leave any room for a Genesis Gap do they. *Unless...maybe...Lucifer was in the navy!*

The phrase "the earth" is found 849 times in the Bible, "earth" is found 987 times. Since the precedent has been set by the Lord Himself that earth is primarily defined as "dry land," there must be significant contextual reasons to treat the words otherwise. Most of the times these words are found they can be understood as "land" or the whole landmass, but in a few instances "the earth" must refer to land, sea and even sky (see Luke 12:56 where "earth" and "sky" are separated). Look at Luke 23:44 where it says,

And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour.

Obviously, this darkness would have not have just blanketed the land masses but the sea and sky as well, but the emphasis is on the land. These instances are quite few but sometimes earth can *represent* more than just the landmass even though it never itself includes more than a landmass.

Much of what was said about the earth can be said about "heaven." The "heaven" of vs 1 is not manifested until vs 7-8 where the firmament is called "Heaven." Which heaven is this of the final three heavens? *It would have to be the second heaven where the sun and moon reside.* This very well could be the "heaven" vs 1 refers to. The first heaven, known to us as the "sky," is created in vs 20. It is called the "open firmament of heaven."

Furthermore, don't neglect the order of creation in vs 1: "the heaven and the earth." This is exactly what happens in the next few verses. In vs 8 He made "Heaven," and in verses 9-10 "Earth." How much clearer do you want?

Notice, now that two heavens have been made Gen 2:1 can truly say,

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

God made the two physical heavens, the dry earth, and everything in them all in the order mentioned in vs 1.

4 - Created In Vain?

Created for a Purpose

One passage the Gap Theorists invariably bring up when talking about Genesis 1 is Isaiah 45:18,

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.

Their desperation is really showing here. They bring up that the Lord "*created it [heavens] not in vain, he formed it [earth] to be inhabited:*" and try to say with a straight face that since God did not create it that way (formless), it must have *become* that way. Has their *Genesis Gap Googles* given them myopia? The text in Genesis 1:2 says the earth was "without form" or formless. The text in Isaiah says He "formed it..." Do we have to spell it out for you? The Lord did not intend for the earth to be inhabited until he was finished forming it! In Gen 1:2 the process was just starting and nothing was yet formed. He didn't make man until the sixth day after everything else was formed and established!

Furthermore, this verse is talking about God's purpose in creating the heavens and earth; His reasons for wanting a creation to start with. He wants it populated with people. He is not talking about the process of creation. This is similar to a carpenter saying about a rocking chair he made, "I did not make this chair to be useless; I formed it for a person to sit and rock in."

The Gap Theorists have overextended themselves with this one.

"Without Form and Void," Again?

Another "key" passage the Gap Theorists like to bring up is Jeremiah 4:23

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

Here we find the same words that are in Gen 1:2. Depending on the stripe of Gap Theorists you may encounter, some insist this is an actual reference to creation (Dake, etc.), but most others will concede this refers to a future judgment on Judah (Jer 4:3, 5) or even the Tribulation.

The context of the passage is the Lord is pleading with Judah and Jerusalem to *"Break up your fallow ground...take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem: lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings"* (vs 3-4). In vs 22 the Lord states, "For my people is foolish, they have not known me...to do good they have no knowledge." Then speaking as looking back from the future judgment the Lord says He *"beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void...."*

Obviously this is a poetic passage where the Lord describes the coming judgment as being so harsh and severe that at least the area of the earth around Judah and Jerusalem will resemble the formless, original state of creation! It is like since man has been continuing to degenerate in understanding and knowledge (vs 22) ever since creation, God is in a sense *un-creating* the earth as well! Man is reducing himself into moral formlessness so the Lord will reduce the earth into physical formlessness.

However, some of the Gap Theorists will not let the passage rest at that. They feel compelled to find a way to use it to bolster their Genesis Gap claims since it has the words "without form and void" in it like Gen 1:2, but as you will see, their tactics are devious.

The Gap Theorists who profess to be Bible Believers have a dilemma. They so much want "was" in Gen 1:2 to be understood as "became" so they can prove their pre-Adamic earth that they can't sit still. Here is an example of their double talk found in the PDF "Ten Reasons Why The Gap Is A Fact." The author states so he can sound like a Bible Believer,

"No one is advocating here (though some have, we do not) that the Scripture should be changed [from "was" to "became."]....However, a closer analysis of the definition of "was" (it can mean "be" or "become") and it's usage in Scripture...opens the door for a broader understanding of Genesis 1.2....But, if we apply the standard definition of the word to Genesis 1.2, we can see that "was" could mean that the earth (sic) became without form and void after it was

made perfect in Genesis 1.1." [source](#)

Talk about trying to "have your cake and eat it too." This guy right before your eyes changed "was" into "became" while emphatically saying he wasn't doing it!

Jeremiah 4:23 is one of the passages they use to try and hoodwink their readers into thinking "was" is really "became." The reasoning goes like this from *The Gap Fact*,

Since the earth is obviously not "without form, and void" now, IT WILL BE during the Tribulation [when the author believes Jer 4:23 will occur]. That means that it WASN'T without form and void at one time before God's judgment "hit." It will BECOME without form and void.

See where he is going? He says since the "without form, and void" of Jer 4 is in the future it will have to "become" that way since its not that way now. Fair enough, this is common sense, but he can't stop there. He goes on to say,

After that event has taken place [Jer 4:23] IT TOO will be PAST just like Genesis 1:2. That is the "crux" of the interpretation of Genesis 1:2.

Then he uses many words to try and convince the reader that since the events of Jer 4:23 are in the future it will have to *become* "without form and void" since it is not now, and since Gen 1:2 which uses the same words is in the past now, it must have had to *become* "without form and void" as well! Have you ever heard such a contrived, convoluted and false argument? They call this "sound doctrine" and "comparing Scripture with Scripture"? It has more holes in it than a screen door!

Just because statements may use some of the same language within them does not mean the state of things in one statement is necessarily true in the other. There are all kinds of differences in the scene of Jer 4 and Genesis Gap. In Jer 4 there are "*mountains,*" "*birds,*" "*cities,*" (*missing*) "*man,*" *etc.* In Genesis 1:2 there is only water. The Jeremiah 4 judgment will not be a destruction like the Gap Theorists claim for the Gap. In Gen 1:2 the only physical object present was water yet no Gapist we are aware of believes the land of Judah (or the earth) will again be nothing but water.

The Lord describes Himself what he means by the earth being *without form and void* in this particular instance in verses 4:24-27,

24, I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly.

25, I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled.

26, I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the LORD, and by his fierce anger.

27, For thus hath the LORD said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end.

He says the land is empty of men and sky of birds; the cities are broken into rubble and the farms turned into a wilderness, and sums it up with, "*The whole land shall be desolate....*" This is nothing like the situation in Genesis 1:2. (Notice again how *earth* is the *land* by comparing vs 23 with vs 27.)

In spite of their similarities, these passages speak of different times and different events and Jeremiah 4 doesn't prove in any way that *without form and void* in Gen 1:2 is the result of a judgment.

5 - Who's Afraid of the Dark?

Darkness All Around

Another word some of the Gap Theorists brethren really like to seize on in Genesis 1:2 is "darkness." They will ride the "darkness" issue bareback trying to prove a previous "world." They often produce a list of verses and arguments showing how "darkness" in the Bible is nearly always negative and evil (John 1:5; 8:12; Acts 26:18; Col. 1:13; 1 Pet. 2:9; 1 John 1:5-7; 2:9-11, etc.), and God is its opposite being "light" and good (1Jo 5:1). They then proclaim that there is no way God would have created the heaven and earth in darkness since He is the epitome of light. Darkness had to be the result of judgment.

Sounds so nice and "logical," doesn't it? Here is what they conveniently omit. Many times when the Bible speak of "darkness" it is not physical darkness but *a lack of moral or spiritual illumination* (Mat 6:22-23; Luke 11:34-36; John 1:5; 8:12; 12:35, 46; 1Jo 1:5; 2:8-9, 11, etc). The great majority of times the terms "darkness" and "light" are used in the Bible they refer metaphorically to spiritual matters. "Light" is the positive element and "darkness" is the negative. This parallels their physical characteristics where darkness hinders sight and light aids it. Sometimes both physical and spiritual light are mentioned together (with physical darkness),

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. (2Co 4:6)

Notice how Paul says the "light shined out of darkness." A clear reference to the first day of creation. The stars are an example of this. The night sky is naturally dark and the points of light shine out of the darkness. Thus darkness is the default state.

However, there are instances in the Bible where darkness is a blessing. When the Israelites were fleeing Egypt the Lord "*put darkness between [them] and the Egyptians*" to protect them (Jos 24:7). Furthermore, Exo 20:21 tells us that God dwells "in the thick darkness." This may be for the protection of man as well. God is

unapproachable spiritual light but dwells in thick, physical darkness (2Ch 6:1; Psa 97:2).

An object of darkness can have a dual role; it can be darkness to one but "light" to another. The darkness the "angel of the lord" placed between Israel and Egypt was only darkness to the Egyptians. To the Israelites it was light and illumination,

"...and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them: And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these:...." (Exo 14:19-20)

Darkness can also be used by the Lord as punishment which makes it an effective tool for righteousness (Nam 1:8). Darkness in blindness (Deu 28:29) can be used for the "glory of God" as the blind man's blindness in John 9.

Creation and Darkness

Of course, the context of creation is physical light and the absence of it causing darkness. According to current understanding darkness is not material or an element of its own; it is a concept that speaks of the absence of any light. The Bible speaks of God creating darkness (Isa 45:7) but this still doesn't mean it has a material existence like light. In one sense it could mean that God creates darkness by simply removing all types of light, but there is more to it than that. *God created the whole concept of physical darkness when he created the physical reality.* There was no such thing until then.

When God created the material reality he made two concepts *default* throughout the physical universe, *darkness* and *cold*. Neither one actually has a material existence. They both are manifestations of the absence of something, that is, *light* and *heat* respectively. Every part of the universe is at absolute zero in temperature and in absolute darkness in illumination until the natural forces of heat and light act upon it in some way. Thus in Gen 1:2 darkness is the natural, default state of the then physical universe. It does not necessarily have any connotation of evil or judgment. The obvious reason the "face of the deep" was dark was because no light had yet been created to dispel it.

Note: Another enigma the Scriptures do not address is how water as liquid could exist in Gen 1:2 without the existence of some source of heat. As we all know water turns to ice below 32 degrees Fahrenheit so the temperature of the existing creation in Gen 1:2 must have been above that temperature. So along with water being created in silence, an unknown source of heat was created as well.

This heat was also needed for the plants created on day three to exist; a day before the sun was created.

At this point the some of Gapists will state that the Bible text doesn't say God created light in Gen 1:3 but that He only revealed already existing light. They insist the words, "Let there be light" are not a creative act. This is just more contrived nonsense. "Let" in a creative sense is used eight times in Gen 1, with the last time being the creation of man. So to follow their reasoning the Lord did not create the firmament, sun, plants, sea life, land animals, or man because He used some form of "let there be..." without specifically saying "create"? Hogwash. When the Lord said,

Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life...And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth.... (Gen 1:20-21)

He is showing us that "Let the waters bring..." is the same as saying "And God created..." Only someone with an agenda would claim otherwise.

However, the Gapists will continue their complaint with, "But God is light and dwells in light, there was light everywhere...." Yes, God is light and is also a spirit, thus *His light is the spiritual light of illumination and glory*. This is the light no man can approach. You don't find any physical light in the Bible until Gen 1:3 where He first created it! Before that the default darkness reigned completely.

Also, it is *very significant to understand that the Lord did not abolish darkness when he created light*. If darkness is only negative and a result of wrath and judgment as most Gap Theorists claim, why did God keep it around? He could have formed a reality that knew no physical darkness and the newly created light (and later sun) shined upon the whole creation constantly, but instead He kept darkness around in 1:4 and even included it in his blanket

proclamation that everything was "very good" in Gen 1:31 (see next section). any of our Gapist brethren need to take a fresh look at their claims.

In view of these facts it is readily apparent that "darkness" was a normal condition at the beginning of creation week. Because of the nature of the physical reality the Lord had just created, darkness would have been the natural result. *Although spiritual darkness can be caused by sin, there is no indication that sin was in any way involved in Gen 1:2.* The Gap Theorists insistence it is, is just more unproven "hot air."

Is it All "Very Good"?

Most of the Gap Theorist brethren will take issue with our statement that the Lord made a blanket proclamation that "everything" he created in creation week was "very good." This is for a couple reasons. One is it makes the Lord say *darkness* in 1:4-5 is good, and second, some of them insist that *Satan and his fallen cohorts were placed in the heavens on day two* when the firmament was made, and God could not say that was good either. This is simply another case of them forcing the Bible to conform to their doctrine.

Some of the Gapists will smugly bring up that the Lord did not say what he created on Day 2 was "good" like he did on the other days so what happened that day must not be good. Then they will insist they know the reason: Satan's fall. However, there are some very pertinent facts about God's proclamations of "good" during creation week they are not telling you (probably because they are just repeating "talking points" and don't know themselves). The events of day two are not the only things the Lord did not directly call "good."

During the six days of creation God said something was "good" seven times. Therefore, the proclamations are not day based but *event based*. One day (day two) he didn't say anything was good, but two days he said something was good twice (days three and six). In addition, look at the first day when God said "Let there be light" (1:3-5). He specifically said that light was "good," but did not say dividing the light from darkness and naming light "Day" and darkness "Night" was good. *Does that mean day and night are in some way evil?* It is similar on day five where God says things are "good" before He tells the sea life and fowls to be fruitful and

multiply. *Is there some hidden, mystical reason He didn't think sea life and birds multiplying was good either, even after He commanded them to do so? Hardly.*

Finally, on the sixth day the Lord says things are "good" twice. The first time for the beasts of the field, and then after He creates man He gives the blanket proclamation. How do we know it covers the whole week? A simple observation of language. With His final proclamation the Lord said, *"And God saw every thing that he had made..."* but *He only made ONE thing since his last "good" proclamation—Adam.* It would be silly to say *"every thing"* for only *one thing*; the Lord does not make linguistic mistakes, *thus the "very good" proclamation encompasses the whole week.*

See what just a little bit of study will reveal instead of relying on someone else's word?

6 - Is It Really Re-plenish?

Fill or Re-Fill?

When reading through the King James Bible from the beginning, the first place where a gap could be suggested to a *modern* reader is in Gen 1:28,

"And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish* the earth..."

The key word being "replenish." When a modern reader sees the word "replenish" he naturally thinks the world is to be *re-filled* with people by Adam and Eve. And, of course, for the earth to be refilled, that means that it must have been previously full at one point and then subsequently emptied for some reason. Thus this one word appears to make the Genesis Gap tenable, but there are a few problems.

Even though we use *replenish* today almost exclusively to re-fill something or do something again, that is not its primary definition and was not its definition at all in 1611. Here is what the current (2019) Merriam-Webster dictionary has to say,

Replenish verb

- 1 a : to fill with persons or animals : STOCK
b archaic : to supply fully : PERFECT
c : to fill with inspiration or power : NOURISH
- 2 a : to fill or build up again
//replenished his glass
b : to make good : REPLACE

Notice how definition 1b is "to supply fully"? This is precisely what it means in Gen 1:28 and 9:1 in the KJB. It does not mean to refill, but to *fill fully, completely or abundantly*. Webster's 1828 dictionary is essentially the same: "*To fill; to stock with numbers or abundance.*" Replenish is a form of the word "replete." which means "fully or abundantly provided or filled."

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* "replenish" was not used in the sense of "refill" until 1632, 21 years after the AV was

published. (One source says it was used in a poetic sense as refill in 1612, but Gen 1:28 is not poetry.) As for the word's origin [this resource](#) states,

Origin

Late Middle English (in the sense 'supply abundantly'): from Old French *repleniss-*, lengthened stem of *replenir*, from *re-* 'again' (also expressing intensive force) + *plenir* 'fill' (from Latin *plenus* 'full').

Notice how it originally meant to 'supply abundantly' and the 're' prefix can express "intensive force" instead of "again."

Furthermore, every other time *replenish* is used in the KJB it always means to "fill" thoroughly or abundantly and not necessarily "refill" (Gen 9:1, Isa 2:6, 23:2, Jer 31:25, Eze 26:2, 27:25). That an instance, such as Gen 9:1, may also happen to be a refill is irrelevant. Filling something does not mean it could not have been filled before; it just means it does not *require* that it have been filled before.

Witness of the Earlier English Bibles

As any student of the history of the English Bible should know, the KJB was based upon the earlier English Bibles. Here is how several of the earlier Bibles rendered Genesis 1:28,

"...and fille ye the erthe," (Wycliffe, 1388)

"...and fyll the erth" (Tyndale, 1530)

"...and fyll the earth, and subdue it," (Coverdale, 1535)

"...& fyl the erth," (Matthews, 1537)

"...and fill the earth," (Geneva, 1560)

However, the King James translators, as directed by King James himself, were to primarily follow the *Bishops Bible* of 1568-1602,

"...and replenishe the earth, (Bishops, 1568)

But the Bishops Bible was mostly based upon the *Great Bible* of 1539 which was the first royally *authorized* English Bible,

"...and replenyshe the erth," (Great, 1539)

So the usage of *replenish* is not original with the KJB but can be directly traced to the *Great Bible* of 1539. The King James translators followed their directive and used the term "replenish" instead of "fill." Moreover, it is clear to see the terms "fill" and "replenish" are used interchangeably.

As soon as these facts are stated some of the brethren will go into "damage control" and make all kinds of baseless claims. Some will say, "The KJB *coined* the usage of replenish as refill. It is advanced revelation...." Hardly, as we mentioned, the modern usage didn't begin until 1632. It took many more years for it to be in common use as such. Others will still insist that *replenish* in Gen 9:1, which happens to also be a refilling, proves a refilling in Gen 1:28, but this is *flawed reasoning* and wishful thinking. How many times have you *filled* your car up with gasoline when it was also a refilling? However, none of those times proves that any previous time it was filled was a refill. Likewise, replenish in Gen 9:1 does not in any way *define* the word in Gen 1:28. That the earth had people on it before Noah is irrelevant.

"But the Re Prefix Demands..."

Some Gapist brethren will go in to a *re-* prefix tirade claiming the *re* always means to do something *again*, but this is not the case. According to Wiktionary the prefix *re-* can be used in one of three ways, as:

- again, anew
- a complete or intensification of the base
- back, backward

To *do again* (*reapply, remake, renew, etc.*) and to *go back* (*recede, return, regress, etc.*) are common usages today, but the prefix *re* used to *do completely or thoroughly* is also in frequent usage today and was even more common in 1611. Actually, it was the original usage in *replenish* (see [here](#)). The *re* prefix *intensified* the base word. Yet today there are many words with the *re* prefix where it is not used as "again" or "back" but as an intensifier. The Bible word "*reverence*" is one. It is formed from the old word "*vereri*" which means to "respect" or "hold in awe" while the *re* intensifies the action (see [here](#)). Thus in both cases *re* acts to intensify the root action with the only difference being the prefix in "replenish" has added the meaning "again" over the years while the prefix in "reverence" has not.

Therefore, it is out of ignorance Gapists contend that in 1611 *replenish* meant to *plenish again* ("plenish" being an old word for "fill") when the fact is it meant to *plenish completely or abundantly*.

Furthermore, with many *re* prefix words today the original *re* meaning has been lost. As one source said, "*the precise sense of re is lost in secondary senses or weakened beyond recognition.*" There are 350 words in the KJB that begin with *re* and many of them do not refer to anything being done again or going back; i.e. *read, require, remain, rebel, reward, rebuke, etc.* The *re* argument of the Gap Proponents is an argument of desperation.

Biblical Parallels

Since the *re* prefix in "replenish" signifies to fill "abundantly," does the text of the Bible bear this out? Sure it does. One key attribute of the KJB is how it can define its own terms using parallel statements. Consider the following parallels,

"Be fruitful, and multiply, and *fill* the waters. . ." (Gen 1:22)

"Be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish* the earth. . ." (Gen 1:28)

"Be fruitful, and multiply, and *replenish* the earth." (Gen 9:1)

"Be ye fruitful, and multiply; bring forth *abundantly* in the earth, and multiply therein." (Gen 9:7)

Notice when the Lord restates His commission to Noah to "replenish the earth," that he tells him to "*bring forth abundantly.*" There is not a hint of a re-filling in the command. The first verse in the parallel statements shows the key purpose for being "fruitful" is to "*fill.*" The last verse shows it is to fill "*abundantly.*" These bookends explain and define "replenish" in the two middle verses. See also Gen 1:20 and 1:21.

For an example of how the Lord's command was being fulfilled by Noah's posterity consider (Exo 1:7),

"And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied...."

There, again, is the term "abundantly" associated with fruitfulness and increase. The pattern is clear.

This definition of "replenish" as "fill abundantly" also fits perfectly with other places "replenish[ed]" is found,

"Be still, ye inhabitants of the isle; thou whom the merchants of Zidon, that pass over the sea, have replenished." (Isa 23:2)
"The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee in thy market: and thou wast replenished, and made very glorious in the midst of the seas." (Ezek 27:25)

The "merchants of Zidon" filled the "inhabitants of the isle," and "the ships of Tarshish" filled Tyrus abundantly until it was "very glorious." There is not a hint of a refilling in the passages.

What About The Hebrew?

We have been able to show that in 1611 *replenish* means fill abundantly without resorting to the Hebrew, but for those with "originalitis," the Hebrew word "*male*" (H4390) which is translated as "replenish" NEVER means to *refill* (according Brown, Driver, Briggs, etc.). It always means "fill" in this context as in Gen 1:22 (see also Gen 6:11, 42:25; 44:1; 1Sam 16:1; 1Kin 18:33; Job 15:2; 38:39; Psa 83:16; Isa 27:6; etc.). Thus, since "male" cannot mean refill, the Gap proponents who insist it does are actually *claiming the AV is not an accurate translation of the Hebrew!* In their fervent quest to promote the Genesis Gap they are in fact undermining the Bible!

Furthermore, with the *re* in "replenish" being an intensifier, the places where the King James translators used "replenish" instead of "fill" shows they deemed those passages worthy of added emphasis. "Replenish" is not a synonym for simply "fill," it is a synonym for "fill completely, abundantly, or thoroughly." This is a distinction not found in the new translations that only use the term "fill," and also a distinction unacknowledged by the Gap Theorists.

As for the brethren who claim replenish is an "advanced revelation" that was only recently revealed or understood. Are they saying that for the first 200 years or so after the KJB was published no one understood the truth of the term by believing it meant "fill abundantly"? Remember, in 1828 it was still primarily defined as "fill." *If so, please explain your reasoning in light of next section below.*

Consistency Anyone?

The Gap proponents who rely (another *re* word) on *replenish* as one of their main Genesis Gap arguments (one brazenly and ignorantly stated that *replenish* should settle the matter for any Bible Believer) will often show their hypocrisy with other archaic English words that have changed meaning over the years. Take "prevent" for instance. Today it means to stop or hinder something from happening. In 1611, however, it meant to *pre-event*, precede, or come before something. Look how using prevent in the modern sense can really mess up a passage. Psa 88:13 says,

But unto thee have I cried, O LORD; and in the morning shall my prayer prevent thee.

Is the prayer here stopping the Lord from doing something? Hardly. The verse is saying the person's prayer will come before the Lord. It will *pre-event* Him. Look at 1Th 4:15 for a more common example,

For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.

Is the passage saying that those who are alive at the Lord's coming or rapture not going to stop those who are dead or asleep? Not at all. It is saying they will not *precede or go ahead of them*. Another example of this is the word "let" in Rom 1:13 and "letteth" in 2Th 2:8. Today "let" means to allow something to happen, but in the 1600s it could mean exactly the opposite, that is, *to hinder*. If a modern KJB reader doesn't realize this he will not understand the verses correctly. Most Gap Proponents will be quick to explain the intended meaning with these archaic English word usages...except for *replenish*. Their duplicity is glaring. It is clear consistency is not a concern with some of the brethren, especially when they have a pet doctrine they are supporting. *Fascinating isn't it?*

Some of the more knowledgeable Gap Theorists will refrain from using the *replenish* argument since they understand it can backfire on them. However, others cannot resist since it lends itself so well to a "Gotcha" moment against those who don't know the true meaning.

Replenish With What?

Even if the Gap Theorists contentions about "replenish" were true most would still have a problem. When one refills or replenishes something in the current sense it is expected that the object be refilled with the same type of contents. If one is refilling an empty glass of water, it is expected, if not required, that it be *refilled with the same substance*: water. Filling it with bleach or motor oil is not replenishing unless it is specifically stated that it should be replenished with something different.

The problem here with some of the Gap brethren is they claim only the "morning stars" and "sons of God" were with Lucifer on the pre-Adamic earth. They insist there were no men there. However, when God told Adam and Eve to "replenish the earth," they could only populate it with mankind like themselves. It would not be populated with the same type of creatures as before! Again, "replenish" only means to "fill abundantly." Understanding this solves all the problems

Ah, the messes some of the brethren get themselves into.

7 - What Did Peter Say?

Did Peter Say That?

Probably one of the Gap Theorist's most relied upon passages is 2 Peter 3:3-7. Some of them claim it is by itself sufficient to "prove" the Genesis Gap to any "real" Bible Believer. Let's see,

3, Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,

4, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.

5, For this they 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.

The Gappers see a *pre-Adamic earth populated by Lucifer, the sons of God, angels and then Lucifer's flood of judgment covering both heaven and earth in these verses*. Not only do they insist there was a cataclysmic destruction of both the heavens and earth, some even claim the craters on the moon were caused by this "war." We must grant that they have a vivid imagination.

First, the topic of the section in 2 Peter 3 is "scoffers" questioning the second coming of Jesus Christ, insisting nothing has changed since "the beginning of the creation" or time. This is basically "Uniformitarianism." In response Peter brings up the initial creation and then Noah's flood to show things can and do change in due time.

Peter's reply to the scoffer's gripe starts with them being "willingly" "ignorant." What is the scoffer ignorant of according to the Gap Theorists? *Why it is something even they admit is not explicitly stated in the Bible*. Now think about that a minute. *How can a person be "willingly ignorant" of a Pre-Adamic flood of the entire universe that the Bible does not explicitly mention, God never*

explicitly revealed, and no one really tried to promote until 1800 years later? The Lord Jesus Christ never talked about it, the apostles never did either, the OT prophets didn't mention it...but they all mention Noah and his flood! Even Peter in the previous chapter mentioned Noah (2Pe 2:4-5), and also in his previous book (1Pe 3:20).

Peter says the scoffer should know "the heavens (plural) were of old" by the "word of God." This obviously is the creation week. This is easily proven in multiple ways. *First, for the heavens to exist by the "word of God" then there should be a record of the Lord using words and speaking the heavens into existence.* Where does this occur? Why on day two of creation week. *There God speaks the "firmament" into existence and names it "Heaven."* Can the Gapists produce a verse showing the Lord speaking a previous heaven into existence? You will starve to death waiting for one.

Next, notice the plural, "heavens." the fact that there are not two heavens mentioned until Gen 1:20 is another snag for the Gapists. In Genesis 1:8 the firmament makes what is now known as the *second heaven* where the sun, moon, and stars reside, and the first heaven, the sky, is revealed in Gen 1:20. *Therefore, by very simple grade school reasoning one can conclude the flood Peter is soon going to mention had to occur AFTER Gen 1:20 or at the earliest AFTER Gen 1:8! This is the only reasonable scriptural way one can come up with more than one heaven.*

Peter also mentions the heavens were "of old." "Of old" is simply a phrase that means something that has been around "a long time" without specifically stating how long. So how can we find out what Peter considers to be "old"? Just look in the previous chapter where he says,

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; (2Pe 2:5)

Isn't it amazing how the Bible explains itself? Here we have an "old world" a "flood" and a "preacher." Context is everything and *Peter's point of reference for something "old" is the flood of Noah,* and of course, the even earlier creation. Peter considers, as we do today and even David did centuries earlier (Psa 68:33), both the earth's creation out of water and Noah's flood to have been a long time ago, "of old."

Next in 2 Pet 3:5 Peter mentions how the "earth" was "standing out of the water and in the water." This is a rather peculiar statement, but where in the Bible does it best fit? Does it refer to a pre-Adamic deluge where the earth is allegedly floating like a fishing bobber in the "great deep" as the Gap Theorists claim or does it refer to the creation of "Earth" ("dry land") as it was emerging out of the waters in Gen 1:9-10? The correct answer is obvious. Gen 1:9-10 is the first time land and sea are both visible. There is no catastrophic pre-Adamic deluge even hinted with these words. This is referring to the initial creation of "the earth" or "dry land."

As for the earth being "in" the water, remember in Gen 1:6 where it says, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters"? The waters were divided with the firmament or heaven in between, then the next day the earth is formed out of the lower waters. Thus the earth can be said to be "in the water" in two ways: it is in the water as it emerges out of it to form land, and it is between the waters divided by the sky or firmament.

With 3:6 Peter says "*Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:*" Even though Noah's flood was about 1700 years after creation, it was the same "world" that was "whereby" flooded with the same water of vs 5. Verses 5 and 6 are connected by referring the same water and same world upon the earth. The waters of creation were also the waters of judgment.

Also, notice the change in words Peter uses much to the dismay of the Gap Theorists. In verses 5 and 7 he says "earth," but in vs 6 he says "world." What is the difference, you may ask? It can be a significant difference.

"Earth," as we have shown many times refers to physical dry land or the entire landmass. "World," on the other hand most often describes the people, society, kingdoms, or civilization that is *upon* the physical earth. The current *world order*. See the last part of Isa 23:17 for a clear example and also Isa 18:3. John 3:16 contains a typical NT example.

Obviously, since the earth houses the world, it can be said to have many of the same attributes as the world. However, the reverse is usually not true. As always, context determines how a word is used.

The Gapists try to claim that the "world" in vs 6 is the *entire universe*. They insist it is referring to both the "heavens" and "earth" of verse 5, but this is just more contrived doctrine. Want to know what Peter (and nearly every other NT writer) means when he says

"world"? Just go back a few verses to 2Pe 2:5,

"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;"

Does the "world" there refer to the entire universe? No, it does not even refer to the earth itself. It is the "world of the ungodly" with all its people, society, and ways that was not spared and thus annihilated. The same present evil world (Gal 1:4) Satan is the "god" of (2Co 4:4). Heb 11:7 says, "*By faith Noah, being warned of God...prepared an ark...by the which he condemned the world;*" that is, the world that breathes which includes humanity. This time was also called the "*days of Noe*" (Mat 24:37; Luke 17:26). It was a different time and *world*, but not a different earth or heavens. This is the way the term *world* is used throughout the New Testament.

Even though the world of the time was decimated, the "earth" itself was not really harmed at all by the flood. It was just covered with water for a while. *The proof is the Lord did not have to re-create anything on or in the earth after the flood was over for the normal earthly processes to continue.* Once the waters receded everything started growing again.

In vs 6 when Peter is speaking of the same "world" perishing by water, he is not referring to some imaginary annihilation of the physical earth and heavens, he is referring to the wicked people and their society (including the land animals) upon the earth being destroyed by the water in Noah's flood (Gen 7:23). Peter very easily could have said, "*Whereby the [heavens and earth] that then was, being overflowed with water, perished,*" but he said "world" instead because he knew only it was destroyed. The "heavens and earth" have yet to be destroyed.

In vs. 7 Peter states "*But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store...*" Because of the way this verse is worded the Gap Theorists like to claim it declares the previous heavens and earth were destroyed and we now have a new heavens and earth, but that is just wishful thinking. They read the verse as, "*But the heavens and the earth [which were destroyed in Lucifer's flood and were replaced by the heavens and earth] which are now...*" (and they claim they do not read anything into passages.).

(This is what *Genesis Gap Goggles* will do to one's thinking. Like

a Calvinist with his Calvinism, they see the Genesis Gap everywhere.)

Again, the passage says nothing about the heavens and earth being destroyed. It says a "world" (of people) "perished." The primary definition of "perish" is "to die." Living people "perish" (Joh 10:28; Act 8:20; 2Pe 3:9). The Lord said in Gen 6:13 He was going to end "all flesh." Peter saying "which are now" simply means he has jumped from the judgment of water in Noah's day to the coming judgment of fire of the current heavens and earth. He is talking about the "now" or current physical universe in contrast to the world or "days of Noe" of before the flood. Again, even though they speak of different *worlds* and times, the actual heavens and earth are the same as those "which were of old" in vs 5.

It is clear there were changes to both the heavens and earth because of the flood. The earth had never seen rain before and the heavens had never before produced it (Gen 7:11), but they are still intact with the same identity today. This is unlike the coming judgment where the heavens actually "pass away" and the earth melts down (2Pe 3:10) and a "new" heaven and earth are created.

That the heavens and earth before the flood is the same heavens and earth today can easily shown by considering just one other verse.

How Many Earths?

According to the Gappers timeline, these are the key events

1. Initial creation of Gen 1:1
2. The destruction of the then existing world by Lucifer's Flood (Gen 1:2)
3. The re-creation of a new heaven and earth (Gen 1:3-31)
4. Noah's Flood (Gen 6-8)
5. The coming destruction of the earth by fire (2Pe 3:7)
6. And another new heavens and earth is created (2Pe 3:13, Rev 21:1)

This leaves the Gappers with *three* earths. The initial one, the one after Lucifer's Flood, and the one after the coming judgment by fire. However, the Bible only speaks of *two* earths. Rev 21:1 makes this quite clear,

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the **first** heaven and the first earth were passed away

If we are now living in the "first earth," there is no place for another earth before Gen 1:2. They do not have a legitimate answer for this obvious problem. About all they can come up with is God simply doesn't count the pre-Adamic earth as an "earth." This simple fact alone should cause any believer much pause in considering their elaborate claims. Their Genesis Gap system cannot accommodate the simplest of verses without mangling them or explaining them away.

8 - The Host of Heaven

A Host of Inhabitants

A significant word in Gen 2:1 is the term "host." It says the Lord finished "all the host of them," that is of all the "heavens and the earth." "Host" can most easily be defined as the inhabitants of a place. It can refer to physical objects like the stars in heaven (Deut 4:19; 17:3; Amos 5:26), to armies on both heaven and earth (Gen 21:22; Exo 14:4; 2Ch 18:18; Job 25:3 etc.), and also to heavenly beings such as angels and cherubim (Gen 32:2; Jos 5:14; 1Ki 22:19; Psa 103:21, 148:2; Isa 24:21; Luke 2:13).

A verse very similar to Gen 2:1 is Neh 9:6,

Thou, even thou, art LORD alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein...and the host of heaven worshippeth thee.

Here it is clear the "host of heaven" refers to the beings of heaven because they can worship the Lord. Now notice how it says the Lord made "heaven" and the "heaven of heavens, with all their host." According to Gen 1:6-8 the Lord made at least one "heaven" on the second day, so since the Scriptures do not specifically state when the Lord created the beings comprising the spiritual "host of heaven," one could surmise from Neh 9:6 creation day two was the time. The verse has the heavens and their host created before the earth which fits the Genesis account perfectly (Exo 20:11; Psa 33:6, 146:6; etc.).

Thus there is no scriptural reason not to conclude day two of creation was the "day" the Lord created the "third heaven" ("heaven of heavens"), the second heaven (named "Heaven") and all their spiritual inhabitants. (He didn't make the physical inhabitants until day four with the sun, moon, and stars). This includes the *cherubim*, *seraphim*, *angels*, *Lucifer*, *morning stars*, *sons of God*, and any other principalities that dwell there. The straightforward reading of Genesis chapter 1 and other verses that refer to the events found there lead to that conclusion.

This order of creation also fits perfectly with the order revealed directly by the Lord in Job 38:4-11. He questions Job in 38:4-5 with,

4, Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding.

5, Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it?

We already know when the foundations of the earth were laid, in Gen 1:9-10 (Heb 1:10). That is where the Lord brought the dry land out of the water and named it "Earth."

Note: Gentle reader...many of you have been so influenced by some of the brethren that you still think Job 38:4 is referring to some planet called "earth" floating in space. We have showed over and over again the Bible defines the dry landmass as earth. *Let the Bible define its own terms!*

The earth being landmasses such as continents allows all the verses that speak of the earth having foundations (Psa 102:25, 104:5) and pillars (1Sa 2:8; Job 9:6) make sense. How does a whole planet floating in space have a foundation or pillars holding it up? Here in Job 38:4-6 the Lord is clearly referring to the dry land He brought up out of the sea. This is when He laid the earth's foundation to the sea bottom, sized it to his measurements, surveyed its lines or pillars, and placed some type of corner stone.

The foundation of the earth is now called the *continental shelf*. This could be the "*bottoms of the mountains; the earth with her bars*" that Jonah speaks of in Jon 2:6. As for the pillars and corner stone, man has not discovered them yet, but you can rest assured they are there.

With the "sons of God" and "morning stars" created with the firmament and heaven on creation day two, they were all available to *sing together and shout for joy* when the Lord brought the earth up from the chaos of the sea (Job 38:7)! It doesn't matter that they were only a day old. The Lord likely created them with massive instinct and intellectual capability as he later did with Adam.

Lucifer And His Bunch

The last major argument we will look at of the Gap Theorists is

their claim that Lucifer and "his angels" were the inhabitants of their pre-Adamic earth and because of Lucifer's rebellion that earth was destroyed. Clarence Larkin describes it this way in his classic *Dispensational Truth*,

"The intimation in this scripture [Eze 28] then is, that Satan, with a host of angelic beings, was placed in charge of the original or primeval earth, and that he through pride (1Tim. 3:6; Isa. 14:12-14) sought to be equal with God, and that to punish him the earth was thrown into a chaotic state, and Satan and his angels, amounting to a third of the angelic hosts (Rev. 12:4) were excluded from Heaven, and took up their abode in the heavenlies...."

Larkin goes on to say about "demons,"

"...the "demons" are believed by many to be the disembodied spirits of the inhabitants of the Pre-Adamite Earth, and their efforts to reembody themselves in human beings, as in the days of Christ, is looked upon as evidence that they once possessed bodies similar to human bodies."

The Gapists have a lot of doctrine riding on their pre-Adamic earth. No wonder they strive so hard to keep it afloat.

The two passages about the "fall" of Lucifer (Isa 14; Eze 28) are inexplicit and quite ambiguous. Each one is primarily directed to a heathen king but also have overtones they speak of the spiritual power behind the kings as well. Since we agree with our Gapist brethren that these passages likely speak of Lucifer as that spiritual entity, we will only look at their contentions as to *when* these events occurred.

Note: Since no place in Scripture, including these passages, explicitly states Satan is referenced in these two passages, the contention that he is, is only speculation. The main reason Gapists and many Non-Gapists alike believe it likely refers to Satan is there is no other person revealed in Scripture who could fit the description...except, maybe Satan's protege—the coming Antichrist. In fact, Isaiah 14 seems to fit future events quite well.

Nevertheless, that Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 make at the best only implicit reference to Satan, that makes the Gap Theory an implicit belief based upon other implicit beliefs! The potential for error is enormous. This is NOT ground one should establish doctrine upon and to consider such a convoluted and contrived belief as FACT is an abuse of language and sign of insecurity. Facts can be proven, the Gap Theory is multiple tiers away from having proof, and insisting it is fact without this proof indicates its proponents recognize its inherent weaknesses.

Determining the time frame and sequence of events in Ezekiel 28:13-19 and Isaiah 14 is a challenge. Plus trying to determine which statements belong only to the human king and which are exclusive to Lucifer is even tougher. Your author knows of no one who has mastered it (especially when Ezekiel chapter 31 is considered). For instance, Eze 28:13 says,

Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering...the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.

One can only apply these words to the human king in a highly figurative or hyperbolic manner. The king of Tyre was never in Eden, was not naturally covered with precious stones, and was not directly created with musical instruments as part of his person! Since these words cannot literally apply to the king, they must apply to the spirit behind the king before he fell.

One Eden or Two?

The problem for the Gap Theorists is the words about Eden. It appears Satan was there before he fell. Genesis 2 and 3 tell us about the Garden of Eden and how Adam and Eve lived there. The garden was planted in Gen 2:8 and Adam was placed in it soon after, but since the Gap Theorists insist Lucifer fell before Gen 1:2, how could he possibly have been in Eden?

Their answer is one of the most contrived arguments of their whole system. They merely claim, without one shred of solid scriptural evidence, there must have been *another Eden* composed of

minerals rather than plants on a previous earth! How convenient. If the Scriptures don't say what you want them to say, just invent your own facts!

This contention alone should be a "wake-up" call to any believer considering the Gap Theory. Any belief system that has to resort to such highly questionable assumptions to keep it afloat should be looked at very, very skeptically and only adopted if there is no other feasible explanation.

Note: To add even more mystery about "Eden" and the "garden of God," look at Ezekiel 31:8-9. This passage speaks about "Pharaoh king of Egypt," and the Lord said "The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him," and He made him so "fair" "that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." It could be said that in some way Pharaoh was in Eden as well!

One Day at a Time

Ezekiel 28:13 and 28:15 also contain another dilemma for the Gap Theorists - the "day" Lucifer/Satan was "created." Most Gap Theorists will rightly insist that the days of Genesis 1 are literal 24 hour days and that chapter mentions the first "day" in the Bible, but this immediately presents a problem with Eze 28:13. If Lucifer was actually created on a "day," that would put his creation AFTER Gen 1:2. So what do the Gapists do here? They simply say the Ezekiel 28 "day" is not really a typical day. They contend it is a generic usage of the word "day" that speaks of any particular period of time. Granted "day" is sometimes used this way in the Scriptures ("day of the Lord," etc.), but "day" in Eze 28:13 is the context of God creating something like He did in Genesis chapter 1. The Gap Theorists resort to a non-literal usage for "day" in this instance while in the same breath boasting about how they take each word "literally."

Another passage the Gap Theorists appeal to concerning Satan is John 8:44 (also see 1Jo 3:8),

"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth..."

Their argument with this verse is since the Devil was a murderer "from the beginning" and the "beginning" is in Gen 1:1, then Satan must have fell in the "gap" which is after or "from" Gen 1:1 but before Gen 1:2. Sounds nice doesn't it, but with just a brief examination of how "beginning" is used in the Bible we learn our brethren are being disingenuous. Actually, we only need to look at one other verse with the word "beginning" in it and they will reveal their own duplicity and inconsistency! Look at Mark 10:6,

But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

Here we have an account of the Lord using "beginning" that is even more specific to creation than its use in John 8:44. Surely the Gap Theorists would consider this "beginning" to be the same "beginning" as the one in John 8:44 wouldn't they? Especially since this one mentions creation specifically? Uh, No. They can't have man created at the "beginning of the creation God" in Gen 1:1 because it doesn't allow for their Genesis Gap! They insist there can't be any men on Lucifer's earth. Man didn't come until the end of the "re-creation" of earth. When questioned on this they say something like, "There are many different beginnings in the Bible. This is speaking of the beginning of mankind, not the beginning of creation..." yet it says "creation right in the verse!"

When Did Satan Fall?

As we previously mentioned, the heavenly host, which includes a heavenly beings such as angels and cherubim, were likely created on day two with the firmament or Heaven. We also saw that the Lord said "every thing" he created during the six days of creation was "very good." Thus the fall of Lucifer or Satan must have occurred sometime between Gen 2:4 and 3:1.

How long a time period is between Genesis 2:4 and 3:1 is unknown. It may have been weeks, months, or even several years. Ezekiel 28 appears to state Lucifer was in Eden. It is interesting to observe that Adam was not created in Eden. The Lord planted the garden there and then "*took the man*" and "*put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it*" (Gen 2:8, 15). So Eden was not Adam's original home, and the time period between the Lord creating the garden and placing Adam there may have been the time

Lucifer was there and subsequently fell (Isa 14:12-16), and all "his" fellow "spirits" with him (1Pe 3:19; Jude 1:6).

Note: Another reason why the Lord charged Adam with "dress[ing]" the garden may be because Lucifer/Satan messed it up! Pure speculation, but an interesting thought.

Some of the Gapists will again bring up John 8:44 at this point and say Satan was "a murderer from the beginning" and insist it must have happened in the Gap, but they are not thinking this through. If the "beginning" is the initial creation, none of them believe Lucifer/Satan was created evil so he had to have fallen sometime *after* the earliest "beginning;" as the text states, "from the beginning." Also, the verse says Satan was a "murderer." When did he murder anyone? Of course, it was Adam and Eve he beguiled into an act of death well after the week of creation. *So it is clear the Lord is using the words "from the beginning" to encompass creation and the fall.*

Although there is much more about Satan and the time of creation in general we would like to know, the scenario we presented above, in spite of its "gaps" (smile), does not violate any Scripture, and neither does it present any fanciful, dogmatic claims.

Satan a "King" or "Prince"?

Some Gapists will quote 2 Corinthians 4:4 where Paul speaks of Satan as being the "god of this world" and claim the Devil was given dominion over the Pre-Adamic *earth* as a "king" or "prince," lost his dominion at his fall and expulsion, and then won it back again from Adam at Adam's fall. That Satan is now the "god of this world" is of no dispute, but again the Gapists are confounding the terms *world* and *earth*. The world in 1Co 4:4 is the worldly system of *kingdoms, nations, and men*. It does not refer to material earth. When Satan took the Lord on a high mountain He showed Him the "kingdoms of the world" and said,

"...All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it" (Luke 4:5-6)

So the worldly power and glory of kingdoms and nations belong

to the Devil (the Lord did not dispute Satan's claim and actually called him the "prince of this world" in other places, i.e. Joh 12:31, 14:30, 16:11), but there is no indication he controls the material earth itself.

The Scriptures do not specifically tell us how or when these kingdoms were "delivered" to Satan, but it indeed may have been when Adam ate of the forbidden tree. Adam may have forfeited his "kingly" or "princely" dominion over the world to the serpent at that time. Nevertheless, even if true, that in no way even implies that Satan was "king" on a previous earth or that a previous earth even existed.

9 - Overview and Summary

Is It Really That Complicated?

The straightforward meaning of Genesis chapter 1 is simple, God states He created the heaven and the earth in the beginning and then gives some details of how he did it. The Gap Theorists will moan and howl with this statement yelling, "Verse 2 is different from the others. It is not part of the narrative." So what? Can a pause for a comment not be placed within the scope of a narrative? Of course, it can. People do it all the time. Consider this modern analogy,

1. Today I baked a cake in the oven,
2. *Now the cake was just batter in a bowl,*
3. I poured the batter into a pan and spread it around,
4. Then I put the pan in the oven and let it bake,
5. ...and that is how I baked a cake in the oven.

This analogy has an introductory statement (#1), a comment (#2), details of the actions taken (#3-4), then a closing statement (#5). It matches the creation account perfectly.

As for the inserted comment, there are other examples similar to this in the Scriptures. Look at Jonah 3:3-4,

3a, So Jonah arose, and went unto Nineveh, according to the word of the LORD.

3b, Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city of three days' journey.

4, And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey....

See how verse 3a is an introduction of what is happening? It says Jonah went unto Nineveh, but he didn't actually go in until verse 4. Verse 3b is a comment inserted into the narrative. For other examples see Genesis 2:11-12 where a comment is inserted about "gold" in the narrative and Gen 13:2 where a comment is placed there about Abraham. Thus, the structure of Gen 1:2 does not require any kind of "gap" at all.

The creation week narrative is simple and straightforward. Any grade school student can understand it as it stands without a Gapist

trying to cloud the matter with their contentions.

In a Nutshell...

Above we addressed practically every argument the Gap Theorists present in support of their claims. We showed,

- That "was" in Gen 1:2 should not be rendered "became" in spite of the great effort some of them make to try and do so.
- That "create," "made," and "form" are often used interchangeably and the hard distinctions the Gapists try to make between them is total bunk.
- That the "And[s]" in Genesis 1 connects the verses together as one unit whether they are a figure of speech (polysyndeton) or not.
- That the Gapist's claims for Isa 45:18 are silly and defy the basic fundamentals of language...until something is formed, it is without form.
- That their alleged parallel account of "without form and void" in Jer 4:23 is highly speculative and assuming and actually applies in the future.
- That their misrepresentation of "darkness" in Genesis 1:2 has kept them in the dark to certain truths.
- That the Lord said "every thing" he created during the whole creation week was "very good." He did not say "every thing" for the only one thing created (man) since his last "good" proclamation.
- That "replenish" is an archaic term meaning "to fill completely or abundantly" and how their rejection of this fact has blinded them to certain truths. The re- prefix speaks of completion.
- That Peter's discourse on judgment in 2 Peter 3 says nothing about a Pre-Adamic earth but deals with creation and Noah's flood which were already in the context.
- How the Bible defines "earth" as "dry land" and not a "planet."
- How the "sons of God" were created before the earth came out of the waters as "dry land."
- That Lucifer could have been in Eden before Adam and fell after creation week.
- How the Gapists will either explain away or ignore any verses that appear to contradict their doctrine.

As we stated at the start, the Gap Theory was born out of a desperate need of some to reconcile the Bible with "modern geology." Certainly they felt they were defending the Bible by trying to keep it relevant in this new "scientific world." The theory was picked up with a little modification by some of the more conservative and fundamental brethren such as George Pember, C. I. Scofield, and Clarence Larkin. These brethren still used it to explain the apparent old age of the earth as well as the expulsion of Lucifer and existence of "devils," but in recent years many of the Fundamentalists and/or Bible Believers have abandoned using it to explain the "vast ages." Thus the obvious question arises, "Why do they even need a gap at all?"

Three Verses That Should Settle The Matter

We have referred the reader to several Bible passages in this treatise, but there are three simple, easy to comprehend verses that will reveal the true nature of the Genesis Gap Theory more than any other. The verses are so simple in their expression and clear in their meaning that any Bible reader without an agenda would have no problem understanding them at all. Consider,

For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is... (Exo 20:11)

But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. (Mar 10:6)

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. (Rev 21:1)

As clear as these verses are, the Gap Theorists cannot accept them as they stand. These are not tricky passages with dispensational overtones, but simple, universal statements. With the first they must "clarify" that it is a mistake to think that God actually created *everything* in six days, then they start "explaining" how "made" is not "create" and God was really *re-making* the heaven and earth.... The second verse fares no better. With it they must explain how "the beginning of the creation" is not really that at all but only the beginning of *man's creation* during the *re-creation* long after the initial "beginning" of creation.... And the third verse is likewise "interpreted." They must explain that the earth we are presently on

now is not really the "first earth" it is actually the second.

If there is any doubt as to the meaning of a Bible passage such as Genesis 1:2, the Scriptural way to understand it is to *look for other Bible passages dealing with the same subject*. The above three verses answer any question Genesis 1:2 may raise concerning an alleged Gap. Ironically, Bible Believers will truthfully and routinely preach that one should understand obscure verses in the light of more clear verses...*except when it comes to the Genesis Gap*. Amazing!

When an alleged Bible doctrine cannot exist without mangling simple and clear Bible passages such as these three and others, then that doctrine must be highly suspect. To establish it as scriptural or "sound" there must be significant scriptural proof to show that the doctrine is indeed biblical. On the contrary the Genesis Gap Theorists cannot prove ANY of its key tenets from Scripture. That fatal weakness speaks volumes.

The simple fact is every one of the passages the Gapists use to supposedly "prove" the Gap can easily be shown to have *more relevant and meaningful application elsewhere*. All their passages have to be "massaged" and viewed through their *Genesis Gap Goggles* to see a Gap in them. They read very much into their "proof" passages. *Take heed, brethren, take heed*.

The Burden of Proof and Purpose

The burden of proof to establish a Genesis Gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 is on the Genesis Gap Theorists. It is not on those who don't believe it to disprove it. Other understandings of all the passages the Gapists use to promote their doctrine have been around and accepted for centuries. The Gapists are the ones trying to change the passages from their straight-forward meaning, thus they need to conclusively prove their claims to be considered. The contention of your author and many others is they have not done so.

Furthermore, the Gap Theorists have failed to show a legitimate reason why a Gap is even needed or what purpose it serves, especially those who now claim it was only a few hundred or thousand years long. As we have seen they interject Lucifer's rise and fall into this period to try and give it credence, but that actually will more easily fit in Genesis 2. If they want people to abandon the common sense, straight-forward meaning of a passage then they need to provide sound and solid reasons why it must be done. *"If I'm*

standing in the sunshine, you better have some overwhelming proof to convince me the sun is not shining."

Is It Important; A Distinction?

Whether there is a Genesis Gap or not is pretty insignificant. Even if true, since it is pretty much hidden in the Scriptures and most Bible readers cannot find it, at best is a third-rate doctrine. Unlike important Bible doctrines about the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ and similar matters, it doesn't make any difference at all to one's walk and service to the Lord if one believes there is a Gap or not. It is superfluous. If it is true and a believer fails to believe it, he is not really missing anything practical in his Christian life (consider all the saints who lived before 1814 AD); however, if it is not true and one still believes it, he is forcing the Scriptures to say more than they actually do and is also being gullible to the errant teachings of others.

The insinuation by some of the brethren that belief in the Genesis Gap is necessary for one to be a true King James Bible Believer is nonsense. It is BY NO MEANS an essential Bible Believing doctrine. Claiming it is, is just another tactic of the insecure. Some have found that subtle belittlement and ridicule are effective methods of keeping "rebellious" brethren in line, so they try to brand the Gap as a distinguishing characteristic of the Bible Believing movement to keep them reigned in. Nevertheless, more and more Bible Believers are abandoning consideration of the Gap Theory because they realize under examination it simply doesn't make the grade of "sound words" (2Ti 1:13) and "sound doctrine" (2Ti 4:3). For something to be sound it must have a firm foundation, but the Genesis Gap's foundation is made of spider webs and cotton balls. If it was a boat it wouldn't be sound enough to go out past waist deep water.

Final Considerations

Why We Must Reject The Gap

Because of the many weaknesses we have detailed in this little treatise, your author has never accepted the Gap Theory. Unlike other doctrines that may need some study or explanation to grasp, the Genesis Gap does not have one clear, explicit verse that even says a gap exists! The whole Gap system is built upon *speculation, conjecture, theorizing, supposition, and imagination*. Real Bible doctrines that are controversial like the *pre-tribulation rapture, pre-millennial return of Christ, election, baptism, tongues, sabbath, triune God, Old Testament law, New Testament grace, etc., etc.*, all have an explicit basis in Scripture even if some elements are implicit. That is, the Bible clearly states *Christ will return, there will be a rapture, there is a baptism, there is an elect, etc.*, the controversy is primarily about *when* they occur, *how* they are applied, or *to whom* they apply...but the Genesis Gap Theory stands alone *with no explicit statement that it even exists*. Even the implicit passages used to justify it are very weak. It is a contrived doctrine based upon even other implicit teachings that make it ripe for *speculation, conjecture, and imagination*. Again, take heed, Brethren, take heed.

"The Gap Fact"—Are You Kidding?

In view of the Gap Theory's scriptural deficiencies, to call it a "Gap Fact" is a gross misrepresentation and clear overstatement. *Facts can be proven*, but in spite of the spirited attempts of its proponents to do so, the Gap has not been proven, not by a long shot. It remains a mere theory and a weak one at that. In response Gap Theorists will often appeal to Isa 28:10, 13 and claim the Gap cannot be found in one passage; it must be pieced together "*precept upon precept; line upon line...here a little, and there a little,*" but all this is to no avail. All the pieces they appeal to more easily refer to other things and other doctrines. No matter how much they try to massage the often obscure and ambiguous passages they appeal to, the Genesis Gap remains nothing more than speculation.

It is actually because some brethren began calling the Gap Theory

the "Gap Fact" that your author wrote this work. When it was just theory or opinion, people could "take it or leave it," but insisting it is a "Fact," is a whole other concept. If something is a proven fact then those who don't accept it are in doctrinal error and can be charged with "not believing the Bible." It is no longer a matter of opinion. With this "fact" claim *the Gapists have made themselves the final arbiters of truth*. If the scriptural proof was present to prove a Gap, the Scriptures themselves would condemn the non-believers, but since they don't explicitly present a Genesis Gap, the Gapists make themselves the standard.

Note: From studying both issues extensively from a Biblical perspective, your author has found the *Flat Earth Theory* held by some believers today has more *apparent* circumstantial support from the Scriptures than the *Gap Theory...and the Flat Earth contention is nonsense!* Yes, the Gap Theory is that weak.

(One of the means God uses to reveal Himself is the observation of the "heavens" and nature (Psa 19:1) but the Flat-Earthers reject this knowledge. The same goes for globe *Geocentrism*. See our book, [*King James Cosmology*](#).)

The Bible says a believer should "prove all things" (1Th 5:21). As Dr. Ruckman says in his commentary of this verse, "*You are to believe NOTHING till it has stood the test of PROOF.*" But in spite of the Genesis Gap contentions of Dr. Ruckman himself, plus C. I. Scofield, Clarence Larkin, and even Finis J. Dake, all men your author admires for their great labor in the word, he cannot follow them concerning the Genesis Gap. Not one element of it can be *proven*.

The simple fact is if one can't prove a doctrine from the Scriptures, it is NOT a Bible fact. "Prove all things."

Proof: A High Standard

To "prove" basically means "to try or test" something to see if it meets a certain standard (Exo 20:20; Luke 14:19) or to determine if something is true to what it claims (Act 24:13, 25:7). Once something is proved it can act as "proof" (2Co 2:9, 8:24).

With written words to prove something that's being alleged

usually requires an explicit statement of fact or very highly implicit circumstantial statements. Take Satan, for instance. The Bible *explicitly* states that Satan exists and is also known as the Devil (Rev 12:9, 20:2 , 7, etc.), but it only *implicitly* states that he is the "god" or "prince of this world" (John 12:31, 14:30, 16:11; 2Co 4:4). However, that Satan is the "god of this world" is very strongly implied because of other circumstantial verses that link him to the world (Mat 4:8, Luke 4:5; Rev 12:9) plus the context the passages are found in. The evidence is so strong that it is almost universally agreed that Satan is this "god" and "prince." It would be fair to say that in a court of law this determination would hold true.

On the other hand, concerning *Lucifer*, there is no passage that states or even implies that Satan is (or was) Lucifer by name. As we mentioned earlier, the passages in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 which are often linked with Satan only suggest he is/was Lucifer because some of the statements cannot literally apply to a human being, and Satan is the only being many reasonable people surmise they could apply to. However, one can also make a reasonable case that the passages do NOT apply to Satan. As a consequence the implication that Satan is/was Lucifer is much weaker than the belief he is the "god of this world."

Since Satan is/was Lucifer cannot be proven absolutely, the reader *should not make any absolute claims* concerning this or any other implied belief. He should say, "The Bible indicates or suggests..." that this or that *may* be true. By no means should he call such an implied belief a "fact." By doing so he is discrediting himself.

Why Do They Still Insist?

Your author has often wondered why some Fundamentalists and Bible Believers cling so tightly to the Genesis Gap Theory. Since it is a relatively recent idea, only around 200 years old, and first promoted by believers they would today deem as "liberal" or "modernistic," *it seems counter-intuitive to their typical conservative approach to the Scriptures*. Especially since Chalmers, et al., said the King James Bible mistranslated Genesis 1:2 and based his main argument on "correcting" it. But that it was unknown for so long may actually may be part of its appeal; it is a doctrine that is "hidden" from the average believer; one most others "can't see" unless they are part of a select group with "secret" knowledge (Psa

25:14; Amos 3:7, etc.).

It would not be hard to imagine that if instead of 200 years ago the Genesis Gap Theory was first brought to prominence today by some "New Evangelical," Pentecostal, or even Baptist minister, the Bible Believers would dismiss it as fantasy. They would relegate it into the same group of false or misapplied doctrine as they do *speaking in tongues, slain in the spirit, British Israelism, baptism for the dead, sabbath keeping, abstaining from meats, baptismal regeneration, post-millennialism, soul sleep, hell is the grave, universal salvation, open theism, etc., etc.* However, since the Gap Theory was initially accepted by some conservative believers as a stopgap against modern geology, it crept into the Fundamentalist mainstream. In addition, each succeeding generation some have embellished more and more doctrine upon it until they have essentially backed themselves into a corner.

Today there are numerous books and novels on the pre-Adamic earth describing a vast worldly empire ruled by Lucifer as its "king;" then an "angelic revolt" took place that resulted in a "universal war" of good against evil resulting in Lucifer being cast down from his throne while the universe was being destroyed by water. Then after the "recreation" of the earth Satan schemes through Eve to get back "his" world from its new ruler, Adam.... This scenario sounds like a modern day movie script, but much of it is actually taught as "fact" by many of the Gapists. They have so much invested in their dramatic and far-fetched doctrine that many would not consider publically questioning it even if they personally have "mental reservations." They couldn't bear to admit possible error and "lose face."

Implicit Faith?

Being a Bible Believer for over 35 years, your author has learned quite a bit about the mentality and demeanor of some of his fellow brethren. Another trait that a significant number of them *share is a marked insecurity* in some of their "Bible Believing positions." In your author's view, the key reason for this is these believers have not personally studied many of the doctrines they profess to believe (or if they have, they realize some are on shaky ground). They "learned" them by following someone they admire, and this makes their faith a type of *implicit faith*. True, the Bible says one can follow a more mature and knowledgeable believer in his Christian walk, as they

follow Christ (1Cor 11:1), but if one bases practically his entire belief system on what doctor or pastor so-and-so says, he will only have confidence in a man's *view* of God's word, not God's word itself. He is still to personally "prove all things." As a wise man once said, "*If two people believe the same about the Bible, only one of them is doing the thinking.*"

Unfortunately, too much of this *mentor worship* goes on in Fundamentalist/Bible Believer circles. It is self-evident. All one need do is make a statement that may question a certain position held by a believer's esteemed *mentor* and the defensiveness will start. If the position questioned is sound and can be proven by the believer, *why doesn't he just prove it and settle the matter right then?* The reason is most often the believer doesn't know any more about the subject in question than he heard from his mentor. *His faith is implicit; dependent upon his mentor's faith.*

Is Your Flesh Showing?

Your author all too well realizes that his questioning the Genesis Gap view of certain prominent ministers, particularly that of Dr. Peter Ruckman, will bring out the *flesh* in some of the brethren. Instead of truly looking at the Gap issue themselves, studying it out, and proving it, they will instantly become defensive and even combative thinking they are "defending" their mentor and by proxy defending the Scriptures. Often their defensiveness is manifested by *ridicule, mockery, belittlement, denigration, and plain old name-calling.* Some of these believers may even be pastors or other ministers yet their rank immaturity rules them in this regard. We can almost hear some of them now,

"Who do you think you are, Morton? Dr. Ruckman (or Scofield, or Larkin, or Dake, etc.) was a great man of God, a hero of the faith, and a great Bible teacher. He knew more about the word of God than you will ever dream of knowing...and some "pip-squeak" like you, a "nobody from nowhere," thinks he knows more about the Bible than Dr. Ruckman? You are an idiot, a self-deceived fool, a 'Bible blockhead' an"

Whether this is true of us or not, the fact remains that in spite of his much ability and many achievements, Dr. Ruckman (and the

others) has not proven a Genesis Gap exists (let alone all the added embellishments.) In fact, it is not even adequately inferred. Most certainly they all make the best case they can, but it is still very weakly evidenced by the Scriptures. There is much more scriptural "evidence" for *speaking in tongues, universal salvation, or open theism* than there is for the Genesis Gap, *but cherry-picked evidence does not prove sound doctrine*. One must consider the Bible as a whole.

The way a mature believer reacts to a challenge of one of his beliefs is to "*prove all things*" (1Th 5:21). He will get in the Bible and try his best with study and prayer to find if the Scriptures actually *prove* a particular belief. If they do prove it, the believer has his answer for the questioner. If it can't be proven scripturally, then the believer must not go beyond that, even if it disagrees with his mentor's or church's position.

Finally, your author understands there is a notable segment of believers who will ride their mentor's coat-tails until death regardless of the facts. They can't entertain the thought that their hero could be wrong on any doctrinal point. However, some believers will remain objective and attempt to prove their mentor's doctrines from the Scriptures. This is the "noble" course of action. Remember how the Bereans were called "more noble" because they "*searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so*" (Act 17:11)? They were checking the words of a God called apostle commissioned directly by the Lord Jesus Christ. If the apostle Paul's words should be checked against the Scriptures, how much more any minister of today?

Appendix 1

Questions For Genesis Gap Theorists

Here are a list of questions proponents of the Gap Theory should answer. If their contentions are sound they should be able to answer them all with Scripture or with scriptural principles.

Note: If the reader wishes to discuss the Genesis Gap Theory with your author, *we request that he first read this entire study from the [beginning](#) and then answer all of these questions and send them along.* Your author has dealt with these questions (and many others) in this study, and it is only fitting that the reader deal with them as well. That way he will have to look into the issue a little if he hasn't in the past.

Questions

- Is the *Genesis Gap* explicitly found in the Scriptures?
- If not explicitly found, is it based upon explicit statements? If so, what are they?
- Is it true that the Gap Theory is an implicit belief based primarily upon other implicit doctrines found in passages such as Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28?
- If not explicitly found, how is it that many call it the "Gap Fact" when implicit beliefs cannot be proven as fact (1Th 5:21)?
- If you consider the Gap a "fact," what scriptural criteria or principles do you use to determine Bible facts?
- Do you think it would be misleading or even deceptive to label a doctrine a Bible "fact" when it cannot be conclusively proven?

- Do you believe that clear Bible passages should be used to understand unclear or ambiguous passages dealing with the same subject?
- If so, why do you not reconcile any question Genesis 1:2 may raise according to the more clear statements of Exodus 20:11, 31:17, Nehemiah 9:6, Mark 10:6, and Revelation 21:1?

- If the above clear Bible statements must be "explained" away from their normal, straight-forward meaning to allow a Genesis Gap, what overwhelming Scriptural principle or proof can you produce to justify such exegesis?
- Do you believe there are other possible explanations for the passages you claim promote the Gap (Isa 14, 45; Jer 4; Exe 28; 2Pe 3)?
- Since "sound doctrine" speaks of doctrine not characterized by weakness but is healthy and robust, how can the Gap Theory qualify since it has obvious weaknesses including a very weak foundation?
- Do you believe there is a distinct difference between the words "created" and "made" in the Bible? If so, do you believe "made" refers to making or remaking something from existing material and "create" speaks of creation from nothing?
- If so, how do you reconcile this belief with Nehemiah 9:6 where it states the Lord "made" the "heavens," "heaven of heavens" (third heaven), "host" of heaven, "earth" and all that is in them?
- Do you believe "Eden the garden of God" in Ezekiel 28:13 refers to the "garden eastward in Eden" found in Genesis 2:8, 15?
- If not, what scriptural evidence can you produce to overturn the apparent connection?
- Do you believe that "replenish" in the King James Bible means to *fill again* or *refill*?
- If so, since the definition of "fill again" or "refill" was unknown in 1611 but *replenish* then meant "fill abundantly," how do you reconcile the difference?
- If you believe the current meaning is *advanced revelation* found only in the King James Bible, did all the believers for over 200 years after the KJB was published but before the meaning was fully changed not understand the word correctly?
- Do you believe some words in the KJB have changed their meaning since 1611?
- If so, do you explain the different meaning of words such as "let" (Rom 1:13) and "prevent" (1Th 4:15) to your listeners?
- If so, what scriptural criteria or principle do you appeal to to

justify explaining the different meaning of those words and not *replenish*?

- Do you use the Genesis Gap to help explain the existence of fossils and the geologic ages?
- If not, essentially all of the early Fundamentalists who promoted the Gap (Pember, Scofield, Larkin, etc., and even Ruckman in his earlier works) did use the Gap to explain the geologic ages. What changed to cause you to deviate from that contention?
- If the Genesis Gap was not millions of years but a shorter period of time; a time too short to accommodate the geologic ages, what purpose does the Gap serve?
- Do you believe when God said "every thing" was "very good" on the sixth day (Gen 1:31) that "every thing" means everything He had created up till that time?
- If so, how do you explain the fall of Lucifer/Satan before that time? If not, how do the words "every thing" make sense since he only created one thing (man) since his last proclamation of something being "good" (Gen 1:25)?
- Did you first learn of the Genesis Gap from your own personal study or from someone else (book, audio, preacher, etc.)?
- Did you believe in a literal six day creation (not re-creation) of the universe before you were introduced to the Genesis Gap Theory?
- If so, what compelling words or evidence caused you to change your mind?
- Do you believe the Genesis Gap is a hidden or concealed doctrine that is difficult for the typical Bible reader to find on his own, let alone understand?
- Can you name another Bible doctrine with similar hidden traits?
- Did you try to find out what your favorite Genesis Gap teacher's position would be in answering some of these questions?

This should be enough to reveal the true nature of the Gap Theory. Most certainly many of its proponents have not considered half of these questions yet they still adhere to it. "Prove all things"

dear, Brethren. "PROVE ALL THINGS"!

Appendix 2

The Verse That Nullifies The Gap Theory

The Genesis Gap Theory insists the creation of Genesis 1:3-31 is a *recreation* on the rubble of the previous earth. Is this a sound Bible doctrine? Is it even scripturally possible? There is one verse that appears to clearly say it isn't and we will look at the arguments both for and against.

Getting Things Ready

Before one can effectively compare Scripture with Scripture he needs to establish some basic study principles. Below is a list of common sense principles that should be used to develop any Bible doctrine.

1. *Explicit statements ALWAYS take precedence over implicit statements.*
2. *Bible statements in context ALWAYS take precedence over statements apart from context.*
3. *Explicit Bible statements in context are the pinnacle of indisputable fact among those who believe the Bible.*
4. *Clear Bible statements ALWAYS take precedence over unclear, ambiguous, or inferred statements dealing with the same subject.*
5. *Doctrine based upon inferred statements CANNOT be considered as indisputable fact because of the very nature of inference.*
6. *Doctrine based upon inference can be acceptable if not contradicted by explicit statements or more strongly inferred statements, but it still cannot be considered proven fact.*
7. *Any apparent conflict or contradiction between statements must be considered dispensationally.*

For a more thorough examination of these principles with examples, we highly recommend the reader see our article *How To Determine True Bible Facts*.

Now lets use the above basic and well established principles to examine some key Genesis Gap claims.

Putting It All Into Practice

First, lets gather some facts,

- God created the heaven (Gen 1:1)
- God created the earth (Gen 1:1)
- God created light (Gen 1:3)
- God created darkness (Gen 1:2, 5; Isa 45:7)
- God created plants (Gen 1:11)
- God created animals (Gen 1:24)
- God created man (Gen 1:26)
- God created the host (inhabitants) of heaven (Gen 2:1)
- God created everything (Col 1:16)
- God finished His creating at the end of the sixth day. (Gen 1:31)

These are all explicit statements and thus indisputable Bible facts to a Bible Believer.

Now consider a statement made in the same immediate context about the Lord's creation.

"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." (Gen 1:31)

This is an *explicit statement made within the immediate scope and context* of all God's creation activities. Now notice the clear and straightforward conclusions of fact one can derive from this and the previous facts,

- The heaven is "very good"
- The earth is "very good"
- Light is "very good"
- Darkness is "very good"
- Plants are "very good"
- Animals are "very good"
- Man is "very good"
- The host or inhabitants of heaven are "very good"
- Everything He created is "very good."

For "every thing" to be "very good" there can be *no hint of*

corruption, judgment, or negativity in the entire chapter. There must be no Devil, no curse, no judgment, and no sin or even the remnants of sin. "Every thing" is deemed to be "very good" by the righteous creator in heaven.

This simple, explicit statement as it stands, which can be understood by a first grader, blows a hole in the gap doctrine a mile wide. It decimates the claim Lucifer and other spirits were cast down and the world destroyed before Gen 1:2. It destroys the argument that "darkness" is a result of sin and judgment. If there was a fallen Devil and his evil hoard in any heaven or earth, or the universe enveloped in the judgment of darkness, then the Lord could not call "every thing" he made "very good."

Those who believe in a gap cannot allow this simple and straightforward meaning to stand. They insist the Devil existed at this time and was present in creation so they must find a way to reconcile their claim with this explicit truth. What are the reasonable and scriptural methods one can use to challenge the Genesis 1:31 statement? We will examine five.

Challenging the Facts

1 — Find Another Explicit Statement

The first way to possibly challenge the statement of Gen 1:31 is to find another explicit statement within the same context that modifies or makes an exception with it. For example, in Gen 2:16 the Lord says,

"...Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:"

Here the word "every" is used and without subsequent modification or conditions this explicit statement would stand; "every" tree could be eaten from. However, the next verse says,

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen 2:17)

This subsequent explicit, same context statement places a condition or exception on the previous statement and thus modifies it. There are several such modifying statements in the

Scriptures...but Gap Theorists have not produced any explicit, creation context statements that modifies or restricts Gen 1:31.

#2 — Dispute the Context or Scope

The second way to challenge the verse is to *dispute the context*. Some gap theorists try this route and claim the statement in Gen 1:31 *only applies to to the sixth day* of creation. This claim is dubious on its face. From the ancient Hebrews to the present day Gen 1:31 has been understood by essentially all to refer to the *whole creation week*. This understanding fulfills another key principle of Bible interpretation, "*When the plain sense of Scripture makes common sense, seek no other sense,*" and it makes perfect sense for the statement to apply to the whole chapter because of the very clear words "*every thing he had made.*" There is no hint that the scope of the statement should be limited. Also notice the word "*behold*" in the verse. This is another difference from the previous "good" decrees. It shows an *added emphasis* on everything the Lord saw, and on the decree.

Furthermore, since the Lord had only made ONE additional thing since His last "good" proclamation (Adam), it *would be very peculiar to say "every thing" for only one new thing created*. The Lord does not make linguistic mistakes, thus according to all accepted principles of interpretation and hermeneutics, the "very good" proclamation must encompass "every thing he had made" unless a proof to reduce its scope it provided.

Others will concede the "very good" statement covers the whole week but *only includes things made from Gen 1:3 onward*. Anything made previously must be excluded. They insist on this so they can slip the creation and fall of Lucifer/Satan in before verse 2 and then pretend God didn't declare him "very good." As any objective person can see, this is simply a manipulation of the text. *Do they actually expect a person to believe that Satan and his demons could fill the "high places" with their "spiritual wickedness" (Eph 6), and the Lord still say "every thing" He created was "very good"?* Furthermore, are the "waters" in vs 2 not good? Is the "deep" not good? The straight-forward picture Gen 1:31 presents is of God beholding "every thing" He had made, not just some things. *There is no sound contextual or explicit reason to limit the extent of these words.*

The burden is upon the gap theorists to *prove why "every thing"*

does not mean everything.

Note: Another avenue some gap theorists will take deals with the "darkness" of verse 2. They build an elaborate scheme showing how darkness is negatively portrayed throughout most of the Bible and then insist by implication the darkness of verse 2 must be negative as well. They insist verse 2 is a negative verse showing the result of sin and judgment instead of a positive verse dealing with creation. This argument is heavily flawed because they make the fatal error of *confusing the symbol with what it symbolizes*.

What the gap theorists neglect to mention in this context is darkness is a result of creation as well. *The Bible specifically says God created darkness* (Isa 45:7), and He did so when he created the physical reality. Much to the gap theorist's chagrin this pertinent fact places it under the scope of Gen 1:31. Darkness is "very good." Notice how the darkness is carried over verse 3 and found in verses 4 and 5. *This is the same darkness*. According to the gap theorist's claims, since this same darkness still exists and is the dominant and default state in the universe (along with coldness), the whole earth and universe is still surrounded by the results of that supposed ancient judgment of God. *In what rational scenario could that situation be called "very good"?*

Genesis 1:31 is a very difficult verse for the gap theorists to overcome. *The simple fact is the words do not allow a Satan, Devil, or universe enveloped in judgment (darkness) to be in existence without God confusing good and evil*. True, the "host" or inhabitants of heaven were around then, but "every" one of them was "very good." As we have seen the gap theorists have to resort to desperate measures to try and salvage their claims. *The power and authority of one very clear and explicit statement easily dominates any contrary notion*. Again, the burden is upon on them to prove that "every thing" does not mean precisely that.

#3 — Dispute the Meaning of the Words

The third possible argument against Gen 1:31 could be a challenge to the *meaning of the words by claiming they are*

ambiguous or unclear, but as it is often found in the Scriptures, *these words are clear and simple*. No gap theorist I know of has tried to dispute the obvious meaning of "very good" or "every thing" except a few may make a last ditch desperate claim to limit the scope of "every." But, again, this attempt falls flat.

The word "every" is first found in Gen 1:21 where it says, "*And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth....*" We know God did create "every living creature" thus we see the extent of "every;" it means "every thing" within the scope of creation. The word "good" is first found in Gen 1:4 referring to light. No limit on "good" hinted either. "Good" can be a very strong term, *even stronger than "righteous."* In fact, the Lord said "*There is none good but one, that is God*" (Mat 19:17). You can't get any more emphatic than that.

A few gap theorists will try the last ditch measure of confounding the terms. For instance, your author has encountered people who say,

"The Lord did not make Satan so he doesn't count in the proclamation of 'very good.' Instead, God made a cherub named Lucifer who later turned into Satan."

That has to be one of the most contrived and forced arguments ever made to support an alleged doctrine. Who can say such a thing and expect to be taken seriously? The logical response to such nonsense is if God did not make or create Satan, who did? They will say God did make the being of Lucifer/Satan, but he did not make him the way he became (evil) after his fall, that is, with pride and sin. In relation to this they will also say God did not make the "without form and void" state of the earth in 1:2 either. Again, if He didn't, who did?

Obviously, since God created all things He did create the being known as Satan. To try and claim that since Satan sinned (as Adam later did) after his creation that that somehow negates God creating Him defies reason. Even if Ezekiel 28:15 applies to Lucifer/Satan, which says, "Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee," *it is said AFTER the iniquity is found in him*, but God still says He created him. These types of extreme, desperate arguments do not speak well of any alleged theory. *If it really is a sound doctrine, all these contrived arguments would be unnecessary.*

Another extreme tactic some gap theorists may use is to try and

bamboozle the gullible by throwing a bunch of irrelevant, circumstantial "evidence" into the mix. They will say things like, "When was Lucifer/Satan created?" "How do you account for his fall?" "When did the demons come about?" "How did sin get into the world?" "Where do you put Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28?" And on and on. All of these questions have nothing to do with any statement found in Genesis chapter 1. The gap theorists try to insert them into their alleged gap, but since they cannot even prove a gap exists, all their claims are moot.

Its the same with the "darkness" claim mentioned above. They try to overwhelm the reader with the negative uses of darkness in the Scriptures suggesting that a large number of indirect, implicit, non-context statements can overcome a clear, explicit, in context statement to the contrary. Any thinking reader can see right through the scheme. *No amount of implicit statements, types, anti-types, symbols, or figures can negate or limit ONE explicit Bible statement! If they can, then your salvation may be in jeopardy!*

#4 — Claim It Is a Figure of Speech

Another possible challenge is to claim an explicit statement is a figure of speech and should not be taken literally. There are many figures of speech in the Scriptures. They are an effective method of communication in many cases, but there is not a hint of Genesis 1:31 being a figure of speech.

The first obvious figure of speech in the Scriptures is found in Genesis 3:5, 7 with the term their "eyes shall be opened." When Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden tree it gave them the knowledge of "good and evil" or as a figure opened their "spiritual" eyes to the truth of evil. It would be ludicrous to say their physical eyes were literally shut since their creation, especially since Eve "saw" that the tree was "good for food" (Gen 3:6), thus the opening of their eyes speaks of a truth being opened or revealed to them.

Nevertheless, there is no figure in Genesis 1:31. The verse is to be taken literally.

#5 — Challenge the Method of Reasoning

The last possible challenge someone could make to try and overthrow the obvious meaning of Gen 1:31 would be to challenge

the method of reasoning. That is, they claim explicit statements should not be regarded the highest expression of truth. This would be an irrational and ignorant claim. To regard inferences from implicit statements at the same level of expression as explicit statements would render all statements as suspect, and one could not know anything for certain.

For example, there is a classic case in the Scriptures of some believers wrongly inferring a belief from something the Lord said,

Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? (John 21:22-23)

The "brethren" wrongly inferred Peter would not die, but Peter corrects them by reminding everyone that the Lord's words were *a conditional statement* that started with "If I will...." Should a statement like this be placed on the same level as and explicit, declarative statement like John 5:24?

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

The answer is obvious, the implicit statement can be misunderstood; the explicit one is clear. *If some try to weaken an explicit statement to the level of implicit so their private doctrine can be inserted, they weaken every statement in the Scriptures.*

Conclusion

We have only examined one explicit verse and it has essentially destroyed the claims of the gap theorists. The statement is so clear and plain that one must have an ulterior motive to try and overthrow it. *The statement simply will not allow anything that is not "good" within the scope of creation.* It does not say a gap is not possible, only that anything that happened before, during and after any alleged gap must be "very good."

Note: It is ironic that Gen 1:31 does not forbid the original reason Thomas Chalmers developed the Gap Theory: to make time for the geologic ages, but it does forbid the current Fundamentalist gap claims of a universal destruction and fall of Lucifer with his "devils." It is quite clear the Fundamentalists have "overextended" themselves.

Nevertheless, it is irrational and irresponsible for any believer to insist the alleged Genesis gap is a proven Bible fact in light of such strong evidence against it. No matter what other evidence one may present to support it, *this single in context, explicit statement throws a monkey wrench into the whole idea.*

The Genesis Gap is a prime example of a doctrine based upon inferred beliefs and implicit statements. It essentially has no explicit Bible statements to support it. Its proponents insert there inferences from Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28, 2 Pet 3, and a couple other places into Genesis 1:2 it seems because they cannot find any better place to put them. They insist Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 refer to the fall of Lucifer who they consider to be the same being as Satan, and this also is an inferred belief. There is no passage that explicitly states they are the same being; it is only surmised, and as we saw in John 21:22-23 what one infers from implicit statements *can be completely wrong.*

Questions For Gap Theorists To Consider

In view of the above if Gap Theorists want to give their claims legitimacy, they should scripturally answer the following questions,

1. What explicit, scriptural proof can you produce that *limits the scope or context* of the words "every thing" and/or "very good" in Gen 1:31 to align with your view of the Gap Theory?
2. What explicit, scriptural proof can you produce that changes the *normal meaning of the words* "every thing" and/or "very good" in Gen 1:31 to align with your view of the Gap Theory?

Without explicit Bible statements that prove the possibility of their contentions, the Gap Theory remain just that, a mere speculative theory that has very weak Scriptural support.

Appendix 3

How Some Misunderstand The Darkness In Genesis 1:2

There are some that teach the "darkness" found in Genesis 1:2 must a result of sin and judgment on a previous earth. They are proponents of what is known as the Gap Theory. We will show below that the darkness in that verse is not in any way negative or a result of judgment but it reflects the natural and default state of the physical reality at the beginning of creation.

We will be critiquing a work by brother Jeffery Mardis titled, *Genesis Gap Notes*.

Brother Mardis said this in his paper,

"For the biggest part of my Christian life I DID NOT believe in a Genesis Gap. The "clincher" for me that "fully persuaded" me was simply a KJB study of the word "darkness"...The weight of this Scriptural evidence shedding light on Genesis 1:2 convinced me, beyond the shadow of any doubt, that WHATEVER was going on within that verse, it could NOT have been something GOOD."

Brother Mardis then quotes the following verses to show what he believes to be the nature of darkness, Job 10:21-22, 30:26; Psa 88:6; Isa 5:20; Amos 5:18, 20; Nah 1:8; Zeph 1:15; John 3:19; Acts 26:18; Eph 6:12; 1John 2:11. Then he says,

"While none of these verses are speaking of Genesis 1:2 directly, they ARE instructive. Many, many more examples could be given, but I challenge anyone to find ONE SINGLE VERSE in the JKB (sic) that portrays "darkness" in a strong, POSITIVE context... and, as far as I can tell, the evidence is overwhelming that [darkness is] never in relation to something GOOD."

Later on Brother Mardis makes a blanket statement saying, "...darkness ALWAYS connotes something BAD."

Your author contends that Brother Mardis is mistaken on several levels. Also, notice where he says above that "none of these verses

are speaking of Genesis 1:2 directly." That is a key admission that shows none of the verses speak in creation context. Moreover, we believe we can show where he is wrong not only *contextually*, but also *semantically*, *symbolically*, and *hermenutically*.

First, concerning Brother Mardis' challenge to find a single verse that portrays darkness in a positive context, *the very verse he is trying influence, Gen 1:2, is the first and most positive one*. When one reads Genesis 1 in a normal, straight-forward manner without bringing any presuppositions of negativity with him, he will not see anything negative in the entire chapter. Creation is a very positive action. The chapter begins with God creating and ends with him declaring "every thing" He created as "very good" (Gen 1:31).

Brother Mardis can only insert a negative inference into the verse by reading implicit passages about *spiritual darkness* that occur AFTER the "very good" declaration of Gen 1:31. This is a grave contextual error. Two key Bible study principles are at work here. The first, "*Explicit statements ALWAYS take precedence over implicit statements*" proves that the explicit declaration of 1:31 overrules any number of implicit statements or inferred beliefs. Second, "*Bible statements in context ALWAYS take precedence over statements apart from context*" also proves that verse 31 rules the understanding of the passage. Brother Mardis violates both rules by *inserting implicit passages that are outside the context* in an attempt to overthrow a *clear, explicit verse within the context!*

For a more detailed look at how Genesis 1:31 makes the Fundamentalist idea of a Genesis Gap impossible, see Appendix *The Verse That Nullifies The Gap Theory*

What About Spiritual Darkness?

Another serious issue with Brother Mardis' treatment of "darkness" is his *failure to acknowledge the distinction between physical darkness and spiritual darkness*. The darkness in Gen 1:2 is physical while many uses of the word later refer to a spiritual or abstract "darkness." Physical darkness is an absence of physical light while spiritual darkness is a lack of inner illumination or understanding about sin, self, judgment, etc. It is easy to distinguish spiritual darkness from physical because they speak of entirely different concepts. For instance, look at John 3:19,

"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the

world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

Notice how the verse says "light came into the world." This is not physical light but a reference to Jesus Christ who is the "Light" of the world (John 1:9). When Christ came He brought light or illumination about God, Himself, and truth with Him. The rest of the verse says "men loved darkness rather than light," that is they do not want the light of Christ illuminating or making manifest their evil deeds. They would rather stay in darkness. Luke 11:34 also speaks of this,

"The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness."

A person's body is not filled with physical light or darkness. These are clearly abstract, spiritual concepts.

Confusing the Physical with the Spiritual

During a brief discussion about darkness in a Facebook group your author made a remark to some who were trying to apply characteristics of spiritual darkness to physical darkness that in their arguments "physical darkness was being conflated with spiritual darkness" leading them to faulty conclusions. To this Bother Mardis replied,

"Literal light typifies spiritual light, just as literal darkness, typifies spiritual darkness. If the literal does not reflect the spiritual, what's the point?"

He then quotes Romans 1:20.

This statement exposes Mardis' error. Physical darkness is not a *type* of spiritual darkness, it is a *symbol* of it. A symbol is defined as,

"Any object, typically material, which is meant to represent another (usually abstract) even if there is no meaningful relationship."

That is exactly how physical darkness represents aspects of the

abstract spiritual darkness. It is obvious to all that *physical darkness hinders physical sight*. When it is "pitch dark" one cannot see anything. It is not that the darkness is evil or even negative in its own essence, *it simply hinders sight*. This fact of darkness can be a negative *from man's perspective* since he relies very much on physical sight, but the darkness itself is not negative at all. As we have seen, it was actually decreed to be "very good" in Genesis 1:31, plus a complete "day" could not exist without it.

As for physical darkness being a symbol or representative of spiritual darkness, the symbol fits very well. *As physical darkness hinders physical sight; spiritual darkness hinders spiritual sight or light*. Notice how the direction of the representation *goes only one way*; from the symbol to what is symbolized. It never goes from the symbolized to the symbol. To do that the roles would have to be reversed. Examining some other Biblical symbols will better illustrate this.

The Bible uses many symbols in various ways. Here are a few,

- The rainbow: a symbol of God's covenant. Gen 9:13; Eze 1:28; Rev 4:3
- A stairway: a symbol of the way to God. Gen 28:11-13; John 1:51
- Thunder, lightning, cloud and smoke: symbols of God's majesty and holiness. Exo 19:16-18; 24:17; Psa 97:2,4; Rev 4:5; Rev 8:5; Rev 11:19
- Thunder: a symbol of God's voice. Psa 29:3; 68:33
- Trumpets: a symbol of God speaking. Ex 19:19; Rev 8:6
- White hair: a symbol of wisdom. Dan 7:9; Rev 1:14
- Wind: a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Jn 3:8; Act 2:2
- Fire: a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Act 2:3
- Dove: a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Matt 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22

Notice the last three where the Holy Spirit has the symbols of *wind, fire, and a dove*. If there is anything as negative as spiritual darkness in the Bible it would be *fire* which is also used as a symbol of judgment and hell. But in this case fire is a symbol of a manifestation of God Himself through His Spirit. The key to understanding this is to realize *the symbolized object usually only carries one key characteristic of the symbol*. In the case of the Holy Spirit having the symbol of *wind*, a key characteristic of wind is its

universal presence. One cannot tell "*whence it cometh or whither it goeth*" (John 3:8). So it is with people born of the spirit; you can't tell how the Spirit rebirths them. With "*tongues as of fire*" the key characteristic of fire used is *how it spreads*. The Holy Spirit spread to all those in the upper room in Acts 2. (Fire's other uses as a symbol speak of how it consumes and purges, Mat 3:10-12.) With a *dove* the key characteristic here is the dove's *appearance of purity, cleanness, and peace*.

However, reversing the symbol with the symbolized can get one into a false analogy very fast. Just because elements of wind, fire, and a dove, can be a symbol for a work of the Holy Spirit, that does not mean the reverse is true, and that is where Mardis and others make their mistake. *The Holy Spirit is NOT a symbol of fire, wind, or any animal*. To say so would require these objects to carry a characteristic of Him. This would be like saying a physical ladder ("Jacob's ladder") gives one access to God (Gen 28:12) or every time it thunders it must be God speaking (Psa 29:3). We may be able to make this even more clearer by using another key symbol in the Bible for sin and corruption: *leaven*.

The Parallel Symbol of Leaven

Leaven is an expanding agent and is known today primarily as yeast or baking soda. Physical leaven is put in bread and other baked foods to make it rise or expand. Spiritual or figurative leaven, however, represents the spreading of something inside something else. Matthew 13:3 shows both aspects,

"Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened."

Here the Lord describes the well known practice of putting leaven in meal or dough until it spreads throughout the whole batch. He uses this analogy as a picture of the "kingdom of heaven" spreading from its small start with His ministry throughout the whole world.

Moreover, in the spiritual sense, leaven is most often used in the New Testament as a symbol of spreading corruption. The Lord makes this clear in Matt 16:

Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and *beware of the*

leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them...How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. (Mat 16:6-12)

The intent of the passage is obvious. The Lord tells the disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, but the disciples miss the spiritual application and can only think of physical bread. Once the Lord explains it to them, then they understand.

Leaven is used as a negative symbol in other places as well. Paul said,

"Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened." (1Co 5:6-7)

"A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." (Gal 5:9)

So just as physical darkness is used as a symbol of spiritual darkness, physical leaven is a symbol of spiritual leaven. Now since spiritual leaven speaks of spreading corruption and sin, does that in any way apply back to physical leaven making it somehow corrupt or even representing corruption? Nonsense. Except for the feast of Unleavened Bread where the Israelites were not to put leaven in their bread in remembrance of being quickly thrust out of Egypt (Ex 12:39), they were told to normally put leaven in their bread (Lev 23:17, Amos 4:5).

Thus we can conclude physical leaven is not evil or corrupt in itself even though it *can be* a symbol of evil and corruption. The leaven in a loaf of bread is serving its intended purpose and is thus good. There is not a hint of evil or corruption linked to it at all. In the same vein physical darkness is not evil or even negative even though it *can be* a symbol of those things; the darkness at the beginning of creation does not have a hint of sin and judgment associated with it either. Even though leaven and darkness *can be* a symbol of negative things, that in no way means they are ALWAYS

is such a symbol every time they are mentioned.

A great lesson these Bible symbols teaches us is *one cannot legitimately apply symbols, types, or figures in the Bible in a reverse manner.*

There are no negative "overtones" whatsoever associated with darkness until AFTER the fall of man in Genesis 3. Any inclination to make "darkness" in Gen 1:2 negative in any way is a *presupposition* the reader *inserts* into the text.

Forcing Characteristics of a Type to Its Anti-Type

A close relative of a symbol is a type. A type is "a grouping based on shared characteristics." There are many types in the Scriptures, and of course, one of the most "typified" persons is the Lord Jesus Christ. For instance, the *Brazen Serpent* of Numbers 21:9 is a type of Christ. He said so Himself (John 3:14-15). The tabernacle of Moses is another type (Exo 40:2 ,34 ; Heb 9:11 ; Col 2:9). Some have claimed to have found up to 21 persons in the Old Testament who are types of Christ. That may be a little excessive but several OT characters are types of Him, such as,

Adam (Rom 5:14),
Abel (Heb 12:14),
Abraham (Eph 3:15),
Aaron (Heb 5:4-5),
David (Psa 89:18-19; Phil 2:9),
Isaac (Heb 11:17-19),
Jacob (John 11:42),
Joseph (Gen 15:19-20),
Joshua (Heb 4:8-9),
Moses (Act 3:20-22),
Noah (2Cor 1:5),
Solomon (2Sa 7:12-13, Luke 1:32-33),
etc.

All of these men have at least one characteristic that typifies them with Jesus Christ, who is their "anti-type." However, it would be a grave error to try and use the types in a reverse manner. *That is, a legitimate Bible type only works if the corresponding truth is known to be true to the anti-type.* What that means is we know that Jesus is a descendant of David and that Solomon is also his descendant. Thus

Solomon is a type of Christ in that regard. But if one goes back to Solomon's life and claims certain things must also apply to Christ that are not already identified with Christ, then that is an open door for error and even heresy.

Consider this revealing example. Nearly all the types of Christ have a couple significant "life experiences" in common. *They were married and had children.* If one wanted to devise a doctrine that claimed Christ also was married and had children it would be easy to do with types and symbols. *One could put together a list of all of His types that were married, show all the places where marriage is good, show how whole books like the Song of Solomon typify a married Christ, and make a compelling argument on the surface...but it would all be smoke.* The types would have been used in an invalid manner. Remember, *types and symbols only flow in one direction* and are limited to what is known of the anti-type or the thing symbolized.

Thus the error of confusing something symbolized with its symbol is a major flaw in Mardis' argument. The fact that the Bible later uses darkness to symbolize evil, judgment, and sin does not mean that darkness itself has or is a result of those characteristics or that every time the word is found it is representing the spiritual counterpart. As another wisely said,

"The fact that a physical reality is used to represent something spiritual does not mean that every time this physical reality is mentioned, it must be representing that spiritual entity."

As we have seen above with "leaven," this statement is true and especially true in Genesis 1:2

Can Darkness Ever Be Positive or Good?

Besides the clear and explicit statement that darkness is included in the "very good" statement in Genesis 1:31, there are other passages in the Bible where it serves a good purpose. In Joshua 24:7 Joshua reminds the Israelites of how God used darkness to protect them from the pursuing Egyptians,

"And when they cried unto the LORD, he put darkness between you and the Egyptians...."

This refers back to Exo 14:20 where the Lord put a "cloud and darkness" between them. This was indeed negative to the Egyptians but very positive and good for the Israelites. Also in Exodus we find where God dwelled in the "thick darkness" (Exo 20:21, 1Ki 8:12, 2Ch 6:1).

Another name for darkness is "night." The Lord named the darkness night in Genesis 1:5. That does not mean every instance of darkness refers to night time, but it does mean that there is physical darkness when it is night.

When the passover of the Israelites occurred in Egypt (Exo 12) it was at night. That is why the Lord told them "It is a night to be much observed unto the LORD for bringing them out from the land of Egypt" (Exo 12:42).

Manna also fell at night to feed the Israelites (Num 11:9). If you don't think that is a positive blessing, you have never been hungry.

Psalms 19:1-2 speaks of how the heavens show the "glory of God" and "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge." So both day and night in a sense speak to mankind, with "night" bringing "knowledge." And, of course, "The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge..." (Pro 1:7).

The Scriptures are clear that physical darkness and night are not evil or even negative in themselves. That both can spiritually refer to negative things is well known and the Bible often uses them that way, but as we have already shown, to try and force the spiritual applications back into the physical object is not sound and even dangerous.

Darkness the Opposite of God?

During the previously mentioned discussion Brother Mardis said,

...Darkness, in and of itself, is not "evil." The Lord created it, yes. But He did so to connote or to MARK THINGS which were THE OPPOSITE OF HIMSELF. Like the "evil" which God creates (Isa. 45:7), darkness did not exist, nor was it necessary, until AFTER LUCIFER'S FALL...."

Notice how Mardis is trying to "have his cake and eat it too" by saying darkness is not evil but yet it marks things which are the "opposite" of God. Since God is holy, righteous, and pure, what would be His opposite? Would it not be unholy, unrighteous, and

impure; or in other words, sin?

Also notice the huge presuppositions he brings with his statement. He says the *reason* for darkness is to "mark things" "opposite" of God, that before Lucifer darkness was *unnecessary*, that it didn't arrive until after a *presupposed fall of Lucifer*, and *darkness is like the evil* God creates. *He doesn't prove any of this* except that God does create evil (in the sense of negative things, not sin). This is typical for many gap proponents. They treat their opinion and various speculations as fact. They believe their own rhetoric.

With this statement, also, Mardis is confusing the physical with the spiritual. Spiritual darkness could be considered the opposite of God because God is Spiritual light, but as we have seen physical darkness is another matter. It does not carry its spiritual counterpart's characteristics, else when darkness comes every night we would be overshadowed by sin and judgment, and when day comes with its light all would bask in righteousness and truth. Of course, this is silly. From a moral and spiritual perspective, physical night is not any different from the physical day.

Darkness the Most Prevalent Thing in the Universe?

Mardis says in his Gap Notes paper,

"Yes, darkness is currently the MOST PREVALENT thing in the Universe. It is a FALLEN Universe. A Universe cursed by sin, under the sway of "the rulers of the darkness of this world" and under the thumb of the one who betrayed Christ and holds "the power of darkness"."

In his first sentence Mardis is mostly right. Physical darkness along with coldness (they always seem to forget coldness) are the default states of the universe. Light and heat must be introduced to make physical life possible. However, the rest of his quote does not apply to Genesis 1 since that chapter was before the fall of man. Mardis claims we live in a "fallen universe," but again, this is just an invention. The Bible says the ground was cursed (Gen 3), but there is no verse that says the whole universe is fallen or cursed.

We say more about the origin of darkness and how it was the logical result of God's initial creation of the physical reality in our chapter, "*Who's Afraid of the Dark.*"

Misapplied Passages

Unfortunately, Brother Mardis is typical of those who are so desperately trying to prove their doctrine that they sometimes "fudge" a passage to make it conform to their doctrine. One example is what he says about Isa 50:3,

The heavens (i.e. second heaven) are BLACK for a reason. The Scriptures testify: "I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering." Isa. 3:50 [sic] "Sackcloth" scripturally speaking, is a picture of mourning and repentance. God clothed the "heavens with blackness" BEFORE Genesis 1:2, BEFORE the creation of man.

Notice how he says, *without providing any evidence*, this occurred before Genesis 1:2, and that the universe is in mourning. This cannot be true for multiple reasons. First, the verse says "heavens," plural, which must be the first (sky) AND second (space) heavens, but he tries to limit it to only the second. When both heavens are black there would be no light at all. The sky would be pitch black. Second, this is exactly what God did in Egypt during the Exodus where He darkened the sky with a "thick darkness" so dark it "may be felt" (Exo 21:22). The context of Isa 50:3 also supports this view. Isa 50:2 speaks of things He has already done, "behold, at my rebuke I dry up the sea, I make the rivers a wilderness:" referring to the parting of the Red Sea and drying up of the Jordan and later Euphrates.

As for the claim the universe is in a fallen state and in some sort of perpetual mourning, how does that square with Psalm 19:1 where it says the "*The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork*"? So the "glory of God" is a fallen, cursed heavens which is in mourning? Nonsense. This is part of the same glory believers "*rejoice in hope of*" (Rom 5:2) and the knowledge of is in the "*face of Jesus Christ*" (2Cor 4:6)! Mardis is badly mistaken. It was the earth that was cursed AFTER Genesis 1, not the heavens. See also Psalm 8:3.

Summary

We have spent enough time looking at the fallacious claim that the darkness in Genesis 1:2 must be a result of sin and judgment.

Darkness is a creation of God just as light is, and He chose to make it part of the default state of the universe. What is ironic for Brother Mardis and others who hold the same view is after the fall of man in Genesis chapter 3 (Rom 8:22), many of his arguments have more relevancy, but they hold none in Genesis chapter 1.

As we mentioned, by far the strongest proof against his view is the explicit, in context statement in Genesis 1:31 stating,

"And God saw **every thing that he had made**, and, **behold**, it was **very good**."

To prevail in their argument the gapists must prove, using Scripture within the context of creation, that "every thing" does not mean every thing or that "very good" does not mean very good. *No amount of non-contextual, implicit statements can overthrow this one explicit decree.* If they continue to insist the scope of either must be somehow limited to allow for their gap claims without scriptural proof, that makes their opinion a "private interpretation" (2Pet 1:20). It is as simple as that!