

The Gap Theory—an Idea with Holes?

by Henry M. Morris

December 1, 1987

‘In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth’ (Genesis 1:1). ‘And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.’ (Genesis 1:2).

Many people assume there is a great gap in time between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. Most of these do this to accommodate the geological age system of billions of years of supposed earth history in the Genesis record of creation.

The idea is something like this: billions of years ago God created the space-mass-time universe. Then the geological ages took place over billions of years of earth history.

The different forms of life developed that are now preserved in the fossil record.

These life-forms represent those ages - the invertebrates of the Cambrian

Period, the dinosaurs of the Cretaceous Period ... finally the mammals, birds and 'ape-men' of the Tertiary Period - just before the recent epoch.

Then the idea is that, at the end of these geological ages, a great cataclysm took place on earth, with Satan having rebelled in heaven and many of the angels following him in that rebellion. God, therefore, cast him to the earth, and the earth underwent a great cataclysm, leaving it finally without form and void, and with darkness on the face of the deep, as described in Genesis 1:2. Subsequently, according to this idea—usually known as the ‘gap’ theory—God then re-created or reconstituted the earth in the six literal days of creation recorded in the first chapter of Genesis.

The argument for this theory makes verse two read, 'The earth became without form and void' (some would render it 'The earth became waste and desolate'), as though it had previously been a beautiful world. But now, because of the cataclysm, it was a devastated remnant of a world, so that there was a change of condition. It became without form and void.

‘Was’ Means ‘Was’

A significant problem with this idea is that the Hebrew word for ‘was’ really should be translated ‘was’. It should not be translated ‘became’. It is the Hebrew verb of being, *hayah*, and normally it is simply translated ‘was’. In all the standard translations of the Old Testament, that is the way this verse is rendered. On some occasions, in an unusual situation if the context requires it, the word can be translated ‘became’. There are some instances like that in the Old Testament.

By far the tremendous majority of times, however, when the verb is used, it is simply translated ‘was’.

In the absence of any indication in the immediate context that it should be rendered by a change of state, where it became something which it wasn't, one would normally assume it was simply a declarative statement describing how the situation existed at the time.

The earth was, in response to God's creative fiat, initially without form and void.

Some people use Isaiah 45:18 as an argument for the use of 'became' in Genesis 1:2. In this verse, Isaiah says that God created the earth not in vain. He formed it to be inhabited.

The word 'in vain' is the same as tohu; that is, the same word translated 'without form' in Genesis 1:2.

So 'gap' theorists say that since God did not create it that way, it must have become that way.

But again, the context is significant.

In Isaiah, the context requires the use of the translation 'in vain'. That is, God did not create the earth without a purpose; He created it to be inhabited.

Genesis 1 tells us then how He brought form to the unformed earth and inhabitants to the empty earth.

It was not really finished until He said so at the end of the six days of creation.

The word *tohu* is actually translated 10 different ways in about 20 occurrences in the Old Testament.

Isaiah 45:19 has the same word, and there it has to be translated 'vainly' or 'in vain'.

It is also proper to translate it that way in Isaiah 45:18.

It depends on the context as to how it is to be precisely translated.

In Genesis 1:2 the context simply indicates the earth had no structure as yet.

It was unformed; it was not even spherical at that point, but was comprised of only the basic elements of earth material.

Sequence

Furthermore, it is important to note that the verse begins with the conjunction, ‘and’ (Hebrew waw), and this same conjunction introduces every single verse of the first chapter of Genesis, so there is a sequence of actions implied. There was this happening, and then this happened, and then this happened, and then this ... each following directly upon the other.

When it said that God created the heavens and the earth, and the earth was without form and void, the implication is that this was immediately following the creation.

Another argument of those who advocate the 'gap' theory is that the word 'darkness' suggests that something is wrong with the creation.

But Isaiah 45:7 says that God created the darkness.

In order for there to be day and night, which was necessary for the further activity of God and man upon the earth, there must be day and night.

So God actually had to create darkness. Thus there is nothing implicitly wrong with it being dark. God created it that way. Darkness later came to represent, in some contexts, a symbol of evil—as

opposed to light—since ‘God is light and in Him is no darkness at all’ (1 John 1:5). But in the context here there is no evil connotation suggested.

On the other hand, there are many overwhelming difficulties with the ‘gap’ theory, and we really should not accept this as the interpretation of Genesis 1:2. The idea that the geological ages took place in between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 is precluded by the plain biblical statement in the Ten Commandments, where God said,

‘In six days, the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is’ (Exodus 20:11). That is, He was telling man that he must work six days and rest one day because God worked six days and rested one day.

The context goes on to say that everything in heaven and earth and in the sea was made in six days.

There could have been nothing left over that was not made during the six days.

The ‘gap’ theory, on the other hand, would require that only the surface of the earth was reconstituted in the six days.

The earth's core, the basic structure, the great fossil beds containing the remnants of the dinosaurs, and so on, all of this would predate the six days of Creation. But God says specifically that everything in the earth and in the heavens and in the sea was made in the six days.

Death Before Sin?

Theologically, there is also a very grave difficulty with the 'gap' theory.

The Bible says there was no sin or death until man brought them into the world.

According to the 'gap' theory, however, there had already been billions of years of suffering and death in the world, represented by the fossils and the sedimentary rocks of the earth's crust, which are supposed now to identify the geological ages.

According to the 'gap' theory, at the end of the geological ages Satan sinned and was cast to the earth and then there was a great cataclysm, so that the geological ages with billions of years of suffering and death took place before Satan sinned and certainly before man sinned. The Bible, on the other hand, says specifically that 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin' (Romans 5:12), so that there was no death in the world until man brought sin into it.

Romans 5:12 (complete):

¹² Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because ^w all sinned—

The 'gap' theory would require billions of years of suffering in the world before man or even Satan had sinned, and that means that God Himself would be directly responsible for sin in the world. God could not be the author of sin. So the 'gap' theory is precluded theologically.

Non-Science

Scientifically, it won't work either, because the whole essence of the geological age system, which some people try to accommodate by the 'gap' theory, is based on what geologists call 'uniformitarianism' that is, the continuity of processes in the ancient world with those in the modern world.

The very structure of the geological age system is based on the assumption that present rates and processes are the same as those that took place in the past. There is no room for a world-wide cataclysm interrupting those processes in the system of the geological ages.

That is why no geologist would ever accept the 'gap' theory.

In order to have a world-wide cataclysm that would destroy all the pre-cataclysm

mountains and cast them into the sea, so that there was the deep everywhere, and then blow billions of tons of debris up into the sky so that there was darkness over the deep everywhere, as Genesis 1:2 describes it, it would have to be a world-wide nuclear explosion, or volcanic explosion, or something which would literally disintegrate the crust of the earth where the fossils and the sedimentary rocks are that identify the geological ages.

So the 'gap' theory would destroy the evidence for the geological ages in order to accommodate them!

It is a self-negating theory scientifically; it creates overwhelming scientific problems. No geologist would ever accept the 'gap' theory.

Therefore, we have to reject the 'gap' theory as an interpretation of Genesis 1:2. We can be confident that a simple and straightforward, literal interpretation of the biblical record will satisfy all the real facts of geology.

The Gap Theory (Part B)

by P. Gadsby

August 1, 1980

The interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2, as it applies to the Gap (Ruin-Reconstruction) Theory, revolves around four major points:

1. The alleged (by Gap Theorists) difference in meaning between the Hebrew verbs *BaRa'* (“to create”) and *aSaH* (“to do,” “make,” etc.). Gap Theorists say that *'aSaH* cannot mean “to create” and so therefore Exodus 20:11 which speaks of Gods “making” (*'aSaH*) everything in six days must refer not original creation but a supposed re-creation (described Gen. 1:2ff).

2. The grammatical relationship of Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. Gap Theorists affirm that the grammar allows, or even requires, a chronological hiatus between the events described by these two verses.
3. The translation of *HaYeTHah* in Genesis 1:2. Proponents of the Ruin-Reconstruction Theory translate: “the earth became, or had become formless and empty”; rather than the traditional “was formless and empty.”
4. The meaning of the expression *BoHU* and *WoHU* (“formless and empty”). Gapists allege that the expression itself implies a process of destruction.

Discussion

Probably the best up-to-date discussion of these exegetical points is that of Weston W. Fields in his book *Unformed and Unfilled* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1978).

Fields shows that none of these claims by Gap Theorists will stand up to a critical, contextual analysis.

We may notice the following points:

Firstly, a study of the history of the exegesis of Genesis 1:1–2 shows that the Ruin-Reconstruction interpretation first appeared about the end of the 18th century, evidently in response to demands by geological science for long periods of time for strata formation.

The earliest interpretation available to us is that of the Greek Old Testament (The Septuagint, abbreviated LXX), which was produced in Egypt in the century following 250–200 BC. The LXX translation does not permit the reading in of any Ruin-Reconstruction scenario, as even Culance—a leading Gapist—realized.

Turning now to consider the four main issues mentioned above:

(1.) *BaRa'* and *'aSaH*. It is generally agreed that *BaRa'* means “to create”—it refers to “the production of that which had no existence before” (Keil).

However, faced with Exodus 20:11, Gap Theorists have sought to prove that *'aSaH* cannot mean “to create,” but means (in this context) “to recreate”—to make something out of substance previously existing.

Thus, Gapists do not interpret Exodus 20:11 as referring to the (original) creation, but to the six days of “re-creation” held to be described in Gen. 1:2ff.

A number of verses show, however, that *BaRa'* and *'aSaH* may be used interchangeably: among them is Nehemiah 9:6. This verse states that God made (*'aSaH*) “the heavens, even the highest heavens, and all their starry host, the earth, and all that is in it, the seas and all that is in them.” The reference is clearly to the (original) creation, but the verb *'aSaH* is used. (We presume that no Gapist will want to propose a Ruin-Reconstruction theory which includes all of heaven and earth! Even if he did, then it would presumably include the ordered strata of geology too, thereby evacuating the whole theory of its purpose. . . .)

The fact is that the two words may be used interchangeably in the Old Testament (OT).

Indeed, in some places they are used in synonymous parallelism (e.g. Gen. 2:4; Exodus 34:10; Isaiah 41:20; 43:7).

Applied to Exodus 20:11 and 31:17, and also Neh. 9:6, this conclusion limits the creation of the universe to the six days of creation recorded in Gen. 1:2ff.

(2.) The Grammar of Genesis 1:2. Gen. 1:2a (“And the earth was formless and empty. . . .”) is a noun-clause.

Following v.1, which is a subject-and-verb clause, v. 2a is therefore correctly identified as a “circumstantial clause”—that is, a clause expressing the circumstances attending the fact described by the principal statement (i.e. v.1).

So v. 2a explains more clearly the condition or the circumstances attending God’s creative act.

Grammatically then, v. 2a (and also 2b and c) constitute a description of the earth as originally created. This conclusion is supported by the recognition that the conjunction *WaW* (“and,” Hebrew *We*) at the beginning of the verse is a “*WaW* copulative,” which grammarian Gesenius compares to the English phrase “to wit” (see Fields, p. 81 ff).

Thus the grammatical relationship of verses 1 and 2 rules out the Gap Theory, since v. 2 actually comprises three clauses descriptive of the original condition of earth as created.

The New International Version (NIV) captures the sense: “Now the earth was formless and empty. . . .”

(3.) The translation of *HaYeThaH* (part of the Hebrew verb *HaYaH*, “to be”). Gap Theorist A.C. Custance claims that of 1320 occurrences of the verb *HaYaH* in the OT, only 24 can certainly be said to bear the meaning “to be.”

But he makes the unwarranted deduction that therefore *HaYaH* in Gen. 1:2 cannot mean “was,” but must mean “became.”

Given the argument of (2.) above, semantic considerations require that in this context, “was” must be the correct translation of *HaYeTHaH*.

This is supported by the Greek (LXX). Furthermore, in Gen. 1:2 *HaYeThaH* is not followed by the preposition *Le*, which would have demanded the translation “became” and removed ambiguity.

Finally,

(4.) The Meaning of *ToHu* and *BoHU*.

The argument that this expression refers to “a sinful, and therefore, not an original state of the earth,” relies on importing into Genesis 1:2 meanings from other OT contexts (viz. Isaiah 34:11 and Jeremiah 4:23).

While *ToHU* and *BoHU* occur together only these three times in the OT, *ToHU* appears alone in a number of places.

The simple meaning common to these latter is “formlessness,” however brought about (whether by judgment, destruction, etc.).

The word itself contains no implication about the causes of formlessness: these must be gained from the contexts in which the word appears.

Isaiah 45:18—a favorite of Gapists—which is rendered by the King James Version: “he created it not in vain (*ToHU*),” should be rendered “he did not create it to be empty, but formed it to be inhabited.”

The context speaks of God’s grace in restoring Israel: he did not choose his people in order to destroy them.

He is the **Lord** who did not create the earth to be a chaos, but to be formed and filled during the remaining days of creation.

Though the expression *ToHU* and *BoHU* in Isaiah 34:11 and Jer. 4:23 do speak of a wasteness and emptiness resulting from judgment for sin, this meaning is not implicit in the expression itself but is gained from the contexts. No such reference is required by the context of

Gen.1:2.

The simple meaning of Gen.1:2 is that God created the earth unformed as yet, and unfilled as yet.

The sequel in Gen.1 relates how the earth was progressively formed and filled.

(By the way, the suggestion that because Gen. 1:28 refers in the KJV to “replenishing” the earth, therefore the earth must have been at some previous time already “plenished” (!) is trite. The simple meaning of the Hebrew word is “to fill,” not “to refill.”).

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion on the exegesis of Gen. 1:1–2 should serve to illustrate the extremely tenuous exegetical support that exists for the Ruin-Reconstruction Theory. The interested reader is directed to Fields' book (op. cit.) for a thorough discussion of these and other relevant points.

What Does 'Replenish the Earth' Mean?

by Charles Taylor

March 1, 1996

Question: Genesis 1:28 in the King James Version (KJV) contains the expression 'replenish the earth'. Some have used this translation to support the 'gap theory', also known as the 'Ruin-Reconstruction theory', which involves the necessity for God to re-fill the earth after a pre-Adamic race had perished as a result of a so-called 'Lucifer's flood'. Is this interpretation correct?

Answer: No. The word ‘replenish’ occurs seven times in the KJV: here in Genesis 1:28, again in Genesis 9:1 (both times in the imperative), and five times in three major prophets in the passive and causative forms. So does the Hebrew original in these cases really mean ‘re-fill’?

But before getting into the Hebrew, we must ask why the KJV translators used the verb ‘replenish’.

1. An examination of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) shows that the word was used to mean ‘fill’ from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries.

In no case quoted in these five centuries does it unambiguously mean ‘re-fill’. The OED defines ‘replenish’ as having 10 meanings throughout its history:

5. *Replenished (adjective):*

fully stocked; provided, supplied;
filled, pervaded;
physically or materially filled;
full, made full.

6. *To replenish:*

make full, fill, stock with, as in: ‘This man made the Newe Forest, and replenyshed it with wylde bestes’ (AD1494);

inhabit, settle, occupy the whole of;
fill with food, satiate;

fill (space) with; fill (heart) with (a feeling);

fill up again; fill up (a vacant office) (AD1632);

become full, attain to fullness.

Note that only ‘*ɪ*’ includes the idea ‘again’.

This use first appears in a poem in 1612.

It appears again in Pepys' Diary, where he says: 'buy ... to replenish the stores'. Only the year 1612 is anywhere near the date of the KJV (1611), and it's a poetic use.

The Hebrew original of Genesis 1:28 is not poetic. All other uses range from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, when it tends to die out in normal writing.

2. The English word comes through a lot of changes from Latin *pleo* or *repleo*.

There's also the adjective *plenus*, 'filled'. So we must now trace the prefix *re-* and see what it means.

In very old Latin it did mean 'again', but by the time the Bible went into Latin it had lost some of this meaning.

We see this in the later French word *remplir*, which doesn't mean 'refill', but

‘fill’. In late Latin it was *re-in-plere*, and *re-* had already lost its basic idea of ‘again’. In many other words it now meant ‘completely’ or ‘altogether’.

Compare ‘research’, meaning to ‘search completely’.

We notice also that two of the meanings in history include ‘making full’.

In similar English words we have this meaning: ‘refresh’ means to make fresh; ‘relax’ to make lax; ‘release’ to make loose or free.

But when the KJV was translated, ‘replenish’ was just a scholarly word for ‘fill’. They almost certainly came to use it because an old word ‘plenish’ was dying out.

We have seen that Latin *re-* originally meant ‘again’ but then developed new overtones.

Before the Bible was translated, *repleo*, the word that gave us 'replenish', normally meant just 'fill'.

Here are some examples from Latin authors:

- *fill up* the number of (Livy)
- what they lacked in votes they *made up for* in noise (Ovid)
- he *filled* the battlefield with men (before the battle) (Livy)
- *fill* veins with blood (Livy)
- *filled* the crowd with his speech (Virgil)
- civil law *full* of right knowledge (Cicero)

There's another English word that comes from *repleo*.

It is 'replete'. We can say 'I am replete', using a politer word than 'full up' with food. It doesn't mean 'full again'.

So my understanding of the word in the KJV is that ‘replenish’ then just meant ‘fill up’, though some hundred years later it began to mean ‘refill’ when some scholars convinced people that *re-* should really mean ‘again’.

So in 1611 it’s quite clear the translators didn’t necessarily convey anything about a second filling of the earth in Genesis 1:28.

3. Now as to the Hebrew word itself: it is *male*’, the simple verb ‘fill’. (Strong’s concordance No. 4390.) In its various forms it occurs 306 times in the Old Testament. Only seven times does the KJV translate it as ‘replenish’, but 195 times ‘fill’, ‘filled’ or ‘full’.

4. Other times it becomes ‘fulfil’ or has some idiomatic meaning.

Quite clearly the idea of refilling is

completely absent from the Hebrew. There's no doubt on that score. So the English of the KJV is the only problem. We all know that languages change over the years.

So that's the real explanation of the misunderstanding about this verse that tells us that God commanded the first humans to fill up completely the earth He had prepared for them.

Finally, the proof is that the similar phrase in verse 22 has the translation 'fill' in the KJV.

Summary

1. The word translated 'replenish' (KJV) simply means 'fill' in the Hebrew.
2. In the English of King James' day, 'replenish' also usually meant 'fill', not 'refill'.
3. The word 'replenish' therefore cannot

be used to support ideas about a previous creation, which was destroyed. In any case, such erroneous theories, invented in response to the ‘millions of years’ idea, must hold to the unbiblical notion that there was death and suffering before Adam’s sin.

CHARLES V. TAYLOR, MA., Ph.D., PGCE, LRAM, FIL., Cert. Th.

Dr Taylor has qualifications in languages, music and theology. He was for many years co-ordinator of applied linguistics courses at the University of Sydney, Australia.

The Gap Theory (Part A)

Problems and Inconsistencies

by Ken Ham

August 1, 1980

There have been many attempts to harmonize or combine the Genesis account of the creation with orthodox “modern” geology—e.g. theistic evolution and progressive creation.

The gap theory is an early and significant attempt by Christian theologians to explain the apparent short scale of world history found in Genesis, in order to reduce or remove conflict with the popular belief that geologists since 1700 have provided undeniable evidence that the world is exceedingly old (currently estimated at 4.5 billion years).

In W.W. Fields' book, *Unformed and Unfilled*, p. 40, he writes, "One of the men who is perhaps most responsible for the origin and popularity of the gap theory is Thomas Chalmers (1780–1847), a famous theologian of Scotland, and founder of the Free Church of Scotland."

The most academic defense of the gap theory can be found in the writings of Arthur Custance in his book *Without Form and Void*, (published by Arthur C. Custance, Brookville, Canada, 1970). Currently, this "ruin-reconstruction" view is held by many who use as Bible study aids the *Scofield Reference Bible* or *Dake's Annotated Reference Bible*.

This view is also implied or allowed for in other Bibles such as *The Newberry Reference Bible*. *Dake's Annotated Reference Bible*, p. 51, states, “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.”

Basically, the gap concept incorporates three strands of thought:

7. a belief in a “literal” view of Genesis,
8. a belief in an extremely long but undefined age for the earth, and
9. an obligation to explain the origin of most of the geologic strata and other geologic evidence to fit between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2.

It is only fair to say that gap theorists are opposed to evolution, but do not believe

in a recent origin of all things.

Their theory is perhaps best summed up in the following way:

Genesis 1:1 In the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth

In the far distant, dateless past, God created a perfect heaven and perfect earth.

Satan was ruler of the earth which was peopled by a race of “men” without any souls.

Eventually, Satan, who dwelled in a garden of Eden composed of minerals (Ezekial 28), rebelled by desiring to become like God (Isaiah 14).

Because of Satan’s fall, sin entered the universe and brought on the earth God’s judgment in the form of a flood (indicated by the water of Genesis 1:2), and then a global ice-age when the light and heat

from the sun were somehow removed.

All the plant, animal, and human fossils upon the earth today date from this “Lucifer’s flood” and do not bear any genetic relationship with the plants, animals and fossils living upon the earth today. (*Unformed and Unfilled*, p. 7).

Genesis 1:2 And the Earth was without form and void. . . .

Western Biblical commentaries, written before the belief in uniformitarianism became widely accepted (1700s), and therefore before the theory of a long age for the earth became popular, postulated no gap between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2, to equate with the “ruin-reconstruction” theory.

(Uniformitarian science maintains a progressive laying down of fossils throughout billions of years, and is used as a basis for the evolutionary theory).

Certainly some commentaries proposed intervals of various lengths of time for reasons relating to Satan's fall, but none ever proposed a "ruin-reconstruction" situation, or pre-Adamite world.

The following is a brief consideration of some of the problems and inconsistencies confronting those who adhere to the gap theory:

(a) The gap theorist accepts that the earth is very old. He has based this view on the acceptance of geologic evidence which was interpreted using the assumption that the present is the key to the past. This assumption implies that fossils formed in the past at basically the same rate as they do today.

It is also used by most geologists and biologists to seek to justify belief in the geologic column.

This geologic column has become the showcase of evolution, because the fossils are interpreted to show “ascent” from simple to complex forms.

However, the gap theorist is committed to literal creation because of his acceptance of a “literal view” of Genesis. Hence, he finds himself in a dilemma. He cannot accept the conclusions of evolution based on the geologic column, nor can he accept that the days in the Genesis record correspond to geologic periods, so he assumes the proposition that God reshaped the earth and re-created all life in six literal days after “Lucifer’s flood,” hence the name “ruin-reconstruction.”

This flood was supposedly caused by the sin of Satan, and the resulting judgment upon that sin reduced the previous world to a state “without form and void.”

Now while the gap theorist may think he has solved the problem here, his solution (Lucifer’s flood) in reality has removed the reason for which he proposed the theory in the first place.

If all the sediments and fossils were produced quickly in one massive worldwide flood, then the evidence that the earth is extremely old (based on the slow formation of the sediments) no longer exists.

(b) One could reasonably assume that if the world was reduced to a shapeless chaotic mass, “without form and void,” it would be difficult to imagine how an ordered assemblage of fossils and

sediments could remain as evidence. Surely, one could conclude that in such a degree of chaos the fossil record would have been severely disrupted if not entirely destroyed.

(c) If we are committed to explaining the fossil record on the basis of Lucifer's flood, then what effect did the worldwide Flood of Noah have? On this point the gap theorist is forced to conclude that Noah's Flood left virtually no trace.

Genesis however, depicts Noah's Flood as a judgment by water for sin.

It is spelled out in Scripture (Genesis 6:8). It covered the whole world (Genesis 6:17 and 7:19–24).

Plants and all life that had breath suffered and died.

It lasted for over a year and only one family survived (Genesis 7:23b).

One can understand his difficulty in maintaining a literal acceptance of Genesis (which includes the catastrophic Noah's Flood), while at the same time not allowing for any trace of that event. Some gap theorists overcome this dilemma by suggesting Noah's Flood was only a local event.

(d) On the basis of Romans 5:12

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,” it is understood that there could not have been death before Adam. There could not have been sin before Adam, as the Bible says it was through Adam that sin came into the world (Romans 5:12).

But the fossil record speaks of disease, decay and death.

Contrary to this teaching of Scripture, the gap theorists must accept that these three things existed before Adam sinned.

(e) The gap theorist must also choose to ignore any evidence consistent with a belief in a young age for the earth, possibly no greater than 10,000 years. There is much evidence for this—e.g. the decay of the earth’s magnetic field, the quantity of meteoric dust on the moon, the breakup of galaxy clusters, etc.

(f) Exodus 20:11 states, “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea *and all that in them is*, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

Note the emphasis, “and all that in them is.”

If the fossil record was in the earth after the six days of creation and before Adam sinned (as gap theorists suppose), then God would have had to make that strata during the time limit of six days, since it is an integral part of “all that in them is”! God declared of everything He had made, in the heaven, earth and sea, that it was “very good.”

How could a fossil record which gives evidence of disease, violence (fossils have been found of animals fighting each other) death, decay, etc.—be described as “very good”?

(g) The gap theory has failed to accommodate or satisfy evolutionary and uniformitarian science as its advocates hoped.

By accepting a long age for the earth (based on the geologic column derived from uniformitarian geology,) the gap theorist leaves the evolutionary system intact (which by his own assumptions he opposes), and he must theorize that Romans 5:12 and Genesis 3:3 refer exclusively to spiritual death.

This theory is not borne out by exegesis of Scripture (1 Corinthians 15; Genesis 3:22–23).

Conclusion

The Genesis record speaks of a catastrophe responsible for destroying all organisms that had the “breath of life in them” except for those preserved in Noah’s Ark.

Christ referred to Noah’s Flood in Matthew 24:37–39.

He said that just as there was once a worldwide judgment of mankind by water, so there will be another worldwide judgment (this time by fire).

It is more consistent with the whole framework of Scripture to correlate this recorded event, Noah's Flood, with most major fossil deposits, than to resort to a vague area of Scripture such as the fall of Satan to justify a speculative geologic catastrophe which achieves nothing for Biblical understanding or science.

Sadly, Christians sometimes appear to be susceptible to what has been termed the "Thomas Aquinas Syndrome."

Thomas Aquinas, one of the early church fathers, said, "We must be on our guard against giving interpretations which are hazardous or opposed to science, and so expose the Word of God to ridicule of

unbelievers.”

By interpreting the Scriptures in the light of the popular beliefs of the day, many Christians have sought to avoid persecution or intellectual conflict, rather than to accept God’s Word by faith. The gap theory appears to reinterpret Scripture to fit in with the favored scientific concepts of the day.