

TOWARDS

BIBLICAL GAP THEOLOGY
BIBLICAL GAP THEOLOGY

PRE-HISTORICAL

PRE-ADAMITE

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

T-O-W-A-R-D-S

PRE-HISTORICAL PRE-ADAMIC THEOLOGY {BIBLICAL <GENESIS 1:1-GAP-1:3> THEOLOGY}

The “Gap Theory” assumes a lengthy ‘*gap*’ of *indeterminate* period of geologic time, between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2-3, comprising of billions of years based on the geological evidence in the fossil record. “*According to the gap theory, God created a fully-functional earth in verse 1. That ancient earth ostensibly featured a full spectrum of animal and plant life, including fish and mammals, various species of now-extinct dinosaurs, and other creatures that we know only from the fossil record.*”¹ Next, “*Proponents of the gap theory suggest that verse 2 ought to be translated, ‘The earth became without form, and void.’ They speculate that as a result of Satan’s fall, or for some other reason, the prehistoric earth was laid waste by an untold calamity. (This presupposes, of course, that Satan’s fall or some other evil occurred sometime in the gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2). Then, according to this view, God created all the life-forms that we now see and thus remade earth into a paradise in six days of recreation.*”²

The ‘*Statement of Faith*’ of ‘www.answersingenesis.org’ and the proponents of other diverse Theories of Creationism state that the “Gap Theory has no basis in Scripture” and that it has no *theological* relevance. Surely, there couldn’t be any measurable “*gap of time*” before the creation of Day 1, even as the elusive “*time*” we measure on earth began with Day 1.

Nevertheless, there are sufficient Scriptures which describe events that can be only convincingly accommodated as having occurred during a *Biblical period* comprising of ‘*white space*’ between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 and ‘*black space*’ between Genesis 1:2 and 1:3. Moreover, the Book of Stone – or Geology provides fossil evidence that can be only accounted for by the ‘*intervals of white and black space*’ between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3; and that may be done without resorting to any ‘*indeterminate chronological slots*’.

Anyway, even apart from any relevant fossil record relied upon by the Gap Theorists, the Scriptural evidence *in itself*, relating to *events* on earth that can be explained *only* as having occurred *prior* to the *works* of Genesis 1:3-31, *demand* a proper *theological* explanation. As such, these *pre-historical pre-adamic events* we find recorded in the Bible provide sufficient basis to convincingly formulate a sound ‘***Biblical Gap Theology***’.

Scripturally-based “*Pre-Historical Pre-Adamic Genesis 1:1<2>3 Gap Theology*”, by implication, has evangelical connotations of profound spiritual significance. When properly understood and appreciated, *Biblical Gap Theology* provides doctrinal background with which to meaningfully appreciate God’s works of the first *six days*. Apart from any such relevant pre-historical *Biblical Gap Theology*, the work of the *six days* becomes theologically inconsequential, having no definite purpose or any spiritual significance. *Biblical Gap Theology* confirms that the Traditional Belief in a ‘*Creation of Cosmos in Six Days, some six to ten thousand years ago*’ is biblically unfounded and evangelically insignificant. The same *belief* fails to account for the biblically recorded *pre-adamic, pre-historical* events.

Anyway, *Genesis 1:2* is of *theological* relevance when accounted for within the framework of Scriptures recorded in Proverbs 8:22-31, Job 38:9-11, Psalms 104:6-9, Isaiah 14:12, Ezekiel 28:12-18. These events can be *only* explained as having occurred during the *time lag* or *unknown period* between *Genesis 1:1* and *1:3* with a *changed state* on earth as described in *Genesis 1:2*. As otherwise, it is not at all possible to *appropriately* interpret the events described by these Scriptures as having occurred after creation of Adam, and before he sinned. As such, the *work* of the *six days* described in *Genesis 1:3-31* is a *later* work of physical *redemption* and *restoration* from the *chaos* and *darkness*. It is a *divine work* having *evangelical significance*.

Biblically as well as theologically speaking, “... ‘*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth*’... Then in the second verse we find things fallen into a state of ruin. ‘*And the earth was waste and empty, and darkness was on the face of the deep*’. This was certainly not as it was created -- for we are expressly told that ‘*not as waste [the same word as in Genesis 1:2] did he create it*’ (Isaiah 45:18). ... A solemn change had come about between the first and second verses of *Genesis 1*. We do not know what length of time elapsed between those two verses..... In verse 2 we find on earth disorder and darkness. “It is in such a scene that God's next activities are presented as taking place – activities which come to an end on the sixth day, so that on the seventh day God rested. This indicates at the very outset the whole subject of Scripture. It is the unfolding of how God has worked, and will work, in a scene of moral disorder to bring about a state of things in which He can rest -- a scene of order and life and fruitfulness where all will be under the dominion of Man in His image and after His likeness.”³ Theologically and evangelically loaded nature of the phased six days’ work *distinguishes* it from the work of an original instant creation.

Traditional Six-day and Young-Earth Creationists owe it to God to accept the *fact* of a ‘*distinct, completed creation phase*’ (Genesis 1:1) followed by a ‘*changed state*’ (Genesis 1:2). This *state* is in no way a *constituent* of the original creation notwithstanding any **grammatical** connection between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. And, rooted in the state of ‘*chaos and darkness on a flooded earth*’ in *Genesis 1:2* are *theological* facts that lie behind God’s *redemptive-restorative* work of the *six days*. These basic facts substantially *affirm* a radical *Evangelically-Based Theology of Creation*.

Anyway, *arguments* provoked by the controversial “*Gap Theory*” and resorted to repudiate any “*pre-historical period*” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3 deserves our attention. These arguments *aim* to refute the claims of any pre-Adamic world or social system on earth under Lucifer’s rule and its *destruction* following Lucifer’s sin before God’s *work* of the *six days*. The same *arguments* can be convincingly *addressed* and *resolved* only if we are willing to shed away our preconceived *traditional* notions and consider the much overlooked but relevant biblical and scientific facts without any bias. Obviously, these *arguments* are prompted by one’s core *traditional* belief of a ‘*creation in six days*’, mistakenly assuming the *chaotic* conditions on *earth* in *Genesis 1:2* as comprising of ‘*God’s activity on Day One*’. However, traditional creational thinking is hopelessly misleading being errant.

It is stated that the so-called “*gap theory*” of ‘*indeterminate geologic time*’, “*poses enormous biblical and theological problems*”. At the same time, it is admitted that it “*allows for a straightforward literal interpretation of the creation days of Genesis 1*”⁴. In a similar vein, Ken Ham states that “*Believing in the gap theory presents a number of problems and inconsistencies, especially for a Christian.*”⁵. Though some of the problems and inconsistencies may be real so as to render the “*Gap Theory*” as defective, the core problems experienced by the traditional six-day creationists are not at all warranted though certainly understandable. Understandable, because such imaginary problems and inconsistencies are subjectively experienced by those who interpret Genesis 1:1, 1:2 and 1:3-31 within the framework of the traditional six-day creationism. When viewed in the light of ignored biblical truth, these problems are baseless.

Anyway, the unwarranted *problems* and *inconsistencies* are confidently *addressed* hereinafter, so as to convincingly *replace* the “*Gap Theory*” with a relevant ***Biblically-based Gap Theology***, having *evangelical* overtones:-

#1: *The Grammar of Genesis 1:1–2*

“Many adherents of the gap theory claim that the grammar of Genesis 1:1–2 allows, and even requires, a time-gap between the events in verse 1 and the events in verse 2. But...the most straightforward reading of the verses sees verse 1 as a subject-and-verb clause, with verse 2 containing three circumstantial clauses (i.e., three statements that further describe the circumstances introduced by the principal clause in verse 1). The Hebrew conjunction “waw”, meaning “and” at the beginning of verse 2, is a “waw copulative,” which compares with the old English expression “to wit.” This grammatical connection between verses 1 and 2 thus rules out the gap theory. Verse 2 is in fact a description of the state of the originally created earth: ‘And the earth was without form and void.’ (Genesis 1:2a)”. (Ken Ham, www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/gap-ruin-reconstruction-theories). See also Weston W. Fields⁶ and M. W. J. Phelan⁷.

We should not allow our *limited* knowledge of Hebrew *grammar* and *syntax* to cause Scripture ‘*here a little*’ to *contradict* Scripture ‘*there a little*’. We do come across Scriptures in the Bible that are grammatically connected to each other but which, when studied together as a single textual unit based on their grammatical connection, actually contradict each other. Examples of such Scriptures include Genesis 1:1-2, Isaiah 14:14-16, Ezekiel 28:12-13 and so on. The principle to be adopted in such a situation is to rightly divide the Scriptures that are grammatically connected to each other but then are clearly seen to contradict each other when studied together as a unit.

There is a significant lack of understanding of the Hebrew Grammar and Syntax of Genesis 1:1-2 amongst biblical scholars. This is obvious from the difficulty experienced in translating Genesis 1:1-2. Hence, we come across diverse, sometimes contradictory, translations of these first two verses in the Bible. How do we resolve this difficulty in properly understanding the intended meaning of these first two verses in the Bible? The principle to be adopted is to obey 2 Timothy 2:15c and rightly divide the Word of Truth which is grammatically connected rather than allow the connected scriptures to contradict with each other. And, to rightly divide such scriptures we must let the Bible interpret the underlying meaning and subsequently divide.

It is well known to all biblical scholars that the *merism*: ‘*heavens and earth*’ in the Hebrew Scriptures means “*totality of all creation*”. It has the sense of “*a completed perfect creation showing forth the glory of God*” (Psalms 19:1-6). As such, we should not allow *chaos* of 1:2 to *contradict* the intended true *meaning* of ‘*heavens and earth*’ in Genesis 1:1 because of any grammatical *connection* between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. In other words, *chaos* of Genesis 1:2 cannot be considered as a *work of perfect creation* in spite of the grammatical connection between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. To state as such is to impugn the character of God whose works are always perfect.

Genesis 1:2 containing ‘*three circumstantial clauses*’ that ‘*describe the circumstances*’ supposedly ‘*introduced by the principal clause in verse 1*’ doesn’t really *mean* that Genesis 1:2 ‘*is in fact a description of the (actual) state of the originally created earth*’, notwithstanding any supposed grammatical connection. In fact, it is a brief description of the *circumstances* on earth, *to wit*: ‘*chaotic earth without form and void, darkness upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters*’ that came to be later on earth, *subsequent* to its original *perfect* creation. To *conclude* that the ‘*three circumstantial clauses*’ of Genesis 1:2 describe the ‘*state of the originally created earth*’ just because they are *connected* to Genesis 1:1 by the conjunction ‘*wau copulative*’ is absolutely illogical.

Certainly, the ‘*Spirit of God*’, *moving upon the surface of the waters*, doesn’t belong to the *state* of the *originally* created earth because of the ‘*grammatical connection between verses 1 and 2*’. As such, any supposed grammatical *link* between verses 1 *and* 2 in no way implies Genesis 1:2 is a description of the actual ‘*state of the originally created earth*’. Again, it is a gross *hermeneutical* error to state that the *three phrases* in v. 2, namely, ‘*without form, and void*’, ‘*darkness was on the face of the deep*’, and ‘*the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters*’ are used “*to describe the original state of the earth*” and to further state that “*A similar barrenness no doubt characterized the whole universe.*”⁸

It is stated that “*The construction of the Hebrew phrase that opens verse 2 is significant. The subject comes before the verb, as if to emphasize something remarkable about it. It might be translated, ‘As to the earth, it was formless and void.’ Here is a new planet, the very focus of God’s creative purpose, and it was formless and void.*”⁹ But, the construction of the phrase that opens v. 2 does not emphasize something remarkable about ‘*the earth* as a newly created planet’ but about a *planet* that *was* in a *chaos*.

The state of *chaos* and *darkness* on a *flooded* earth in Genesis 1:2 cannot be interpreted to be the actual ‘*state of the originally created earth*’ because of any supposed *grammatical* connection with Genesis 1:1. The *chaos* and *darkness* on earth in Genesis 1:2 needs to be *differentially* and *factually* interpreted as circumstances occurring on earth *later on*. It has nothing to do with the originally created earth just as the ‘*Spirit of God*’, ‘*moving upon the face of the waters*’ has no *connection* whatsoever with the *chaotic circumstances* in Genesis 1:2. As such, it is totally misleading to state Genesis 1:2 is the ‘*state of the originally created earth*’ of Genesis 1:1, on the same premise that the *Spirit of God* is not a “state of the originally created earth”. Now if it is wrong to conclude that “*Spirit of God* is a state of the originally created earth” in spite of its grammatical connection with verse 1, then it is also equally wrong to conclude that the other two circumstantial clauses are an actual state of the originally created earth.

Similarly in Ezekiel 28:12, in spite of the grammatical connection between the clauses, we know we cannot interpret this Scripture by stating that the King of Tyrus actually ‘*sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, perfect in beauty*. Even though this particular clause is actually addressed to King Tyrus, and grammatically speaking it should refer to King Tyrus, yet we cannot at all attribute these characteristics to King Tyrus. Instead, they are appropriately attributed to Lucifer. Similar is the case in Isaiah 14: 4-12; in spite of the grammatical connection in this passage, we will never state that the King of Babylon is Lucifer. As such, in spite of the grammatical link, it is improper to state Genesis 1:2 is the condition of the earth in Genesis 1:1.

Next, according to the NIV translators, “*__ the vast majority of prose sentences in OT Hebrew begin with one of the two Hebrew forms for the word ‘and’*. *The word for ‘and’ appears even when there is absolutely nothing preceding to which the sentence logically connects. In fact, six books of the OT (Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, Ezra, Ruth and Esther) begin in Hebrew with the word ‘and’, though they obviously do not follow anything. Accordingly, it is now recognized by Hebrew grammarians that ‘and’ at the beginning of a sentence is virtually the equivalent of the use of capitalization at the beginning of English sentences. __ it simply means that ‘and’ is only sometimes and certainly not a majority of the time, the best translation in English*”¹⁰. As otherwise, “*The simple English sentence beginning with a Capital letter will do nicely in most cases.*”¹¹ Accordingly, NIV translators “*reduce the number of occurrences of ‘and’ (in Genesis 1) to eleven*” as compared to KJV translation with a ‘*total of thirty times*’.

In spite of the fact that Genesis 1:2 contain three *clauses* that describe the circumstances introduced by the principal clause in Genesis 1:1, NIV translators saw it fitting to separate Genesis 1:1 from Genesis 1:2. Accordingly, NIV Verse 1: “*In the beginning God created the Heavens and the earth*” is independent of Verse 2: “*Now the earth was (Or ‘possibly became’ - NIV foot note) formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.*” The NIV translation of Genesis 1:1-2 allows no contradiction between the *contents* or the *subject matter* of the two *independent* verses. However, when the two verses are linked together with a copulative ‘waw’ or ‘and’ as in the KJV the contradiction and the subsequent *misinterpretation* is inevitable.

Even otherwise, “and” is used 153 times in Genesis 1-2 to separate the 102 recorded independent acts of God. Verse 2 is as independent of verse 1 as to time and subject matter as all the other separate acts of God. Verse 1 refers to the whole universe being created and inhabited in the dateless past, while verse 2 refers to chaos because of sin. Verses 3-31 picture the restoration of the earth as before chaos, and its second habitation with present man and the earth and water creatures brought into being about 6,000 years ago.”¹²

The content of Genesis 1:2 describing the chaos on earth is at total variance with the contents of Genesis 1:1 describing a creation which, as defined by the Hebrew *merism*: ‘*heavens and earth*’, had to be ‘*perfect and complete*’. As such, biblically speaking, any relevant grammatical link or connection between the two verses becomes inconsequential. We need not allow the ‘*chaos*’ of Genesis 1:2 to contradict with the Hebrew *merism* “*heavens and earth*” (Genesis 1:1), meaning a ‘completed perfect creation’.

Next, the hermeneutical principle to consider the “*context, Context, CONTEXT*” during exegesis of Scriptures need not be necessarily applicable to every single Scripture or textual unit. If that be the case, then there is no need to “*divide the Word of Truth*” (2 Timothy 2:15) which is very essential to obey, seeing that the Word of Truth relating to any biblical subject is given “*here a little and there a little*” (Isaiah 28:10, 13) in the Bible.

As such, when any grammatically connected Scriptures contextually contradict, analyzing the immediate context is of no use. We must simply obey God and rightly divide and separate the contradicting scriptures so as to preserve their true original biblical sense. Therefore, it is hermeneutically appropriate to divide and separate Genesis 1:1 from Genesis 1:2.

Anyway, *Traditional Six-Day Creationists* who are firmly convinced and believe in a “*creation of the cosmos in six days some six to ten thousand years ago*” will somehow hang on to their *traditional beliefs* in spite of the *contradictions*. Subsequently, any other biblically relevant view will not be easily accepted as biblical truth because it simply doesn’t agree with one’s ingrained *traditional beliefs*. Tradition, by all means, reigns *supreme*.

Nevertheless, it is biblically *inconsistent* to *subjectively* conclude that the ‘*grammatical connection between verses 1 and 2 rules out the gap theory*’, defective though it may be. For an in-depth and thorough refutation of the views held by Weston W. Fields that the “*Gap is Grammatically Impossible*”, the reader is recommended to read in this book, ‘*Appendix A*’, reproduced from a Personal Communication made to me by Jack W. Langford, which is also described in his Book¹³. Notwithstanding *traditional beliefs*, *Biblical Gap Theology* based on a proper exegesis of Genesis 1:1, 1:2 and 1:3 with the help of other *Scriptures* relating to the *events* that can be *solely* accounted for as having occurred during the *period* between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3 has much *relevance* and profound *evangelical* significance.

-
- 1: John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning*, op.cit; p.75 2: *ibid*, p.75**
- 3: Charles A. Coates, *An Outline of Genesis*, op.cit. p.2**
- 4: John MacArthur, Jr., *The Battle...op. cit*, p.75.**
- 5: Ken Ham, www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/gap--ruin-reconstruction-theories**
- 6: Weston W. Fields, *Unformed and Unfilled*, Master Books, USA, 2005**
- 7: M. W. J. Phelan, *The Genesis ‘Gap Theory’, Its Credibility and Consequences*, Twoedged Sword Publications, UK, 2005**
- 8: John MacArthur, *The Battle.....*, op. cit. p.74, 73. 9: John MacArthur; *ibid*, p.74.**
- 10, 11: Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, “*How to Read the Bible for All its Worth*”; OM Books, Indian Reprint 2000, A. P., India, p. 42.**
- 12: F. J. Dake, op. cit. p. 76.**
- 13: Jack W. Langford, *The Gap Is Not a Theory*, op. cit., pp.75-80.**

#2: “The gap theory flatly contradicts Exodus 20:11: ‘For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day’.” (John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning*, *op. cit.* p. 76).

May be, some “*Gap Theorists*” attempt to *accommodate* the theories of evolution between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 so as to explain and account for the fossil record of billions of years. However, ‘*Gap Theology*’ propounded briefly in this treatise aims to *convincingly* explain the biblical *realities* of Lucifer’s rule and pre-Adamic life on earth *prior* to Genesis 1:2 and the *subsequent* destruction consequent to Lucifer’s fall. But, in no way does it *contradict* Exodus 20:11 which actually *summarize* God’s later *additional* work of the first *six days of creation*, re-creation. The *apparent* contradiction is due to *faulty* interpretation of *Exodus 20:11*. This faulty interpretation is made based upon *traditional assumptions*. As such, we need to interpret Exodus 20:11 with the help of related relevant *Scriptures*.

That is, if we rely on the *Scriptures* in Genesis 1: 8, 10 and 14-18 to interpret the *Scripture* in *Exodus 20:11* and in *31:17* instead of interpreting the same with the *myths* of ‘*defective six-day creationism*’, then it will be clear that *Exodus 20:11* and *31:17* *doesn’t* speak of the *original Heavens* and the *Earth* of *Genesis 1:1* which were first *created* (*bara*, in Hebrew) by *fiat, ex nihilo*, outside of any measurable *time*. Instead, it will be confidently ascertained that *Exodus 20:11, 31:17* speak of *Heavens* of *Genesis 1:8, 14-18*, and of the *dry land named Earth* of *Genesis 1:10*, and of the *Sea(s)* of *Genesis 1:10* which *God made* (rather *re-ordered*, ‘*asah*’ in Hebrew, from *previously* existing material) and *all that in them is*, in *six days*, which after He *saw* the same retrospectively, said “*very good*” (Genesis 1:31).

It’s *only* in the *atmospheric* ‘*heavens* of Genesis 1:8 of day *two*’ and on the *dry land* called ‘*earth* of Genesis 1:10 of day *three*’ and in the ‘*sea* of Genesis 1:10 of day *three*’ do we find ‘*all that in them is*’, that is, the *flora* and *fauna*, which *God made on the third, fifth and sixth day*. Certainly, *all* what *God created* during the *six days* was not a *constituent* of the *earlier original* perfect creation of Genesis 1:1. ‘*All that in them is*’ refers to all what *God brought into existence* in the *atmospheric heavens* and on *earth* and in the *seas* during the *work* of the *six days* of Genesis 1:3-31. As such, Exodus 20:11 has no direct reference to heavens and earth of Genesis 1:1.

The above Scriptures make it very clear that the ‘heavens’, ‘earth’ and the ‘sea’ of Exodus 20: 11 are not the same “*heavens and earth*” of Genesis 1:1. Accordingly, the Bible speaks of ‘*generations*’ of *heavens and earth* in Genesis 2:4a, *distinguishing* thereby the *heavens and earth* that were created earlier (Genesis 2:4a) from *those* that were made later (Genesis 1:8, 10; 2:4b)

In an attempt to *refute* the above distinction, Ken Ham *pointedly* states that “bara and asah are used in Scripture to describe the same event. For example, asah is used in Exodus 20:11 to refer to the creation of the heavens and the earth, but bara is used to refer the creation of the heavens and the earth in Genesis 1:1. The word asah is used concerning the creation of the first people in Genesis 1:26 – they did not previously exist. And then they are said to have been created (bara) in Genesis 1:27.”¹

It is true that at times *bara* and *asah* are used in Scripture to describe the same creation event. But in *Exodus 20:11* and *31:17* *asah* is definitely used to refer to the “heavens” of Genesis 1: 8, 14-18 and to the “earth” and to the “sea” of Genesis 1:10 which God MADE out of existing things, during the Creation Week. In NO WAY do these refer to the “Heavens” and the “Earth” of Genesis 1:1 or to the “waters” covering the earth of Genesis 1: 2 which God created instantly “*In the Beginning*” out of nothing, *ex nihilo*.

Both the words “asah” and “bara” are used in Genesis 1: 26-27 to describe the creation of the first people. This is because in the “creation of man”, ‘Adam’ was first formed (*asah*) out of the existing material and then God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life thereby creating (*bara*) the ‘*human spirit*’ in him (1 Corinthians 2:11). There could be no other way to consider the use of both these words to describe the creation of man after God’s Image and Likeness. Anyway, the words ‘asah’ and ‘bara’ may not always be necessarily said to be used synonymously.

Again, both words ‘*bara*’ and ‘*asah*’ are used synonymously when referring to *heavens and earth*. This is because of the heavens and the earth that were created (*bara*) out of nothing *ex nihilo* in the beginning and the ‘*heavens*’ and ‘*earth*’ and the ‘*sea*’ that were made during the creation week out of the *existing* material as in Genesis 1:8, 10-18. In certain Scriptures God speaks of the permanence of heavens and earth. And in certain other Scriptures He speaks of their transience. This apparent contradiction can be resolved by the fact that the creation of Genesis 1:1 is permanent whereas what was re-created in Genesis 1:8, 10-18 for man’s habitation is transient.

When God Himself clearly distinguishes the *heavens and earth* He first created by fiat in the beginning (Genesis 1:1) from *those* He made during the *six days* (Genesis 1:8, 10-18) then why should we hesitate to accept the *distinction* God Himself makes? Anyway, we should never allow our *wrong* interpretations based on any *traditional* concepts to fit into the Scriptures so as then to passionately hold on to the *traditional six-day creation*, ONLY.

We can, therefore, conclude that Nehemiah 9: 6 refers to the ‘*heaven of heavens*’ and to the ‘*heavens and earth and the sea*’ of Genesis 1:8, 10-18 which are, of course, a part of the *original* heavens and the earth of Genesis 1:1, created *ex-nihilo*. Anyway, the Bible speaks of “*Generations*” of *Heavens* and *Earth* (Genesis 2:4a) distinguishing the ‘*heavens and earth*’ that were originally *created* (Genesis 1:1) from the ‘*heavens and the earth*’ that were *made* (Genesis 1:8, 10, 12-18; 2:4b). Next, there will be a *third* new “*Generation*” of “*heavens and earth*” when once *created* and or *made* after the Millennium and final judgment.

Moreover, there are *three* kinds of heavens: one, the *atmospheric* heavens (Genesis 1: 8); second, the *stellar* heavens (Genesis 1:1a) and third, the *heaven of God’s throne*, wherein Paul was taken (2 Corinthians 12:2, 4). The fact that the words ‘*bara*’ and ‘*asah*’ are used interchangeably in the Hebrew Scriptures and that in some places they are used in synonymous parallelism doesn’t mean we can ignore the distinction between different ‘generations’ of heavens and earth, or that there are *three* kinds of heavens.

As accurately stated by Henry Morris, President of the *Institute for Creation Research*, USA: “*In the first chapter of Genesis, both types of activity are stressed, the account finally concluding with the summary: ‘All His work which God created and made’ (Genesis 2:3). The two types of work are almost synonymous when referring to the divine activity but not quite (otherwise ‘created’ and ‘made’ would be redundant). Specifically, the three acts of true creation in Genesis are the creation of the physical elements of the cosmos, the entity of biological life, and the spiritual image of God in man (Genesis 1:1, 21, 27). These entities God simply called into being, ex nihilo, by His Word. Everything else He made, or formed, or let be, out of the three basic entities that were specially created. He is both Creator and Maker of all things and we should worship Him as such.”² God created the *heavens* and the *earth* by *fiat* in *Genesis 1:1*. He also made the visible heavens of *Genesis 1:8*, 14-19 and the *earth* and *sea* of *Genesis 1:10*.*

It is very clear that there are *two* distinct creation *phases* in Genesis 1. It should be obvious that *Exodus 20:11, 31:17* are not talking of the original perfect creation of *Genesis 1:1* at all, which God *created* (*bara*) and brought into existence *ex nihilo*, not in six days but *instantly*. After all, it surely had to be a *perfect and beautiful creation* for “HE is ROCK; His work is perfect” (*Deuteronomy 32:4*). Next, “He hath made everything beautiful in his time: also He hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end” (*Ecclesiastes 3:11*).

As such, “The original creations of God include the heavens, the earth, and all things therein as first brought into being. They were made perfect the first time. *Genesis 1:1* refers to the dateless past or the beginning of the creative ages (*Job 38; Psalms 8:3-8; 19:1-6; Proverbs 8:22-31; Acts 17:24-26; Colossians 1:15-18; Hebrews 1:1-12; 11:3; Revelation 4:11*). In the beginning, the dateless past, and not in 6 days about 6000 years ago, God created the heavens, including the sun, moon and stars—all the heavenly bodies in space and the earth as a dry land.”³

‘*Biblically-based Gap Theology*’ unlike the ‘*Traditional Six-Day Creationism*’ doesn’t contradict *Exodus 20:11*. Instead, it is very much in agreement with it. It all depends on how one chooses to interpret the same.

When viewed through the lens of *traditional concepts* it looks like the *heavens and earth* God created in a beginning as in *Genesis 1:1* are one and the same the Scriptures talk about that were *made* during the work of the *six days*. But, when viewed through the pure lens of Scriptures, one can easily confirm that the heavens and earth of *Genesis 1:1* are not one and the same described in *Genesis 1: 3-31*. It should be obvious to any unbiased mind, spiritual or unspiritual, that *Exodus 20:11* actually and precisely refer to the ‘*heavens and earth*’ that were *made in six days*. Biblically speaking, the work of the six days begins from *Genesis 1:3* and not from *Genesis 1: 1*. As such, in no way *Exodus 20:11* has any reference to the *original* heavens and earth of *Genesis 1:1*. ‘*Traditional Six-Day Creationism*’ after all contradicts both Biblical and Natural Revelation and should, therefore, be rejected.

1: Ken Ham, *Could God Really Create in Six Days?* www.answersingenesis.org

2: Henry Morris, *The Lord is Our Maker*, www.icr.org

3: Finis J. Dake, *op. cit.* p. 76.

#3: “If the fossil record is to be explained by an interval in the white space between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, that means death, disease, suffering and calamity were common many ages before Adam fell. Yet Scripture says Adam’s sin was the event that introduced death and calamity into God’s creation: Through one man sin entered the world and death through sin. (Romans 5:12).” (John MacArthur, *ibid.* p. 75-76).

Romans 5:12 states that *death*, as a *consequence* of Adam’s *sin*, entered *into* the world of *men* of which Adam is the *federal* head. After all, the Holy Bible basically deals with the sinful descendants of Adam. This fact, in itself, doesn’t rule out pre-adamic life. Nor does it rule out existence of sin and death prior to Adam. In fact, there are Scriptures to account both for sin and its consequences prior to Adam’s sin or fall. As such, sin did not *originate* with Adam. It originated with Lucifer’s rebellion, who ‘*sinneth from the beginning*’ (1 John 3:8) subsequent to Genesis 1:1. And the ‘*wages of sin is death*’. It is spiritual *death* resulting in separation from God.

Christ says He saw “*Satan as lightning fall from heaven*” (Luke 10:18) during which *fall* (Isaiah 14:12), *destruction* on earth, as well as in the heavens, cannot be ruled out. Apart from any *destructive* consequences of Lucifer’s sin and that of the fallen angels and pre-adamic men prior to the creation of Adam, the *chaos* described in Genesis 1:2; Jeremiah 4:23-27; 2 Peter 2:3-6 cannot be accounted for on earth as a product of some *creative* acts of God at the *beginning* of the *original* creation (Genesis 1:1). Anyway, Lucifer’s sin (Isaiah 14:13-14; Ezekiel 28:15) and the sin of angels (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6) resulted in their ‘*spiritual death*’ - eternal *separation* from God.

The sins of pre-Adamic men brought death without any suffering but in a swift *destruction* (Heb: *abad*, Ezekiel 28:16) along with the rest of the *pre-Adamic creation*. Accordingly, “...we have clear and indubitable evidence in the organic remains before us, of fossils, bones, skins, flesh, skeletons, etc that the creation disintombed by the geologist did not come as it is now from the Creator’s hands. To any who would question the wisdom of a pre-Adamic creation, we would say, have you ever reflected on the goodness of God in turning the primeval vegetable world into coal?”¹ All this fossilized geological evidence recorded in the ‘Book of Stone’ is not the same as that which is available subsequent to Noah’s flood.

Suffering, calamities, disease and death in our world *down* through the *ages* are as a consequence of Adam's sin as well as a consequence of our *individual* private sins. However, the consequence of sins of the pre-Adamic men must have been swift destruction and death without there being any prior disease and suffering. As such, we need not assume that *death, disease, suffering* have been common throughout the history of pre-Adamic men.

Unlike the *calamities, suffering, disease* and *death* that are now as a consequence of sin since the *fall* of Adam, we need not assume it had to be also as such in the pre-Adamic life. Like the angels who were created directly, so also the pre-Adamic men must have been created directly *after their own kind*. All these men, in whom the Wisdom of God *delighted* (Proverbs 8:30) must have continued to live perfectly sinless lives before they were wiped out as a result of their subsequent sin. The Wisdom of God took *delight* in the pre-Adamic men as they were sinless and perfect just as the angels were perfect before they sinned.

There is no biblical record of any men living sinless lives in Adam's world in which God's Wisdom could be said to have taken delight. There never have been any perfect men on earth since the *Fall*. All men are born tainted by Adam's *sin*. As such, there could not have been any perfect men on earth at any time, barring the few individuals comprising of God's elect.

It is a scriptural fact that there were *nations* of men under Lucifer's rule on earth. Next, Lucifer's subsequent boastful pride and mis-rule led to his rebellion and downfall. And just as he led the angels under his rule to sin, so also obviously he did lead the once perfect pre-Adamic men to rebel and live in sin. So eventually, swift destruction and death without necessarily any ongoing suffering and disease had to be a consequential reality.

This fact may be biblically established by applying the hermeneutical principle or Law of Double Reference to Ezekiel 31:3-18 depicting Lucifer's *primeval Edenic rule* and *fall*. Lucifer's arrogant *rule* (Ezekiel 31:3-15) ended up in the destruction of pre-Adamic life during which Lucifer was "*brought down with the trees of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth" (Ezekiel 31:16-18). These Scriptures cannot refer to any period on earth in Adam's world. The trees of Eden here should refer to pre-Adamic life. At the same time, based upon the principle of "Double Reference", these trees should symbolically refer to Lucifer and pre-Adamic men of renown. As otherwise we have no record of there being any such trees in Adam's world.*

Ezekiel 31:14-15 demonstrate that pre-adamic life on earth was wiped out as an aftermath of Lucifer's rebellion. So also, pre-Adamites who sinned along with Lucifer were also crushed to death as a consequence. The fate of Pharaoh to whom Ezekiel 31 is addressed resulted in a similar defeat. After all, the same Lucifer who ruled and deceived the pre-Adamic nations under him was very much active influencing Pharaoh's rule. Lucifer's goal is to exalt himself. And to exalt himself he sways the rulers of this world bringing them under his control. Eventually, his misrule ends up in destruction.

The fossil record in the Book of Stone can, therefore, very much relegated to the destruction depicted in Ezekiel 31. Accordingly, the '*Carboniferous Period*', defined by *pale-anthropological* data of *fossil record*, cannot be an *aftermath* of Noah's flood.

Geo-chronologically, Carboniferous Period logically has to cover a much longer period. Certainly, it has to be a period that is much longer than the period which is comprised of from the period of Noah's flood down to our times. "*If, then, the voice of science urgently demand a vastly longer period for the formation of its numerous strata than that wrongly marked in our Bibles, and, further, that vegetation must have flourished, light and heat existed, and land animals at least lived under conditions not furnished by the present state of things since man was created. What is the natural conclusion? Why, that our thoughts, our previous habits of thinking and speaking, are wrong, not the Word of God!"²*

We can, therefore, confidently state that based upon Fossil Record and Biblical revelation, swift death and destruction if not disease and suffering, was a reality prior to sin and death entering into Adam's world. It is only in this context it could be stated that Satan knew what it meant to die so as to tempt Adam and Eve to commit sin and die. On the other hand, Adam had not yet witnessed the reality of death. Death, perhaps, became more of a reality once he witnessed it after Cain killed Abel. For any sin and death to enter into Adam's world, both sin and its consequence death necessarily had to exist prior to Adam's sin and consequent death. Moreover, if sin was not in existence prior to Adam, then the biblical statement that the Lamb was *figuratively* slain even *before* the foundation of this world (Revelation 13:8) becomes inconsequential, and theologically insignificant.

1: Walter Scott, *op.cit.* p.15

2: Walter Scott, *op. cit.* p.15.

#4: A related theological problem posed by Henry Morris, Founder and President Emeritus of the Institute for Creation Research, USA, is that: “...the wonderful saving gospel of Jesus Christ is essentially subverted and destroyed if we must accept the vast ages of the evolutionary cosmologists and geologists, with their eons-long spectacle of suffering and death as recorded in the global fossil graveyard. Sound theology must say no to any such concession! Fossils speak of death and death results only from sin and judgment.” (Henry Morris, *op.cit*; link: www.icr.org).

Anyway, without accepting ‘*the vast ages of the evolutionary geologists with their eons-long spectacle of suffering and death*’ as a reality, the *nature* and rare *composition* of a ‘*global fossil graveyard*’ demonstrate *sudden destruction and death*. This could be only as a result of *judgment* following Lucifer’s *sin*, that of his angels and pre-adamite men. It’s only after seeing the reality of physical *death* of the pre-adamite men, Satan could know the gravity of sin’s penalty so as to induce Adam to sin and die.

Even otherwise, the *wonderful saving gospel* of Jesus Christ cannot be said to be *essentially subverted and destroyed*. The entrance of *sin* into the *original pre-Adamic world*, subsequent to Lucifer’s rebellion, is not without its *defiling* effects. As such, the *need* for Christ’s *blood* to *appease* God’s wrath and *cleanse* the *defilements* caused by Satan’s sin on *heavenly things* was necessary (*cf.* Hebrews 9: 23b) even before the fall of Adam. Therefore, the *Gospel* is not *subverted*; rather, its propitiatory value, with its *appeasing* and *cleansing* aroma, was a spiritual necessity and therefore *relevant* even before Adam’s sin *entered* into the world of humanity!

Biblically based pre-Adamic *Gap Theology* upholds the spiritual value of the *everlasting gospel* of Jesus Christ (Revelation 14: 6a). His ‘*slaying as a sacrificial Lamb of God even before the foundation of the world*’ (Revelation 13:8c) was *symbolically necessary* to *cleanse* the *defiling* effects of Lucifer’s *sin*. And, that was necessary even long before ‘*Adam’s sin*’ entered into the *world of humanity*, much later. Jesus’ death doesn’t pay the *penalty* of Satan’s sin. But it does *cleanse* and *remove* the defilement of the heavenly things (**Hebrews 9:23b**) caused by Satan’s sin (Ezekiel 28:18a; Revelation 12:8) who once inhabited the earth and eventually left his habitation to usurp God’s throne, thereby defiling the heavenly things. If this be not the case, then one has to explain how *heavenly things* are defiled.

We are accustomed to owning *only* the defiling effects of Adam's sin whilst overlooking such effects caused by Lucifer's sin. However, the slaying of the Lamb *figuratively* even *before* the foundation of the world, becomes much more relevant because of the *defiling* effects of Lucifer's sin.

As a matter of fact, 'Biblical Gap Theology', instead of undermining the *gospel* faithfully *upholds* the *same* at its very foundations. *Figuratively*, the *shed* blood of Christ, the Lamb that was *figuratively* slain before the foundation of the world *cleanses* all and any *defilement* caused *not only* by Adam's sin but *also* by Satan's sin. As otherwise, how could a *thrice* Holy God of *Integrity* ever allow Satan to present himself *before* His throne (Revelation 12:8, 12d)? Or, even have a *dialogue* with him (Job 1:6, 2:1, 7) *apart* from the *propitiatory* and *purifying* value of Christ's *shed blood*?

Unfortunately, the *flawed* unbiblical theology of '*limited atonement*' places its focus on *limiting* the *efficacy* of Christ's *shed* blood *solely* for the *cleansing* of sins of the *elect*. But, it fails to appreciate the *universal cleansing effect* of *Christ's blood* that was very much *figuratively* in operation even before the *foundation* of the world. Defilement of *heavenly* things caused by Satan's sin needed then and still need a '*better sacrifice*' for their *cleansing* and *purification* (Hebrews 9:22).

As such, it is a *sound gospel truth*. Not only has it made a provision by "*the substitutionary death of Christ as the awful wages of man's sin*" for the *believer's* forgiveness and justification but also it has *immense efficacy* in *cleansing* the *heavenly things* (Hebrews 9: 23). Symbolically, Christ's *sacrifice* for *propitiation* precedes its *substitutionary* purpose. It became *figuratively* necessary from the *casting away* of the pre-Adamic world (*katabole kosmou*, Matthew 13:35) even before Adam sinned. It is Lucifer's sin that existed before Adam entered into this world once Adam gave in to Satan's temptation. Satan's pre-existing *sin* next entered into *man's* world.

Moreover, God's plan for the *atonement* of human sin and *redemption* of mankind from its *bondage* to sin has its *focus* upon the consequences of Satan's sin which are described in Genesis 1:2. As such, the *physical* work of the six days *figuratively* marks the *proclamation* of the *everlasting* Gospel of Salvation through its '*object-lessons*'. Definitely, it is essentially a *work* of *physical restoration*. In a way, the six-day work involves earth's physical redemption from its chaotic state which parallels man's redemption from sin's chaotic spiritual consequences.¹

Undoubtedly, the *physical* work of the six days is *symbolic* of the *spiritual* work of God in the *darkened* and *chaotic* human hearts. This spiritual work is evident in the hearts of the redeemed souls, through the course of the ensuing *six* millennia whilst living under Satan's dominion and his deceptive mis-rule on earth. *Traditional six-day creationists* will not easily accept the spiritual *reality* of the *symbolic* aspects of God's Work of the *six* days followed by *rest* on the *seventh* day as something of prime *evangelical significance* and *importance*. Nevertheless, Hebrews 4 very clearly brings out the *evangelical* significance of God's *work* of the *six days* pointing to a *future* millennial spiritual *rest*.

No wonder, the phased work of the six days is characterized by physical redemptive and restorative acts. The earth under 'slavery' to satanic chaos is made free, rather redeemed, from the '*chaos*' during the first three days. Next, following a reorganization of the solar system on the fourth day, life is restored on earth and in the sea on the fifth and sixth day. For a detailed explanation of the rich spiritual symbolism of God's work of the first three days and the subsequent work of the next three days, the reader has much to gain by visiting: www.separationtruth.org.²

The fact that life was restored on earth through re-creation is clearly evident. Light was restored on earth through God's commanding it out of darkness; dry land was restored by commanding the waters to return to its former place constituting the sea/s. So also, life was restored by giving express commands to the earth and the sea to bring forth into existence living forms '*after their kinds*' that formerly existed and was next wiped out. "*This is why the specific phrasing of "after his kind" or "after their kind" is used by the Spirit in describing the Lord's regenerative work.*"³

Human life, however, was next created "*after God kind*"; that is, in the image and likeness of God. And, the re-created new "Generation" of "heavens and earth" were placed under man's dominion. And, God saw every thing that He had created and made during the six days and said "*Very Good*". It was an evangelical declaration by God. But it doesn't rule out the existence of *evil* prior to Adam! After all, *darkness* was still there!

1, 2: Jack W. Langford, *The GAP Is Not a Theory*, www.separationtruth.org, 2010

3: Kaines Johnson, *The BIBLE, Genesis and Geology*, www.kjvbible.org , p.13

*#5: “In Genesis 1:31, after God had completed all His creation, He declared it ‘very good’ – which would not be a fitting description if evil had already entered the universe.” (John MacArthur, *op. cit*; p. 76).*

Evil did enter into God’s original creation the moment Lucifer sinned and became Satan. Period! “*Evil had come into the universe the moment Satan said "I will", and it became the great question in the universe* ¹.” Next, “*When the Lord says of Satan, that he was a liar from the beginning, that goes back a long way*” ². As such, Satan, personification of *evil*, was already present in the Garden of Eden, as a subtle *serpent*, ready to tempt Adam and Eve. And, since *satanic-evil* was there, there was the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, whose fruit Adam was commanded not to eat, failing which ‘*dying he would die*’ (Genesis 2:17). If *evil had not then had entered the universe*, then the *command* to Adam to *responsibly* avoid eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is *irrelevant*.

What God saw and declared ‘very good’, was everything that He had made during the six days. And, that which He created and made during the six days is clearly specified in Genesis 1:3-30 which God then looked at and said, “*very good*” (v.31). That, of course, doesn’t include “**darkness**” which is symbolic of the *evil* forces of *spiritual darkness*. And, God never called ‘*darkness*’ good. Therefore, God Himself separated the existing *darkness* from the “light” which is symbolic of *righteousness, truth, and peace*, and therefore “*good*”. As such, what God specifically created and made during the six days of the creation week was *good* as compared to the chaotic conditions on earth in Genesis 1:2 that were *not good* but were *evil* or *bad*.

Lucifer who became Satan and the angels who became demons were not created during the creation week. Lucifer and the angels that sinned were created before the creation of the universe (Job 38:7). Next, Lucifer *did* actually *rebel* and *sin* and became Satan (Isaiah 14:12-14) before the *work* of the six days. *Evil* which is symbolized by *darkness* in the Bible existed prior to Genesis 1:3-31. Satan was on earth in the Adamic Garden of Eden as a *subtle sly serpent*. However, what God created during the six days does not include *darkness*. And, of course, it does not include the Serpent as an instrument of *evil*, though it was certainly ‘*good*’ as a *creation* of God when created on the sixth day. It’s when Satan got inside the *serpent*, to deceive and tempt mother Eve, the *serpent* became a ‘*symbol of evil*’!

Traditional Six-day Creationists cannot accept the fact of Lucifer's rebellion and *fall* as occurring prior to the creation week. This is because Lucifer's rebellion prior to the work of the six days does *contradict* their defective doctrine of *six-day creationism*. However, Lucifer sinned from the *beginning*, long before the creation of man, as can be ascertained from Isaiah 14:12-14, Ezekiel 28:12a-19, Jude 6, 1John 3:8, Revelation 12:9.

Certainly, all these Scriptures do not suggest that Lucifer sinned *after* Day Seven so as for the *traditional six-day creationists* to confidently state that he did not sin *before* the *creation week*. Anyway, "... *in the light of the first Epistle of John... sin existed at that time, (i.e. during the creation week) but it did not exist in connection with man nor in relation to the creation brought before us in the opening of Genesis and which God pronounced to be 'very good'. Sin existed already in relation to Satan; he was the original sinner – he 'sinneth from the beginning' or 'outset', but there was a created scene down here without sin.*" (J. Pellatt, *op. cit.* p.150).

Evil already had entered the universe much *before* the work of the six days. It was characterized by 'waste' and 'emptiness' and the *disappearance* of the conditions of life. The *original* dry land was covered by 'waters' and 'darkness'. God's *work* during the first *six days*, therefore, involved restoring the lost *life-conditions*. Accordingly, God declares His later works as "*very good*" thereby *distinguishing* the newly created *good* conditions from those that were *not good* or, rather, were '*evil*'. As otherwise, it wasn't *necessary*, in fact it was meaningless for God to *specifically* declare the newly created life-conditions as '*good*', if there were not earlier '*evil*' or '*very bad*' conditions in sharp *contrast* to the re-created '*good*' conditions. Darkness, after all, wasn't *good* even at the end of the six-day work.

The *very fact* that God declares His works of the *six days* as '*very good*', proves that whatever existed on earth as described in Genesis 1:2 was '*not really good*' but '*very bad*' or '*evil*' in His sight. Accordingly, the chaotic *evil* conditions on earth in Genesis 1:2 could not have been created but were a result of *judgment* of the '*evil one*'. And it is these 'evil' conditions that God takes into account and *restores* those that were 'good' for the *habitation* of life. Accordingly, He set the earth *free* from the '*evil one*'. However, God didn't eradicate all evil or its consequences at that time.

1: C. A. Coates, *Miscellaneous Works...Vol. 30*, p. 26.

2: *ibid*, p. 26

#6: Ken Ham argues differently: “some theorists put the fall of Satan in this supposed period (Genesis 1:1 and 2). But any rebellion of Satan during this gap of time contradicts God’s description of His completed creation on day 6 as all being “very good” (Genesis 1: 31)”. (www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/gap-ruin-reconstruction-Theories#fnList_1_22).-----

The argument is not necessarily biblically warranted, or just. The very fact that God specifically describes His *works* of the *six days* as ‘*very good*’ implies that it was *not* all well, or ‘*very good*’ on earth, prior to God’s work of the six days. And, rightly so; as otherwise, God would not *separate* the *light* from the *darkness*; ‘*darkness*’ wasn’t *good*! But, in no way ‘*darkness*’ prior to Genesis 1:3-5 ‘*contradict completed creation on day 6 as all being “very good” (Genesis 1: 31)*.’ As such, rebellion of Satan before *Genesis 1:2* need not contradict *God’s description* of the six-day creation as *very good*.

God states His six-day *physical* re-creation as ‘*very good*’ including the *serpent* created on *day six*. “*Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made*” (Genesis 3:1). *Satan* turned *serpent* and the *fallen* angels are not a part of the *physical creation*; as such, there is no contradiction. But, the fact that the *serpent* was more *subtle* from the day it was made indicates that Satan was already there on day six.

Actually, when was Lucifer created? And when were the angels created? Were they created during the work of the six-days?

The angelic host was created *before* the universe of Genesis 1:1 which in turn was created earlier than the *Heavens* of *Genesis 1:8* and *Earth* and the *Sea* of *Genesis 1:10*. The same is ascertained by the fact that the angels shouted for joy when God laid the *foundations* of the earth (*Job 38:7*). Next, as *noted* by John Mac Arthur, “*In eternity past, before men were created, before the earth was formed, worship was taking place. Referring to the angels, Nehemiah 9:6 says, “The heavenly host bows down before Thee.” That is their activity, and it has been their activity from their creation.*”¹ On the one hand, we are told the heavenly hosts were created during the creation week, on the other hand they tell us worship by the heavenly host was already taking place in the eternity past? How do we put these two together?

As such, the *assumption* that the angels must have been created *during* the creation week of *Genesis 1:3-31* is biblically *untenable*, and falls flat.

Was Lucifer ‘*sinless and perfect*’ when in the Garden of Eden at the time of Adam’s creation? Or was he there already as Satan even before day 1 inhabiting *darkness* as described in Genesis 1:2 *cf.* Jude 6?

When did Lucifer actually sin? And where was he when he and the angels sinned? *Was he in heaven?* ² Or *on earth?* Did Lucifer sin *first* and then *tempted* Eve to commit sin? Did Lucifer *sin* after Day Seven as *assumed* by the *traditional and young-earth six-day creationists?* ³ According to John MacArthur “*Satan’s fall must have occurred sometime between the end of creation (marked by that glorious day of rest on day seven) and the events described in Genesis 3 ---which appear to have come very soon after the creation of Adam and Eve, before they had conceived any offspring.*” ⁴

If we were to merge the *biblical six-day creationism* of Genesis 1:3-31 with Genesis 1:1, then one could agree with the *six-day creationists* that Lucifer and his angels sinned *soon* after Day Seven --- “*very soon after the creation of Adam and Eve, before they had conceived any offspring*”. However, Lucifer did not sin *after* Day 7 of the creation week but *very much* earlier. For, it is clearly evident from Genesis 1:24-25 that the *Serpent* of Genesis 3:1, symbolic of the Evil One, was created and already there earlier on Day Six. “*Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made”.*

Revelation 12: 9, 20:2 interpret the ‘*Serpent*’ to be Satan or Devil and 2 Corinthians 11:3 states that it is the *serpent* who beguiled Eve. Obviously, Lucifer must have had sinned *before* Day Seven and *not after*; for he was already there as a *subtle* Serpent by Day Six. Thus the *serpent* symbolized *willy -nilly* Satan from its very creation on Day Six. And since the *Serpent* was already there to tempt, God commanded Adam soon after his creation on Day Six not to eat of the fruit of the Tree of knowledge of *good and evil*.

Lucifer and the angels under him *sinned* when they were on *earth* and *not* when they were in *heaven*. As such, the “*Angels who kept not their first state, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness (cf. Genesis 1:2?) unto judgment of the great day.*” (Jude 6). The record of Lucifer’s sin is found in Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28. These two passages make it clear that Lucifer’s rebellion was not in heaven; nor it could be in the Garden of Eden of Genesis 2:8 *soon after Day Seven*. **But the traditional six-day along with young-earth creationists drunk with the mixed wine of traditional concepts will not accept it because it is too painful.**

In the **Garden of Eden** of Ezekiel 28:13a in which Lucifer was placed some time after his creation, he is symbolized as a beautiful Tree. He was more beautiful than all the other trees in that Garden of the Lord. He was so much beautiful that all the other trees in the Garden envied him (Ezekiel 31:9). And, that was of course long, long, before his fall.

Next, in the Garden of Eden of Ezekiel 28:13a in which Lucifer was placed, every precious stone was his covering. He was also given a *throne* from where he said “*I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. I will also sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the North. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High” (Isaiah 14: 13-14). **And that was exactly when he rebelled and sinned against God, when he was on earth. He was not then in heaven.***

Are we to conclude that Lucifer acted on his pride and sinned when in the Garden of Eden of Genesis 2: 8? If this be the case, then we will have to conclude that Lucifer sinned between day 3 and day 6; for it was on day 3 that the Garden of Eden had to be created and on day 6 we find the *subtle serpent* symbolizing Satan created along with other beasts.

However, it is *unimaginable* that Lucifer could have sinned in neither such a short time; *nor even some time after Day 7* or even before Adam and Eve could conceive any offspring. It is not only *unimaginable* humanly speaking, but it is also theologically and *doctrinally unreasonable* and most certainly it is *biblically inaccurate and therefore untenable*.

Unimaginable, because Lucifer who was created full of wisdom could not be so foolish so as to end up in sin in such a short time. How long was it when Lucifer sinned before Adam and Eve could conceive any offspring? Wisdom required that Lucifer take time to consider the pros and cons of rebelling against God. Next, he still needed much more time to mobilize the support of other angels. Next, he had to have some idea about God’s throne in heaven before he could *ascend up* to conquer it **assuming** he and his angels were on earth soon after their creation.

Doctrinally unreasonable, because God who is in sovereign control would never ever simply allow Lucifer to sin against Him that soon at the cost of compromising His sovereignty; and that too, soon after completing the work of the six days; that is, “*soon after the creation of Adam and Eve, before they had conceived any offspring.*”

Biblically untenable, because:

(i) There is not even a slightest hint or indication in the Bible stating that Lucifer and all the angels were created *during* the work of the six days. On the other hand, Job 38:7 definitely and conclusively proves that the angels were already created earlier so as to be there to witness the creation of the earth and shout for joy. Therefore, they could not have been created during the *six days*. After all, earth's foundation was not laid during any of the six days but long before the creation of the first day.

(ii) Lucifer and the angels were in heaven after their creation. They '*were on the holy mountain of God*'. And that was long before the creation of heavens and earth of Genesis 1:1. Next, after the creation of heavens and earth Lucifer and the "*non-elect*" angels were placed on the '*habitable part of the earth*'. Lucifer was ruling on earth when actually the thought of conquering God popped up in his mind, dwell on it, and then ascend into the heavens where God's Throne is. He thus rebelled and fell.

(iii) At one time before his *fall*, Lucifer was one of the three *Cherubs* that were *anointed* and *covered* God's throne in the *heavens* (Ezekiel 28:14). "*You were the anointed cherub who covers; I established you*". This could not be really the case if he and the other angels were created during the creation week and were on earth soon after their creation. There wasn't any God's throne on earth at any time for Lucifer to cover it as anointed cherub.

(iv) Lucifer could not be then upon the *holy mountain* of God in the heavens, walking up and down in the midst of the stones of fire: ("*you were on the holy mountain of God; you walked back and forth in the midst of fiery stones*" Ezekiel 28: 14), if he were created during the creation week and was on earth soon after that. There wasn't any *holy mountain* in the Garden of Eden or anywhere on earth, prior to the establishment of Mount Zion as far as the revealed biblical record is concerned.

(v) Lucifer could not be cast out of the mountain of God as a *profane* creature at any time after his creation and before he sinned (Ezekiel 28: 16b), if he were created during the creation week and was on earth, soon after that. The truth is: he wasn't in heaven but on earth when he revolted.

(vi) There was no *throne* in the Garden of Eden of Adam's time for Lucifer to occupy and take charge (Isaiah 14:13b); instead, Adam was given

the charge to tend and keep the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2: 15). As a matter of fact, Adam was required to obey God and qualify to rule on earth by defeating Satan - who was there as a *subtle* serpent. However, Adam succumbed to Satan's temptation by disobeying God, and brought humanity under Satan's government ever since then.

(vii) There were no *nations* on earth soon after the creation week which Lucifer (before he became Satan) could weaken (Isaiah 14:12 c) so as to cause them to sin. These very nations on earth that he ruled eventually led to his pride to the point of exalting himself and rebel against God (cf. Ezekiel 31: 8-18). Isaiah is not talking about any other nations on earth whom Lucifer weakened and caused to sin.

It should be obvious from the above facts based upon "*the clearest account of Satan's rebellion given in Ezekiel 28:11-19*" and "*Isaiah 14 that sheds more light on Satan's fall*" that, in no way, Satan's fall could be said to have occurred soon after Day Seven. Nor it could be stipulated from the above Scriptures that Satan's fall occurred in heaven. To state as such is to contradict Isaiah 14 which '*sheds more light on Satan's fall*' wherein Lucifer states: "*I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High*". It was at this time when *iniquity* was found in him.

Before his fall, Lucifer had to be on earth from where he did *ascend* into the heavens so as to '*literally usurp the throne of God*' in the heavens. It is only then from where he *fell* even as the same was witnessed by Christ. Satan could not appear '*suddenly and unexpectedly in Genesis 3:1*' from nowhere. He was on earth as a rebel angel cast out of heaven back to earth during which the *chaos* on earth surrounded by *darkness* was the result.

If we are to carefully *exegete* the account of Satan's rebellion in Ezekiel 28:11-19 along with that of Isaiah 14:12-15 then it becomes pretty difficult to assign Satan's *fall* '*sometime between end of creation and the events described in Genesis 3*'. There was hardly any time "*between end of creation and the events described in Genesis 3*" so as for Lucifer to conspire his plot against God in an attempt to dethrone Him, and thereby sin and fall.

Traditional Six-day Creationists have no option but to come to terms with the above biblical facts which cannot be denied. As such, they have no scriptural reason to reject "*pre-Adamic gap theology*"!

To reject the biblically-based ‘pre-historical pre-adamic *gap theology* relating to *facts* that can be only accounted for as having occurred between Genesis 1:1 and 1:3’ is to unwarily reject *truth* having its roots in biblical revelation. Sound wisdom requires that we accept the plain truth manifested in the light of the above and other biblical facts highlighted hereinafter.

Accepting the biblically-based “*gap theology*” doesn’t mean one should be converted into an ‘*old-age creationist*’ or become a ‘*progressive creationist*’. The *age* of the earth or that of the universe is not a biblical *issue*. It should not be an issue seeing that the Bible is totally *silent* about it.

One may reasonably be satisfied with either *an old-age earth* or a *young earth* once we come to terms with the *theological* relevance of biblical events that occurred before the creation of *time* as we measure on earth. However, we cannot overlook geological and cosmological evidence relating to the age of the universe. ‘*Biblical gap theology*’ basically deals with and focuses upon *events* relating to the ‘*chaos*’ in ‘*timelessness*’ as having *theological and evangelical* relevance.

Could be there no consequences on earth, if not in the heavens, of Lucifer’s sin? If Adam’s sin could have its consequences and bring a curse on earth how grave should be the consequences of Lucifer’s sin? Moreover, along with Lucifer the angels on earth and pre-adamite men also sinned.

Undoubtedly, the *conditions* on earth as described in *Genesis 1:2* are of *judgment* and cannot be of *original* creation, which was *perfect*. And, as it has been proved above, Lucifer was on earth from where he sinned resulting in *chaos* and *darkness* and a *flooded* earth. Accordingly, the imaginary “gap” against the background of “*timelessness*” comprising of the “*white space*” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 covering the pre-Adamite life and the “*black space*” between Genesis 1:2 and 1:3 covering the *chaotic* conditions with a universal *flood* and *darkness* on earth (Genesis 1:2) is assuredly a *biblical reality* – a fact and not a ‘theory’, having *theological and evangelical* implications and connotations.

As such, “*The first verse of the Bible is a separate and independent affirmation*”. The use of “AND” in verse 2, is “*as independent of verse 1 as to time and subject matter as all the other separate acts of God. In fact “and” is used 153 times in Genesis 1 and 2 to separate the 102 recorded independent acts of God.*” (Jennings Finis Dake, *op. cit.* p.76).

However, it is not revealed in the Bible as to how long it was before God executed His work of the six days. As stated by Charles A. Coates, “*We do not know what length of time elapsed between those first two verses; possibly the long periods of which the geologists and biologists speak might come in there*”⁵ Anyway, it is not necessary to know nor can we ever know as to how long the period was between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2.

Nevertheless, Scriptures leave no doubt as to the existence of pre-historical, pre-Adamite life on earth. Next, it is scripturally also clear that Lucifer ruled on earth prior to Genesis 1:2 and that he eventually sinned and fell. Lucifer *sinned* in the ‘Beginning’ (1 John 3:8b). Consequently, the *chaos* of Genesis 1:2 is the **curse** upon earth, evidenced by *fossil* record. If ever there was any biological evolution then it could be only prior to Genesis 1:2. The fact that life existed prior to the works of Genesis 1:3-31 is a biblically based reality. However, we are not told in the Bible as to how pre-adamic life was created, or whether any evolutionary process was set in operation, which is highly biblically improbable. May be, some fine day, irrefutable evidence, if any, from the “Book of Stone” will tell us.

Genesis 1:2 describes the *changed* conditions on an otherwise once *perfect original earth* created in the *eternity past*. We find the earth ‘*waste and void*’, *flooded with waters* and *covered with darkness*. These *chaotic* conditions on an earlier *perfect* earth are *not of direct* creation, but of a later judgment; a ‘primeval catastrophe’ associated with the rebellion of Satan against God’.

1: John MacArthur, Jr. *The Ultimate Priority*, Moody Press, USA, 1983, p.24.

2: John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning*, *op.cit.* p. 200;

3: Ken Ham, *ibid.*

4: John MacArthur, *ibid*, p.200.

5: C.A.Coates, *An Outline of Genesis*, *op.cit.* p.3

6: W. Scott, *op. cit*; p. 17.

7: *ibid* p.16.

#7: “While it is reasonable to assume that God’s creation referred to in Genesis 1:1 was ‘perfect,’ this fact is not actually so stated until after v.10 ... mentioned again in Genesis 1:12,18, 21,25, and 31. In the light of these citations, it would be difficult to maintain that God’s creative work in Genesis 1:2was not really ‘good’; As for the reference to the earth’s being ‘waste and void’ (Heb. *tohu wabohu*) in Genesis 1:2, it is not altogether clear whether this was a subsequent and resultant condition after a primeval catastrophe, ---possibly associated with the rebellion of Satan against God. It must be understood, however, that there is no explicit statement anywhere in Scripture that the primeval fall of Satan was accompanied by a total ruin of earth itself; it is simply an inference or conjecture, which may seem persuasive to some Bible students but be somewhat unconvincing to others.” (Gleason L. Archer, Jr. *op.cit.* p.65.

It is not at all necessary to reasonably assume that ‘God’s creation referred to in Genesis 1:1 was perfect’. It was, indeed, **certainly** perfect and beautiful seeing that whatever God creates and does, it is always perfectly beautiful. As such, it had to be reasonably perfect (Deuteronomy 32:4) and beautiful (Ecclesiastes 3:11) in consonance with God’s glorious perfect character. As a matter of fact, the Holy Spirit did not even see it fitting or necessary to qualify God’s creation in Genesis 1:1 as ‘good’ or ‘very good’ or ‘perfect’. There wasn’t anything imperfect as yet. It was expected that it would be well understood to be as such by those who would know God as an Intelligent Designer who creates everything perfect and beautiful to bring Him glory, honor and pleasure (Revelation 4:11). So, why then reasonably assume it was somehow perfect? It was certainly perfect! However, the chaotic condition on earth in Genesis 1:2 was not good at all because it was not ‘God’s creative work’ but a consequence of sin.

And, it is from the chaotic conditions that God set forth His hand to restore the original good life-promoting conditions on earth. As such, God saw it necessary to distinguish His six-day creative work in Genesis 1:3-31 as ‘very good’. This was necessary because it was additional work to restore the ‘goodness’ of God’s original creation (Genesis 1:1) that was lost subsequent to Lucifer’s rebellion resulting in chaos and darkness on earth (Genesis 1:2). The very fact that God after restoring the original conditions designates them as very good proves that the conditions on earth in Genesis 1:2 were in no way good but evil. Period!

As otherwise, it would be of no spiritual significance at all for God to declare His own works of the six days as “*very good*” seeing that His works are always *very good*. As such, God declares His works of the six days as ‘*good*’ so as to differentiate the same from the existing satanic ‘*evil*’.

Genesis 1:2 is not at all a ‘*creative work*’. To describe it as a ‘*creative work*’ is a *contradiction in terms*. There was nothing ‘*creative*’ and ‘*good*’ in Genesis 1:2 as compared to all that was *created* and declared ‘*very good*’ (Genesis 1:3-31). And, when the chaos is compared to a *perfect* creation in Genesis 1:1 *only* the *imperfection* of *chaos* and *darkness* becomes *obvious* as is briefly described in Genesis 1:2.

Next, God is not the Author of *chaos* or *confusion* (1 Corinthians 14:33). “...*the earth was waste and empty, and darkness was on the face of the deep. This was certainly not as it was created – for we are expressly told that ‘not as waste [the same word as in Genesis 1:2] did He create it’* (Isaiah 45:18). As such, a solemn change had come about between the first and second verses of Genesis 1”¹

The conditions in *Genesis 1:2* were: “As to the earth, it became (Hebrew: hayah) *formless (tohu) and void (bohu) and darkness was upon the face of the deep*”. Now ‘*tohu*’ signifies a ‘*wasteland, a desolate place*’ and ‘*bohu*’ means ‘*empty or void*’; which means before the earth *became* a wasteland and empty, it had to be a *fruitful* land. These chaotic conditions are the same as in Jeremiah 4:23-26 and Isaiah 34:11 which are descriptive of *judgmental outcomes*. As a matter of fact, as it has been succinctly pointed out by John MacArthur *tohu* and *bohu*, “*picture God as architect of judgment, using a plumb line of tohu, which is kept taut by weights made of bohu.*”² As such, the chaotic conditions of Genesis 1:2 are surely a display of *judgmental outcomes*.

Next, in the Scriptures, the sea is a symbol of the Devil and his power. Obviously, the original *sea* symbolizing Lucifer’s *power* broke forth the *limit* that God hath set upon it. As a result, typifying Satan’s rebellion, the *sea* advanced and engulfed the entire earth; so that, at the time of re-creation, God had to set bounds upon it. “*The waters stood above the mountains. At your rebuke they fled; at the voice of Your thunder they hastened away*” (Psalms 104:6-9). This Scripture doesn’t refer to Noah’s flood during which the *waters* were not *rebuked* but gradually *receded* in the course of time. As such, Psalm 104:6-9 definitely refers to a pre-Adamic flood on earth.

When God *first* created the primeval earth the waters were in one place forming a vast ocean: “When He drew a circle on the face of the deep, when He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, when He assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters would not transgress His command, **when** He marked out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside Him as a master craftsman; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.” (Proverbs 8:27-30).

Proverbs 8:27-30 doesn't describe ‘*creation with words that perfectly parallel*’ the Genesis 1: 6-10 account. It refers to the *original* creation ‘**when** God marked out the foundations of the earth’ (Proverbs 8:27b), when He ‘*assigned to the sea its limit*’ symbolizing Satan's *limited* power, very well under God's sovereign control.

It is the *limit* that God set upon the *sea* in the *beginning* (Proverbs 8: 29) that it *broke* forth (Job 38:8, 10; Genesis 1:2) symbolically portraying Lucifer's rebellion. As such, God had to *rebuke* the *sea* for breaking its *decreed* limit (Psalms 104:7). And in *response* to such *rebuke*, the waters *fled*; at the voice of God's thunder they *hastened* away (Psalms 104:6-9) to their *original* place (Job 38:8-11) causing the *dry land* to appear *again* as in Genesis 1:9-10 in obedience to God's command.

Moreover, “*The waters covering the earth in a flood as a result of Lucifer's rebellion were ‘more devastating and lasted longer than Noah's flood, for it destroyed even vegetation (Genesis 2:5-6; Jeremiah 4:23-25), while the one year and 17 days of Noah's flood did not. (Genesis 8:11, 22)’*”³

Genesis 1:2 is certainly a precise description of *chaotic* conditions on earth which were a consequence of Lucifer's sin. Both ‘*darkness*’ and the ‘*waters*’ covered the earth depicting satanic ‘*take-over*’ of the earth. “*Thus the sea may symbolize the Abyss, the source of demonic powers that are opposed to God” (Revelation 9:1). *This view agrees with the OT images of the sea as the origin of the satanic sea monsters (the dragon).*”⁴*

And, no wonder, we do not find the *sea* and *darkness* any more in the *new earth* (Revelation 21:1) once the Devil is cast into the fire. As such, “*The sea – the source of the satanic beast (Revelation 13:1) and the place of the dead (Revelation 20:13) will be gone. The sea serves as an archetype with connotations of evil. Therefore, no trace of evil in any form will be present in the new creation.*”⁵

“In Scripture, all instances of obscuring the sun and bringing consequent darkness, and the two past cases of universal floods are revealed to be the result of judgment, not creation.(Genesis 6:8-8:22; Exodus 10:21-23; Isaiah 5:30; Jeremiah 4.23-26). All predictions of such future darkness depict judgment (Matthew 8.12; 24.29-31; Revelation 6.12-17; 8.12; 9.2; 16.10; Isaiah 13.10; Joel 2.30-3.16; Amos 5.18-20). Could we say that Genesis 1:2 is an exception and the only place in Scripture where darkness and universal flood on the earth are not an act of judgment? If then, as in other cases, these are the result of judgment, Genesis 1:2 definitely proves there was a pre-Adamite world which was destroyed by flood.”⁶

There is sufficient Scriptural *evidence* to prove the *primeval fall of Satan was accompanied by ruin* on earth. It is not simply an *inference* or mere *conjecture* that seems to be *persuasive* only to some. All one has to do is to read Isaiah 13:10, Joel 2:31, Revelation 16:10 and it will be obvious that what is predicted to happen in the end is declared in the beginning itself.

How long the *changed state* in Genesis 1:2 lasted exactly we are not told because it is *not essential* for us to know and *no man can find out* nor is there any need to guess. “*The secret things belong to God*”! So, why guess? All we can say is that “*those huge rocks, from 15 to 20 miles deep, (were) formed of accumulated and countless millions of particles of matter, and arranged in successional layers of formation periods of time as vast as to defy human calculation.*” (Walter Scott, *op. cit.* p.16). The huge rocks of remote ages are known to have formed the bed of the ocean, and others of dry land, covered with rich luxuriant vegetation, serpents and reptiles of enormous length, birds with giant wings, giant animals and mammals that, perhaps, looked like human beings over whom Lucifer was given dominion.

And all of these turned into “*fossilized fuel stone*” in the course of time, having been subjected to the pressures perhaps of a sudden disastrous catastrophe. The *fossil fuel* cannot be accounted for with reference to any life on earth since Genesis 1:3-31; *or*, since the universal flood of Genesis 6. Even otherwise, the conditions on earth as Genesis 1:2 states can not be accounted for other than that being of *judgment*. And it was a *judgment* resulting from Lucifer’s rebellion and that of the angels and pre-adamite nations that sinned with him. This is very well covered by the fact that pre-Adamic men, created perfect, under Lucifer’s influence, allowed pride to bring their downfall (Ezekiel 31: 8, 9 read with verse 14, in keeping with the Law of Double Reference) and, therefore, their consequent judgment.

Briefly, “Geology clearly... establishes the truth of a creation prior to Adam, but no conflict need thereby be apprehended between science and the Mosaic or rather Divine account of creation. The first verse of Genesis refers to the original creation of heavens and earth, and is an independent statement entirely apart from what follows; the second verse shows the earth in a ruined state, yet, at a period prior to man; while from verses 3-31 we have the earth got ready in six literal days as a dwelling for man.”⁷

From the Genesis 1 record, “In verse 2 we find the earth a scene of disorder and darkness. It is in such a scene that God’s movements and activities are presented as taking place – activities which come to an end on the sixth day, so that on the seventh day God rested.”⁸ Accordingly, the ‘Gap Theology’ is undoubtedly *biblically* relevant; and God’s phased restorative work of the six days is *evangelically* typical and very significant.

Evangelically and theologically speaking, subsequent to Genesis 1:2, “In ‘the earth ... that is waste and empty’, with ‘darkness ... on the face of the deep’, we behold a scene in which God could find no pleasure or rest -- a striking figure of the state of man as fallen under the power of sin, Satan, and death, and without the knowledge of God. But it is blessed to see that, though God could not rest in such a state of things, He did move and work there. ‘The Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters’”.

The Hebrew word “rachaph”, meaning “*hovering, to brood, relax,*” is translated ‘*fluttered*’ in Deuteronomy 32:11 and ‘*shake*’ in Jeremiah 23: 9. “The word used is suggestive of affectionate interest, for it is the same as in Deuteronomy 32:11, ‘As the eagle stirred up its nest, hovered over its young’. It has something to say of the solicitude of divine love which would put forth its activities where all was ruin in order to bring about conditions which could be pronounced ‘very good’, and in which God could rest.

“Before the work of the six days began there was this primary movement of the Spirit of God. In a fallen and ruined world, where all have come under sin and death, there must be a movement of the Holy Spirit in the souls of men as the starting point of any result for God. The new birth must be effected; otherwise divine light would shine in vain. There is nothing in man that God can trust until men are born anew. Of the natural man it is said, ‘There is not a righteous man, not even one; there is not the man that understands, there is not one that seeks after God ...’, Romans 3:10 - 18.

“Therefore God has to prepare the way for divine light to come in by that mysterious operation which cannot be traced. It is needful that ye should be born anew. The wind blows where it will, and thou hearest its voice, but knowest not whence it comes and where it goes: thus is every one that is born of the Spirit’, John 3:7, 8. The preaching of the gospel would effect nothing if God did not move sovereignly in the souls of men by His Spirit causing them to be born anew. Man, the fallen sinner, is, as such, hopelessly lost, for he does not desire God, and when the light of God in Christ is brought to him he rejects it.”⁹

In a way, we find God’s Spirit hovering ‘upon the face of the waters’ as if to ‘incubate’ the waters covering the earth, in a prelude to bring forth fruit of the next phase of God’s creative acts, culminating in the creation of new men - Adam and Eve, in the Likeness and in the Image of God.

1: Charles A.Coates, op.cit. p.2

2: John MacArthur, op. cit., p. 74

3: Finis J. Dake, op. cit. p.76.

4: Frank E. Gaebelin, General Editor, *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, Regency Reference Library, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1981; p. 323.

5: *ibid.* p. 593.

6: Finis J. Dake, op. cit. p.79.

7: Walter Scott, op. cit. p. 200.

8: C. A. Coates, op. cit. p.2.

9: C. A. Coates, *An Outline of Genesis*, op. cit. p. 3.

PHASE TWO presents the *six-day* work of *restoration* of *conditions of life* necessary for the habitation of flora and fauna, followed by the creation of Adam and Eve. As a matter of fact, the work of the six days is not a work of *direct* creation; rather, God sends forth His Spirit and *renews* the face of the earth (Psalms 104:30) and restores the original conditions.

As such, it will be noticed that *each* day's work of the six days is marked out and distinguished from each other and also from the earlier work of *instant* creation by the phrase "And God said"! Next, it could be concluded that each day's work was predominantly *redemptive* and *restorative* as is obvious from the express commands given to the cosmic forces of *darkness*, under Satan's control, to "Let Things Be" or to "Happen" so as to liberate the earth from being enslaved under satanic chaotic conditions and subsequently *restore* the *original* life conditions for the sustenance of *new life* on earth.

From an *analysis* of the nature of the six days' work, it becomes obvious that these works, more or less, bring into existence what was originally there in the original creation but got destroyed once Lucifer, his angels and the pre-adamite men sinned. It was a work of liberation or redemption of the physical creation that was taken away captive by Satan subsequent to his rebellion. God deliberately planned to carry out His work of physical redemption through *six days* so as to typify His work of spiritual redemption through the course of six millennial days. As otherwise, it was not necessary for God specifically to work through some six days but create everything *instantly* by *fiat* just as in the beginning.

The *redemptive* and *restorative* aspects of God's physical works of the six days are dealt with in detail in the section to follow, without meaning to *spiritualize* in any manner. At the same time, the *evangelically* predictive nature of the *work* of the *six days*, which distinguishes it as a totally *different* work from that of the *instant* work of *original* creation by *fiat*, is accordingly addressed next, *affirming a radical evangelical theology of creation*.



Genesis 1:2