The Noahic Flood

Allen Dvorak

Text: Genesis 6-9

Introduction:

I. God put Adam and Eve in a garden filled with every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food (Genesis 2:9).

A. After Adam and Eve sinned, part of the divine punishment was the cursing of the ground ("Cursed is the ground for your sake; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life. Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you…" – Genesis 3:17b-18a).

B. Did the cursing of the ground produce the physical conditions of today's world, particularly, some of the adverse weather phenomena (e.g., hurricanes, tornadoes, severe storms, etc.)? I don't think so.

1. "Thus, the Biblical record implies that the age between the fall of man and the resultant Deluge was one of comparative quiescence geologically. The waters both above and below the firmament were in large measure restrained, temperatures were equably warm, there were no heavy rains nor winds and probably no earthquakes nor volcanic emissions. Probably a larger ratio of land surface to water surface existed than at present, but the atmosphere was maintained at a comfortable humidity by the low-lying 'mist' rising from an intricate network of 'seas' (Genesis 1:10) and mildly-flowing 'rivers' (Genesis 2:10-14) evidently fed partially or largely by gentle springs."[1]

2. The fossil record alone, in terms of type and distribution, provides evidence that a very different world existed at one time.

3. Martin Luther described the antediluvian world as "a veritable paradise compared with the world that followed."[2]

II. In what ways was the antediluvian world different from our present-day world?[3]

A. Larger land mass

1. Today, about seven-tenths of the world's surface is covered with water. The land mass of the earth, however, is not entirely usable (e.g., the great deserts of Asia, Africa, America and Australia, the mountain belts, the frozen tundra of Canada and Siberia, the ice-covered continents of Greenland and Antarctica).

2. Of the earth's land mass, only about 50% is suitable for extensive human habitation. This was not the case in Noah's day.

a. "In the first place, it was a world with more 'living space' for the human race than the present world offers. The world of Adam and his immediate descendants contained proportionately more habitable land than the world of today. There were no enormous waste areas, such as the great deserts of Africa, Asia, America, and Australia. Nor were the land masses separated by such vast expanses of ocean water…"[4]

b. "Fossils of plants and man-made implements found in the Sahara show that this great African desert was at one time covered with luxuriant vegetation and was inhabited by man. Similar remains have been found in the Gobi Desert of China and in the great desert areas of northwestern India."[5]

B. A uniform, nearly sub-tropical climate on the earth

1. There were apparently no ice caps or arctic regions. In fact, those present-day regions show evidence of having once supported fauna and flora that couldn't possibly survive there now.

   a. "The most significant of these Biblical inferences is that of a universally warm climate, with ample moisture for abundant plant and animal life. It is significant that fossil remains everywhere in the world and throughout the geologic column testify to just such a condition. The fossiliferous rocks have been divided into geological 'ages' in the uniformitarian system, and it is significant that practically all of these 'ages' are inferred from the organic and physiographic character of the deposits to have been universally mild and warm."[6]

   b. "With respect to climate, the fossils show that there was a uniformly mild climate in high and in low altitudes of both the northern and southern hemisphere. That is, there was a perfectly uniform, non-zonal, mild, and spring-like climate in every part of the globe. This does not mean that the climate was of necessity the same in all parts of the earth. There were differences, but not the present extremes."[7]

2. This climate supported dense vegetation around the globe.

   a. The abundance of vegetation would have supported larger creatures, including enormous dinosaurs that would have had difficulty surviving in the postdiluvian world.

   b. As will be discussed later in this outline, the world's abundant stores of coal are the result of global pre-flood conditions.

3. In light of present-day climate differences around the globe, how was such a climate possible prior to the flood?

   a. It is thought that the mountains of the antediluvian world were lower.

      1) "Many lines of dinosaurs evolved during the 100 million years or more [according to the evolutionists' timetable – BT] of Mesozoic history in which they lived…In those days the earth had a tropical or sub-tropical climate over much of its land surface, and in the widespread tropical lands there was an abundance of lush vegetation. The land was low and there were no high mountains forming physical or climatic barriers."[8]

      2) "Probably there were no very substantial regional differences in land densities before the Flood, and correspondingly no very large regional differences in elevation. Mountains were relatively low and ocean beds relatively shallow as compared with present conditions."[9]

      3) "Today great mountain ranges divide the continents and smaller land masses into clearly defined climatic and biological zones. Think of the Rocky Mountains in North America, the Andes in South America, or the Himalayas in Asia, and the tremendous effect these rocky walls have had on the climate in the respective continents where they are found. But this was not always so. The mountain ranges in the world of Adam were not the same high, forbidding walls as found in the world of today, but were much lower, covered with vegetation, and did not seriously interfere with the climatic condition as do the mountains of today."[10]

b. It is theorized by some that the present tilt of the earth's axis (approximately 23 degrees) occurred at the time of the flood.

1) Rehwinkel cites an earth with no axis tilt as one possible theory to explain the uniform, mild climate. No tilt would eliminate the difference of climate at the poles and also the existence of seasons.[11]

2) Seasons are mentioned in Genesis 1:14 as being the result of the creation of the heavenly lights on the fourth day of creation.

a) "Some have objected, however, that seasons are mentioned on the fourth day of Creation (Gen. 1:14). But the seasons there are not climatic seasons but are for marking periods of time. It is not till this passage (Gen. 8:22) that there is any mention of such variations as summer, winter, cold, and heat."[12]

c. Another suggestion for the antediluvian climate is that the continents were surrounded by warm ocean waters.

1) Rehwinkel notes this suggestion, but quickly observes that it wouldn't explain the presence of lush vegetation in the polar areas.[13]

2) A variation of this theory is that the continents were warmed by warm ocean currents similar to the present-day Gulf Stream and the Japan Current. Although such actual ocean currents do affect the weather of land masses, even this variation of the "warm ocean" theory fails to explain how the Polar Regions could be covered with lush vegetation while in darkness for several months of the year.[14]

d. [Speaking of the "waters above the firmament"] "As we have seen, these waters apparently existed in the form of a great vapor canopy around the earth, of unknown but possibly very great extent. As vapor, it was quite invisible but, nevertheless, would have had a profound effect on terrestrial climate and meteorological processes. The most immediate and obvious of these effects would be to cause a uniformly warm temperate climate around the earth. Such water vapor as is present in the atmosphere today has this specific effect of regulating the earth's temperature. The inferred antediluvian vapor envelope would have produced this result in much greater degree, with a larger percentage of the sun's incoming radiant energy being absorbed and retained and uniformly distributed over the earth than at present, both seasonally and latitudinally. This effect in turn would largely inhibit the atmospheric circulations which characterize the present troposphere and which are caused basically by temperature differentials between points of different latitudes and topographies. The constant battle of 'fronts' would be mostly absent, so that antediluvian climates were not only warm but also without violent windstorms."[15]

C. Large animals (dinosaurs, etc.)

1. "With such favorable climatic conditions prevailing everywhere, it requires no great flights of the imagination to perceive that the flora and fauna of that world would be in harmony with their physical surroundings, and therefore far superior to the flora and fauna of the world today. And so it was, for this, too, is borne out by the records in the rocks. Beginning with the animals, we find that the fossils reveal 1) a great distribution of the various genera and species in all parts of the earth; 2) a far greater variety of genera and species than have existed in the world since then; and 3) a

distinct deterioration of the animals which have survived when compared with their antediluvian ancestors."[16]

2. "It is quite clear, therefore, that we live in a zoologically impoverished world, from which all the hugest and fiercest and strangest forms have disappeared."[17]

D. Extended life spans of human beings and animals (?)

1. The genealogy of Genesis 5 records that antediluvian men were living significantly longer (an average of 907 years) than postdiluvian men.

2. The extended life spans of men also would suggest that the human population increased much faster than after the flood.

III. The world described above is not simply the result of speculation. There is physical and biblical evidence to support all of these contentions.

IV. The global flood in Noah's day affected virtually every aspect of the natural world and left its "fingerprint" on every area of natural science studied by men today.

V. In summary, "The Flood constitutes a sharp line of demarcation between *our present world*, with its basically uniform cycle of seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, and summer and winter (Gen. 8:22), and *the world at that time*, with its low-lying, fossil-free and ice-free mountains, its rainless sky and universally warm and humid climate, and its shallow seas. The transformation that ended *that* world and started *this* world was as sudden and supernaturally cataclysmic as the change that shall end this present world…"[18]

VI. Note carefully the words of the apostle Peter: "For this they willfully forget: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in the water, by which the world that then existed perished, being flooded with water" (2 Peter 3:5-6). Indeed!

Body:

I. **Summary of the Text: Genesis 6-9**

A. The reason for the flood (Genesis 6:1-7, 11-13, 17)

1. It appears from earlier in the history of mankind, that the descendants of Seth and the descendants of Cain became two separate genetic lines of humanity, one serving God and the other not (Genesis 4).

2. Those lines eventually intermingled (Genesis 6:1-2) and the sons of God (descendants of Seth) were negatively influenced to the point that "all flesh had corrupted their way on the earth" (Genesis 6:5, 11-13).[19]

3. The wickedness of man was great and "every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually"; the earth was "filled with violence" (Genesis 6:5, 11, 13).

4. Noah, however, found grace in the eyes of the Lord (Genesis 6:8).

B. Instructions to Noah (Genesis 6:14-22; 7:1-5)

1. God gave instructions to Noah regarding:

a. The construction of the ark

b. The preservation of representative creatures in the ark

c. The gathering of food for the creatures preserved in the ark

2. The record of God's instructions to Noah is admittedly brief, which fact probably accounts in part for the variety of different artistic renditions of the shape and

construction of the ark. It is likely, as with divine revelation in other subject areas, that Moses did not record all of the instructions that God gave to Noah.

C. Construction of the ark

1. The Hebrew word for "ark" in Genesis 6 [תֵּבָה; *tebhah*] literally refers to a box or chest.[20]
    a. It is the same word used in Exodus 2:3 to describe the "ark of bulrushes" in which the infant Moses was placed.
    b. The shape of a rectangular box would have been adequate for its purpose since the ark was not designed to go anywhere in particular.[21]
2. The ark was to be made of gopherwood and was to be covered with pitch (a sealant) inside and outside.
3. The dimensions of the ark (length, width and height) were given (300 cubits x 50 cubits x 30 cubits).
    a. The ratio of these dimensions is recognized by shipbuilders to produce an extremely stable vessel.
    b. In modern times, wooden sailing vessels did not go much beyond 200' in length because of durability issues. It wasn't until metal began to be used in the construction of ships that the 200' barrier was broken.
4. The ark was to have three decks with rooms ("nests" – ASV), a door in its side and a "window."
5. Other observations:
    a. God provided Noah with adequate time to build the ark, even as substantial in size as it was. Was the time between the command to build and the onset of the flood essentially 120 years (Genesis 6:3)?
    b. It is not necessary to assume that Noah and his sons did all the work on the ark.
    c. Noah was probably blessed by God with substantial material means for the construction of the ark, even as God blessed other patriarchs (Job, Abraham, etc.).

D. Chronology of the flood

1. 600th year, 2nd month, 10th day – Noah and his family entered the ark (7:4, 10-11)
2. 600th year, 2nd month, 17th day – the fountains of the great deep were broken up; the rain began and continued for 40 days and nights (7:11)
3. The waters increased for 150 days. (7:24)
4. 600th year, 7th month, 17th day – the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat (8:4)
5. 600th year, 10th month, 1st day – the tops of the mountains were seen (8:5)
6. After 40 days, Noah opened the window of the ark. (8:6)
7. 601st year, 1st month, 1st day – Noah removed the covering of the ark (8:13)
8. 601st year, 2nd month, 27th day – the earth was dried; Noah and his family left the ark (8:14)

II. **Genesis 1-11: Myth or History?**

A. We understand why the biblical doctrine of creation is attacked. Why do some deny the historicity of the account of the flood?

1. By definition, atheistic evolutionists deny that the supernatural exists.

2. The flood represents divine intervention in the history of mankind. There are clearly supernatural elements in the story of the flood.

a. "The simple fact of the matter is that one cannot have *any* kind of a Genesis Flood without acknowledging the presence of supernatural elements."[22]

b. "A careful analysis of the relevant exegetical data reveals at least six areas in which supernaturalism is clearly demanded in the doctrine of the Flood: (1) the divinely-revealed design of the Ark; (2) the gathering and care of the animals; (3) the uplift of oceanic waters from beneath; (4) the release of waters from above; (5) the formation of our present ocean basins; and (6) the formation of our present continents and mountain ranges. Each of these supernatural aspects of the Flood constitutes a radical break with the naturalistic presuppositions of modern scientism, and for this reason deserves our careful consideration."[23]

3. On the other hand, not everything involved in the flood was miraculous.

a. "Apart from the specific miracles mentioned in Scripture, which were necessary to begin and to terminate this period of global judgment, the Flood accomplished its work of destruction by purely natural processes that are capable of being studied to a certain extent in hydraulics laboratories and in local flood situations today."[24]

B. Identifying the early chapters of Genesis as mythical in nature has serious consequences. If we can't trust the first eleven chapters of Genesis, how can we trust other parts?

1. There are numerous references to Adam in the New Testament. The apostle Paul alone referenced Adam in several passages (Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:22, 45; 1 Timothy 2:13-14).

2. Paul also alluded to the Genesis story of the sin of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (2 Corinthians 11:3).

3. Jesus referred to the creation story (Matthew 19:4-5) and Noah (Matthew 24:38).

4. Noah appears in genealogies in several places in Scripture besides the early chapters of Genesis (1 Chronicles 1:4; Luke 3:36).

5. Noah is mentioned by Ezekiel along with Daniel and Job (Ezekiel 14:14, 20).

6. Peter specifically mentioned Noah in both of his epistles (1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5).

7. The author of Hebrews included Abel, Enoch and Noah among the faithful of the Old Testament, all of whom are mentioned in Genesis 1-5 (Hebrews 11:4-7).

8. The apostle Peter referred to the Genesis flood to confirm the certainty of the final destruction of the world by fire (2 Peter 3). If the flood story of Genesis is merely myth, it would be the worst possible illustration to use to confirm the certainty of the final destruction of the world as an actual event of future history!

9. There are numerous other allusions in Scripture to the creation story and the flood (e.g., Psalm 104).

C. There is a fundamental contradiction between belief in a global flood and the acceptance of the geological ages postulated by advocates of the General Theory of Evolution.

1. "The Biblical Flood in the days of Noah has become a great divide between two watersheds of belief. On the one hand there are those who say it is either a purely mythological event or else possibly a local or regional flood. This group includes practically all evolutionists, but it also includes the 'old-earth creationists.'

   These all accept the so-called geological ages as the approved record of Earth history, recognizing that a global hydraulic cataclysm would have destroyed any evidence for such geological ages. **The geological ages concept and a worldwide devastating Flood logically cannot coexist.**

   On the other hand, 'young-earth creationists' accept the Biblical record of the Flood as a literal record of a tremendous cataclysm involving not only a worldwide Flood, but also great tectonic upheavals and volcanic outpourings that completely changed the crust of the earth and its topography in the days of Noah.

   Those of us who hold this view are commonly ridiculed as unscientific and worse, so it would be more comfortable and financially rewarding if we would just go along with the evolutionist establishment, downgrade the Flood, and accept the geological ages."[25]

2. "What is called 'modern' geology has eclipsed Flood geology because of a dislike for those supernatural elements which are the backbone of Christianity. The Flood theory of geology has not been abandoned because it does not satisfy actual geological conditions. There is nothing known about the earth's geological state today which makes the Deluge theory any less satisfactory an explanation of the fossiliferous strata than in the days when the leading scholars of the world accepted it. Rather the contrary – there are facts known now about the geological conditions of the earth remarkably supporting the Flood theory…It is a disregard for God and the sacred record of his acts, and nothing else, which has caused the discard of the Flood theory to take place."[26]

D. The ubiquitous nature of flood traditions among various cultures suggests that there is a common historical source.

1. "Preserved in the myths and legends of almost every people on the face of the globe is the memory of the great catastrophe. While myths may not have any scientific value, yet they are significant in indicating the fact that an impression was left in the minds of the races of mankind that could not be erased."[27]

2. "The account of the Flood in Genesis does not stand alone. Traditions similar to this record are found among nearly all the nations and tribes of the human race. And this is as one would expect it to be. If that awful world catastrophe, as described in the Bible, actually happened, the existence of the Flood traditions among the widely separated and primitive people is just what is to be expected. It is only natural that the memory of such an event was rehearsed in the ears of the children of the survivors again and again and possibly made the basis of some religious observances…This awful disaster left an indelible impression upon the minds of men before they were scattered abroad; and whether we go to ancient Babylon, to the Sumerians or to the Chaldeans, to the Chinese or to the American Indians, to the natives of the Pacific Islands or to the ancient inhabitants of India, everywhere is found some trace of a Flood tradition and a

memory of a fearful catastrophe which destroyed mankind and left but one or a few survivors."[28]

3. How widespread are these "flood traditions"?[29]
   a. "Dr. Richard Andree, another German scholar, has compiled another collection of Flood traditions. Twenty of these have an Asiatic origin, five come from Europe; seven were found in Africa; ten in Australia and the South Sea Islands; and forty-six were found among the aborigines of the Americas."[30]
   b. Rehwinkel lists a number of specific examples of peoples who have/had flood traditions:[31]
      1) People of the Americas, including the Athapascan Tribe, the Papago Indians of Arizona, the Arapaho Tribe, the Algonquin Tribe, Alaskan natives, the Mayans, Mexican Indians, tribes in the northern part of South America, in the Orinoco River system.
      2) Other areas and peoples (both modern and ancient): Sudan, Greenland, Hawaii, Mongols of eastern Tartary, Battaks of Sumatra, Borneo, Andaman Islands, the Kurnai and Fijians (aboriginal tribes of Australia), Polynesia, Micronesia, Tahiti, New Zealand, New Guinea, Melanesia, Lithuania, gypsies of Transylvania, India, China, Persia, Chaldea, Egypt, Phrygia, Greeks, Romans and Babylonia.
   c. It was previously thought that the Babylonian flood story (related by the ancient writer Berosus who lived during the time of Alexander the Great) was the result of contact with Hebrew literature (Genesis) during the Babylonian captivity.[32]
      1) The discovery of the Gilgamesh Epic by George Smith in 1872 destroyed this view.
      2) The Gilgamesh Epic is a flood story much more ancient that Berosus' version (dating from a period prior to the Babylonian Captivity) and yet agreeing in many small details.
   d. Even though there was a scattering of the people after the Tower of Babel (chapter 11), the flood had made such an impression on the minds of the people that the story of the flood was retained in the various cultures which later developed.
4. There are several common elements in these flood stories.
   a. "But, as might be expected, these traditions have been modified through the ages and have been influenced by the customs of the various peoples and by the environment in which they are found and thus have taken on local color and sometimes extravagant and fantastic proportions, so that the kernel of truth in many cases is seriously obscured. And yet, when stripped of the accretions which have accumulated as they were handed down from father to son through the generations, the essential facts of this great catastrophe are easily discernible. There is almost complete agreement among them all on the three main features: 1. There is a universal destruction of the human race and all other living things by water. 2. An ark, or boat, is provided as the means of escape. 3. A seed of mankind is preserved to perpetuate the human race. To these might be added a fourth, which, though not occurring in all the traditions, occurs very frequently, namely, that the wickedness of man is given as the cause of the Flood."[33]

5. The flood traditions are extremely strong evidence for a global flood.

E. There are a number of objections which have been raised to challenge the historicity of the biblical flood story.

1. "It has been repeatedly asserted by these men that even if Noah could have collected such a vast number of animals, the Ark could not have contained them, nor could they have been properly cared for by eight persons for an entire year."[34]

2. "The ark was of inadequate size for all the animals and their foodstuffs."

a. Noah was instructed to build an ark which was 300 cubits long by 50 cubits wide and 30 cubits tall.

1) The cubit measurement was used by several ancient peoples, but apparently not all "cubits" were the same length.

a) The "cubit of the elbow" was approximately 18 inches.

b) The "cubit of the arm pit" was the length of the whole arm.

c) The length of the cubit varied from country to country and even changed over time within particular countries.

d) Naturally, any linear measurement based on human physiology will also vary from individual to individual.

2) If an 18-inch cubit is assumed:

a) Each of the three decks would have had 33,750 square feet, for a total deck surface area of 101,250 square feet.

b) The cubic capacity of the ark would have been on the order of 1,518,750 cubic feet and must be considered inasmuch as smaller animal cages could be stacked on one another.

c) The cubic volume of the ark available for occupants and foodstuffs would have to take into account the infrastructure of the ark, of which we know very little.

3) If a 24-inch cubit is assumed:

a) Each of the three decks would have had 60,000 square feet, for a total deck surface area of 180,000 square feet.

b) The cubic capacity of the ark would have been on the order of 3,600,000 cubic feet.

4) Various illustrations have been given to help us visualize the volume of the ark. Whitcomb suggests that it was comparable to "520 modern railroad stock cars", i.e., 10 freight trains each pulling 52 boxcars.[35]

b. The capacity of the ark to hold all of the creatures to be preserved is also a function of their total number and relative sizes.

1) Some of the skepticism regarding the sufficiency of the ark is due to the equation of "kind" (Genesis 6:20; 7:14) with the man-made designation of "species."

2) "Another common method of 'multiplying the species' has been to identify the 'species' of modern taxonomy with the 'kinds' of Genesis…But a

hundred years of further study in the science of zoology has brought to light some interesting facts concerning the amazing potentialities for diversification which the Creator has placed within the Genesis kinds. These 'kinds' have never evolved or merged into each other by crossing over the divinely-established lines of demarcation; but they have been diversified into so many varieties and sub-varieties (like the races and families of humanity) that even the greatest taxonomists have been staggered at the task of enumerating and classifying them."[36]

3) Whitcomb and Morris argue that Noah took seven of each "kind", not fourteen.[37]

3. The logistics of mixing predators and prey – this objection ignores the possibility of supernatural intervention.

4. The impossibility of gathering all the animals

   a. This is perhaps the weakest of the objections currently being considered inasmuch as the Genesis text specifically says that the animals would "come" to Noah (6:20; 7:9, 15). It was thus unnecessary for Noah to "round up" all of these creatures to be preserved in the ark.

   b. Some skeptics have made fun of the concept that the animals made their way to the ark on their own.

   c. Surely the same Creator who placed "instincts" in creatures in the beginning could direct the animals to Noah.

      1) "I also might point out that Genesis 6:19-20 makes it clear that God caused the animals to 'come unto Noah.' Noah did not have to 'go after' all the various animals. Even Bernard Ramm has admitted that the animals must have come to Noah as they were 'prompted by divine instinct' (1954, p. 169). Here, too, is an intriguing point to consider: If God could bring the animals to Adam to be named (Genesis 2:19), could He not bring them to Noah to be saved just as easily?"[38]

   d. Some would argue that such "migrations" would have been impossible due to topographical difficulties and climate differences.

      1) "An equally serious fault in this type of reasoning is that it begs the question of the extent and effects of the Deluge. It assumes, for example, that climatic zones were exactly the same before the Flood as they are now, that animals inhabited the same areas of the world as they do now, and that the geography and topography of the earth continued unchanged. But on the assumption of a universal Deluge, all these conditions would have been profoundly altered. Arctic and desert zones may never have existed before the Flood; nor the great intercontinental barriers of high mountain ranges, impenetrable jungles, and open seas (as between Australia and Southeast Asia, and between Siberia and Alaska). On this basis, it is quite probable that animals were more widely distributed than now, with representatives of each created kind of land animal living in that part of the earth where Noah was building the Ark."[39]

      2) It should also be noted that the animals to be preserved in the ark had an extensive period to make the trek to Noah's location.

5. The inability of eight people to care for the animals on the ark

a. The strength of this objection likewise depends in part upon the number of animals being cared for – a number that we have no way of determining with precision.

b. However, it is quite possible that many of the animals may have gone into some sort of hibernation for at least a portion of the time that they were on the ark.[40]

6. Not enough water to cover the mountains (this objection will be addressed in a detailed fashion in section IV)

III. **The Flood: Local or Global?**

A. A surprising number of well-known religious writers, theologians, and even apologists do not believe in a global flood.[41]

1. Bernard Ramm, evangelical theologian: "…urged those who accept the biblical account of a global Flood to abandon their 'hyper-orthodox' attitude toward uniformitarianism and surrender the notion that the Flood was universal in scope." (*The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, 1954)

2. John Clayton, apologist: "There is no way geologically of supporting the idea that there was a worldwide flood…The Bible does not maintain positively that this was a worldwide flood…It seems to me plausible that possibly the flood was confined to the known earth at that time." ("Does God Exist?" – Dandy Designs, 1969)

3. John T. Willis, professor at Abilene Christian University:

a. "There is simply not enough concrete information to allow a dogmatic judgment in this matter." (*Commentary on Genesis*)

b. "Geologists have discovered ample evidence of flooding all over the globe but no conclusive evidence of one universal flood. Rather, available remains can as easily point to local floods that occurred over at different historical periods."

4. Neal D. Buffaloe (biology professor @ the University of Central Arkansas) & N. Patrick Murray (Episcopalian minister): "By contrast [to the literal, historical view of Genesis], the mainstream of Biblical scholarship rejects the literal historicity of the Genesis stories prior to Genesis 12, and finds the literature of parable and symbol in the early chapters of Genesis." (*Creationism and Evolution*, 1981)

5. Hugh Ross, progressive creationist: "I kind of read through the text and it seemed obvious to me that it had to be a local flood, not a global flood, and I was shocked to discover that there are all these Christians, and even Christian scholars, that held to a global flood. And I wanted to figure out, you know, how did this happen? You know, how did people get off track like this?" (*Creation and Time*, 1990)

6. Thompson cites several other authors who likewise favor a local flood:

a. Robert Jamieson, one of the authors of the Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary (1870), presented a lengthy defense of the local flood theory.

b. Arthur Custance, Canadian anthropologist and religionist, defended the idea of a local flood in his works entitled *The Extent of the Flood: Doorway Papers No. 41* (1958) and *The Flood: Local or Global?* (1979).

c. John Warwick Montgomery defended the local flood theory in his book *The Quest for Noah's Ark* (1972).

B. Why do these individuals mentioned above seem to want to ignore the plain statements of the Scriptures?

1. The swing of the pendulum in the study of geology has been from the point of view of catastrophism to that of uniformitarianism.[42]

a. Although geologists practically unanimously subscribed to the idea of a global flood through the end of the eighteenth century, the nineteenth century saw the gradual acceptance of uniformitarianism, an idea popularized by Charles Lyell (1797-1875).

b. Substantive uniformitarianism was one of the fundamental building blocks of the general theory of evolution as proposed by Charles Darwin.

c. Substantive uniformitarianism is the view that "existing physical processes, acting essentially at present rates, are sufficient to account for all geological formations."[43] The phrase often used to describe this view is "the present is the key to the past."

d. Substantive uniformitarianism has given way in modern geology to methodological uniformitarianism which allows for great local catastrophes, but still denies any miraculous divine interventions.[44]

e. "Christians who understand Scripture are well aware of the fact that the Bible points to the validity of uniformitarianism in a limited sense during the post-Deluge and pre-eschatological era in which we *now* live (e.g., 2 Peter 3:7 – 'the present heavens and earth by his word are being reserved for fire, kept for the day of judgment…'). This especially applies to present-day *geological* processes (e.g., the rate of the earth's rotation and its tilt of axis—Genesis 8:22), *astronomical* processes (e.g., the movements of celestial bodies—Jer. 33:20, 25), and *meteorological* processes (cf. Eccles. 1:6 and Matt. 16:2, 3)…In addition, biblical catastrophism maintains that uniformitarian processes must be the *normal* and *characteristic* pattern of God's providential control of the earth *throughout* its history, or else miracles would lose their identity and sign-value by virtue of the very frequency and familiarity of their occurrence."[45]

2. Those who subscribe to the local flood view often are simply bowing to the pressure exerted by the community of scientists and educators to affirm the "fact" of macroevolution.

C. We need to consider the specific language used in the biblical description of the flood.

1. Note the expressions used by Moses:

a. "all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered" (7:19)

b. "all flesh died that moved on the earth" (7:21)

c. "all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, all that was on dry land, died" (7:22)

d. "only Noah and those who were with him in the ark remained alive" (7:23b)

e. "The waters were on the face of the whole earth" (8:9).

2. "A measure of the waters is now made by comparison with the only available standard for such waters – the mountains. They are said to have been 'covered.' Not a few merely but 'all the high mountains under all the heavens.' One of these expressions alone would almost necessitate the impression that the author intends to convey the

idea of the absolute universality of the Flood, e.g., 'all the high mountains.' Yet since 'all' is known to be used in a relative sense, the writer removes all possible ambiguity by adding the phrase 'under all the high heavens.' A double 'all' (*kol*) cannot allow for so relative a sense. It almost constitutes a Hebrew superlative. So we believe that the text disposes of the question of the universality of the Flood."[46]

3. Peter wrote: "by which the world that then existed perished, being flooded with water" (2 Peter 3:6).

4. It is hard to fathom how one can read the biblical account and conclude that a local flood was under consideration!

D. There are several arguments against a local flood which can be made from the biblical text.

1. The stated purpose of the flood

   a. The flood was intended to "destroy from under heaven all flesh in which is the breath of life" (Genesis 6:17).

   b. Unless all of mankind lived in the same area, a local flood would not accomplish the stated purpose of the flood.

2. The depth of the flood

   a. As already noted, the Scriptures indicate that "all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered" (Genesis 7:19).

   b. Note the all-inclusive terms used: "all" and "whole". If ALL the high hills under the WHOLE heaven were covered with water, it would necessitate a global flood. It should also be remembered that water seeks equilibrium; the inundation of "high hills" would necessitate an equally high level of water in other locations, barring any natural barriers to water's tendency to equilibrium.

   c. Illustration: Jesus said that "all" of the Sodomites were destroyed except Lot. "All" means everyone! Note the comparison with Noah and the flood (Luke 17:26-30).

3. The need for an ark to save Noah, his family and assembled animals

   a. It would be unnecessary to build an ark to escape a flood which was years in the future (cf. Genesis 6:3). An ark, particularly of the biblical dimensions, would likely have required many years to construct.

   b. Noah and his family could simply have migrated to another region of the earth to avoid a local flood.

   c. As with Noah and his family, it would be unnecessary to protect animals in an ark. The animals could simply migrate out of the area affected by the flood.

   d. "But to look at the matter from a different standpoint, wholly apart from the question of the exact size of the Ark, *there would have been no need for an Ark if the flood was local in extent*. The whole procedure of constructing such a vessel, involving over one hundred years of planning and toiling, simply to escape a local flood, can hardly be described as anything but utterly foolish and unnecessary. How much more sensible it would have been for God simply to have warned Noah of the coming destruction in plenty of time for him to move to an area that would not have been affected by the Flood, even as Lot was taken out of Sodom before the fire fell from heaven. Not only so, but also the great numbers of animals of all kinds, and certainly the birds, could easily have moved

out of the danger zone also, without having to be stored in a barge for an entire year. The biblical record simply cannot be harmonized with the concept of a Flood that was confined to the Near East."[47]

4. The need to stay in the ark for over a year
    a. A local flood would not require a year-long stay in an ark. "Local" floods typically dissipate relatively quickly.
5. The apostle Peter compared the destruction which resulted from the flood with the destruction of the world (2 Peter 3:3-7). Was he using a local flood to confirm a global destruction?
6. The promise of a rainbow (Genesis 9:8-17)
    a. The rainbow was intended to be a sign of the covenant which God made with Noah and the earth. In that covenant God promised "never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of the flood; never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth" (vs. 11).
    b. The language of this covenant is comprehensive, just like the language used to describe the flood. If the language of the flood is to be understood to indicate a local flood, why would the language of the covenant not be understood in the same way?
    c. If the rainbow was a sign of God's promise not to bring any local floods again (like the "local" flood of Noah's day), the occurrence of many such floods since then would indicate that God did not keep His covenant.

E. There are abundant natural evidences that support a global flood.
1. Rubble drift is a geologic expression which refers "a certain type of deposit or sediment consisting of massive, angular unrolled material tumultuously deposited in local pockets and catchment areas, full of shattered bones."[48]
2. Rubble drift often fills areas known by geologists as ossiferous fissures, "cracks" in the crust of the earth which were formed by some violent contortion of the earth's surface.
    a. These fissures, found in many places on the earth, often measure from 140 to 300 feet deep.
    b. They have been filled with debris, apparently soon after they were opened.
    c. The nature of the debris is interesting; these fissures are filled with the bones of a wide assortment of animals.
        1) "Fissures in the rocks...all over western Europe, are choked with bones of animals, some of extinct races, others, though of the same age, of races still surviving. The bones...are mostly broken and splintered into innumerable sharp fragments and are evidently not those of animals devoured by beasts of prey. The Rock of Gibraltar is intersected by numerous crevices filled with bones. The bones are broken and splintered. The remains of panther, lynx, caffir-cat, hyena, wolf, bear, rhinoceros, horse, wild boar, red deer, fallow deer, ibex, ox, hare, rabbit, have been found in these ossiferous fissures. On Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily the broken bones of animals choke the fissures in the rocks.

> The state of preservation of the bones indicates that the animals, all of them, perished in the same period of time. No hardened animal feces were found, indicating that the dead beasts had not lived in these hollows or fissures. No teeth marks of hyena or of any other animal are found in the osseous mass. The bones are those of animals of all ages down to the fetus, nor do they show traces of weathering or exposure.
>
> The extremely fresh condition of the bones, proved by the retention of so large a proportion of animal matter, shows that the event was, geologically, comparatively recent. The fact that animals of all ages were involved in the catastrophe shows it to have been sudden."[49]

2) "Again, it has been observed…that these ossiferous fissures are usually found upon isolated hills of considerable height, places on which we might expect animals to gather in seeking safety from an approaching flood. Fleeing in terror and driven by the common danger, the carnivorous and herbivorous alike sought refuge on the same elevation, only to meet even here a common watery grave."[50]

3) [Referring to a 10-acre bone bed at Agate Springs in Nebraska] "Animals of every kind died in great numbers and were buried apparently almost instantly. With many there can be no doubt that this was so. It has been suggested that ruthless men slaughtered these animals, but considering the number of the remains that have been found, thrown together in small heaps, mixed in great confusion, large and small animals, herbivorous and carnivorous, mammals and birds, all in one pile, buried in alluvial deposits, intermingled with remains of plants and trees, sea shells and fish, this theory becomes absurd on the face of it."[51]

4) "We must next inquire what the nature of this catastrophe was. Let us, then, focus on the necessary conditions. We want a cause that should kill the animals, and yet not break to pieces their bodies, or even mutilate them, a cause which would in some cases disintegrate the skeletons without weathering the bones. We want a cause that would not merely do this as a widespread murrain or plague might, but one which would bury the bodies as well as kill the animals, which could take up gravel and clay and lay them down again, and which could sweep together animals of different sizes and species, and mix them with trees and other debris of vegetation. What cause competent to do this is known to us, except rushing water on a great scale?"[52]

3. Rubble drift and "erratics" ("large isolated masses of rock far removed from their original source and deposited in areas where the same type of rock is not found"[53]) are better explained by a global flood than the current glacial theories widely accepted by geologists.[54] However, an "ice age" may have been one of the consequences of a global flood.

4. The prevalence of fossils is another striking evidence for a global, catastrophic flood.

   a. It is relatively difficult to become a fossil! Natural processes almost always eliminate the bodies of dead animals and plants before they can be preserved as a fossil.

b. "In contrast to the lack of fossilization going on in the world today, consider the almost unbelievable amount of fossilization that has occurred in the past…Nothing could be more obvious than the fact that billions of fossils of crustaceans, fishes, land animals, and plants, many of them almost perfectly preserved in huge sedimentary deposits, could not have been buried by processes observable in the world today."[55]

c. "Formations have been discovered containing hundreds of billions of fossils and our museums now are filled with over 100 million fossils of 250,000 different species."[56]

d. The existence of huge fossil beds argues for a catastrophe such as a global flood that could bury and preserve these creatures in a very short time.

   1) Furthermore, fossils are found virtually everywhere! In fact, there are even marine fossils on mountains tops and in the great deserts of the world.

   2) "The great bone deposit at Agate Springs in northwestern Nebraska has already been referred to. Specimens from this deposit are found in all the larger museums of the country. What else but a catastrophe like the Great Flood could have brought together on one spot such an aggregate of animal remains as found there? Either this spot was a high elevation of land in the antediluvian world, to which the terrified animals of the surrounding country took refuge when the waters of the Flood rose higher and higher, or their floating carcasses were carried together by the Flood waters and deposited on this hill when the Flood subsided. Nor must we overlook the remarkable fact that marine fossils are found on mountaintops hundreds of miles inland from any sea, as in the Canadian Rockies, or buried beneath hundreds of feet of clay, sand, gravel, and other debris…What wonders of a strange but perished world the fossils reveal! But as we examine them, whether they be found in America, Europe, Asia, or Australia, or any other place on the face of the earth, they all tell one and the same story, and that is a sudden, wholesale destruction followed by an immediate burial. Only one force known to man is capable of accomplishing that, and that force is water. Hence we conclude that the fossils found in every part of the world constitute convincing evidence for the Biblical Flood."[57]

e. Although it is often thought that fossils confirm the General Theory of Evolution, fossils more often create a problem for evolutionists.

   1) Fossils often do not follow the dictates of the General Theory of Evolution, *i.e.*, the simplest fossils should be at the bottom of the geologic column and the most complex fossils should be nearer the top, *i.e.,* simplest creatures in the oldest strata and most complex in the most recent strata.[58]

   2) Scientists sometimes employ circular reasoning in the dating of fossils.

      a) The age of a particular rock is determined by the "index" fossil in it. Gish explains, "Geologists have classified sedimentary deposits according to the type of fossils found in the deposits. Certain fossils are believed to have been laid down during a restricted time span. These fossils have been designated as 'index fossils' and are used by evolutionists to identify and date rocks. For example, any rock containing fossils of a certain type of trilobite is designated as a Cambrian rock."[59]

b) Such fossils are sometimes dated by the "age" of the rock in which they are discovered!

5. The discovery of the frozen carcasses of woolly mammoths is a particularly thorny problem for evolutionists.[60]

   a. Consider the following facts:

      1) The woolly mammoth is a relative of the present-day elephant. Despite popular impressions to the contrary, it was not a cold-weather animal. Brown lists several reasons for this conclusion.[61]

      2) Numerous carcasses (in some cases, of the entire animal) of mammoths have been found in northern Siberia and northwestern Alaska. The significance of these locations is that they are areas in which little vegetation of any kind presently grows, certainly not enough food for a creature the size of a mammoth (much larger than modern elephants).

      3) Mixed with mammoth bones are the bones of many other animals, including those of a horse, musk ox, wolverine, vole, squirrel, bison, rabbit and lynx. Several woolly rhinoceroses have also been found, some preserved largely complete.

      4) The number of mammoths which once lived in the Arctic region is estimated to be in the millions. This estimate is based on the prevalence of bones, teeth and tusks of the mammoth. It is reported that on some of the remote Arctic islands and in parts of Siberia the main component of the soil is mammoth remains.

      5) Perhaps the most famous mammoth discovery is the Beresovka mammoth.

         a) Discovered in Siberia near the Beresovka River in 1900, the carcass was found in an upright position.

         b) The hind legs of the 50-year-old male were rotated forward under the body. The pelvis, several ribs and a shoulder blade were broken. The right foreleg bone was crushed, but the surrounding tissue was not damaged.

         c) The penis of the animal was erect and horizontally flattened. This probably indicates that the animal died of suffocation and was compressed by some great force. Death by suffocation is apparent in other cases of mammoth discoveries.

         d) The death of the animal occurred so quickly that portions of its final meal were still on the surface of its tongue. Analysis of the contents of its stomach (24 pounds of undigested vegetation) indicated the presence of 40 different species of plants, many of which do not grow in Siberia.

            1] "At normal body temperatures, stomach acids and enzymes break down vegetable material within an hour. What inhibited this process? The only plausible explanation is for the stomach to cool to about 40°F in ten hours or less. But because the stomach is protected inside a warm body (96.6°F for elephants), how cold must the outside air become to drop the stomach's temperature to 40°F? Experiments have shown that the outer layers of skin would have had to drop suddenly to at least -175°F!"[62]

2] Parts of the flesh of the animal were so well preserved that the blood of the animal could be analyzed.

b. The significance of these discoveries is summarized by Whitcomb: "A startling illustration of the fact that a great catastrophe once struck this planet may be found in the four or five million mammoths and other large animals which were destroyed in the north polar regions, many of them frozen instantly and preserved whole and undamaged, and in some cases either standing or kneeling upright!"[63]

6. The presence of oil and coal reserves is evidence of catastrophism.

a. It is generally accepted that the world's extensive coal reserves are the result of the rapid burial and subsequent compression of large amounts of vegetation.

1) Many feet of compressed vegetation are required to produce a coal seam a single foot in depth. Some seams of coal are 30-40' thick.[64]

2) Coal is found on every continent and in the arctic areas as well.

3) The production of coal requires a special set of conditions:[65]

a) As already noted, abundant vegetation is required. This requirement would have been met in the antediluvian world.

b) The vegetation must be preserved without decay or mixture with other substances until a great accumulation is accomplished.

c) The accumulated vegetation must be covered up rapidly with other deposits, excluding air and compressing the vegetation.

d) The rapid accumulation of vegetation and its complete and rapid burial could easily have been accomplished by a global flood.

e) Although a "peat-bog theory" has been suggested for the formation of coal, it labors under the following difficulties:

1] The vegetation which grows in peat bogs is not the same vegetation seen in fossil form at the borders of coal seams.

2] There is no demonstrable formation of coal in modern-day peat bogs.

f) In summary: "Furthermore, there is no actual evidence that peat is now being transformed into coal anywhere in the world. *No locality is known where the peat bed, in its lower reaches, grades into a typical coal bed.* All known coal beds, therefore, seem to have been formed in the past and are not continuing to be formed in the present, as the principle of uniformity could reasonably be expected to imply."[66]

b. Oil fields, on the other hand, appear to be formed from the rapid burial of animals, particularly marine animals.

1) The existence of massive fossil fish beds is well-documented and it is widely believed that these fossils are the source of oil reserves.

2) "It can be definitely said that through all of the geologic formations in which fish remains occur, the large proportion of the remains consist of entire fishes or of sections in which every scale is still in position; every fin is extended as in life attitude; the bones of the head, though often crushed in and broken through subsequent diastrophic strains, still retain almost the

normal positions; while near them may be coprolites of the same sort or some other types of fish in a practically entire state. All of this conclusively proves that when myriads of such fishes were simultaneously killed, their bodies were deposited or stranded with a few hours or a few days at most after death, so that the flesh, the liver, the alimentary canal, and other soft parts were unquestionably enclosed and intact when sediment sealed them up…We unhesitatingly conclude then that a large proportion of the fishes met with in 'fish beds' and oil strata were stretched out and preserved intact by immediate and rapid entombment. So whatever amount of oil any individual or species may have contained, such must have filtered out gradually into surrounding strata."[67]

3) "However, we need not limit ourselves to fishes as the sole source of oil. No doubt all other organisms containing substances convertible into oil, contributed to the great oil deposits of the present world. As life of every kind, including the myriads of the prehistoric reptiles great and small as well as all other living creatures, was suddenly overtaken, destroyed, and buried, sometimes in great heaps, numbering thousands upon thousands of individuals, the oil contained in these bodies was distilled by heat and pressure and thus stored in sands between impervious strata and there preserved through the ages to the present day."[68]

4) Oil deposits require the sudden death and rapid burial of large numbers of animals. Of fish, Immanuel Velikovsky comments: "When a fish dies its body floats on the surface or sinks to the bottom and is devoured rather quickly, actually in a matter of hours, by other fish. However, the fossil fish found in sedimentary rocks is very often preserved with all its bones intact. Entire shoals of fish over large areas, numbering billions of specimens, are found in a state of agony, but with no mark of a scavenger's attack."[69]

c. The requisite conditions for the formation of coal and oil argue strongly against uniformitarianism and in favor of a global flood.

IV. **Mechanisms of the flood**

A. The beginning of the flood: Where did all the water come from?

1. There are several theories regarding the source(s) of sufficient water to cover the then-existing entire land mass.

2. Genesis 7:11 states that "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up." What does that expression mean? Dr. Walt Brown has proposed the hydroplate theory as a possible explanation.[70]

a. The hydroplate theory begins with a couple of assumptions: 1) "About half the water now in the oceans was once in interconnected chambers about 10 miles below the earth's surface" and 2) "the pressure in the subterranean water was increasing."

b. The theory involves four stages: rupture, flood, drift and recovery.

1) In the first stage, increasing pressure in subterranean chambers filled with water resulted in a "rip" in the earth's crust which quickly ran around the globe (basically following the present Mid-Oceanic ridge). This allowed the water below the earth's crust to escape into the atmosphere – some of it even above the atmosphere where it froze and then returned to the earth's

surface as "huge masses of extremely, cold, muddy 'hail'" (Brown, 101). "That hail buried, suffocated, and froze many animals, including some mammoths" (Ibid). Water that remained in the atmosphere would have fallen as torrential rain, probably great distances away from the rupture in the crust.

2) In the second stage, the upward-jetting water eroded the sides of the fissure in the crust, increasing the width of the fissure and producing massive amounts of sediment (in addition to sediment produced by erosion from the subterranean chambers) which would have settled out over the earth's surface, trapping many plants and animals and beginning the process of fossilization.

3) The third stage is called the "continental drift phase." As the fissure in the earth's crust widened, underlying pressure would have caused the rise of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, resulting in the rapid "drift" of the hydroplates away from both sides of the Ridge. Depletion of the water under the hydroplates and collision with something on the other side of the plate would produce a compression event which would, in turn, result in the buckling, crushing and thickening of each plate. This "thickening" would have caused the continents to rise out of the water.

4) The fourth stage is the "recovery phase." The hydroplates settled onto the subterranean chamber floor, cutting off the exodus of any remaining water in that chamber. Over centuries, they sank in the basalt floor, causing the ocean floor and water levels to rise and burying land bridges between all the continents.

   a) Large amounts of water were trapped in continental basins. Some of those "lakes" slowly evaporated over centuries. Other lakes increased in size (from rainfall and drainage from higher terrain) until they breached their rim, in some cases creating a massive, rapid outflow of water.

   b) It is likely that the Grand Canyon was formed in this manner.

   c) The sudden formation of large mountains would have caused a shift in the earth's balance, causing the earth to roll about 45 degrees. This shift would explain, in part, why so much coal is found at the present-day South Pole and evidence of lush vegetation, vast dinosaur remains and frozen mammoths is found inside the present-day Arctic Circle.

      1] Brown quotes an ancient Chinese record found by Jesuit missionaries: "…The Earth was shaken to its foundations. The sky sank lower toward the north. The sun, moon, and stars changed their motions. The Earth fell to pieces and the waters in its bosom rushed upward with violence and overflowed the Earth. Man had rebelled against the high gods and the system of the Universe was in disorder."[71]

c. Brown claims that his theory explains, among others, the following geologic phenomena:

   1) The Grand Canyon and other canyons

   2) The Mid-Oceanic Ridge

3) Continental shelves and slopes
4) Ocean trenches, seamounts and tablemounts
5) Earthquakes
6) Magnetic variations on the ocean floor
7) Submarine canyons
8) Coal and oil formations
9) The Ice Age and frozen mammoths
10) Plateaus and salt domes
11) Changing axis tilt
12) Comets, asteroids and meteoroids

d. Brown argues that the Hebrew word translated "firmament" in Genesis 1:6-7 refers to the earth's crust, rather than its atmosphere.[72]

1) The waters above the firmament would then be the oceans and seas and the water in subterranean chambers would be the "waters which were under the firmament."

2) Brown's view depends on the meaning of the Hebrew word *raqia*, (רָקִיעַ) translated "firmament" in the KJV and NKJ, "expanse" in the ESV, NAU, NIV and NET.[73]

a) He argues that the word means "plate" or "a pressed out solid."

b) The Septuagint parallel word is **στερέωμα,** a word defined as following:

1] Thayer: **"***that which has been made firm*; a. (Vulgate *firmamentum*) *the firmament*; so the Septuagint for רָקִיעַ, the arch of the sky, which in early times was thought to be solid"

2] Friberg: "strictly *solid body* or *part*, as what has been made solid or firm; hence, as a quality of faith that is strong and unchanging *stability, steadfastness, firmness"*

c) The most difficult verse for Brown's assertions is Genesis 1:8a – "And God called the firmament Heaven."

1] He favors the view of Robert Hooke (1635-1703) who proposed the idea of two firmaments. The first (described in Genesis 1:6) was the earth's crust; the second was the heavens (sky, atmosphere or outer space).

2] According to Hooke, the second firmament is indicated when the phrase "of the heavens" follows the use of *raqia* (as in Genesis 1:14, 15, 17, 20).

3) Brown cites the following Scriptures as supporting his view:

a) **NKJ Psalm 24:2:** For He has founded it upon the seas, And established it upon the waters.

b) **NKJ Psalm 33:7:** He gathers the waters of the sea together as a heap; He lays up the deep in storehouses.

c) [NKJ] **Psalm 104:3:** He lays the beams of His upper chambers in the waters, Who makes the clouds His chariot, Who walks on the wings of the wind,

d) [NKJ] **Psalm 136:5-9:** [5]To Him who by wisdom made the heavens, For His mercy *endures* forever; [6] To Him who laid out the earth above the waters, For His mercy *endures* forever; [7] To Him who made great lights, For His mercy *endures* forever -- [8] The sun to rule by day, For His mercy *endures* forever; [9] The moon and stars to rule by night, For His mercy *endures* forever.

e) [NKJ] **2 Peter 3:5:** For this they willfully forget: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in the water,

4) He also cites passages in extrabiblical literature:

a) *The First Book of Adam and Eve*: "God…established the earth upon the waters." (70:15).

b) *II Enoch*: "The Lord…fixed the earth upon the waters." (47:5).

c) *II Esdras*: "On the second day you created the angel of the firmament, and commanded him to make a dividing barrier between the waters, one part withdrawing upwards and the other remaining below. On the third day you ordered the waters to collect in a seventh part of the earth; the other six parts you made into dry land…" (6:41-42).

d) *II Esdras*: "He has shut up the sea in the midst of the waters, and by His command He has hung the earth upon the water." (16:58).

3. Another explanation for the source of the flood waters is the theory the earth was surrounded by an antediluvian vapor/water canopy which collapsed to produce at least some of the waters of the flood.

a. Those who argue in favor of a water canopy do so primarily on the basis of Genesis 1:6-10. Genesis 7:11 states that "the windows of heaven were opened" and it rained for forty days and forty nights.

1) [NAU] **Genesis 7:11:** In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day all the fountains of the great deep burst open, and *the floodgates of the sky were opened*. (emphasis mine – asd)

2) [NLT] **Genesis 7:11:** When Noah was 600 years old, on the seventeenth day of the second month, all the underground waters erupted from the earth, and the rain fell in mighty torrents from the sky.

b. Rehwinkel, Whitcomb, Morris, Dillow and Geilow also subscribe to some form of vapor/water canopy theory. As Dillow notes, there are several canopy models. Some form of the canopy theory dates back to the nineteenth century.

1) In his book, *The Waters Above*, Dillow considers "the details and physical implications of such a canopy" (Preface, xviii), attempting to evaluate the scientific plausibility of a water canopy. His work is thorough and technical. He does, however, consider the evidence from Scripture first, before moving to scientific possibility.

a) Brown identifies several "problems" that he believes exists in the canopy theory.[74]

2) "The pre-Flood earth was enveloped in a thermal vapor blanket capable of precipitating many feet of water which condensed in the recent geological past in 40 days due to volcanic eruption, resulting in a geographically universal flood."[75]

a) Rehwinkel, Dillow and others view the "fountains of the great deep" to be perhaps a way of referring to volcanic action.

b) Dillow makes several predictions, based on the presence of the vapor canopy and/or its collapse:

1] A greenhouse effect

2] High present day concentration of He^3

3] Greater atmospheric pressure

4] Shielding from cosmic radiation

5] A global flood

6] Volcanic ash mixed with glacial ice

7] A sudden and permanent temperature drop in the polar regions

8] Fewer meteorites in older strata

9] Residual amounts of water in the stratosphere today

10] A changed appearance of the heavenly bodies

3) "According to this theory the earth was originally surrounded by a canopy of vapor which intercepted the direct rays of the sun. The heat which penetrated the canopy was diffused so equally over all the zones of latitude that the subtropical climate prevailed even in the high latitude. This canopy served to bring about conditions similar to those in a hothouse with a temperature of about 72° F. The chemical rays of the sun, especially those most active in the aging of living things and those that bring about decay and fermentation, were intercepted by the canopy, and as a result, men and animals lived to great ages."[76]

4) Geilow's view of the vapor canopy is a little different from that of Dillow and, while interesting, seems to have some serious difficulties.

a) He believes that "the water above the sky had certain similarities to the planetary ring that exists around Saturn today."[77]

b) The earth was slowly watered during the antediluvian period (approximately 1656 years?) from the "snowball" (technically, ice crystals) layer of water surrounding the earth as certain parts of it condensed.

c) He suggests that the Designer of the planetary ring may have used a meteor to trigger its collapse through "molecule-to-molecule" collisions that resulted in chain reactions.

d) The ice crystals, starting at approximately -300° F, would have reached the ground at about -175° F. "One mile of sleet (in northern latitudes –

asd), falling in a matter of perhaps four hours, represents a fall rate of over 20 feet per minute. The mammoth was buried in approximately 30 seconds."[78]

e) Geilow doesn't clearly explain how some of the ice crystals in the planetary ring would fall to the earth as sleet, but the rest of the vapor canopy would fall as rain (the forty days of rain). He spends much more time describing the melting of the sleet layer on the earth than he does explaining the source of the forty days of rain.

B. The Scriptures do not provide adequate information to understand how everything happened during the flood and its aftermath.

1. The hydroplate theory and the variations of the water canopy theory propose to explain the phenomena observable in the study of geology.
2. Such physical evidence, of course, is subject to the interpretation of scientists.
3. For the purpose of the believer, however, it should be noted that there are reasonable explanations to answer the question of how the flood could have occurred.
4. "The Flood itself appears to have been due to a combination of meteorologic and tectonic phenomena. The 'fountains of the great deep' emitted great quantities of juvenile water and magmatic materials, and the 'waters above the firmament,' probably an extensive thermal atmospheric blanket of water vapor, condensed and precipitated torrential rains for a period of forty days."[79]

Conclusion:

I. The subject of the global flood of Noah touches an extremely broad field of scriptural and scientific inquiry. This outline is admittedly but a scratch on the surface of the subject!

II. Christians should not be afraid to boldly affirm the truthfulness of the biblical flood account.

A. If there was NO physical evidence to verify the account, the Bible has adequate support to confirm its general truthfulness.

B. However, the physical evidence for a global flood is overwhelming.

1. Natural phenomena constantly point to a cataclysmic global flood in the past.
2. Fossil beds, frozen mammoths, oil and coal deposits, among other geologic evidence, are best explained by a global flood.

C. There are reasonable theories for the source(s) of water to flood the entire earth.

III. There is no need to interpret Genesis 1-11, and particularly the Noahic flood story, as mythical. In fact, such an interpretation has serious implications for the rest of Scripture.

IV. It is neither necessary nor reasonable to understand the Noahic flood as being local in its extent.

A. The language of Scripture clearly indicates a global flood.

B. The implications of the flood story demand a global flood.

C. The geologic evidence in the natural world clearly supports a global catastrophe in the form of a flood.

Allen Dvorak
776A Orvil Smith Road
Harvest, AL 35749
a.dvorak@mchsi.com

Selected Bibliography

Brown, Walt. *In the Beginning.*

Cates, Curtis A. *The Noahic Flood.*

Davidson, B. *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.*

Dillow, Joseph C. *The Waters Above.*

Gielow, Robert L., *Noah's Flood*

Gish, Duane T. *Evolution? The Fossils Say NO!*

Leupold, H. C., *Exposition of Genesis*, Vol. I.

Oard, Mike. *Flood By Design*.

Rehwinkel, Alfred M. *The Flood.*

Thompson, Bert. *The Bible and the Age of the Earth.*

Thompson, Bert. *The Global Flood of Noah*.

Ward, Nathan. *The Growth of the Seed.*

Whitcomb, John C. & Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*.

Whitcomb, John C. *The World That Perished.*

Wilson, William. *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies*.

End Notes

[1] Whitcomb and Morris, p. 243.
[2] Rehwinkel, p. 2.
[3] The material in this section is summarized from chapter 1 in Alfred Rehwinkel's book *The Flood*. Whitcomb and Morris in The Genesis Flood also comment on the antediluvian climate (p. 243ff).
[4] Rehwinkel, p. 2.
[5] Rehwinkel, p. 4.
[6] Whitcomb and Morris, p. 243.
[7] Rehwinkel, p. 7.
[8] E. H. Colbert, "Evolutionary Growth Rates in Dinosaurs," Scientific Monthly, 69:71. Cited by Bert Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, p. 26. As evident from the statement by Colbert, he is an evolutionist.
[9] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 268.
[10] Rehwinkel, p. 6.
[11] Rehwinkel, pp. 9-10.
[12] Dillow, p. 99.
[13] Rehwinkel, p. 10.
[14] Rehwinkel, pp. 11-12.
[15] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 240.
[16] Rehwinkel, p. 13.
[17] Alfred Wallace, *The Geographical Distribution of Animals*, I, 150, 151. Cited by Rehwinkel, p. 21.
[18] Whitcomb, p. 46.
[19] Ward, pp. 100-109. Ward gives a rather extensive discussion of the meaning of the "sons of God" and the Nephilim.
[20] Wilson, p. 20. So also Davidson.
[21] Cates, p. 25.
[22] Whitcomb and Morris, p. 76.
[23] Whitcomb, p. 21.
[24] Whitcomb, p. 68.
[25] Henry Morris, "Why Christians Should Believe in a Global Flood," *Back to Genesis*, 116:a-c, August, 1998; cited by Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, p. 8.
[26] Byron Nelson, *The Deluge Story in Stone*, p. 137; cited by Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, p. 18.
[27] Harold Clark, *Fossils, Flood and Fire*, p. 45; cited by Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, p. 20.
[28] Rehwinkel, pp. 127-128.
[29] Rehwinkel (p. 129) lists several researchers who have done extensive work in this field. Among them are Johannes Riem (*Die Sintflut in Sage and Wissenschaft*), James Frazier (*Folklore in the Old Testament*), Hugh Miller and William Wundt (*Elements of Folk Psychology*).
[30] Rehwinkel, pp. 129-130.
[31] Rehwinkel, pp. 131-152. He discusses the Gilgamesh Epic (the Babylonian flood story) in the following chapter.
[32] Rehwinkel, pp. 153-154.
[33] Rehwinkel, p. 128.
[34] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 63.
[35] Whitcomb, p. 25. This illustration may not be very helpful for those who don't routinely ship livestock or have not pursued a career of freighthopping in the past!
[36] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 66. Rehwinkel makes the same point (p. 69ff).
[37] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 65.
[38] Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, pp. 37-38.
[39] Whitcomb & Morris, pp. 64-65.
[40] Whitcomb, pp. 32-34; so also Thompson, *The Global Flood of Noah*, pp. 39-40. Whitcomb argues that the same God who could set aside the natural instincts of creatures could also cause them to hibernate after initially eating of the food stocks accumulated by Noah. Rehwinkel also gives credence to the possibility of hibernation (pp. 75-76)
[41] The citations in this section are taken from Thompson, p. 5ff.
[42] Whitcomb and Morris, pp. 89ff.

[43] Gish, p. 57.
[44] Whitcomb, p. 102.
[45] Whitcomb, p. 103.
[46] Leupold, pp. 301-302.
[47] Whitcomb, p.49.
[48] Rehwinkel, p. 179.
[49] Immanuel Velikovsky, *Earth in Upheaval, Tidal Wave*, pp. 51-54. This excerpt from the cited work was taken from the website: www.zetatalk.com.
[50] Rehwinkel, p. 180.
[51] Rehwinkel, p. 183.
[52] Henry Howorth, *The Mammoth and the Flood*, p. 184. Cited by Dillow, p. 368.
[53] Rehwinkel, p. 306.
[54] Rehwinkel (pp. 308-327) and Whitcomb & Morris (pp.292ff) believe that an ice age is not inconsistent with the biblical record or the consequences of a flood. Rehwinkel, however, notes some difficulties presented by the glacial theory most commonly accepted by geologists, observing that the Noahic flood offers a better explanation of the very geologic phenomena supposedly the result of glacial action.
[55] Whitcomb, p. 76.
[56] Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 9.
[57] Rehwinkel, pp. 236-237.
[58] Gish, pp. 67-70.
[59] Gish, pp. 57-59.
[60] Extensive discussions of the mammoth finds and the significance of those finds can be found in Rehwinkel (pp. 238-254), Whitcomb & Morris (pp. 288-291), Whitcomb (pp. 76-82), Cates (pp. 93-96), Dillow (pp. 311-422) and Brown (pp. 159-187). The discussions of Dillow and Brown are by far the most extensive and extremely interesting. Brown considers a number of "explanations" for the frozen mammoth phenomenon and evaluates them. He even includes a summary table of mammoth finds (helpful because of the publication date of his book; more recent than *The Genesis Flood*) and a map correlating the location of each find. Dillow provides a great deal of helpful information regarding the cause of climate change in the areas where mammoth carcasses are typically found.
[61] Brown, pp. 162-163.
[62] Brown, p. 165.
[63] Whitcomb, p. 76.
[64] Whitcomb, pp. 81-82.
[65] Rehwinkel, p. 193.
[66] Whitcomb & Morris, pp. 163-164.
[67] J. M. MacFarlane, *Fishes, the Source of Petroleum*, p. 14. Quoted by Rehwinkel, p. 204-205.
[68] Rehwinkel, p. 205.
[69] Immaneul Velikovsky, Earth in Upheaval, p. 222. Quoted by Whitcomb & Morris, p 157.
[70] Walt Brown, pp. 85-119. In this section of his book "In the Beginning", Brown offers an overview of the hydroplate theory. Summaries of his theory can also be found online, in addition to critiques.
[71] Brown, p. 107. Brown's citation is from Charles Berlitz, *The Lost Ship of Noah: In Search of the Ark at Ararat*, p. 126.
[72] This section is a summary of material in Brown's book on pages 263-266.
[73] Dillow addresses the idea that *raqia* means a "pressed out solid", but is apparently more concerned with incorrect ideas about Hebrew cosmology than the actual meaning of the word. He states: "It appears that a possible verbal meaning, which sometimes involves the spreading out of metals, has incorrectly been forced into the noun usage in Genesis 1:6-8. It is a noun that is found in Genesis 1:6-8 and not a verb." (p. 45). Although he is correct in identifying the use of noun and verb in the passages under consideration, it seems to me that his argument which seeks to distance the meaning of the noun (*raqia*) from the basic meaning of the verb cognate (*raqa*) is weak.
[74] Brown, p. 260-263
[75] Dillow, p. 136.
[76] Rehwinkel, p. 12.
[77] Geilow, p. 18.
[78] Geilow, p. 83.
[79] Whitcomb & Morris, p. 328.