

PART TWENTY-ONE:  
THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD  
(Gen. 7:1-24)

1. *The Embarkation* (Gen. 7:1-24). *The Biblical Account.*

"1 And Jehovah said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation. 2 Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, the male and his female; and of the beasts that are not clean two, the male and his female: of the birds also of the heavens, seven and seven, male and female, to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth. 4 For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and every living thing that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the ground. 5 And Noah did according unto all that Jehovah commanded him.

"6 And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth. 7 And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark, because of the waters of the flood. 8 Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of birds, and of everything that creepeth upon the ground, 9 there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, male and female, as God commanded Noah. 10 And it came to pass after the seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth. 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 were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. 12 And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

"13 In the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark; 14 they, and every beast after its kind, and all the cattle

## GENESIS

*after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and every bird after its kind, every bird of every sort. 15 And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath of life. 16 And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God commanded him: and Jehovah shut him in. 17 And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth. 18 And the waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters. 19 And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered. 20 Fifty cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered. 21 And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both birds, and cattle, and beasts, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: 22 all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, of all that was on the dry land, died. 23 And every living thing was destroyed that was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and creeping things, and birds of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only was left, and they that were with him in the ark. 24 And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days."*

2. *The Moral World Under the Flood.* (1) By "moral world" we mean the totality of "moral" beings, that is, creatures constitutionally endowed with intelligence and free will, and hence made responsible to the Creator for their acts; in a word, all creatures who can properly be designated *persons*. In view of their distinct *personal* endowments they are said in Scripture to have been created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27). This world of persons *under* the Flood was made up of just two classes: the same two classes that have always made up human-kind, namely, those *who have*, and those who *have not*,

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

conformed their lives to the Will of God, the Author of all moral and spiritual law. (Cf. Matt. 7:24-27, 7:13-14, 25:31-46; John 5:28-29; Rom. 2:4-11; Rev. 20:11-15, 22:12-15). Similarly, the antediluvian moral world was made up of those who refused to heed the warnings of God about the impending doom (the world of the ungodly), and those who, by faith, took God at His Word and conformed to His plan for their deliverance: in sum, those *outside* the ark and those *inside* the ark of safety.

(2) The condition that necessitated the Flood was, as noted heretofore, the universal wickedness brought about by the intermarriage of pious Sethites and the irreligious Cainites. This condition became so intolerable that "it repented Jehovah that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." "And Jehovah said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the ground" (6:6-7). (Cf. such passages as Num. 23:19, 1 Sam. 15:29, Ezek. 24:14, Mal. 3:6, Jas. 1:17). Haley ADB, 63-68): "God has promised blessings to the righteous and threatened the wicked with punishment. Suppose a righteous man should turn and become wicked. He is no longer the man whom God promised to bless. He occupies a different relation toward God. The promise was made to an entirely different character. . . . His attitude toward sin and sinners, on the one hand, and toward goodness and good on the other, is the same yesterday, today, and forever. It is precisely *because God is immutable*, that his relation to men, and his treatment of them vary with the changes in their character and conduct. In a word, *he changes not because he is unchangeable*. . . . To sum up, *if man changes, the very immutability of God's character requires that his feelings should change toward the changed man*." (SIB, I, 112, n.): "God's *repentance* denotes not any change of his purpose or will within himself. In this respect he is unchangeable, and cannot repent. . . . But it denotes the change of his

## GENESIS

providence correspondent with his fixed purpose. It is a word suited to our capacity; and here it denotes God's detestation of sin, and his fixed resolution to punish it, after man had made himself quite another thing than God had made him at first." (Cf. 1 Sam. 15:11, Ps. 106:45, Deut. 32:36, Hos. 11:8, Jer. 18:5-12). (3) Noah, on the other hand, was "a righteous man, and perfect in his generations." Two distinct Hebrew words are translated "generations" here (6:9). The first signifies "families" or "genealogies." The second signifies "the period of a man's life." Noah was righteous: it was his disposition to do the Will of God. He was perfect, that is, upright and sincere, a man of integrity. He was perfect in comparison with those of his period or age. (Cf. Luke 1:6, 2 Cor. 1:12, Phil. 2:15, 1 Pet. 2:15.) "Noah was perfect *in his generation*, amidst men extremely wicked, and notwithstanding their evil counsels, examples, and persecutions." His character is proved by the fact that he persisted through one hundred and twenty years pleading—all in vain—with those of his time, to repent and reform their lives in obedience to God's warning. What greater proof of a man's piety could be desired? What a contrast to the enormous impiety of the multitudes reveling unrestrained in lust and violence, sinning against God openly and presumptuously, without any fear of Him, any respect for His law, in very defiance of His justice!

3. *The Physical World Under the Flood.* (1) By the *physical* world we have reference here to the physiological aspects of the planet Earth. Thus it becomes apparent at once that any treatment of this subject necessarily involves the problem of the *extent* of the Flood which is described in the seventh chapter of Genesis. That is to say, was the Genesis Flood universal? Or was it more or less localized in the region anciently regarded as the "world," or more especially the region known today as the Near East. To try to discuss this problem in its various

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

ramifications—Biblical, geological, palentological, physio-chemical, etc.—would require the writing of a book within a book, so to speak, a task for which we have neither time nor space available, in the preparation of the present text. We shall be content, therefore, with presenting the problem in its broad outlines and giving the reader the titles of the books published in recent years in which the different views are set forth. (These titles are named in the List of *Specific Abbreviations* at the forefront of this volume.)

(2) In this connection, the first problem we encounter is one of translation. The Hebrew *erets* as used in Genesis and generally throughout the Old Testament, translated consistently as "earth" in our English Bibles, is also the term used repeatedly for "land" or "country." (E.g., Gen. 13:10—"the land of Egypt"; 13:12—"the land of Canaan," etc.). (There is another word, *tebel*, which is used in the later Old Testament writings, which designates the habitable earth or the world as a whole; however, this word does not occur in the entire Pentateuch. Again, the word *adamah*, translated "ground," occurs in Gen. 7:23, 8:8, 8:13, 8:21 (cf. with its use in Gen. 3:17), and has reference strictly to the surface (productive) soil of the same area that is designated *erets* in other verses.) But it is *erets* alone, uniformly translated "earth," which is used throughout the Narrative of the Flood, and significantly in those very passages which convey the connotation of universality, and which, as stated above, could be just as correctly and meaningfully rendered "land" wherever it occurs (e.g., Gen. 6:17c could be as correctly translated, "everything that is in the *land* shall die"). On the other hand, the phrase, "under the whole heaven," as used in 7:19, causes difficulty: it cannot be easily explained as indicating a geographical *region* only. For this reason, such well-known Bible exegetes as Delitzsch in the last century (BCOTP) and in recent times Leupold (EG),

## GENESIS

and others, have not conceded the possibility of translating the seventh chapter of Genesis as describing a mere localized flood.

(3) Was the Flood universal or local? Jauncey writes (SRG, 76): "Some discussion has gone on as to whether the Flood was a local flood or whether over the whole complete earth. The reason for the discussion is that the word used, translated "earth" in Genesis 7:4 also means "land." Therefore, an equally good translation would make it appear that the whole land or area of Mesopotamia was inundated rather than the whole earth as we know it now. Against this, though, is the fact that there are memories of the Flood all over the world. Of course, some of these could have come through hearsay. Again, we do not know." Dean (OBH, 16): "It rained for forty days. The waters continued to rise for one hundred and fifty days, and to subside for two hundred and twenty-five days. It was either universal, or what is more probable, occurred early in the history of the race, before they had spread widely. Either view would account for the universal tradition." Dummelow (CHB): "The question has been discussed whether the Flood was limited in its extent to the early home of man, and the birthplace of the tradition, viz., Central Asia, or whether it was world-wide. Various scientific objections to a universal immersion of the earth have been brought forward, such as its inconsistency with the existing distribution of animals, the impossibility of the different species of animals finding accomodation in the ark, the want of sufficient moisture in our world, either in the form of vapor or of water, to cover the highest mountains, and the disturbance of the solar system which would have been caused by the sudden creation of the amount required. In consideration of these objections, we must remember that the impression of a general divine judgment would be quite adequately produced by the submergence of the comparatively small

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

district inhabited at the time by man; also, that the preservation of the record could only be due to the survivors, whose ideas of the extent of the catastrophe were drawn from their personal experiences, and the limited geographical knowledge of the time." (It should be noted that this writer, as do most of those who reject the idea of a universal deluge, ignores altogether the possibility of a Spirit-inspired revelation). Ramm (CVSS, 244-246) holds that insurmountable problems are raised by the view that the Deluge was universal in extent, such as, especially, the following: 1. According to best estimates, to cover the highest known mountains, such as the Himalayas, eight times more water than our earth now possesses would be required. 2. The withdrawal of such a huge volume of water would constitute an almost insuperable problem, in the fact that there would be no place or places to which it could drain off: the atmosphere could not store that much water in evaporated form, and there is no evidence that underground cavities exist capable of holding more than a fraction of the additional volume of water. 3. Hardly any forms of plant life could have survived submersion under salt water for any length of time. Moreover, the mingling of ocean water with rain water must have produced a lethal saline concentration, in which nearly all marine life surely would have perished through inability to withstand the tremendous pressures created. And in particular how could those species of marine life which migrate far from their feeding grounds have survived such migrations? Moreover, fresh water fish must have perished as well, even though the salinity might have been sufficient to support salt water fish. 4. Finally, says Ramm, certain areas of the earth's surface show no definite evidence whatever of a general submersion. He cites, for example, reports of ashes in Auvergne, France, produced by volcanoes thousands of years older than the Flood which show no evidence of disturbance by flood waters.

## GENESIS

Gleason reviews these arguments as follows (SOTI, 195-196): "Perhaps difficulties 1 and 3 can be accounted for by special creative or recreative acts of God. (But why then the concern for the preservation of the land animals in the ark, if re-creation was so readily available?) But 2 would seem to call for a good deal of uncreation or complete annihilation of aqueous matter—which appears highly improbable. Difficulty 4 seems to defy explanation, unless the volcanoes involved were really of post-Noahic origin, and the criteria for dating them earlier turn out to be erroneous. Or else perhaps the scoria and ashes may not have been so easily disturbed by water action as the argument assumes. It cannot be maintained, however, that even a local flood will solve all these scientific difficulties. Genesis 7:19 states most explicitly that all the water level rose well above 'all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven.' Assuming that the mountains involved were merely local (a difficult interpretation to make out from the text), at the very least the peaks of Mount Ararat itself were covered, since the ark came to rest where the higher peak (over 17,000 feet high) would be visible. The unavoidable inference would be that the water level rose more than 17,000 feet above the present sea level. This creates difficulties almost as grave for the local flood theory as those which that theory is supposed to avoid. How could the level have been that high at Ararat without being the same height over the rest of the world? Only during a very temporary surge, such as that of a tidal wave, can water fail to seek its own level. To suppose a 17,000-foot level in Armenia simultaneous with an uninundated Auvergne in France would be to propound a more incredible miracle than anything implied by the traditional understanding of a universal flood. The only possible solution, apparently, would be found in the supposition that the height of Ararat was much lower than at present. It is very difficult to date



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

reliably a major upward thrust of the mountain-making variety, and hence it is quite possible that even in the few millenia which have followed the Flood the great mountain ranges have attained far higher elevation than they did before Noah's time. But such a supposition would be applicable not only to the Ararat range but also to the Himalayas and the Cordilleras as well, and it would alleviate somewhat the problem of water supply for a universal flood."

(4) T. C. Mitchell (NBD, 427-428) summarizes as follows: "That everything (6:17), including man (6:7, 7:21) and beast (6:7, 13, 17; 1:21, 22), was to be blotted out by the Flood is clearly stated, but it can be argued that these categories are qualified by the statements of locality: upon the earth (*erets*: 6:17; 7:17, 23); under heaven (*shamayim*, 6:17, 7:19); and upon the ground (*adamah*: 7:4, 23). *Erets* can mean 'land' (e.g. Gn. 10:10), *shamayim* can mean 'sky,' or the visible part of heaven within the horizon (e.g., 1 Ki. 18:45), and the extent of *adamah* would be determined by these other two words; thus it is possible that a flood of unexampled severity might meet these conditions without covering the entire surface of the globe. The argument that such a flood would make the preservation of animals unnecessary might be countered with the suggestion that if a whole environmental zone with its own individual fauna were involved, such a measure would be necessary. The statement that all the high mountains (*bar*) under the whole heaven were covered (7:19, 20) and that near the end of the Flood they began to be seen (8:5) is interpreted in this scheme as a phenomenon due to the cloud and mist that must have accompanied the cataclysm. This interpretation favors a limited Flood, but the text is also capable of bearing the interpretation of a universal Flood, and dogmatism is not reasonable, either way. The

## GENESIS

theological teaching of the Bible has traditionally been interpreted in the sense that all men except Noah and his family were destroyed."

(5) R. Milligan (RR, 196-197) contends for the universality of the Flood. He writes: "The language of Moses, taken literally, proves, beyond all doubt, that the deluge was universal. (See Genesis 7:19-23 and 9:8-17). And so, also, do the words of Peter, in the third chapter of his second Epistle. This much is conceded by all parties. And, as it is a fundamental rule of interpretation that 'all words must be taken in their literal sense unless it can be shown, for reasons clear and satisfactory, that they should be construed figuratively,' the presumption is in favor of the old hypothesis, that the deluge was universal, and the burden of proof falls on those who would limit it to a portion of the earth's surface." To the above quotations, pro and con, I should call attention to certain scientific views bearing on the subject. Geologists tell us that they have the unequivocal testimony of the rocks that many of the high mountains of Eurasia and the Americas were, at a comparatively recent period, covered with water to such a depth that immense icebergs loaded with huge masses of granite, gneiss, sand, etc., were freighted over their summits and carried from the Polar regions toward the equator. They tell us that the rocky deposits found in our Central States came to be where they are in the following manner: that, during the successive periods of thawing and freezing in the Arctic regions, they were detached from mountain ranges; and that, at some time in the past, a vast inundation of water heaved them up, carried them across the continent, and deposited them where they are today. Again we quote Milligan: "It seems more reasonable to conclude, in the light of both Natural Science and Sacred Hermeneutics, that the Noachic deluge was universal; as the final conflagration will also be universal. But, which ever mode of interpreta-

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

tion is adopted, the student of the Bible may rest assured that there is here no more conflict between Natural Science and the Bible than there is between Natural Science and the testimony of every formation of the pre-Adamic earth."

(6) Again, the question has been raised as to whether in fact the Flood brought about the destruction of the whole human race. It has been pointed out that the lists of descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth, as given us in the tenth chapter of Genesis do not permit any easy identification of these ethnic groups with the peoples inhabiting the remote reaches of Africa, Far East Asia, Australia, and the Americas; especially is this said to be true of Australia, the land area in which such strangely unique human and subhuman species still survive that obviously are far removed, supposedly as the consequence of long separation from the Eurasian continent, from any possibility of identification with the human and subhuman specimens who became passengers in Noah's ark. Again, as suggested heretofore, the possibility cannot be ruled out arbitrarily that we have in the Biblical story of Adam and Eve and their offspring the account of the real origin of *natural man* by special Divine act (that is man created in God's image for the actualization of His Eternal Purpose); moreover, that this does not necessarily exclude the concomitant existence of humanoid ("near-human") species that have long been lost in the oblivion of passing time and change. Let it be stated here positively, that no real reason can be put forward for questioning the possible—even probable—biological modification and variation ("evolution") of species *regressively* as well as progressively, whatever humanoid or genuinely human specimens may have been involved. Archer (SOTI, 197-198): "Perhaps, then, these scholars suggest, we are to see in the family of Noah only the ancestors of the nations more immediately surrounding the Holy Land, that is, the peoples of the Near and Middle East, and of the Mediter-

## GENESIS

ranean coastlands." He then goes on to point up "three formidable difficulties, in the light of Biblical evidence," inherent in the notion of a more or less localized Flood, as follows: 1. The Divine purpose, as indicated in the Flood narrative, was to destroy the entire human race (Gen. 6:7, 17). "Even if we hold in abeyance the admissibility of translating *erets* here as 'land' rather than 'earth,' it seems quite evident that a total destruction of the human race was involved." 2. It is unquestionably evident in the Genesis account that it was man's wickedness *universally* that brought on the Divine judgment in the form of the Deluge. Cf. Gen. 6:5, 6:11. "It hardly seems likely that the ancestors of the Australians and Far Eastern peoples presented such a stark contrast in morals to the Middle Eastern nations that God saw fit to exempt them from the judgment of the Flood. The Scripture includes all mankind in the verdict of guilty (e.g., Rom. 3:19: . . . 'that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be guilty [RSV, 'accountable'] before God'). This is a basic premise of the New Testament gospel. No ground for differentiating between the nations closer to Palestine and those more remote from it can be possibly made out." 3. "The unequivocal corroboration of the New Testament that the destruction of the human race at the time of the Flood was total and universal." Cf. 2 Pet. 3:6, 2:5; and especially the words of Jesus, Matt. 24:38, 39—"knew not until the flood came, and took them all away." "While the word 'all' may not always be used in a completely universal sense in Scripture, it is consistently used to apply to the whole number of individuals involved in the situation under discussion. Certainly all men since Adam have been sinners; therefore even in Noah's day all must have been included in the destruction of the great Deluge." 4. The universality of the traditions (oral and written) of the Flood which have long persisted among the most widely

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

distributed geographically and most culturally diverse peoples of earth. (This will be treated *infra*.) Cf. again Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26, 27: *the writer of the present text wants it to be clearly understood that he has no intention, now or ever, of entering into a controversy with the Lord Jesus Christ on any subject whatsoever, the One before whose mind the vision of eternity as well as of time (as defined by Plato, "the moving image of eternity") was ever-present.*

(7) Dr. Henry M. Morris, distinguished professor of engineering science, states what he calls "very cogent reasons" for accepting the Scripture account of the Flood as describing a universal cataclysm, as follows (SBS, 40-42): 1. "The expressions of universality in the account (Genesis 6-9) are not confined to one or two verses, but are repeated in various ways more than a score of times, the writer apparently guarding by every means possible against this very theory that the Flood might only be a limited inundation." 2. "There are numerous references to the Flood in later parts of Scripture, all plainly indicating that the writers regarded the account in worldwide terms. The Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26, 27) makes the worldwide judgment of the Deluge to be a type of His own return in judgment on the present world." 3. "The record makes it plain that the waters overtopped the mountains which even in the vicinity of the Tigris-Euphrates region reach great heights. The mountains of Ararat contain peaks over fifteen thousand feet high. The waters 'prevailed upon the earth' at least 150 days, so that waters which covered mountains in one region of the world must necessarily have attained to similar elevations in all other parts of the world." 4. "The primary purpose of the Flood was to 'destroy all flesh' and especially to destroy man from the earth. During the years before the Flood (perhaps 1600), conditions were evidently favorable to abundant procreation. The idea that man could

## GENESIS

only have spread over a small region during this period is quite unreasonable and certainly could not be said to harmonize with anthropology. Consequently, the geographical extent of the Flood would have to be worldwide." 5. "The purpose of the Ark was to 'keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth,' but this purpose was entirely superficial and unreasonable if the only life that was destroyed was within a certain limited area. The Ark had a carrying capacity at least equal to that of 500 ordinary cattle cars, far too large for the needs of merely a small region." 6. "Most important, the entire Biblical record of the Flood becomes almost ridiculous if it is conceived in terms of a local flood. The whole procedure of constructing a great boat, involving a tremendous amount of work, can hardly be described as anything but utterly foolish and unnecessary. How much more sensible it would have been for God merely to have warned Noah of the coming destruction, so that he could have moved to another region to which the Flood would not reach. The great numbers of animals of all kinds, and certainly the birds (which migrate vast distances), could easily have moved out also, without having to be stored and tended for a year in the Ark. The entire story thus becomes little more than nonsense if it is taken as a mere local flood in Mesopotamia."

(8) Under the caption of "geological implications" of the Narration of the Flood, Dr. Morris has added other telling points, as the following: 1. "There were great volcanic and tectonic disturbances, and great quantities of juvenile water (i.e., water which emerged for the first time from the earth's crust to become part of the earth's surface waters) poured out on the earth. This is the reasonable implication of statements made concerning the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep (Gen. 7:11, 8-2)." 2. "Antediluvian meteorological conditions

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

were quite different in character from those now prevailing. Otherwise, it would have been quite impossible for rain to have fallen continuously for forty days and forty nights all around the world, especially in such torrential fashion that it was described as the 'flood-gates' (A.V. 'windows') of Heaven being opened. The tremendous amounts of water implied are not possible under present atmospheric conditions," etc. 3. "The great volumes of water which were thus turned loose on the earth, both from 'the fountains of the great deep' and from the 'flood-gates of heaven, must, of absolute necessity, have accomplished a vast amount of geologic work in relatively short period. The Bible also speaks of the waters 'going and returning continually' (Genesis 8:3), then of 'the mountains rising and the valleys sinking, with the waters hastening away' (Psa. 104:6-9, A.S.V.), and of the waters overturning the earth' (Job 12:15). Erosion and resedimentation must have taken place on a gigantic scale. Previous isostatic adjustments, of whatever sort they were, must have been entirely unbalanced by the great complex of hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces unleashed in the floodwaters, resulting very likely in great telluric movements. Associated with the volcanic phenomena and the great rains must also have been tremendous tidal effects, windstorms, and a great complexity of currents, cross-currents, whirlpools, and other hydraulic phenomena. After the flood-gates were restrained, and the fountains of the deep stopped, for a long time much more geologic work must have been accomplished at the masses of water were settling into new basins and the earth was adjusting itself to new physiographic and hydrologic balances." 4. "Since the Flood was said to have killed 'every living substance upon the face of the ground,' and in view of the great masses of sediment being moved back and forth and finally deposited by the flood-waters, it would be expected that great numbers of plants and animals would be buried

## GENESIS

by the sediments, under conditions eminently favorable to preservation and fossilization. Conditions for extensive fossil production could never have been so favorable as during the Deluge. Since the Deluge was worldwide and recent, this can only mean that many, probably most, of the fossils that are now found in earth's sedimentary rock beds were entombed there during the Flood." 5. "Finally, it may very fairly be inferred from the record that it would now be impossible to discern geologically much of the earth's history prior to the Flood, at least on the assumption of continuity with present conditions. Whatever geologic deposits may have existed before the Flood must have been almost completely eroded, reworked, and redeposited during the Flood, perhaps several times. Such geologic time-clocks as we may be able to use to date events subsequent to the Flood cannot therefore legitimately be used to extend chronologies into antediluvian time. The basic premise of all such chronometers is uniformity and, if the Flood record be true, the premise of uniformity is, at that point at least, false."

*Uniformitarianism might be used legitimately to describe changes in the permanently fashioned earth, but the theory simply does not lend itself to an adequate description of the origin of earth as a separate planet. There are indeed many aspects of geology, as earth-science, in the explanation of which catastrophism is far more felicitous than uniformitarianism. As Dr. Morris concludes (pp. 43-44): "In view of all the above facts, it is necessary to conclude that the geologic principle of uniformity would not have been in operation during at least two extremely important periods of earth history, the Creation and the Deluge. Thus the Bible, and not the present, is the key to the future. This is a very important fact, because the entire structure of evolutionary historical geology rests squarely upon the assumption of uniformity, and the scientific basis of the theory of evolution is almost*



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

entirely grounded on the testimony of historical geology. And in turn the theory of evolution has been made the basis of all the godless philosophies that are plaguing the world today and in particular is the spearhead of attack against Biblical Christianity.”

*To this we add that any person with normal intelligence could easily see that the earth could not have been brought into existence by the same physical forces and processes which operate to preserve it in existence and to effect whatever changes that may take place from time to time, as cause-and-effect, in its constitution as an existing entity (planet). It would be absurd to propose uniformitarianism as the explanation of the hypothetical origin of the earth (and indeed of astronomical bodies in general) as suggested by the contents of such recently published books as Struve's *Stellar Evolution*, Ashford's *From Atoms to Stars*, Gamow's *Biography of the Earth*, Hoyle's *Nature of the Universe*, etc.*

Rehwinkel, in his book entitled *The Flood*, presents a description of the world (earth) before the Flood that is intriguing, to say the least. As he pictures it, it was a world characterized by such features as the following: 1. A vast amount of "living space" (as compared with our postdiluvian earth with its uninhabitable desert and mountain belts, its tundras, its swamps, its ice-covered continents, etc.). 2. A uniformly mild climate in all its parts, as a consequence probably of various phenomena, such as (a) a non-tilted stance of the earth (whereas our earth's axis inclines about  $23\frac{1}{2}$  degrees in relation to its orbital plane), (b) the consequent distribution of warm ocean waters around the then existing land masses, and (c) the probable enshrouding of the earth of that time under a canopy of vapor which intercepted the direct rays of the sun. 3. A flora and fauna far superior to that of our age (note, for example, the luxuriance of plant life in that early world, as indicated by the great coal beds

## GENESIS

found in every continent today). 4. A human population endowed with far greater physical vigor than that on earth subsequent to the flood, and consequently long-lived. 5. A human race which had grown to sufficient proportions to enable it to take possession of a very large part of the earth as it then existed, and which had made great progress both in the useful arts and in the fine arts, thus indicating a highly advanced civilization. On what evidence does Rehwinkel base these conclusions? We have not the space here, of course, to present the details of his argument. Suffice it to say that his main supporting evidence is the fact of diversified mammal remains which have been found in ossiferous fissures in widely separated places in both hemispheres. Because no complete skeleton has been found, the inference is that these animals did not fall into the fissures while yet alive. Moreover, there is no indication of weathering in these bones nor of their being rolled by water. Hence, since they were found to be cemented together by calcite, the conclusion is that they must have been deposited under water in the first place. These finds point, undoubtedly, to a sudden catastrophe which broke up the earth's crust into enormous cracks, into which were poured the corpses of great numbers of animals that had been overwhelmed suddenly by a flood. In some instances, the remains indicate that the animals had perished instantly in great numbers. The remains of the mammoth—an *extinct* species— have been found in many divergent places of earth; hence, in this case the matter of first importance is the actual date of their extinction. The unsolved problem here is whether or not fluorin dating and carbon 14 tests would indicate a date sufficiently late to identify the catastrophe with Noah's Flood. Of course, the reliability of carbon 14 dating is now being questioned in several quarters. For instance, Albright in an interview repeated in *Christianity Today* (Jan. 18, 1963, p. 4) went so far as to say that

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

"carbon 14 is now almost totally useless in dating bones, which contain a minimum of carbon." Rehwinkel, generally speaking, thinks of the antediluvian world as cotemporaneous with the history of early man as we find it in the first eight chapters of Genesis. To appreciate the details of his argument, one must read his book; this the student of the Bible who really wants to be informed will do.

For a thoroughgoing presentation of the evidence for the universality of the Flood, from every point of view—both Biblical and scientific—the student should read the excellent book by Drs. Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, Jr., the former a scientist of high repute and the latter an equally informed Bible scholar. The title of the book is *The Genesis Flood* (See GF in our list of Bibliographical Abbreviations *supra*). These authors summarize their basic arguments for the geographical universality of the Flood as follows: "(1) The Bible says that the waters of the Flood covered the highest mountains to a depth sufficient for the Ark to float over them; (2) the Bible also informs us that this situation prevailed for a period of five months and that an additional seven months were required for the waters to subside sufficiently for Noah to disembark in the mountains of Ararat; (3) the expression, "fountains of the great deep were broken up," points unmistakably to vast geological disturbances that are incompatible with the local-Flood concept, especially when these disturbances are said to have continued for five months; (4) the construction of the Ark with a capacity of at least 1,400,000 cubic feet, merely for the purpose of carrying eight people and a few animals through a local inundation is utterly inconceivable; (5) if the Flood had been limited in extent, there would have been no need for an ark at all, for there would have been plenty of time for Noah's family to escape from the danger-area, to say nothing of the birds and beasts; (6) Peter's use of

## GENESIS

the Flood as a basis for refuting uniformitarian skeptics in the last days would have been pointless if the Flood had been merely a local one, especially when we consider the cosmic setting into which he placed that cataclysm (2 Pet. 3:3-7); and (7) a widely distributed human race could not have been destroyed by a local Flood. In support of our seventh argument, we presented four Biblical reasons for the necessity of a total destruction of humanity in the days of Noah: (1) since the stated purpose of the Flood was the punishment of a sinful race, such a purpose could not have been accomplished if only a part of humanity had been affected; (2) the fact that the Flood destroyed the rest of mankind is greatly strengthened by repeated statements in Genesis, 1 Peter, and 2 Peter, to the effect that *only* Noah and his family were spared; (3) the Lord Jesus Christ clearly stated that all men were destroyed by the Flood (Luke 17:26-30); and (4) the covenant which God made with Noah after the Flood becomes meaningless if only a part of the human race had been involved. In addition to these arguments for total destruction of the human race except for Noah's family, we give two reasons for believing that the human race could not have been confined to the Mesopotamian Valley at the time of the Flood: (1) the longevity and fecundity of the antediluvians would allow for a rapid increase in population even if only 1,655 years elapsed between Adam and the Flood; and the prevalence of strife and violence would have encouraged wide distribution rather than confinement to a single locality; (2) evidence of human fossils in widely-scattered parts of the world makes it difficult to assume that men did not migrate beyond the Near East before the time of the Flood. The writers are firmly convinced that these basic arguments, if carefully weighed by Christian thinkers, would prove to be sufficiently powerful and compelling to settle once and for all the long-debated question of the geographical extent of

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

the Flood. This is not to say, of course, that a universal Flood presents no serious scientific problems; for the remaining chapters of this volume are devoted largely to an examination of such problems. But we do believe that no problem be it scientific or philosophical, can be of sufficient magnitude to offset the combined force of these seven Biblical arguments for a geographically universal Flood in the days of Noah" (GF, 33-35). The foregoing excerpt should encourage the genuinely interested Bible student to secure a copy of the Morris-Whitcomb book and study in searchingly from beginning to end before joining the ranks of the mythologizers and "demythologizers."

### 4. *The Alleged Composite Character of the Flood Narrative*

The analytical critics have parceled out the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Genesis among their hypothetical J and P and R (for "redactor") sources. However, as Archer puts it (SOTI, 119), "these divergencies are made possible only by an artificial process of dissection." For example, it is insisted by the critics that the general command to take two of every species into the ark (assigned to P) is incompatible with the exceptional provision to take seven of every "clean" species (attributed to J). But the basis for this distinction seems so obvious that any ordinary reader should understand it. Green (UBG, 91, 92): "There is no discrepancy between the general direction (6:19P), to take a pair of each kind of animals into the ark in order to preserve alive the various species, and the more specific requirement, when the time arrived for entering the ark, that clean beasts should be taken by sevens and the unclean by twos (7:2J). If it had been said that only two should be taken of each kind, the case would have been different. J also relapses into the general form of statement (7:9); or if the critics prefer, R does so, which amounts to the same thing, as by

## GENESIS

hypothesis he had J's previous statement before him. There is no contradiction here any more than there is between the general and the more exact statement of Noah's age in 7:6 and 11."

Again, the critics profess to find a discrepancy concerning the number of days during which the Flood lasted. They insist that J gives the duration of it as forty days (Gen. 7:12, 17; 8:6—plus two more weeks for the sending out of the dove), whereas P makes it to have been 150 days (Gen. 7:24). Archer (SOTI, 119): "But a consecutive reading of the whole narrative makes it apparent that the author put the length of the downpour itself at forty days, whereas the prevalence of the water level above the highest portions of the land surface endured for 150 days (for 7:24 does not say that it rained during that entire period." Allis (FBM, 97-100) points out that only in the three major points that are emphasized in the Flood narrative is it possible to make out a case for alleged "parallel accounts." These are: universal wickedness as occasioning the necessity for Divine judgment; the destruction of "all flesh" as the purpose of it; and the gracious rescue of a chosen remnant of human and subhuman creatures from this destruction. These three points of emphasis exemplify the characteristic Hebrew device of reiteration for the sake of emphasis. Outside these points, however, says Allis, it is impossible to ferret out parallel accounts which do not depend on each other to supply the missing links (details). All this boils down to the fact that the data involved in the Mosaic text are easily reconcilable with unity of authorship, but on the other hand present serious obstacles to attempted allocation into divergent sources. (It seems to be a characteristic of the Teutonic analytical mentality to see discrepancies where none exist, that is, to be unable to see the forest for the trees.) Green (UBG, 9-93) exposes in detail this false methodological device of "parading a part as though it

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

were a whole." The student is referred to this work if he is interested in pursuing the study of this critical problem. Green's treatment of the documentary theory here, that is, with respect to the narrative of the Flood, is so thorough as to compel rejection of the theory by all unbiased minds. Again we quote Allis: "The second feature of the Biblical style which readily lends itself to source analysis is the frequency with which elaboration and repetition occur in the Bible. It is true that the style of the Bible is often marked by brevity and compactness. A great deal is often said in remarkably few words. But the Bible is a very emphatic book. Its aim is to impress upon the hearer or reader the great importance of the themes of which it treats. The most natural way of securing emphasis in a narrative is by amplification or reiteration. Consequently the Biblical style is often decidedly diffuse and characterized by elaborateness of detail and by repetition. . . . There is perhaps no better illustration of repetitive style in the Old Testament than this flood narrative in Genesis."

### 5. *Universality of the Traditions of the Flood*

(1) The extent to which oral and written traditions of the Flood have persisted in all parts of the world is most significant. Uniformly these are accounts of an earlier race or an early world that was once destroyed by the Deluge. The peoples of Southwest Asia—Sumerians, Akkadians, Babylonians, Assyrians, etc.—might be expected, of course, to cherish a tradition similar to that of the Hebrew people, as they inhabited the areas generally accepted as the seat of antediluvian cultures. The Egyptian version is repeated in Plato's *Timaeus* (his "likely story" of the Creation of the world by the Demiurgos). In the version preserved by Manetho the Egyptian priest (3rd century B.C.) the only one saved from the Deluge was the god Thoth. In the Greek account, Zeus, the

## GENESIS

supreme god of the Greek pantheon, is represented as having determined to destroy the race because of its utter degeneracy. However, on the basis of their piety, it was decided to save one Deucalion and his wife Pyrrha. Deucalion built a ship in which he and his wife floated in safety during the nine days' flood which destroyed all the rest of the people. The ship finally came to rest on Mt. Parnassus in Phocia, whereupon the two survivors consulted the sanctuary of Themis and gained knowledge as to how the race might be restored. Thus arose the tradition of the autochthonous origin of the Attican people, from stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha behind them: from those thrown by the former, men sprang up out of the soil, and from those cast by Pyrrha, women sprang up. (This story is exquisitely told by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*). The Egyptian and Greek traditions might have been a borrowing, of course, from the Near East. The same could be true of the Noah tradition in Apamea (in Asia Minor) which apparently inspired a representation of the ark on some of their coins. Archer (SOTI, 199): "But what shall we say of the legend of Manu preserved among the Hindus (according to which Manu and seven others were saved in a ship from a world-wide flood); or of Fah-he among the Chinese (who was the only survivor, along with his wife, three sons and three daughters); or of Nu-u among the Hawaiians, or of Tezpi among the Mexican Indians, or of Manabozho among the Algonquins? All of these agree that all mankind was destroyed by a great flood (usually represented as world-wide) as a result of divine displeasure at human sin, and that a single man with his family or a very few friends survived the catastrophe by means of a ship or raft or large canoe of some sort."

(2) Again, what shall we say of the numerous Flood traditions which do not include the saving instrumentality



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

of an ark or boat of some kind? Among the Andaman Islanders, for example (in the Bay of Bengal), and the Battaks of Sumatra, a high mountain top is said to have provided the refuge for a lone survivor. Other primitive traditions follow the basic structure of the Genesis narrative: they preserve the report of a universal deluge which wiped out the whole human race with the exception of only one or two survivors. Among those holding such traditions, Archer (p. 199) lists the Kurnai (a tribe of Australian aborigines), the Fiji Islanders, the natives of Polynesia, Micronesia, New Guinea, New Zealand, New Hebrides, the ancient Celts of Wales, the tribesmen of Lauke Caudie in the Sudan, the Hottentots, and the Greenlanders. He summarizes as follows: "Whether or not the world-wide prevalence of these traditions is reconcilable with a local-flood theory, at least it emphasizes the inclusion of all human races in the descendants of Noah, rather than excepting some of the populations of Africa, India, China and America (as Ramm seems to imply in CVSS 239-240)." It seems most reasonable to conclude that this universal tradition must have emanated from a common origin and become world-wide through diffusion of peoples from that common origin. And certainly the Biblical account of the Noachic Flood must be accepted as that common origin, if on no other ground than that of its moral and spiritual motif. (The student is referred to Richard Andree's German work *Die Flutsagen* [1891] for the most complete collection of Flood legends from all over the world, and to Sir James Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament* [Vol. I, 1918] for what is perhaps the most comprehensive collection in English).

### 6. *The Babylonian Story of the Flood*

(1) This version of the Deluge story constitutes the eleventh book of the famous Assyrian-Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh. The cuneiform text in its extent form came

## GENESIS

from the library of the Assyrian king, Ashurbanipal (669-626 B.C.), but was evidently transcribed from much older originals. The Flood tablets were unearthed by Rassam at what was once Nineveh, but not identified until 1872, when George Smith, who was then engaged in studying and classifying cuneiform finds, first recognized them. This was one of the most spectacular discoveries in the whole history of Biblical archaeology. However, this Assyrian version of the story of the Deluge was similar in substance to an older Sumerian legend, recorded on the fragment of a tablet found at ancient Nippur in north central Babylonia. In this tablet it is recorded how a certain king-priest Ziusudra, warned of an approaching deluge which the assembly of the gods had decreed for the purpose of destroying mankind (despite the groanings of the goddess Ishtar for her people), built a huge boat in which he "rode out" the threatened catastrophe. This table dates from about 2000 B.C., but the story had been known in Mesopotamia for centuries. It is found in Akkadian versions from both Babylonia and Assyria, in more than one composition. The best known of these is the one mentioned above, which forms part of Tablet XI of the longer composition, the Epic of Gilgamesh, and which was as Assyrian recension of the Akkadian, and in which Ziusudra of the older Sumerian version reappears as the legendary hero under the name of Utnapishtim ("the day of life").

As the story is given in the Assyrian (generally designated the Babylonian) narrative, the hero Gilgamesh is seeking the last survivor of the great Flood to learn from him the secret of immortality. After crossing difficult mountain ranges and successfully navigating the Waters of Death, Gilgamesh finally meets Utnapishtim, who tells him all about his salvation from the Flood through his obedience to the god Ea, the god of wisdom. The follow-

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

ing is Utnapishtim's story, as summarized in texts by Cornfeld (AtD), Unger AOT), Archer (SOTI), et al (translations in quotes from Pritchard [Ed], *Ancient Near East Texts*). The gods in assembly had decided on the destruction of mankind by a flood. The god Ea wanted to warn Utnapishtim, but apparently it was forbidden to divulge the proceedings of the assembly. Nevertheless Ea devised a strategy by which he enabled Utnapishtim, who dwelt at Shuruppak, a city on the Euphrates, to escape the impending doom by means of a huge cube-shaped boat. The poet then describes the approaching storm: "The gods were frightened by the deluge; the gods crouched like dogs." Especially did Ishtar, the sweet-voiced mistress of the gods, bewail her part in the destruction of her people by the Flood; and after contemplating the terrible doom that was falling upon mankind as a consequence of their decree, all the gods mourned. The storm, which was brief, lasting only six days and six nights, was of such violence of wind and rain, that the gods themselves were terrified. After landing on Mount Nisir, one of the mountains of "Urartu" (Ararat?) in the Zagros Range northeast of Babylon, the ark held fast, and Utnapishtim sent out, in the order named, a dove, a swallow, and a raven. The raven did not return. Then he let out all "to the four winds and offered a sacrifice." The gods responded in a most undignified way to the sacrifice so gratefully offered by the hero: "The gods smelled the savor, The gods smelled the sweet savor, The gods crowded like flies about the sacrifice." Enlil (or Bel) showed up later incensed that Utnapishtim had escaped death, but Ea successfully appealed to his sense of justice, and thereupon he elevated Utnapishtim and his wife to a blessed immortality. (It is interesting to note here than in an older version of the Flood tradition—the Atrahasis Epic—a different, and very significant, cause of the Deluge is

## GENESIS

given. "The land became wide, the people became numerous, the land hummed like a lyre (or: bellowed like old oxen). The god (Enlil) was disturbed by the uproar. Enlil heard their clamor, And said to the great gods: 'Oppressive has become the clamor of mankind; by their clamor they prevent sleep.'" This sounds very much like the cause of Divine judgment declared in Genesis 6:13: "The earth is filled with violence." It bears not too remote a resemblance to the clamor—riots, revolutions, demonstrations, orgies, cruelties, wars—of mankind in our own time.

What, then, are we to conclude as regards the relation between the Babylonian and the Hebrew accounts of the great Deluge? It must be admitted that there are several striking similarities. Unger (AOT, 55-65) lists these as follows: both accounts (1) state explicitly that the Flood was divinely planned; (2) agree that the fact of the impending catastrophe was divinely revealed to the hero involved; (3) connect the Deluge with moral degeneracy of the human race; (4) tell of the deliverance of the hero and his family; (5) assert that the hero was divinely instructed to build a huge boat for this deliverance; (6) indicate the physical causes of the Flood; (7) specify the duration of the Flood; (8) name the landing place of the boat; (9) tell of the sending forth of birds at certain intervals to ascertain the measure of the subsidence of the waters; (10) describe acts of worship by the hero after his deliverance; (11) allude to the bestowing of special blessings on the hero following the disaster.

On the other hand, account must be taken of the differences in details between the narratives, and in those details especially that are of ethical and spiritual significance. Heidel (GEOTP, 14) has carefully analyzed a number of these differences (repeated briefly by Morris and Whitcomb [GF, 39] according to the following table:

# THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

## *Genesis Narrative*

## *Babylonian Account*

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1. The <i>Author</i><br>of the Flood            | The one living and true God brought on the Flood to wipe out universal human degeneracy.   | The Flood was invoked by the rashness of the god Enlil, and in opposition to the will of the other gods.   |
| 2. The <i>Announcement</i><br>of the Flood      | God Himself warned Noah of the impending judgment, but gave man 120 years to repent and reform.  | The fact of impending doom is kept as a secret by the gods, but Utnapishtim is surreptitiously warned of it by the god Ea.   |
| 3. The <i>Ark</i> and its<br><i>Occupants</i>   | Noah's ark is said to have been 300 x 50 x 50 cubits, with three decks, carrying eight persons, two pairs of each unclean animal species, seven pairs of each clean animal species, plus the necessary food. | The Ark is 120 x 120 x 120 cubits, with nine decks, carrying the hero's family and relatives plus all his gold and silver, the boatman, all craftsmen (or learned men), and "the seed of all living creatures."  |
| 4. <i>Causes and Duration</i><br>of the Flood   | Caused by the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep and the openings of the windows of heaven, continuing for 150 days followed by an additional 221 days during which the waters subsided.         | The only cause mentioned is rain, and this lasted only six days, then after an unspecified number of days the occupants left the vessel.   |
| 5. The <i>Birds</i>                             | A raven is sent out first, then a dove three times at intervals of seven days.   | A dove is sent out first, then a swallow, and finally a raven, at unspecified intervals. No mention is made of the olive leaf.   |
| 6. The <i>Sacrifice</i><br>and <i>Blessings</i> | The Lord graciously received Noah's sacrifice, gave him and his family a commission to repopulate the earth, emphasized the sanctity of human life, promised never again to destroy the earth by a flood.    | The hungry gods "gathered like flies" around the offerer because they had been so long deprived of food. A quarrel between Enlil and Ea ensued. Finally Enlil blessed Utnapishtim and his wife, after being rebuked by Ea for his rashness in bringing the Flood upon them. Finally, the hero and his wife were rewarded by deification. |

## GENESIS

What, then, can we reasonably conclude about the relation between these two Flood narratives? *That the Babylonians borrowed from the Genesis account?* Hardly, because the earliest known tablets from Mesopotamia are undoubtedly much older than the book of Genesis: indeed they are dated back as far as the third millenium B.C. On the other hand, it is possible that the version of the Deluge given us in Genesis may have existed in some form, even possibly in oral tradition, centuries before it became embodied by supervisory inspiration of the Spirit in the Mosaic account. Then can we accept the view advanced by certain archaeologists, *That the Genesis account is a borrowing from earlier Babylonian traditions?* Or, *that it was a transplant, as some have contended, from western Amorite traditions both to Palestine and to Babylonia?* Here, however, we encounter an insuperable difficulty—that of the divergent character, in motif and in tone, of the two accounts. That is to say, the Biblical account of the Flood is so far more rational, consistent, and ethically elevated in content, that it would be unreasonable to assume that it is in any respect borrowed from, or de-thetical earlier sources. For example, in the Babylonian Flood story the gods are represented as gathering clouds and bringing on thunder and lightning, thus producing such fearsome celestial clamor; that the terror of the storm drives the gods themselves into the most inaccessible heaven. But, as Kaufmann points out, in the Genesis account there is no mention of terrifying natural spectacles; on the contrary, “God brings on the Flood by opening the gates of the deep and the windows of heaven; clouds are not even mentioned,” nor is there any mention of “divine raging in storm.” Cornfeld (AtD, 31): “The parallels between the Biblical account and the Babylonian version are fairly obvious and at times remarkable for their resemblance, though the major part of the Epic of Gilgamesh is far different. Its polytheist spirit is in contrast

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

with the basic purpose of the Hebrew narrative. In form the latter is impersonal and it purports to account for God's actions, his motives and his judgment by the depravity of humanity. The story told by Utnapishtim is in the form of an illustrative tale, in which he tries to convince his listeners that immortality was granted to him under unique circumstances, never again to be achieved by a mortal. It contains no judgment on the concern of the gods or on the moral conduct of man." (See Unger, AOT, 65-71, for a thoroughgoing presentation of the vast differences between the two accounts, in their conceptions of God, in their moral conceptions, and even in their philosophical assumptions—hopeless confusion of matter and spirit and attribution of eternity to both, etc.).

Finally, in this connection, could it possibly be, as a third explanation of the relation between the two accounts, *that both might have originated from a common source which had its beginning in an actual occurrence?* On this point, Unger (ATO, 70) quotes A. T. Clay (*The Origin of Biblical Traditions, Yale Oriental Series, XII* [1923], p. 164) as follows: "Assyriologists, as far as I know, have generally dismissed as an impossibility the idea that there was a common Semitic tradition, which developed in Israel in one way, and in Babylonia in another. They have unreservedly declared that the Biblical stories have been borrowed from Babylonia, in which land they were indigenous. To me it has always seemed perfectly reasonable that both stories had a common origin among the Semites, some of whom entered Babylonia, while others carried their traditions into Palestine." To this, Unger himself adds (ATO, 71): "The Hebrews scarcely lived an isolated life, and it would be strange indeed if they did not possess similar traditions as other Semitic nations. These common traditions among the Hebrews are reflected in the true and authentic facts given them by divine inspiration in their sacred writings. Moses very likely was

## GENESIS

conversant with these traditions. If he was, inspiration enabled him to record them accurately, purged of all their crude polytheistic incrustations and to adapt them to the elevated framework of truth and pure monotheism. If he was not, the Spirit of God was able to give him the revelation of these events apart from the need of any oral or written sources. In either case supernatural inspiration was equally necessary, whether to purge the perverted polytheistic tradition and refine it to fit the mold of monotheism or to give an original revelation of the authentic facts apart from oral or written sources." We are in complete agreement with these conclusions.

### 7. *The Physiographic Causes of the Flood*

(1) *Gen. 7:11; cf. 8:2.* (a) "*All the fountains of the great deep were broken up*" (R.S.V., "burst forth"). T. Lewis (CDHCG, 305) suggests that the "great deep" here refers to the concept of subterranean oceans from which the waters burst forth. Likewise Skinner (ICCG, 164): "Outbursts of subterranean water are a frequent accompaniment of seismic disturbances in the alluvial districts of great rivers; and a knowledge of this fact must have suggested the feature here expressed. In accordance with ancient ideas, however, it is conceived as an eruption of the subterranean ocean on which the earth was believed to rest. At the same time *the windows of heaven were opened* allowing the waters of the heavenly ocean to mingle with the lower." The view seems to prevail among commentators that the phrase, "fountains of the great deep" implies that the waters of all seas broke out and poured over the land, that the earth was rent asunder in many areas, and great fissures or chasms appeared on its surface. But such changes as these are cataclysmic, such as are caused only by earthquakes, volcanic activities, tidal waves, etc. (Cf., however, my *Genesis*, Vol. I, pp. 270-276, in which it is emphasized that the "deep" of *Gen. 1:2* could well have been *the depths of infinite space*, on the basis



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

of the meaning of the context in which the word occurs, and on the basis also of the fact that in the thinking of the ancients what we today call *chaos* really did mean *empty space*. Of course, all such events as those associated with the bursting forth of subterranean waters and even with the downpour of waters in the form of rain *incur atmospheric changes of all kinds* (and surely the "firmament" [literally, "expanse"] of Gen. 1:6-8 is descriptive of the regions of the atmosphere which make up space in general). Lange suggests this fact, in relation to the meaning of Gen. 7:11 (CDHCG, 305): "*All the fountains of the great deep were broken up*: the passive form denotes violent changes in the depths of the sea or in the action of the earth—at all events in the atmosphere.") (b) "*The windows of heaven were opened*" (A.S.V., "the heavens"); that is, the flood-gates (sluices) were opened for rain from above. "*And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.*" Literally, "*there was violent rain,*" etc. The verb here is not that which is used to designate any rain, but that which clearly designates torrential rain: it is used of other things which God is said to pour down from heaven (Exo. 9:18, 16:4). (For the phrase "windows of heaven," see Gen. 8:2, 2 Ki. 7:19, Isa. 24:18, Mal. 3:10.) Whitelaw (PCG, 117, 118): "Though the language is metaphorical and optical, it clearly points to a change in the land level by which the ocean waters overflowed the depressed continent, accompanied with heavy and continuous rain, as the cause of the Deluge . . . yet 'the exact statement of the natural causes that concurred in the Deluge is a circumstance which certainly in no wise removes the miraculous nature of the whole fact—who has unveiled the mysteries of nature?—but certainly shows how exact was the attention paid to the external phenomena of the Deluge' (Havernick)." But, someone may object, the water cycle on our planet operates in a closed system. The critic overlooks the fact that the

## GENESIS

Flood could have changed the original balance between lands and seas and heavy rain of the duration specified could have contributed greatly to this change. But—*where did all the water come from?* Rehwinkel suggests: (a) in normal times there are areas in the world where heavy rains continue to fall day after day, year in and year out; (b) there is clear evidence that the Flood was accompanied by an abrupt change in climate resulting finally in the rigors of the polar regions of the earth; (c) extensive volcanic activities in all parts of the earth could have contributed to the formation of clouds and heavy rainfall. In a word, the impact of these sudden changes must have been terrific as cold air and cold water currents met and mingled with the warm, producing mountains of fog and cloud rising into the air and discharging their load in torrential rains. *Noah's flood was not just a "normal" flood—it was cataclysmic. This is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture from beginning to end, that special Divine Judgments are, to say the least, horrendous, producing catastrophe and temporary chaos in the physical world, and terror in all mortals who experience them (cf. Exo. 19:16-24; Rom. 2:8-11; Heb. 10:26-31, 12:18-29; Rev. 4:5, 6:15-17). Even the experience of the Divine Presence in blessing is awesome beyond the power of mortal man to apprehend or describe in words (cf. Gen. 19:16-17).*

8. *Successive Stages in the Increase of the Flood (7:17-19).*

V. 17: The waters increased, that is, *grew great*: this first increase was marked by the elevation of the Ark above the land. V. 18: The waters increased greatly, the second degree of increase marked by the moving (floating) of the Ark upon the waters. V. 19—The waters prevailed (became strong) exceedingly, the third degree of increase being marked by the submergence of the high mountains. Note Whitelaw's comment here (PCG, 119):

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

"While it is admitted that the words may depict a complete submergence of the globe, it is maintained by many competent scholars that the necessities of exegesis demand only a partial inundation." Again (p. 121) in reference to the universality of the Flood: "The conclusion seems to be that, while Scripture does not imperatively forbid the idea of a partial Delugem science seems to require it, and, without ascribing to all the scientific objections that are urged against the universality of the Flood that importance which their authors assign to them, it may be safely affirmed that there is considerable reason for believing that the *mabbul* which swept away the antediluvian men was confined to the region which they inhabited." (For the pros and cons of this controversy, see PCG, under "Homiletics," pp. 119-121). Strange as it may seem, Murphy, whose orthodoxy can hardly be questioned, takes the same view. He writes (MG, 193): "*Upon the land.* The land is to be understood of the portion of the earth's surface known to man. This, with an unknown margin beyond it, was covered with the waters. But this is all that Scripture warrants us to assert. Concerning the distant parts of Europe, the continents of Africa, America, or Australia, we can say nothing. *All the hills were covered.* Not a hill was above water within the horizon of the spectator or of man." Again (p. 192): "The beautiful figure of the windows of the skies being opened is preceded by the equally striking one of the fountains of the great deep being broken up. This was the chief source of the flood. A change in the level of the land was accomplished. That which had emerged from the waters of the third day of the last creation was now again submerged. The waters of the great deep now broke their bounds, flowed in on the sunken surface, and drowned the world of man, with all its inhabitants. The accompanying heavy rain of forty days and nights was, in reality, only a subsidiary instrument in the deluging of

## GENESIS

the land." (It should be noted here that Murphy renders *erets* as "land" and *bar* as "hills" [not "mountains"] in these verses.) (All these various excerpts from eminent authorities of all persuasions—"conservative" or "liberal" or in-between—certainly show that the controversy between the advocates of the universal-flood theory and those of the localized-flood theory is still going on, and without any prospect of dogmatic resolution. The author of the present text must confess that he is inclined to the acceptance of the vigorous presentation of the universal-flood theory, as found in the texts by Rehwinkel, and by Morris and Whitcomb.)

### 9. *The Contents of the Ark.*

(1) These included Noah and his wife, their three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and their respective wives, eight persons in all (Gen. 7:7, 8:17; also 1 Pet. 3:20; 2 Pet. 2:5); of every living species, by twos, that is, male and female (6:19, 7:2, 7:8-9; and 7:15-16, which especially makes it clear that "two and two" means, "by twos," or male and female). It seems evident that in the first communication from God (6:19), which was given 120 years previous to the actual event, when detailed instructions were not as yet necessary, it was simply stated that the animals should be preserved by pairs; that in the second, when the Ark was finished and the animals were about to be assembled, an exception was to be made to the previously announced general rule, namely, that not just one pair, but seven pairs of one kind (*clean* animals) and two pairs of another kind (*unclean* animals), were to be preserved. (Cf. 7:2, "*of beasts that are not clean by two,*" etc. Whitelaw [PCG, 115]: "Cf. Gen. 2:25, where the phrase denotes the ethical personality of human beings, to which there is here an approximation, as the preserved animals were designed to be the parents of subsequent races. The usual phrase which is employed in ch. 1:28 [a so-called Elohist] and ch. 7:3 [a so-called Jehovist]

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

section] refers to the physical distinction of sex in human beings.”) (This, of course, negates the notion sometimes suggested that “seven and seven” of 7:2, or “by sevens,” specifies three pairs, with one left over for sacrificial purposes.) To sum up: Of living species all went in *by twos*, male and female (6:19), divided as follows: of *clean* animals, seven pairs of every kind (7:14), of *unclean* animals, two pairs of every kind (7:2), of birds of the heavens, seven pairs of every kind (7:3). (Note especially the significance of the word *kind*, as used in 7:14 of all these categories.) Cf. 6:19-20, 7:14, and 7:21-23: it will be noted that the classification here is precisely that which is given in the first chapter of Genesis (v. 24) to describe the different *kinds* of land animals, namely, *cattle* (domesticated animals, mainly Herbivora, probably), *beasts of the field* (wild beasts, roughly Carnivora), and *creeping things* (reptiles, insects, and very small quadrupeds). Morris and Whitcomb affirm—rightly, this author believes—that these passages destroy the argument that is frequently offered, that only domesticated animals were taken into the Ark. They write (GF, 13): “If only domesticated animals were to be taken into the Ark, are we to assume that only domesticated animals were created by God in the first chapter of Genesis? The fact of the matter is that no clearer terms could have been employed by the author than those which he did employ to express the idea of *the totality of air-breathing animals in the world*. Once this point is conceded, all controversy as to the geographical extent of the Deluge must end; for no one would care to maintain that all land animals were confined to the Mesopotamian Valley in the days of Noah.” (Cf. Gen. 6:7; 6:17; 6:12-13, 19-21; 7:2-4; 8, 14-16; 8:1, 17-19; 9:8-17, and especially 7:21-23, with Gen. 1:20-27). (NBD, 427: “No mention is made of sea-creatures, but these may have been included in ‘every living thing of all flesh’ [6:19] and could have been accomodated outside

## GENESIS

not a matter of any consequence to Noah—he needed a boat for *floating* only). (Cf. the construction of Odysseus' "raft," *Odyssey* V, 243-261.)

(2) Again, *What shall we say about the capacity of the Ark in relation to its cargo?* This raises the question as to what the word "kind" includes, with reference to the Ark's living cargo (7:14). The problem is not how "kinds" are classified by man, but how they are classified by God; not what man means by the term, but what God means by it, for, let us not forget, it is God who, by His Spirit, is telling the story. Does "kind," then, refer to a phylum, or a genus, or to a species? The common unit in such classifications by scientists is the *species*, which is roughly defined as a distinct (hence, "specific") kind of animal or plant whose members breed together and produce fertile offspring, *though not necessarily a rigidly fixed kind*. Because protoplasm is characterized by the power of molding itself to various environments, the lines of classification cannot be regarded as inevitably determined. As a matter of fact, as Rehwinkel puts it (*Fl*, 71), "a species is a concept in the eye of the scientist." (It seems to be a tendency among present-day zoologists to multiply species unnecessarily.) How many species are there in the world today? Who can say? How many were there in Noah's time? Again, who can say? Were there as many in Noah's time as there are today? Who knows, or even can know? (It seems obvious that the remains of prehistoric species—e.g., dinosaurs, brontosaurus, ichthyosaurs, pterodactyls, mammoths, etc.—were fossilized either before the Flood or as a consequence of the Flood.) Biologists of our day suppose a classification of fifteen separate phyla. But life, we are told, tends to appear in these few basic forms and then to move in ever-spreading diversity. We simply do not know, we cannot know, how many "kinds" are in existence today, much less how many there were in Noah's day or how many were represented in the

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

animal population of the Ark. All we need know, as a matter of fact, is that the diversity was sufficient to allow for the preservation of those species (prototypes) necessary for the preservation of all species, necessary to the total life of the inhabited world, and necessary in a special sense to the welfare of man, the crown of the whole creation (Ps. 8).

Concerning the problem of the Ark and its cargo, Archer (SOTI, 200) presents one view, as follows: "There are, of course, manifold problems connected with maintaining such a large number of animals over so many months (especially if they maintained their normal eating habits), but none of them are insuperable. Perhaps it should be remarked at this point that a mere local flood, only coextensive with the human race in the Mesopotamian or Aral-Caspian depressions is hard to reconcile with the divine insistence (cf. Gen. 6:19, 20) upon the preservation of representatives of all the various kinds of animal. There are very few species today which are confined to that particular region, and so it is difficult to see why the animals in the surrounding, non-flooded area would not have been able to repopulate the devastated region without hindrance, once the waters had receded. Hence it would have been pointless to include them in the Ark." T. Lewis (CDHCG, 298) really states the crux of the problem in these words: "There is more force in the objection arising from the stowage of the ark, if we take the common estimate of the animals. But here, again, everything depends upon the theory with which we start. Throughout the account the several *alls* . . . become universal or specific, widen or contract, according to our pre-judgment of the universality or partiality of the flood itself." (This writer's Excursus on this problem, CDHCG, 314-322, is recommended as being probably the most thoroughgoing defense of the localized-Flood theory available to the student. The excerpts quoted in foregoing

## GENESIS

sections will serve to show that there is disagreement as to whether the Flood was universal or only regional in extent, even among authorities who do not even question the Divine inspiration and authority of the Bible.)

(3) Again, *How was it possible for eight persons to feed and provide drink for all the different animals housed in the Ark for more than a year? How was it possible for them to clean the vessel? How could the Ark have accommodated the natural increase of the animals in it?* In answer to these related problems, the suggestion has often been made that probably the animals *hibernated* during the greater part of the time they were in the Ark. This certainly is not beyond the realm of possibility, and it surely would provide a solution for many troublesome questions.. However, it implies a miraculous interference with the living habits of most of the animals aboard, and certainly Divine interference for Divine ends, by the Divine Intelligence and Will which is the constitution of all being, is not to be ruled out arbitrarily, except by those "intellectuals" who pride themselves on being known as "naturalists." But, after all what is *nature*? Certainly it is not an entity in itself; rather, it is only a convenient term for observed phenomena. And who knows, as Santayana is said to have put it, but that the "supernatural" is simply the "not-as-yet-understood natural"? As for the task of keeping the Ark clean and sanitary, at least for human occupancy, we may well suppose—to use a favorite Darwinian phrase—that this too was accomplished in some satisfactory manner by Divine direction. Again, could not the natural increase of species have been controlled by means known to those persons who were in charge of the Ark and its cargo? It would appear that this might have been accomplished by separation of females from the males at proper rhythmic intervals natural to each kind; indeed it is possible that the sexes were kept separate throughout their entire occupancy of the vessel;



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

according to Scripture their procreative functions were to be renewed especially for repopulating the *postdiluvian* world with their various "kinds." Moreover, should there have been increase of the various "kinds" (of clean animals especially) within the Ark, this undoubtedly would have been used for food and for sacrificial purposes also. If the Ark was of the dimensions indicated above, the stowage of necessary vegetable food ("fodder") for the animals seems not to involve too great a problem. As for preservation of plant life, that is no problem whatsoever. The life of the plant is in the seed, of course. And seeds that were buried beneath the sands of Egypt five thousand years ago have been dug up, planted, and found to reproduce their respective kinds. Therefore, it follows that Noah had only to preserve intact the seeds of the various plant forms to effect the restoration of all kinds of flora in the postdiluvian world.

### 11. *The Distinction Between Clean and Unclean Animals*

It should be noted that this distinction prevailed prior to the building of the Ark: it was embodied in God's specifications as to the kinds of species, and numbers of each kind, that were to be taken into it (Gen. 7:2). There is no evidence that the distinction originated after the Flood or even in connection with the Flood. On the contrary, Scripture points indubitably to the fact that the distinction was an integral part of the Law of Sacrifice from the beginning. In Genesis 4:4, we are told that Abel brought of the "firstlings" of his flock, that is, on the basis of "the best for God," and, undoubtedly by Divine authorization, to point forward to God's Firstborn (Only Begotten) as the Lamb of God slain (in the Eternal Purpose) "from the foundation of the world" (Exo. 12:3, 5; Exo. 13:12; John 1:29, 3:16; Col. 1:15, 18; Heb. 1:6; Isa. 53:7; Rev. 1:5, 13:8; Matt. 25:34; Rev. 17:8; 1 Pet. 1:18-21). Although this distinction involved the moral virtue of obedience, it was essentially a *positive*

## GENESIS

enactment; that is, its validity rested solely on the ground that God ordained it. (It must be remembered that a moral law is commanded because it is right *per se*, whereas a positive law is right because God commands it.) This distinction between clean and unclean animals was carried over into the Mosaic System, not only in connection with the institution of sacrifice, but also with respect to man's food. Clean beasts included the following: "whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, and sheweth the cud, among the beasts, that ye may eat" (Lev. 1:1-3). It did not suffice for an animal to possess only one of these characteristics: it had to possess all three of them to be classed as a clean animal. Sacrificial victims had to be taken from clean animals and birds (Gen. 8:20): these could be bullock, goat, sheep, dove, or pigeon (Lev. 11:1-3, Gen. 15:9), but not camel, hog, ass, or hare (Lev. 11:4-8, 46-47; Exo. 13:13). As shown in previous sections herein, the Law of Sacrifice is coetaneous with true religion (Gen. 3:21, 4:1-5; Heb. 11:4; Rom. 10:17).

### 12. *The Supernatural in the Genesis Story of the Flood*

(1) Much has been said and written about the "natural" and the "supernatural" in the Biblical account of the Deluge. It is not necessary, however, to assume that a universal Flood would have necessitated (as Ramm puts it, CVSS, 244) "an endless supplying of miracles." On the other hand there are certain aspects of the narrative which clearly indicate special Divine intervention, that is, "supernatural" Divine activities, commonly called "mighty works" or "miracles," works which lie beyond the scope of human power to effect (cf. Acts 2:22). This supernatural element cannot be ruled out altogether, nor can it be "explained away": it is there to be reckoned with, if the Deluge was anything like the event described in Genesis, and especially if it accomplished the ends for which God brought it on the wicked antediluvian world.

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

(2) It will be noted, first of all, that it was God who warned Noah of the impending judgment, that it was God who gave Noah the plans and specifications for the Ark and its contents by means of which they were to ride out the catastrophe in safety; that it was God who, when the vessel was completed, invited Noah to come into it with all the members of his house (7:1). It was God who said to Noah concerning the animals, "two of every sort *shall come unto thee*" (6:20); hence we read that "*they went in unto Noah into the ark*, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life" (7:15). Note well that God directed the animals *to come* unto Noah, not Noah to go in search of the animals (6:20; 7:9, 15). As Noah and the members of his house, eight souls in all (1 Pet. 3:20), went in unto God into the Ark, so all the animals went in unto Noah into the Ark, to man who was by God's appointment lord tenant of the creation (Gen. 1:27-28). How is this gathering of the species unto Noah to be accounted for? Obviously, only by a Divine impartation to them of some form of *instinctive* migratory response which impelled them to their destination. After all, what is *instinct* but the Universal Intelligence operating through the whole of the subhuman world to direct all species to the actualization of their respective inherent ends of being? Rehwinkel (Fl, 72): "In the expression 'they came' it is clearly indicated that the animals collected about Noah and entered the ark of their own accord, that is, without any special effort on Noah's part. The animals came by instinct, but God had planted in them this special instinct for this occasion. Just as, in the beginning, God had brought the animals to Adam that he should name them, so he now brought them to Noah that he might keep them in the ark for a replenishing of the earth after the Flood." Morris and Whitcomb (GF, 76): "Once we grant God's power in

## GENESIS

bringing the animals *to* the Ark, we have no right to deny His power over the animals while they were *in* the Ark. The simple fact of the matter is that one cannot have *any* kind of a Genesis Flood without acknowledging the presence of supernatural elements" (cf. Psa. 29:10, where the reference is clearly to the Noahic Deluge, *mabbul*). Again: "That God intervened in a supernatural way to gather the animals into the Ark and to keep them under control during the year of the Flood is explicitly stated in the text of Scripture. Furthermore, it is obvious that the opening of the 'windows of heaven' in order to allow 'the waters which were above the firmament' to fall upon the earth, and the breaking up of 'all the fountains of the great deep' were supernatural acts of God. But throughout the entire process, 'the waters which were above the firmament' and 'the waters which were under the firmament' acted according to the known laws of hydrostatics and hydrodynamics."

(3) Again, in this connection, Lange (CDHCG, 295) notes that "the history of the Flood is a *hapax legomenon* in the world's history, analogous to the creation of Adam, the birth and history of Christ, and the future history of the world's end." And again Morris and Whitcomb (GF, 793: "Whether or not such a concept can be adjusted harmoniously into one's theological or philosophical presuppositions, it happens to be true nonetheless that the Flood was an utterly unique and never-to-be-repeated phenomenon, a year-long demonstration of the omnipotence of a righteous God which mankind has never been permitted to forget, and a crisis in earth-history that is comparable in Scripture only to the creation and to the final renovation of the earth by fire at the end of the age. It is because the Bible itself teaches us these things that we are fully justified in appealing to *the power of God*, whether or not He used means amenable to our

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

scientific understanding, for the gathering of two of every kind of animal into the Ark and for the care and preservation of those animals in the Ark during the 371 days of the Flood."

(4) Finally, it should be noted well that once Noah and his family, and the animals, and the food for their sustenance, had all been gathered into the Ark during the seven days of embarkation, it was Yahew who closed the door of the Ark and shut them in, thus sheltering them from the catastrophe which broke upon the earth in all its fury: from the raging of the elements and from the blind rage no doubt of a wicked generation whose sins had finally found them out (Num. 32:23, Gal. 6:7). (I am reminded of the title of a sermon by a preacher friend, "What Happened to the Carpenters who Helped Noah Build the Ark?") Noah could—and did—build the Ark according to the specifications God had given him, he could receive the animals who came to him for deliverance from the Flood, he could spend 120 years warning the ungodly antediluvian world of the terrible judgment about to descend upon them, and calling them—all in vain—to repentance and reformation of life, but when in God's time-clock the period of probation came to its end, it was God Himself, and *only* God, who could close the door of the Refuge provided by His grace for the eight souls whom He found worthy of His mercy (cf. Deut. 33:27; Psa. 46:1, 62:7, 94:22; Jer. 16:19).

### 13. *The Embarkation*

In the six hundredth year of Noah's life the Ark was completed (7:6). Note 7:4—"for yet seven days," that is, *after seven days*: in this interim the embarkation was begun and completed. "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were

## GENESIS

opened" (7:11). The Flood was upon the world. God's judgments on the unbelieving and the impenitent may be delayed by His longsuffering grace, *but they are inevitable* (cf. 2 Pet, 2:4-10).

\* \* \* \* \*

### FOR MEDITATION AND SERMONIZING

#### *New Testament Witness to the Genesis Narrative of the Flood*

The applications of the Genesis account of the Flood to Christian teaching and life, as found in the New Testament, are most significant, as follows: 1. It is referred to *as evidence of God's judgment and justice* (2 Pet. 2:4-10, cf. Psa. 89:14, Gal. 6:7-8). 2. It is referred to *as a warning of our Lord's Second Coming* (Matt. 24:37-39, Luke 17:26-30). 3. It is referred to *as an example of the faith that leads to salvation* (Heb. 11:7, Jas. 2:14-26). 4. It is referred to *as prototypical in certain respects of the Gospel Plan of Salvation* (1 Pet. 3:19-21: note the phrase, A.S.V., "after a true likeness"; A.S.V. marginal, "in the antitype"; A.V., "the like figure"; R.S.V., "baptism, which corresponds to this"). In this Scripture we are told that through the Holy Spirit, Christ went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that is, in the prison-house of sin (Isa. 42:7, 61:1), when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah "while the ark was a preparing." (It seems obvious that the Divine message was communicated to the antediluvian world through Noah who, consequently, is called "a preacher of righteousness" to those of his own time, 2 Pet. 2:5.) (Cf. 1 Cor. 1:21, Rom. 10:6-17, 1 Thess. 2:13).

#### *Analogies Between Noah's Deliverance and Salvation in Christ*

The following analogies between Noah's deliverance from "the world of the ungodly" (2 Pet. 2:5) and our deliverance from the guilt and consequences of sin on the

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

terms of the New Covenant ("the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 16:19; cf. Eph. 1:13, Rom. 10:16, 2 Thess. 1:8, 1 Pet. 4:17), are clearly indicated in Scripture as follows: 1. Noah was saved by the *grace* of God (Gen. 6:8—grace is *unmerited favor*); so are we saved by grace. No man was ever saved by virtue of his own merits; salvation is, without exception, an outpouring of Divine grace. It is through the grace of God that redemption has been provided for fallen man (Tit. 2:11, Eph. 2:8, John 3:16). 2. Noah was saved by *faith*: so are we. (Heb. 11:6, 7; Rom. 5:1; Mark 16:16; John 20:30-31). We are *not* saved by faith *alone*, but by faith as the continuous principle which motivates us to repentance, obedience, and good works (Jas. 2:14-26). 3. Noah was saved by *godly fear*. Moved by godly fear, he prepared an ark to the saving of his house (Heb. 11:7). Likewise, when we are moved by godly sorrow, by the awareness of God's goodness, we *turn* from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God: this is *repentance*. (2 Cor. 5:11, Heb. 10:31, Rom. 2:4, 2 Cor. 7:10, Luke 13:3, Acts 17:30, Matt. 12:41; Jonah 3:8, Isa. 55:7, Acts 26:18). 4. Noah and his house were saved *through water*, the transitional element through which they passed from the world of the ungodly into a world cleansed of its wickedness. The antitype is Christian baptism, immersion (Rom. 6:4-6, 1 Pet. 3:19-21, Acts 2:38-47, Gal. 3:27, Matt. 28:18-20). In each of the nine cases of conversion recorded in the book of Acts specific mention is made that those who obeyed the Gospel were baptized. For all accountable human beings, baptism was, and is, the line which divides the world and the church, the kingdom of Satan and the Kingdom of Christ. When Jesus had expired on the Cross, one of the Roman soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and out of the wound came blood and water (John 19:34). We are saved, if saved at all, by the efficacy of Christ's blood which was shed for the sin of the world (John 1:29,

## GENESIS

1 John 1:7), and the only place divinely appointed where the penitent believer meets the efficacy of that blood is the grave of water (baptism): cf. Rom. 6:1-7, Gal. 3:27. Water is the transitional element through which the believing penitent passes from Satan's authority, the kingdom of this world, into the jurisdiction (reign, authority) of Christ, the Kingdom of God's Son (Col. 1:13, 2 Cor. 4:4, Eph. 2:2). Hence we are baptized *into the name*, that is, into the authority, into the jurisdiction, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19). Although baptism involves the moral virtue of obedience, it is indicative essentially of this *change of relationship* (Gal. 3:27). Baptism is the institution in which Divine grace and human faith meet together, and the Divine promise inseparably linked to it for the obedient believer is remission of sins (Acts 2:38). No doubt this is the reason why it has been so persistently attacked by Satan throughout our entire Christian era, by Satan acting through human agency, and in particular through churchmen, who have ignored it, distorted it, belittle it, ridiculed it, and actually blasphemed it and the Lord who ordained it. Because it stands here, at the entrance to the church, the ordinance which marks the dividing line between the world and the church, it is against this ordinance that Satan has directed his most vicious and unrelenting warfare. Men still call baptism "a mere outward act," "a mere external performance," etc. When in the name of all that is holy did our Lord ever go into the business of setting up "mere outward acts" or "mere external performances," or "mere" anything? 5. Noah was saved through the instrumentality of the *Ark*. The ark points forward both to Christ and to the Church: to be *in* Christ is to be in the Church, which is the Body of Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1, 2 Cor. 5:17, Eph. 1:22-23, Col. 1:18). 6. To summarize: Noah was not saved by grace *alone*, nor by faith *alone*, nor by repentance *alone*, nor by



## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

the water *alone*, nor by the Ark *alone*, but by *all of these* as constituting the total Divine plan of deliverance. Similarly, in the Christian Dispensation, we are not saved by faith *alone*, nor by repentance *alone*, nor by baptism *alone*, nor by the church *alone*, but by all these taken together as constituting the Gospel Plan of Salvation. And even to these must be added the essentials of the Spiritual Life, because life, in any form, is growth, and where there is no growth, there is only stagnation and death. "Eternal security" is realized only by God and His saints working together, in God's way, and according to God's plan. (Acts 2:42; 2 Pet. 3:18, 1:5-11; Phil. 2:12-13; 1 Cor. 15:58; Gal. 5:22-25; Rom. 14:17; Heb. 12:14, etc.).

### *Analogies Between the Ark and the Church*

We do not insist here that Scripture specifically declares the Ark to have been a type of the Church. We simply call attention to many interesting, and meaningful, analogies between the two institutions (Rom. 15:4), as follows: 1. The Ark was made of *gopher wood* throughout; that is to say, of one and only one kind of material (Gen. 6:14). Similarly, the Church, the Body of Christ is made up of just one kind of material—baptized penitent believers (Eph. 2:19-22, 2:10; 1 Pet. 2:1-5; Acts 2:38-47, 8:12, 8:34-39, 10:47-48, 16:14-15, 16:31-34, 18:8, 22:16; Rom. 10:9-10, 6:1-11; John 3:5; Col. 2:11-12; Gal. 3:26-27). Christ has but one Body, the Church (John 10:16, 17:20-21; Eph. 4:4-6, Matt. 16:18; 1 Cor. 12:12). In our days, it is common to exhort a man "to join the church of his choice." But this is nonsense from the Scriptural point of view, for two reasons: (1) no man "joins" church: instead, he obeys the Gospel commands and then the Lord adds him to His Church (Acts 2:47); (2) our Lord has established the Church, His Body, in which salvation is to be enjoyed, and has given us the pattern of this Church in the apostolic writings (Acts 1:1-3; John 14:26, 16:13-15; 2 Pet. 1:3; Jude 3; 2 Tim.

## GENESIS

3:16-17). This Church is the *one* Body of Christ; He purchased her with His own precious blood (Eph. 4:4, Matt. 16:16, Eph. 5:23, Acts 20:28). In a word, the choice of Church has already been made by our Lord, the Head (Eph. 1:20-23). There is no salvation in denominationalism; salvation is possible only by one's living and dying in Christ (Gal. 3:27, Rom. 8:1, Rev. 14:13), and to live and die in Christ is to live and die in the true Church.

2. There was one window in the Ark. (Note how this differs from the usual pictorial representations of the vessel as a kind of flatboat with windows on all sides like portholes.) Just what this was, and how it was built into the vessel has always been a matter of some speculation. The consensus seems to be that it was an opening of some kind extending around the top of the Ark constructed either to reach within a cubit of the edge of the roof or a cubit below the roof (Gen. 6:16). A window is the medium through which light shines into a building from an outside source. The Word (Bible) is the window through which the Holy Spirit provides spiritual light for the Church (1 Cor. 2:9-11; Psa. 119:105, 130; 2 Tim. 3:16-17, Rom. 10:6-11). We have so many denominations in Christendom simply because men have added so many windows. The Holy Spirit, shining into a man's heart through the Bible alone, will make nothing more nor less than a *Christian* (Acts 11:26, 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16; Col. 3:17; Acts 4:11-12).

3. There was one door in the Ark (6:16). Christ is the Door to the Church (John 10:7, 9). Faith, repentance, confession lead *unto* the Door (Rom. 10:10, Matt. 10:32-33, 2 Cor. 7:10); baptism leads *into* the Door (Gal. 3:27). (It is equally true, of course, that all of these taken together induct one *into* the Door.) To be in Christ is to be in the Door and in the Church (Acts 2:47).

4. *Clean animals* went into the Ark first. Jews were admitted to the Church first (John 1:11, Acts 2:5-7, Rom. 1:16).

5. *Unclean*

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

*animals* were taken in last. Similarly, Gentiles were admitted to the Church several years after Pentecost (Acts 10, 11:1-18, 15:7-11). 6. When all the occupants were inside the Ark, it was Yahwe who closed the door. The door to the Church was opened on Pentecost and stands wide open today; nor will it be closed until the Lord comes again. He alone has the authority (that is, moral power, the right) to open the Door of the Church and to close it. And when He shall close it, it will be closed forever. And, as in the days of Noah, so shall it be at the coming of the Son of man (Matt. 24:37, Luke 17:26), the cry of the ungodly, shut out forever from the presence of God, will be the cry of uncontrollable despair. So intense will be their sense of loss that they will cry for the rocks and the mountains to fall upon them and hide them from the righteous wrath of Eternal Holiness (Rev. 6:16-17, Matt. 25:31-46, John 5:28-29, 1 Cor. 15:50-57).

\* \* \* \*

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART TWENTY-ONE

1. What were the two classes in the *moral* world before the Flood?
2. What general condition precipitated the Divine Judgment on the antediluvian world?
3. How can it be said that God "changes because He is unchangeable"?
4. How is God's *repentance* to be explained?
5. What is meant by the *physical* world before the Flood?
6. What might be the import of the Hebrew word *erecs* in relation to the extent of the Flood?
7. Summarize what Dr. Jauncey has to say about the extent of the Flood.
8. Summarize what B. S. Dean has to say about this problem.
9. What are Ramm's arguments against the universal-Flood theory?

## GENESIS

10. Summarize Archer's review of Ramm's arguments.
11. List Mitchell's remarks about the extent of the Flood.
12. State the gist of Milligan's treatment of the subject.
13. State Archer's three objections to the view that only a part of the race perished in the Deluge.
14. State Morris' argument for the universality of the Flood.
15. Give his summary of the "geologic implications" of the Genesis account.
16. What is the theory of uniformitarianism?
17. Can this theory be extended to explain anything more than changes in the permanently fashioned earth?
18. Show why it cannot be used to explain the origin of the earth.
19. Summarize Rehwinkel's account of the earth and its inhabitants prior to the Flood. On what does he base his conclusions?
20. Summarize the seven arguments for a universal Flood as presented by Morris and Whitcomb.
21. What are the four Biblical reasons which they give to support their view?
22. What two reasons do they give for maintaining that the human race could not have been confined to the Mesopotamian region prior to the Deluge?
23. Review the objections to the view that we have in the Genesis narrative "parallel accounts" of the Flood.
24. What is meant by the *repetitive* characteristic of the Old Testament writings?
25. How universal are the traditions of the Flood?
26. What conclusions are we to derive from this universality?
27. List the similarities between the Babylonian and Genesis accounts of the Flood.
28. List the differences. What do the Jewish authors, Kaufmann and Cornfeld, have to say about these differences?

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

29. What is Unger's general conclusion about the origin of the Genesis account?
30. Is there any justification for ignoring the revelatory work of the Spirit of God in this case? Why, then, is it ignored by so many so-called "scholars"?
31. State the physiographic causes of the Flood.
32. Identify the successive stages in the increase of the Flood.
33. How many persons went into the Ark, and who were they?
34. How many pairs of each kind of clean animals went into the Ark? How many pairs of each kind of unclean animals?
35. What probable needs were there for the greater number of clean animals?
36. What is the probable meaning of the phrases, "two of every sort," "two and two" or "by twos"?
37. What other material completed the Ark's cargo?
38. What is the probable meaning of the term "kind" in this classification?
39. Compare this classification of kinds as given in the Flood story with that of the Creation narrative (Gen. 1:24).
40. What are the objections to the view that only domesticated animals were taken into the Ark?
41. What probably was the capacity of the Ark?
42. What were the dimensions of it?
43. How do you suppose it was possible for eight persons to feed and provide drink for all the animals on board for so long a time, probably more than a year?
44. How could they have cleansed the vessel?
45. How do you suppose the Ark could have accommodated the natural increase of the animals on board?
46. Could hibernation be a solution for these troublesome questions?

## GENESIS

47. What were the characteristics of a clean animal in Old Testament times?
48. How did this distinction between clean and unclean animals arise? When, and in connection with what institution, must it have originated?
49. Why do we say that this distinction must have been a positive law?
50. What is the distinction between a moral law and a positive law?
51. List the supernatural elements in the Genesis account of the Deluge.
52. How do we account for the assembling of the animals at one time to enter the Ark?
53. With what two other crucial events in God's Cosmic Plan is the Flood to be associated?
54. How did Peter apply the story of the Flood as evidence of God's unfailing justice?
55. What does the writer of Hebrews tell us about Noah's faith?
56. How did Jesus associate the Flood story with the circumstances of His Second Coming?
57. List the analogies between Noah's deliverance from the wicked antediluvian world and our deliverance from the bondage of sin under the New Covenant.
58. What factors entered into Noah's deliverance? What factors enter into our salvation through the atoning blood of Christ?
59. In what sense did water as the transitional element through which Noah's deliverance was accomplished *typify* Christian baptism? Where is the Scripture to be found which states this truth?
60. In what sense was Noah saved "through water"?
61. What is the design of baptism in God's Eternal Purpose?
62. Why is this ordinance downgraded, even belittled and blasphemed, by churchmen?

## THE WORLD UNDER THE FLOOD

63. What do we mean by saying that in baptism Divine grace and human faith find a meeting place?
64. What does God promise us through our obedience in baptism (Acts 2:38).
65. List the analogies between Christ and the Church.
66. How many windows in the Ark? How does the Scripture representation of the Ark differ from pictorial representations of it as a kind of flatboat with windows all around it like portholes?
67. How many doors did the Ark have?
68. What function is served by a window? How many windows in the Church?
69. Show how window-adding by human authority has divided Christendom.
70. Who is the Door to the Fold (the Church)?
71. What are the Scripture requirements for entrance into this Door?
72. What people were first admitted to the Church of Christ? Who were last to be admitted? How are these facts analogous to the reception of the animals into the Ark?
73. When the entire cargo of living beings and accompanying stowage had been gathered into the Ark, who closed the door?
74. Who *only* has the authority to open and to close the Door of the Church?
75. Has our Lord Himself chosen the Church through which salvation will be enjoyed? Where is the pattern of this Church to be found?
76. Is this Church a denomination of any kind? When and by whom will the Door to the Church of Christ be closed for ever?
77. What will be the ultimate destiny of those left outside?
78. What, according to Scripture (2 Pet. 3:1-13), will be the character of the next—and last—universal judgment?