

surrounding, catastrophically eroding uplands, and from sediment derived from cavitation debouching in water slurries from the broken-up conduits of the great deep depressurising during Noah's Flood. Peleg's 'earth division' (Genesis 10:25) gives a clue to the matter, in that 'division' suggests 'tension', stress that tends to pull a rock body apart, which is not commonly associated with mountain-building. Mountain-building most often comes from compression of rocks. Thus, Peleg's 'division' by tension does not correlate with the origin of the Persian Gulf (by compression between active tectonic plates), which gulf is a major divisional feature between nations of the Middle East. Rather, the Persian Gulf and its great geosyncline, mostly filled, had to have formed when prodigious amounts of sediment were available, which was the case in Noah's Flood. The 'Peleg division' correlates instead with the first of two tensional movements that twice widened the Red Sea post-Flood, as shown in my paper. All this in turn strongly suggests that the 'Peleg division' was **not** a segment of a global cataclysm that literally divided the whole Earth into the general configuration that we have today.

In answer to Mr Butel's question '*... how did endemic species find their way to isolated continents or islands?*', I quote from his letter:-

The creationist reply to this is that after the division of the Earth there existed land bridges which enabled fauna to cross to the separated continents and islands ...!

But I'm not prepared to defend that position.

Regarding chronologies, actually I am not locked into Ussher's; it seems that his is my convenient source at hand. In my thesis² I consider the possibility of a longer chronology, like that of the Septuagint, better harmonising with the geological aspects of the 'Peleg problem'.

Regarding his challenge of my regional interpretation for the extent of the catastrophe, the most often used Old Testament Hebrew word for 'earth' is 'erets'; it is the same word both in

Genesis 1:10 and Genesis 10:25.³ But this apparent correlation does not appear to be significant to the question of the extent of tectonic division of the Earth during the time of Peleg, because the single, universal landmass of Genesis 1:9-10 (and Genesis 1:25,26) does not have an exclusive word 'earth' given to it by Scripture. Note that the same 'earth' of Genesis 1:25a and Genesis 1:25b are different Hebrew words, 'erets' and 'admah' respectively.⁴ Also compare verse 26. Therefore, according to all applicable Scripture, and following the rule of Isaiah 28:9-10, the divided Earth of Genesis 10:25 was not necessarily derived from the breakup/'division' of the unbroken, single, universal landmass.

John A. Watson,
Austin, Texas,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Watson, J. A., 1991. **Antediluvian Hydrology and Plate Tectonics of the Middle East and Adjacent Africa, and Creation-Flood Geology of Arabia, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Iran.** Thesis, Pacific College of Graduate Studies, Victoria, Australia.
2. Watson, Ref. 1.
3. Strong, J., 1894. **Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible**, 45th printing 1989, World Bible Publishers, Inc., Iowa Falls, Iowa.
4. Strong, Ref. 3.

GENESIS 2:5 AND THE PLANTS

Dear Editor,

I would like to commend Michael Kruger for adhering to a recent six-day creation and defending Biblical inerrancy.¹ However, I question his interpretation that in Genesis 2:5 '*plants designed for mankind* — . . . *will spring up after man*' (p. 108). Is he saying that plants designed for mankind were not created on Day Three? That appears to be what he is saying. Or does he believe that plants

designed for mankind grew elsewhere besides the Garden of Eden and that Adam had to transplant them there, and eat from outside of Eden until they grew?

I don't think his interpretation will stand. Creationists have always believed that all 'kinds' of plants were created on Day Three, and indeed that is the clear teaching of Genesis 1. I do not think Genesis 2 may be reasonably held to say that '*plants designed for mankind*' grew everywhere except his intended home — the Garden of Eden — and then they were transplanted there.

John Goertzen,
Winona Lake, Indiana,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Kruger, M., 1997. An understanding of Genesis 2:5. **CEN Tech. J.**, 11(1):106-110.

The Author Replies . . .

I appreciate John Goertzen's response to my paper and commend his obvious commitment to a six-day creation and Biblical inerrancy. However, I think he has missed the main thrust of my argument. My case is simply that the type of vegetation spoken of in Genesis 2:5 was specific to the Paradise of the Garden of Eden and did not spring up until after mankind appeared. This is a necessary conclusion for two reasons:-

- (1) Genesis 2:5 says that these specific plants need both rain and mankind to flourish. This obviously could not have happened until after man appeared on Day Six.
- (2) If the vegetation in Genesis 2:5 (which clearly comes **after** man) is the same vegetation spoken of on Day Three, then we have a clear and unavoidable chronological contradiction. Were the plants created first or was man created first? I avoid this contradiction by suggesting the plants in Genesis 2:5 are unique to the Garden of

Eden and distinct from the plants created on Day Three.

My conclusion is supported by the fact that different Hebrew terms are used for the plants described in Genesis 2:5 than are used to describe the plants on Day Three. This is a point in my paper to which Goertzen has failed to respond. Perhaps this is because the different Hebrew words certainly are inexplicable if the author of Genesis is trying to communicate that the plants of Genesis 2:5 are identical with the plants of Day Three (as Goertzen believes).

I find Goertzen's letter quite confusing, because it is clear that he has completely misunderstood my argument. In fact, he even suggests that I am saying that

"plants designed for mankind" grew everywhere except his intended home — the garden of Eden and then they were transplanted there'.

I am baffled by this statement because it is the exact opposite of what I am saying! I am suggesting that these plants of Genesis 2:5 were specific to the Garden environment and were not elsewhere on the planet (at least until mankind multiplied and spread out over all the Earth). Goertzen offers no quotes from my article that support his understanding of my argument.

Even though Goertzen disagrees with my conclusions, interestingly he never actually offers an argument for why my conclusions are in error. He simply asks some questions and declares, *'I don't think this interpretation will stand'*. Why will it not stand? Goertzen says that it is contrary to what *'creationists have always believed'*. However, this is simply mistaken. He has not documented such a statement and there are numerous exceptions, one of which is scholar H. C. Leupold in his commentary on Genesis, where he makes it clear that the vegetation in Genesis 2:5 is distinct from the vegetation created on Day Three.¹ In addition, simply noting that a view is unique does not necessarily make it erroneous. Goertzen has to offer more

than simply saying 'it's always been this way'.

Goertzen seems to have forgotten that his insistence that the plants of Genesis 2:5 were created on Day Three leads him to a chronological contradiction. Genesis 2:5 explicitly says that these plants required man to grow and therefore must have sprung up **after** man (as I have suggested). But, if the plants of Genesis 2:5 supposedly sprung up on Day Three with the rest of the vegetation, **before** man was created, then he is left in a contradiction. Therefore, it is actually Goertzen's view that is untenable if we wish to preserve Biblical inerrancy.

The only way we can be true to the text and at the same time avoid a contradiction is to acknowledge that the plants described in Genesis 2:5 are distinctive from those created on Day Three, because of the unique function they would serve in the Garden of Eden.

Michael J. Kruger,
Mesa, Arizona,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCE

1. Leupold, H. C., 1942. **Exposition of Genesis**, Vol. 1, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, pp. 112-113.

BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY

Dear Editor,

Dr Perry G. Phillip's article 'Humphreys' Cosmology and the "Timothy Test"¹ stresses the necessity of using extra-Biblical sources to understand parts of the Scriptures. In his reference 43 he says that

'Thiele realised that a resolution to the chronology problem was not forthcoming solely from the Biblical material . . . Without reference to this extra-Biblical information it would be impossible to understand the Biblical text. . .'

This is contrary to the impression I have of Thiele's work. He worked out the pattern of the Hebrew kings **without** synchronising them with known dates from Near Eastern history, and only synchronised the Hebrew kings with known dates **after** the problem had been solved.²

Philip Rayment,
Pakenham, Victoria,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCES

1. Phillips, P. D., 1997. D. Russell Humphreys' cosmology and the 'Timothy Test'. **CEN Tech. J.**, 11(2):189-194.
2. Thiele, E. R., 1983. **The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings**, New Revised Edition, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, pp. 16-17.

Dear Editor,

In reply to David Malcolm's letter concerning suffering and God's omnipotence and goodness I would offer Wilder-Smith's **Is This a God of Love?** His answer boils down to this: God did not create a race of androids but of people possessing free will in order to **choose** to serve God out of love for Him. There necessarily must be other choices available than good alone to have genuine free will. It is also true that our sufferings are *'but for a moment'* in view of eternity and will secure for us everlasting rewards and joy.

It was also great to see John Osgood writing again — even if only a book review! I believe his series of papers in the first three volumes of this journal, along with the earlier work on the date of the Flood from **Ex Nihilo, 4:1**, contain the most accurate Biblical chronology. He places the Flood at 2304 BC, the dispersion at Babel at 2200 BC, pre-Dynastic Egypt ca 2150 BC, the Exodus at 1447 BC, the Conquest of Canaan by Israel at 1407 BC, and the laying of the foundation of Solomon's temple at 967 BC. It would be great to have him and others build on this foundation to