

“This is an important book for the church. It clarifies problems and gives carefully crafted and nuanced explanations and corrections to common misunderstandings about what the Old Testament teaches. It is not surprising that such an ancient text written in such a different place and cultural context could be difficult to understand in today’s world, at least in some of its parts. Naturally, some readers might quibble about certain points, but the authors select the problems well and treat them in a fair, judicious, and helpful manner.”

—Richard E. Averbeck, director, PhD in Theological Studies,
professor of Old Testament and Semitic languages, Trinity
Evangelical Divinity School

“Unfortunately ‘urban legends’ grow like weeds in the garden of biblical interpretation. In this volume the authors do some much-needed weeding. Using sound interpretive principles and insightful contextual exegesis, they expose forty common misconceptions about Old Testament passages. Each chapter is clearly written and concise. The epilogue to the book, though short, is especially helpful. The authors here explain how interpretive misconceptions get started. In the process, they identify several key principles for proper biblical interpretation which, if followed, will go a long way toward weed prevention.”

—Robert B. Chisholm, Jr., department chair, senior professor of
Old Testament studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

“I have sometimes thought about writing a book called ‘What the Bible Doesn’t Teach,’ but now I will forget the idea; David Croteau and Gary Yates have done it. This book is a magnificent debunking of forty mistaken ideas about the Old Testament. It will be great if pastors, Sunday school teachers, and Bible study leaders read it, causing some of these urban myths to die.”

—John Goldingay, professor of Old Testament and David
Allen Hubbard Professor Emeritus of Old Testament, Fuller
Theological Seminary

“It is important to know what the Bible says, but it is also important to know what the Bible *does not* say. Croteau and Yates have produced a very informative and fascinating book to help us disentangle fact from fiction in a number of OT passages. This is an outstanding book and I highly recommend it; but—spoiler

alert—be warned, you just may run into some of your own favorite [mis]interpretations here! That is all the more reason for all of us to read it.”

—J. Daniel Hays, dean, Pruet School of Christian Studies,
professor of biblical studies Ouachita Baptist University

“As a veteran of battling poor thinking about Scripture on the front lines of the internet and in the classroom, it is hard to express how much this book is needed and how it succeeds in hitting the mark. The authors are seasoned Bible scholars and professors with a heart to nurture clarity and faithfulness to the biblical text among their students. Readers who find among its pages one of their own cherished myths about something the Bible “teaches” might be miffed. Others—and I count myself among them—will cheer its direct yet irenic and engaging rebuttals and debunkings. This book will be a recommended antidote to careless Bible study and the propensity to impart its flawed results to others.”

—Michael S. Heiser, scholar-in-residence, Faithlife

“It’s rare to come across a book that is as engaging as it is scholarly, and as fascinating as it is edifying. Whether read cover to cover or used as a reference book, *Urban Legends of the Old Testament* will serve casual readers, study groups, and scholars well.”

—Karen Swallow Prior, professor of English, Liberty University

“The authors of this book have done a remarkable job of choosing just the right issues to address, and they have offered thoughtful, balanced, well-researched, and gracious suggestions to help us adjust our thinking. Leaving behind these ‘urban legends’ will aid us on our quest to be faithful interpreters of God’s Word who are accountable to the inspired Scripture. Reading this book will help pastors, Bible study leaders, and Sunday school teachers avoid these traditional pitfalls. Laypeople will find it readable and practical. In short, I recommend this book for anyone who wants to become a better reader of the Old Testament.”

—John Walton, professor of Old Testament, Wheaton College

URBAN LEGENDS OLD *OF THE* TESTAMENT

40 Common Misconceptions



DAVID A. CROTEAU AND GARY E. YATES

B&H
ACADEMIC
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Urban Legends of the Old Testament
Copyright © 2019 by David A. Croteau and Gary Yates

Published by B&H Academic
Nashville, Tennessee

All rights reserved.

ISBN: 978-1-4336-4832-8

Dewey Decimal Classification: 221.1
Subject Heading: BIBLE. O.T.--CRITICISM / BIBLE. O.T.--EVIDENCES, AUTHORITY,
ETC. / BIBLE. O.T.--HISTORY

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations are taken from The Christian Standard Bible. Copyright © 2017 by Holman Bible Publishers. Used by permission. Christian Standard Bible®, and CSB® are federally registered trademarks of Holman Bible Publishers, all rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NET are taken from the NET Bible®. Copyright © 1996–2006 by Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C. <http://netbible.com>. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NASB are taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®. Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Scripture quotations marked ESV are taken from the ESV® Bible (The Holy Bible, English Standard Version®). ESV® Text Edition: 2016. Copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. The ESV® text has been reproduced in cooperation with and by permission of Good News Publishers. Unauthorized reproduction of this publication is prohibited. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NIV are taken from THE HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®, NIV® Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.® Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

Scripture quotations marked NKJV are taken from the New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

The web addresses referenced in this book were live and correct at the time of the book's publication but may be subject to change.

Cover design by Darren Welch. Cover illustration by Gustave Doré; sourced from Nicku/shutterstock.

Printed in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 VP 24 23 22 21 20 19

DAVID: To Ann, Danielle, and D. J.—may we all learn to grow in the fear and knowledge of our Lord.

GARY: To my wife, Marilyn—her example of what it means to live out the true message of God's Word has blessed me and our children more than I could ever express.

Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
Prologue	xiii
1. In the “Gap” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, Satan Fell, Genesis 1:1–2	1
2. The Trinity Is Directly Taught in Genesis 1:26, Genesis 1:26.	7
3. Women Were Created Inferior to Men, Genesis 2:18–20.	13
4. The Virgin Birth Was Prophesied in Genesis, Genesis 3:15	19
5. Radical Islam Has Inherited Ishmael’s Violent Spirit, Genesis 16:12	25
6. The Angel of the Lord Refers to the Preincarnate Jesus, Genesis 18:1–13 . . 31	
7. Taking the Lord’s Name in Vain Refers to Using God’s Name as a Curse Word, Exodus 20:7	37
8. The Tabernacle Was an Elaborate Picture of Jesus, Exodus 25–40	43
9. Unintentional Sin Is Inconsequential, Leviticus 4–5	49
10. The Mosaic Food Laws Were about Healthy Living, Leviticus 11	57
11. The High Priest Wore a Rope around His Ankle on the Day of Atonement, Leviticus 16	63
12. Old Testament Saints Were Saved by Keeping the Mosaic Law, Leviticus 18:5.	69
13. Using the Mosaic Law to Label Homosexuality as Sinful Is Logically Inconsistent, Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13	75
14. The Tithes in Ancient Israel Were 10 Percent of Income, Leviticus 27:30–33.	83
15. The Old Testament Law Is Divided into Three Parts, Deuteronomy 6:1 . . . 89	
16. God Never Expected Israel to Keep His Law, Deuteronomy 29:4	95
17. NASA Found Joshua’s Long Day, Joshua 10:12–15	101
18. You Can Know God’s Will by Putting out the Proverbial Fleece, Judges 6 . 107	

19. God Never Wanted Israel to Have a King, 1 Samuel 8–12	113
20. Christians Should Never Question the Authority of Church Leaders, 1 Samuel 24–26	119
21. If Americans Repent, God Promises to Fix Our Nation, 2 Chronicles 7:14	127
22. Behemoth and Leviathan Are Dinosaurs, Job 40–41	133
23. Psalm 22 Directly Predicts the Crucifixion of Jesus, Psalm 22:16	139
24. Imprecatory Psalms Are Horrible Models for Christian Prayer, Psalm 109	145
25. Psalm 116 Teaches How God Welcomes His Saints at Death, Psalm 116:15	151
26. Proper Parenting Guarantees Godly Children, Proverbs 22:6	157
27. Without Vision, People Perish, Proverbs 29:18	163
28. Proverbs 31: A Checklist for the Perfect Wife, Proverbs 31:10–31	167
29. “Under the Sun” in Ecclesiastes Refers to Life without God, Ecclesiastes 1:2–3	173
30. The Song of Songs Is a Biblical Model for Dating and Marriage, Song of Songs 3:6–5:1	181
31. Isaiah 9 Contains a Prophecy against Post-9/11 America, Isaiah 9:10–11	187
32. Isaiah 14 Portrays the Fall of Satan, Isaiah 14:12–15	193
33. God Created Evil, Isaiah 45:7	199
34. God’s Word Will Never Return Void When We Preach and Evangelize, Isaiah 55:11	205
35. God Has Promised You a Bright and Prosperous Future, Jeremiah 29:11	211
36. The City of Babylon Must Be Rebuilt to Fulfill Prophecy, Jeremiah 50–51	217
37. God Intended “Ezekiel Bread” to Be a Health Food, Ezekiel 4:9	223
38. Gog of Magog Refers to the Leader of Russia, Ezekiel 38–39	229
39. Jonah’s Preaching Produced the Greatest Revival Ever, Jonah 3	235
40. Christians Must Bring Their Whole Tithe into the Local Church, Malachi 3:8–10	241
Epilogue	247
Name Index	249
Scripture Index	253
Subject Index	271

Acknowledgments

FROM DAVE:

I want to thank several people who helped me in writing this book. First, Brian Gault and Ben Noonan were so gracious in talking with me and providing resource after resource, enabling me to provide much more informed research. To Nate Montgomery, who provided some aid in doing research that was very helpful. Also, to Columbia Biblical Seminary, John Harvey, and Jim Lanpher, for allowing me to take a sabbatical and work on this project. Finally, to Gary Yates, my coauthor, who read through every chapter I wrote and lovingly guided this New Testament scholar through this journey.

FROM GARY:

I first of all want to thank my coauthor, David, for the opportunity to work with this project. We first talked about this book at a coffee shop here in Lynchburg, and his fine work on *Urban Legends of the New Testament* convinced the editors at B&H that an Old Testament volume was a worthwhile project as well. I am also thankful to my Hebrew and Old Testament professors at Dallas Theological Seminary, who instilled in me a love for the Hebrew Scriptures and provided invaluable training for how to read and interpret the Old Testament. I hear their voices often in my own teaching, even if I often fall short of the high standards they modeled. Last, I want to thank my colleagues in the School of Divinity at Liberty University for the opportunity to teach the Bible for the past sixteen years and for the students in my classes whose questions over the years have helped me to dig deeper into many of the passages discussed in this book.

Prologue

Did George Washington say to his father “I cannot tell a lie” while confessing to chopping down a cherry tree? Did he also skip a silver dollar across the Potomac River? Did Patrick Henry really shout, “Give me Liberty, or give me Death!”? Finally, did Benjamin Franklin propose that the Great Seal of the United States contain a turkey? All of these are popular myths. An urban legend is a commonly circulated myth that is not true, but is repeated throughout the culture as common knowledge.¹

In this book, we will discuss forty passages in the Old Testament that are commonly misunderstood. These carefully selected passages are not the only commonly circulating misinterpretations, but they represent a cross section of different issues involved in interpretation across the Old Testament. There is no desire to be “nit-picky” on our disagreements, because most of these misinterpretations are serious misunderstandings of what the original authors were attempting to communicate to the original audience.

Our hope is that through reading this book, you will see modeled careful interpretation and will not only learn the reasons for the misconceptions, but also learn how to interpret Scripture more accurately yourself. In discussing these forty passages, we have attempted to reflect sound hermeneutical approaches, but also engage larger issues related to biblical theology and how believers today read and apply the Old Testament as Christian Scripture.

¹ See David A. Croteau, *Urban Legends of the New Testament: 40 Common Misconceptions* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2015), xiii.

The title of each chapter is the legend itself, not the correct interpretation of the text(s) at hand. Each chapter will begin with a presentation of the legend, presented *as if* we believe it. Then we will try to prove to you that it is an invalid interpretation of the passage. Finally, we will explain what the text does mean.

CHAPTER 1

In the “Gap” between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, Satan Fell

Genesis 1:1–2

The Legendary Teaching on the “Gap Theory” in Genesis 1

The fall of Satan occurred in the “gap” between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. After the creation of the universe, Satan led a heavenly rebellion and was cast out of heaven and down to Earth. God judged the earth after Satan took up his residence there, reducing the planet to a condition of ruin and chaos. Genesis 1:2 should be read, “And the earth *became* formless and empty.” God’s work of re-creation (or restitution) of the ruined earth begins in Gen 1:3 and continues throughout the six days of creation recounted in the rest of the chapter. The gap theory provides an explanation of when Satan fell, and the undetermined time of the gap between Gen 1:1 and 1:2 explains how the universe can be millions or billions of years old even with the literal six-day creation portrayed in Genesis 1.¹ Geological strata indicating an old Earth belong to this original creation.

Countering the Legendary Teaching

The gap theory fails for various reasons. The syntax of the opening verses in Genesis 1 does not allow for the translation “And the earth *became* form-

¹ The *Scotfield Reference Bible* (1917) states that the expression “without form, and void” in Gen 1:2 demonstrates “that that the earth had undergone a cataclysmic change as the result of divine judgment. The face of the earth bears everywhere the marks of such a catastrophe. There are not wanting imitations which connect it with a previous testing and fall of angels.”

less.” The insertion of a satanic fall and divine judgment into Gen 1:1–2 is pure speculation, and the Hebrew Bible offers no clear account of the fall of Satan.² There is also nothing in the Bible to suggest that God judged the earth itself when Satan fell, and the reasons for such a judgment are not clear.

The gap theory is reflective of a problem with many contemporary readings of Genesis 1–2. In these readings, concerns with how the biblical account comports with modern scientific theories about the origin of the universe become the focal point rather than discovery of the theological message of the text itself. The particular question of the age of the universe has often dominated evangelical discussion of Genesis 1–2; although this issue has importance, we must first remember that this text is to be read as an ancient creation account, not a modern scientific one.

“Formless and Empty”: An Indication of Divine Judgment?

Proponents of the gap (or restitution) theory propose that the expression translated in the King James Version as “without form, and void” (*tohu webohu*; CSB: “formless and empty”) offers proof that catastrophic judgment resulting from the heavenly rebellion led by Satan has occurred between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. The term *tohu* has the meaning of “wasteland,” “emptiness,” or “nothingness.”³ It refers to a desert or uninhabited city (see Deut 32:10; Job 12:24; Ps 107:4; Isa 24:10), the “nothingness” of idols (1 Sam 12:21; Isa 41:29; 44:9), and futile words or deeds (Isa 29:21; 49:4). The term *bohu* (“void, waste”) appears only with *tohu*, and the two words joined by a conjunction likely convey a single idea of utter or complete emptiness.

This word pair *formless and empty* (*tohu webohu*) appears elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Isa 34:11 and Jer 4:23. In these passages, the condition of something being “formless and empty” is the result of judgment. The fact that divine judgment is the cause of *tohu webohu* in Isaiah 34 and Jeremiah 4 does not, however, necessitate the same cause for this condition in Genesis 1. The chaos in Gen 1:2 merely reflects that God has either not begun or completed his work of creation.⁴ Isaiah 45:18 states that God did not create the world to be a “wasteland” (*tohu*), and the specific

² See chap. 32 for further discussion.

³ Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament Study Edition*, trans. M. E. J. Richardson (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:1688–90.

⁴ John H. Walton, *Genesis*, New International Version Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 74.

purpose of God's work in the six days of Genesis 1 is to bring order out of this chaos. There are multiple possible causes for a condition of *tohu wabohu*, just as there could be multiple reasons for a jigsaw puzzle to be in a state of disorder. It could be that I have just taken the puzzle pieces out of the box or that I slammed my fist into the puzzle out of frustration. If the narrator's intent was to indicate that divine judgment was the cause of the condition of the chaos in Gen 1:2, it seems that the text would more explicitly reflect that idea.

The Gap Theory and the Grammatical Structure of Genesis 1:1–3

Proper understanding of the expression "formless and empty" eliminates the necessity of a gap between the pristine creation of Gen 1:1 and the chaos of 1:2. The syntax and structure of Gen 1:1–3 effectively rule out even the possibility of such a gap. Verse 2 begins with the conjunction *waw* ("and, but, now") attached to the noun *earth*. This type of circumstantial clause introduced by a *waw* + nonverbal form (referred to as a *waw*-disjunctive) is not an independent clause and does not denote sequence, which prevents the progression required by the gap theory: "and the earth *became* formless and empty." The other two clauses in verse 2 ("darkness covered the surface of the watery depths" and "the Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of the waters") are also *waw*-disjunctive clauses and provide background information prior to the first specific creative act that begins with "Then God said" in verse 3.

While the gap theory is ruled out, two possibilities remain for how to understand the relationship between the verses in Gen 1:1–3. One is the traditional view that Gen 1:1 describes God's first act of creation with the six days that follow in the chapter portraying how God brings order out of the initial chaos.⁵ The second option is the precreation chaos view, which reads Gen 1:1 as the title for the chapter and views the chaos described in 1:2 as conditions that exist prior to God's actual work of creation that begins in 1:3.⁶

⁵ See Mark F. Rooker, "Genesis 1:1–3: Creation or Re-Creation? Parts 1 and 2," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 316–23, 411–27.

⁶ See Bruce K. Waltke, "The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3—Part 3: The Initial Chaos Theory," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (1975): 216–28; and the translation notes on 1:1–3 in the NET Bible.

Traditional View
Gen 1:1—God’s initial act of creation
Gen 1:2—Conditions resulting from God’s initial act of creation
Gen 1:3—“Then God said” (God’s creative work resumes)

Precreation Chaos View
Gen 1:1—Title for chapter
Gen 1:2—Conditions that exist prior to God’s work of creation
Gen 1:3—“Then God said” (God’s first creative act in the chapter)

There are several key issues dividing these two readings, but, unlike the gap theory, both are viable readings of Gen 1:1–3.⁷ The same basic structure for Gen 1:1–3 proposed by the precreation chaos view also appears in the opening verses of the complementary creation account found in Gen 2:4–7.⁸ One implication of the precreation chaos view would be that Genesis 1 does not portray an *ex nihilo* (“out of nothing”) creation. This understanding of creation is affirmed elsewhere in the Bible (see John 1:3; Col 1:16; Heb 11:3) but would not be the point of Genesis 1 itself. In contrast, the traditional view affirms creation *ex nihilo*, and the larger biblical teaching on creation raises questions as to why Gen 1:1 would affirm the existence of preexistent chaos that lies outside of God’s creative activity.

The takeaway from this discussion is that there are viable arguments for both the traditional and precreation chaos views, and the details of Gen 1:1–3 do not fully resolve the issue of young Earth versus old Earth that gave rise to the gap theory. The syntax of Gen 1:1–3 can accommodate an old-Earth creation but also allows for a young Earth view if read in connection with a literal

⁷ These issues include whether 1:1 is an independent or subordinate clause, whether 1:2 is to be read as subordinate to verse 1 or verse 3, and whether the noun *beginning* (*rešhit*) should be read as a construct (“in the beginning of” or “when God began to create”) or absolute (“in the beginning”) noun. The precreation chaos view treats *rešhit* as a construct noun, which is the form in which this word appears in forty-nine of its other fifty occurrences in the OT. The noun *rešhit* is also a construct noun in the four other times where the expression “in/at the beginning” appears (Jer 26:1; 27:1; 28:1; 49:34), but another noun appears with *berēšhit* in these passages, which is not the case in Gen 1:1. In support of the traditional view, the noun *rešhit* does appear as an absolute noun in Isa 46:10 in the statement that God declares “the end from *the beginning*.”

⁸ For Gen 2:4–7, there is also (1) title (2:4), (2) series of *waw*-disjunctive clauses providing background information, and (3) main verb (“and God formed”) as the first action. Nevertheless, the parallel between the two sections is not exact, in that 1:1 contains a finite verb (“created”) and 2:4 does not.

six-day creation in the rest of the chapter.⁹ Faithful readers of Scripture have read Genesis 1 in both ways. For young-Earth creationists, the narrative genre, the numbering of the days, and the references to morning and evening support a literal six-day creation. Other commentators acknowledge these details but read the narrative in more figurative or analogical ways.¹⁰

The Message and Purpose of the Creation Account in Genesis I

Like other ancient Near Eastern creation accounts, Genesis 1 pictures creation out of a watery chaos. The narrative in Genesis 1 particularly resembles Egyptian creation accounts, which also begin with a watery chaos and then attribute the creation to the spoken word of Atum.¹¹ Recognition of such parallels helps contemporary readers to appreciate more fully the message of Genesis 1 in its ancient literary context. These parallels do not indicate that the biblical text has borrowed from these pagan texts or has adopted their mythological worldview. These parallels merely reflect common conceptual understandings from the ancient world that the biblical writer (and the Holy Spirit) employed to convey his message in an understandable way to his audience. The purpose of biblical revelation was not to correct ancient cosmogony or to provide advanced scientific understanding of how the world was created. The biblical writer also employed parallels with ancient Near Eastern creation accounts to polemicize against the false beliefs reflected in the pagan myths and stories of creation.¹²

The biblical account stresses that the one true God is the sole actor in the creation process. The sun, moon, and stars that were deified in other cultures are simply identified in Genesis as "the greater light," "the lesser light," and markers of the seasons (1:14–17).¹³ There is no cosmic battle with the forces of chaos as God creates solely through the power of his word (Gen 1:3, 6, 8–11, 14, 20, 22, 24, 26). God is both separate from his creation and distinct from

⁹ Michael S. Heiser, "Creation, Evolution, Intelligent Design, and the Replicating Universe: What Does the Hebrew Text of Genesis 1 Allow?" accessed November 15, 2017, www.michaelsheiser.com/Genesis%201%20and%20creation.pdf, 7.

¹⁰ See J. Daryl Charles, ed., *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013).

¹¹ See further Johnny V. Miller and John M. Soden, *In the Beginning . . . We Misunderstood: Interpreting Genesis 1 in Its Original Context* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), 77–112.

¹² For more on the relationship between the Old Testament and ancient Near Eastern myth, see John N. Oswalt, *The Bible among the Myths: Unique Revelation or Just Ancient Literature?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009).

¹³ Miller and Soden, *In the Beginning*, 180.

the forces of nature. The radical differences between Genesis and other ancient Near Eastern creation accounts are far more striking than the similarities.

Application

Genesis 1–2 does not directly address our contemporary and scientific questions about creation, but the text informs our Christian worldview and is foundational to our understanding of the one true God. Yahweh, the God of Israel, is the Creator of the world and every living thing. The Lord is transcendent over all of his creation, and every human being lives under his sovereign rule. The manner in which God creates by his word reminds us as well of the power of God’s Word and its importance as the source of life and blessing. The good and powerful God who has created the universe is worthy of our worship and obedience.

Annotated Bibliography

BOOKS

- Charles, J. Daryl, ed. *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013. Overview of major evangelical views on how to interpret Genesis 1–2.
- Walton, John H. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009. Thoughtful discussion of how reading Genesis 1 in its ancient Near Eastern context impacts contemporary understandings of origins issues.

COMMENTARIES

- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. Scholarly evangelical commentary with excellent discussion of the interpretive issues surrounding Gen 1:1–3.

ARTICLES

- Rooker, Mark. “Genesis 1:1–3: Creation or Re-Creation? Parts 1 and 2.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 316–23, 411–27. Defends the traditional view of Gen 1:1–3 and argues against the precreation chaos theory.
- Waltke, Bruce K. “The Creation Account in Genesis 1:1–3, Parts 2 and 3.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132 (1975): 25–36. Offers a solid refutation of the gap theory.

WEBSITES

- Heiser, Michael S. “Creation, Evolution, Intelligent Design, and the Replicating Universe: What Does the Hebrew Text of Genesis 1 Allow?” accessed November 15, 2017. www.michaelsheiser.com/Genesis%201%20and%20creation.pdf. Helpful discussion of key differences between the major views on Gen 1:1–3.