

The Genesis Flood

by Allen Dvorak
June 27, 2011

Introduction:

- I. The continent of Australia was in the news early this year as extensive floodwaters swept through the northeastern part of the continent.
 - A. “Queensland has been in the grip of its worst flooding for more than two weeks, after tropical downpours covered an area the size of France and Germany combined. Entire towns have been swamped, more than 200,000 people affected, and the coal industry and farming have virtually shut down.”¹
 - B. “The water was literally leaping, six or 10 feet into the air, through creeks and over bridges and into parks. There was nowhere to escape, even if there had been warnings. There was just a sea of water about a kilometer (half a mile) wide.” (Greg Kowald)²
 - C. “There was water coming down everywhere in biblical proportions.” (Joe Ramia, council member of the town Toowoomba)³
 - D. “In many ways, it is a disaster of biblical proportions.” (Andrew Fraser, Queensland State Treasurer)⁴
 - E. Not to minimize the seriousness of the Australian floods nor the suffering and damage which they have caused, but these floods are not “biblical” in their proportions, if one is referring to the Genesis flood. They are insignificant in comparison!
- II. How do you imagine the early days of the flood?
 - A. Do you think of heavy rain which began to flood streams and rivers?
 - B. Do you see people standing in the doors of their houses after days of rain, both amazed and anxious at the rising waters in their cities?
 - C. Were there groups of people who began to gather necessary supplies and trudge through the rain on their way to higher ground...and then to still higher ground?
 - D. Do you envision the ark surrounded by anxious people who were perhaps pounding on its sides, wanting to enter it? Did Noah and his family have to listen to the cries of those who succumbed
 - E. I suspect that this is the common view of the flood which came in Noah’s day. I am also convinced that this mental picture of the onset of the flood is completely wrong!
- III. It is wonderful to be able to study the story of the Genesis flood and benefit from the research of others.
 - A. Our ability to travel relatively quickly to this place for this conference is, in my opinion, the result of the Genesis flood.
 - B. The vehicle that brought you to this location very likely utilizes fuel refined from oil produced by the effects of the flood.
 - C. We live in a culture which depends in many ways on the benefits provided by oil.
 - D. Tempestuous weather, shortened life spans – the effects of the flood are everywhere!

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

Body:

I. The Antediluvian World

A. The physical world

1. Larger and more usable land mass
 - a. Today, about seven-tenths of the world's surface is covered with water. The land mass of the earth, however, is not entirely usable (e.g., the great deserts of Asia, Africa, America and Australia, the mountain belts, the frozen tundra of Canada and Siberia, the ice-covered continents of Greenland and Antarctica).
 - b. Of the earth's land mass, only about 50% is suitable for extensive human habitation. This was not the case in Noah's day.
2. A uniform, nearly sub-tropical climate on the earth
 - a. There were apparently no ice caps or arctic regions. In fact, those present-day regions show evidence of having once supported fauna and flora that couldn't possibly survive there now.
 - b. This climate supported dense vegetation around the globe.
 - c. This view is supported by fossil evidence around the world.
 - d. Even evolutionists believe that most of the ages of the geologic column were characterized by this kind of climate.
3. A qualitative difference in flora and fauna
 - a. There was a wider and more even distribution of the various types of animals.
 - b. There was a greater variety of animals and plants.
 - c. There were many larger animals and plants.
4. In summary, was the antediluvian world very similar to our own? Absolutely not!
 - a. Adverse weather phenomena (tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, etc.) and temperature extremes common to our world were not characteristic of that world.
 - b. Martin Luther described the antediluvian world as "a veritable paradise compared with the world that followed."⁵

B. Human population

1. Although the paucity of material between the record of the creation and that of the Noahic flood might leave the impression that the time span between those two events was likewise relatively miniscule, the genealogical evidence of Genesis 5 (see also 1 Chronicles 1:1-4 and Luke 3:36-38) proves otherwise.
2. The time between creation and the flood would be on the order of at least 1,650 years, depending upon how the genealogical records are viewed (e.g., rounding of ages).
3. Although some "local flood" advocates postulate that the human population at the time of the flood was confined to the general area of Mesopotamia, even conservative assumptions regarding the rate of population growth give an entirely different picture.

-
- a. Remember that the life spans of individuals were much longer in the antediluvian world.
 - b. The period of reproductive ability was apparently likewise longer than in the present-day.⁶
 - 1) Mahalaleel had a son at age 65 (Genesis 5:15).
 - 2) Noah, on the other hand, was 500 years old when he had his first children (Genesis 5:32).
 - c. The favorable environmental conditions and the vitality of antediluvian mankind also favor large families and thus rapid population growth.
4. Rehwinkel argues that the antediluvian population could easily have been on the order of billions of individuals.⁷
- C. In summary, “The Flood constitutes a sharp line of demarcation between *our present world*, with its basically uniform cycle of seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, and summer and winter (Gen. 8:22), and *the world at that time*, with its low-lying, fossil-free and ice-free mountains, its rainless sky and universally warm and humid climate, and its shallow seas. The transformation that ended *that* world and started *this* world was as sudden and supernaturally cataclysmic as the change that shall end this present world...”⁸
 - D. Note carefully the words of the apostle Peter: “For this they willfully forget: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in the water, by which the world that then existed perished, being flooded with water” (2 Peter 3:5-6). Indeed!

II. Genesis 1-11: Myth or History?

- A. The early chapters of Genesis are viewed by some as mythical in nature. Why?
 1. There is a fundamental contradiction between belief in a global flood and the acceptance of the geological ages postulated by advocates of the general theory of evolution.
 2. Theistic evolutionists must find a way to “reconcile” the Genesis record with what they believe the evidence from the natural world supports.
 3. The prejudice among some “scientists” against the idea of the supernatural and creation is so strong that evidence from the natural world is sometimes mishandled:
 - a. Theories proposed to explain some evidence don’t really fit the evidence (e.g., the “peat bog” theory for the formation of coal) or contradict universally accepted natural laws or facts (e.g., laws of thermodynamics; law of biogenesis).
 - b. Evidence that does not support the general theory of evolution is ignored or unreported in discussions of the subject of origins (e.g., frozen mammoths).
- B. This view has serious consequences for the rest of Genesis and the Scriptures in general.
 1. There are numerous references to Adam in the New Testament. The apostle Paul alone referenced Adam in several passages (Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:22, 45; 1 Timothy 2:13-14).
 2. Paul also alluded to the Genesis story of the sin of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (2 Corinthians 11:3).

-
3. Jesus referred to the creation story (Matthew 19:4-5) and Noah (Matthew 24:38).
 4. Noah appears in genealogies in several places in Scripture besides the early chapters of Genesis (1 Chronicles 1:4; Luke 3:36).
 5. Noah was mentioned by Ezekiel along with Daniel and Job (Ezekiel 14:14, 20).
 6. Peter specifically mentioned Noah in both of his epistles (1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 2:5).
 7. The author of Hebrews included Abel, Enoch and Noah among the faithful of the Old Testament, all of whom are mentioned in Genesis 1-5 (Hebrews 11:4-7).
 8. The apostle Peter referred to the Genesis flood to confirm the certainty of the final destruction of the world by fire (2 Peter 3). If the flood story of Genesis is merely myth, it would be the worst possible illustration to use to confirm the certainty of the final destruction of the world as an actual event of future history!
 9. There are numerous other allusions in Scripture to the creation story and the flood (e.g., Psalm 104).
- C. The ubiquitous nature of flood traditions among various cultures suggests that there is a common historical source and offers support for the historicity of the Genesis flood account.
1. The agreement of the flood traditions on several key points argue for a single, global flood as their source rather than multiple, localized floods.
 2. The significance of these flood traditions (myths) is that they clearly confirm that the flood in Noah's day left an indelible impression in the collective mind of mankind.
- D. Arguments against the historicity of the Genesis flood story
1. "The ark was of inadequate size for all the animals and their foodstuffs."
 - a. The volume of the ark was somewhere between 1.5 and 3.6 million cubic feet, depending upon the exact length of a "cubit."
 - b. Any question about the ark's capacity to hold the required creatures is tied directly to the number of animals preserved and their size (infants/adolescents versus mature adults).
 - c. "Kind" (used in Genesis) doesn't mean "species" (used by taxonomists).
 2. The logistics of mixing predators and prey – this objection ignores the possibility of supernatural intervention.
 3. The impossibility of gathering all the animals
 - a. This is perhaps the weakest of the objections currently being considered inasmuch as the Genesis text specifically says that the animals would "come" to Noah (6:20; 7:9, 15). It was thus unnecessary for Noah to "round up" all of these creatures to be preserved in the ark.
 - b. Some would argue that such "migrations" would have been impossible due to topographical difficulties and climate differences. This objection projects such features of our present world back into the antediluvian world; evidence suggests that the world was very different then.
 4. The inability of eight people to care for the animals on the ark
-

-
- a. The strength of this objection likewise depends in part upon the number of animals being cared for – a number that we have no way of determining with precision.
 - b. However, it is quite possible that many of the animals may have gone into some sort of hibernation for at least a portion of the time that they were on the ark.⁹

III. The Flood: Local or Global?

- A. A surprising number of well-known religious writers, theologians, and even apologists do not believe in a global flood. Why would such individuals seem to want to ignore the plain statements of the Scriptures?
 1. The swing of the pendulum in the study of geology has been from the point of view of catastrophism to that of uniformitarianism.¹⁰
 2. Those who subscribe to the local flood view often are simply bowing to the pressure exerted by the community of scientists and educators to affirm the “fact” of macroevolution.
 3. “Old-earth creationists” also subscribe to the local flood view because a global flood is incompatible with the column of geological ages popularized by evolutionists.
- B. We need to consider the specific language used in the biblical description of the flood.
 1. Note the expressions used by Moses:
 - a. “all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered” (7:19)
 - b. “all flesh died that moved on the earth” (7:21)
 - c. “all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, all that was on dry land, died” (7:22)
 - d. “only Noah and those who were with him in the ark remained alive” (7:23b)
 - e. “The waters were on the face of the whole earth” (8:9).
 2. It is hard to fathom how one can read the biblical account and conclude that a local flood was under consideration!
- C. There are several arguments against a local flood that can be made from the biblical text.
 1. The stated purpose of the flood
 - a. The flood was intended to “destroy from under heaven all flesh in which is the breath of life” (Genesis 6:17).
 - b. Unless all of mankind lived in the same area, a local flood would not accomplish the stated purpose of the flood.
 2. The depth of the flood
 3. The need for an ark to save Noah, his family and assembled animals
 - a. It would be unnecessary to build an ark to escape a flood that was years in the future (cf. Genesis 6:3). An ark, particularly of the biblical dimensions, would likely have required many years to construct.
 - b. Noah and his family could simply have migrated to another region of the earth to avoid a local flood.

-
- c. As with Noah and his family, it would be unnecessary to protect animals in an ark. The animals could simply migrate out of the area affected by the flood.
 4. The need to stay in the ark for over a year
 5. The apostle Peter compared the destruction which resulted from the flood with the destruction of the world (2 Peter 3:3-7). Was he using a local flood to confirm a global destruction?
 6. The promise of a rainbow with its significance (Genesis 9:8-17)
 - a. The rainbow was intended to be a sign of the covenant which God made with Noah and the earth. In that covenant God promised “never again shall all flesh be cut off by the waters of the flood; never again shall there be a flood to destroy the earth” (vs. 11).
 - b. The language of this covenant is comprehensive, just like the language used to describe the flood. If the language of the flood is to be understood to indicate a local flood, why would the language of the covenant not be understood in the same way?
 - c. If the rainbow is a sign of God’s promise not to bring any local floods again (like the “local” flood of Noah’s day), the occurrence of many such floods since then would indicate that God did not keep His covenant.
 7. [Whitcomb] “The biblical record simply cannot be harmonized with the concept of a Flood that was confined to the Near East.”¹¹
- D. There are abundant natural evidences that support a global flood.
1. Ossiferous fissures, rubble drift and “erratics” (“large isolated masses of rock far removed from their original source and deposited in areas where the same type of rock is not found”¹²)
 2. The prevalence of fossils and their global distribution are striking evidence for a global, catastrophic flood. There are even marine fossils on mountains tops and in the great deserts of the world.
- E. What happened to the woolly mammoths?
1. Japanese researchers are hoping to clone a mammoth in five years. They will implant the nuclei of mammoth cells into an elephant’s egg cell which will be inserted into an elephant’s uterus.¹³
 - a. “The team, which has invited a Russian mammoth researcher and two US elephant experts to join the project, has established a technique to extract DNA from frozen cells, previously an obstacle to cloning attempts because of the damage cells sustained in the freezing process.”¹⁴
 - b. “Exactly why a majority of the huge creatures that once strode in large herds across Eurasia and North America died out towards the end of the last Ice Age has generated fiery debate. Some experts hold that mammoths were hunted to extinction by the species that was to become the planet’s dominant predator – humans. Others argue that climate change was more to blame, leaving a species adapted for frozen climes ill-equipped to cope with a warming world.”¹⁵
-

-
2. The discovery of the frozen carcasses of woolly mammoths is frankly a “sticky wicket” for evolutionists.¹⁶
 - a. Consider the following facts:
 - 1) The woolly mammoth is a relative of the present-day elephant. Despite popular impressions to the contrary, it was not a cold-weather animal.
 - 2) Numerous carcasses (in some cases, of the entire animal) of mammoths have been found in northern Siberia and northwestern Alaska. The significance of these locations is that they are areas in which little vegetation of any kind presently grows, certainly not enough food for a creature the size of a mammoth (much larger than modern elephants).
 - 3) The number of mammoths which once lived in the Arctic region is estimated to be in the millions. This estimate is based on the prevalence of bones, teeth and tusks of the mammoth. It is reported that on some of the remote Arctic islands and in parts of Siberia the main component of the soil is mammoth remains.
 - 4) Perhaps the most famous mammoth discovery is the Beresovka mammoth.
 - a) Discovered in Siberia near the Beresovka River in 1900, the carcass was found in an upright position.
 - b) The hind legs of the 50-year-old male were rotated forward under the body. The pelvis, several ribs and a shoulder blade were broken. The right foreleg bone was crushed, but the surrounding tissue was not damaged.
 - c) The penis of the animal was erect and horizontally flattened. This probably indicates that the animal died of suffocation and was compressed by some great force. Death by suffocation is apparent in other cases of mammoth discoveries.
 - 1] The death of the animal occurred so quickly that portions of its final meal were still on the surface of its tongue.
 - 2] The only way that such materials could escape decay would have been for the animal to be “fast-frozen.” “The only plausible explanation is for the stomach to cool to about 40°F in ten hours or less. But because the stomach is protected inside a warm body (96.6°F for elephants), how cold must the outside air become to drop the stomach’s temperature to 40°F? Experiments have shown that the outer layers of skin would have had to drop suddenly to at least -175°F!”¹⁷
 - b. The significance of these discoveries is summarized by Whitcomb: “A startling illustration of the fact that a great catastrophe once struck this planet may be found in the four or five million mammoths and other large animals which were destroyed in the north polar regions, many of them frozen instantly and preserved whole and undamaged, and in some cases either standing or kneeling upright!”¹⁸
 3. The presence of oil and coal reserves is evidence of catastrophism.
-

-
- a. It is generally accepted that the world's extensive coal reserves are the result of the rapid burial and subsequent compression of large amounts of vegetation.
 - b. Oil fields, on the other hand, appear to be formed from the rapid burial of animals.
 - c. The requisite conditions for the formation of coal and oil argue strongly against uniformitarianism and in favor of a global flood.

IV. Mechanisms of the flood

- A. One of the objections to a global flood is the quantity of water it would have required to cover all the landmass. What was the source(s) of all this water?
 1. There are several theories regarding the source(s) of sufficient water to cover the then-existing entire landmass.
 2. The hydroplate theory (Genesis 7:11); proposed by Dr. Walt Brown
 - a. The hydroplate theory begins with a couple of assumptions: 1) "About half the water now in the oceans was once in interconnected chambers about 10 miles below the earth's surface" and 2) "the pressure in the subterranean water was increasing."
 - b. The theory involves four stages: rupture, flood, drift and recovery.
 - 1) In the first stage, increasing pressure in subterranean chambers filled with water resulted in a "rip" in the earth's crust which quickly ran around the globe (basically following the present Mid-Oceanic ridge).
 - a) This allowed the water below the earth's crust to escape into the atmosphere – some of it even above the atmosphere where it froze and then returned to the earth's surface as "huge masses of extremely, cold, muddy 'hail'" (Brown, 101).
 - b) "That hail buried, suffocated, and froze many animals, including some mammoths" (Ibid).
 - c) Water that remained in the atmosphere would have fallen as torrential rain, probably great distances away from the rupture in the crust.
 - 2) In the second stage, the upward-jetting water eroded the sides of the fissure in the crust, increasing the width of the fissure and producing massive amounts of sediment (in addition to sediment produced by erosion from the subterranean chambers) which would have settled out over the earth's surface, trapping many plants and animals and beginning the process of fossilization.
 - 3) The third stage is called the "continental drift phase." As the fissure in the earth's crust widened, underlying pressure would have caused the rise of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, resulting in the rapid "drift" of the hydroplates away from both sides of the Ridge.
 - a) Depletion of the water under the hydroplates and collision with something on the other side of the plate would produce a compression event which would, in turn, result in the buckling, crushing and thickening of each plate. This "thickening" would have caused the continents to rise out of the water.

-
- 4) The fourth stage is the “recovery phase.” The hydroplates settled onto the subterranean chamber floor, cutting off the exodus of any remaining water in that chamber.
 - a) Over centuries, they sank in the basalt floor, causing the ocean floor and water levels to rise and burying land bridges between all the continents.
 - b) Large amounts of water were trapped in continental basins. Some of those “lakes” slowly evaporated over centuries. Other lakes increased in size (from rainfall and drainage from higher terrain) until they breached their rim, in some cases creating a massive, rapid outflow of water. It is likely that the Grand Canyon was formed in this manner.
 - c) The sudden formation of large mountains would have caused a shift in the earth’s balance, causing the earth to roll about 45 degrees. This shift would explain, in part, why so much coal is found at the present-day South Pole and evidence of lush vegetation, vast dinosaur remains and frozen mammoths is found inside the present-day Arctic Circle.
 - c. Evaluation of Brown’s theory: (observing that I do not have the educational background to evaluate the scientific soundness of his theory)
 - 1) His theory seems to explain a large number of geologic phenomena that we see in our world.
 - 2) His theory does not explain how the earth had a uniform, warm and mild climate prior to the flood.
 - 3) Brown argues that the Hebrew word translated “firmament” in Genesis 1:6-7 refers to the earth’s crust rather than its atmosphere.
 3. Water canopy theory - the earth was surrounded by an antediluvian vapor/water canopy which collapsed to produce at least some of the waters of the flood.
 - a. Those who argue in favor of a water canopy do so primarily on the basis of Genesis 1:6-10. Genesis 7:11 states that “the windows of heaven were opened” and it rained for forty days and forty nights.
 - b. Rehwinkel, Whitcomb, Morris, Dillow and Geilow all subscribe to some form of vapor/water canopy theory. As Dillow notes, there are several canopy models.
 - 1) “The pre-Flood earth was enveloped in a thermal vapor blanket capable of precipitating many feet of water which condensed in the recent geological past in 40 days due to volcanic eruption, resulting in a geographically universal flood.”¹⁹
 - a) Rehwinkel, Dillow and others view the “fountains of the great deep” to be perhaps a way of referring to volcanic action.
 - b) Dillow makes several predictions, based on the presence of the vapor canopy and/or its collapse. Among them are:
 - 1] A greenhouse effect
 - 2] Greater atmospheric pressure
 - 3] Shielding from cosmic radiation
-

-
- 4] Fewer meteorites in older strata
 - 5] A changed appearance of the heavenly bodies
 - 6] A global flood
 - 7] Volcanic ash mixed with glacial ice
 - 8] A sudden and permanent temperature drop in the polar regions
 - 9] Residual amounts of water in the stratosphere today
- 2) “According to this theory the earth was originally surrounded by a canopy of vapor which intercepted the direct rays of the sun. The heat which penetrated the canopy was diffused so equally over all the zones of latitude that the subtropical climate prevailed even in the high latitude. This canopy served to bring about conditions similar to those in a hothouse with a temperature of about 72° F. The chemical rays of the sun, especially those most active in the aging of living things and those that bring about decay and fermentation, were intercepted by the canopy, and as a result, men and animals lived to great ages.”²⁰
- B. The Scriptures do not provide adequate information to understand how everything happened during the flood and its aftermath.
1. The hydroplate theory and the variations of the water canopy theory propose to explain the phenomena observable in the study of geology.
 2. Such physical evidence, of course, is subject to the interpretation of scientists.
 3. For the purpose of the believer, however, it should be noted that there are reasonable explanations to answer the question of how the flood could have occurred.
 4. “The Flood itself appears to have been due to a combination of meteorologic and tectonic phenomena. The ‘fountains of the great deep’ emitted great quantities of juvenile water and magmatic materials, and the ‘waters above the firmament,’ probably an extensive thermal atmospheric blanket of water vapor, condensed and precipitated torrential rains for a period of forty days.”²¹
- V. **The search for Noah’s ark**
- A. The Scriptures record that the ark came to rest “on the mountains of Ararat” (Genesis 8:4).
 - B. There have been many reported sightings of the ark over a long period of time.
 - C. Some difficulties:
 1. There is some question regarding the identification of Mount Ararat.
 2. The supposed site of the ark is almost always covered with ice and snow and visibility is often limited by clouds.
 3. For a long time, getting access to Mount Ararat was difficult because of political concerns (Armenians, Turks and Soviets) which made it difficult for expeditions to reach the site.
 - D. There are at least three locations in the same general area which have received a great deal of attention as possible sites for the ark.
-

1. In April, 2010, an expedition to the mountain announced a 99% probability that the ark had been found.
 2. Others seem to be just as certain about another site!
- E. Although it would be interesting to locate the ark with certainty, the truth is that the physical evidence for a global flood is extensive and, in many cases, indisputable.
- F. For those who are determined to reject the biblical story of the flood, would even the confirmed discovery of the ark be enough to produce belief?
1. Remember the Pharisees in John 9 – unwilling to believe even though the evidence was indisputable.

VI. Observations

A. What does Noah bring to mind?

1. Divine grace
2. Faith and obedience (Hebrews 11)
 - a. Was Noah the only person capable of building a boat? Why were there not other people saved?
 - b. The flood occurred rapidly enough that there would have been very little time to build anything once the flood began.
 - c. As Nathan Ward (99) observes, Noah wasn't saved by a boat alone!
3. Perseverance in righteousness
4. Fallibility of mankind

B. The flood reminds us of several things.

1. God's attitude toward wickedness is illustrated by His willingness to destroy nearly all of mankind and the natural creation with a flood.
2. God's attitude toward His promise regarding the woman's seed is seen in that He didn't just end mankind.

C. Note the command regarding the shedding of blood (Genesis 9:6). An interesting law, in light of the fact that God had just exterminated nearly the entire population of the earth!

1. The earth had been filled with violence.
2. Clearly, the Lord wanted to impress upon Noah and his family the sanctity of human life.

Conclusion:

- I. The subject of the global flood of Noah touches an extremely broad field of scriptural and scientific inquiry. This class is admittedly but a scratch on the surface of the subject!
- II. The global flood of Genesis was responsible for huge changes in the environment of the world.
- III. Christians should not be afraid to boldly affirm the truthfulness of the biblical flood account.
 - A. If there was NO physical evidence to verify the account, the Bible has adequate support to confirm its general truthfulness.
 - B. However, the physical evidence for a global flood is overwhelming.

-
1. Natural phenomena constantly point to a cataclysmic global flood in the past.
 2. Fossil beds, frozen mammoths, oil and coal deposits, among other geologic evidence, are best explained by a global flood.
- C. There are reasonable theories for the source(s) of water to flood the entire earth.
- IV. This is no need to interpret Genesis 1-11, and particularly the Noahic flood story, as mythical. In fact, such an interpretation has serious implications for the rest of Scripture.
- V. It is neither necessary nor reasonable to understand the Noahic flood as being local in its extent.
- A. The language of Scripture clearly indicates a global flood.
 - B. The implications of the flood story demand a global flood.
 - C. The geologic evidence in the natural world clearly supports a global catastrophe in the form of a flood.

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

Selected Bibliography

- Brown, Walt. In the Beginning.
- Cates, Curtis A. The Noahic Flood.
- Davidson, B. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.
- Dillow, Joseph C. The Waters Above.
- Gielow, Robert L., Noah's Flood
- Gish, Duane T. Evolution? The Fossils Say NO!
- Leupold, H. C., Exposition of Genesis, Vol. I.
- Oard, Mike. Flood By Design.
- Rehwinkel, Alfred M. The Flood.
- Thompson, Bert. The Bible and the Age of the Earth.
- Thompson, Bert. The Global Flood of Noah.
- Ward, Nathan. The Growth of the Seed.
- Whitcomb, John C. & Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood.
- Whitcomb, John C. The World That Perished.
- Wilson, William. Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies.

¹ Kristen Gelineau and Tertius Pickard, “Scores missing in tsunami-like flood in Australia,” Associated Press (electronic article), January 11, 2011.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Torsten Blackwood, “‘Biblical’ floods threaten Australian homes,” (electronic article), January 1, 2011.

⁵ Rehwinkel, p. 2.

⁶ Rehwinkel, p. 28.

⁷ Rehwinkel, pp. 28-31. Brown concurs (p. 273).

⁸ Whitcomb, p. 46.

⁹ Whitcomb, pp. 32-34; so also Thompson, pp. 39-40. Whitcomb argues that the same God who could set aside the natural instincts of creatures could also cause them to hibernate after initially eating of the food stocks accumulated by Noah. Rehwinkel also gives credence to the possibility of hibernation (pp. 75-76).

¹⁰ Whitcomb and Morris, pp. 89ff.

¹¹ Whitcomb, p.49.

¹² Rehwinkel, p. 306.

¹³ Shingo Ito. “Researchers aim to resurrect mammoth in five years,” (electronic article), January 17, 2011.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Extensive discussions of the mammoth finds and the significance of those finds can be found in Rehwinkel (pp. 238-254), Whitcomb & Morris (pp. 288-291), Whitcomb (pp. 76-82), Cates (pp. 93-96), Dillow (pp. 311-422) and Brown (pp. 159-187). The discussions of Dillow and Brown are by far the most extensive and extremely interesting. Brown considers a number of “explanations” for the frozen mammoth phenomenon and evaluates them. He even includes a summary table of mammoth finds (helpful because of the publication date of his book; more recent than The Genesis Flood) and a map correlating the location of each find. Dillow provides a great deal of helpful information regarding the cause of climate change in the areas where mammoth carcasses are typically found.

¹⁷ Brown, p. 165.

¹⁸ Whitcomb, p. 76.

¹⁹ Dillow, p. 136.

²⁰ Rehwinkel, p. 12.

²¹ Whitcomb & Morris, p. 328.