

# Genesis 1:2 and the Gap Theory Revealed

**A Scriptural Investigation of the Gap Theory, and a Word-by-Word, Letter-by-Letter  
Study of Genesis 1:2**

Copyright 2026

Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted & encouraged.

Author: John Lobota

Research Assistant: Claude Cowork

[papertiq@bellsouth.net](mailto:papertiq@bellsouth.net)

# Table of Contents

---

|                                                                                                                                                    |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Introduction.....</b>                                                                                                                           | <b>4</b>  |
| Why sincere believers read Genesis 1:2 two different ways, the Gap Theory's case stated at full strength, and how this study weighs its arguments. |           |
| <b>Part One: The Gap Theory.....</b>                                                                                                               | <b>8</b>  |
| The Ruin-Reconstruction reading tested on its own terms, from first principles to its own open questions.                                          |           |
| <b>Chapter 1: What Is Solidly Established.....</b>                                                                                                 | <b>8</b>  |
| What every side already agrees on, where the real, narrower question lies, and man's distinct creation.                                            |           |
| <b>Chapter 2: The Genesis 1:2 Text Itself.....</b>                                                                                                 | <b>13</b> |
| The verse's own Hebrew grammar — hayah, tohu, and the scene-setting clause pattern — tested directly.                                              |           |
| <b>Chapter 3: Isaiah 45:18 Examined.....</b>                                                                                                       | <b>15</b> |
| Scripture's own clearest statement that God did not create the earth tohu, tested against the Gap reading.                                         |           |
| <b>Chapter 4: Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 Examined.....</b>                                                                                           | <b>16</b> |
| The two texts most often read as Lucifer's fall, tested against their own context — and what the fall requires of creation.                        |           |
| <b>Chapter 5: What Remains Unproven, and the Working Position.....</b>                                                                             | <b>22</b> |
| Where the evidence does and does not reach, the one place the Gap Theory could sit, and what would change this study's mind.                       |           |
| <b>Chapter 6: Open for Future Study.....</b>                                                                                                       | <b>26</b> |
| Questions Part One leaves open rather than forcing shut.                                                                                           |           |
| <b>Part Two: Genesis 1:2 — A Word and Letter Study.....</b>                                                                                        | <b>28</b> |
| Building on Part One's working ground, the verse itself, word by word and letter by letter.                                                        |           |
| <b>Chapter 7: The Text, and How This Study Reads It.....</b>                                                                                       | <b>28</b> |
| The verse in Hebrew, transliteration, and English, and the method this study follows.                                                              |           |

|                                                                                                                                             |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 8: The Words, Narrated One at a Time.....</b>                                                                                    | <b>29</b> |
| All fourteen words, each for its plain sense and then its own letters.                                                                      |           |
| <b>Chapter 9: Right Cutting, the Verse's Turn, and Its Numbers.....</b>                                                                     | <b>36</b> |
| Where the verse's true division falls, and what its own numbers say.                                                                        |           |
| <b>Chapter 10: A Cohesive Understanding of the Verse.....</b>                                                                               | <b>39</b> |
| The fourteen words drawn together into one connected reading.                                                                               |           |
| <b>Chapter 11: Open Questions and Working Hypotheses.....</b>                                                                               | <b>40</b> |
| The author's own working hypothesis, offered as unfinished.                                                                                 |           |
| <b>Appendix A — Weight of Each Argument.....</b>                                                                                            | <b>42</b> |
| Every argument in this study, its weight, and what the opposing reading fairly answers — including what this version corrected or withdrew. |           |
| <b>Sources Consulted.....</b>                                                                                                               | <b>44</b> |
| The classical, historical, and modern scholarly sources consulted, cited but never treated as an authority.                                 |           |
| <b>Scripture Index.....</b>                                                                                                                 | <b>45</b> |
| Every scripture quoted in full across this study, in canonical order, with the chapter and section where it appears.                        |           |

# Introduction

---

## A. A Verse Believers Read Differently

Genesis 1:1 states, without any real dispute among Bible-believing Christians, that God created the heaven and the earth. Genesis 1:2 is a different matter. "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" — those same words are read by sincere, Bible-believing students of scripture in two genuinely different ways, and have been for the better part of two centuries.

One reading takes the verse at its plainest sense: God created the earth in verse 1 already in this unformed, unfilled starting condition, and the six days that follow are God shaping and filling material that was never anything but raw material to begin with. The other reading, commonly called the Gap Theory or the Ruin-Reconstruction reading, holds that an unstated span of time — possibly a very long one — separates verse 1 from verse 2, and that verse 2 does not describe an original starting condition at all, but the aftermath of a catastrophe: a once-complete creation thrown into ruin, most often tied to the rebellion and fall of Lucifer, which the six days of Genesis 1 then re-form rather than form for the first time.

This is not a fringe position invented by one teacher, and it is not treated that way here. Some form of the gap reading was already circulating among nineteenth-century expositors — the Scottish minister and geologist Thomas Chalmers is often credited with popularizing it around 1814, as a way of reconciling the geological ages science was beginning to describe with a plain reading of Genesis — and it has since been carried forward, in various forms and with various emphases, by a long line of teachers, preachers, and published study Bibles, including the notes of the Scofield Reference Bible and the structural notes of E. W. Bullinger's Companion Bible, a serious structural reference treated fairly here. It remains a live and sincerely held position among believers who share the same high view of scripture this study holds — not a settled matter one side simply overlooked, and not a position that can responsibly be reduced to any single name.

That is exactly why it deserves a real hearing on its own terms, rather than a quick dismissal or a quick embrace, and why this study takes it up first. Part One tests the Gap Theory directly: what does scripture itself establish, what does it leave unproven, and where does the honest weight of the evidence fall — separating what a text establishes directly from what is merely inferred, testing the strongest supporting texts against their own grammar and context, and holding a position only as far as the evidence carries it. Part One's closing chapters then set out the positive scriptural case against the theory's required sequence, and name the one place in the text where the theory would have to sit.

**Weighing it: Framing only — takes no side yet on whether Genesis 1:2 records a ruin.**

## B. What Part Two Adds

Part Two, *Genesis 1:2 — A Word and Letter Study*, then takes up the verse in its own right, on the working ground Part One reaches — that the verse's own grammar favors reading it as the earth's real, unformed starting condition, not the record of a ruin. Part Two does not re-argue that question. It picks up from it: given that starting condition, what does the verse's own vocabulary and letter-structure say about it? Every one of the verse's fourteen words is taken up in turn, first for its plain sense (*peshat*) — drawn from the classical Jewish commentators, the Talmud, the Zohar, and modern Hebraist scholarship — and then a second time for what its individual paleo-Hebrew letters picture (*Remez*, a symbolic reading), with *gematria* (the numerical values of Hebrew letters), method-noted throughout so the two kinds of reading are never blended without being labeled. It closes with the verse's numbers, the seam where it turns toward the six days that follow, and one working hypothesis of the author's own, offered as unfinished rather than settled.

The two parts are complementary, not competing. One is grammatical and historical, and weighs a genuinely disputed question about what kind of event, if any, verse 2 records. The other is lexical and symbolic, and explores what is sitting inside the words once that question has been given a full, fair hearing. Read together, they are meant to leave a reader with both: a reasoned, openly held position on the Gap Theory, and a close, patient reading of the verse that position is drawn from.

**Weighing it: Framing only — describes Part Two and argues nothing.**

## C. The Case for the Gap Theory, Stated at Full Strength

Before any of it is answered, the Gap Theory's case should be stated the way its own advocates would state it, in its own emphases and with its own best verses.

1. **"Was" can mean "became."** The Hebrew verb in verse 2, *hayah*, can mean "became" (Genesis 19:26, Lot's wife "became a pillar of salt"). Read that way, the earth *became* without form and void — something happened to it.
2. **God did not create the earth *\*tohu\**.** "He created it not in vain [*tohu*], he formed it to be inhabited" (Isaiah 45:18). If God did not create it *tohu*, and Genesis 1:2 finds it *tohu*, it must have become so after verse 1.
3. **The phrase *\*tohu wabohu\** belongs to judgment.** Its only other appearance as a pair is Jeremiah 4:23 — "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light" — a vision of the land laid waste under God's judgment. Isaiah 34:11 sets the two words together over Edom's judged ruin. Wherever else scripture uses them, something has been destroyed.
4. **Darkness is not the work of the God who is light.** "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). Darkness over the deep reads more naturally as the mark of judgment than as a condition God first created.

5. **Lucifer's fall needs a time and a place.** Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezekiel 28:12-17 describe a being created perfect, exalted, and then cast down to the ground. Genesis 3:1 already has the serpent fallen. Between the "very good" of Genesis 1:31 and the serpent of 3:1 scripture leaves no room for a war in heaven; between verses 1 and 2 it leaves all the room needed.

6. **Scripture speaks of a world that perished.** "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now..." (2 Peter 3:6-7). Bullinger's Companion Bible reads "the world that then was" as the world of Genesis 1:1, and Genesis 1:2 as its end.

7. **"Replenish."** God tells Adam to "replenish the earth" (Genesis 1:28), and tells Noah the same after the flood (Genesis 9:1) — as though the earth had been filled once before.

Points 1 and 2 are answered in Chapters 2 and 3; point 3 in Chapter 2 §A; point 4 in Chapter 1 §A and Part Two's chapter on darkness (Chapter 8 §E); point 5 in Chapter 4 §§C-D; point 6 in Chapter 5 §A and Chapter 9 §B; and point 7 in Chapter 5 §A. Some of these answers are strong and some are only reasonable, and each is rated where it is given.

**Weighing it: Opposing case, stated — this section argues neither side; it sets out the case for the Gap Theory at full strength.**

## D. How This Study Weighs Its Arguments

This study uses the King James Version as its base text, and keeps three kinds of evidence apart: what scripture states directly, what follows from it by reasoning, and what comes from outside it (commentators, history, comparative study), which may corroborate but never decides. Part Two adds a fourth kind — the symbolic reading of letters and numbers (Remez) — which is labeled every time it appears and never counted as evidence for any claim.

Every section ends with a short note in bold, headed **Weighing it**. Each note says two things. First, how strong the section's argument is, on a five-step scale. **Direct statement** means scripture says it in so many words, and the only question is what the words mean. **Strong inference** means it follows closely from what scripture says, and the alternative has to strain against the text. **Reasonable inference** means it is the more natural reading, but an honest reader working carefully can take it otherwise. **Corroboration only** means it is consistent with this study's position and roughly as consistent with the opposite one — it may be stated, but it will not be leaned on. **Neutral** means it is commonly cited but settles nothing. Sections that argue nothing — narrative, method, a concession, or a symbolic letter reading — say so plainly rather than being given a manufactured rating.

Second, each note says *which way the section points*, and on which question. This study argues six claims, and they are worth having in one place before the first chapter:

|   | The claim                                                                                                               | Argued in                  |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| G | Genesis 1:2's grammar describes a standing condition, not an event that happened to the earth                           | Ch. 2 §B; Ch. 8 §B; Ch. 10 |
| T | <i>Tohu</i> , and Isaiah 45:18's use of it, do not require the sense of a prior ruin                                    | Ch. 2 §A; Ch. 3            |
| F | Lucifer's fall followed the founding of the earth, and most plausibly the six days; no text dates it before Genesis 1:2 | Ch. 4 §§A-D; Ch. 5 §B      |
| X | The Gap Theory has only one place it could sit — between verses 1 and 2 — and scripture leaves that place empty         | Ch. 4 §E; Ch. 5 §§A, D     |
| S | Adam received a spirit-component, held on condition and lost the day he sinned                                          | Ch. 1 §D                   |
| H | The clause "and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" is the verse's hinge toward verse 3                | Ch. 9 §B; Ch. 10           |

A seventh idea, the author's free-will hypothesis (Chapter 11), is held open and is not argued as a claim. Appendix A collects every argument in one table, with its weight and what the opposing reading fairly answers — including the claims this version of the study corrected or withdrew. Chapter 5 §E names the findings that would change this study's mind.

**Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.**

## In Short

Genesis 1:2 is read two ways by sincere believers: as the earth's unformed starting condition, or as the ruin of an earlier creation. The Gap Theory has real texts behind it, and they are stated here at full strength before anything is answered. This study weighs every argument openly, names the six claims it makes, and keeps the symbolic letter readings of Part Two apart from the evidence.

# Part One: The Gap Theory

---

This part takes up the Gap Theory — the Ruin-Reconstruction reading of Genesis 1:2 — on its own terms. The question tested: does Genesis 1:2 record the aftermath of a prior angelic rebellion and catastrophe, with the six days of Genesis 1 describing a re-forming of a ruined earth, rather than an original forming?

The method is to separate what specific texts establish directly from what is inferred or asserted, to test the strongest supporting texts against their own grammar and context, and to hold a position only as far as the evidence carries it — declining to adopt a tenet where the evidence does not support it, even where the underlying theological instinct (a real spiritual enemy, a real fall, a real remedy in Christ) is independently well-founded.

This part does not stop at weighing that evidence and reporting an open verdict. Its closing chapters (4 and 5) set out a positive case, built from scripture's own description of how this fall occurs and from scripture's repeated statement of when creation's redemptive purpose was fixed. That case shows the Gap Theory has exactly one place it could stand — between the first verse and the second — and then shows that every line of evidence available at that point stands against it.

## Chapter 1: What Is Solidly Established

---

### A. Everything God Creates or Makes Is Good and Perfect

**Genesis 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25** *And God saw that it was good.*

**Genesis 1:31** *And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.*

**Deuteronomy 32:4** *He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.*

**1 John 1:5** *This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.*

This premise is not in dispute. The open question tested throughout this study is narrower than the premise itself: whether “God’s work is perfect” requires every intermediate stage of a process to already be complete, or whether it describes a process — beginning with unformed material and ending “very good” — that is itself perfect in its design. An unshaped starting material is not, by itself, evidence of damage; it may simply be a starting point. This distinction is the hinge of the entire study and is referenced throughout.

The same God who is light also says of himself, in the chapter this study turns to in Chapter 3: **“I form the light, and create darkness” (Isaiah 45:7)**. Darkness is not, in scripture’s own words, something that can only arrive as a mark against God’s work; he names it among the things he forms. That does not

settle what Genesis 1:2's darkness is, but it answers the claim that darkness over the deep must be the mark of judgment.

**Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G: God's work is perfect, and he names darkness among the things he himself creates; an unformed start is not evidence of damage.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that "perfect" most naturally describes a finished work, not a starting stage; this study grants that the premise alone settles nothing and rests the question on the verse's grammar (Chapter 2).

## B. Angelic Beings Existed Before the Six Days of Genesis 1

**Job 38:4, 7** *Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?... When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?*

"Sons of God" (bene elohim) is Job's consistent term for angelic beings elsewhere in the same book (Job 1:6; 2:1). This places angelic beings present and rejoicing at the founding of the earth — solid support for a heavenly, non-physical order of beings, including whatever became of Lucifer, already existing before or alongside the physical creation described in Genesis 1.

**Nehemiah 9:6** *Thou, even thou, art LORD alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host... and the host of heaven worshippeth thee.*

Established: a heavenly realm and angelic host, of which Lucifer was one, existed at the founding of the earth, and so before the six days of Genesis 1 were complete.

**Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim F: the angels were present, and all of them rejoicing, when the earth was founded.** Both sides agree the angels existed first; the Gap reading can fairly answer that "the foundations of the earth" may describe Genesis 1:1's original creation, before a later fall — which is exactly where Chapter 4 takes up the question.

## C. Satan Is Real, His Rebellion Is Real, and Christ Is the Remedy

This is affirmed throughout scripture independent of the Genesis 1:2 question and is not contested in this study: Satan's fall, his ongoing opposition, and Christ's role as the appointed remedy and eventual destroyer of his works are all directly and repeatedly stated (e.g. Luke 10:18; Revelation 12:9; 1 John 3:8; Hebrews 2:14). What is tested below is narrower and specific: whether Genesis 1:2 itself is the textual record of the event that caused that fall.

**Weighing it: Common ground — argued by neither side, denied by neither side.**

## D. The Sixth Day Departs From the Pattern

Across the six days, God's creative acts follow a consistent formula: God speaks, and it is so.

**Genesis 1:3** *And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.*

**Genesis 1:6-7** *And God said, Let there be a firmament... and it was so.*

The same pattern repeats for the dry land and vegetation (1:9, 11), the lights (1:14-15), the sea and air creatures (1:20), and the land animals (1:24). Man's creation is described differently, and not only by

decree — first with a deliberation found nowhere else in the chapter ("Let us make man in our image," Genesis 1:26), and then, in the second chapter's closer account, by God's own hand:

**Genesis 2:7** *And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*

Man is formed (yatsar, a potter's word), not merely spoken into being, and receives something further beyond bare animation: breath directly from God's own act, rather than a spoken command to the ground or the waters to bring forth.

This distinct treatment is a genuine textual observation, independent of the Gap Theory question tested in this document. This study's working position is that what Adam received in Genesis 2:7 included a real spirit-component distinct from the soul and body that constitute every other living creature — one held conditionally, and lost the very day he sinned, while body and soul continued.

**Genesis 2:17** *But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*

This warning is not answered by Adam's immediate physical death — he goes on living for centuries afterward (Genesis 5:5, "all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died"). The Hebrew behind "thou shalt surely die" doubles the verb (mot tamut, literally "dying, thou shalt die"), a construction Hebrew uses to make a statement emphatic and certain. God meant this death to be certain, and the warning names a day — not centuries later. Something did die that day. Compare the full created constitution named in the New Testament:

**1 Thessalonians 5:23** *And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Genesis 1:26–27 already supplies the third term this verse names. Man is formed of dust (body, Genesis 2:7) and becomes a living soul the moment breath animates that body (soul, Genesis 2:7 again — the identical Hebrew phrase scripture uses of the animals, Genesis 1:20, 24, so "living soul" alone cannot be what sets man apart). What does set man apart is a separate, third act: man alone is said to be created in God's own image and likeness (Genesis 1:26–27) — and since God himself is Spirit (John 4:24), unseen by any man (John 1:18), the only sense in which his "image" can be borne by a physical creature is a spirit likeness, not a physical one. Body, soul, spirit: the same three terms 1 Thessalonians 5:23 names as constituting a human being "wholly." What follows builds on that three-part reading and adds one further piece: why the spirit-connection could be lost at all.

Read this way, Genesis 3 answers its own question. Adam and Eve did not fall over dead the day they ate; what changed immediately, in that same chapter, was the relationship — hiding from God, shame, a broken fellowship where an open one had stood before (Genesis 3:8–10). Scripture names this exact condition elsewhere in the plainest terms:

**Ephesians 2:1** *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.*

**Ephesians 4:18** *Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart.*

**1 Corinthians 2:14** *But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*

“Dead,” while still walking, breathing, and thinking — the spirit-connection severed the very day it was warned it would be, while body and soul carried on exactly as 1 Corinthians 2:14's “natural man” still does today. Physical death, meanwhile, did not vanish from the sentence; it simply moved to a certain future day, its own separate timetable (Genesis 3:19, 22–24; Romans 5:12) — a two-part death, spiritual at once and physical later.

The further piece is this: not merely that Adam's spirit-connection was lost, but why it could be lost at all, on a single day, for a single act. Scripture's own pattern, everywhere it records the Spirit resting on someone before Pentecost, is conditional and revocable, never a fixed possession:

**1 Samuel 16:13–14** *Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the LORD came upon David from that day forward... But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him.*

The same chapter that records the Spirit coming upon David records it departing from Saul — one administration (one of the successive periods in which scripture shows God dealing with man on distinct terms), the same conditional arrangement working in both directions, gift and loss, within consecutive verses. The judges before them received the Spirit the same way, by measure and by occasion, never as a permanent possession (Judges 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 14:6, 19; 15:14). David himself, already anointed, still asks God not to do to him what had just been done to Saul:

**Psalms 51:11** *Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.*

If David could ask this in genuine fear after his own sin, the Spirit's presence in that administration was never an unconditional seal — it was always held on the condition of continued right standing, exactly the condition Adam was given, and broke, in Genesis 2:17. Set against this, the New Birth is described in exactly the terms this Old Testament pattern never uses:

**John 14:16–17** *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever... for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.*

**Ephesians 1:13–14** *...in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance.*

**Romans 8:9** *But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*

“Abide... for ever.” “Sealed.” A settled fact of identity, not a conditional visitation that could depart on a single failure — the very thing Adam's own spirit-possession was not, and the very thing no one under any administration between Adam and Pentecost ever received either.

Working position: Genesis 2:7 gave Adam a real spirit-component, held on the same conditional footing scripture shows throughout every administration before Pentecost (the judges, Saul, David's own fear in Psalm 51:11); Genesis 2:17's warning was of the immediate loss of exactly that spirit-connection, precisely the day it was broken (Genesis 3:8–10; Ephesians 2:1, 4:18); physical death followed on its own separate, later timetable (Genesis 3:19, 22–24). The New Birth, sealed and permanent (Ephesians 1:13–

14; John 14:16–17), is not a return to what Adam had — it is the first time in scripture God's own spirit-gift stops being conditional at all. That is itself part of why creation's whole arc, worked out in Chapter 4 below, was never a repair job improvised after an unplanned catastrophe: even the terms on which the first man held, and lost, the spirit were already set before he existed, and their permanent remedy in Christ was foreordained along with them (Ephesians 1:4; 2 Timothy 1:9).

This position should be weighed honestly, because each of its steps carries a different weight, and there are real texts on the other side.

First, "in the day." The Hebrew *beyom*, "in the day," can mean "when" rather than a single twenty-four-hour day: two chapters later, **"in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens" (Genesis 2:4)** covers the whole creation week. And the same warning formula, *beyom* with the doubled verb, is used by Solomon to Shimei — **"on the day thou goest out... thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die" (1 Kings 2:37)** — where the sentence fell on the day he went out, but the execution came later (1 Kings 2:46). So a reader can take Genesis 2:17 as a sentence of certain death passed that day and carried out later, with no spiritual death needed to explain it. This study still holds its reading, because Genesis 3:8–10 shows something broken that very day, and Ephesians 2:1 and 4:18 name the condition; but it is a reasonable inference, not a direct statement.

Second, "image." After the fall, scripture still calls fallen men God's image: **"for in the image of God made he man" (Genesis 9:6); "men, which are made after the similitude of God" (James 3:9)**. If the image *were* the spirit and the spirit was lost, those verses would be hard to read. The honest answer is that Genesis 9:6 points back to how man was *made* ("made he man"), not to what every descendant still possesses, and that James 3:9 says the same, "are made"; but a reader can fairly take "image" more broadly — as man's likeness to God in reason, rule, and relationship (Genesis 1:26's "let them have dominion") — and still hold the three-part reading of 1 Thessalonians 5:23 without equating the image with the spirit.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim S: Adam held a spirit-connection on condition and lost it the day he sinned; the conditional pattern before Pentecost (Saul, David) is direct statement, the application to Adam is inference.** The opposing reading can fairly answer that "in the day" may mean "when," as 1 Kings 2:37 shows, and that fallen men are still called God's image (Genesis 9:6; James 3:9); this study answers both above, and rates the whole at reasonable inference accordingly.

## In Short

Everything God makes is good, and he names darkness among the things he forms, so an unformed start is not evidence of damage. The angels were present and rejoicing when the earth was founded. Satan, his fall, and Christ's remedy are common ground. And man's creation stands apart from the rest of the six days: this study reads Genesis 2:17 as the immediate loss of a spirit-connection Adam held on condition — a reasonable inference, weighed openly against "in the day" meaning "when" and against fallen men still being called God's image.

## Chapter 2: The Genesis 1:2 Text Itself

---

**Genesis 1:1-2** *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*

### A. Tohu Wabohu

“Without form” (tohu) and “void” (bohu) — bohu occurs only three times in the Hebrew Bible, always paired with tohu: here, Isaiah 34:11, and Jeremiah 4:23. Tohu itself has a demonstrated range of meaning beyond “ruin”:

**Deuteronomy 32:10** *...in the waste howling wilderness [tohu]...*

**Job 26:7** *He stretcheth out the north over the empty place [tohu], and hangeth the earth upon nothing.*

**1 Samuel 12:21** *...vain things [tohu] which cannot profit...*

Both a neutral physical sense (“empty terrain”) and a purposive sense (“without profit or result”) are attested elsewhere. Tohu does not, on its own, require a sense of prior ruin or catastrophe.

The pair is a different matter, and it should be faced squarely. Where tohu and bohu stand together outside Genesis 1:2, the setting is judgment:

**Jeremiah 4:23** *I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light.*

Isaiah 34:11 likewise stretches over judged Edom “the line of confusion [tohu], and the stones of emptiness [bohu].” This is the Gap reading’s best lexical argument, and it is real. But look at what Jeremiah is doing. His vision goes on: the mountains trembling, no man, the birds fled, the fruitful place a wilderness, the cities broken down — **“at the presence of the LORD, and by his fierce anger” (Jeremiah 4:24-26)**. He names the judgment, and he describes the land of Judah running Genesis 1 backwards: no light, no man, no birds, no fruitful ground. The prophet borrows Genesis 1:2’s words precisely *because* they describe the condition before God’s ordering work — so that judgment can be pictured as creation undone. That tells us what the phrase meant to Jeremiah; it does not tell us that Genesis 1:2 itself was a judgment. Where Jeremiah and Isaiah name the judgment in their own verses, Genesis 1:2 names none.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim T: tohu alone carries no built-in sense of ruin, and the pair’s use in judgment scenes borrows Genesis 1:2 rather than explaining it.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that both other uses of the pair describe destruction, and that this is a real pattern; this study grants the pattern and answers only that the later prophets name their judgments where Genesis 1:2 names none.

## B. The Verb “Was” (hayah) and Hebrew Narrative Grammar

Hayah can mean simple “was” or “became” (compare Genesis 19:26, Lot's wife “became [hayah] a pillar of salt”). This ambiguity is real and is the primary textual foothold for the Gap Theory reading — it is not a manufactured point.

However, sequential narrated events in Hebrew are normally marked by a specific verb form, the waw-consecutive (wayyiqtol) — the form used in Genesis 19:26 for Lot's wife's actual transformation. Genesis 1:2 does not use this form. It uses a waw + subject + verb construction (“vehaaretz hayetah tohu”), which is the standard Hebrew pattern for supplying background or setting information, not for narrating a sequential event. The same construction appears in:

**Jonah 3:3** *Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city...*

**Genesis 3:1** *Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field...*

**Judges 11:1** *Now Jephthah the Gileadite was a mighty man of valour...*

In each case, this construction sets a scene or describes a standing condition — it is not used to report that something happened to bring that condition about. Jonah 3:3 is the closest match of all: it uses the very same verb form, hayetah, in the very same construction. This is the primary reason most Hebrew grammarians — including conservative scholars on both sides of the age-of-the-earth question — read Genesis 1:2 as supplying the earth's starting condition before God's forming and filling work begins in verse 3, rather than narrating a catastrophe.

Assessment: the grammar most naturally supports “unformed starting material,” not “ruined material.” The Gap reading's best reply is that the same construction can introduce a new state of affairs when the context requires it; that is true in principle, but nothing in Genesis 1:2's own context supplies such a requirement.

**Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim G: the verse uses the construction Hebrew uses for background and standing conditions, not the form it uses to narrate a change.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that grammar describes how a sentence is built, not what lay behind it, and that a background clause can still describe a condition that arose earlier; this study grants that grammar alone cannot exclude an earlier cause, and claims only that the verse does not narrate one.

### In Short

Tohu has a range — wilderness, empty place, a thing without profit — and needs no ruin to explain it. The pair tohu wabohu appears elsewhere only in judgment scenes, a real point for the Gap reading, but those prophets name their judgments and borrow Genesis 1:2's words to picture creation undone. And the verse's grammar is the grammar of a standing condition — the same construction, and in Jonah 3:3 the same verb form, Hebrew uses to set a scene.

## Chapter 3: Isaiah 45:18 Examined

---

**Isaiah 45:18** *For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain [tohu], he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else.*

This is the strongest single verse in favor of the Gap Theory: God states plainly he did not create the earth tohu. Taken alongside Genesis 1:2's use of the same word, this creates a real and legitimate tension worth taking seriously.

One verse later, Isaiah 45:19 reads:

**Isaiah 45:19** *I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain...*

Isaiah himself uses tohu one verse later in the sense of “without result or purpose,” not physical wasteland. This opens a live alternative reading of 45:18 consistent with its own immediate context: God did not create the earth to remain without purpose — he formed it for the stated purpose of habitation, named in the same verse — rather than a claim that no unformed intermediate stage ever existed. Both readings remain live; Isaiah's own adjacent usage does not force the ruin sense.

The verse's own shape supports that alternative. It sets two phrases against each other: he created it "not tohu" — he formed it "to be inhabited." The contrast is between two purposes, emptiness and habitation, not between two moments in the earth's history.

Assessment: genuinely double-edged. A real point for the Gap Theory, with a real, textually-grounded alternative reading available from Isaiah's own usage one verse away and from the verse's own parallel.

There is a further point worth holding onto for later. Isaiah 45:18 states not only that God did not create the earth tohu, but why: “he formed it to be inhabited.” Habitation — a home for man — is named here as creation's own stated purpose, in the same breath as the tohu question this chapter examines. Chapter 4 below develops this purpose further.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim T: Isaiah 45:18 most naturally speaks of God's purpose for the earth, not of a stage it never passed through.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that "created it not tohu" is, taken at face value, the plainest statement in scripture on the question; this study grants it is the theory's strongest verse and rates its own reading of it no higher than reasonable inference.

### In Short

Isaiah 45:18 is the Gap Theory's strongest verse, and it is taken seriously here. But Isaiah uses the same word one verse later for "in vain," and the verse itself sets "not tohu" against "to be inhabited" — a contrast of purpose. God did not make the earth to stay empty; he made it to be lived in.

## Chapter 4: Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 Examined

---

Both passages are tested using the legitimate, well-attested principle that individuals in scripture may function as types pointing to a greater spiritual reality (e.g. David as a type of Christ in Psalm 22 and Psalm 110; Melchizedek as a type of Christ in Hebrews 7).

### A. Isaiah 14:12–15

**Isaiah 14:4, 12–14** ...*thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon... How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!... I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God... I will be like the most High.*

Explicitly addressed to the king of Babylon (14:4). The description plausibly points beyond the human king to Satan under the type-principle, a reasonable reading given the language's poor fit for a purely human referent. The passage states the figure's own boast ("thou hast said in thine heart") but does not itself date when the described fall occurred. Its own language of a fall from heaven to the ground is examined further below, alongside Ezekiel 28's, in light of what any "casting down" requires (§D).

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim F: Isaiah 14 plausibly describes Satan behind the king of Babylon, but it does not date his fall.** The opposing reading can fairly answer that the passage is a taunt-song over a human king throughout, using the language of pride; this study grants the type-reading is an inference, and nothing in this study's case depends on it.

### B. Ezekiel 28:12–15

**Ezekiel 28:12–13** *Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering... the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.*

Explicitly addressed to the king of Tyre (28:12). As with Isaiah 14, language here (created perfect, in Eden, an anointed covering cherub, on God's holy mountain) fits a human king poorly, and plausibly points to Satan under the type-principle — this is a real and defensible reading.

Two further textual details, examined more closely than a first pass usually gives them, bear directly on how this passage should be used — and they cut in different directions, which is worth stating plainly rather than smoothing over.

The same prophet, three chapters later, applies strikingly similar imagery to a different figure entirely:

**Ezekiel 31:8-9** *The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him... all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him.*

**Ezekiel 36:35** *This land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden.*

Ezekiel 31 announces its own subject in its opening line and never leaves it — "Speak unto Pharaoh king of Egypt, and to his multitude; Whom art thou like in thy greatness?" (31:2) — and tracks Assyria and Egypt throughout under the figure of a great tree, the same convention this book and scripture generally

use elsewhere for kings and kingdoms: Nebuchadnezzar's tree in Daniel 4, the cedar and eagles of Ezekiel 17, the trees choosing a king in Judges 9's fable. Read this way, the trees of Eden "envying" him (31:9) is ordinary Hebrew poetic personification — the same figure of speech that has trees clapping their hands (Isaiah 55:12) and hills skipping like rams (Psalm 114:4) — not a claim about literal angelic beings. A reading of chapter 31 as describing angels is possible only by first deciding, on other grounds, that Ezekiel 28's Eden is itself a heavenly location; chapter 31 does not independently supply that reading, and it should be named as a minority position resting on that prior decision rather than treated as settled.

That still leaves Ezekiel 28's own Eden to place, and two readings are defensible from the text itself. This study takes up both honestly, rather than adopting whichever one most conveniently answers the Gap Theory.

The first, read alongside Ezekiel 36:35's use of the same name for a later, restored land, treats "Eden" and "garden of God" as this prophet's own stock figure for paradise, applied here to the king of Tyre / Satan the same way it is applied elsewhere to Assyria's king and to restored Israel — favoring, on this reading, the real Genesis 2–3 garden as the point of comparison, later than Genesis 1:2, not earlier.

The second reading takes seriously the direction every "casting down" text uses for this fall. Isaiah 14:12 has the same figure "cut down to the ground" after falling "from heaven"; Ezekiel 28:17, two verses later, reads "I will cast thee to the ground." If the casting-down is what brings this figure to the ground at all, then "Eden, the garden of God... the holy mountain of God" (28:13–14) names where he was before that casting — heaven, not a garden later planted on the earth he is cast down to. This is not an invention to rescue a difficulty: scripture uses "paradise" this same way elsewhere, for a heavenly reality distinct from earth's Eden. Paul's being "caught up into paradise" is the same event, in his own words, as being **"caught up to the third heaven" (2 Corinthians 12:2–4)**, and Revelation places **"the tree of life... in the midst of the paradise of God" (Revelation 2:7)** in a heavenly, not earthly, setting. Isaiah 14:13's "the sides of the north," naming the mount where this figure boasted he would sit, is likewise the phrase Psalm 48:2 uses for Mount Zion, the seat of God's own dwelling — not an obvious description of Adam's garden.

On balance, this second reading is the better-supported one. It is what the passage's own verbs require — a fall lands somewhere; it does not simply relocate within the place it already occupied — and it rests on a use of "paradise"/"garden of God" scripture supplies independently, in Paul's and John's own writing, not one invented to answer this question. Read this way, the exalted, created, guardian position Ezekiel 28:13–14 names was a heavenly one, and the fall from it — like every fall described anywhere in scripture — was downward, from heaven, not a demotion within a garden already on the earth.

A further point of precision belongs here as well. Ezekiel 28:14 names this figure "the anointed cherub that covereth" — a specific guardian office at God's own throne, the same role cherubim hold flanking the mercy seat (Exodus 25:18–20) — not an explicit claim that he ruled the whole angelic order. The titles given after his fall describe a claimed authority over this present world's system specifically — **"the prince of this world" (John 12:31)**, **"the god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4)**, **"the prince of the power**

**of the air” (Ephesians 2:2)** — not a stated former rulership of heaven's angels generally. The jewel list in 28:13 (sardius, topaz, diamond, beryl, onyx, jasper, sapphire, emerald, carbuncle), corresponding closely to nine of the twelve stones of the high priest's breastplate (Exodus 28:17–20), and the “anointed cherub that covereth” itself, both favor this same priestly, guardian reading over a claim of general angelic rulership — consistent with Ezekiel's own priestly vocabulary (he is himself a priest, Ezekiel 1:3).

Notably, neither reading of Ezekiel 28's Eden rescues the Gap Theory's link to Genesis 1:2. If Eden here is the earthly garden, the fall belongs to Genesis 2–3, later than verse 2. If it is the heavenly Eden — the better-supported reading — the fall is a fall from heaven that could, on this text's own terms, be placed at any point before Genesis 3:1; nothing in Ezekiel 28 ties it to Genesis 1:2 specifically either way. Job 38:7 supplies a real counterweight worth keeping in view throughout this discussion: “the sons of God” — the whole angelic host, Lucifer presumably among them — “shouted for joy together” at the earth's own foundation, which reads oddly if he was already fallen and hostile by that point.

Assessment: the type-reading pointing to Satan is reasonable and defensible for both passages. Neither passage, examined on its own details and against Ezekiel's own usage pattern elsewhere, supplies a date for that fall prior to Genesis 1:2 specifically, on either reading of Ezekiel 28's Eden.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim F: Ezekiel 28's Eden is better read as heavenly, and on either reading the passage gives no date before Genesis 1:2.** The opposing reading can fairly answer that Ezekiel elsewhere uses “Eden” of the earthly garden (Ezekiel 31; 36:35), so the plainer reading is earthly; this study grants that reading is defensible, and shows above that it helps the Gap Theory even less.

## C. Before Eden Is Not Before Genesis 1:2

Genesis 3:1 opens with the serpent already present, already subtle, already adversarial: “Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made.” That Satan had already fallen by the time of Eden's temptation is common ground; nothing in this study disputes it, and gap and no-gap readers agree on it alike.

But “fallen before Eden's temptation” and “fallen before, or at, Genesis 1:2” are two different claims, and the Gap Theory needs the second, not merely the first. A fall could be placed anywhere between Genesis 1:31 (“very good,” the six days' own close) and Genesis 3:1 without ever touching verse 2 — the text supplies no description of that interval either way, so a fall placed there is exactly as unproven from silence as one placed before verse 2, but it does not require verse 2 to record any ruin at all.

The Gap Theory's actual bridge argument deserves to be stated in its strongest form, not a weak one: the creation week through Eden's temptation reads as one tight, unbroken span, with no described gap between 1:31 and 3:1. If a war in heaven needs real narrative room scripture does not otherwise supply, the reasoning goes, it has to be pushed into the one place the text leaves undescribed — whatever precedes or is folded into verse 2 — where Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 supply the missing content: an original, exalted, created state (“perfect... till iniquity was found in thee,” Ezekiel 28:15) followed by a violent fall (“cast thee to the ground,” 28:17). This is a coherent, structured inference, and it deserves

more credit as reasoning than a quick dismissal gives it, even though, as the next chapter states plainly, neither text supplies its own date.

It is also answerable on its own terms. Scripture nowhere describes Lucifer's original fall as a drawn-out conflict needing an age to accommodate it; Jesus's own word for it is **"as lightning" (Luke 10:18)**. Revelation 12's war in heaven is often cited here, and it reads as swift and decisive — though a careful reader should note that Revelation 12 places that war after the man child **"was caught up unto God, and to his throne" (Revelation 12:5-7)**, so it may describe a later casting-out rather than the first one, and should not be leaned on for the original fall's length. A fall that occurs within the same compressed span scripture already uses for everything else between 1:31 and 3:1 needs no gap at all. Job 38:7's angels "shouting for joy together" at the earth's foundation is a second consideration: at the founding of the earth, the whole host was still rejoicing, so the rebellion had not yet happened.

That last point cuts carefully, and it is worth stating exactly. Job 38:7 places the fall *after* the earth's foundation. A Gap reader can agree — and place the fall after Genesis 1:1's founding and before verse 2's ruin. So Job 38:7 rules out a fall before any creation; it does not by itself choose between "after verse 1" and "after the sixth day." What does bear on that choice is Genesis 1:31: at the close of the sixth day, "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." A heavenly host already divided by rebellion, with a fallen adversary already at work in the creation, sits uneasily under "every thing... very good." That is the better reason to place the fall after the six days, and it is an inference, not a statement.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim F: "fallen before Eden" does not mean "fallen before Genesis 1:2," and "very good" at the close of the sixth day favors a fall after it.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that "very good" describes the renewed earth, not the state of the angelic host, and that 1:31 to 3:1 leaves little room for a war in heaven; this study answers that scripture gives the original fall no length at all, and rates its own placement as inference only.

## **D. Why the Fall Requires a Prior Creation**

Every text in scripture describing this fall describes a movement from one place to a lower one — never a rebellion that simply occurs in place, and never a rebellion into nothing. Isaiah 14:12 has the figure "fallen from heaven... cut down to the ground." Ezekiel 28:17 has him "cast... to the ground." Jesus himself says, **"I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke 10:18)**. Revelation 12 describes the dragon's tail drawing "the third part of the stars of heaven" and casting them **"to the earth" (Revelation 12:4)**, and states that after the war in heaven, **"neither was their place found any more in heaven... he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him" (Revelation 12:8-9)**. Peter and Jude describe fallen angels in the same spatial terms: God **"cast them down to hell [Greek tartaros, thrust down to Tartarus], and delivered them into chains of darkness" (2 Peter 2:4)**; they "left their own habitation" and are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6).

Read together, these texts describe one consistent shape: a real "from," a real "to," and a real place received at the end of the fall — the ground, the earth, a chained darkness reserved for judgment. None

of them describes a rebel cast into non-existence, or into a void that precedes creation itself; every one names a destination that is part of the created order.

That bears directly on when the fall could have occurred. Before Genesis 1:1, on scripture's own account, there was no earth, no ground, no lower realm at all — only God, who alone is without beginning. A fall that requires somewhere to land requires, first, that there be a “down.” The fall cannot precede its own destination. So whatever else remains open about its timing, it cannot be placed before creation itself; every text that describes it places it after a creation already standing — the ground already there to be cast to, the earth already there to receive him, “their own habitation” in heaven already an established fact.

An honest reader must now notice what this argument does and does not do, because an earlier version of this study claimed too much for it. It rules out a fall *before* Genesis 1:1. But the Gap Theory, in the form its advocates actually hold, does not place the fall before Genesis 1:1. It places it *after* verse 1 — after the heaven and the earth were created — and *before* verse 2, with the ruined earth of verse 2 as the ground he was cast to. On that reading, the destination the fall requires already exists: verse 1 supplied it. So this argument, standing alone, does not exclude the Gap Theory. What it does is narrow the question to exactly one place. If the fall is to be tied to Genesis 1:2 at all, it must sit in the space between the first verse and the second, and nowhere else. Chapter 5 §D takes up whether scripture leaves that space open.

**Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim F: every text describing the fall names a created destination, so the fall followed the creation of Genesis 1:1.** The Gap reading can fairly answer — and does — that this is its own position, since it places the fall after verse 1; this study now grants that, and uses the argument only to show where the Gap Theory would have to sit, not to exclude it.

## E. Creation's Purpose, Fixed Before the Foundation of the World

This is not only a technical point about geography. It bears on what Genesis 1:2 is for. Scripture is direct about how far back God's plan reaches. The provision for a Redeemer, and the whole shape of the salvation he would bring, is repeatedly described as fixed before creation existed at all, not decided afterward in response to a crisis:

**Ephesians 1:4** *According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.*

**1 Peter 1:19-20** *But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you.*

**2 Timothy 1:9** *Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.*

**Titus 1:2** *In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.*

Even the adversary's own end is described the same way — prepared in advance, not improvised in response to an unplanned catastrophe:

**Matthew 25:41** *Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.*

“Prepared” places even the judgment awaiting the fallen angels inside the same foreknown design as everything else — not a repair God is making after the fact, but a provision God had already made.

If the Redeemer, the redeemed, and even the adversary's reserved judgment were all settled “before the foundation of the world,” then the picture the Gap Theory is most often preached with — a creation knocked off course by an unplanned angelic catastrophe, which the six days are then left to repair — has nothing left to explain. Nothing in this design was a surprise to God, and nothing in Genesis 1:2 needs to have gone wrong for the rest of the chapter to make sense. It should be said fairly that many Gap readers also believe in God's foreknowledge, and would say the ruin, too, was foreknown; so this argument answers the “repair job” framing, not every form of the theory.

What, then, was creation — this whole lower, physical realm, distinct from heaven — for? Scripture's answer is not “a place to contain a war.” It supplies, first, a real but temporary domain for the fallen adversary — real (“the prince of this world,” John 12:31; “the god of this world,” 2 Corinthians 4:4) but time-limited (“he knoweth that he hath but a short time,” Revelation 12:12; his end already “prepared,” Matthew 25:41). Far more centrally, it supplies the stage for man — **“he formed it to be inhabited” (Isaiah 45:18)** — and for the Redeemer man would need:

**Hebrews 2:14-16** *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same... For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.*

This is a direct scriptural statement that the mechanism of redemption runs through flesh and blood — the created, mortal, lower realm — and specifically not through the angelic order Lucifer belonged to. Philippians 2:6-8 describes the same descent in Christ's own case: “he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men... he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death.” Colossians 1:16 states whom such a realm exists for: “all things were created by him, and for him” — this world, with its vulnerability to suffering, choice, and death, was not an afterthought bolted onto a ruined estate; it was made, on purpose, as the place where the Son himself would take on its lowest condition to redeem it, and then be raised and exalted to God's right hand (Philippians 2:9; Ephesians 1:20).

That lowering is where scripture locates the clearest demonstration of God's own love — and locates it within this created, lower realm, not as an abstraction above it:

**John 3:16** *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

**Romans 5:8** *But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.*

**1 John 4:9-10** *In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.*

God's own nature is love before and apart from anything created ("God is love," 1 John 4:8) — that is not in dispute, and this study does not claim love itself began at creation. What these texts describe is love's outworking: a demonstration that required a world capable of sin, suffering, and death to demonstrate itself against, "while we were yet sinners," at real cost, to real effect. Read this way, Genesis 1:2's raw, unformed condition is not damage love is later called in to repair. It is the opening scene of the one story scripture says was written before the world began.

**Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim X: the Redeemer and redemption were settled "before the foundation of the world," so creation was never an improvised repair.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that foreknowledge could include a foreknown ruin between verses 1 and 2; this study grants that, so this section answers the "repair job" picture of the Gap Theory, not the theory in every form, and carries only corroborating weight against the ruin reading itself.

## In Short

Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 plausibly describe Satan's fall, and Ezekiel 28's Eden is better read as heavenly — but neither text dates the fall before Genesis 1:2. Every text describing the fall names a created place he was cast to, so the fall followed the creation of verse 1; that does not by itself exclude the Gap Theory, which also places the fall after verse 1, but it leaves the theory only one place to sit. And scripture says creation's redemptive purpose was fixed before the foundation of the world, so creation was never an improvised repair.

## Chapter 5: What Remains Unproven, and the Working Position

---

### A. What Was and Was Not Established

The central claim tested in this study — that Genesis 1:2 is specifically the textual record of damage caused by Lucifer's rebellion and a war in heaven — was examined for direct textual support and not found. This section states plainly what was and was not established, and answers the Gap reading's remaining points from the Introduction (§C).

No text examined (Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28, Revelation 12, 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6, Luke 10:18) dates a war in heaven or Lucifer's fall to a point specifically before Genesis 1:2, on that text's own stated terms.

Ezekiel 28's own details support two readings of its Eden — the earthly garden of Genesis 2-3, or a heavenly Eden distinct from it — and Chapter 4 finds the second better supported, by the text's own casting-down language and by scripture's own heavenly use of "paradise" elsewhere (2 Corinthians 12:2-4; Revelation 2:7). Neither reading ties the fall to Genesis 1:2 specifically.

The Hebrew grammar of Genesis 1:2 (a scene-setting construction, not the sequential-narration form used elsewhere for an actual change of state) favors reading the verse as the earth's unformed starting condition, not as the record of a catastrophe.

"God's work is perfect" and "in him is no darkness at all" are fully satisfied by a perfect process that begins with unformed material and ends very good (Genesis 1:31) — and the same God says **"I form the light, and create darkness"** (Isaiah 45:7).

**"The world that then was" (2 Peter 3:6)** does not describe a world before Genesis 1:2. Peter's own sentence names what overflowed it — "being overflowed with water, perished" — and his letter has already named that event: God **"spared not the old world, but saved Noah... bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly"** (2 Peter 2:5). The world that then was is Noah's world.

**"Replenish" (Genesis 1:28)** does not imply a former population. The Hebrew word is *male'*, "fill" — the same word God speaks to the sea creatures a few verses earlier, **"fill the waters in the seas"** (Genesis 1:22) — and in the English of 1611, "replenish" meant simply "to fill." Its reappearance to Noah (Genesis 9:1) is the same word in the same sense.

An argument of the form "God has only one enemy, therefore this specific unproven claim about Genesis 1:2 must be the explanation" is an argument from elimination, and is only sound if every alternative has genuinely been ruled out. The alternative — that Genesis 1:2 simply describes unformed starting material, unrelated in the text to Satan's fall — has not been ruled out; on the grammar, it is the better-supported reading.

**Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim X: the Gap reading's supporting texts either do not speak to Genesis 1:2 (2 Peter 3:6; Genesis 1:28) or do not date the fall (Isaiah 14; Ezekiel 28).** The Gap reading can fairly answer that its case is cumulative — several weaker points together — and that Isaiah 45:18 and the judgment-use of *tohu wabohu* remain; this study grants both remain real, and has rated them where they are answered.

## B. Working Position

Held as established: Satan is a real being, created perfect, who with the whole angelic host existed at the earth's founding (Job 38:4, 7; Nehemiah 9:6). He exercised free will to rebel against God, and remains scripture's one great spiritual adversary, for whom Christ is the appointed and sufficient remedy (Hebrews 2:14; 1 John 3:8; Revelation 20:10). Held as established also: his fall followed the creation of Genesis 1:1, since every text describing it names a created place he was cast to (Chapter 4 §D).

Held as the more probable reading, but not as established: that the rebellion followed the six days of creation, not the reverse. The reasons are that the whole host was still rejoicing at the earth's founding (Job 38:7), and that "every thing that he had made" was "very good" at the close of the sixth day (Genesis 1:31) — both of which sit uneasily with a host already divided and an adversary already at work. This is a reasonable inference; an earlier version of this study held it as established, and that was more than the evidence carries.

Not held as established: that Genesis 1:2 is the specific textual record of the catastrophe caused by that rebellion. The grammatical evidence in Genesis 1:2 itself, and the details of the passages most commonly cited to support the connection (Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28), do not establish this link. This is recorded as a live, defensible position with real supporting texts (Isaiah 45:18, the *hayah* question, and the judgment-use of *tohu wabohu*) that has not, on balance, met the standard of textual support this study asks of its own positions.

This position is adopted deliberately rather than by default: where the evidence for a claim is insufficient, the claim is not adopted, even where the surrounding theological framework (a real enemy, a real fall, a real remedy) is independently sound and not in question.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — Satan's existence and fall are direct statement; the fall following Genesis 1:1 is strong inference; the fall following the six days is reasonable inference; the Gap link to verse 2 is not supported.**

### C. A Reconciling Point, Regardless of How *Hayah* Is Read

One further point holds regardless of how the *hayah* question in Chapter 2 §B is finally resolved. *Bara* — create, the word Genesis 1:1 uses for God's first act — is used within the six days for only three points of origination: the heaven and the earth themselves (Genesis 1:1), the first animate creatures of sea and air (Genesis 1:21), and man bearing God's own image (Genesis 1:27) — three genuine beginnings, not a word used loosely throughout the chapter. (It appears again only in the closing summary, Genesis 2:3-4, of the whole work.) Everything else across the six days is described in different terms: God said, God made (*asah*), God divided, God called, God set. This is ordering and shaping language.

Even granting the "became" reading of Genesis 1:2 — that the earth became formless and void, rather than simply was — the material itself was already created (*bara*) in verse 1, and nothing in the rest of the six-day account uses *bara* of the earth or its material again. Under either reading of *hayah*, God is not shown re-creating the heaven and the earth in the six days; he is shown speaking what already exists into order, with *bara* reserved for the two further, genuinely new things — animal life and man — that appear partway through.

This has one consequence worth stating fairly. The verse most often cited against the Gap Theory — **"For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is" (Exodus 20:11)** — uses *asah*, "made," not *bara*. By this study's own reading of the two verbs, Exodus 20:11 describes the six days of making and ordering, and does not by itself exclude an interval between verse 1's creating and the days that follow. This study therefore does not lean on it.

This does not resolve whether Genesis 1:2 records the aftermath of a specific catastrophe (§§A-B above still apply), but it does mean that question and the six-day account's own scope are separable: however Genesis 1:2 is read, the days that follow describe ordering and two further acts of origination, not a second creation of the earth itself.

**Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G: bara is used within the six days only for the heaven and earth, the first animate creatures, and man; the rest is ordering language.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that this is consistent with its own view that the six days re-form a ruined earth; this study agrees, which is why this section is called a reconciling point rather than an argument against the theory — and why it sets Exodus 20:11 aside as neutral.

## **D. Where the Gap Theory Would Have to Sit — and Why the Seat Is Empty**

Chapter 4 §D showed that the fall cannot precede creation: every text describing it names a created place it lands. Chapter 4 §C showed that "fallen before Eden" does not mean "fallen before Genesis 1:2." Put together, they leave the Gap Theory exactly one place to sit: in the space between the first verse of the Bible and the second, with Lucifer cast down to the earth of verse 1 and the ruin of verse 2 as the result. The question is whether scripture leaves that seat open.

Four independent lines of evidence say it does not.

First, the grammar. The one sentence that would have to report the ruin is built, in Hebrew, the way Hebrew describes a standing condition, not the way it reports an event (Chapter 2 §B). The text does not narrate anything happening between verse 1 and verse 2.

Second, the silence of the fall texts. Every passage that describes the fall — Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28, Luke 10:18, Revelation 12, 2 Peter 2:4, Jude 6 — was searched for a link to Genesis 1:2's condition, and none was found (§A above). The theory has to supply the link itself.

Third, the close of the sixth day. **"God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Genesis 1:31).** On the Gap reading, that verse stands over an earth built on the wreckage of a judged world, with a fallen host already cast down upon it. A reader can hold both, but the verse does not suggest it.

Fourth, the entrance of death. **"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men" (Romans 5:12).** The Gap Theory, in its classic form, places a whole judged and perished world — and in Chalmers's day the fossil record with it — before Adam. Paul names Adam's sin as the door by which sin entered the world. A Gap reader can answer that Paul speaks of man's world and man's death, and that is a fair answer; but the more natural reading of "entered" is that it was not there before.

Add to these the purpose scripture gives for creation — fixed "before the foundation of the world," for man and for the Redeemer (Chapter 4 §E) — and the picture of creation as a ruin under repair has no support in the text at all.

That is the finding, and it should be stated at exactly its real strength. The Gap Theory is not *disproved*: grammar cannot rule out an earlier cause behind a standing condition, and each of the four lines above has a fair answer. But it has only one place it could sit, and at that place every line of evidence the text supplies stands against it, while the only supports it has there are a verb that can mean "became" and a verse (Isaiah 45:18) better read as speaking of purpose. On the evidence, the seat is empty.

**Weighing it: Strong inference, cumulative — for claim X: the Gap Theory can sit only between verses 1 and 2, and grammar, the silence of the fall texts, Genesis 1:31, and Romans 5:12 all stand against it there.** The Gap reading can fairly answer that no single one of these is decisive, and that Romans 5:12 may speak only of man's world; this study grants that, and claims a strong cumulative case, not a proof — an earlier version of this study said the theory was "excluded" and had "no place to sit," which was more than the evidence carries.

## **E. What Would Change This Study's Mind**

A study that claims to follow scripture should be able to say what scripture would have to show to overturn it. These are the findings that would change this study's position; none of them, as far as this study has found, is in the text.

1. **A text that ties Lucifer's fall, or any judgment, to the earth's condition in Genesis 1:2** — a passage that names the earth's formlessness as the result of a rebellion. That would overturn claim X outright.
2. **A demonstration that the Hebrew construction of Genesis 1:2 is used elsewhere, without contextual signal, to narrate a change of state** rather than to describe a standing condition. That would overturn claim G.
3. **A text placing a rebellion in heaven before the founding of the earth**, or describing the angelic host as already divided when the earth was founded. That would overturn the reasoning behind claim F.
4. **A use of *tohu wabohu*, or of Genesis 1:2's language, that describes a judgment without the judgment being named in its own context.** That would strengthen the Gap reading of the pair considerably and weaken claim T.

**Weighing it: Method, not argument — names what would overturn this study's position.**

## **In Short**

No text dates Lucifer's fall before Genesis 1:2, and the Gap reading's remaining texts either do not speak to verse 2 ("the world that then was" is Noah's world; "replenish" means "fill") or have been weighed where they arise. The fall followed the creation of verse 1, and probably the six days. The Gap Theory can sit in only one place — between the first verse and the second — and there the grammar, the silence of every fall text, "very good," and Romans 5:12 all stand against it. It is not disproved; on the evidence, its seat is empty.

## **Chapter 6: Open for Future Study**

---

### **A. Questions Left Open**

Whether further Hebrew grammatical analysis (beyond the scene-setting pattern identified here) could shift the balance on *hayah* in Genesis 1:2.

Whether Isaiah 45:18's use of *tohu* can be more precisely determined for or against the ruin sense through comparison with further prophetic usage.

Whether 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6 (angels reserved in chains) connect more properly to Genesis 6 or to an earlier event, and whether that bears on the timing questions here.

Whether Revelation 12's war in heaven describes the original fall or a later casting-out after the man child is **"caught up unto God" (Revelation 12:5-7)**, and whether that timing has any bearing on Genesis 1:2 (current assessment: no direct textual link found; Chapter 4 §D excludes any dating before creation itself, and the placement between Genesis 1:31 and 3:1 remains a reasonable inference only).

Whether the real but temporary domain given to the fallen adversary within creation (Chapter 4 §E) sheds further light on the scope and limits of his present authority.

One question this chapter formerly left open — whether Genesis 2:7's distinct language for man's creation indicates a spirit-component lost at the fall, and whether Genesis 2:17 names immediate spiritual death — is now answered in Chapter 1 §D, and weighed there at reasonable inference.

**Weighing it: Open questions — argued by neither side.**

## Part Two: Genesis 1:2 — A Word and Letter Study

---

Part One reached its working position: the verse's own grammar favors reading it as the earth's real, unformed starting condition, not the record of a ruin. Part Two takes that position as its working ground rather than re-arguing it, and turns to the verse in its own right — every one of its fourteen words, first for its plain sense and then for what its own individual letters picture, closing with the verse's own numbers and the seam where it turns toward the six days that follow.

## Chapter 7: The Text, and How This Study Reads It

---

The verse is read the same way the author's companion study of Genesis 1:1 reads that opening verse: the Hebrew text first, its transliteration beneath it, and the King James translation beneath that — each line one layer further from the original, in the order the words were actually produced. A plain-sense (peshat) reading of each word follows, worked together with what the classical Jewish commentators, the Talmud, the Zohar, and serious modern Hebraist scholarship each say about it, and then a letter-by-letter (Remez) reading of each word's individual paleo-Hebrew letters, with gematria — method-noted throughout, so that grammar-based readings and letter-symbolism readings are never blended without being labeled.

Two things this study does not do. It does not reopen the question weighed in Part One: that the verse's own grammar favors reading it as the earth's unformed starting condition, not the record of a catastrophe. That working position is carried forward here. And it does not force a symmetry between this verse and Genesis 1:1 where none exists — where the numbers or the patterns simply are not there, this study says so rather than manufacturing a match.

**Weighing it: Method, not argument — sets out how Part Two reads the verse.**

וְהָאֵרֶץ הָיְתָה תוֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם

V'ha'aretz hayetah tohu vavohu, v'choshekh al-p'nei tehom, v'ruach Elohim m'rachefet al-p'nei hamayim.

**Genesis 1:2** *And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*

### In Short

Part Two reads Genesis 1:2 in Hebrew, transliteration, and English, word by word: first the plain sense, then — always labeled — the symbolic reading of the letters.

## Chapter 8: The Words, Narrated One at a Time

---

Fourteen words. Each one is taken up below in turn — its plain sense, what the classical and modern commentators say about it, and its own letters read as pictures — and the conclusions reached about it are stated plainly at the point they are reached, not held back for a summary at the end. The summary comes after, once every word has had its own say.

### A. V'ha'aretz — “And the Earth”

אֶרֶץ (ha'aretz), “the earth,” pairs the definite article ha- with אֶרֶץ (eretz), “earth” or “land.” Nothing in its grammar is disputed; the word is common and its sense here is plain — the physical earth, named again from verse 1, now the subject of the description that follows.

Its letters build one continuous picture. Aleph (א) is pictured in the ancient paleo-Hebrew script as an ox's head — strength, the master or the leader of a household; value 1. Resh (ר) is pictured as a head in profile — a man, a chief, what stands first; value 200. Tzadi (צ), in the form it takes at the end of a word (the form eretz closes with), is pictured as a man bent low, or a fishhook — humility, harvesting, a low reach toward the ground; value 90.

Read straight through, eretz's three letters build one picture: the master (aleph), the head of a household, a man (resh), bent low (tzadi). The letter that closes eretz is the same letter that opens tzaddik, “righteous” — the person who bends low before God the way this letter pictures bending toward the earth. (The two words share the letter, not a root.) A different word for the ground, adamah (אֲדָמָה), used in Genesis 2:7, is the word from which Adam's own name is drawn — the man formed, quite literally, from the ground. Eretz and adamah are two words for the earth, not one root; but both point low, and man is taken from the low place.

Tzadi carries a second reading worth holding separately rather than blending into the first. In the classical square script used in Torah scrolls today (Ketav Ashuri), as distinct from the older pictographic script the reading above uses, tzadi is built from two smaller strokes — a bent nun (a humble, bowed servant) joined to a yod (a hand lifted upward). Read this way, tzadi pictures a servant bent low with a hand raised — humility and praise held in the same posture, the same letter Hebrew shares with tzaddik, “a righteous person,” and with tzedek and tzedakah, “righteousness” and “justice.”

This letter also takes two different shapes depending on where it falls in a word: in its ordinary form (צ) the figure is read as kneeling; in the final form (ץ) — the very form closing ha'aretz — the same figure is read as standing upright, hand still raised, but now on its feet. Jewish tradition reads that difference directly onto the fate of the righteous: kneeling describes this life; standing describes the life to come.

**Psalm 1:5** *Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.*

**Philippians 2:10** *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.*

The wicked cannot stand; the righteous will. Kneeling now, in humility; standing later, in reward. The letter that closes ha'aretz closes it in the very posture, and the very form, tradition reserves for the righteous standing at the last — no longer bent, but still with the hand raised.

Method note: the pictograph readings above (aleph-resh-tzadi as “master, man, bent low”; the kneeling-and-standing reading of final tzadi) are Remez, not peshat — genuine, independently attested traditions, read from two different stages of the Hebrew script (the older paleo-Hebrew pictograph and the later square script respectively), and this study keeps them distinguishable from each other and from the plain grammatical sense rather than folding all three into a single claim.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense is lexical fact; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## B. Hayetah — “Was”

הָיְתָה (hayetah), “was,” is the Qal perfect, third-person feminine singular, of הָיָה (hayah), Hebrew's ordinary verb “to be” or “to become.” It is also the only finite verb in the entire verse — every other clause in verse 2 runs on a participle or a bare noun phrase, not a conjugated action-verb. That grammatical fact matters for how the whole verse should be read, and is picked up again below.

Whether hayetah means simple “was” or “became” is a real and long-argued question, not a manufactured one — compare Genesis 19:26, where the same verb describes Lot's wife actually turning into a pillar of salt. What settles it here is not the verb alone but the sentence's construction: waw plus subject plus verb (“v'ha'aretz hayetah”), not the sequential wayyiqtol form Hebrew narrative uses to report that something happened (the form used in Genesis 19:26 itself). This construction is Hebrew's standard pattern for supplying background or setting a scene, not for narrating an event — the same pattern found in Jonah 3:3 (“Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city”) and Genesis 3:1 (“Now the serpent was more subtil”). This is the central grammatical finding of Part One: hayetah here describes a condition, not an event.

The classical commentators argue past each other on a closely related question — not what hayetah means, but how it connects to bereshit in verse 1. Rashi reads bereshit as bound to the verb that follows it, “at the beginning of God's creating,” not as a free-standing claim that heaven and earth were the very first things made — his own argument being that the waters (mentioned only in verse 2, “the Spirit of God was hovering on the face of the waters”) must themselves already have existed for that hovering to happen, so verse 1 cannot be reporting an absolute first act. Ibn Ezra reads the construction similarly but ties the subordinate clause forward to verse 2 rather than verse 3 — “In the beginning of God's creating the heavens and the earth, the earth was...” — making verse 2 itself, not verse 3, the main clause the “beginning” modifies. The Westminster Commentary (S.R. Driver, 1904) and the International Critical Commentary (John Skinner, 1910) — serious grammatical scholarship, cited throughout this study — both note that this reading has old roots and is not merely a modern critical import. Worth noticing for Part One's question: on both Rashi's and Ibn Ezra's reading, verse 2 is the condition in which the creating began, not a ruin that followed it.

A further, more substantial point does not need letter-symbolism to make it. Hayah's own three root letters — hey, yod, hey (an older form הוה, havah) — are the same root standard Hebrew lexicography derives God's own self-declared name from at the burning bush:

**Exodus 3:14** *And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.*

“I AM” is אֶהְיֶה (Ehyeh), the first-person form of the very verb hayah supplies in the third person as hayetah, “was.” The word this verse uses for the earth's condition and the word God uses to name Himself are, at the root, the same word — a fact of Hebrew grammar, not a letter-symbolism reading.

Its letters, read as pictures: hey (ה) — a figure standing with arms raised, exclaiming or beholding; breath, revelation; value 5. Yod (י) — a hand, an arm; work, a deed brought about; value 10. Tav (ת) — a mark, a sign, a covenant, the alphabet's own last letter; value 400. Then hey again, closing the word as it opened it. Gematria: 5 + 10 + 400 + 5 = 420.

**Weighing it: Strong inference — for claim G: hayetah is the verse's only finite verb, set in a scene-setting construction; the letter picture that follows it is Remez and bears no weight.**

### C. Tohu — “Without Form”

תוהו (tohu) has a real range of its own outside this verse — the “waste howling wilderness” of Deuteronomy 32:10, the “empty place” stretched over the north in Job 26:7, the “vain things” of 1 Samuel 12:21. Bare terrain, emptiness, or lack of profit; tohu does not, on its own, carry a sense of prior ruin (Part One, Chapter 2 §A). Driver's own gloss is direct: “something unsubstantial, or (figuratively) unreal.”

The Talmud takes the word further than “absence.” Rav Yehuda, in the name of Rav, states in Tractate Chagigah (12a) that tohu is “a green line that surrounds the whole world, from which darkness emerges” — reading Isaiah 34:11's own pairing, “the line of tohu” (קוֹ-תְּהוֹ), quite literally, as a boundary-marker rather than a mere figure of speech. On this reading tohu is not simply the word for nothing; it names something — a line, a boundary — that itself gives rise to darkness. The same page of Talmud lists tohu as one of ten specific things created on the first day, alongside heaven, earth, vohu, light, darkness, wind, water, and the measures of day and night — every one of them drawn directly from Genesis 1:1-5's own words, tohu and vohu included among the list of created things rather than treated as mere descriptions of an absence.

Its letters: tav (ת) — mark, sign, covenant; value 400. Hey (ה) — behold, breath; value 5. Vav (ו) — a hook, the word Exodus itself uses for the hooks holding up the Tabernacle's pillars (Exodus 27:10); joining, without erasing the seam between what is joined; value 6. Gematria: 400 + 5 + 6 = 411. Read as a picture: a sign (tav) that reveals (hey) nothing yet to hook onto (vav) — not the absence of a sign, but a sign of absence: something real enough to be marked and named, and marked specifically by having nothing yet joined to it. That picture sits comfortably beside the Talmud's own “boundary line” reading above — a line is, after all, exactly the kind of mark that has nothing on either side of it yet joined together.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## **D. Vavohu — “And Void”**

בוהו (bohu) occurs only three times in the whole Hebrew Bible — here, Isaiah 34:11, and Jeremiah 4:23 — and every single occurrence pairs it directly with tohu. It never once stands alone anywhere in scripture.

The same Talmudic passage (Chagigah 12a) that reads tohu as a boundary-line reads vohu just as concretely: “the spongy stones of the abyss from which the waters emerge” — again anchored to Isaiah 34:11's own wording, “the stones of bohu” (אֲבִי-בֹהוּ). Nachmanides (Ramban, 13th century) takes a related but distinct direction: bohu is an intermediate state in which four fundamental properties have already been set in place — fire, air, water, and earth, not yet materials but the potential properties materials will be built from. On Ramban's reading, tohu and bohu together describe not bare nothing but the raw components of everything that follows, already present and already ordered relative to one another, before any of it has taken visible form.

Its letters: bet (ב) — a house, a tent, an enclosed dwelling; value 2. Hey (ה) — behold; value 5. Vav (ו) — a hook, a joining-place; value 6. Gematria (bohu alone):  $2 + 5 + 6 = 13$ ; with the verse's own vav prefix (vavohu), 19. A house (bet) that reveals (hey) nothing yet to hook onto (vav) — the same closing two letters as tohu, joined this time to a dwelling rather than a mark. Read together, tohu vavohu pictures a sign and a house both alike still waiting for something to be joined to them — formlessness and emptiness as two sides of one condition, exactly as the two words are never once separated anywhere else in scripture, and exactly as the Talmud reads them: not absences, but real, named things — a line and a set of stones — each waiting for what comes next.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## **E. V'choshekh — “And Darkness”**

חֹשֶׁךְ (choshekh), “darkness,” is an ordinary, common noun — the same word used of the ninth plague (Exodus 10:21) and of the darkness out of which God's voice spoke at Sinai (“ye heard the voice out of the midst of the darkness,” Deuteronomy 5:23). It is not exclusively a negative term in scripture's own usage; it sometimes marks God's own concealed presence rather than only privation or evil: **“He made darkness his secret place” (Psalm 18:11)**. And God names it among his own works: **“I form the light, and create darkness” (Isaiah 45:7)**.

Ramban reads this darkness as the property of fire itself — “fire, which is essentially dark,” the visible fire we observe being, on his account, the product of an interaction between that essential dark-fire property and the other three elements (air, water, earth) rather than darkness being fire's simple absence. This is a serious, deliberately physical reading from one of the most careful of the medieval Hebrew grammarian-commentators, offered here as his own, not adopted as settled.

Its letters: chet (ח) — a fence, a wall, an enclosure; what shuts a space off or shuts something in; value 8. Shin (ש) — two front teeth; to consume, to sharpen, to press; value 300. Kaf (כ) — an open palm, a hand bent to cover or to allow; value 20. Gematria (choshekh alone):  $8 + 300 + 20 = 328$ . A wall (chet) that presses in (shin), covering (kaf) — darkness pictured as an active enclosure, a covering wall, not a bare absence. This sits comfortably beside choshekh's own ordinary usage elsewhere in scripture, where it names God's own concealing presence as readily as it names privation or judgment — a covering, not necessarily an evil.

**Weighing it: Direct statement — for claim G: scripture uses this word for God's own concealing presence and names darkness among the things he creates, so darkness in verse 2 need not be the mark of judgment; the letter picture is Remez and bears no weight.**

## F. Al-p'nei Tehom — “Upon the Face of the Deep”

עַל (al), “upon,” and פְּנֵי (p'nei), the construct form of panim, “face,” are ordinary grammatical scaffolding — not theologically loaded terms on their own, though panim's plain sense (a face, something that can be seen and that sees) is worth holding onto for what follows.

תְּהוֹם (tehom), “the deep,” is the primeval waters, the cosmic deep. Driver's own note is direct: not what “the deep” suggests to a modern reader (the sea), but “the primitive undivided waters, the huge watery mass which the writer conceived as enveloping the chaotic earth” — and Driver flags, without overstating it, that “tehom recalls at once the Babylonian Tiamat,” the primeval sea-goddess of the Enuma Elish creation epic. Modern comparative-Semitic scholarship (surveyed by Michael Carasik, a contemporary Hebrew Bible scholar, drawing on Guy Darshan's 2019 study in the *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*) extends the same comparison to a Phoenician cosmogony, preserved only secondhand in a 2nd-century-CE Greek source, which opens the world with “a dark and windy air... and a muddy and gloomy chaos” — darkness, wind, and chaos together, the same three elements Genesis 1:2 itself names. Genesis is not quoting either story directly, on this reading; its first readers most likely knew cosmologies of this general shape, and the text uses and reshapes their shared vocabulary rather than borrowing it uncritically — tehom in Genesis is not a rival god to be defeated, as Tiamat is in the Babylonian story, but simply a mass of water, wholly subject to the one Elohim already named in verse 1.

Ramban reads tehom more plainly still, as “a basin, where earth contains water” — the properties of earth and water both present together in this one word.

Tehom's letters: tav (ת) — mark, sign, covenant; value 400. Hey (ה) — behold; value 5. Vav (ו) — hook, joining; value 6. Mem (מ) — water, the deep, the chaotic; the same letter counting the flood's forty days and Israel's forty years; value 40. Gematria:  $400 + 5 + 6 + 40 = 451$ . The same sign-and-hook pattern already read in tohu, now joined directly to mem, water itself — a sign (tav) revealing (hey) the joining-place (vav) of the waters (mem). Tehom's own letters point, by this reading, at exactly what the word names in plain Hebrew: the place where the deep waters are gathered and joined.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## **G. V'ruach Elohim — “And the Spirit of God”**

רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים (v'ruach Elohim) is, in the judgment of serious Hebraist scholarship, the single most difficult phrase in the verse. Ruach can mean an ordinary wind (paired with “rain” in 2 Kings 3:17) or a spirit, something animate and self-aware moving through the air with purpose (as in 1 Kings 22:21). Elohim, joined to it, may function as an ordinary possessive (“of God”) or, on the reading many grammarians favor elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew, as a superlative intensifier — the way English has begun using “biblical” to mean “way out of proportion,” so that ruach Elohim could mean something closer to “a mighty wind” than “the Spirit of God” as such. Michael Carasik lays out the honest range plainly: a ferocious wind; a divine wind; or the spirit of God — three real English possibilities for one Hebrew phrase that does not itself choose between them. Ibn Ezra reads an ordinary wind; Driver and Skinner favor the divine Spirit; this study does not adjudicate between them, since the Hebrew itself does not force the choice. (The King James, followed throughout this study, reads “the Spirit of God,” and so does every mention of the clause elsewhere in these pages.)

Ramban places ruach among his four elements as air — air's proper place, on his account, is above fire, closest of the four elements to God, but positioned here, artificially, below fire and above water specifically so that it could hover over the waters as this verse describes. The Zohar identifies the qualities of verse 2 with two paired terms of its own: darkness-upon-the-deep with *tohu*, and the Spirit of God hovering over the waters with *bohu* — reading the second half of the verse as the active, ordering counterpart to the first half's raw formlessness, from which, in the Zohar's own account, light itself will issue.

Elohim's own letters and grammar are worth reading in full here rather than merely naming the word, since the reading matters for the verse as a whole. אֱלֹהִים (Elohim), “God,” carries Hebrew's ordinary masculine-plural ending, -im — the same ending that turns *melek* (“king”) into *melakim* (“kings”). Yet wherever Elohim governs a verb, as in Genesis 1:1's *bara Elohim* (“he created,” not “they created”), the verb is singular. This pairing of a plural noun with a singular verb is what Hebrew grammarians call a plural of majesty or plural of intensity — a form expressing fullness or completeness of a single subject, not a count of several. Elohim is grammatically plural and theologically singular in the very same word.

Rashi's classical commentary asks why Elohim, and not God's personal name (the Tetragrammaton), governs the creation account's opening: his answer, still widely cited, is that God's original intention was to create the world under the attribute of strict justice alone — the quality Elohim specifically denotes in rabbinic tradition — but seeing that a world built on justice without mercy could not endure, gave mercy precedence, joining it to justice rather than replacing it. Genesis 2:4, where both names first appear together (“the LORD God,” YHWH Elohim), is read on this account as the moment that combination becomes explicit in the text.

Elohim's letters: lamed (ל) — a shepherd's staff; to teach, to goad forward, authority exercised through guidance rather than force; value 30. Hey (ה) — a figure standing with arms raised, exclaiming or

beholding; breath, revelation; value 5. Mem (מ) — water, the deep, the chaotic; value 40. Aleph (א) — an ox's head; strength, the master or leader; value 1. Yod (י) — a hand, an arm, a deed; value 10. Gematria:  $1 + 30 + 5 + 10 + 40 = 86$ .

Ruach's own letters: resh (ר) — a head, a man, what stands first or foremost; value 200. Vav (ו) — hook, joining; value 6. Chet (ח) — a fence, an enclosed space, and, by a separate and widely-repeated tradition (not a settled etymology — standard Hebrew lexicons do not derive it this way), the letter popularly associated with chai (חַי), “life”; value 8. Gematria:  $200 + 6 + 8 = 214$ . A head, or a chief (resh), joined (vav) to what is enclosed — or, on the popular association, to life itself (chet) — read plainly, the foremost one entering into and joining Himself to the enclosed, still-forming space just described.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## H. M'rachefet — “Hovered”

מְרַחֶפֶת (m'rachefet), “moved,” more precisely “hovered” or “fluttered,” is a Piel participle, feminine singular (agreeing with ruach, which Hebrew treats as feminine), of the rare root רָחַף (rachaph), which occurs in this same Piel stem in only one other place in the whole Hebrew Bible:

**Deuteronomy 32:11** *As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings:*

Michael Carasik's own close reading of the verb is worth reproducing directly: the same root, in a different conjugation, describes the prophet's bones “trembling or shaking” inside him in Jeremiah 23:9, and the verb is also attested in Ugaritic literature as something birds do. Some read it closer to “swoop” than “hover.” Carasik's conclusion: whatever ruach Elohim is, “it is not swooping from place to place, but is nonetheless in constant motion. Though nothing in this picture is changing, it is not still but dynamic” — full, in his own phrase, “of the potential energy that will be actualized in verse 3.” That is as precise and as useful a description of this word's function as this study found anywhere, from a source with no theological stake in the outcome.

Its root letters: resh (ר) — a head, a chief; value 200. Chet (ח) — a fence, an enclosure; value 8. Pe (פ) — a mouth; to speak, to blow, an edge or an opening; value 80. Gematria (root only):  $200 + 8 + 80 = 288$ ; the full inflected word, adding the participial mem prefix and tav suffix,  $40 + 200 + 8 + 80 + 400 = 728$ . A chief (resh) breathing or blowing (pe) at the edge of an enclosed space (chet) — consistent with the word's single grammatical twin in Deuteronomy 32:11, a parent bird stirring the air with beating wings just above a nest not yet ready to fly from.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

## I. Al-p'nei Hamayim — “Upon the Face of the Waters”

הַמַּיִם (hamayim), “the waters,” is the definite article on mayim, the ordinary Hebrew word for water. A genuine puzzle, raised plainly by Carasik and not resolved by this study any more than by his: is “the face of the deep” (tehom, three clauses earlier) the same location as “the face of the waters” here, or two different ones? If they are the same, why does the text switch words rather than simply repeating tehom or mayim throughout? If they are different, what would it mean for a still wholly unformed, undivided mass to have two distinct “surfaces”? Scripture does not answer this, and this study records the question honestly rather than forcing a resolution it cannot supply.

Mayim's letters: mem (מ) — water, the deep, the chaotic; value 40. Yod (י) — a hand, work, a deed; value 10. Mem (מ) again, closing the word exactly as it opened it. Gematria (mayim alone):  $40 + 10 + 40 = 90$ . Mayim is one of only a small number of Hebrew words built as a mirror around its own middle letter, water framing a single hand on both sides — a real, checkable fact about the word's spelling, distinct from any claim about what it must mean. Read as a picture, the hand of work (yod) is set directly between two waters (mem, mem) — the same middle position m'rachefet has already placed the Spirit's own hovering presence in, over the face of these same waters.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the plain sense and the commentators' readings are reported as found; the letter picture is Remez, a symbolic reading, and bears no weight on any claim.**

### In Short

Word by word, Genesis 1:2 describes a real, named condition: the earth; tohu and bohu, which the Talmud treats as real things rather than bare absences; a darkness scripture elsewhere uses of God's own concealing presence; the deep; and the Spirit of God hovering, with a verb whose only other Piel use is an eagle over her nest. The letter pictures, always labeled as symbolic, follow the same shape — but they are illustration, not evidence.

## Chapter 9: Right Cutting, the Verse's Turn, and Its Numbers

---

### A. Right Cutting: Word-Division in This Verse

The author's companion study of Genesis 1:1 reads bereshit itself as containing a second, shorter word folded inside its own spelling — bar and shith, “a son have I established” — by dividing the word's six letters into two smaller words in their own right. The natural question is whether Genesis 1:2 yields comparable readings once its own words are “rightly cut.” The honest answer is not uniform across the verse, and this study reports that plainly rather than forcing every word into the same mold.

Most of this verse's words do not split into two independent sub-words the way bereshit does. What tohu and bohu receive instead, from the Talmud itself (Tractate Chagigah 12a, already read above), is not a division but a definition — the rabbis do not cut either word into smaller words; they instead insist

that both name a specific, concrete thing (a boundary line; stones of the abyss) rather than functioning as bare adjectives for “absence.” That is a different kind of “right cutting” than bar/shith — not splitting a word open to find a second word inside it, but refusing to let a word be flattened into a vaguer, more abstract sense than its own concrete referent actually carries. This study treats that as a genuine, if different, form of the same discipline: reading a word for exactly what it says, rather than for what translation convention has smoothed it into.

One further candidate was tested and set aside rather than included without support. A reading has circulated associating vohu with the two-word phrase bo hu (“in it, He” or “there is something in it”) — a notarikon-style division comparable to bar/shith. This study searched for a primary rabbinic or classical source attesting that specific reading and did not find one; it is not included above, consistent with this study's rule against asserting a claim that cannot be traced to a real source. If a primary attestation for it turns up later, it belongs here and should be added; until then, it is left out rather than repeated on the strength of circulation alone.

**Weighing it: Method, not argument — reports which divisions of the words are attested and which are not.**

## **B. Where Verse 2 Turns: the Ruach Clause and the Seam Toward Verse 3**

One question is worth answering on its own, separate from the word-by-word readings above: should “And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” really be read as the completion of verse 2's own thought, or does it belong, in substance, with what verse 3 goes on to do?

Two independent lines of evidence bear on this, and they point the same direction.

First, the Masoretic accentuation itself. Every verse in the Hebrew Bible carries its own internal punctuation, older than chapter and verse numbers, marking how the verse was traditionally divided when read aloud — and the main disjunctive accent in Genesis 1:2, the atnach, falls under תְּהוֹם (tehom, “the deep”), not at the verse's end. That splits the verse into two balanced halves: “And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep” — and then, as its own distinct second half, “and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” The accentuation does not move the clause into verse 3; it keeps it inside verse 2. But it does not treat it as a third item loosely appended to the first two, either — it sets it apart as the verse's own second half, in deliberate balance against the first. This same grammatical fact is worth restating from a different angle: hayetah is the verse's only finite, conjugated verb; “darkness was” and “the Spirit hovered” both run on participles and bare clauses rather than their own separate finite verbs, meaning the whole verse — not merely its first half — is a single extended description, not a sequence of separate reported events. The atnach divides that one description into two balanced parts; it does not divide one event from a second one.

Second, and more directly on point: the Companion Bible of E.W. Bullinger — a major structural reference for Hebrew scripture, built on the premise that scripture's own repetitions and correspondences of subject matter, not merely its grammar, mark out its structure — draws exactly this line in its own printed Structure of Genesis, at the very front of the book:

Companion Bible, Structure of Genesis 1:1-2:3 A | 1.1. "The world that then was" (2 Pet. 3:6). Its creation in eternity past. — B | 1.2-. Its end. Ruin. — A | 1.-2-31. "The heavens and the earth which are now" (2 Pet. 3:7). Their creation in time present. (The six days.) — B | 2.1-3. Their end. Blessing.

Read closely, this reference notation ("1.2-" followed immediately by "1.-2-31") splits verse 2 itself at precisely this seam. The first part of the verse — without form, and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep — closes out the first structural member, paired backward with verse 1. The second part — the Spirit of God moving upon the waters — opens the next structural member, paired forward with the six days of ordering that follow. This printed structure places the hinge exactly at the ruach clause.

A caveat has to be stated plainly, though, and it matters: this source labels its first member "Ruin" — a Gap Theory reading of verse 2's first half, the same reading Part One, above, tested directly and did not find supported by the verse's own grammar. This study does not adopt that label. What it adopts is narrower and independent of it: the seam itself — the observation, confirmed separately by the Masoretic accentuation, that the ruach clause functions as its own distinct unit, oriented toward what happens next rather than folded flatly into the description of what came before. Michael Carasik's own, independently-reached description of m'rachefet — "full of the potential energy that will be actualized in verse 3" — is a modern, non-theological restatement of the very same seam.

Put together: formally, no — the clause stays inside verse 2, by the verse's own oldest internal accentuation, and this study keeps the standard versification rather than reassigning the clause to verse 3. Functionally, yes — the accentuation, the Companion Bible's structure, and modern Hebraist scholarship together treat the clause as the verse's hinge rather than its third parallel item, already leaning toward the ordering work verse 3 carries out.

One more point should be noticed, because Part One's question depends on it. The Companion Bible's own structure pairs "the world that then was" with 2 Peter 3:6. As Chapter 5 §A showed, Peter's own letter identifies that world as the one the flood overflowed (2 Peter 2:5; 3:6). The seam the Companion Bible draws inside verse 2 is worth adopting; the label it gives the first half, and the text it pairs it with, are not.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claim H: the accent divides the verse at "the deep," and the ruach clause leans toward verse 3.** The opposing reading can fairly answer that the atnach is a reading accent, not a statement of meaning, and that the clause is formally part of verse 2's description; this study agrees on the formal point and claims only a functional hinge.

## C. Numbers in the Verse

Counted the same way the Genesis 1:1 companion study counts its own opening verse: Genesis 1:2 runs fourteen words and fifty-two letters, with a total gematria (summing every word's value, vav prefixes included) of 3,546.

Fourteen is two sevens — the same number Matthew's genealogy structures itself around in three sets of fourteen (Matthew 1:17), and the gematria of David's own name (dalet + vav + dalet = 4 + 6 + 4 = 14).

Fifty-two does not repeat any pattern established in the Genesis 1:1 study. Three thousand five hundred forty-six factors as  $2 \times 3^2 \times 197$  — not a multiple of 37 the way Genesis 1:1's own total is, and not a perfect or triangular number either. This study reports that plainly rather than forcing a pattern onto it: Genesis 1:2 does not reproduce Genesis 1:1's own remarkable arithmetic, and no attempt is made here to manufacture an equivalent one where the numbers themselves do not supply it.

One further, honest observation: verse 2 contains no occurrence of  $\text{וַ$  (*et*), the untranslatable direct-object marker that appears twice in verse 1 and was read there as the Master's own sign, first and last. Its absence here is worth noting rather than passing over — a verse built entirely from description (what the earth was, what covered it, what moved over it) rather than from any reported act of making has no direct object for a creative verb to fall on, and so no occasion for *et* to appear. The marker's absence is exactly what the verse's own grammar (Chapter 8 §B) would predict.

**Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — the counts (fourteen words, fifty-two letters, 3,546) and the absence of *et* are checkable facts; any meaning drawn from the numbers is symbolic and bears no weight on any claim.**

## In Short

Only two of the verse's words are given concrete definitions by the Talmud; none splits into a second word the way *bereshit* does, and one circulating split (*bo hu*) was left out for lack of a source. The Masoretic accent divides the verse at "the deep," making the Spirit's hovering its own second half, leaning toward verse 3. The numbers are reported honestly: fourteen words, fifty-two letters, 3,546, and no pattern forced onto them.

## Chapter 10: A Cohesive Understanding of the Verse

---

Taken word by word, the readings above converge on a shape rather than a list of unrelated observations, and it is worth stating that shape plainly now that every word has had its own hearing.

Genesis 1:2 is, grammatically, one single, unbroken description — its only finite verb is *hayetah*, "was," and every clause that follows runs on participles and bare noun-clauses rather than separate reported actions. It is not a sequence of things that happened; it is a scene being set, in the same way "Now the serpent was more subtil" sets a scene in Genesis 3:1 before anything happens in it. The Talmud treats the verse's own vocabulary the same way scripture's own grammar treats its syntax — not as figures of speech for bare absence, but as a list of specific, real things: *tohu* a boundary line, *bohu* the stones of the deep, wind and water and darkness and light each their own item, ten things in all counted directly from these five verses. Ramban goes a step further still and reads the same list as the four classical elements — fire (darkness), air (*ruach*), water (*tehom/mayim*), and earth (*ha'aretz*) — already present, already distinguishable from one another, before any of them has yet been shaped. Whichever specific accounting is preferred, the pattern across all of them is the same: this verse describes a real, existing condition with real, nameable components, not an empty nothing and not (on the grammar this study finds most defensible) the wreckage of something else.

That condition itself divides cleanly in two, and three independent kinds of evidence — the Masoretic accent, the Companion Bible's printed structure, and a modern Hebraist's plain reading of a rare Hebrew verb — all draw the line in the same place. The first half (without form, and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep) is bare description: raw material, named and real, but static. The second half (the Spirit of God hovering upon the waters) is already in motion — “full,” in Michael Carasik's phrase, “of the potential energy that will be actualized in verse 3.” The letters themselves trace the same seam without needing to be told to: *tohu* and *bohu* both read, letter by letter, as a sign and a house each still waiting for something to be joined to them; darkness reads as a covering, not an emptiness; but *ruach*'s own letters read as a head or chief joining Himself to what is enclosed, and *m'rachefet*'s letters read as that same chief breathing, actively, at the edge of the space just described. Three separate methods — an ancient reading tradition, a structural reference Bible, and a contemporary academic Hebraist — locate the same hinge at the same place in the same verse. (The letter readings are illustration only, and are not counted among the three.)

Put together as one sentence rather than fourteen separate words: the earth, already brought into being in verse 1, is described here in its raw, unformed, but entirely real starting state — form, distinction, and light not yet present, but water, wind, darkness, and the earth itself already there, already named, already, on the Talmud's own reading, counted among the things God made on the first day — and into that raw, still state, before anything is yet spoken, the Spirit of God is already present and already active, poised at the exact hinge between what the earth was and what God is about to say it will become.

**Weighing it: Reasonable inference — for claims G and H: the chapter draws the grammatical, lexical, and structural findings together; the letter readings illustrate but carry no weight.**

## In Short

Genesis 1:2 is one description, not a sequence of events: the earth, already created in verse 1, in its raw, real, unformed state — and the Spirit of God already present and moving over it, at the hinge between what the earth was and what God is about to speak it into.

## Chapter 11: Open Questions and Working Hypotheses

---

The author's own working hypothesis, not yet an established reading: verse 2 may not describe anything having happened to the earth at all. It may instead be an emphasis on the perfection already declared in verse 1, expressed by way of “without form, and void... and darkness... upon the face of the deep” as a description of free will — everything created in verse 1, including the freedom for chaos, emptiness, and darkness to exist as real possibilities, which is what makes Elohim's plan of redemption **“good, and acceptable, and perfect” (Romans 12:2)**. On this reading, Genesis 1:3 onward is where Elohim then demonstrates, by His own spoken word, the order of His creation — itself, on the reading of Melvin W. Elliott's *Genesis One: God's Table of Contents to the Bible*, a table of contents to the entirety of scripture.

This hypothesis sits naturally on top of Part One's grammatical conclusion rather than against it: if hayetah describes a condition rather than an event, and tohu and bohu carry no inherent sense of ruin but instead name real, existing components of a not-yet-formed world, then verse 2 was never describing damage in the first place — leaving the question fully open: what, then, is it describing? The wider research of Part Two offers real, if not conclusive, support. The Talmud's own insistence that tohu and bohu are named, existing things rather than bare negations fits a “real raw material” reading better than a “ruin” reading. The verse's own structural hinge — the seam this study locates independently three separate ways in the section above — fits a reading in which the static first half (the condition, including whatever freedom it carries within it) gives way, already within verse 2 itself, to the Spirit's own active, ordering presence, continuing directly into verse 3's spoken word. None of this by itself establishes the free-will reading specifically. It is recorded here, honestly, as a working hypothesis to be tested further, consistent with this study's practice of separating what is established from what is proposed.

Not yet done: tracing this hypothesis against the fuller shape of Genesis 1:3 onward (the spoken-word ordering of creation, and the reading of Genesis 1 as a table of contents to scripture, per Melvin Elliott and the author's Genesis 1:1 companion study); checking whether “without form, and void” has any parallel elsewhere in scripture where it plainly describes unrealized potential or open possibility rather than either ruin or bare emptiness; and following up Isaiah 45:18's use of tohu (Part One, Chapter 3, above) against the wider question raised here, since that verse is the one place scripture states outright that God did not create the earth tohu — a real tension for any reading, including this one, that treats verse 2's tohu as part of a very-good design rather than either a ruin or a simple accident of process.

Part One's material on creation's purpose (Chapter 4 §E) and on where the Gap Theory would have to sit (Chapter 5 §D) bears directly on this hypothesis, though it was developed independently of it and is presented in Part One as a scriptural argument in its own right, not as support recruited for this chapter. If creation's lower, physical realm was purposed in advance as the one place capable of housing real chaos, real emptiness, real darkness — the very conditions Genesis 1:2 names — because only such a realm could stage love's costliest demonstration (John 3:16; Romans 5:8; 1 John 4:9–10), then the free-will reading offered above fits that argument well — better, on this study's reading, than the ruin reading does. A world with no real capacity for tohu and bohu would have nothing for redeeming love to overcome. But fitting an argument is not the same as being required by it, and Chapter 4 §E's argument stands whether or not this hypothesis is adopted. This connection is recorded here for what it is — a working hypothesis gaining real support from an independent line of argument — not yet fully drawn out, and left for further development.

**Weighing it: Held open — a working hypothesis, not argued as a claim; it bears no weight on any of this study's claims.**

## In Short

The author's working hypothesis — that verse 2 describes not damage but the real freedom and possibility a very-good creation held, which made redemption's plan possible — fits Part One's findings and Part Two's readings, but is recorded as unfinished and is not argued as settled.

## Appendix A — Weight of Each Argument

This table collects every argument this study makes, with the claim it bears on (the letters are defined in the Introduction, §D), where it is made, how much weight it carries, and what the opposing reading can fairly answer. The last rows record what this version of the study corrected or withdrew, so a returning reader can see what changed and a later version does not quietly reinstate it.

| #  | Argument                                                                                         | Where    | Weight               | What the other reading fairly answers                                                                         |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | G — God's work is perfect, and he names darkness among his works (Isa. 45:7)                     | Ch. 1 §A | Direct statement     | "Perfect" most naturally describes a finished work                                                            |
| 2  | F — The angels were present and rejoicing at the earth's founding                                | Ch. 1 §B | Direct statement     | The founding may be Gen. 1:1, before a later fall                                                             |
| 3  | S — Adam held a spirit-connection on condition and lost it the day he sinned                     | Ch. 1 §D | Reasonable inference | "In the day" can mean "when" (Gen. 2:4; 1 Kings 2:37); fallen men are still God's image (Gen. 9:6; James 3:9) |
| 4  | S — The Spirit before Pentecost was conditional (Saul, David)                                    | Ch. 1 §D | Direct statement     | —                                                                                                             |
| 5  | T — Tohu alone carries no built-in sense of ruin                                                 | Ch. 2 §A | Direct statement     | —                                                                                                             |
| 6  | T — The pair's use in judgment scenes borrows Gen. 1:2 rather than explaining it                 | Ch. 2 §A | Reasonable inference | Both other uses of the pair describe destruction                                                              |
| 7  | G — The verse uses the scene-setting construction, not the narrative form                        | Ch. 2 §B | Strong inference     | A background clause can describe a condition that arose earlier                                               |
| 8  | T — Isaiah 45:18 speaks of purpose ("not tohu" against "to be inhabited")                        | Ch. 3    | Reasonable inference | It is the plainest verse on the question, taken at face value                                                 |
| 9  | F — Isaiah 14 plausibly points to Satan but gives no date                                        | Ch. 4 §A | Reasonable inference | It may be a taunt over a human king throughout                                                                |
| 10 | F — Ezekiel 28's Eden is better read as heavenly; neither reading dates the fall before Gen. 1:2 | Ch. 4 §B | Reasonable inference | Ezekiel elsewhere uses "Eden" of the earthly garden                                                           |

| #  | Argument                                                                                                                   | Where                 | Weight                                                    | What the other reading fairly answers                                                                                                       |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | F — "Fallen before Eden" is not "fallen before Gen. 1:2"; "very good" favors a fall after the six days                     | Ch. 4 §C              | Reasonable inference                                      | "Very good" may describe the renewed earth only                                                                                             |
| 12 | F — Every fall text names a created destination, so the fall followed Gen. 1:1                                             | Ch. 4 §D              | Strong inference                                          | The Gap Theory already places the fall after verse 1 (granted)                                                                              |
| 13 | X — Redemption was fixed "before the foundation of the world," so creation was no improvised repair                        | Ch. 4 §E              | Direct statement (corroboration against the ruin reading) | Foreknowledge could include a foreknown ruin                                                                                                |
| 14 | X — The Gap Theory's supporting texts do not speak to Gen. 1:2 ("world that then was" is Noah's; "replenish" means "fill") | Ch. 5 §A              | Strong inference                                          | The case is cumulative                                                                                                                      |
| 15 | G — Bara in the six days marks only three beginnings; the rest is ordering                                                 | Ch. 5 §C              | Direct statement                                          | Consistent with re-forming a ruined earth (agreed)                                                                                          |
| 16 | — Exodus 20:11 uses "made," not "created"                                                                                  | Ch. 5 §C              | Neutral                                                   | — (set aside by this study)                                                                                                                 |
| 17 | X — The theory can sit only between verses 1 and 2, and grammar, silence, Gen. 1:31, and Rom. 5:12 stand against it there  | Ch. 5 §D              | Strong inference, cumulative                              | No single line is decisive; Rom. 5:12 may concern man's world only                                                                          |
| 18 | G — Hayetah is the only finite verb, in a scene-setting clause                                                             | Ch. 8 §B              | Strong inference                                          | —                                                                                                                                           |
| 19 | G — Darkness is used of God's own concealing presence                                                                      | Ch. 8 §E              | Direct statement                                          | —                                                                                                                                           |
| 20 | H — The atnach divides the verse at "the deep"; the ruach clause leans toward verse 3                                      | Ch. 9 §B              | Reasonable inference                                      | The accent is a reading mark, not a statement of meaning                                                                                    |
| 21 | — Letter pictures and gematria throughout Part Two                                                                         | Ch. 8-9               | Symbolic (Remez)                                          | Carry no weight on any claim, by this study's own rule                                                                                      |
| 22 | <b>Corrected</b> — "The Gap Theory has no place to sit"; the fall "could not have occurred there even in principle"        | Ch. 4 §D;<br>Ch. 5 §D | Withdrawn                                                 | The fall-requires-creation argument excludes only a fall before Gen. 1:1, which the Gap Theory does not hold; restated as a cumulative case |
| 23 | <b>Corrected</b> — The rebellion following the six days "held as established"                                              | Ch. 5 §B              | Demoted                                                   | Now a reasonable inference                                                                                                                  |

| #  | Argument                                                                                                                               | Where                              | Weight    | What the other reading fairly answers                              |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24 | <b>Corrected</b> — Genesis 2:25 as an example of the scene-setting construction                                                        | Ch. 2 §B                           | Withdrawn | It uses the narrative form; replaced by Judges 11:1                |
| 25 | <b>Corrected</b> — "The thick darkness Moses entered" (Exod. 20:21) as a use of choshekh                                               | Ch. 8 §E                           | Withdrawn | That word is 'araphel; replaced by Deut. 5:23                      |
| 26 | <b>Corrected</b> — "Merachefet" occurs "in this exact form" in Deut. 32:11                                                             | Ch. 8 §H                           | Restated  | Same Piel stem, different form                                     |
| 27 | <b>Corrected</b> — Eretz and tzaddik share "the same root"; adamah is "a close relative" of eretz                                      | Ch. 8 §A                           | Withdrawn | They share a letter, not a root; adamah is a different word        |
| 28 | <b>Corrected</b> — Mot tamut as the form "for its most solemn pronouncements," death falling "the very day named"                      | Ch. 1 §D                           | Restated  | Emphatic, but 1 Kings 2:37 shows sentence and execution can differ |
| 29 | <b>Corrected</b> — "Chapter 4 above" (Chapter 1's reference forward) and "Section 2.2," "Section 5"                                    | Ch. 1 §D;<br>Ch. 5 §C              | Corrected | Cross-references fixed                                             |
| 30 | <b>Added</b> — The Gap reading's own case (Jeremiah 4:23, 2 Peter 3:6, "replenish," Isaiah 45:18) stated at full strength and answered | Intro §C;<br>Ch. 2 §A;<br>Ch. 5 §A | —         | Previously absent                                                  |

**Weighing it: Summary only** — collects the weights stated where each argument is made.

## Sources Consulted

This study is built directly from scripture, in the King James Version; the sources below were consulted for classical, historical, and modern scholarly corroboration, held at a lower weight than scripture itself, and none carries scriptural weight in the argument. For Part One, the historical shape of the Gap Theory itself — its rise among nineteenth-century expositors, most notably the Scottish minister and geologist Thomas Chalmers around 1814, and its later popularization through study Bibles such as the Scofield Reference Bible — reflects the standard historical record. For Part Two, the classical Jewish commentators were consulted: Rashi and Ibn Ezra on the relation of bereshit to what follows it and on the sense of ruach Elohim; Nachmanides (Ramban) on bohu, tehom, and darkness read against his four classical elements; and the Zohar's pairing of the verse's two halves with tohu and bohu. The Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Chagigah 12a, supplied the reading of tohu as a boundary line and bohu as the stones of the abyss, and the listing of ten things created on the first day. Two grammatical commentaries were cited for the Hebrew text itself: S. R. Driver's Westminster Commentary (1904) and John Skinner's

International Critical Commentary (1910). Michael Carasik, a contemporary Hebrew Bible scholar, supplied the close reading of ruach Elohim and of m'rachefet, and the comparative-Semitic material on tehom, drawing in turn on Guy Darshan's 2019 study in the Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages. E. W. Bullinger's Companion Bible supplied its printed Structure of Genesis 1:1–2:3, engaged critically in Chapter 9 §B. Melvin W. Elliott's Genesis One: God's Table of Contents to the Bible is named in Chapter 11 for the table-of-contents reading of Genesis 1. The Hebrew verb forms cited in Chapter 2 §B and Chapter 8 (Genesis 2:25, Judges 11:1, Jonah 3:3, Deuteronomy 32:11) and the Hebrew behind "thick darkness" in Exodus 20:21 were checked against an interlinear text. Every doctrinal claim in this study has been tested directly against the text of scripture itself.

## Scripture Index

---

|                                                     |                                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| <b>Genesis 1:1-2</b> Chapter 2                      | <b>Jeremiah 4:23</b> Chapter 2 §A        |
| <b>Genesis 1:2</b> Chapter 7                        | <b>Ezekiel 28:12-13</b> Chapter 4 §B     |
| <b>Genesis 1:3</b> Chapter 1 §D                     | <b>Ezekiel 31:8-9</b> Chapter 4 §B       |
| <b>Genesis 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25</b> Chapter 1 §A | <b>Ezekiel 36:35</b> Chapter 4 §B        |
| <b>Genesis 1:6-7</b> Chapter 1 §D                   | <b>Jonah 3:3</b> Chapter 2 §B            |
| <b>Genesis 1:31</b> Chapter 1 §A                    | <b>Matthew 25:41</b> Chapter 4 §E        |
| <b>Genesis 2:7</b> Chapter 1 §D                     | <b>John 3:16</b> Chapter 4 §E            |
| <b>Genesis 2:17</b> Chapter 1 §D                    | <b>John 14:16-17</b> Chapter 1 §D        |
| <b>Genesis 3:1</b> Chapter 2 §B                     | <b>Romans 5:8</b> Chapter 4 §E           |
| <b>Exodus 3:14</b> Chapter 8 §B                     | <b>Romans 8:9</b> Chapter 1 §D           |
| <b>Deuteronomy 32:4</b> Chapter 1 §A                | <b>1 Corinthians 2:14</b> Chapter 1 §D   |
| <b>Deuteronomy 32:10</b> Chapter 2 §A               | <b>Ephesians 1:4</b> Chapter 4 §E        |
| <b>Deuteronomy 32:11</b> Chapter 8 §H               | <b>Ephesians 1:13-14</b> Chapter 1 §D    |
| <b>Judges 11:1</b> Chapter 2 §B                     | <b>Ephesians 2:1</b> Chapter 1 §D        |
| <b>1 Samuel 12:21</b> Chapter 2 §A                  | <b>Ephesians 4:18</b> Chapter 1 §D       |
| <b>1 Samuel 16:13-14</b> Chapter 1 §D               | <b>Philippians 2:10</b> Chapter 8 §A     |
| <b>Nehemiah 9:6</b> Chapter 1 §B                    | <b>1 Thessalonians 5:23</b> Chapter 1 §D |
| <b>Job 26:7</b> Chapter 2 §A                        | <b>2 Timothy 1:9</b> Chapter 4 §E        |
| <b>Job 38:4, 7</b> Chapter 1 §B                     | <b>Titus 1:2</b> Chapter 4 §E            |
| <b>Psalms 1:5</b> Chapter 8 §A                      | <b>Hebrews 2:14-16</b> Chapter 4 §E      |
| <b>Psalms 51:11</b> Chapter 1 §D                    | <b>1 Peter 1:19-20</b> Chapter 4 §E      |
| <b>Isaiah 14:4, 12-14</b> Chapter 4 §A              | <b>1 John 1:5</b> Chapter 1 §A           |
| <b>Isaiah 45:18</b> Chapter 3                       | <b>1 John 4:9-10</b> Chapter 4 §E        |
| <b>Isaiah 45:19</b> Chapter 3                       |                                          |