

⁴Ibid.

⁵"Jericho," *Encyclopedia Americana* (1996) and at www.visit-palestine.com/jericho/places/place.htm

⁶Private e-mail with Carol in 2003.

Arlan Blodgett
554 NE 63rd Street
Salem OR 97301

Just Wait

I would like to briefly address Alan Blodgett's letter, "A Response to Carol Hill's 'Noachian Flood' Account."

1. *Date for Noah/Flood.* Yes, I know that many Christians date the Flood 500-1000 years before ~3000 BC. Some also date it much later than I do. This is because there is no real way of knowing when Noah's Flood occurred, and so one can only do one's best to bracket the date using clues from archaeology and the Bible (which I tried to do in my article "A Time and Place for Noah," *PSCF* 53, no. 1 [March 2001]: 24-40). If it happened a thousand years earlier, Noah's Flood could correspond to the flood of Utnapishtim (the date of which is not firm) and to Woolley's "flood deposits" at Ur. However, since floods are endemic to Mesopotamia, this could have been another flood entirely.
2. *Flood Deposits.* Two points relate to this discussion:
 - (a) Floods not only *deposit* sediment, they also *erode* sediment. Therefore, the intensity or "greatness" of a past flood *cannot* be determined by the thickness of sedimentary deposits in any specific place (such as at Ur).
 - (b) There have been no recent comprehensive studies done on the absolute dating, distribution, deep drilling, or correlation of flood deposits in different parts of the Mesopotamian hydrologic basin. Most studies are old, such as those of Woolley (1920s) and Parrot (1930s). Therefore, any firm conclusions concerning the age and extent of flood deposits in Mesopotamia is premature (i.e., "ambiguous," and so should be treated as such, as I have tried to do).
3. In my past articles on the Garden of Eden and the Flood (*PSCF*, March 2000, March 2001, September 2002), I do not discuss the Origins problem at all—for good reason. This is a very complicated and controversial subject that is not possible to address in a short paper, let alone in a brief response letter. For one possible scenario, the reader is referred to John McIntyre's article on "The Historical Adam" (*PSCF* 54, no. 3 [September 2002]: 150-7).
4. *How Could the Ark Have Traveled Up-Gradient to Jabal Judi?* A series of articles on the hydrology of the Flood is planned for sometime in the future. Arlan Blodgett and others will just have to wait for this explanation.

Carol A. Hill
ASA Member
17 El Arco Drive
Albuquerque, NM 87123
carolannhill@aol.com

Concordism Revisited

I have followed with interest the correspondence between Carol Hill, Art Hill, and Paul Seely concerning a local Genesis flood (*PSCF* March 2003, June 2003, and September 2003). However, not being a geologist, I do not wish to enter into the discussion about the nature of the flood itself.

On the other hand, I would like to comment on an issue that Seely raises concerning the kind of record presented in the early chapters of Genesis. In his letter (June 2003), Seely comments:

I do not believe that concordism's long-standing attempt to read Scripture as describing a merely local flood covering no more than Mesopotamia or the Black Sea is any closer to the biblical data than creation science is to the scientific data.

The purpose of this letter is to note that present archeological data lead to the *presumption* that the chapters of Genesis before Abraham in 2000 BC (chapter 11 back to the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7) present the same kind of reliable history as the chapters after Abraham. Because of this *presumption*, the interpretation of these early chapters (including the flood in chapters 6-8) should assume that the Genesis record is historical.

The basis for this *presumption* of historicity for the early chapters of Genesis is that Scripture has been shown to be in agreement with secular history back to Abraham. For example, in his *History of Israel* (1959), John Bright writes:

It has become increasingly evident that a new and more sympathetic evaluation of the traditions is called for ... Far the most important of these (various lines of objective study) has been the light cast by archaeological research on the age of Israel's origin ... And, as the early second millennium has emerged into the light of day, it has become clear that the patriarchal narratives, far from reflecting the circumstances of a later day, fit precisely in the age of which they purport to tell.¹

Bright repeats this statement verbatim in the 1981 edition of his book.

Scriptural history, then, is reliable back through Abraham (about 2000 BC) in Chapter 12 of Genesis. But the earlier chapters of Genesis, back to the formation of Adam in Gen 2:7, are connected by genealogies to Abraham. Furthermore, these genealogies are repeated without interruption in Luke 3 from Christ to Adam through Abraham. The *presumption*, then, is that the history before Abraham is a continuation of the confirmed history after Abraham. The account of the flood, as part of the history before Abraham, should be historical.

During his investigation of Adam,² I have been surprised how often secular history supports the *presumption* that the Adam of Gen 2-4 is an historical person. Scripture presents Adam as a farmer in lower Mesopotamia with sons who are a farmer and a herdsman. From this information, secular history (archeology) concludes that Adam and his sons lived in Mesopotamia after 10,000 BC.³ This being true, secular history also reveals that other people were living in Mesopotamia at the same time as Adam and his family. The presence of these people from secular