

# Was it Noah's Flood or Lucifer's?

*"Was it Noah's Flood or Lucifer's?"*

© 2012 The King James Bible Church

It is the gappists' belief that the following passage refers to 'Lucifer's flood' and not to Noah's.

*"For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of **old**, and **the earth** standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby **the world that then was**, being overflowed with water, perished:"*  
([2Pet 3:5-6](#))

They believe that it was 'Lucifer's flood' that resulted in the earth being covered with water in [Gen 1:2](#).

As always, let's study to show ourselves approved unto no-one else but God himself.

**Well, doesn't 2 Pet 3:5-6 refer to the gap or Lucifer's flood?**

Put it this way, the **only** mention of any flood in either of the two Peters ([1Pet 3:20](#) and [2 Pet 2:5](#)) is that of **Noah's**. So would it be natural to assume that the flood mentioned in [2Pet 3:5-6](#), would also be that of Noah.

From all accounts, 'everyone' on earth was and is aware of Noah's flood. If anyone was going to be willingly ignorant of a flood, it would have to be this one. Sure, there are people who don't know about Noah's flood, and these people would simply be classed as "ignorant" but **not** "willingly ignorant".

Put it this way, if you know about something, but **choose** not to believe it, you are what is termed "willingly ignorant". If something is well known by people in general, then they can also choose to be "willingly ignorant".

Now when Peter was writing, everyone in the world, and a higher percentage than today perhaps, would have known about the flood that occurred 2,400 years previous in 2340BC.

Should Peter have been referring to another flood, you would think that he would have told us and mentioned it in his two epistles – but he doesn't. The only flood mentioned is that of Noah. So the reader naturally, and rightfully assumes, that it is the flood of Noah that Peter talks about.

## **Scoffers**

Certainly today, this is the case that there are scoffers who are willingly ignorant of Noah's flood. Why? They simply choose to.

The evidence is there in the Bible with its detailed description in the Old Testament. They all have seen the classic movies of decades ago. We all have been reminded of the modern movies of Russell Crowe and Steve Farrell playing Noah.

We all know of the movie called "2012", where the Tibetan monk is gonging his bell as the waters rush over the highest of the snow capped mountains on earth.

People are occasionally reminded in the newspapers of some archeological dig unearthing some bits and pieces of the ark and so on.

As the movie actor Paladin would say "Believe it or Not!". They simply choose not to.

Now as there is nothing in the scriptures about Lucifer's flood, we could be excused for being ignorant of it, but certainly not willingly ignorant.

However, the same doesn't apply to Noah's flood. However, one could not be willingly ignorant of a flood that God had never revealed to them in his word.

In Peter's epistles, there is only one flood mentioned – Noah's. Never Lucifer's.

In all of scriptures, there is only one flood mentioned – Noah's. Never Lucifer's.

*For more information contact:*

AUSTRALIAN BIBLE MINISTRIES PO Box 5058 MT Gravatt East 4122 Qld, Australia

[www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com](http://www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com)

The case is clear, there is **only** one flood you could only be accused of being ignorant of, willing or otherwise – Noah's.

Lucifer's flood never happened.

## **2 Pet 3:5-6 states 'the heavens' and were of old. Can we say 'the earth' was of old?**

Yes – by association we can.

*"For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the **heavens** were of **old**, and **the earth** standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby **the world that then was**, being overflowed with water, perished:"*  
([2Pet 3:5-6](#))

## **Can we say 'the world' was of old?**

Yes, the English is very clear – the world that then was

## **Do we know when this 'old world' was?**

Yes. Turn to [2 Peter 2:5](#) and we see the term '**old world**' mentioned –

*And spared not the **old world**, but **saved Noah** the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; ([2 Pet 2:5](#))*

Noah was spared, so therefore it was **Noah's flood** that hit the old world.

## **So 2 Peter 3:5-6 refers to Noah's flood?**

Correct.

## **What about 'the world that then was ...perished'?**

Gappists assume that because Noah and his family were spared, the world didn't perish, and as such, this must be referring to an earlier disaster in which everything and everyone was destroyed.

There are a couple of points here:

First, despite what gappists think, the world did perish. We see that

*And **every living substance** was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were **destroyed** from the earth: and **Noah** only **remained alive**, and they that were with him in the ark. ([Gen 7:23](#))*

For more information contact:

AUSTRALIAN BIBLE MINISTRIES PO Box 5058 MT Gravatt East 4122 Qld, Australia

[www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com](http://www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com)

You see, about 120 years earlier, God has separated Noah and his family from the world and so when the passage says **every living substance was destroyed**, this is **not** referring to Noah and his family. Certainly when Noah was on the ark, he wasn't part of the world.

## The world vs the earth

People get confused between the terms of **world** and **earth**. The former is the system that operates on the earth today where the **god of this world**, satan blinds the minds of them that won't believe ([2 Cor 4:4](#)).

It is the people, the society and the government and so on that makes up the world and the world's system ([Gal 4:3](#)). Further understanding is gleaned from scripture, as *inhabitants of the world are dwellers **upon** the earth*

([Is 18:3](#)) and *the kingdoms of the world are **upon** the face of the earth* ([Is 23:17](#)).

So God's flood at the time of Noah brought destruction of the world and the inhabitants of the world – and Noah was **not** part of that!

Similarly today, Christians live in this world but are not of this world.

*If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are **not** of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. ([John 15:19](#))*

and again

*I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are **not** of the world, even as I am not of the world. ([John 17:14](#)).*

So as a Christian, you are not in the world, but in Christ. Similarly, as the **ark** was a **type** of Christ, Noah was **not** in the world either, as he was in a type of Christ.

## But aren't there three earths?

If you mean the following, there is a problem:

**Earth 1:** prior to [Gen 1:2](#)

**Earth 2:** this current earth

**Earth 3:** the one that God has yet to create as described in the following two verses:

*For, behold, I create new heavens and a **new earth**: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. ([Is 65:17](#))*

and

*Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a **new earth**, wherein dwelleth righteousness. ([2Pet 3:13](#))*

However, if we look at [Rev 21:1](#), it states that the earth we are now on is the first earth and **not** the second.

*And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and **the first earth** were passed away; and there was no more sea. ([Rev 21:1](#))*


Now, surely if there are three earths, God would say **the second earth**?

### **Conclusion ...**

The evidence is crystal clear, that there has only ever been one flood in the Bible, and that is **not** Lucifer's.

\*\*\*\*\*

By Harley Hitchcock



Australian Bible Ministries, PO Box 5058 Mt. Gravatt East 4122 Qld, Australia  
[www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com](http://www.AustralianBibleMinistries.com)