

The word “replenish” has come up in the context of some discussions concerning Noah’s worldwide flood that I have heard in the last few days; more specifically TWO worldwide floods. Before I started to write this article I have already looked in context at every occurrence of the word “replenish(ed)” in the King James Bible. I have also gone to the Oxford English Dictionary and looked it up. For those of you that do not know it, the Oxford English Dictionary is more than just a source of definitions. It is an etymological treasure chest. Etymology is a study of the history of the origins and usage of words. The Oxford English Dictionary first cites the definition of the word and then follows that with the etymology of the word. The Oxford English Dictionary is the master etymological source for the English language; though not a perfect master as it relates to the King James Bible. Many times the Oxford English Dictionary will give a contextual definition using sentences from the King James Bible as its source.

The first entry of the word “replenish” in the Oxford English Dictionary has replenish defined as “A fresh supply, a refill” as indicated below:

Reple'nish, sb. rare. [f. the vb.] A fresh supply (of money); a refill.

1806 SURR Winter in Land. II. 75, I know you took it queer that I did not stand it, when you wanted a replenish last week. **1881** W. P. LENNOX Plays, Players, etc. II. I. 9, I gave assent for a replenish of the glass.

As noted in the Oxford English Dictionary, the first documented case of replenish being used in the sense of a refill occurred in 1806 and then again in 1881 (Please note the definition of the word “replenished” at the end of this article) . The second entry of the word “replenish” in the Oxford English Dictionary indicates that its overriding definition is given in the sense of “to fill for the first time (my interpretation)”. However, there is an entry in paragraph I.9 that indicates that the word “replenish” has been used in the sense of “to fill up again” since 1612 (after the publication of the King James Bible in 1611). Note the following definition:

Replenish., v. Forms: 4-5 replenys, 5 -ysch, 5-6 -ysh(e, -yssh(e ; 4-5 replenisoh, -issh, 6 -ishe, 4- replenish (also 5 -esoh, 6 -esh ; 5 repleiusch, -pleynsch, 6 ? repylnysch). See also REPLESHED and REPLEVISH v.² [f. OF. repleniss-, lengthened stem oirepknir: see RE- and PLENISH.].....

.....**9.** To fill up again; to restore to the former amount or condition.

1612 PRAYTON Poly-olb. ii. 38 The naked Sea Nymphs ride Within the ouzie pooles, replenish! euey Tide. **1666** PEPYS Diary 19 July, Full of wants of money and much stores to buy, for to replenish the stores, and no money to do it with. **1748** Ansons Voy. m. viii. 370[^] His stores replenished, and an additional stock of

provisions on board. **1776** ADAM SMITH IV. N. u. ii. (1869)1.301 The coffers of such a company.. must require..a more constant and uninterrupted exertion of expense in order to replenish them. **1832** HT. MARTINEAU Homes Abroad v. 68 Susan was always ready.. to replenish the wallets and fill the cans. **1883** C. J. WILLS Mod. Persia 185 She took the little silver spoon, and replenished my inkstand with water.

Now, let us take a brief look at the Oxford English Dictionary definition of the word “replenished”. This is that definition in toto:

Reple-nished, ppl. a. rare. [f, prec. + -ED¹.] Full ; perfect; restored to fullness.

1594 SHAKS. Rich. III, iv. iii. X8 We smothered The most replenished sweet worke of Nature. **1611** IVixt. T. n. 1.79 The most replenish'd Villaine in the World. **1641** G. SANDYS Paraphr. Song Sol. vi. iv. 24 More faire then the replenisht Moon.

What you see is that the Oxford English Dictionary documents one case of replenished being used in the sense of “restored to fullness”. That came from a 1594 Shakespeare document.

For the record, I do not support the Gap Theory, the Pre-Adamic Race Theory, or the Two Worldwide floods theory because I cannot support them from the King James Bible.

The conclusion that would have to be drawn from the documented evidence from the Oxford English Dictionary is that the words “replenish” and “replenished” were rarely used in the sense of “refilling” or “restoring to fullness” until modern times. Using and interpreting the word in its modern sense, how can you replenish that which has not been filled to start with as is the case in Genesis 1:28. “In the beginning” nothing had been created yet. Nothing was in existence to replenish in the modern sense of the word “replenish”. Interpreting the word to mean “refilling” or “restoring to fullness” ignores the immediate context of Genesis 1:28. Genesis 1:28 (and all the verses in Genesis chapters 1 and 2) were written to document that which was in the beginning (Genesis 1:1). There is no intervening time period and the text does not insinuate that there is. Every promoter of two worldwide floods and the “Gap Theory” has to read an entire doctrine into a text where it does not exist (I also know about the doctrinal shenanigans, charades, and nonsense that are marched around Isaiah 45:18-19 and 2 Peter 3:5-6!). Common sense would dictate that since God has just said that he just created (not recreated!) the heaven and the earth in Genesis 1:1 that the modern definition of the word “replenish” does not fit the context of Genesis chapter 1. There was nothing in existence to replenish in the modern sense. Duh! If my definition of a given word does not fit the context from which it was taken, then I need to find the reason for it and correct it. Rule number 1: Form and interpret the definition from the context. Rule number 2: If you are still having difficulty, consult the Oxford English Dictionary for the etymology of the word.

As an aside, for those of you who are quasi King James Bible followers, I know that some who

support the Gap Theory and the Two Worldwide flood theories like to appeal to the “original” languages in explaining many passages from the King James Bible. I do not need the Hebrew and Greek non existant originals to teach or preach anything that God would have me to preach or teach in English. In any English speaking congregation, any public appeal in preaching and teaching to the “originals” is nothing more than intellectual pride and scholarolatry. I said all that to say this. If you use the non existant “originals” to defend your doctrine, then you might ought to look at the word “fill” in Genesis 1:22. The word “fill” in Genesis 1:22 and the word “replenish” in Genesis 1:28 have at least one thing in common. They are both based upon the same Hebrew word! That would be Strong’s #4390. What are you gonna do now?!?

There is another issue that I cannot let slide. Many who get deeply involved in the discussion that is before us also like to play around with the words “void” in Genesis 1:2 and “in vain” in Isaiah 45:18. In my humble opinion, E. W. Bullinger creates a contradiction in those two passages with his interpretation and commentary he provides on them in his “Companion Bible”. In my opinion, the word “void” in Genesis 1:2 refers to the actual physical creation while the words “in vain” in Isaiah 45:18 refers to God’s feelings concerning his act of creation. I believe that Bullinger perceived a non existant contradiction between the two passages and his mind would not let him receive it. So, to resolve the perceived contradiction in his mind he reasoned that there must have been two creations. I do not buy that.

Then there is the issue of 2 Peter 3:5-7. I believe those verses when read and interpreted literally refer to one and only one creation and one and only one worldwide flood. I believe that those who interpret it of two creations and two worldwide floods do so based upon an inaccurate definition of the word “replenish” from Genesis 1:28. There is another reason that I believe there have not been two worlwide floods. Two floods would be inconsistent with the revealed nature of God from his statements in Genesis 9:8-17. I realize that those who advocate for two creations or two floods do so based upon their belief that those events took place before Noah’s flood. I am not trying to confuse the chronology here. I am just simply stating that I believe two worldwide floods would be inconsistent with God’s nature.