

Dear Mr. Roland:

Thank you for your recent letter.

I was glad to hear of your interest in ~~the~~ Old Testament studies. It is a large and involved field. The most important thing is that we be solidly grounded in the fact that God has spoken and that His Word is entirely true and free from error. Once we allow ourselves to ~~ik~~ take a questioning attitude as to the dependability of <sup>God's</sup> His Word we are in a ~~danger~~ dangerous position so far as Christian education is concerned.

Second to this--not as important, but yet extremely important, is the willingness to recognize our own ~~in~~fallibility as interpreters of God's message. To my mind it is tremendously important to realize that God has not revealed everything in the world to us. The Bible is given in order to show us ~~the~~ way of salvation and to It is God's purpose to tell us about our sin and our need of a Saviour and to show the wonderful provision that He has made. He has presented the basic truths of salvation so clearly that a wayfaring man, though a fool need not err therein. When we get into side issues and questions that are of interest only ~~to~~ from the viewpoint of satisfying our curiosity there is a tremendous range of ~~his~~ possible interpretation.

In my opinion this is <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ reason that God had permitted a certain ~~amount~~ amount of error to come in in the ~~translation~~ transmission of His Word. The amount is actually very slight. The Bible has been transmitted to us with far greater accuracy than any other book from ancient times. Yet there are a small number of errors of which we have definite manuscript evidence, and a certain number of others of which we do not have clear manuscript evidence. A few of this latter case there is evidence in parallels and study of Scriptural problems sufficient to make their existence absolutely certain, while in taking

The ~~origing~~ original Scripture as given by the Lord in the original languages <sup>written</sup> and in the original autographs was doubtless entirely free from error. Our

If one is to do work in this field that will redound to the glory of God it is particularly important that he be solidly grounded in the fact that God has spoken and that His Word is entirely true and free from error. We do ~~not~~ ~~not~~ believe this because we think we can prove every sentence in it to be true but because we are followers of Jesus ~~h~~ Christ and this was the attitude which he declared and which he assumed in all of His utterances.

A second ~~point~~ point to consider--not as important as this one, and yet extremely important, is that we should always be ready to recognize ~~our~~ our own ~~fallibility~~ fallibility as interpreters ~~of~~ of God's Word. It has always impressed me as extremely important to realize that God has not revealed all the facts of the universe to us. The Bible is given primarily to show us our lost condition and to tell us how we may be saved. God has presented the basic truths of salvation so clearly that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need ~~not~~ not err therein. When we get beyond the basic truths of salvation, and particularly when we get into side issues and questions that have little purpose other than to satisfy our curiosity, there is a tremendous range of possible interpretation.

It is my opinion that this is the reason why God has permitted a certain amount to have crept in in the course of transmission of His infallible Word. The Bible has been better preserved by far than any other book that has come down to us from ancient times, and yet enough error has ~~come~~ come in in transmission to warn us that we must not build a great deal on any one verse but must compare Scripture with Scripture.

Some people find comfort in taking the simple view that God ~~has~~ has preserved the present text of our Hebrew ~~Bible~~ Bible; some would even say the precise text from which our King James ~~Version~~ translation was made in a condition that is absolutely free from error. There is no such claim anywhere in the Scripture. It is original Scripture as given by God in the original autographs which were written in Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic that was entirely free from error.

Our present manuscripts bear about the same relation to it that a man would have in walking across a solid concrete bridge ~~over~~ over a wide river in flood when about an inch of water was above the top of the bridge. He would know with certainty that there was a solid/<sup>basis</sup>~~bridge~~ underneath upon which his feet ~~and~~ could stand firmly, and yet there would be a slight covering over it so that he could not see every bit of the solid foundation

and this is explicitly stated by many of its defenders. It is their ~~esset~~ essential belief that all things have developed from one simple start ~~in~~ by purely natural or, as one might say, purely accidental, development

Unfortunatly many ~~for~~ Christian students are led to believe that anything that involves development is wrong. The result is that when/<sup>one</sup>~~anyone~~ who holds evolution in the extreme anti-Christian sense gives them evidence for even a small amount ~~of~~ of development or change, they immediately conclude that the whole idea ~~from~~ from beginning to end ~~must~~ must be true. We make it harder (more difficult) rather than easier, for students to hold their faith when we give them oversimplified impressions of what we believe. Theistic evolution is a contradiction in terms, if we use evolution in its proper sense rather than a mere ~~synonym~~ synonym ~~for~~ for development. The question of the length of time that God spent in the course of His creation is an entirely different matter. The evolutionary theory requires a very long period to give room for accidental development from a very simple beginning to the complex situation that we have today. It is wrong for us to/<sup>allow</sup>~~let~~ this fact lead us to lead us to think that therefore we must believe that the time was necessarily ~~entirely~~ extremely short. We do not decide what the truth is by taking the opposite of what unbelievers say. The only way to decide the truth is to find ~~out~~ what the Bible ~~now~~ teaches.

I often tell my students that we are making a mistake if we go to the Bible



with two simple questions: Is such-and-such a matter a fact, or is it not a fact? We should also ask a third question; we should say: "Does the Bible not give me an answer to this question?" I am quite convinced that this third is the correct attitude in relation to the question of the length of the creative days.

God could have created the whole ~~universe~~ universe in two seconds if He chose ~~had chosen~~ had chosen. There was no reason He had to take six twenty-four periods. He could - have - done it in a very brief time or in a very long time. We cannot ~~compel~~ compel God to act in the way that may seem desirable to us. The question is: ~~What~~ What does the Bible ~~teach~~ teach?

To assume that the Hebrew word must mean exactly the same as our English word "day" is a rather foolish assumption. The way to determine what a Hebrew word means is to see how it is used in its ~~context~~ context. ~~When we examine its context~~ it in context. When we examine its context I believe that we find that ~~in~~ this Hebrew word does mean just about what our word "day" means in our language, but unfortunately most people have a completely false idea as to what our word "day" means.

If I were to meet someone at 11 o'clock at night in the middle of winter, and to say to him, "Isn't this a lovely day?" he would probably think that I was out of my mind. He would say, "It is not day; it is night." And the first usage use of the word "day" in the Scripture is where it says that God called the light ~~the~~ day and the darkness He ~~called~~ called night. In this verse the word "day" certainly does not mean a ~~twenty-four~~ twenty-four-hour period; it means a period of activity between two periods ~~of darkness~~ of inactivity and this I believe is the usual meaning of the word anyway.

I question whether people use the word "day" very much in the sense of a twenty-four-hour period except when they are calculating interest or making <sup>transportation</sup> railroad or airplane timetables. (How about buses? boats?) Ordinarily we use the word day to mean a period of activity between two periods of inactivity which usually corresponds more ~~or~~ or less to the time ~~when the~~ of light between the two periods of darkness. Yet we often use it in quite a different way, as when

Our present manuscripts have about the same relation to it that a man would have in walking across a bridge that had one inch of water over it. He would ~~ki~~ know with certainty that there was a solid basis underneath on which his feet could stand firmly, and yet there is a slight covering of that which is uncertain. /

It is God's will that we study each passage with extreme care in order to get everything out of it that we can, but also that we be very careful not to read into it anything that is not there. Human words are ~~not~~ not like a photograph which might be enlarged greatly and yield more and more evidence. They ~~extend~~ are more like blunt instruments. A word is an area ~~extension~~ of meaning, ~~not~~ not a point. In any sentence there is a certain amount of information that can be gathered with absolute certainty, but ~~there~~ there is a far greater amount of information that is suggested but ~~is~~ not clearly taught. It is therefore extremely important to compare ~~a~~ Scripture with Scripture if we are to know exactly what it means.

You mention the question of theistic evolution, and here we immediately come into a problem of semantics. It is unfortunate that the word "evolution", like so many other words, has come to be used in a great number ~~of~~ of senses. ~~Am~~ A man said to me once that he did not see ~~x~~ how anyone could doubt evolution because anyone can see the evolution of a boy into a man. It is true that when you compare a small babe (baby) with the same person ~~x~~ forty years later it is hard to see <sup>many</sup> points of ~~resemblance~~ resemblance. <sup>Great</sup> ~~small~~ changes have occurred <sup>gradually</sup>, and often these changes would have been ~~exte~~ extremely difficult to predict with accuracy. Development is a common thing in life. <sup>2</sup> ~~A caterpillar~~ develops into a butterfly.

<sup>no 10</sup> Who would ever dream, in looking at <sup>a</sup> the caterpillar, that eventually it would ~~be replaced by a butterfly?~~ <sup>3</sup> Life is full of development, and of small changes. It would be ~~absurd to deny that development is~~ <sup>as a very</sup> a real fact of life. <sup>4</sup> ~~It is yet~~

<sup>5</sup> ~~means something quite different. In the fullest sense it designates~~ the word evolution, ~~as properly used it should be taken as meaning the~~ idea that everything has developed by purely natural processes from an extremely simple beginning into the great ~~complex~~ complexity that we find today. <sup>the</sup> The theory, <sup>excludes</sup> thus by its very nature, rules out divine direction. It ~~rules out~~ any idea of a

a (2) and this

① goal or purpose, It involves a purely natural, and one might say, accidental, development. As held by the great leaders of evolution, this is exactly what they have taught. Unfortunately many of our students are given to understand that anything that involves development is wrong; that a man who believes in evolution in the extremely anti-Christian sense gives them evidence for development or change and they immediately conclude that the whole matter from beginning to end must be true. We make it ~~xxx~~ harder rather than easier for students to hold their faith by giving them oversimplified ideas of what we ~~xx~~ believe. In my opinion theistic evolution is a contradiction in terms if we are to use "evolution" in its proper sense rather than as a mere synonym for development.

6 3/8 The ~~question of the~~ length of time that God used in creation is an entirely different question. It is true that a long process of development from a very simple beginning to the complex situation that we have today ~~xxx~~ requires a ~~long~~ long period, but this is not to say that it is wrong to have a long period. It is purely a question of what the Bible teaches. A lecturer may present communism in such a way that he convinces his hearers of ~~xxx~~ in the whole subversive system. This does not mean ~~xxx~~ that lectures are bad, although it would be extremely difficult it is true that it would be extremely difficult for communism to be disseminated if such means as lectures and ~~discussions~~ discussions were not available for it, but acceptance of the possibility of lectures does not by any means mean that communism must follow.

I heard once that someone was against the ~~xxx~~ establishment of public libraries. He said that when you get public libraries people go into them and spend days and weeks reading ~~maximally~~ and studying and next you know they come out communists. He said, "You know This is what happened to Marx." Therefore we should not have libraries." We ~~xxxx~~ certainly believe in libraries and wide dissemination of ideas. It is the duty of those of us who oppose communism to use ~~xxx~~ use intellectual means to show its error, its fallacy, and its great danger.



~~The same is true of evolution.~~ If the Bible ~~is~~ clearly teaches that the world as it is ~~was~~ came into existence six thousand years ago this would inevitably rule out evolution. However, ~~is~~ if the Bible does not tell us when the world came into existence this does not prove evolution. It is an utterly erroneous argument to say that we must deny the possibility of any long period because if we do so it is a step toward evolution. The question is, "What does the Bible teach?"

It seems to me that one thing must be clearly established. The word "day" in Hebrew as in English does not essentially or definitely or universally mean a ~~twenty-four hour~~ twenty-four hour period. The very first use of it in the Bible, in Genesis 1: is that God saw the light that it was good and He called the light day, and the darkness He called night. Now the period that is referred to in this verse could be exactly twelve hours at in certain parts of the world; in other areas it would be a far shorter or a far longer period. At the poles it might even be as long as six months, <sup>but the</sup> ~~outside~~ cases would be few indeed where day as used in this verse represents a twenty-four hour-period. In fact the common use of the word "day", not only in the Bible, ~~but~~ also in ordinary life is for a period that is a period of activity that is ~~surrounded~~ preceded and followed by a period of rest. If you meet a man at midnight, and you say, "Isn't this a lovely day?" ~~He would~~ he would certainly laugh at you. He would say, "This is not day; it is night." About the only cases that I know of where we in common language today use the word "day" for a twenty-four hour period is in the figuring of interest or in the making out of railroad or airplane (travel) ~~in~~ schedules.

I notice that in the last paragraph I used the word I said "When we use the word 'today' Here I surely was not by "today" meaning December 22~~nd~~, 1966. I was referring to the general ~~period~~ period in which we live. I heard a man over the radio say recently that back in Lincoln's day they did not have automobiles. This did not refer to a twenty-four-hour period . It referred to the general

period of Lincoln's activity. The word "day" is ~~never~~ rarely used in common speech for a twenty-four-hour period. To say that it must mean such a thing when used in Genesis 1 is reading something into the Bible that has no warrant here in common usage or in Biblical ~~x~~ usage.

Thus in Genesis 1: ? the word clearly means something very different from a twenty-four-hour day. The same is true in Genesis 2:4 where it speaks ~~i~~ of heaven and earth in the day when they were created where the word "day" is clearly involving ~~incomprehension~~ the whole process that is described as a six-day process in chapter 1. This day must be at least six times as long as some of the days in Genesis 1. The word "day" then does not in itself give any idea as to how ~~x~~ long the period is.

*m* -2 → The only way to tell how long the day is in any particular usage is to see whether the context does or not give us evidence. I believe that we find such evidence in Genesis 1. Thus in verse it says that God ~~cud~~(?) bring forth herbs and trees, and ~~that~~ that the earth brought forth herbs and trees, and it was evening and it was morning such-and-such a day.

Now when you imagine a situation in which the earth becomes covered with great trees rising dozens of feet in height it is certainly abnormal to think ~~of~~ that all of this happened in a twenty-four-hour period. The suggestion here is very clear of something that involved a long stretch of time. God ~~could~~ could of course have caused that things would move like a moving picture that has been tremendously <sup>what</sup> speeded up so that/would normally take hundreds of years could occur <sup>within</sup> in the course of a few minutes. Yet there is no Scriptural evidence to ~~show~~ show that this is what He did. The verse sounds very clearly as if God performed a process which resulted within this third day in the earth being covered with great trees.

The same is true of verses and . They do not say, "Let the earth be covered with trees or with animals, and so on." ~~It says~~ It says, "Let the earth bring forth trees, let the waters bring forth sea monsters, let the earth <sup>used</sup> bring forth reptiles. The terminology/~~not~~ certainly suggests a long period



rather than a ~~twenty-four-hour~~ twenty-four-hour period. It thus seems to me that Genesis 1, while it does not clearly tell us how long the ~~by~~ days were, suggests very strongly that they were long periods. The burden of proof is upon ~~those~~ those who would show the contrary. In my mind they would have an impossible task. I do not know how long the days were. God could have done <sup>everything</sup> ~~nothing~~ described in any one of these days in one minute if He ~~had~~ chose, or even in one second. On the other hand ~~He could~~ He could perform them over a long period.

You say that you regard the ~~so-called~~ "gap theory" ~~as~~ as an exegetical impossibility. Personally I cannot ~~fully~~ follow this. The only <sup>that</sup> ~~art~~ argument/I know to show that the gap theory is an exegetical impossibility is the statement that the word ~~"hi-yah"~~ "hayah" could not mean ~~to become~~ "to become" but must mean ~~to be~~ "to be." <sup>However, as a</sup> ~~Now this statement~~ <sup>merely</sup> shows <sup>an ignorance of</sup> ~~the word~~ <sup>how the word</sup> ~~I once went through the whole chapter and examined~~ all the cases where in the English translation the word "to be" occurs. Then, leaving out ~~of~~ of account the usage in verse 2 which <sup>is</sup> the one we are studying, I found that the others divided about equally between those <sup>that indicate</sup> ~~which represented~~ a situation in which a thing was, and those <sup>that indicated</sup> ~~which represented~~ a situation to which it became. Thus when it ~~says~~ says, "He saw that it was good." it is clearly ~~describing~~ describing a <sup>situation</sup> that was there. When it says, "It was evening" and "It was morning." what it means is that ~~a state became~~ <sup>it became</sup> ~~(better word?)~~ <sup>came</sup> ~~into existence~~ of evening, and ~~a state of morning came~~. It represents a dynamic procedure. "It became evening" and "It became morning" would be a much <sup>and</sup> ~~translation~~ <sup>translation</sup> than ~~the~~ "It was evening" ~~or~~ "It was morning." Then I looked carefully at the Hebrew and I found that in every case where our English verb "to be" represented a dynamic <sup>and</sup> ~~change~~ <sup>that</sup> could just as well be translated ~~as~~ "become." And this was about half ~~of~~ of the cases of the use of the English word in the chapter. In every one of these the Hebrew word "hayah" was used, while in every case where in the context it ~~is~~ clearly represented simply the observation that a situation existed the word was never used. In

M-2 ✓  
Hebrew the ordinary way of expressing our English <sup>word</sup> "to be" is ~~simply~~ to put two words next to each other. "Huyah" is not a copula. If you look in Brown, Driver and Griggs, a Hebrew dictionary, you will find that it gives as its primary meaning "to become", "to happen"; it does not ~~say~~ say anything about "to be." The use of it <sup>haya</sup> ~~as a~~ like our modern copula is ~~a~~ a late development <sup>in Hebrew</sup>. Therefore it would be a far better translation of verse 2 to say either "the earth became without form and void", or, "there came into existence an earth without form and void." It does not mean that something was, but that something came to ~~be~~ be. However, this does not prove that there was an earth before that. "God created heaven and earth." In verse 1, in my opinion, indicates the original creation of matter. Whether one minute intervened between this and the situation described in verse 2, or whether billions of years intervened, we are not told, but at any rate something did intervene, because verse 2 is indicates a definite state (statement?) of a change of situation. There came into existence an earth without form and void. If those astronomers are right who think that there were many great ~~gaps~~ galaxies and suns, and that eventually our sun cast off a large amount of matter which formed the planets, then verse 2 would describe that situation where the material that formed this planet began to come together, and we had an inchoate group of matter which was the earth in a liquid state corresponding closely to what is in verse 2.

I do not say that this is what the Bible says happened. I am not at all sure ~~h~~ that we are in a situation to know what happened a long time ago. Scientists may make guesses; and they may make other guesses. New Hypotheses may be made (better word?) (not "concocted" - but ? It may be a long time before we can have certainty about a great many elements in this. Unfortunately many researchers are much more dogmatic than the facts evidence. However, most of the scientific theories that are made about the origin of this earth do not in any way contradict Genesis 1; they are

possible so far as Genesis 1 or 2 are concerned. Thus I cannot reject the "gap theory" as an exegetical impossibility. It is possible that this earth was first created, and <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ then/through some crisis it fell into a chaotic condition. After all, there is no question that Satan/before man was put into the Garden of Eden. When Satan came to tempt Adam he was already a fallen creature. It surely must have happened before Genesis 2:1. I would think there must be an interval between verses 1 and 2 in which Satan fell, but/whether his fall had anything to do with this earth we have no Scriptural evidence. I know of no Scriptural basis on which to say that the earth existed before Genesis ~~verse=12~~ 1:2 ~~but~~ but I do not know of any clear Scriptural proof that it did not. My own guess is that some sort of the cosmic process was initiated by God in verse 1 which describes His original creation of matter, and then that at some point in this process, perhaps immediately after it began, perhaps billions of years later, He produced the ~~condition~~ condition described in verse 2 in which He began to take this inchoate mass of matter and to form it into the earth on which He intended that man should dwell.

Dr. Whitcomb asked me to look over the book on the Flood before it was published. I wrote him that I would be very glad to look over the part that he wrote, the first four chapters, but that the remaining chapters dealing with <sup>geology</sup> ~~theology~~, were in an area in which I was not competent to pass judgment, and I could see no object in my ~~study~~ going through them. He sent ~~ex~~ me the first four chapters. His first three chapters are devoted to proving from the Biblical basis that the Flood that the Bible teaches that there was a universal Flood. I think he has gathered the material in an excellent way, and has presented it very cogently. I made a number of minor suggestions about the ~~manner~~ manner of presentation and he informed me that he had accepted all of my suggestions. They were all very minor. I felt that he had done an excellent ~~piece~~ piece of work in these three chapters. In the fourth chapter he begins to use the work ~~uniformitarianism~~ "uniformitarianism" which I believe is an



think  
 unfortunate word. I do not/~~believe~~ (sp?) that scientists can be divided into  
 uniformitarianists and ~~cataclysmianists~~ cataclysmianists. There is no question  
 that there have been great cataclysms. Every scientists knows of the existence  
 of volcanoes and of ~~the~~ tremendous/in the earth that take place in a short time.  
 On the other hand anyone who ever goes into ever ~~traveled~~ traveled at all  
 can see the slow effects of erosion that occur. ~~There are~~ There are small and  
 3 5/8 ugly (?) of subsidence and of the rising of areas of the world. There  
 is no doubt that small changes are constantly taking place in a more or less  
 uniform system. And there is also no doubt that cataclysms occur. It  
 impressed me that on the whole ~~Whitcomb~~ Whitcomb had done a good job on this fourth  
 chapter but not nearly as good a job as on the other three.

The~~r~~ remainder of the book which Whitcomb did not write, but which was  
 written by a man by an engineer who had taken a minor in geology deals with an  
 attempt to show that all, or most of the strata in the world had been produced  
 by the Flood. So far as I can see the Bible does not say anything about how  
 the strata had been produced. I feel that there is much in this area that has not  
 been properly worked out. However, I doubt that anyone is in a position to work  
 it out unless he takes at least three years <sup>at</sup> in getting a ~~Ph.D. in geology~~ Ph.D. in geology  
 and at least three years of post-doctoral study in geology in order to be in a  
 position to make satisfactory judgments in this area. When he would finish this  
 preparation I would think it probable that he could make some real advances in the  
 study of the formation of strata that would be worth while. I doubt that anyone with  
 less training in that area can say much that will ~~be~~ be of any real value in  
 the field. Whatever the conclusions I do not see how it has much relevance so far  
 as the Bible is concerned. I do not know of any place where the Bible says that  
 strata were deposited by the Flood. I think the Bible teaches a universal ~~Flood~~ flood  
 and that it is important therefore that we accept this as true, but it does not  
 give much detail on the physical processes that God used to cause the Flood and  
 tells nothing at all about the changes, whether great or small, that the Flood may  
 perhaps have made in the surface of the earth. I feel, therefore, that the whole

matter of Flood geology is something which is quite aside from my area of interest as a Bible student.

Since, so far as I know, practically everyone who has specialized in geology holds that Flood geology is not true, I hesitate ~~absolutely~~ about in any way tying myself up with ~~it~~ such a theory, particularly when I do not see how it has any particular relevance so far as the Bible is concerned.

You asked for material in the magazines and quarterlies dealing with the Old Testament and related subjects. The Biblical Archaeologist (quotes or underlining?) has some good articles ~~xxx~~ although it also has others with which I do not agree. The Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society has some good articles in it; so has the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation. All three of these cover a wide range of material and there is much in them with which I would agree and much with which I would disagree.

there~~s~~ is in them much with which I would agree and much with which I would disagree. Unless one takes a considerable amount of advanced training in archaeology and in related fields I am not sure that he is well qualified to deal in~~s~~ the areas of the Bible ~~that~~ affect this material. I would feel that for the person who has not done such study the best area of progress for Old Testament study is in exegesis and in study of syntax and of vocabulary. There is much ground to conquer cover in this area and it is one in which, with a comparatively few tools, any able person can make a great deal of progress.

I do now know how much of a department of Near--Eastern languages and literature Eastern Indiana University has. There are some excellent men in this field and there are also many men in it who are not particularly good. It is difficult for the outsider to make form a judgment. I have taken a great deal of work in these areas and have heard the top experts give their opinion of one another, and it is often very different from what the students of the other man think~~/~~ of him, or~~/of~~ any judgment~~s~~ that outsiders are competent to make. For the Christian the most important question is, "Just what does the Bible teach?" I feel that we are making a great mistake to go to with a particular question and say, "Does it teach this?~~?~~ ~~xxx~~ as true?" "Or does it rule this out as untrue?" We should go with three possibilities in mind: "Does it teach that this is true?", "Does it rule it out as untrue?" or, "Is it a subject which, so far as we know, God has not revealed to us?" All such



?

subjects and such problems should be put on the shelf in order that our lines may be alert for further evidences in case the ~~Lord~~ Lord should bring it to our attention. As we study the Bible often we find unexpected light on problems that we have been thinking about. If we were not aware of the problem we would never have seen the relevance of the new materials to it.

If you should have a chance to see the Bibliotheca Sacra of about three years ago you ~~would~~ would find in it two articles that I wrote on the servant of the Lord in Isaiah. This would give you an idea of the sort ~~of~~ exegetical and ~~interp~~ ~~insight~~ interpretative study that I feel is particularly needed, but is not being carried on to any great extent I fear.

I had an article in the fall of 1959 in the Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society on the relation between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. This would give you an idea of the sort of study that I feel is helpful also in this field.

If you have further questions or suggestions I would be glad to receive them to hear from them. I do not at the moment know what particular book to recommend ~~for concentrated study~~ for concentrated study on the Old Testament, aside from good grammars and dictionaries and concordances. I recommend particularly either The <sup>a</sup> Englishmen's Hebrew Concordance or Young's Concordance. Young's is much easier to use, and is, in my opinion, far superior for the serious Bible student to either Strong's or to any other concordance that I know of.

Sometimes I am extremely busy; at other times I have a little more time. I am greatly interested in pushing forward in every area of Biblical study, and had a little time free at the moment and so was glad to write at this length in relation to the questions that you asked. If you care to write me further may be able to give you answer to some simple question immediately on hearing it. If it is a more complicated one like the questions you asked in your letter, even if I have the answer right at my tongue's end, weeks or even months might pass before I ~~would~~ would time or opportunity to ~~write~~ word the material clearly. I find that writing is slow and takes a great deal of time, but it is well worth the time. Also, I ~~am~~ might ~~have~~

have written something already that would answer a particular question that you would have. So please do not hesitate to write me, but also please do not be disappointed if I am not able to give an answer to a long question immediately on hearing it.

Sincerely yours in Christ.

714 E. Main  
Danville, Indiana  
December 6, 1966

Dr. Allan E. MacRae  
Faith Theological Seminary  
Elkins Park, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. MacRae,

I am a recent graduate of Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary and am presently pastoring a small Baptist church in Danville, Indiana. While in seminary under Dr. Leon Wood I became very interested in the O.T. area and am now pursuing studies in Near-Eastern Languages and Literature at Indiana University.


In the General Association of Regular Baptists, of which I am a part, there has recently been a lot of discussion over creation - the days, etc. I have held to the age-day theory and this view is really looked down upon as being another term for Theistic Evolution, which I do not believe. However the more I study Hebrew grammar, I find some problems with the age-day view so I am really in a state of confusion. I have rejected the gap theory as an exegetical impossibility, so where do I go now?

I have purchased Whitcomb's book on The Flood and find many evangelical scientists (A.S.A.) and theologians (E.T.S.) think he has some good material but do not agree with him completely. Would you give me your personal opinion of his material and conclusions and your general feelings for flood geology?

Also I am trying to subscribe to some magazines and quarterlies that deal with the O.T. and related subjects. Could you suggest some titles that you feel are worthy of subscription? At present I receive the Biblical Archaeologist. Also I would appreciate knowing about any books that you could recommend for good concentrated study on the O.T.

I realize you are very busy, so if you cannot answer this letter I will understand.

Sincerely,

  
Leon Rowland



Dr. D. O. F. H. E.  
Dear "Duke":

It was a real pleasure to get your letter last week and to know that you had received the long essay that I sent you explaining why it seems to me that the more natural interpretation of the Scripture is to consider the days of Genesis 1 as long periods of time rather than as 24-hour days.

I hope that you had a grand time on your trip to California.

Thank you for sending me the copy of the negative side of the debate between Dr. Rimmer and Dr. Riley. I wish I could have been present. It must have been a very interesting occasion. As I read it carefully a few things stood out in my mind. Perhaps you will be interested in my reactions.

The first thing that I noticed was the attitude that Dr. Rimmer took, as he began to speak. He evidently had been much pleased with the witty remarks of Dr. Riley, and set out to answer in kind. He asserted that it is pleasant to hear witty remarks when one is not dealing with an enemy of the faith, but simply comparing two views that are equally acceptable to true Christians. In fact he went so far as to say that even if the audience should vote that they felt that he was the winner in this debate with Dr. Riley, he still would consider it entirely possible that in the end it might prove that Dr. Riley had been right and he wrong on the matter. In other words he did not consider this to be such a difference of opinion as should in any way separate true believers.

I feel that many of Rimmer's later remarks have to be taken in the light of these statements that he made at the beginning of his talk. Each time that he declares that surely his opponent will be converted by what he has said--each time that he makes an extremely dogmatic statement about the absolute certainty of the correctness of his views--I can just imagine him turning with a smile to Dr. Riley and putting such a tone in his voice as would say, "Here is an extreme statement for you to knock at. It is fun to examine these things together. Actually we can't really be sure which of us is right."

All this fits with my personal view on the matter, that the length of the days is not something that has been so revealed to us that we can take it as an article of faith, but rather that it is simply a matter of trying to decide what the Scripture really teaches.

The first part of Dr. Rimmer's eighth argument contains some important statements.

On pp. 10-11, he says:

THE EIGHTH REASON we accept the solar duration of the days <sup>of Genesis</sup> is the apparent <sup>the apparent day</sup> fact that Moses' clear intention was to convey the twenty-four hour idea. The wild flights of my honorable opponent's fancy (and some of them are wild!) cannot go so far as to say that Moses intended to convey the modern geological idea of aeons in each day of creation. This is an idea born of science that came long after Moses, and he, in his simplicity, penned the words of God with the evident intention of conveying the accepted idea of a day as we know it. If, then, we try to read into the Mosaic account theories and ideas Moses never intended to express, are we not liable to the charge that we are "wise above what is written," and are we not in a very definite sense "adding to" the sacred record?

This statement deserves very careful attention. I am particularly pleased with <sup>its last sentence</sup> ~~the statement at the end of it.~~ We should be very careful not to become "wise above what is written," or to add to the sacred record. We should not read into the Mosaic account theories and ideas that Moses never intended to express.

Yet there was one phrase that I did not quite like, where it said: "the accepted idea of a day as we know it." It should have said, "as Moses knew it." Here Rimmer has fallen into the very danger that he is attacking. He declares on page 7, line 2 that "a day is the diurnal revolution of the earth on its axis." On line 6 of the same page he says: "a solar day is nothing more or less than the time it takes the earth to make one complete revolution on its axis." ~~The same idea is repeated at the place~~ Actually we may be sure that Moses never heard

[m. by Phanshew]

of any of these terms. The idea of a twenty-four-hour day was quite unknown to him. He had no clocks of the type that we have. Neither did he have any idea, so far as we know, that the <sup>earth</sup> sun turned around on <sup>an</sup> its axis. This is not a proper way to define what Moses meant by a day.

Rimmer says that scientific ideas of today must not be read into the Bible, but insists that we must interpret its words in the light of scientific discoveries made only a few centuries ago. Actually both methods are false. We must interpret the Bible in the light of itself, not of modern scientific discoveries. *If we do, we are "adding to"*

The only way to find out what Moses meant by the word yom is to look at the Bible itself. When we do so we find that in the Scripture the word "day" is <sup>often</sup> used to represent a period of light preceded and followed by <sup>as in Gen 1:5</sup> periods of darkness. The length of this period may vary from a [to p. a3]



comparatively few minutes <sup>to nearly</sup> to a <sup>time</sup> six months in length, depending what part of the earth one is in and what time of the year <sup>it is</sup> he is there. Another <sup>common use of the word is to indicate</sup> use for it is for a period of day with the period of darkness immediately preceding it. <sup>to the</sup> Hebrews a day began at sunset. <sup>Such a day is rarely exactly 24 hours in length. Another</sup> The new day began at sunset. Whether this concept began at the very beginning

is not certain but would seem highly probably from the fact that Moses speaks of the day

<sup>fairly common use is to indicate</sup> as beginning with an evening and ending with a morning. <sup>②</sup> Moses also uses the term day

<sup>①</sup> for a period of indeterminate length, as in Genesis 2:4 where <sup>③</sup> he speaks of the day of

creation as including all that had been included in the <sup>④</sup> 6th day of Genesis 1. <sup>entire six</sup> <sup>many</sup>

<sup>today</sup> The question is not how do we understand the term but how did Moses understand <sup>particular case we must decide from context which is meant. None of them is exactly equivalent to our modern</sup> the term. The evidence is that <sup>⑤</sup> Moses used the term <sup>⑥</sup> day in all three ways, but there is

<sup>⑦</sup> no evidence that he ever meant by it the scientific definition of the time it takes this

particular planet to revolve once on its axis. <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <sup>⑰</sup> <sup>⑱</sup> <sup>⑲</sup> <sup>⑳</sup> <sup>㉑</sup> <sup>㉒</sup> <sup>㉓</sup> <sup>㉔</sup> <sup>㉕</sup> <sup>㉖</sup> <sup>㉗</sup> <sup>㉘</sup> <sup>㉙</sup> <sup>㉚</sup> <sup>㉛</sup> <sup>㉜</sup> <sup>㉝</sup> <sup>㉞</sup> <sup>㉟</sup> <sup>㊱</sup> <sup>㊲</sup> <sup>㊳</sup> <sup>㊴</sup> <sup>㊵</sup> <sup>㊶</sup> <sup>㊷</sup> <sup>㊸</sup> <sup>㊹</sup> <sup>㊺</sup> <sup>㊻</sup> <sup>㊼</sup> <sup>㊽</sup> <sup>㊾</sup> <sup>㊿</sup> <sup>①</sup> <sup>②</sup> <sup>③</sup> <sup>④</sup> <sup>⑤</sup> <sup>⑥</sup> <sup>⑦</sup> <sup>⑧</sup> <sup>⑨</sup> <sup>⑩</sup> <sup>⑪</sup> <sup>⑫</sup> <sup>⑬</sup> <sup>⑭</sup> <sup>⑮</sup> <sup>⑯</sup> <



Rimmer arranges his material under 12 heads. <sup>(2)</sup> The first of these arguments, which he calls <sup>(1)</sup> the meaning of the word yom, <sup>(1)</sup> I have already discussed, <sup>(4)</sup> the other <sup>(6)</sup>—I have <sup>(7)</sup> examined <sup>(3)</sup> the other <sup>(5)</sup> if very carefully, and am prepared to discuss any one of them quite fully.

However, I will not burden you with the time it would take to read such a full discussion.

Most of them consist of ideas or arguments based <sup>entirely</sup> upon human speculation or theorizing. <sup>although</sup>

Rimmer presents them very cogently and in lively fashion, ~~but~~ However, most of them are

<sup>more</sup> simply arguments from <sup>actually</sup> human reasoning and this sort of thing proves nothing. As Rimmer

himself said on page 2: "Supposition and human opinion, even when

*that opinion is of the most scholarly is NOT evidence or proof!*  
*Set me briefly describe a few of the arguments of this type. beginning*

~~Just a couple of examples of the type of arguments that most of them are.~~ <sup>with</sup> The

<sup>which is found on page 4 of this argument</sup> second argument is the claim, <sup>(4)</sup> consists in pointing out the fact that in the King James

Version, <sup>(1)</sup> the word yom <sup>(3)</sup> is translated as "day" in the 1181 times, <sup>(2)</sup> out of the 1480 times <sup>(5)</sup> that it occurs in the Hebrew text. <sup>(4)</sup> If this proves anything at all, it would merely show what the

<sup>opinion of the</sup> King James translators thought it meant, and would not be a ~~Biblical proof~~ but a proof

<sup>(7)</sup> from the ideas of certain interpreters. However, it does not even show that, <sup>(9)</sup> and in many

<sup>(8)</sup> cases the King James Interpreters used the word day where it means a period of indefinite

<sup>(12)</sup> length as when they speak of the day of the Lord, <sup>(11)</sup> or when as in Genesis 2:4, <sup>(10)</sup> the word is

used to cover the whole of the six days of creation, <sup>(10)</sup> where it <sup>(11)</sup> certainly does

<sup>(13)</sup> (A 2:12; 13:6; 9; Joel 2:1, 11; 3:14; etc.). <sup>(14)</sup> "The third argument is that whenever the word yom is preceded by a numerical

article, we are forced to accept it as a literal day. <sup>(15)</sup> Rimmer gives no reason why we are

<sup>(16)</sup> forced to accept it as a literal day. Naturally, the commonest use of the word day with

a number before it is in enumerating days of the month, and this is true in the Hebrew Bible

as in almost any other type of literature. Yet this does not by any means prove that the

word if used with a number before it always has to refer to a solar day. <sup>(16)</sup> It would be

<sup>(15)</sup> There is no such rule stated anywhere in Scripture.

[to p. 10 d 2]



what we mean by a solar day. When you speak of the ark resting on the 17th day or of the rain falling for 17 days it would naturally mean this sort of day. But this does not prove that the use of a number necessarily means that a solar day is involved. ~~Not~~ Unless we have a Scriptural statement to this effect we are being wiser than the text and not adding to it.

*A* ~~Thus a person might easily say there are four important days in Scripture. There~~ *first*  
~~is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2). There is the day of the vengeance of God. No, say,~~  
~~a second day is the day of the vengeance of God (2, 34, 8).~~ *The*  
~~day of the Lord (many references, this is referred to many times in both Old and New Testaments).~~ *So*  
~~The fourth day is the day of Christ (Phil. 1:10, 2:11, 2:14, 2:15).~~ *is my indication*  
 of the first day, the second day, the third day, the fourth day, without necessarily meaning 24-hour days. Whether Scripture does this or not, I do not know. But there is certainly no reason why it could not do it, and certainly the use of the number means nothing at all as to whether the days in Genesis are 24-hour days or not. *[to Bond]*

...statement at the end of page 10 impresses me as entirely without foundation, "the appearance of the number in each case DEMANDS that we accept it as a day of literal meaning, that is, 24 hours."

Toward the bottom of page 6 we find the 4th argument, we find the following statement: THE FOURTH ARGUMENT ably answers the quibble of my respected opponent: that the rays of the sun has not reached the earth until the 4th day. Under this head Rimmer proceeds to assert that the fact that, that the reference to the sun on the 4th day does not prove anything at all about the first three days, but here ~~sh~~ he fails to note what is said about the 4th day. He readily admits that the fourth day does not tell about the creation of the sun. In fact he expresses the belief that the sun had been created "ages and ages" before the time of the 4th day (page ). Rimmer asserts (top of page 7) that a day is the diurnal revolution of the earth on its axis." A little further down he says "a solar day is nothing more or less than the time it takes the earth to make one complete revolution on



quite natural for any of us to ~~make a statement~~ such a statement as this:

the following:

"There [to Adam] 17e

The sixth argument is stated as follows:

Of course this is not the question under discussion at all. God could have done

everything that is described in Genesis 1 in 6 ~~24-hour days~~ or in 6 periods of 24 minutes

each or of 24 seconds each. He could have done it all in one second. The question is

not what he could have done, but what he did. For this it is just a matter, all that matters

is to see what the Scripture says about it. As Rimmer himself says on page 24:

"A MAN OF BRAINS AND ABILITY CAN MAKE UP A PLAUSIBLE CASE FOR ANY SIDE OF ANY

QUESTION." Such arguments as these prove nothing, the only thing that matters is what

are the actual facts.

Similarly, the 12th argument is that since evolutionists believe in long periods of creation we should not believe in them. I certainly feel that we should not accept any view because unbelievers hold it, but neither should we reject a view because unbelievers hold it. We should go to the Scripture and see what it teaches. Such arguments as these are interesting and often seem convincing but prove nothing.

The 12th argument, that since the sun's rays were not visible, since the sun was not visible to the earth on the 3rd day, the 3rd day could not have been a long period because vegetation could not grow without the sun. It is based upon human experience, in farming.

We cannot say what God might have chosen to do. Anyway, the first day provided light, and what the vegetation needs to grow is light, not necessarily direct rays of the sun. Such arguments prove nothing. As Rimmer himself says in p. 24 (5) above:

What really matters is the specific evidence that Rimmer advances. I did not find

a great deal of this in the 14 pages of the debate. However, there were a few statements

which seem to point specifically to definite evidence. Rimmer is an able speaker, capable

[to d 3]



of moving audiences. His particular work was not that of the careful gathering of facts, yet ~~X~~ if we are to make decisions on matters like this, they must be based on facts.

Occasionally Rimmer does make very definite statements about facts as on page 12, where <sup>the lower part of</sup> he refers to the mention of the seventh day in <sup>5 4:14</sup> where he says that the Hebrew yom, that the day when God rested is referred in Hebrew and says: "In the Greek text of the New Testament this and is there used by the Greek word hemera, and he says the Greek word is <sup>and it means</sup> hemera always indicates a solar day."

This sounds like a definite statement of fact, however, I looked up hemera in a concordance and within two minutes I came across a dozen cases where the word could not possibly be referring to a solar day. ~~Thus~~ When Paul speaks of the day of salvation <sup>(2 Cor. 6:2)</sup> it is certainly not a 24-hour day. When he speaks of ~~hastening unto~~ the day of Christ <sup>(Phil. 1:10 etc.)</sup>, it is certainly not a 24-hour day. When <sup>Peter</sup> he speaks of the day of the Lord <sup>(2 Peter 3:10 etc.)</sup> it is <sup>is not referring to</sup> certainly not a 24-hour day. When ~~John says~~ <sup>says</sup> quotes Jesus as saying <sup>"Abraham saw my day and was glad"</sup> ~~he is~~ <sup>was</sup> certainly not speaking of a 24-hour day. Many other examples could easily be cited where the Greek word hemera does not mean a 24-hour day. It is unfortunate that Dr. Rimmer should have said, "~~The Greek word hemera always indicates~~ <sup>means</sup> a 24-hour day."

When it comes to matters of evidence there is really only one strong argument in the whole of Rimmer's presentation. This is a statement, which ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> provable, would indicate a great deal. It occurs on p. 8, where we read: [To Am 8]

~~Indebit~~  
~~No Indebit~~  
~~Here only an illustration is given, that of the first day. But not the strong statement~~



its axis. Whatever else we may or may not know about the meaning of Genesis 1, we do know ~~that~~ this was not the best--this definition was certainly not what Moses or anyone of that time had in mind. The only way they could have ever dreamed of such a definition of a sun would be a specific revelation of God to them about the fact and we have no evidence that he made such a revelation. If He had it would have been strange indeed that so many centuries elapsed before anyone ever thought of the idea as far as evidence goes that the earth revolves on its axis. The fact of the matter is of course that it states in the fourth day that God caused the sun, moon and stars to appear and made them measures of time for days and for years. This certainly excludes the idea that the sun, the relation of the earth to the sun was a measure of time of the days in the previous three days. This fourth argument is a negative one and it is one which does not seem to grasp the meaning of the statements ~~also~~ at the 4th day at all.

*A*  
*INDENT*  
The 5th argument is an interesting one. He says, *[INDENT]* "ARGUMENT NUMBER 5 is even more forceful and unanswerable than this. In the accounts of the various acts of creation in this week, the wording of the text in each case is such as to ~~demand~~ demand instantaneity. *[End of indenting]* It may be argued from the English translation, that a time-period is possible in the meaning of the word day, but the Hebrew text is emphatically reversed, the reverse, as an instance on the first day the text says..."

*[Not indented]*  
Here *only one* illustration is given from the first day *that of* but the statement is made that *But note the strong "I" in the accounts of the various acts of creation in this week,* "in each" the wording of the text in each case is such as to demand instantaneity." *Set* Let us look at the wording of the text *we examine the facts. Set us begin with the very last creative action. In* Genesis 1:27 we read: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

*At*  
Surely at *first* first sight this seems to fit in quite definitely with the statement that in connection with, that in every case *the* that wording of the text is such as to ~~demand~~ demand instantaneity. However, *we must compare Scripture with Scripture.* God's word does not contradict itself. When we seem to find a contradiction we must explain the two passages in the light of each other. We turn *In Gen 2 there is a fuller account of the creation of man and*

*[to top of 9e]*



woman, Gen 2:7 reads:

to chapter 2 and we find a more detailed account of the creation of man. There we find

the statement made in Genesis 2:7: "and the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into <sup>②</sup> his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here we

find that the creation of man involved Does this word demand instantaneity? Surely it proves the exact opposite, there are

at least two stages in it, the forming of his body from the dust of the ground, and then

the breathing <sup>①</sup> into his nostrils of the breath of life. This cannot be taken as an instantaneous act. Furthermore, the statement in Genesis 1:27 said, "male and female created he them." According to Dr. Rimmer's statement this wording requires

It sounds as if it is an instantaneous immediate creation of man, "male and female." But

in chapter 2, we read of various things that happened between verse 7, when man was

created and verse 22, when woman was created. The statement in Genesis 1, which at

first sight sounded like an instantaneous act, on examination proves in the light of chapter 2 not to be an instantaneous act at all. God could of course if he chose have simply said,

"Let men and women be standing here, wholly formed and complete," but that is not what He did. Genesis 2 shows that something quite different occurred. [to 9f]

Let's look at some of the other statements. Verse 6 says, God said let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. Verse 7 doesn't say there was a firmament, it says God made the firmament, and divided the waters. This can describe an instantaneous act or it can be something which gradually took place over a long period of time.

In verse--on the 3rd day we find as Dr. Rimmer himself points out, under the

(13 1/4) argument, three different events taking place. God said, let the

waters under the heavens be gathered together in one place, and let the dry land appear, and it was so. God could have said, let all the waters be together and the dry land separate from them, and had it happen instantaneously, but this is not what the words say. He said,

"let them be gathered together." The wording as it is stated describes a process which could have occurred within a few hours, which might have taken years possible have been performed with a tremendously strong wind in the course of only a few hours, but which would seem more likely to have taken a long period of time before to

occur. This is even clearer when we look at the other statements. E & B on n. 9f.



~~As~~ <sup>9f</sup> No other description of a creative act in Gen. 1. is  
so expressed "as to demand instantaneity." Most of them  
are so ~~expressed~~ <sup>worried</sup> as strongly to suggest the  
contrary. Thus <sup>(2)</sup> in verse 1 <sup>(1)</sup> we read <sup>(3)</sup> that God said, "Let  
the [to A on p 9e

statement about the other  
great creative act that occurred on [to C on 2ff.

copy rest of p 2f  
continue on 3f to  
end of 3rd line  
Then back to here

↓ ¶ So far from every creative act of Gen. 1 being  
stated in such a way as to demand instantaneity,  
we have found that the very opposite  
is true of every one of them, except, perhaps,  
for the creation of light on the first day. [to A on 6f]  
~~which Pimmes so vividly describes, or~~  
~~8-9. Even here questions might be raised by [over]~~

The other matters dealt with are matters of argument and which various opinions could be hold, Dr . Rimmer states his very dogmatically but the opposing view could be stated equally dogmatically on every one of them. Thus he makes the statement that wherever the word day is preceded by a number it indicates a solar day. I know of no Scriptural statement to this extent. Naturally if you speak of the 13th dy of the month you have a number used before and probably it refers to a solar day. This does not prove that one might not just as well use the word day dealing with another kind of day altogether. If you say that baseball games are held on sunshiny days in the days before bright illumination was used for nighttime playing, you might then say that the first day on which they played was the 25th of March , the second day was the 14th of April, the 3rd day was the 5th of May. In these cases you would refer to a solar day but what you would have in mind would actually be the light portion rather than any 24-hour day at all, except of course for matters of designation.

Much argument is made as to whether <sup>G</sup> God could have done each of these acts in a 24-hour day. I would think perhaps a fourth of the whole ~~speech~~ speech is on this. However that really should not interest us. Why should God require a 24-hour day? Why not do it in 24 seconds instead of 24 hours. Why ~~do~~ not do it in one second? God could have done the whole work of the six days in one second if He chose. But the account as it reads does not sound like that at all, but like the description of a series of processes which God may have chosen to spread out over a very long period of time.

A → <sup>It</sup> Personally, I have no objection to anyone thinking these were 24-hour days, <sup>consider to be for anyone</sup> But I think ~~that~~ it is very foolish to be dogmatic about it and to insist that they were. <sup>words stand</sup> We just don't know. As the ~~statements occur~~ in the Scripture, <sup>that</sup> regardless of what anybody thinks ~~from any view point of geology or of any other science,~~ they sound to me much more like long periods than like 24-hour days. <sup>ing</sup> I feel that on this matter we should live and let live, <sup>since God has not chosen to tell us</sup> leave each one free to think what he wants, whether they were 5-minute days, or 24-hour days, or 2-billion-year days, or indeterminate periods of time, <sup>[to 79]</sup> God simply has not



~~revealed to us.~~

May the Lord richly bless you in your stand for the truth of the gospel. The clear statements of the word are being attacked at many points, and we must stand absolutely four-square for them. <sup>But</sup> ~~If we hold a view, try to hold a view which the Bible does not specifically teach, I feel that we expose ourselves to unnecessary attacks, and that no good thing is accomplished by it.~~

In the past many people have felt that the Bible clearly taught that the earth was the center of the universe. <sup>Today scientists are</sup> ~~Personally I do not think that it teaches one way or the other, whether the earth or the sun is at the center of our particular solar system.~~

~~Science is thoroughly convinced on many evidences today, that the sun is the center of the universe, the center of our solar system. This does not contradict any statement of the~~

~~Scripture. However, it does contradict many statements of Christian people who thought~~

~~the Bible taught the contrary (cf. Ps 19:46) at one time that this was what the Bible meant.~~

~~The same is true about the flatness of the earth, many people think that the Bible teaches a flat earth. I do not find that anywhere~~

~~in it. However, neither do I find in it any clear teaching that the earth is round. Many~~

~~people in the past have been convinced that the Bible taught a flat earth. Students have~~

~~become convinced that the earth was round and decided therefore that the Bible was untrue~~

~~and have lost their faith. I feel that it is important that we stand absolutely four-square~~

~~on the position that is clearly taught in the Bible, and verbal inspiration is I believe~~

~~clearly taught in the Bible, but that when a word is used in various senses in the Bible it,~~

~~is a mistake for us to insist upon one interpretation as being the only correct one.~~

May the Lord richly bless you in every phase of your <sup>personal</sup> life and of your valuable <sup>7</sup> witness

to His truth. It is always a joy to hear from you.

Cordially yours in Christ,

Dear Friend:

Thank you for your letter with its enclosure of the debate by Harry Rimmer, which I am returning herewith in accordance with your request.

I wish I could agree with you and say that it impresses me as logical and consistent and scholarly.

The Christian world today is facing an interesting situation. We have the Word of God which is our complete and final source of information on spiritual matters, and there is nothing more important than ~~we~~ disseminating the spiritual information that it contains. The Bible also contains a considerable amount of material dealing with various sciences. Yet it was no part of God's plan to give us full information about these sciences. If he had desired to do so it would have had to be many times as long as it is.

I am thoroughly convinced that everything that is taught in the Bible relating to any field of knowledge whatever is absolutely true and dependable. However I am equally sure that it was not the Lord's intention to give us full information about a great many things about which the Bible teaches. I feel that ~~as~~ it is very important that we see exactly what is given there and what is not stated. On matters that are not stated it is important that we keep from taking a position which might later be proven to be erroneous.

It nowhere states in the Bible that the earth is round. Neither does it state that the earth is flat. Many modernists assert that the Bible is out of date because it says that the earth is flat. I unhesitatingly challenge them

where such a statement is made. Yet I cannot say that the Bible clearly teaches that the earth is round although one or two passages seem to suggest such a view. The Lord did not choose to give us definite information on this point.

The same is true about the matter of the earth going around the sun. The



rough letter - 2

Bible speaks of the sun coming out of his chamber like a strong man to run a race. The impression that one would get on this would be that the sun goes round the earth. Many modern scientists feel <sup>fact that the</sup> ~~that~~ the earth moves around the sun shows that the Bible is out of date. I am well satisfied with the interpretation that the statements about the sun moving through the heaven are figurative, and dealing simply with appearances and not claiming to give us definite knowledge. Modern science seems to have proven that the earth goes around the sun and I feel that it is extremely unfortunate, when people get the impression that this in any way contradicts the Bible. Actually, in my opinion, the Bible does not deal with this particular matter.

Modern science holds that most of the stars that we see in the heavens are other suns, many of them far larger than our own and some of them being billions of miles away. The Bible nowhere teaches this, but neither does it contradict it.

It would be unfortunate if people would get the idea that this was a contradiction other than the Bible.

The same is true about the astronomic discovery of recent years, that practically all the stars that we see form one great galaxy, and that there are millions of other galaxies in the heavens, some of them far greater than the one of which our sun is a minor member. All astronomers today believe this to be true. The Bible says nothing about it, but neither does it contradict it.

If the Bible stated that the earth was created in six 24-hour days, I would have no hesitation in believing it. However, He could equally well have done it in six seconds. It is not a question of what the Lord can do but of whether the Bible actually tells us or not how long a time he caused to be taken up in the matters described in Genesis 1.

Harry Rimmer was a very able speaker, and many people were greatly blessed by his messages. His books dealing with scientific matters were used of God to save the



faith of many high school students. Yet an earnest highly-educated Christian told me one day that Harry Rimmer had ~~saved~~ his faith when he was in high school, and then had nearly wrecked it when he was in college. The reason ~~for~~ for this was that Harry Rimmer took many excellent arguments in various scientific fields~~ss~~ and presented them fortibly in defense of the Word, but did not take the time to ~~give~~<sup>get</sup> the details accurate in any of the fields in which he worked. This makes it very easy for a college professor to take almost any of his scientific writings and show many inaccurate and erroneous statements about various de~~m~~ils.

A fine Christian archeologist told me one day that he had gone through a book by Harry Rimmer on Archeology. He said that it had some very fine arguments in it but that the details contained many errors. He referred to the simple matter of fact of the names of the various archeological museums in different cities of the world. He said that in such a simple matter of fact as this he found 20 definite errors in the book. It was as if he had said, "Many people in New York work in the Loop. In Chicago the great statue of Billy Penn on top of City Hall stand s at the end of State Stree. In Philadelphia one of the most interesting buildings is the Empire State Building." ~~20 years~~ Twenty errors of this kind dealing with the names of archeol ogical institutions occurred in the one book.

I regret to say that I find many errors of this type in the address that you sent to me. Thus on page        he takes Dr. Riley severely to task for building an argument on the use of the word day (hemera) in the New Testament, insisting that it is only the Old Testament that is important in the present discussion. Yes on page        Dr. Rimmer himself makes a~~n~~ big argument from the use of the word Hemer in the New Testament, stating that it always means a solar day.

Just at a cursory glance in a concordance, I quickly located a dozen cases where hemera could not possibly be interpreted as a 24-hour day. (see F)

Yet Dr. Rimmer dogmatically states that "hemera" always indicates a solar day.

Dr. Rimmer makes a great deal of his claim that yom always means the time that it takes the earth to make one revolution on its axis. Yet there is not a single place in the Bible where the word is defined in this way, nor do we have any reason to think that this idea ever occurred to any of the people who used it in ancient times. To them a day was simply the light period between two periods of darkness, or a series of such periods. The word was also frequently used to indicate a period of definite length. This is what the word means in the Bible and it is not proper interpretation to fasten on it a meaning different from what the Bible shows it to have had.

On page            Dr. Rimmer says that all the acts of God in Genesis 1 were instantaneous and quotes the statement about the creation of light on the first day. Yet the statements in the other days are most of them very different from this. It is doubtful that ~~at this~~ it could be shown that more than a third of the statements in Genesis 1 clearly represent an instantaneous act on God's part. One place where this might be ~~thought~~ taught on superficial examination would be the statement in verse 26: "God created man: male and female created he them." Yet in Genesis 2 it is clearly explained that a number of events were included in this simple statement and that God performed a number of distinct acts between the creation of man and the formation of woman. Dr. Rimmer's general statement simply does not fit the facts. It is based only upon the first day and is quite different from the way that things are actually expressed.

If the Bible clearly stated that the earth is the center of the universe and everything else revolves around it, and God figures time according to the turning of ~~g~~ the earth on its axis, we would have no doubt that this is the case. I do not find ~~any~~ such statement in the Bible, and feel to accept such a view is ~~returning~~ reading into the Bible what is not ~~there~~.



there. It puts us in sharp ~~op~~position to the view of all astronomers that the earth is merely one of the ~~p~~lanets that goes round the sun, the sun merely one of ~~th~~ millions of suns in our galaxy and our galaxy only one of millions of galaxies. ~~As~~ If the Bible contradicst all the astronomers in the worls, I would not hesitate to stand by the Bible, but where there is no such statement ~~in~~ at all in the Bible, and the evidence adduced by the astronomers is very complete and very definite, ~~a~~ it seems to me that we are hurting rather than helping the cause of Christ by reading ~~into~~ the Bible something that is not there.

I find the debate by Dr. Rimmer full of dogmatic statements and slurs upon the intelligence of his opponents, but I find very little of solid evidence and nothing to prove that the view that he gives is actually taught in the Scriptures.

It seems to me that we have enough to do to stand upon what the Bible clearly teaches, without inserting into it something that is not there. As I showed in my paper in my previous letter, the word yom in the Bible clearly indicates a period of light between two ~~perids~~ periods of darkness, and is also used for counting the number of such alternations, and also for an indefinite period of time. We are nowhere told how long. The days of creation were, and I feel that we are taking an unneecessary burden upon our selves in insisting upon a particular length for them.

As I pointed out in that letter the terminology used on the 3rd, ~~4th~~ 5th and 6th days fits far better with a long period than with a brief day.

On the first page of his debate, Dr. Rimmer asserts that this is a matter on which good Christians can differ without ~~the~~ thinking any the less of one another. He says of Dr. Riley, "in all our acquaintance we have never found ourselves in opposition on any essential ~~p~~oint of Scriptural revelation and even now after seeking for a long time for a question on which we can honestly disagree, neither of us is dogmatic or unmovable on this issue we here discuss in the most friendly manner possible."

In my opinion, we injure the cause of verbal inspiration rather than help it when we try to insist upon one particular view of the meaning of the word day in Genesis 1. Personally, I think that the Scriptural evidence without even looking at any other evidence from any other source rather clearly indicates that these were long periods. But I have no criticism of anyone who feels differently. Surely this should be considered as a matter on which true believers in verbal inspiration can differ in friendly fashion, rather than one on which pronouncements should be made or dogmatic stands taken.

I am sorry to disagree with you on this point, but feel that the work of Christ is better advanced by charity regarding it than by an attempt to force Christians into one mold.

Thank you for letting me see the debate which I return herewith. I wish you had made an extra carbon for me.

May the Lord greatly bless you in every part of your vital testimony to the cause of Christ.

Cordially yours in Him,



twenty four

B is the apparent fact that Moses' clear intention was to convey the ~~24~~ hour idea. The wild flights of my honorable opponent's fancy (and some of them ~~are~~ wild!) cannot go so far as to say that Moses intended to convey the modern geological idea of aeons in each day of creation. This is an idea born of science~~x~~ that came long after Moses, and he, in his simplicity, penned the words of God with the evident intention of conveying the accepted idea of a day as we know it. If, then, we try to read into the Mosaic account theories and ideas Moses never intended to express, are we not liable to the charge that we are "wise above what is written," and are we not in a very definite sense "adding to" the sacred record?" (End of indenting)

This statement deserves very careful attention. I am particularly pleased with the statement at the end of it. We should be very careful not to become "wise above what is written," or to add to the sacred record. We should not read into the Mosaic account theories and ideas that Moses never intended to express. [to Con p. 92]

The question immediately comes, how much of science did Moses intend to express? The Bible is not written to teach us science. The Bible is written to teach us how to know how to know God and how to be saved through the Lord Jesus Christ. We can be sure that God has given us all the information that we need in the spiritual realm. We have in the Bible everything that is necessary for us to know how to live lives that ~~have~~ are worthwhile in His sight and how to come to know Him and His Son the Lord Jesus Christ. This does not mean that the Bible tells us everything that might be known about theology. I am sure that there are great depths to the character of God and there are an infinite number of things that He has done or does do that we know nothing about and cannot learn about from the Bible. If the Bible were to tell us all that must be known about God it would take thousands of volumes to contain the information. If--John tells us, in John 20:31 that ~~is~~ if the Bible were to tell --that Jesus did many more things that are not told in ~~His~~ his gospel and that if all of them were to be written he doubts if all the books in the world would be

sufficient to contain the information. God has ~~not~~ told us everything about Himself by any means. He has told us all that is necessary for us to know in the spiritual realm.

When it comes to science God has certainly not intended to tell us all about biology or geology or chemistry or even all about history. He tells what is necessary for us to know in these fields in order to understand the spiritual truths that He gives us.

My understand ng is that verbal inspiration that wherever He touches upon these fields what He says is accurate and true. It does not mean that He gives us a full account of ~~any~~one of these fields. There is much in them that we may discover that is not at all contained in the writings of the Bible. However, what we may discover is not denied in the writings of the Bible. If anything in these fields actually contradicts the Biblical statements, then our discovery has been a mistaken one. God is the creator of the world, and God is the author of the Bible and the two ~~cannot~~ cannot contradict each other. But we may discover a great deal in nature that the Bible says nothing about. It is therefore ~~the~~ very important that we be ~~be~~ careful not to read into the Bible what is not stated there.

Now we ask ourselves what is it that Moses intends to say in this field. How are we going to find out? ~~And~~ I do not at all like the statement, the last part of this statement: "this is an idea born of science that came long after Moses, and he, in his simplicity, penned the words of God with the evident intention of conveying the accepted idea of a day as we know it." I don't like ~~the~~ statement a day as we know it. It certainly should say a day as he knew it. How are we to know what kind of a day Moses knew? I find repeatedly in this ~~paper~~ the statement that a day means <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ revolution of ~~a day~~ the earth upon its axis. I find repeatedly the statement that no matter whether <sup>it</sup> ~~there~~ is light or whether there is no light at all, a day--the earth always takes the same length of time to revolve upon its axis and this is what is meant by a day. ~~I find~~

However, I searched the Bible through and find no evidence anywhere in it that Moses knew anything whatever about the length of time it takes the earth to revolve on



its axis. I find no evidence that Moses knew that the earth had an axis, or that the earth revolves at all. Whether Moses thought that the earth went around the sun or that the sun went around the earth, is nowhere stated in the Bible. I do not know whether Moses knew anything about this or not, but I do not believe that he has given us any information about it. When we say that Moses by the word day means the length of time that it takes the earth to revolve--to go round on its axis--we are reading modern scientific ideas into the Bible and becoming wise above what is written. ~~W~~ If we want to know what Moses meant by day the only way to find out is to see how he used the word.

When we undertake to do this we find that what Moses meant by a day in the first case where he uses it is a period of light between two periods of darkness. We find this right in Genesis 1: . He called the light day and the darkness he called night. This is by far the most common--this is the most general use of the word day. It is a period of light between two periods of darkness. The length of this period varies tremendously. When Moses spoke of six days, did He mean six combinations of a period of darkness and a period of light, or did he mean six periods of light without including in his enumerations the period of darkness. As far as I know we have no way to tell. Of this I am sure, that Moses did not mean a period of time that would be marked as 24 hours on a clock. Moses had never heard of a 24-hour day, nor had he ever heard of the <sup>earth</sup> sun revolving on its axis.

Moses clearly used the word day in three senses. He uses it of the period of light between two periods of darkness. He uses it for a succession of days, whether they be simply the periods of light or whether it also includes with each period of light the preceding period of darkness. And he uses it for a general period of time. Thus in chapter 2 he speaks of the whole creation as one day. These are the generations of heaven and earth in the days when they were created. This includes all the six days in one. It is --the word day is often used in the Bible for a general period of time. All that we can say

of a particular usage is that it indicates a period of time and to know how long the period is intended to be, we must examine the context and see what the writer had in mind. If he speaks of the 23rd day of a certain month, we know that he refers to the sort of calendar system which was then used. One quite different from the system we use today, and yet agreeing with ours in this, that it numbers the days consecutively within each month.

There is a great deal of discussion of whether God could have created the world in six days, periods of 24 hours. Dr. Rimmer's debate contains a great deal of ~~material~~ material about this. Actually, this has nothing whatever to do with the question. God could just as well have created the world in six seconds as in ~~se~~ six periods of 24 hours. The matter of what God could do is not at all involved. It is the question of what God did do, and the only way we can tell anything about this is to see what is said in the Bible, trying to see exactly what is stated and to avoid becoming wise above what is written. The fact of the matter is that there is absolutely no evidence to show how long the <sup>creative</sup> ~~created~~ days were. And there is no reason whatever to think that Moses had in mind when he spoke of them the period of time that it would take this particular planet to revolve once upon its axis. It may be that each of them was a 24-hour period. They may have been 10-hour periods, they may have been 5-hour periods, or they may have been billions of years in length. The Bible does not state and when we try to say, we are simply being wise above what is written.

I like the statement that Dr. Rimmer makes on the first page of his discussion, when he says of Dr. Riley, "for my honored and beloved opponent, I have naught but the highest affection, nay, even reverence. In all our acquaintance we have never found ourselves in opposition on any essential point of Scripture~~al~~ revelation, and even now, after hunting for a long time for a question on which we can honestly disagree, neither of us is dogmatic or immovable on this issue we here discuss in the most friendly manner possible. Even though the audience votes me the winner in this debate, I am still unable



to assert that my respected opponent may not be right. "

There is an excellent ~~statem~~ent near the middle of page 2 of Dr. Rimmer's remarks. It reads: "Supposition and human opinion, even when that opinion is the most scholarly, is NOT evidence of proof." Dr. Rimmer's 14 pages contain a great many very strong statements that the word day must be a solar day, and that the whole context of Scripture demands this interpretation. It is interesting however to turn aside from the all points of--from all the rhetorical statements, some of which are very witty and very forceful, some of which are very forceful, and to look specifically at the evidence that he presents. He says that he felt, on this same page, "I will advance Twelve lines of evidence to show that the days of Genesis are NOT geological periods." Let us look at these 12 arguments, and see just what evidence is given under each of them.

Near the middle of page 3 Dr. Rimmer gives the first argument which he entitles : "The meaning of the word 'yom'." He then says Dr. Riley is right ~~about the word,~~ when he said that this word, in the Hebrew language, has many varieties of meaning. He is also right when he says its meaning is sometimes an indefinite period of time; but he then proceeds to argue from this true premise to a false conclusion, that is, because the word sometimes means an indefinite period, it cannot mean a solar day in Genesis the first chapter."

I do not have Dr. Riley's statements and so do not know whether this is a proper interpretation of his words. I would certainly fully agree that the fact that it sometimes means an indefinite period of time does not mean that it cannot mean a ~~we~~ solar day in Genesis the first chapter. However, this is not proof that in the first chapter it does mean a solar day. The word yom has <sup>three</sup> ~~two~~ distinct meanings. We have no right to insist that any one of the three is the one that is used in a certain context, unless we have clear evidence ~~that~~ in favor of ~~such~~ an interpretation in that particular context.

In continuing the argument on page 4, ~~Dr.~~ Rimmer said, "BUT IN EVERY INSTANCE ~~WHERE~~ WHERE..."

...here I would like to ask just who has established this as a rule that unless the context shows it's an indefinite period it must be a solar day? The fact is that the context must show which of the three meanings the word has in the particular instance. Moses never established such a rule, nor does any Bible passage establish such a rule. As far as the meaning of the word yom is concerned we do not know from that which interpretation is the right one in Genesis one.

The second argument that Dr. Rimmer gives is the statement that the word yom occurs 1480 times in the Hebrew text and it's translated "DAY" 1181 times in the English Bible. He therefore says, "this, ~~therefore~~ then, establishes a general rule for the guidance of the investigator; the word 'yom' is to be rendered 'day', unless the context holds some reason and authority for translating it otherwise." We note however--he goes on to say "please note the authority is to be found in the text." Here however he is making the authority not the text but the interpretation given by the translators thousands of years after Moses wrote. However, in addition to that, the fact that the word is translated day so many times does not prove at all what sort of day is meant. It is often used to mean simply the light period between two periods of darkness. It is also used a very considerable number of times, to mean an indefinite period.

Argument 2, there is no evidence given that would have any validity in determining the matter.

At the bottom part of page 4, we find the third argument. This is the fact that there is a rule of Hebrew that is invariably followed in the sacred text: WHENEVER THE WORD 'YOM' <sup>IS PRECEDED</sup> ~~is preceded~~ <sup>NUMERICAL</sup> BY A NUMERICAL PARTICLE we are forced to accept it as a literal day.

Here is an argument which certainly needs to be examined. Is it a Biblical fact that whenever the word day is preceded by a number this proves that it means the time that it takes the earth to revolve on its axis. There is certainly no statement to this effect anywhere in the Bible. When a day of the <sup>month</sup> ~~month~~ is mentioned, naturally what is meant is



Similarly, in verse 11 and 12 we read, "and God said let the earth bring forth grass...." "and it brought forth grass...." He speaks of all the different types of vegetation, not that God said let the earth be covered with vegetation but let the earth bring forth. Certainly the suggestion here of the word...

d.3. (1/4)

...statement to require that it all occurred in that way. It would be just as likely that a certain period of time was involved in the removing of the very thick barrier that would keep the sun, moon and stars from being visible.

In the fifth day, again we find--fifth and sixth days-- we find statements about the animals exactly  $\nabla$  like the statements about the plants in the third day. It does not say that God caused that instantaneously and suddenly the world would be covered with various kinds of animals. He said let the waters bring forth abundantly. He said let the earth bring forth. The words as they stand do not demand spontaneity, in fact, they suggest the very opposite.

Thus we have looked at all the statements in the various days of the , about the acts  $\nabla$  that were done, except the one that Dr. Rimmer quotes in connection with the first day. He says ~~he~~ in his debate, that as an example of the fact that in each case the words of the text demand ~~instantly~~ instantaneity, that on the first day God said let there be light and there was light. He says, "there is no absolute literal translation from the Hebrew to the English of the this phrase, but the nearest that we can come to it is perhaps ' and ~~said~~ God said light, exist; and light existed!'" The entire phrase is one of instant absolute obedience to <sup>a pressing</sup> ~~the second~~ command, and implies an act consummated in the instant of its inception. Here, on this day, more than any other perhaps, the era of theory of my esteemed opponent appears extremely ridiculous. Why in the name of common sense should it take the omnipotent creator 500,000 years to receive a response to His command, 'let light be!?' Especially when the text may be transliterated 'then God said "let light be!" and light was!' Did it take God a half million years to speak this sentence, or was the

light slow to obey? Or did it come at once, and ~~th~~ God then waited 500 millenniums before He started any further activity? Truly the proponents of the age theory are like those of old who strained at a gnat and swallowed the camel!"

This sounds very convincing as proof that the action, that God's activity on the first day was an instantaneous creation of light. It may very well be that this is the case but in every other instance where God's actions during the creative week the language does not demand ~~cont~~ spontaneity, but in fact suggests the very opposite.

Furthermore in connection with this day it is not quite so apparent<sup>as</sup> these words would suggest~~as~~ as Dr. Rimmer's words would suggest, that the Scriptural statement requires spontaneity. We have already noticed that the statement, God created man, male and female created he them, is proven by chapter 2 not to be an act that occurred instantaneously but rather something that was spread over a period of time. It is possible that the great act of the first day, also, took a period of time.

Many people interpret the action of the first day ~~the action~~ exactly ~~th~~ as Dr. Rimmer does in his discussion under argument #5, and in this case it may very well have been an instantaneous act. However, Dr. Rimmer himself does not seem to interpret it

~~A in that way elsewhere.~~ In his discussion of argument 4, in the lower part of page 7, <sup>where</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>he also</sup> describes what ~~he considered to~~ have happened on the first day:

"Age after age, the earth has revolved in Stygian <sup>blackness,</sup> ~~darkness~~, and darkness and gloom have hidden Earth's face from the light of the sun. Now the voice of God is heard, and while the flaming beauty of the sunrise and the sunset is ~~absent~~, yet the black cloud is relieved by the influence of the sun which is yet unseen, and the pale light of Creation's first day prevails where impenetrable darkness long had reigned. This condition prevailed for the first three days, or revolutions of the earth on its axis, then the command of God is once more heard and the planet is freed entirely from the fog and vapor that have so long obscured the light of sun. Spinning in its ceaseless motion, as it long had been



accustomed to move, the earth suddenly is gladdened by its first sunrise.... The reason faded from ~~the~~ sight on the Fourth Day was because the earth ~~did~~ kept right on turning as it had the first two days, and aeons before these days began."

Dr. Rimmer in under argument 4 does not interpret the appearance of the statement, let there be light, as a creation of light at all, but merely as the beginning of the time when a little light from the sun reached the earth after ages and ages in which no light at all from the sun had reached the earth. Then on the 4th day he thinks that all of the fog and vapor that had so long obscured the light of the sun was removed.

This interpretation of Dr. Rimmer's seems to rob the first day also of all instantaneity. It is true indeed that God could say, let all the fog and vapor that has been so extremely black and so completely obscured, kept away all light from the sun, suddenly be eradicated. But there is no reason to think that He did, in the light of the way He created man, it is equally possible that in this --if Dr. Rimmer's interpretation is correct that the removal of barriers which kept all light from reaching the earth during ~~ages~~ ages and ages, was something which occurred gradually over a long period of time rather than an instantaneous act. The Bible simply does not state.

Perhaps the action of the first day was instantaneous, perhaps not; in any event there is no other--it cannot be said that there is any other statement in the first chapter that "demands instantaneity. It is unfortunate indeed that when the facts ~~that~~ are as they are, that a statement should be made that "the wording of the text in each case is such as to demand instantaneity. In most cases it is the exact opposite.

The 6th point consists of the argument of the insistence that God could accomplish on any one day all that the Bible says He did--on one solar day--all that the Bible says he did on ~~any~~ one of these days. This is readily granted. But it may as well be an argument for days that were five minutes long as for days that were 24 hours long. God could have performed everything described in Genesis 1 in one second if He chose.

The question is not what could God do, but what did He do. The Bible actually does not tell ~~us~~ us how long he took in performing the acts described in chapter 1. If someone prefers to believe that it was 6 24-hour days I see no objection to his believing this. But I do think that he has no right, that it is his duty to give equal right to anyone else to interpret the Scripture, the statements of Genesis 1, in what seems to me the far more natural sense.

Page 10 gives the 7th argument. This states "OUR SEVENTH CONTENTION is a refutation of the great stronghold of the "era- ". This is a profusion of (10 3/4) records". Personally, I think that this argument is completely aside from the matter under consideration. The question is not what does science prove, but what does Genesis 1 say. Apart altogether of any evidence from science, I find no Biblical evidence whatever to say that the days of Genesis 1 necessarily 24 hours long. Perhaps there were billions of years in length, we simply do not know. The language used in connection with the third, fifth and sixth days sounds to me far more as if God performed processes, caused processes to occur that took millions of years than as if he caused, did something within a 24-hour period. In any event, these three days do not describe instantaneous acts, but processes, even if they may have been so speeded up as to occur within a few hours.

And there is no Biblical statement anywhere that such a speeding up occurred.

Under his discussion, Dr. Rimmer has a very interesting suggestion, he says that each of these days is only the time when that particular thing began. Thus when vegetation was created there might have been only two blades of grass and two of trees of each kind, that came into existence, nothing more, and then all the rest came in succeeding time. The days would be simply the beginning of processes, rather than the complete occurrence. Of course we do not say God covered the entire earth with (12 3/4) in their present profusion." Yet this is not what the Scripture says. The Scripture does not say that God said on the 3rd day, let the earth be covered with trees and that a tree began and later others came. But he says on the 3rd day is that the earth brought forth trees.



The whole suggestion of it is that great amounts of vegetation came into existence on that day.

The 8th reason which begins at the bottom of page 10 I have already quoted in full at the beginning of this letter. It is merely a statement that we should not read anything into the Scripture that is not there. There is no evidence contained under a discussion of this particular point. A statement is made at the end as to what the ancient fathers of (13 1/2) believe. I am sure (record unclear)

d.4. (1/2)

...we cannot say that Moses intended to convey the modern geological idea of aeons in each day of creation." Neither can we say that Moses intended to convey the modern astronomical idea of the time that it takes the earth to revolve once on its axis. It is clear in the Scripture that the word day as used in the Hebrew means a period of time and does not specify, and that the ~~length~~ length of the period has to be gathered from the concept. Sometimes it is an extremely short period, sometimes it is an extremely long period. Which it is in Genesis 1 the Lord has not revealed to us and we are wrong in attempting to be wise above what is written."

In the middle of page 11 we read these words:

REASON NUMBER NINE goes right to the heart of the controversy: we are in favor of the solar idea because any other idea is merely a concession to the time element demanded by the evolutionary school of geology; and why should we concede them anything from the Scripture? They are irreconcilable enemies and their program does not call for reconciliation with the Scriptures but rather eradication of the Scriptures. This theory was born to uphold the contentions of the enemies of the Bible, and we owe them no consideration in the matter."

This <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ the sort of argument which, no, as far as the statements of the argument are concerned I would agree with it one hundred percent. We do not need to make any

concessions to the demand of unChristian interpreters. Neither do we need to make concessions to the demands of Christians who are scientists. We need not make any sort of concession, we are simply interested in seeing what the Bible teaches. Yet we must be equally careful not to read into the Bible theories which have come into our minds from recent scientific thoughts or recent attitudes, such as the idea that the length of time it takes the earth to revolve in its axis is a fundamental time measure of the entire universe and of God's economy. This is a natural idea for earthbound mortals to get, but there is nothing in the Scripture to indicate that it is necessarily true. It is a concession to thought that is not based upon the Scripture. The Scripture does not tell us how long these days were.

However, though I agree that we need not make concessions to enemies to the Bible, not to anyone but merely to take what the Bible teaches, I think we must be very careful not to adopt any theory simply because it is contrary to what other people may hold, whether these people be enemies or ~~fine~~ friends. And that we also should be very careful not to reject an interpretation of the Scripture because it fits with ideas which are held by people who are against the Scriptures. We're not interested in whether the Scripture agrees or disagrees with particular groups of human beings, we are interested in what the Scripture teaches. Any idea, no matter where it comes from is worth examining in Scripture to see whether it fits with Scripture or not, but we should not be prejudiced in our relation to Scripture by the source of the idea. The question is not who holds an idea or who has originated an idea but what does the <sup>u</sup>cripture actually teach.

It is a little difficult to be sure exactly what Dr. ~~Re~~ Rimmer means by the 10th argument, which begins at the bottom of page 11. He~~s~~ says:

The tenth argument we advance is the evident fact that the days of Moses are — the days of Genesis are solar days, as they follow the general Hebrew custom of ~~dividing~~ dividing the day into evening the beginning, ~~the~~ and morning, the start of the daylight period.



This would suggest that he is arguing from the fact that it says, ~~w~~ and there was evening and there was morning, one day. This argument ~~as~~ I fully examined in my previous letter to you, and showed that it ~~w~~ could not possibly fit from any viewpoint—fit at all in the first day, nor could it fit on the 2nd and 3rd day. It would be only the last two that could possibly fit. These terms are used figuratively no matter what length of days they were. They mean beginning and end, not a time of increasing darkness and increasing light, as the words literally mean. However, before he is finished with this argument, Dr. Rimmer says: "Another Scripture reference that should settle the matter, and would, if my dear opponent were not Irish, is the quotation in Hebrews 4:4, where the inspired writer refers directly and specifically to this 7th day in the book of Genesis. The reference reads:

"For he hath said somewhere on the 7th day on this wise, and God rested on the 7th day from all his works." In the Greek text of the N.T. this word is "hemera," and it always means solar day.

Here is an argument based upon the use of a Greek word in the N.T. The statement is made "hemera" ...always means solar day." Actually at a very brief glance I noted a dozen instances where the Greek word hemera cannot possibly mean a solar day. A very brief examination of its use in the N.T. will ~~make~~ make absolutely clear that it is used exactly like the word yom in the O.T. That is to say it very frequently means a period of ~~light~~ light between two periods of darkness and the length of this varies with the part of the world or the time of the year. It is used also for an alternation of light and darkness, as when one figures a number of days. However, there are many cases in the N.T. where it is used of a period of indefinite length, as where in I Cor. Paul says now is the day of salvation. Does he here mean a solar day? Where Paul refers in Thess. to the day of Jesus Christ, does he mean a solar day there? Jesus said Abraham saw my day and was glad. Did he mean a 24-hour day there? There ~~are~~ are many such instances in the N.T.

If there is one thing we can be sure of in this discussion, it is that hemera does not "always mean solar day."

The 11th argument which begins on the bottom of page 12 deals with Moses' statement that God rested on the 7th day and tries to show that a 24-hour day was sufficient for God to rest, there was no need of His resting a geological age. However, this is surely quite beside the point. No one thinks of God as like a man having to rest. Elsewhere in the debate, Rimmer spoke of God's having ceased from His creative labor on the 7th day. God does not set up an example for our rest in that he after six days of work finds it necessary to rest one day. God gives us an analogy to show what the program is that He wants us to follow, of alternations of six days of work then one day of rest. He ceased from His creative labor on the 7th day. It nowhere says that all of God's ceasing from creative ~~labor~~ labor was over before Adam was created. Whether this refers simply to a brief period that came after the creation of man or whether it refers to a long period including the present in which God had ceased from creative labor is perhaps not necessary to attempt to determine. The important thing is that God ~~is~~ gave us an example to show how, the way that He had made our constitution and that He wished us to alternate in our work and rest. Actually God ~~simply~~ ceased from creative labor, He did not rest as we do. An attempt to insist on a precise analogy is not an argument at all as to how God created the world.

On the lower part of page 13 Rimmer says:

THE TWELFTH AND FINAL ARGUMENT is taken from the quiver of our now-enlightened opponent and turned against him for his final defeat.

This 12th argument is not stated in any one sentence anywhere, but the best I can figure out for its meaning is that he says that it would have been impossible for if the 3rd day was a long period for the plants to have grown without the light of the sun.

I am very wary of any arguments based on what it would have been possible or impossible for God to do. The question is not what could God do but what did God do?



God ~~could surely~~ could surely create the world in six seconds if he wanted, he ~~is~~ didn't need six 24-hour days. He could certainly cause the processes described in this first chapter of Genesis to reach over a period of billions of years if he chose. He does not have to speed His work up to suit our human ideas of time. It is not a question of what God could do but what He chose to do. As far as the 3rd day is concerned it is definitely stated that light was made on the first day. H<sub>o</sub>w much light plants need to grow cannot be proven by the experience of a farmer today, it is a matter of how God made the plants.

The situation in the world in many ways must have been very different before the flood than it is after. Even a cursory ~~of~~ reading of the early chapters of Genesis makes this clear, yet exactly how it was or what differences there were in the makeup of the universe we are not in a position fully to understand. We do not know just what the conditions were during the 3rd day, but the Bible says that during the 3<sup>rd</sup> day God ordered that plants should grow up and ~~cover~~ over the earth, and then it was on the 4th day that he made the sun appear and become usable as a measure of time. If this is the way that the Bible says God did it and I see no difficulty in accepting it regardless of the length of the days involved.

8-71-53  
1091 Evans Street,  
San Bernardino, Calif  
August 3rd - 1953

Allan A. McRae, Ph.D., Pres  
Faith Theological Seminary  
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Mr. McRae:

I am much interested in your series of articles running currently in Bibliotheca Sacra on the "Scientific Approach to the Old Testament." The first in the series in the January issue is especially fine. But I am somewhat confused by your second article in the April issue relating to the question of the "days" in Genesis 1. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of writing you for I feel that the whole matter of scientific approach is jeopardized by the ambiguity of your discussion of the "day" question.

When I was a small boy, they taught us in Sunday School that God created the universe in six days of twentyfour hours. That the six days of Genesis 1 is an amplification of the brief but all inclusive statement in Genesis 1:1. Then later, when I was in my teens, the liberals were getting under way with their "more scientific approach" and we were told that these "days" were really great geological ages of untold millions of years.

A few years later when I was delivered from Church, "denominational" controlled teaching and discovered the Scofield Reference Bible and had the privilege of studying with some of the best Evangelical and pre-millennial teachers, my attention was called to the fact that there was an original CREATION, a DESOLATION or chaos, followed by a RESTORATION. We were then taught that there is no way of knowing how old the original creation mentioned in Genesis 1:1 is nor by what method or how long God took in accomplishing it. This would allow for all of the time the geologists think they need for the original creation if Bible scholars must hold out an olive branch to men of science.

There is plenty of scientific evidence that there was a universal chaos and just how long the earth lay in a chaotic condition, there is no way of knowing. Then some time after that, probably not more than 6000 years ago, God re-made or restored the heavens and earth and this must have been accomplished in six days of 24 hours. God was setting up a new order under which man was to live. On the third day, Genesis 1:9, vegetation was created. If the days were ages and not 24 hour days, this vegetation would not have survived a night of hundreds or thousands of years. It is a known scientific fact that corn will not survive without a man to care for it. Man was created three days later and was ready to take over the care of the garden. The survival of corn down to the present day cannot be explained in any other way.

The teaching that there was an original creation, followed by a desolation and later by a restoration has satisfied thousands of young people in a way that no other interpretation of the Genesis account has. I feel that it is most unfortunate that one in your position presenting an otherwise fine series of articles on the Scientific Approach should have failed to indicate three distinctions indicated above. I would welcome any correspondence on the matter your busy time would allow.

Yours for the Faith,

Ray R. Perry



8/2/67

4 carbons

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

Please forgive me for not having answered your letter sooner. These have been very busy days.

It was a special pleasure to hear about you again, since I well remember having heard fine things about

We ought to be very careful not to read our own preconceived ideas into the Bible. In interpreting any part of God's Word we need to determine how each word is used in the Scripture.

Thus any one of us might think that he knew exactly what is meant by the word "son." Surely we would not call two men father and son if they lived many centuries apart. Yet we find that Matthew 1:1 calls Jesus Christ "the son of David, the son of ~~Abraham~~ Abraham." How could a man be the son of someone who lived a thousand years before, and how could that second man be the son of ~~another~~ another who lived many centuries before he did? These and many other evidences make perfectly clear that in the Bible the word "son" means simply a male descendant who may be in the next generation, or several generations later.

Further on in this first chapter of Matthew we find, in verses 7 to 11, the names of the kings of Judah from Solomon to Jehoiachin (Jechonias). The history of these <sup>of Judah</sup> kings is given at length <sup>both in Kings and in Chronicles</sup> in the Old Testament. When we compare, we find that Matthew omits the names of three of them. This omission is not accidental, since we are told in verse 17 that there are 14 in the list, not 17. <sup>not</sup> Moreover, every Jewish child knew the names of the kings of Judah. It could not be an accident that <sup>the Scripture there</sup> speaks of a king as begetting his great-great grandchild. <sup>Clearly,</sup> So we see that in the Bible the word "beget" means "to become an ancestor," just as the word "son" denotes one who is a descendant.

Thus, in studying the Bible we must carefully investigate the use of each word to determine exactly what it means. I believe in standing positively and strongly against those who do not accept what the Bible says, but I am sorry indeed when <sup>③</sup> disagreement about <sup>misinterpretation</sup> the meaning of a word or phrase produces <sup>②</sup> divisions <sup>by</sup>

① divisions are ④ which good Christians may differ.



<sup>train</sup>  
~~road~~ or airplane ~~transportation~~ timetables, or ~~whether~~ when they calculate ~~interest~~ interest. In all other connections the word "day" is used in one of two senses, both of which are quite different from this.

The most common ~~sense~~ <sup>to represent</sup> usage of "day" is a period of light between two periods of darkness. This period varies greatly. In the northern part of ~~the~~ <sup>continental</sup> United States it may be as long as eighteen hours in mid-summer, and as short as six or seven in ~~midwinter~~ midwinter. In northernmost Alaska it might be as ~~long~~ <sup>long</sup> as six months. ~~One thing about it of which we can be sure is that it is rarely rarely is it static.~~

The other sense in which the word is quite commonly used is the sense of a period of activity. ~~I incline to think that actually this is the source of our using the word for a period of light between two periods of darkness.~~ <sup>Once I heard</sup> Thus I remember ~~hearing~~ <sup>sneaking</sup> the mayor of New York ~~say~~ <sup>refers to "what"</sup> on the radio that Al Smith used to say ~~in his day~~ <sup>hour</sup> "in his day." I am sure that he did not refer to any twenty-four ~~day~~ <sup>Similarly</sup>. I heard someone ~~else~~ <sup>states</sup> say that "they did not have automobiles in Lincoln's day." The New Testament ~~says~~ <sup>Jesus</sup> that ~~Abraham~~ <sup>states</sup> said, "Abraham saw my day and was glad." Here certainly ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> was referring to the entire period of His earthly activity, not to any one period of light, and certainly not to any one twenty-four-hour period.

The first usage of the word "day" in the Scripture is in ~~Genesis~~ <sup>Genesis</sup> 1:5 where it says, "God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night." This certainly does not refer to a twenty-four-hour period. ~~Then there are the six uses the length of which is not stated.~~ <sup>after the account of</sup> In Genesis 2: ~~it says,~~ <sup>4-</sup>

"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens." <sup>In this instance</sup>

~~"These are the generation of heaven and earth in the day when they were created."~~

~~Thus the word "day" in this verse, includes the whole six days of the previous chapter.~~ <sup>here evidently</sup>

~~Thus it seems to me to be quite clear that in normal present day usage, and certainly in Biblical usage the word ~~day~~ "day" means a~~ <sup>often</sup>

4 period of activity, and rarely, if ever, means a period of precisely twenty-four hours.

After the ~~references to~~ <sup>account of</sup> the six days <sup>①</sup>, in Genesis 1, Genesis 2 <sup>③</sup> <sup>tells</sup> speaks of a seventh day, on which God rested. This certainly does not mean that God was tired and took twenty-four hours to relax Himself. Its meaning must be something quite different. To my mind there is no doubt that it means simply that God ceased from the creative work of the previous six periods of activity. It is not my impression that God has ~~done~~ performed any creative work since the creation of man and woman. Consequently it would seem that the seventh day is still going on today ~~and will probably continue until God creates the new heaven and the new earth.~~ <sup>and will continue until</sup> <sup>probably continue until</sup> God creates the new heaven and the new earth. It is here used as an <sup>instance</sup> ~~example~~ of the succession of

six periods of activity followed by one of cessation, as an example for us, since God made us with a constitution that needs to follow a similar progression. <sup>as</sup> ~~Since~~ the seventh day <sup>of Genesis</sup> is almost certainly a long period, this might suggest that the same is true regarding the first six as well. However, it would only be a suggestion, not a proof. God could have created the world in six periods of activity of five minutes each or of six hours each or of twenty-four hours each, or of three billion years each. We are not told how long the periods were. The Bible leaves us free to guess if we desire, but we should be charitable toward others who make a different guess.



5.

Whether God created the world in a period that would be equivalent to six present 24-hour days, or whether a process involving millions of years is involved, has nothing to do with the question of evolution. The theory of evolution is that all things have developed from a very simple beginning into their present complex state by purely natural forces.

a1

Dr "Duke":

It was a real pleasure to get your letter last week and to know that you had received the long essay that I sent you explaining why it seems to me that the more natural interpretation of the Scripture is to consider the days of Genesis 1 as long periods of time rather than as 24-hour days. /

I hope that you had a grand time on your trip to California.

Thank you for sending me the copy of the negative side of the debate between Dr. Rimmer and Dr. Riley. I wish I could have been present, It must have been a very interesting occasion. As I read it carefully a few things stood out in my mind. Perhaps you will be interested in my reactions.

The first thing ~~that~~ I noticed was the attitude that Dr. Rimmer took <sup>as he began</sup> ~~on the first~~ <sup>to speak</sup> ~~page~~. He evidently had been much pleased with the witty remarks of Dr. Riley, and set out to answer in kind. He asserted that it <sup>is pleasant to hear</sup> ~~was easy to have~~ witty remarks when one <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ not dealing with an <sup>enemy</sup> ~~enemy~~ of the faith, but simply comparing <sup>are</sup> ~~two~~ views that ~~were~~ <sup>are</sup> equally acceptable to true Christians. In fact he ~~went~~ so far as to say that even if the audience <sup>should</sup> ~~were to~~ vote that they felt that he was the winner in this debate with Dr. Riley, he still ~~would~~ consider it entirely possible ~~that~~ in the end it might prove that Dr. Riley had been right and he wrong ~~on~~ the matter. In other words he did not consider this <sup>to be such</sup> ~~a~~ difference of opinion <sup>as should in any way separate</sup> ~~that was vital as between true believers, but simply an interesting matter for~~

I feel that many of Rimmer's later remarks have to be taken in the light of these statements that he made at the beginning of his talk. <sup>when he declares, from time to time that</sup> ~~as he refers constantly how sure he is~~ <sup>(2)</sup> ~~that his opponent will be converted by what he has said, And as he makes extremely~~ <sup>such</sup> ~~dogmatic statements about the absolute certainty of the correctness of his views~~ I can just imagine him turning with a smile to Dr. Riley and putting <sup>such</sup> ~~a~~ tone <sup>as</sup> ~~in~~ his voice ~~that~~ would say <sup>Here</sup> ~~there~~ is an extreme statement for you to know ~~at~~. It is fun to examine these things <sup>Each time that he declares that surely (3) said — each time that he makes</sup> ~~extremely~~



5) together. <sup>really</sup> Actually we can't be sure <sup>a2-</sup> in the end which of us is right.

All this fits with my personal view on the matter, that the length of the days ~~is~~ is not something that has been so revealed to us that we can take it as an article of faith, but rather that ~~it~~ is simply a matter of trying to decide what the Scripture really teaches. <sup>Eto Am 26</sup>

As I looked over the <sup>twelve</sup> arguments, the 12 arguments that Rimmer gives, it impressed me that the bulk of them were simply matters of opinion. He declares for instance that we must not adopt a view if it is presented by evolutionists who are deniers of the faith. I would certainly agree with him there. We must not take a view because it is held by enemies of the gospel. Neither however must we reject a view if it is held by enemies of the gospel. Our interest should not be what is held by any exterior view, but what does the Scripture say? Does it give us definite evidence on this, or does it not?

I liked very much the statement that Dr. Rimmer made in his 8th argument. There he stressed that we must not let modern ideas interpret for us what ~~Moses~~ meant. We

must simply see what the Bible itself has to say. Yet there was one sentence in it that I didn't quite like where he said: it must be ~~Moses~~ words as we understand them. <sup>please</sup> The

question is now how do we understand the words Moses said, but how did Moses under-

stand them. Here it impresses me that Rimmer has fallen into the very same danger that he

is attacking. He declares <sup>on page 1 line 2 that "a day is"</sup> that when Moses says day he means "the time it takes the

earth to revolve on its axis, for the diurnal revolution of the earth." <sup>and he gives other</sup>

terms of this type of what Moses meant by a day. <sup>6 of the same page he says: "a day is nothing more or less than"</sup> Actually Moses <sup>on its axis: on line</sup> certainly never heard

of any of these terms, The idea of a 24-hour day was quite unknown to him. He had no

clocks of the type that we have, ~~nor did people divide into hours as we do.~~ Neither did he

have any idea, so far as we know, that the sun turned around, that the earth turned around

on its axis. This is not a proper way to define what Moses meant by a day. <sup>Eto Rom 26</sup> What did it

mean to him. We must examine the way the word is used. When we find that in the

Scripture and including, as in the writings of Moses, "day" is used to represent a period of

light with two periods of darkness in between, separated by two, from with a period of

darkness before and one after, and this, the length of this period may vary from a <sup>the word</sup> <sup>preceded and followed by</sup> <sup>5</sup> <sup>the p a 3</sup>



A ¶ The first part of Dr. Rimmer's eighth argument contains some important statements. <sup>On pp 110-11, he</sup> says:

[Indent] → THE EIGHTH REASON we accept  
 the solar duration of the days [to Bar 1c]

D ¶ Rimmer says that scientific ideas of today must not be read into the Bible, but insists that we must interpret its words in the light of scientific discoveries made only a few centuries ago. Actually both methods are false. ~~We must~~ We must interpret the Bible ~~in the~~ in the light of itself, not of modern scientific discoveries. ~~The only thing that matters is, what did Moses mean when he used the word "day".~~ ¶ The only way to find out

~~When we look at the~~  
 what Moses meant by the word yōm is to look at the Bible itself. [to Eon a2]



Genesis is referred to in the N.T. by the ~~GR~~ Greek word **Hemera**, which he says always means a solar day. This statement --this was ~~an~~ offhand ~~statement~~ of ~~k~~Dr. Rimmer's. Evidently simply an argument given without investigation. I make this I draw this conclusion because only on a ~~brief~~ examination of a concordance I found the word hemera, I came across a dozen instances where the word hemera was used for something ~~other than~~ a solar day. When the statement is made, this is the day of salvation, it certainly does not mean a solar day. When it says that Jesus said Abraham ~~waw~~ my day and was glad, he certainly did not mean a 24-hour day. When Paul tells the people that they are hastening unto the day of Jesus Christ, he hardly means a 24-hour day, when the N.T. speaks of the day of the Lord it certainly does not mean a 24-hour day. In all these and many other cases the word used is hemera.

The most important bit of evidence that Dr. Rimmer gives is the statement that in connection with the days of Genesis every single command is stated in such a way ~~as~~ to require that it be taken ~~as~~ an instantaneous act. As proof of this he gives the command on the first day let there be light, which he says can also be rendered let light exist. Leaving aside for the moment the question ~~whether~~ this command, particular command, is necessary instantaneous, ~~as~~ I believe most people would consider it to be, I look at the other ~~coman~~ds given in the creative days. Immediately it occurs to me that when it says that God said let us create man in our image after our likeness and male and female created he them, this sounds like an instantaneous act. However, when I turn to chapter 2 I find the creation of man ~~fnale~~ male and female described in such a way as to show that it was far from instantaneous. God took of the ~~best~~ dust of the earth and breathed in to it and it became a ~~living~~ soul. Is this described as an instantaneous act? Or as a process which took at least a certain amount of time. Then there is a godd deal that is mentioned between this statement and the statement in, at the end of chapter 2 of how woman was created. Yet the woman is included in the statement in ~~k~~Genesis male and female created he them. What sounds like an instantaneous act, at first ~~sight~~ there is clearly the kind of a process

which must have consumed--must have spread over a considerable bit of time. If all the animals were brought to Adam between the creation of Adam and the creation of Eve it is ~~hard~~ to think that it could possible have occurred in one 24-hour day. At any rate it was not instantaneous.

Furthermore, while I myself might incline that the statement that God said let there be light denotes an instantaneous act, on Dr. Rimmer's own interpretation it would probably not be instantaneous. There he describes the coming of the light ~~on~~ the first day in the following words:

Thus we see that a statement that all these acts were instantaneous simply is not evidence.

I found only one other statement in the debate which would seem to be a matter of evidence rather than a matter of argumentation. This is the statement made in that all the fathers of Israel held that this was a 24-hour day. This ~~is a statement~~ should not really be considered evidence because evidence as to what the Bible should be found in the Bible rather than in the views/~~of~~ interpreters of any sort. However, the statement is not a true one. We have no evidence whatever as to views on such a matter as this, on almost any matter held by any fathers of Israel before the time of the church fathers.

(d.2.1/4) From the time of the church fathers on, of whom Dr. Rimmer says that they ~~very~~ varied greatly on their interpretations on this point. We find various fathers of Israel holding views on many subjects of many different types of great contrast, probably having on this particular subject every bit as much difference among them as the church fathers had. So the statement as contained under argument 8 is not a presentation of fact at all. However, it is not a matter anyway of Biblical evidence and so should not really concern us.



I have occasionally heard it said that the six days of Genesis must be ~~exact~~  
 exactly like ~~the~~<sup>a</sup>/twenty-four day that we experience with which we are familiar  
 because of the words "evening" and "morning" in them. However, I do not see that  
 it is possible to interpret them this way. As we today think of a twenty-four-  
 hour day for purposes of timetables, we consider it as beginning at midnight. The  
 modern Jews, for purpose of observing the Sabbath, think of it as beginning at  
 sunset. Consequently their day begins with evening and ends with morning.  
 ceremonial day ( ? ? ?

For ~~their~~<sup>a</sup> ~~their~~/time of waiting the Book of Daniel uses the phrase "evening - morning"  
 which is translated "day" in our King James Version. However, it is impossible to  
 think of a real evening, that is, a period of decreasing light, as coming at the beginning of  
 the time before there was any light at all. Furthermore, it was not until the fourth ~~day~~  
 day that we read that the sun and moon and stars were made indicators of time, so  
 that there would be no warrant certainly no warrant for measuring time by the sun  
 during the previous days. It seems most reasonable to think that ~~evening and~~ "evening  
 and "morning" simply here here simply mean beginning and end, and do not actually  
 indicate physical features.

Of course God's work of preservation and of providence continues constantly. He  
 could not rest from this for a minute or everything would dissolve into chaos. When  
 it says that God rested it does not mean that He ceased to exert influence upon His  
 creation, but simply that He ceased from His creative work, and that cessation still  
 continues during this entire seventh day.



*not* Such a theory is definitely contrary to Christian teaching, and to many Biblical statements. There are many details about the way that God created the world that he has not revealed to us, just as there is a great deal about its present condition that the Bible tells us nothing about. If a man is driving on a mountain road with a steep <sup>drop</sup> cliff <sup>on</sup> the side <sup>(2)</sup> he does not ~~ix~~ increase his safety by hugging the ~~inn~~ inside of the road so tightly that he constantly brushes against the side of the cliff ~~above him~~. It is important that he

keep away from the edge of the steep drop, but to say that six ~~feet~~ feet away is more dangerous than twelve feet away is rather stupid. *In flying from error, we grow*

*nothing by going beyond the Scripture - in fact we sometimes make it easier*  
~~danger that it is very easy for us to run into when we deal with anti-Christian~~  
*for our opponents when we do so.*  
anti-Christian theories such as that of evolution.

<sup>Biblical</sup> The account of the creation of man implies that he was created full-grown.

It is not impossible that God created ~~fossils~~ the earth with fossils in it at different levels so constituted that they would look as if they had been formed from the decay of the bodies ~~of~~ of animals or plants. Yet ~~at~~ to many people it would seem more reasonable to think that such animals actually had lived during one or more of the creative days. If so, this does not prove evolution, nor is it a step in that direction. The Bible says nothing about fossils and gives us no definite statement as to how long ago the creation occurred or how rapidly it went. We know that it was ~~not~~ not all instantaneous, since we are told that it was divided into six definite periods.

I hope that ~~these statements~~ <sup>said</sup> that I have ~~made~~ will be of ~~some~~ help to you in your thinking. If further questions occur to you on which I might perhaps have ideas please let me know.