

rather than a ~~twenty-four period~~ 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/~~nothing~~ ^{everything} 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 ~~God's gap theory~~ "gap theory" ~~as~~ as an exegetical impossibility. Personally I cannot ~~follow~~ follow this. The only ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~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." ^{However and a merely} ~~Now this statement~~ ^{simply} shows

^{an ignorance of} ^{how much} ^{of the first of these} ~~the word~~ I once went through the whole ~~chapter~~ ^{of the first of these} 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 ~~is~~ ^{is} the one we are studying I found that the others divided about equally between those ~~which represented~~ ^{that indicate} a

situation in which a thing was, and those ~~which represented~~ ^{that indicated} a situation to which it became. Thus when it ~~says~~ says, "He saw that it was good." it is clearly ~~describing~~ describing

a ~~situation~~ situation that was there. When it says, "It was evening" ~~and~~ ^{and} "It was morning." what it means is that ~~a state became~~ ^{it became} ~~(better word?)~~ ^{came}

~~into existence~~ of evening, and ~~a state of morning~~ ^{came}. It represents a dynamic procedure. "It became evening" ~~and~~ ^{and} "It became morning" would be a much

translation than ~~the~~ "It was evening" ^{and} "It was morning." Then I looked carefully at the Hebrew ~~and~~ ^{and} I found that in every case where our English

verb "to be" represented a dynamic ~~change~~ ^{and} ~~that~~ 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

2314