

relevant to the passage under consideration. In the study of every passage we must notice various possibilities of interpretation and we must see which possibilities fit best with those of other passages. Thus as we compare Scripture with Scripture we learn what it really teaches, just as the scientist brings data together, compares them and draws his conclusion from them.

Sometimes people talk a great deal about "the conflict between science and theology." It is true that there have often been great conflicts between scientists and theologians. Between true science, however, which is the knowledge of the natural world, and ~~the~~ <sup>pure</sup> theology, which is the knowledge of those matters which God has revealed, there can be no conflict, because God is the author of both. Scientists often misunderstand the data and draw conclusions from them which are not warranted. Theologians often misunderstand the source of their data, the Bible, and draw unwarranted conclusions from it. When the scientist uses proper scientific method in dealing with the data of revelation, there can be no conflict between the results which each secures. It is only when one or the other goes beyond the facts and makes unwarranted inferences, that disagreement is found. See 68

It is often said that there is a conflict between Christianity and science regarding the length of creation as described in Genesis 1. This is a very good place to illustrate the true scientific approach to the Old Testament. In the early days of the Christian church there is evidence that various views were held concerning the meaning of the word ~~day~~ <sup>day</sup> in this passage. In the middle ages allegorical interpretation of the Bible was carried to great extremes. In reaction against this, the Reformers of the ~~Sixteenth~~ <sup>Sixteenth</sup> century rightly insisted ~~upon~~ <sup>upon</sup> stressing the literal meaning of ~~the~~ <sup>Bible</sup> words. Sometimes their followers carried this to an extreme quite foreign to the