

He did do. Among all the millions of scientific facts of God's activities, past and present, that He could have revealed to us, He has chosen to include only a very few in the Bible. Whatever He has given is absolutely true and dependable. But we must be careful not to read into the Bible matters that God has not revealed to us. The length of the creative days is such a matter.

There are certain considerations that suggest rather strongly that the days were far longer than 24 hours. These grow out of the language used in connection with the third, fifth and sixth days. Thus v.17 does not say, ~~let~~ the earth be covered with grass, herbs and all sorts of trees, but ~~let~~ the earth bring forth grass, etc. The same is true of the statements about the fifth and sixth days. God could have caused that the earth be suddenly covered with trees already including tree rings, and with mature animals of every sort. But this is not what the verses say. They suggest <sup>seem rather to</sup> rather a long process, which might have taken thousands or even millions of years.

Against interpreting the days as long periods there has been advanced a claim that the words "evening" and "morning" imply a 24-hour day. Yet these words cannot in any case be taken literally. They indicate the beginning and ending of a period rather than a literal evening and morning. Previous to the 4th day the sun was not available as a measure of time. "Evening" literally means the beginning of the dark period between two periods of light, and evening <sup>in</sup> ~~at~~ this sense could not have occurred at the beginning of the first day. It is always evening in one part of the world and morning in another. So the words could not be used for a delimitation of absolute time, but only of the time of an individual at a particular place on the earth. There is nothing in the chapter to indicate that these are 24-hour days. It cannot be proved that they were not, but the phrase <sup>looks</sup> looks very much in the direction of long periods.

6. <sup>The</sup> ~~A~~ relationship of the species. It is impossible to fit a theory of natural progressive development, with everything ~~preceding~~ <sup>preceding</sup> by natural causes from one simple