

second edition in 1917. This Bible used the King James Version, but the nine conservative editors provided a large number of explanatory notes to supplement the text. As already mentioned in Chapter 4 above, the notes which were provided to accompany the first chapter of Genesis favored the idea of a very old earth, with a long time gap between verses 1 and 2, as Chalmers, Pember, and others had taught. The notes also allowed for the possibility of creation days much longer than 24 hours, pointing out that the word "day" is used in several different senses in the Bible.¹² The majority of fundamentalist leaders, during the period up to 1950, held to one or the other of these two views. Usually these leaders were not in serious conflict with each other concerning which of the two views was held, since both allowed for the full inspiration of the Bible and recognized the first chapter of Genesis as historical rather than mythical.¹³ It is also significant to note that the acceptance of the great antiquity of creation, which these men readily admitted, did not lead them to accept evolutionary theories. On the contrary, their interest and efforts in opposing evolution increased greatly, until in the 1920's fundamentalists carried on an intensive campaign against this doctrine.

During the early 20th century there was of course a large part of the Christian world which did not consider the details of the first chapter of Genesis to be of great significance. As stated earlier, the liberals considered the entire account to be mythical. Also, a great many of the moderate conservatives held that it is an inspired, but basically nonhistorical account, having little or no relation to the discovered scientific facts. Along with the non-historical views, a theistic version of biological evolution usually was accepted.¹⁴ Nonhistorical views are still very popular among moderate conservatives today, and have been diversified into several forms. Such conservatives usually hold that the Genesis account of creation is a part of inspired revelation, but that it tells us nothing about the order God used in creation. They maintain that the purpose of the account is almost entirely a spiritual one.

During the first half of the 20th century there was no sizeable segment of the Christian community attempting to promote the Flood explanation of the fossil record. However, there was one prominent Seventh-Day-Adventist author, George M. Price, who wrote several works attempting to minimize the geologic evidence for great age, and to account for the fossil record by appealing to the Biblical Flood. His published works date from 1913 to 1935.¹⁵ A few fundamentalists made considerable use of these books. This they did, failing to realize that what was being called a "new" geology was little more than a restatement of views which were formed in previous centuries before anyone had ever recorded observations of the deeper sedimentary strata of the earth.

From 1950 to the Present

At the midpoint of the present century all of the views which were prominent during the earlier decades were still being held by at least minor groups within the Christian community. Nonhistorical