

# Letters to the Editor

## EARLY HISTORY OF MAN

Dear Editor,

I have been reading with interest two of the latest **Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journals** and have enjoyed many of the articles presented. Of particular interest were those of Bill Cooper, though regrettably I have not seen Parts 1 and 2. Like Mr Prasher [CEN Tech. J., 6(1):93] I have some misgivings about the overall Hebrew chronology of Edwin Thiele, although some of his concepts I found interesting, and I would like to read Aaronson's article if I could obtain it.

The chronology that I have followed is 63 years longer than Edwin Thiele's, making Geoffrey's apparent error for the synchronism of Cunedagius somewhat greater than Mr Cooper supposes. However, the error may have been caused by mistaken identity. Geoffrey, or more probably his sources, could have mistakenly copied Isaiah's name for Hosea. The ancient records may easily have dropped the initial letter in Hosea's name, thinking it was the Hebrew definite article, leaving a name which could be taken for a contracted form of Isaiah. This means that the synchronism could be placed at the beginning rather than the end of Uzziah's reign. Indeed, if the records obtained the name transmitted through the Greek, then Uzziah himself may be the person intended for the synchronism. A badly written *zeta* could be mistaken for *sigma* and the name read as Isaiah rather than Uzziah (the two names must have sounded rather similar, as in English, so the error may have occurred by recording from dictation). On the whole I would plump for Hosea, since the synchronism appears to be to a prophet rather than a king. The desire to make it Isaiah would be natural as he is probably the more celebrated prophet. Whether Hosea or Uzziah was intended the error in the historical synchronism would vanish.

My 63 excess years over the chronology used by Bill Cooper could easily be accommodated in the type of calculation he employs at the end of his article. The beginning of Brutus' reign would have to be changed to c. 1164 BC rather than 1104 BC to synchronise with my dates for Eli.

The articles have given me much food for thought and again show how man tries to reject evidence supporting the veracity of Scripture. I really enjoyed both of the articles by Bill Cooper and look forward to further contributions by him. As a minor point I would like to correct a common mistake that occurs in his computations. Between 18 BC and AD 12 there were 29 years and not 30 as indicated in his

table (a similar mistake is made in the notes to the table). From 18 BC to 1 BC is 17 years, from 1 BC to AD 1 is one year and from AD 1 to AD 12 is 11 years, making a total of 29 years. Since AD 43 is a fixed date in the scheme, all Mr Cooper's BC years must retreat by one year. So Cymbeline began his reign in 19 BC and not 18 BC.

Another article I liked was that of Charles Taylor, 'A Question of Translation?' (CEN Tech. J., 6(1):72). May I say that the problem of Acts 13:20 is not a matter of translation but that of texts. It appears from what Dr Taylor says that the New King James Version translates Acts 13:20 differently from all other versions. This is not so. The Authorised Version has substantially the same translation and this is not very surprising since both the Authorised Version and the New King James Version follow the Received Text. The other versions follow the Nestlé-Aland/United Bible Society Text. In the latter the natural interpretation is as Charles Taylor says. However, the Authorised Version and New King James Version translations are from a different text in which the timespan occurs after the qualifying phrase 'After this He gave them Judges' and the natural reading is as the Authorized Version and New King James Version have translated. Which text is the more accurate is a subject of more than one book and cannot be discussed here. For my part I take the Authorised Version as correct.

G. Ewan,  
Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire,  
UNITED KINGDOM.

## The Authors reply ...

I am grateful indeed to Mr Ewan for his most intriguing letter and the many points of interest that he has raised. I am also grateful for the one or two corrections that he offers to the chronology of the early British kings (in particular to my own silly *faux pas* re the reign of Cymbeline!). The chronology itself certainly needs some amendment and adjustment, but only in its finer details. There is nothing about the chronology itself that is basically flawed, and this was my purpose in constructing it, to demonstrate that contrary to all the opinions of the modernists, Geoffrey of Monmouth was passing on to us a reliable historical account. Such a chronology would not have been possible to construct if Geoffrey had merely written what is commonly regarded to be a gigantic 'leg-pull'.

Mr Ewan's letter is valuable in that it opens the first really serious discussion of the chronology that has been

held since, perhaps, Elizabethan times (I refer to the investigations of John Dee *et al.* carried out in the late sixteenth century). Actually, there is more adjustment needed (in its finer details) than even Mr Ewan suspects or has pointed out. I have been carrying out of late some very detailed investigations into a medieval Welsh chronicle (MS LXI, Jesus College, Oxford) that is itself a translation from ancient into medieval Welsh of the same ancient source that Geoffrey used for his latin **Historia**. Details will follow in a future article, but suffice it to say for now that the evidence overwhelmingly points to the fact that both the Welsh chronicle and Geoffrey's Latin are translations of one and the same body of source-material, and are by no means translations of one another as was once assumed.

Importantly for the chronology, although the Welsh chronicle records exactly the same ancient names that Geoffrey latinised, and in exactly the same order, there are discrepancies (albeit minor ones) between some of the lengths of reign attributed to certain kings. For the most part, this is of the magnitude of only a year or two, although the reign of King Leir (Llŷr) has a discrepancy of 20 years. It is therefore a matter of discerning which is the more reliable, the Welsh chronicle or Geoffrey's. The differences between the two are easily accounted for if we assume either the partial illegibility of the source-material, or the obvious difficulties encountered in any attempt to translate an archaic language into two distinct modern languages, or both. In the end, I suppose, it will be simply a matter of preference, but such will be unimportant against the fact that here we are presented with detailed documentary evidence that carries our knowledge of human history back, generation by generation, to the year of Babel and beyond, the whole being an immensely powerful vindication of the Genesis record. My thanks again to Mr Ewan, and if he develops his theory concerning the synchronism of Cunedagius (*Kynedda* in the Welsh chronicle) then I shall be very interested indeed to hear of it.

Bill Cooper,  
Ashford, Middlesex,  
UNITED KINGDOM.

I appreciate Brother Ewan's concern about Acts 13:20, although the passage does not materially alter my concern with the length of the sojourn in Egypt. I am, of course, a supporter of the Majority Text, as anyone reading my book **Bibles with Holes** must surely realize. But I did not wish to introduce this matter into an article concerning Hebrew, adding to complexity. However, it is **still** a matter of translation, not of text.

The *Textus Receptus*/Majority Text says literally:

*'... he gave-by-lot to-them the land of-them, and after that, about 450 years, he gave them judges ...'*

as opposed to the Nestlé-Aland, which I reject, but which

in this matter happens to support my point.

Now one can translate the *Textus Receptus*/Majority Text in two ways:

- (a) *He gave them their land by lot, and then gave them judges for about 450 years ...*
- (b) *He gave them their land by lot, and after that, that is, after about 450 years, he gave them judges ...*

In view of the Semitic tendency to place time lengths after the events they measure, (b) is the more 'Semitic' way of understanding the text. Thus Acts 13:20 can mean that the 430 years from Abram at 75 to the Exodus is equivalent to about 450 years from Genesis 15 to the Conquest.

The alternative is to make the judges period 450 years long, whereas if Solomon's foundation of the Temple was 480 years later than the Exodus (1 Kings 6:1), then the judges period cannot be as long as 450 years, since 40 years of wilderness plus the reigns of Saul and David leave at most 380 years for the judges. This being so, it seems we must take the 450 years as referring to the earlier period, say, from the Covenant in Genesis 15 to the beginning of the judges period. (D. A. Courville and others suggest such an explanation.)

Charles Taylor,  
Gosford, New South Wales,  
AUSTRALIA.

## THE SPEED OF LIGHT

Dear Editor,

From **my** reading of the statistical evidences, there does appear to be a case for a decrease in the velocity of light. A higher *c* in the past would help explain many astronomical, geological and physiological phenomena. If indeed a higher *c* does result in lower fluid viscosity, faster nerve impulses, more efficient breathing, diffusion, growth, blood flow and ion transfer, then that could help explain the phenomena of giantism. The fossil record shows that flora and fauna were larger in the past: there once existed, mosses three feet tall, giant ferns, 12 inch cockroaches, shellfish five feet across, crocodiles 50 feet long, and dragonflies up to four feet long!

Ancient Jewish and Christian traditions speak of the wondrous height of Adam before the sin. Even after the sin and his diminution, he was still approximately 20 feet tall! Today, a man 12 feet tall would weigh **eight** times as much as a six footer, but his bones would be increased in area only fourfold: a recipe for broken bones! To have had true giants in the past would have required greatly different physiological conditions: *'There were giants in the earth in those days'* (Genesis 6:4). The worldwide traditions of the superior size, strength, fecundity and intelligence of the first men, possibly wrought by a higher *c*, would explain the many puzzling post-Flood megaliths: the Egyptian pyra-