

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 (Llvr) 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 gigantism. 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-

mids, the Babylonian and Mexican ziggurats, the Stone Men of Easter Island, the fantastic structures around Lake Titicaca, the enigmatic lines of Nazca Valley, Stonehenge, the temple at Baalbek, etc., all of whose construction is still a mystery.

The giant dinosaurs are a case in point. The flight of the Pterosaurs, with wingspans of up to 50 feet, has long perplexed aeronautical engineers, as with today's lift-to-drag ratios, no such creature could even get off the ground. But a higher  $c$  would greatly increase that ratio, so that flight would easily be possible. In order to explain the almost **1000mm** Hg of blood pressure that would be required to maintain the blood supply to the brain of the 45 foot tall Brachosaur, some researchers (**The Lancet**, August 29, 1992) have been forced to go to the rather absurd length of assuming that the dinosaur had **five** hearts, which is totally unnecessary if one postulates a higher  $c$ . And what about the 100 foot long Diplodocus and Chronosaurus, let alone the Tannin, Leviathan, Re'em and Behemoth of the Bible? A higher  $c$  in the past would explain much of the ability of such creatures to exist, and a detailed study predicting its far-reaching effects presents a scope of vast and fruitful study, as according to most researchers the **statistical** debate on  $c$  decay appears to have reached an equivocal impasse for the moment.

Is anyone today even measuring the current  $c$ , using old methods but with new instruments (but **not** the atomic clock method)?

Amnon Goldberg,  
London,  
UNITED KINGDOM

### The Editor comments ...

Yes, see Dr Jay Wile's measurement of  $c$  technique, pp. 88-92.

---

## CREATIONIST GEOLOGY

Dear Editor,

Dr A. A. Snelling<sup>1,2</sup> and Dr K. P. Wise<sup>3,4</sup> discussed some very real difficulties they have encountered in fitting geological observations to the creationist, young-earth model. These difficulties include:

- the cooling rates for large igneous bodies, for example, batholiths tens of kilometres across;
- sedimentary sequences up to several tens of kilometres thick and covering thousands of square kilometres;
- criteria for distinguishing rock units of different ages within the model, for example, Day 3, pre-Flood, Flood; and
- evidence of climate and seasons in fossil tree rings.

In addition to the above I challenge Dr Snelling and Dr Wise and the wider creationist community to consider the following:

- How was the erosion, transport and deposition of the vast quantity of sedimentary rocks now extant, effected within the constraints of the creationist model? It is self evident that for there to have been an event there must have been a mechanism.

The settling behaviour of particles in water today is described by two laws; Stokes' Law and Newton's Law for slow and fast settling particles, respectively. As a result, modern sediments are highly environment-specific. Each environment has characteristic grain-size distributions, particle mineralogy, particle shapes and surface features, sedimentary structures and facies relationships.

From Snelling,<sup>2</sup> prior to the end of the Flood year climatic conditions (and therefore depositional environments) were substantially different from those currently applying. If this were so, sediments formed then should differ from modern sediments. If Stokes' and Newton's Laws did not apply, this too should be reflected by the sedimentary rocks.

Alternatively, if the mechanisms and environments of deposition were similar, ancient and modern sediments should share similar characteristics.

Which is the case?

- From Snelling,<sup>2</sup> vast thicknesses of sediments (several tens of kilometres in places) accumulated within comparatively brief time periods, for example, the Day 3 regression, the Flood year.

By what mechanisms could these accumulations of presumably initially soft sediments have been achieved and dewatered within these time periods without profound rheotropic effects?

- Some sedimentary rocks show features denoting sediment/water or sediment/atmosphere interfaces. These features include rain-drop impressions, desiccation cracks, animal tracks and burrows and bioturbated sediments. Other features of the stratigraphic record, such as unconformities, palaeo (and modern) soil and weathering profiles, require substantial energy input or chemical activity.

How does the creationist model account for features such as these?

- Dr K.P. Wise<sup>4</sup> should expand his studies of fossil tree rings and seasons to include fossil corals, stromatolites and varve sediments. This would extend the studies into pre-Devonian times for which, as Dr Wise acknowledges, little information is provided by dendrochronology. His studies should also include modern corals, ice-cores and tree rings. If the earth is only a few thousand years old, should not Dr Wise aspire to locating sufficient 'overlapping' specimens and so derive a continuous record of all seasons from 'Day 1' to the present?