

the Flood. Such a titanic calamity should have taken precedent as the instrument of God's judgment, rather than the water that prevailed upon the earth. Third, a general mass of debris would be difficult to clear from the solar system in a few thousand years.

Wayne has suggested that an interstellar swarm of debris swept through the solar system at that time. I concede that this would answer this final objection. However, that suggestion is not as far removed from my suggested source, a comet swarm. The only differences are that my comet stream would have directly affected only a few bodies in the solar system and leaves the possibility of a return visit by the stream.

This sort of speculation is only in its infancy. It is a real pleasure to have such fine individuals as Wayne Spencer involved in this. It is my desire that my modest proposal act as a catalyst to stir up the thinking and discussion of others.

Danny Faulkner  
Lancaster, South Carolina  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## The third day — Precambrian skeletons in the closet?

I was somewhat taken with Carl Froede Jr's paper on Precambrian metazoans,<sup>1</sup> in particular the statement, *'The presence of animal traces within these deeply buried strata means that they cannot be Creation Week rocks.'* Those of your readers who have considered Precambrian fossils will perhaps recall a proposal by Wise, that microbios existed in the seas by early Day Three of Creation Week, thus explaining the fossils of the Precambrian.<sup>2</sup> Wise suggested that the process of continental elevation led to deposition of Precambrian

sediments, which entrapped and buried Precambrian fossils in what he calls the 'Day Three Regression'. (Regression, as I understand, implies a return of the waters to a former state or location. If so, I hardly think it a suitable substitute for *'the gathering together of the waters'*<sup>3</sup> on the third day. Possibly he meant recession.)

The foregoing proposal, it would appear, rests on whether Precambrian fossiliferous rocks are third day, or Flood sediments.

In this vein of thought, it was stated by Max Hunter<sup>4</sup> that:

*'Oard<sup>89</sup> [Hunter's reference<sup>89</sup> seems to be a nonentity] questions the need for geological activity on Day 3, noting that the earth was in the process of being created "very good" (Genesis 1:9-13) and that God could have raised the dry land without erosion and sedimentation.'*

I believe that Oard's proposal under examination is not without a healthy measure of sound reasoning, and is complimentary to Froede's quest for a better understanding of the forces that historically formed the earth's sedimentary legacy. Bear with me in my attempt to verify this claim.

Psalm 104:8 (*'mountains rose, and valleys sank'*), a **third day Divine construct**, tells us that on the first day of Creation, the submarine lithic surface was as *'void and without form'* (untenanted and featureless), as the water that composed its swaddling cover. From the moment of the all-prevailing command to gather together, the transportation process, unhindered by any vestige of flow impediment was undoubtedly accomplished with the barest degree of superficial lithic turmoil. I have suggested in an unpublished paper that the rising continents, though fracturing, were ingesting water (I offer this process as forming the *'fountains of the great deep'*), so in like manner it was absorbing, not yielding, sedimentary products.

When did the fossil-bearing sediment originate? I believe a third day interpretation is not acceptable scientifically, and is certainly biblically extravagant!

William Tompkins  
Toronto, Ontario  
CANADA

1. Froede Jr, C.R., Precambrian metazoans within a young-earth Flood framework, *CEN Tech. J.* **13**(2):90-95, 1999.
2. Wise, K.P., Precambrian fossil record, *CEN Tech. J.* **6**(1):69, 1992.
3. Genesis 1:10b, KJV.
4. Hunter, M.J., Pre-Flood/Flood boundary in the earth's mantle? *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(3):351, 1996.

## So-called error in Luke 3:36

I was surprised at the non-cautionary approach taken by Larry Pierce with respect to the alleged error in Luke 3:36 (i.e. that Cainan is a supposed addition in the genealogy through copyist error).<sup>1</sup> He states:

*'The evidence from Josephus and Gill shows conclusively that the extra name Cainan is not part of God's original Word, but due to a later copyist's error.'*

Really? Was he there? **His reliance on extra-biblical sources to try to correct God's Word reminds me of another dangerous trend in the creation-evolution debate — that of interpreting Genesis according to extra-biblical 'scientific' sources.** This trend is dangerous and contributory to the undermining of faith in the veracity and surety of God's Word.

Even Dr Morris, whom Mr Pierce cites, is far more cautionary in his approach to the supposed error. Never does he say that the presence of Cainan in the genealogy is conclusively an error. Preferring to allow the possibility of his own error, he instead states the following:

*'Although the question is unsettled, the weight of evidence does seem to be in favour of the Hebrew text as it stands ...[the] insertion [of Cainan] in Luke 3:36 is most likely a copyist's error.'*<sup>2</sup>