

Poughkeepsie Oct 27 96

Mr. Dawson

Dear Sir.

Your postcard is just at hand.

Your statement therein surprises me. There was no thought of attributing to you the identical sentence referred to by you, <sup>but</sup> only its substance & meaning.

It charges that certain persons - referring in the MS. note to the author of The Origin of the World have said, "that once the days were not accurately defined. Turning to p. 200 of that book, Harper's '887, I read near the bottom, "nor were the limits of days at all accurately defined." If the limits of days were not at all accurately defined, the days themselves were not.

(2) that <sup>once</sup> the sun & moon & stars were dark bodies, <sup>line 10,</sup>  
 I made that assertion because on p 201 I  
 read that "they were included in the creation of (at)  
 the beginning," and, on page 105; that "outside of  
 that outer garment was the darkness of  
 space destitute of luminaries, at least of  
 these greater ones, &c." And on page 117, "Light  
 then came from luminous matter (I miswrote  
 in calling it phosphorescent, altho' I don't see  
 the difference) diffused thro' the whole  
 space of the solar system, or surrounding our  
 globe as with a garment." Then, "It slowly  
 concentrated towards the centre of the solar sys-  
 tem, or else formed a special envel-  
 ope of the earth." "We may suppose this  
 light-giving matter the same with that which  
 now surrounds the sun." "We may suppose  
 it was at length all gathered within the  
 earth's orbit." p. 202. "This process of concentra-  
 tion was now complete" to wit in the  
 fourth <sup>period, and of course</sup> after the appearance of grasses  
 herbs & fruit trees.

I submit that these quotations sustain every item in the sentence complained of. I do not see how any fairer or more moderate summing up of its teachings ~~on~~ these subjects - light & luminaries - could be made.

You may remember that I wrote to you in Feb. asking whether your Origin of the World set forth your present views, & that you replied Feb 21 "My views are substantially as in the Origin of the World."

Valuing your opinion very highly I sent you my syllabus of 19 propositions. In your reply (see Bib. Sacra 5:25) after referring to Origin of World, says, "I make no remark on the 19 propositions in the <sup>admit</sup> literal or some of which, in my judgment, of some difference of opinion, whether viewed as interpretations of Genesis, or of results of modern Science." It was after the receipt of this that I sent you the postal spoken of above.

This necessitated an examination of your book to find out what your present views are, and to point out those in wh. you have "a difference of opinion" from my 19 propositions. I found many very great differences, especially as to light & its nature and luminaries and their origin & condition. The remark as representing the atmosphere (p. 162 line 3) & the remarkable assertion that it was good. (When he had made it, he saw that it was good," p. 172 line 15) as well as the omission of any notice <sup>that</sup> fine important things do not receive the verdict good. all attracted my attention & excited my surprise.

The placing of the highest vegetation - grass, herbs & fruit trees before the Paleozoic (p. 192 l. 9<sup>#</sup>) and the assertion p. 181. line 10 from bottom "It seems as if every thing at first was in its best estate" is all very different from the views wh. I hold.

I do not intend to send you a critique on your book but only to point out definitely some of the points in which there is room as you say for differences of opinion.

# See also page 191 l 4 to 12.

There is much else of wh. I might speak, but time and your patience forbid.

The M.S. note was sent only to you. The letters of some of the scientists in July No. B. Soc. amazed me. The majority very frankly agree with the 19 propositions, while others as Merton, averbally agree but with much less willingness. Merton's paper is a study!

My paper in July no. contained a reply to each writer, and an extended critique on several. Prof. Wright saw fit to omit the latter. I think justice to myself and theme may cause me to put forth the whole in another form.

If, on second thought, you find your views have changed from those in your Origin of the World, and will point out which of the 19 propositions <sup>sent you</sup> are wrong <sup>which</sup> and there is any doubt about, & which, if any, you pass no opinion on, it will not be necessary

For me to refer to the Origin of the Wd at all. The views of all scientists have changed during the last 40 years.

I greatly honor you for the noble stand you have taken for the truth of the Bible, and for the only tenable ground for this account, its absolute literalness.

Yours truly  
C B Warring

If not delivered in 5 days, return to  
DR. C. E. WARRING,  
POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

POUGHKEEPSIE  
NOV 4  
10 AM  
96



Posted Nov 4  
C. E. W.

*Dr Warring*  
*Nov 4*

Princ. J. W. Dawson, L.L.D.  
Mc Gill College  
Montreal  
Canada.

McGILL AL  
NOV 4  
23--0  
1968

NOV 4  
1968

McGILL UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
ACC. NO. 909A12
REF. 302