

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 3, Number 6

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: June 30, 2010
Issue: Volume 3, Number 6
Home Pages: <http://www.AnOldScientist.com>
<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>
<http://www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com>

Circulation: The subscriber list is growing. Circulation grows by readers passing it on. If you are not a subscriber, to get another issue, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to: signup@anoldscientist.com.

Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

"Truth: That which is in accord with fact and reality."

This is written so that you may believe the bible because of science rather than in spite of science.

What's in This Issue:

- 1) What's Happening at Science and the Bible?
 - 2) What Did David See?
 - 3) Word of the Month: *"Foundation of the Earth"*
 - 4) Reprint Rights.
 - 5) Sign up for this E-zine.
-

1) What's Happening at Science and the Bible?

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

This has been a busy month. It is summer, and time has escaped. I realize people are busy, but I am asking for your feedback.

This month I have asked for your short comment at the end of the last article, the one on the word of the month. Many times this work has been dismissed as just another re-interpretation of the bible to make the bible appear to agree with the latest fad interpretation of modern science.

But is it really just a re-interpretation, or have the original intended meanings of the science related passages of the ancient scripture been obscured over time for lack of scientific knowledge, and is that original meaning really in accord with reality?

You be the judge, and let me know what you think.

2) What Did David See?

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

King David saw something. What he saw was important enough to be recorded in detail in two different books of the bible. For thousands of years, to theologians, it has sounded like so much theobabble—the incoherent religious sounding babbling of a religious nut—and much of it has been translated as such. Little did the theologians suspect that it may possibly be an accurate description of a phenomenon that is quite understood today. At the time it was recorded, the limited, non scientific vocabulary that was available has caused limited understanding. As a result it has been poorly understood for thousands of years, and parts of it have been consistently translated into incomprehensible nonsense.

On the brighter side, a detailed study of David's first hand account, with examination of the meanings of the original words, it appears to be an accurate and factual description of a phenomenon that is claimed by modern scientists to be in the domain of modern science. It is an archaic, primitive description of a natural, scientific phenomenon using the only vocabulary available. Actually, the description contains reference to multiple scientific phenomena. And it appears the knowledge base of this scientific stuff was more advanced than assumed by modern man, more scientifically advanced than assumed by both theologian and scientist alike.

In reading the bible, it seems as though King David had a lot of battles to fight. Apparently, there was a certain time, among all the battles he had to fight, when David was in trouble with the army of some enemy. He was facing an overwhelming army of ungodly men, and it was surely going to end in his defeat. His life was passing before his eyes, so to speak. To paraphrase the way David put it, "The floods of ungodly men made me afraid, the certainty of death overwhelmed me, The grave was pulling me in. I was looking death in the eye."

David called upon his God.

And then, the strangest thing happened.

The ground beneath his feet began to shake and tremble.

The foundations of the mountains were disturbed and began to reel because they were hot. Smoke began ascending as though it was being blown out from its nose. Fire was blowing out as though it was being blown from its mouth.

A good linguist, well versed in the intricacies of the Hebrew language may be able to tell you whether the "it" that had a nose and a mouth referred to the ground beneath his feet, or the elevated ground (mountains) whose support was disturbed. In either case, it is irrelevant as to the ultimate source of the vomit. That which was being ejected was coming from deep within the earth.

The use of the words translated nostrils and mouth in the king James version is not to mislead you into thinking that which was ejecting the smoke and projectiles had to be human.

Considering the basic properties of the ancient Hebrew language, the function of the

nostrils of being the opening where stuff was ejected such as smoke appearing water vapor on a frosty morning, snot in a sneeze, or simply the blowing out of air, and the function of the mouth to eject such stuff as words, spit, and gunky vomit, and considering the fact that the ancient Hebrew language had no other words for that same function of the earth or mountains during a volcanic eruption where smoke was blown out and gunky magma was ejected—the English language has such words, we call it a volcanic vent—it makes sense that David would use the words for the human counterpart to describe the holes in the ground or mountains where such stuff was coming out.

“It” spewed out blazing coals. The spewing spread out across the skies and cast down darkness at his feet. It was carried by a *cherub* (an un-translated word of unknown meaning) as it flew and was spread out on the outer reaches of the wind. It caused darkness that concealed where he was. Thick clouds filled the skies and blackness was raining down about him. Yet there was brightness before him and the thick clouds produced stones and coals of fire. (Here the description changes to the present tense.) The sound is deafening like the voice of the supreme God among the stones and embers of fire. He is sending arrows (of fire) and scattering them (David’s enemies), he is shooting out lightening and disorienting them.

There are flowing channels revealing the foundations of the earth.

Note: Now that is a curious statement. This passage (flowing channels) is sometimes translated channels of water, but in the ancient Hebrew language, the meaning of the word used for water was, “that which flows.” Therefore, it may not have been referring to water at all, but to molten lava that was flowing similar to the flow of a river of water. Could it be that David saw flowing molten lava, which at that time was assumed to be the foundations (that which supports) of the earth? Could it be that it was common knowledge at the time of David that the mountains (continents) that they referred to as “earth” as opposed to sea, was actually buoyed up by what they called the “*foundations of the earth*,” the fluid-like rock in which the continents float? See the Word of the Month section of this month’s E-Zine.

As David saw it, David was rescued from deep trouble. He was rescued from the strong enemy, from the ones that hated him and that were too strong for him. And he credited it all to his God upon whom he had called.

Just what was it that David witnessed? What was it that interrupted the battle with an overwhelming enemy? Could it have been a volcanic eruption that produced falling hot lava stones and rivers of flowing molten lava?

Or did David just make up some ridiculously religious sounding gobbly-de-gook to make his God look good?

In either case, it has made for the inspiration of several modern time songs that are familiar to many people today. You will recognize them as you read the King James version.

You can read David’s first hand account in the bible at Psalm 18 and II Samuel 22.

3) **Word/Concept of the Month:** “*Foundation of the Earth*”

The idea that until a only few centuries ago it was widely believed that the earth was flat—is only a myth.

That myth has been widely taught. At the time of the voyage of Columbus, some people believed the earth was flat and that there was danger of sailing off the edge of the earth into an eternal abyss. The assumption that the flat earth belief was widespread is a perversion of actual history. Some scholars may have misinterpreted religious beliefs to that end, but neither ancient Greek science, nor the ancient scripture of the bible held that view. In fact, ancient Greeks had figured out not only that the planet earth was a sphere, but they had a good estimate of its size. And Christopher Columbus was aware of this.

Some theologians interpreted the bible in such a way as to support the idea that ancient Hebrews believed the earth to be flat. But a study of the ancient scriptures shows that to be an erroneous conclusion. The earlier ancient Hebrews even had a better concept of the universe than did the later ancient Greeks.

There is a curious phrase/concept used in the ancient Hebrew scripture. It has to do with what supports the earth. It has been translated, “*foundations of the earth.*” But the underlying meaning of the words in the original language reveals a greater understanding than was otherwise available until modern science confirmed the ancient Hebrew view.

To many bible readers and to modern scientists, the biblical phrase, “*foundations of the earth*” conjures up visions of a sphere with what looks like North and South America among swirling clouds, resting upon the back of a turtle. Maybe even that turtle is upon another turtle, upon another turtle...

To other bible readers, that phrase conjures up visions that there was an ancient archaic model of the universe where the earth is a flat structure held up with vertical solid marble stone columns.

Both are concepts from recent eras, concepts lacking understanding of the historical and scientific wastelands through which the ancient scripture has survived. Neither concept is not what the biblical phrase, “*foundations of the earth*” is talking about.

(For a report on the erroneous assumptions as to the model of the universe held by ancient Hebrews, see a special report about Historical Concepts of the Earth www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/Historical_Concepts.pdf)

First, the word “*earth*” in that phrase, does not refer to the planet as a whole. Rather, it refers to the part that is solid ground, the dry land of the continents, as opposed to the vast majority of the planet which is wide open oceans.

(See the February, 2010 issue of this Ezine: Word of the Month: *Earth*. <http://www.scienceandthebible.net/ezone/2010/SATB-Ezine-2010-02-28.pdf>)

That phrase, “*foundations of the earth,*” refers to the support that holds up the continents so they are not washed over by the oceans. The oceans cover the non-continental portions of the planet an average of about three miles deep. If nothing

held the continents up, they would be spread out under the ocean and the planet earth would be completely covered by water as it was before the continents emerged. Curiously, that emergence of the continents was described in the bible thousands of years before it was more recently discovered by modern science.

Modern scientists do not think of the continents as having a foundation. They do not think of the continents as being held up by stone columns, or by solid foundation stones as we visualize when we use the word “foundation” in reference to a man made structure.

They think of the continents as being supported from beneath by the buoyant properties of the mantle.

This fact was unknown to modern science until around the turn of the century, a little over a hundred years ago, when it was discovered that the mantle supports the continents by buoyancy. That is a concept similar to floatation in a fluid, to being supported by something more dense than that which is floating in it. And so it is with the continents and the mantle.

So, what did the ancient scriptures mean by the phrase translated into the King James as, “*foundations of the earth?*”

When looking at all the occurrences of that concept in the bible, is it consistent with reality, or is it consistent with the imaginative visions of those who interpreted the ancient scriptures before reality was discovered by modern science?

Language:

But first, lets talk about the differences in the way different languages form nouns, the different ways that different languages name things or concepts.

The Hebrew language has peculiarities of which it is helpful to recognize. Many nouns in the Hebrew language are derived using a different philosophy than in the English language. Many nouns are derived from the function of that which is named rather than derived from the physical features of it. The word selected for a bird may literally mean, “a flyer.” As such, it could also include a flying mammal such as a bat or a flying reptile. The word used for a pencil may mean that with which you put words on paper or record thoughts. As such a concept, it could also include a pen or typewriter. In English, a bird cannot be a mammal or a reptile because that is outside the definition. In English, the word for a pencil cannot include a typewriter because in English, a pencil is named for its physical features rather than for its function.

Many such Hebrew words are translated into more restrictive English words or phrases in English Versions of the bible. The more restrictive English words may actually, in their English form, exclude the original intended meaning that is included in the original Hebrew form.

The Greek language also has a different philosophy for forming nouns. It is more like the English language, the Greek may find a word that describes the physical form that is to be named. A pencil may be named with a word that describes a thin hollow piece of wood with a graphite core, independent of whether it was to be used for writing or for punching holes in something. In so naming a pencil, the same name

could not be used to describe a pen or a typewriter. Understanding the philosophy of how words are formed in a language gives greater understanding of what the author is trying to communicate, especially when he is trying to communicate a scientific concept that has not yet been discovered nor defined, and there is no specific word for that concept.

Hermeneutics:

In the understanding of ancient language, it is sometimes difficult to determine the original thought that was expressed.

The first rule of hermeneutics is:

The original intended meaning is the proper interpretation as to what it means.

Many times the original intended meaning is difficult to establish. Imagine for a moment that there is an ancient language where the concept “baby color” was a word, and it was established that in that culture baby colors were pink and blue. An ancient poem might be discovered that had the line, “His eyes are as the “baby color” of the sky.” In this case, the phrase is obviously referring to his baby blue eyes. We know this by applying a rule that keeps us in touch with the reality that most of the time the sky is blue, and eyes are generally found to be blue, not generally pink as seen in the sunrise or sunset sky.

Unless, of course, it is a fictional account of a red eyed space alien. Then, it would be obviously referring to his pink eyes. In this case reality would have nothing to do with it.

This illustrates the need for a commonly used, yet “rarely stated,” rule of hermeneutics. If the ancient writing claims to be a work of fiction, or if it claims to be a true account, the rule would be applied differently. That rarely stated rule is:

If there are two equally possible interpretations of the meaning, and one is in accord with reality, and the other is not, the one in accord with reality is the proper interpretation.

If the work claims to be a true account, this rule is to be applied. If the writing is a fictional account, this rule is not to be applied.

The bible claims to be a true account. Therefore, this rule of hermeneutics is just as valid as any other, maybe more so. Suppose there is a concept in the bible that means, “that which supports something.” It could be translated variously as foundation, support, columns, suspenders, or vertical stone structures called pillars, or any of many other translations, depending upon what is being supported. Of course, here we are talking of holding up the continents, or “earth” (*erets* or *eartz* as it is called in the Hebrew language.) As you can see, various translations would limit the concept beyond the limit of the original concept of simply, “that which supports.”

Reality Check:

For the Bible to pass the “Reality Check,” for the bible to be true, all interpretations which can be compared to the external evidence of God’s creation, and don’t ring true, must have an equally valid alternate interpretation which must ring true.

Scientific principles such as whether the sun rotates around the earth versus the earth

rotates around the sun, and whether the earth rests on marble pillars, versus the continents are buoyed up by “molten support,” can be compared to the external evidence of God’s creation. Then, with the correct interpretation, the bible rings true.

Having been brought up in Sunday school and having been told many times that science contradicts the bible so we are to be skeptical of science, it is hard to believe that the bible actually teaches much of what modern science has recently discovered.

According to many science reference readily available, scientists assume the earth at one time was hot and had a molten surface. However, no one seems to want to claim credit for that discovery. The assumption is that it cooled enough for water to accumulate. But no one appears to claim credit for that discovery either. Apparently, modern science assumes that the phases the earth went through in ancient times are obvious. For a while it was too hot for water to be on the surface, then volcanic action was the source of the first water on the surface when it finally cooled sufficiently. No one is given credit for discovering these obvious truths either.

However, not many years ago, no one knew of this. Biblical scholars assumed that the earth was created cool as it is today, and in appearance as we see it today.

Yet, in contrast to the beliefs of many biblical scholars, the bible has an obvious position on these details that seems to be in accord with the latest views of modern science. And these details were published thousands of years before their discovery by modern science.

As a side note, the bible’s position, while in accord with reality of modern science, is in contrast to many other religions that have made up ridiculous explanations that are obviously not true to facts of science.

To a scientist, the idea of laying the support for the continents may seem like a ridiculous thing to mention because it is so obvious that something holds up the continents. However, a deeper study into the words used in the ancient Hebrew language brings the realization that God knew more about it than appears on the surface. God knew the Foundations of the earth were the fluid, or at least semi-fluid support for the continents known to science as mantle. God also knew it sometimes leaks to the surface as lava flows.

In describing the support for the continents, the King James translation obscures the original meaning by restricting it to something other than “buoyant support.”

I Samuel 2:8 “...for the pillars of the earth [are] the LORD'S, and he hath set the world upon them.”

And

Job 9:6 *Which shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble.*

In the original Hebrew language, the word translated “pillars” also means “molten support,” or “buoyant support.” Obviously that concept was missed by the early translators. And the rest of the bible is translated assuming the “pillars” are somehow solid vertical posts visualized as stone columns common in ancient Greek architecture.

How could something that simply meant “support” be restricted to “pillars?”

If the translator did not understand that concept of “buoyant support” was even valid, and if one did not realize that King David understood that melted rock was the molten support for the continents, you might miss the significance of what David said when he saw a river of hot lava leaking from beneath the continent.

But, apparently, even if the translator did not understand the principle mentioned in the books of I Samuel and Job, King David did seem to understand the origin of the hot melted lava that he saw flowing as a river. And he recorded it in the very next book, II Samuel, and also in a Psalm, later recorded in the book of Psalms.

More Evidence of the True Meaning of the Biblical Concept: Foundations of the Earth.”

Was the original meaning the limited concept into which we have translated it? Or did it simply mean the support? If it simply meant the support, it is completely in accord with what modern science has independently determined to be reality.

The concept of the earth (continents) being supported by something is mentioned in several verses in the ancient scripture. In each of these verses, the context is either the early history of the planet earth concerning the formation of that which is to support the continents in the future, or the later history of the planet where the support is already in place.

In the Early Hadean Era, the earth existed as a hot barren ball of molten rock. As that planet cooled it went through several stages as described in the bible accounts of creation. First it had no oceans nor continents. Then it became covered with water. After that, the lesser specific gravity rocks that had been spread out over the surface of the mantle (foundations of the earth), under sea level, were gathered into continents, and emerged to be above the level of the sea, buoyed up by the more dense material of the mantle.

When the planet earth first formed, there were no oceans. There wasn't even any water condensing out of volcanoes:

Pro 8:24 *When [there were] no depths, I was brought forth; when [there were] no fountains abounding with water.*

Before the planet earth was covered with ocean, the mantle was laid:

Psa 104:5 *[Who] laid the foundations of the earth, [that] it (the earth/continents) should not be removed for ever.*

Psa 104:6 *Thou coveredst it with the deep (oceans) as [with] a garment: the waters stood above the mountains.*

Then, in the next verse, a catastrophic event occurred that caused the continents to emerge to be above sea level:

Psa 104:7 *At thy rebuke they (the waters of the oceans) fled; at the voice of thy thunder they hasted away.*

Then, continuing the sequence in yet another sequential verse, the effect of the buoyancy of the mantle on the continents is emphasized as the rebound of that

catastrophic event causes the mountains to rise:

*Psa 104:8 The mountains go up, the valleys go down
unto the place which thou hast founded for them (where they are in equilibrium).*

In another biblical description of the same sequence of events, first the mantle (foundation) was laid, the earth's bases and cornerstones were sunk (below sea level) then the earth emerged to be above sea level in a catastrophic event, never again to permanently disappear below sea level:

*Job 38:4 Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell {Me,} if you
have understanding,*

*Job 38:6 On what were its (earth's) bases sunk? Or who laid its (earth's)
cornerstone,*

*Job 38:8 Or {who} enclosed the sea with doors When, bursting forth, it (earth) went
out from the womb;*

Job 38:9 When I made a cloud its garment And thick darkness its swaddling band,

Job 38:10 And I placed boundaries on it And set a bolt and doors,

*Job 38:11 And I said, 'Thus far you (earth) shall come, but no farther; And here shall
your (ocean's) proud waves stop'? (NASB)*

The laying of the support for the continents, along with the emergence of the continents from below to be above sea level are two of the most mentioned details found in the many origin accounts of the bible.

*Isa 48:13 It was my hand that laid the foundations of the earth. The palm of my right
hand spread out the heavens above... (NIV)*

*Zec 12:1 The burden of the word of the LORD for Israel, saith the LORD, which
stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the
spirit of man within him. (KJV)*

*Hbr 1:10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth;
and the heavens are the works of thine hands:*

*Psa 102:25 Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens [are]
the work of thy hands.*

You be the judge. Some doubters of the bible have accused this analysis to be simply a re-interpretation of the bible to agree with modern science. But is it really? Was the original meaning the limited English concept into which it has been translated? Or did it originally, simply mean the support? If it simply meant the support, it is completely in accord with what modern science has independently determined to be reality. The evidence above is not complete—it has been limited to keep the interest of the reader of this Ezine.

You be the judge. Send a comment of your reaction to:

SimpleTruth@AnOldScientist.com

4) Reprint Rights.

Permission is granted to use any of the articles in this e-zine in your own e-zine or web site, as long as you include the following blurb: "Retired Scientist, Theologian and Author, Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist, publishes the FREE Science and the Bible E-zine, nearly every month. Visit <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net> for more articles like this."

5) Sign up for this E-zine.

The Science and the Bible E-Zine is emailed to subscribers. If you have not subscribed, someone might have thought you would be interested. Please feel free to forward it to others. But please be careful to send it only to those who may be interested. Also, if you have not personally done so, please sign up for future issues. Right now there is not an automated way to sign up. So for now, to sign up, and get future issues, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to signup@anoldscientist.com. Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

This E-zine is free, you may take it and pass it on to others. However, this E-zine is copyright Max B. Frederick, 2008, 2009, 2010. Therefore, with my permission I encourage you to email this E-zine to any friends of yours who might be interested in Science and the Bible. I only ask that you email the whole thing, not bits and pieces. Otherwise, you'll be getting desperate calls at midnight from your friends asking where they can get their own free subscription.

If you miss an issue, I plan to archive all back issues on my web site at: <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net/ezine>

Max B. Frederick, Publisher, www.scienceandthebible.net © 2010
