

## **Ancient Technical Knowledge and Modern Science on Water Filling our Oceans**

by

**Max B. Frederick, An Old Scientist**

**Edited by Debbie Knapp, BS, MS**

### **Abstract:**

In the written accounts from Ancient Religions, in the so called creation myths of both the Ancient Hebrews and Ancient Egyptians are found correct technical details about the forming of the oceans and continents of our planet, about where the water for our ocean came from, about how that abundance of water got into the oceans, and even information about water on other planets and in the open space of the solar system. Ancient knowledge in these technical details is found to be consistent with the recent discoveries by modern science. Recently, modern science discovered several of these technical details over ten years after their recognition in the ancient accounts had been published. In effect, ancient technical knowledge published in ancient religious accounts anticipates or predicts recent scientific discoveries. In addition to being consistent with yet undiscovered modern science, the ancient accounts put these technical details in the proper chronological order. Recognizing the correctness of information in the ancient accounts, and the story of the complex modern science search for that same information reveals the impossibility of the typical politically correct explanations for the existence of such ancient knowledge. This paper focuses on the ancient record of the details concerning the water of our oceans, where it came from, how it got here, and the timeline of modern science discovery of those same details.

### **Introduction:**

Technical knowledge about the water in our oceans, where it came from, and how it got there is recorded in the annals of both modern science and ancient religious writings. Amazingly, an intellectually honest analysis shows the ancient religious writings pre-published various mentions of the same technical details currently being discovered by modern science, and put them in the same chronological order. Such ancient knowledge is not limited to just one religion. Together, the consistency among ancient accounts and the consistency with reality as currently being discovered by modern science lead us to the conclusion that the ancient technical information came from a common source; it came from reality. The question of which religion had it first and how that religion got it is not the topic of this article but is addressed in another<sup>1</sup>.

The water molecule is one of the most abundant<sup>2</sup> molecules in the universe.

How did the water of the oceans on our planet become so abundant as to form a layer 2.3 miles deep<sup>3</sup> covering over seventy percent<sup>4</sup> of the planet?

That has been one of the more hotly debated<sup>5</sup> topics of science during recent times. What is the source of the water that fills the ocean on the planet earth? Did it come from internal to the planet itself? Did it accumulate from outer space?

**The Ancient Record:**

The source of the water and how it got into the oceans is addressed concisely in one particular biblical creation account. In the context of the origin of four items that are essential for vegetation to exist, (light, air, water, and dry ground,) one aspect of the source for the waters of our oceans is revealed that has been only recently recognized by modern science: It is the arrival of water from outer space. In this paper we will explore those four items in the order they are presented in that particular biblical creation account, paying particular attention to the technical information about the water of the ocean found in that and other biblical creation accounts. Subsequently we will discuss the consistency of those technical details with the discoveries published by modern science during the past half century.

It has been said that the bible is not<sup>6</sup> a science book. But sorting out and considering the technical details in thirty-four biblical creation accounts<sup>7</sup> you see (other than the universal claim in those accounts that it was all created by the God of the Bible) what appears to be more of a collection of ancient science books than a religious document. An authentic comprehensive biblical technical account of the origins is found in the summation of those thirty-four biblical creation accounts.

In the first part of the book of Genesis is found a collection of several pre-existing creation accounts, often misinterpreted to be one long chronologically ordered account of the beginnings.

A side note: The Genesis 1 series of six days is not<sup>8</sup> an authentic biblical account of the origins. The six days of Genesis 1 is mentioned in the bible in only four places. Each of those four places it is in the context of the six literal twenty-four hour days of labor of the Sabbath principle where the seventh day is to be a day of rest. In fact, in the first chapter of Genesis those six days are superimposed upon one of the thirty-four authentic biblical creation accounts using the technical details of the underlying account to illustrate the six literal twenty-four hour days of the Sabbath principle.

The above four essential items, light, air, water, and dry ground, are addressed in the first half<sup>9</sup> of the second account in that collection of biblical accounts. These four technical details are found in Genesis 1:3-12. In those ten verses is given the chronology of the development of these essentials that had to be in place before vegetation could exist. In that presentation there are also many technical details concerning the origins heretofore unknown, but consistent with the recent discoveries of modern science.

But first, a note about the ancient biblical language used to present that technical information: The original language itself was not scientific in nature and many technical details are presented as best that language could. The humans through whom the information was translated struggled as different languages became the means of communication. They had a difficult time translating some of the technical details they did not understand. The key to understanding the science in ancient writings is to understand the original technical meanings<sup>10</sup> of the original words.

**The First Essential, Light:**

For vegetation to grow there must be energy from the sun to convert the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) from the atmosphere and the water (H<sub>2</sub>O) from the ocean into stored energy that

forms the hydrogen-carbon compounds of which all vegetation is composed. That energy comes in the form of light. But where did light come from? It was extracted from darkness

“...and God divided [extracted] the light from the darkness” (Genesis 1:4 KJV).

One of those language difficulties surrounds the English word “divided.” We naturally assume “divided” is in reference to keeping things apart. But in the original language the technical meaning was akin to the act of taking things apart as in extracting, as in separating whey from curds in the making of cheese. It appears to be a reference to a process in which the light was extracted, or produced, from the darkness.

Where the bible says the light was divided from the darkness it was natural for pre-modern science minds to assume light and darkness could not be mixed in such a way that light had to be separated, divided, produced, or extracted from darkness. This is a puzzling concept but is supported by the statement in another biblical creation account referring to the same concept in the same context, the origins.

“the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended [held back by force] it not.” (John 1:5)

Nearly sixty years ago, before modern science discovered the concept that the ancient scripture was referring to, my Greek professor at San Jose Bible College,<sup>11</sup> mused that “comprehended” was a very poor translation of the original language. The original meaning had nothing to do with comprehension as in understanding. That word meant that darkness could not hold back light by force. This was before modern science made the significant discovery that darkness can hold back light by force. It was back when darkness was assumed to be nothingness, the absence of light. So, the professor asked the obvious question about why would the bible say that light was not forcefully restrained by darkness when everyone knows darkness, the absence of light, the nothingness, has no force with which to hold back anything, let alone light? Then later, modern science did discover<sup>12</sup> that the darkness of the “black hole,” from which it is postulated that light escaped in, or after the “Big Bang” at the beginning of the universe, did have sufficient gravity<sup>13</sup> to hold back light from escaping.

What that ancient account really says is not that the light came from nothingness, but was separated [extracted or produced] out from darkness.

In that technical detail of the origin of the universe, the detail that sometime in the beginning, light came from darkness, science has come around to accepting exactly what the bible published thousands of years ago.

### **The Second Essential; Atmosphere (Air):**

“And God said, Let there be a firmament [atmosphere] in the midst of the waters, and let it divide [extract] the waters from the waters. (Gen 1:6)

The second essential for plant life to exist, after light, is air, the atmosphere. The atmosphere contains the ingredients of Carbon Dioxide and Water necessary for plants.

But the translation in the King James Version says “Firmament.” That is another problem of understanding the technical meaning of what the original language actually says. According to Gesenius's Lexicon, the ancient Hebrews believed there was a solid

crystalline sphere surrounding the planet earth holding back a heavenly ocean.<sup>14</sup> But that entry in the Gesenius Lexicon is not true. This concept of a “firmament” is from later Ancient Greek Science<sup>15</sup>, not from the older Ancient Hebrews. There was no such thing as a “firmament” in the Ancient Hebrew Scriptures until after it was introduced into the Greek translation known as the Septuagint (LXX) made at the Legendary Library of Science at Alexandria, Egypt around 250 BC. Other English translations offer such concepts as “space” (NLT), “vault” (NIV), “expanse” (ESV), (CSV), (NASB)..., and “dome” (NRSV). But the true meaning is found in the definition located later in this biblical creation account itself where it is defined as that in which the birds fly:

“...and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven” (Gen 1:20).

This could be nothing else but the atmosphere. That is what birds fly in.

So, the second essential in the sequence of the development of the essentials for the vegetation of the food chain, in the context of this biblical creation account, is the atmosphere.

In another biblical account of the time early in the development, before there was any such thing as vegetation, let alone humans, outgassing of mist from internal to the earth caused watering of the surface. Apparently this mist was not only the first source of atmosphere, but also the source of the first liquid water on the surface.

“...every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and *there was* not a man to till the ground. But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.” (Gen 2:5, 6)

Apparently from internal to the earth was the source of both the first atmosphere and the first surface water. But it was not abundant enough to fill the oceans.

### **The Third Essential, Abundant Water:**

So, the biblical creation accounts apparently pre-publish the modern science contention that the first water accumulating on the planet earth came from interior to the planet earth itself. But, what about the abundant water? Where did the abundant water come from? Several of the biblical creation accounts give technical details on the filling of the oceans. Apparently the atmosphere had something to do with the arrival of water.

Let’s go back to the discussion of the second biblical creation account in the book of Genesis...

Where the atmosphere is first mentioned by such concepts as “firmament,” “space,” “vault,” “expanse,” and “dome” its location and function are also mentioned.

“And God said, Let there be a firmament [atmosphere] in the midst of the waters, and let it divide [extract] the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament [atmosphere], and divided the waters which *were* under the firmament [atmosphere] from the waters which *were* above the firmament [atmosphere]: and it was so.” (Gen 1 6,7).

These waters above the atmosphere and below the atmosphere can be nothing other than the waters above the atmosphere which would be water in outer space and the waters below the atmosphere which would be water in the ocean. It even mentions the direction of the division [extraction, production] of the waters is from above to below; from outer

space into the ocean.

To put it in plain modern English, the atmosphere has something to do with extracting water from outer space and depositing it into the oceans below. This would be in addition to the water out gassing from the interior of the planet. Is that in the bible too?

In the biblical creation account, “*Eyewitness Account by Wisdom*,” (found in Proverbs 8), it is pointed out that not all the water came from the interior to the earth, not all from “the fountains of the deep.” Somehow the clouds above added to the “strength” or amount of water coming from interior to the earth filling the sea, so much so that it had to be limited.

“When he established the clouds above: [By establishing the atmosphere,  
When he strengthened the fountains of the deep: [Additional water was added to the source]  
When he gave to the sea his decree,  
that the waters should not pass his commandment...” (Proverbs 8:28, 29)

It appears clear that it is saying the first water coming to the surface of the planet came from interior to the earth, and then later that was added to by water that, as described in the second biblical creation account, was being separated from above to below by some function of the clouds in the atmosphere. In all the other biblical creation accounts where this is mentioned, are all consistent in what they teach.

But then, according to modern science, sometime after the filling of the oceans came a point in time that there was no more exposed dry land, there came a point in time when the planet earth was completely covered by waters of the ocean; there were no continents.

In the *Chronological Order of Creation* account found in Psalm 104, not only is the fact stated that there was a time when the entire planet was covered with ocean, it even places the filling of the oceans in the proper chronological position—after the laying of the mantle, the first outer rock layer before the planet was covered with oceans—and before the emergence of the continents which are now resting by buoyancy upon that mantle as a foundation..

“*Who* laid the foundations of the earth [dry land, continents]  
*that* it [continents] should not be removed for ever.  
Thou coveredst it [continents] with the deep [oceans] as *with* a garment:  
the waters stood above the mountains.” (Psalms 104 6, 7)

So, this biblical creation account too states that at one time in the development of the planet earth there was a time when, before the ocean was filled, there was no ocean. After which the ocean was filled. It was filled to overflowing the entire surface of the planet covering the mountains.

### **The Fourth Essential, Dry Land:**

And then there is the essential of dry land for plants to put their roots into. What happened so that the solid ground, less than a third of the surface of the planet, became piled up over three miles high so as to extend well above that water level of that vast ocean? And what happened so that the waters of the ocean with the unique<sup>16</sup> physical nature of the water molecule are the basis of the hydrological cycle that causes the waters of the ocean to naturally irrigate the continental portions of the planet? The biblical creation accounts have a lot to say about that too.

Back to the account in Genesis 1, the fourth item required for vegetation to grow and produce food is dry land, also called earth, which we recognize as continents.

“And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry *land* [continents] appear: and it was so. And God called the dry *land* Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas...” (Gen 1:9, 10).

Thus the forming of the “earth” [dry land, continents] was completed as anticipated by the introductory account in verses 1 and 2 where, after it says the heavens and earth [continents] were created, it says the continents were not formed.

“And the earth [continents] was without form and void.” (Gen 1:2).

Then, when the continents were formed, they were no longer void, when they rose, and emerging to be plateaus rising over two miles above the sea bed to be above sea level

In all the biblical creation accounts this “forming of the earth” is the most talked about technical event, in the creation sequence of events. The emergence of the continents from below the surface of the ocean that had covered the whole planet is described as a sudden event. Yet, modern science had not yet discovered the suddenness of it until that detail was published in May of 2018<sup>17</sup>.

To continue the biblical story of the forming of the earth, see the section Eon 3 Part 1 “The Emergence of the Continents” in the book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*, pages 186 to 190<sup>18</sup>, or the book, *How the Earth was Formed*<sup>19</sup>, on the internet.

### **Back to the Original Question about knowledge of where that Water came From?**

Back to the question at the top: Where did the abundant water surrounding our planet originally come from; interior to the planet or from extraterrestrial sources?

Both mechanisms are published in the ancient religious literature—juvenile water from the interior of the earth, and water from outer space both contributed to the water of the oceans. And thus the oceans were filled, by the combination of first juvenile water from the interior of the earth, then later by addition of water from extraterrestrial sources. This too, modern science will eventually realize. Modern science may even eventually hypothesize that the juvenile water and other gasses from the interior of the earth formed the first atmosphere, which then aided in capturing the water from the extraterrestrial sources.

For several decades the quandary over the source of the water in our oceans has puzzled modern science. The latest publication is less than six months ago, the discovery of water with the same composition of our ocean water is found in a comet. This is swaying scientists toward the opinion that water really could have come via comets. Some of our water may have, in reality, come from outer space with the atmosphere softening the collision and capturing the water, “dividing” it from outer space, and integrating it into the hydrological rainfall cycle converting it into gentle rainfall.

The bottom line is, the writers of the ancient accounts got the technical details right when they published them thousands of years before modern science discovered the same information.

### **The Modern Science Search for the Same Information:**

A brief history of the modern science search for knowledge about the source of the water, and how it got here, is in order. Let's watch as modern science tries to figure it out. Many theories have been put forth and rebutted.

For many years, apparently, it had been just assumed that the water to fill the oceans had always been here.

**September 1, 1951** – The state of modern science knowledge in 1951.

In 1951, William Rubey<sup>20</sup>, a well-respected geologist, published a classic work that established the lack of knowledge of any mechanism for filling the ocean. Rubey's "Geologic history of seawater: an attempt to state the problem" summarized the knowledge of science concerning the water of the earth, and the problems with the then current state of the knowledge. At that time, the water in the oceans of the earth was assumed to be the product of the out gassing of the rocks within the earth. In other words, ocean water came from the interior of the planet earth, from juvenile water never before having been present on the surface. The problem was the water that could have possibly been from that source fell short by many orders of magnitude of being able to fill the oceans; even if the earth were considered to be a terrarium, never losing any water to outer space.

Incidentally, but significant later in this article, it was only a year earlier (Jan 3, 1950) Jan Oort<sup>21</sup> proposed comets came from a cloud of comets far out in the solar system from which "Oort Cloud" comets would occasionally be deflected toward the sun thus supplying us with the observed comets. That same year, (Jan 15, 1951), Peter Kuiper<sup>22</sup> proposed another source for comets to be from a "Kuiper Belt" closer in, but beyond the planet Neptune, but I digress.

**August, 1983** – The Planet Earth a Terrarium?

In 1983, Shiklomanov and Sokolov<sup>23</sup> published a paper assuming the earth was essentially a terrarium, neither gaining nor losing water from or to outer space.

By this time, the scientific community, even though most of the scientists did not realize it, was at a total loss for an explanation of the source of water in the oceans of the earth.

**April, 1986** – Water from Extra-terrestrial source?

But then modern science was rudely awakened.

In 1986, Frank and Sigwarth<sup>24</sup> first introduced the possibility in their infamous Small Comet Theory that the waters of our ocean could have come from outer space captured by our atmosphere. To Louis Frank and John Sigwarth goes the credit for awakening the scientific community to the idea that the water of our oceans came from an extra terrestrial source or sources.

The publication of that theory was met with extreme skepticism and hostility in the scientific community.

**July 29, 1988** – Hostility toward the new theory of water from outer space.

In 1988 R. A. Kerr<sup>25</sup> declared that Small Comets were a clerical error. The hostility was not so much with the theory, but with the idea that any scientist from a different discipline would have the insolence to suggest that what scientists had previously

believed was wrong. But it had the effect of waking up the scientific community to a new idea. They had not even considered the possibility of our oceans being filled with water from outer space. In any case, whether the theory that much of the water of our oceans came from outer space is ever proven to the satisfaction of doubters, or some other explanation is discovered, the attitude of modern science toward the water in the solar system, the universe, even the hydrologic cycle on earth has dramatically changed since the 1986 publication of that theory.

**February, 1991** – Snow Storm in Space?

In February of 1991, just five years after the publication of the infamous Small Comet Theory, Dr. Vincent Kotwicky<sup>26</sup> published, “Water in the Universe,” a peer reviewed article in the *Hydrological Sciences Journal*. This article is a restatement of the state of knowledge of water in the universe published forty years earlier by Rubey when the earth was considered a terrarium. In this newer publication however, the scope of hydrology on earth was proposed to be expanded to cover phenomena encountered on other celestial bodies. Kotwicky presented the state of the science at that time as considering the hydrologic cycle on earth to be simply an extension of an even greater hydrologic system in the solar system, and even extending to the open universe.

In that publication, Kotwicky, even though recognizing water could be coming from outer space, felt the need to distance himself from the infamous Small Comet Theory of Frank and Sigwarth. He dismissed it by stating that the Small Comet Theory had been disproved by Kerr. That claim of disproof served to isolate Kotwicky from accusations of influence by the Small Comet Theory.

**1995** – Insufficiency of non-extraterrestrial water becomes critical.

By 1995, the insufficiency of the source of water coming via out gassing from the interior of the planet earth was becoming a cause for concern. Water from interior of the planet being the source of water for the oceans was in doubt. Van Andel<sup>27</sup>, in his, *New views on an old planet - A history of global change*, suggested that subduction was carrying water to great depths into the mantle at a faster rate than water is being returned to the surface by out gassing. Thus, the assumed source of water for the oceans was possibly in fact a loss, not a gain of water for the oceans.

**February 15, 1999** – Extraterrestrial Water becomes a Possibility.

In 1999, after four more years pass, David Deming of the School of Geology and Geophysics at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma, published a classic paper in which he openly and seriously considers the Small Comet Theory. After thirteen years no longer is an author obligated to distance himself from Frank and Sigwarth. In this paper, Deming states:

A consideration of observational and circumstantial evidence suggests that Earth may be subject to high influx rates (10(11)-10(12) kg/yr) of extraterrestrial-sourced volatile elements (carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen) derived from comets or other primitive solar-system material. The total extraterrestrial influx rate may be four to five orders of magnitude greater than previously thought, large enough to account for today's total near-surface inventories of water and carbon.<sup>28</sup>

In the intervening years since the announcement of the infamous theory of small comets, evidence has been collected which has been interpreted to both prove the existence of

water from space, or to disprove the existence of water from space, depending on the biases of the scientists doing the interpreting.

All the while, modern science has been drifting toward considering the earth as an open system and acceptance of an extraterrestrial source for the water of the oceans. No longer was it dogmatically considered to be not gaining water from outer space or losing water to outer space.

**May 14, 2010** – Oops, back to the Theory of Planet Earth as a Terrarium

In May of 2010, however, that drift was temporarily halted when Dr Maria Schönbachler, et.al.<sup>29</sup> published, “Heterogeneous Accretion and the Moderately Volatile Element Budget of Earth,” in the Journal *Science*, investigating original make up of the planet earth. Analysis by a contemporary journalist interprets the highly technical article to resurrect the theory that the planet earth is a terrarium neither gaining nor losing water since birth.

According to the researchers; the findings mean that comets and asteroids were unlikely to have brought the bulk of volatile elements to Earth - as commonly thought....The findings give a new boost to a 30 year old model, which suggests that volatile elements were already present in the final stages of the Earth's birth. We don't now need any theories about how water came to Earth - such as comets and asteroids - it was most likely here almost from the beginning...<sup>30</sup>

**October, 2010** – Within the next six months other Scientists Pile on to the old idea of Planet Earth as a Terrarium

In October of 2010, later that same year, a NASA earth observatory web page, *The Water Cycle*<sup>31</sup> is published agreeing with the May publication that the planet earth is neither gaining nor losing water from space stating that the planet earth is unique among the planets due to its water. It is quoted as saying “Believed to have initially arrived on the surface through the emissions of ancient volcanoes, water is a vital substance that sets the Earth apart from the rest of the planets in our solar system”

But at the top of the page we are met with the warning:

This page contains archived content and is no longer being updated.

At the time of publication, it represented the best available science.

Read on and you will see why the warning.

**October 5, 2011** – Reviving the idea of the Possibility of Water from Space

Barely one year passes before discussion of the possibility of water from outer space is re-opened with the publication of, “Ocean-like water in the Jupiter-family comet 103P/Hartley 2” By P. Hartogh, D. Lis, D. Bockelée-Morvan, et al.<sup>32</sup> NASA/JPL<sup>33</sup> put it this way, “Space Observatory Provides Clues to Creation of Earth's Oceans” and “Astronomers have found a new cosmic source for the same kind of water that appeared on Earth billions of years ago and created the oceans. The findings may help explain how Earth's surface ended up covered in water.” A web site from the University of Michigan<sup>34</sup> puts it this way, “New evidence supports the theory that comets delivered a significant portion of Earth's oceans...”

**February 25, 2014** – Again, Serious Consideration of Water from Space Theory

On February 25, 2014, with twenty-four pages, thirteen figures and about two hundred

fifty references, scholars from Cornell University<sup>35</sup> essentially describe what in layman terms may be called a snowstorm in the outer space of the solar system thereby water is accumulated from space and lost to space by planets in the solar system depending upon changing conditions over the millennium.

**June 13, 2014** –Extra-Terrestrial Water Theory Denounced -we already had plenty. On June 13, 2014 several scientists publish a paper<sup>36</sup>, “*Dehydration melting at the top of the lower mantle.*” That paper implies the source of water that fills our ocean may have been from internal to the planet earth. As Sebastian Anthony<sup>37</sup> puts it, “After decades of theorizing and searching, scientists are reporting that they’ve finally found a massive reservoir of water in the Earth’s mantle — a reservoir so vast that could fill the Earth’s oceans three times over. This discovery suggests that Earth’s surface water actually came from within, as part of a ‘Whole-Earth water cycle,’ rather than the prevailing theory of icy comets striking Earth...”

**October, 2014** - Planets Formed in Water Rich Regions of the Solar System Four months later in October of 2014 other scientists<sup>38</sup> publish a paper, “*Early solar system. Early accretion of water in the inner solar system from a carbonaceous chondrite-like source,*” “Determining the origin of water and the timing of its accretion within the inner solar system is important for understanding the dynamics of planet formation.”

One commentary<sup>39</sup> on this paper appears to emphasize that planets formed in water rich regions of the solar system. “While the environmental conditions in Earth’s early years made it impossible for water to remain on the planet’s surface, scientists have found evidence that the ingredients for water were protectively stored inside rocky bodies near our planet — and maybe inside Earth itself. The new findings suggest that there was water in the inner solar system...”

Scientists at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution<sup>40</sup> seem to emphasize that same paper to say that water did not arrive here from comets; rather it arrived earlier via meteorites.

Sciencemag.org editor highly technical summary of the paper<sup>41</sup>:

Astronomers know that interstellar water is abundantly available to young planetary systems—our blue planet collected (or accreted) plenty of it. Still, the details of water's movement in the inner solar system are elusive. Sarafian *et al.* measured water isotopes in meteorite samples from the asteroid Vesta for clues to the timing of water accretion. Their samples have the same isotopic fingerprint of volatiles as both Earth and carbonaceous chondrites, some of the most primitive meteorites. The findings suggest that Earth received most of its water relatively early from chondrite-like bodies.

**7 Apr. 2015** –Recognizing of Extra-Terrestrial water: “Snow Storm in Space” April 7, 2015 NASA published a news release<sup>42</sup> “The Solar System and Beyond Is Awash in Water.” This reference is a compilation of observations of water in almost every nook and cranny of the solar system at one time or another and the story of how water is continuously changing residences. Here is just a sample of what is in that article:

The space closer to the sun was hotter and drier than the space farther from the sun, which was cold enough for water to condense. The dividing line, called the "frost line," sat around Jupiter's present-day orbit. Even today, this is the approximate

distance from the sun at which the ice on most comets begins to melt and become "active." Their brilliant spray releases water ice, vapor, dust and other chemicals, which are thought to form the bedrock of most worlds of the frigid outer solar system.

Scientists think it was too hot in the solar system's early days for water to condense into liquid or ice on the inner planets, so it had to be delivered -- possibly by comets and water-bearing asteroids. NASA's Dawn mission is currently studying Ceres, which is the largest body in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter. Researchers think Ceres might have a water-rich composition similar to some of the bodies that brought water to the three rocky, inner planets, including Earth.

**13 Apr. 2017** – Other Oceans in our Solar System

The planet earth is not the only world<sup>43</sup> in our solar system to have oceans. Scientists are rapidly gaining new insights into these other oceans as they look into the abundance of water in space. In April, 2017, a NASA press release looks into these other oceans in our solar system. Here are a couple of quotes: “We once thought oceans made our planet unique, but we’re now coming to realize that ‘ocean worlds’ are all around us.” “Two veteran NASA missions are providing new details about icy, ocean-bearing moons of Jupiter and Saturn, further heightening the scientific interest of these and other "ocean worlds" in our solar system and beyond.”<sup>44</sup>

**October 24, 2017** – Scientist concludes comet water inconsistent with our ocean

In October of 2017 Charles Q. Choi<sup>45</sup>, Published “Facts About The 'Dirty Snowballs' of Space” summarizing what has been learned about comets during the past few years of space exploration including actually landing on one of the comets. He speculates. “Some researchers think comets might have originally brought some of the water and organic molecules to Earth that now make up life here.” But, at this time the tentative conclusion by Choi is that comets have the wrong composition of regular water to heavy water to have been the source of the water of our oceans.

**December 7, 2017** – NASA Scientists Become more Cautious in Statements

At this point in time, NASA<sup>46</sup> cautiously states, “Comets may have brought water and organic compounds, the building blocks of life, to the early Earth and other parts of the solar system.”

**September 9, 2018** – Back to Primordial Water Filling the Ocean-Not from Outer Space

Nine months later an article by Mike Wall<sup>47</sup> tends in the other direction stating that new research suggests all of our ocean water may have been here since the planet first started taking shape, ridiculing the idea of water arriving later from space. He reiterates,

“The origin of Earth's water has long been a topic of considerable discussion and debate. Some scientists hold that the wet stuff is mostly primordial,...But others think Earth was born very dry and that it took sustained bombardment by sopping-wet asteroids and comets long ago to dampen the planet to its present state....The new results should hearten the primordialists. In two new modeling studies, researchers determined that tiny grains of dust swirling around the newborn sun in the region where Earth eventually formed could have held enough water to explain the amount on the planet today.”

**November 14, 2018** – Nope, water not from outer space.

Two more months pass and Washington University in St. Louis<sup>48</sup> publishes another article reinforcing the idea published eight years earlier in May of 2010 by Dr Maria Schönbachler that, “We don't now need any theories about how water came to Earth - such as comets...”

**May 20, 2019** – Reversal Again, all Comets may Deliver Oceanic Water

Six months later Dariusz C. Lis et.al.<sup>49</sup> again re-opens the possibility of oceanic water being delivered by comets with publication of the article, “Terrestrial deuterium-to-hydrogen ratio in water in hyperactive comets,” describing better measurements which show all, not just a certain class, of comets have ocean like water. The article states it this way:

The D/H ratio in cometary water has been shown to vary between 1 and 3 times the Earth's oceans value, in both Oort cloud comets and Jupiter-family comets originating from the Kuiper belt. This has been taken as evidence that comets contributed a relatively small fraction of the terrestrial water. We present new sensitive spectroscopic observations of water isotopologues...Alternatively, isotopic properties of water outgassed from the nucleus and icy grains may be different due to fractionation effects at sublimation. In this case, all comets may share the same Earth-like D/H ratio in water, with profound implications for the early solar system and the origin of Earth's oceans.

**May 23, 2019** – Suddenly NASA is all in for Comet Deliver of Oceanic Water

Three days later on May 23, 2019, NASA/JPL boldly publishes “Comet Provides New Clues to Origins of Earth's Oceans<sup>50</sup>” and SOFIA (Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy) publishes “SOFIA Observations Fuel Debate about the Origin of the Earth's Oceans,” again emphasizing the theory that water to fill the oceans arrived on the planet earth via comets. As the SOFIA article so aptly puts it:

The mystery of why Earth has so much water, allowing our "blue marble" to support an astounding array of life, is clearer with new research into comets. Comets are like snowballs of rock, dust, ice, and other frozen chemicals that vaporize as they get closer to the Sun, producing the tails seen in images. A new study reveals that the water in many comets may share a common origin with Earth's oceans, reinforcing the idea that comets played a key role in bringing water to our planet billions of years ago.<sup>51</sup>

**Today, October, 2019**

Scroll down through the NASA “Ocean Worlds” web site<sup>52</sup>

<https://www.nasa.gov/specials/ocean-worlds/> and see the latest educated guess and speculations on what is out there in the way of the water cycle in our solar system. NASA has finally come around to what was so accurately described in the ancient literature of the biblical creation accounts when there was no humanly way of knowing what to write down

This has been a tremendous change of attitude by modern science drifting toward what was originally published thousands of years ago in the ancient scripture, yet unknown to modern science until now.

**Conclusions:**

In the early stages, our planet was formed in water rich region of our solar system. At first the surface was hot and dry, but as it cooled, water spewed out from the interior in such ways as we see volcanoes of today. Along with that water spewing out, other volatiles came that eventually accumulated as a primitive atmosphere. Early on that volcanic water fell as a mist to water the surface. As things progressed, the atmosphere was built up to the point that performed two important functions. It captured water incoming from outer space and protected it itself and the water from escape via being blown off by the solar winds (much as we see comets losing their water to outer space by being blown off by the solar winds.) Eventually the oceans were over-filled to such a depth that the planet no longer had any dry land, no continents. Then, suddenly, the continents rose, emerging from below the surface of the ocean to become dry land [earth] upon which, along with rain water from the surrounding oceans, plant life [vegetation] could thrive.

That is the story from ancient knowledge that is the story modern science is coming to validate.

**Extras:**

In reference to the beginning of the formation of the planets of the solar system, the bible says: “*Who layeth the beams [fig. beginning of construction] of his chambers [planets<sup>53</sup>] in the waters...*” Ps. 104:3 (KJV.) In the waters??

That is what this article is all about. It is about the ancient knowledge that the planets of the solar system formed in a water rich region of the solar system.

It is about the modern science recent discovery of that fact.

It is about the continuing discovery of the processes by which the oceans were filled.

It is about ancient religious writings publishing it thousands of years before modern science.

It is about recorded ancient knowledge concerning the water covering the planet before there was any continental dry ground and then the sudden emergence of continents surrounded by waters of the oceans. It is about the ancient Egyptian Creation Myth and the Biblical Creation Accounts both getting technical details correct thousands of years before the discovery of those same technical details by modern science.

It raises the questions, “Which religion had it first?” and “Where did that ancient technical information come from?”

What is the original source of that ancient knowledge of technical information? Two sources have been discussed. First is a claim by a claimed original source itself. The other is a suggestion by those unwilling to accept the claim. The “claim” is that there was a creator that communicated the technical details to humans. The “suggestion” is that ancient humans evolved such a technically savvy society that they figured it out similar to our modern science then that society was destroyed without a trace except for the preservation of their sacred writings containing that technical information. But that is not what this article is about. This article is about the technical correctness of that ancient information.

## References and Notes:

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Frederick, Max B. (2018, Aug 17). Modern Science Discovery Predicted by Ancient Religious Literature. *Academia.edu*, [https://www.academia.edu/39826957/Modern\\_Science\\_Discovery\\_Predicted\\_by\\_Ancient\\_Religious\\_Literature](https://www.academia.edu/39826957/Modern_Science_Discovery_Predicted_by_Ancient_Religious_Literature) Also published on *Science and the Bible.net* website, [http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20180817\\_Modern\\_Science\\_Discovery\\_Predicted\\_by\\_Ancient\\_Religious\\_Literature.pdf](http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20180817_Modern_Science_Discovery_Predicted_by_Ancient_Religious_Literature.pdf) ,
- <sup>2</sup> Kotwicki, Vincent (1991) Water in the Universe, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 36:1, 49-66, DOI: 10.1080/02626669109492484 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02626669109492484>
- <sup>3</sup> NOAA. (2013, June 1). How Deep Is the Ocean? [oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/oceandepth.html](https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/oceandepth.html). Retrieved from <https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/oceandepth.html>  
Quote: “The average ocean depth is 2.3 miles.”  
Abstract: The average depth of the ocean is about 12,100 feet (3,688 m).
- <sup>4</sup> USGS. (2019, Mar 12). How Much Water Is There on Earth? [usgs.gov/special-topic/water-science-school/science/how-much-water-there-earth](https://www.usgs.gov/special-topic/water-science-school/science/how-much-water-there-earth). Retrieved from [https://www.usgs.gov/special-topic/water-science-school/science/how-much-water-there-earth?qt-science\\_center\\_objects=0#qt-science\\_center\\_objects](https://www.usgs.gov/special-topic/water-science-school/science/how-much-water-there-earth?qt-science_center_objects=0#qt-science_center_objects)  
Quote: “About 71 percent of the Earth's surface is water-covered.”
- <sup>5</sup> A cursory search of the internet will reveal many more articles debating this subject than it is practical to cite in a paper such as this. Since Rubey (1951) published his classic analysis of the absence of a mechanism to explain the abundance of water on the surface of this planet many papers have appeared explaining how it could have come from the interior. Since Frank and Sigwarth (1986) first introduced the possibility it could have come from outer space captured by our atmosphere. That theory was first met with great hostility and since then has waxed and waned until presently it is finally gaining acceptance.
- <sup>6</sup> Ham, Ken. (2016, Dec 18) “Is the Bible a Science Textbook?” *Answers in Genesis*. [answersingenesis.org/blogs/ken-ham/2016/12/18/is-the-bible-a-science-textbook/](https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/ken-ham/2016/12/18/is-the-bible-a-science-textbook/). Retrieved from <https://answersingenesis.org/blogs/ken-ham/2016/12/18/is-the-bible-a-science-textbook/>
- <sup>7</sup> Frederick, Max B. (2008, Aug 30) Thirty-four Biblical Creation Accounts. *Science and the Bible.net* website, retrieved from [https://scienceandthebible.net/20080830\\_Thirty\\_Four\\_Biblical\\_Creation\\_Accounts.pdf](https://scienceandthebible.net/20080830_Thirty_Four_Biblical_Creation_Accounts.pdf)
- <sup>8</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, Debbie A. Knapp, BS, MS. (2019, May 30). “Intellectually Honest Answer to the Six Days of Genesis Dilemma.” *Academia.edu*. retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/40148106/Intellectually\\_Honest\\_Answer\\_to\\_the\\_Six\\_Days\\_of\\_Genesis\\_Dilemma](https://www.academia.edu/40148106/Intellectually_Honest_Answer_to_the_Six_Days_of_Genesis_Dilemma) ,also [https://www.scienceandthebible.net/20190630\\_Intellectually\\_Honest\\_Answer\\_to\\_the\\_Six\\_Days\\_of\\_Genesis\\_Dilemma.pdf](https://www.scienceandthebible.net/20190630_Intellectually_Honest_Answer_to_the_Six_Days_of_Genesis_Dilemma.pdf)
- <sup>9</sup> Genesis 1: 3-12, the first half of the second biblical creation account in the collection of biblical creation accounts up front in the bible addresses the technical essentials of the botanical (plant) side of the food chain. The second half, v. 13-31, addresses the zoological (animal) side and the ritual presentation of the food chain to humans.
- <sup>10</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, (2014) Glossary: The Technical Meanings of Religious Words. *ScienceAndTheBible.net* website. retrieved from <https://www.scienceandthebible.net/glossary.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> I cannot remember My Greek Professor’s name, but he was at San Jose Bible College, San Jose California, in the early 1960’s
- <sup>12</sup> Redd, Nola Taylor (2019, July 11). What are black holes? *Science & Astronomy*, retrieved from <https://www.space.com/15421-black-holes-facts-formation-discovery-sdcmp.html>
- <sup>13</sup> Reucroft, S. and Swain, John D. (1998, August 3). If light cannot escape the gravitational pull of black holes, how is it that scientists have detected plumes of radiation coming from them? *Scientific American*. retrieved from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/if-light-cannot-escape-th/>

<sup>14</sup> Gesenius, Wilhelm, (1890) Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures, Translated, With Additions and Corrections from the Author's Thesaurus and other Works. Translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 53 East Tenth St., London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1890. Page DCCLXXX upper right hand corner of page.

[https://books.google.com/books?id=TXZ8MFz6Da0C&pg=PR780&lpg=PR780&dq=%22to+which+the+stars+were+supposed+to+be+fixed%22+Gesenius&source=bl&ots=YXoxn2\\_d1A&sig=ACfU3U3EI7G71PI-tXkDI5tEywxP-Z\\_hA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi-zbTIqOjlAhXRJzQIHRpHAhOQ6AEwAHoECAkQAOQ#v=onepage&q=%22to%20which%20the%20stars%20were%20supposed%20to%20be%20fixed%22%20Gesenius&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=TXZ8MFz6Da0C&pg=PR780&lpg=PR780&dq=%22to+which+the+stars+were+supposed+to+be+fixed%22+Gesenius&source=bl&ots=YXoxn2_d1A&sig=ACfU3U3EI7G71PI-tXkDI5tEywxP-Z_hA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi-zbTIqOjlAhXRJzQIHRpHAhOQ6AEwAHoECAkQAOQ#v=onepage&q=%22to%20which%20the%20stars%20were%20supposed%20to%20be%20fixed%22%20Gesenius&f=false)

מְרִקְיָא m. Gen. 1:6, 7, 8; Psalm 19:2; fully מְרִקְיָא הַשָּׁמַיִם Gen. 1:14, 15, 17, 20, etc. *the firmament of heaven, spread out* like a hemisphere above the earth (from the root מְרִקְיָא), like a splendid and pellucid sapphire (Ex. 24:10, compare Dan. 12:3), to which the stars were supposed to be fixed, and over which the Hebrews believed there was a heavenly ocean (Gen. 1:7; 7:11; Ps. 104:3; 148:4; compare, however, Gen. 2:6). LXX. στερέωμα. Vulg. *firmamentum*. Luth. *ጸፍቱ*.

<sup>15</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, (2008, December 18) The Story Behind The Legend of the Firmament *ScienceAndTheBible.net* website. retrieved from [http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20081218\\_The\\_Legend\\_of\\_the\\_Firmament.pdf](http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20081218_The_Legend_of_the_Firmament.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> Pollack, Gerald H. (2013) *The Fourth Phase of Water*. Ebner and Sons Publishers, Seattle, WA, USA. EBNERANDSONS.COM, ISBN 9780962689543

<sup>17</sup> Bindeman, I. N., Zakharov, D. O., Palandri, J., Greber N. D., Dauphas, N., Retallack, G. J., Hofmann, A., Lackey J. S. & Bekker, A. (2018, May 23) Rapid emergence of subaerial landmasses and onset of a modern hydrologic cycle 2.5 billion years ago. *Nature*. 2018 May;557(7706):545-548. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0131-1. Epub 2018 May 23.

<sup>18</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, (2008, July). *Eyewitness to the Origins, Third Edition, ALL BIBLICAL ORIGIN ACCOUNTS COMBINED, The Chronicle of Existence From Eternity Past to Eternity Future, Scientific Evidence of the Supernatural Authorship of the Bible*, Max B. Frederick, Publishing, Central Point, Oregon, United States of America, July, 2008, <https://www.amazon.com/Max-B-Frederick/e/B0711GC5Y4> p. 41,42

<sup>19</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist. (1996). *Origin of the Continents: An Introduction to the Theory of The Lithologic Cycle*. Max B. Frederick, Publishing, Central Point, Oregon, United States of America, First Edition 1996, Second Edition October, 2006, Third Edition July, 2008, reprinted December, 2014. available from <https://www.amazon.com/Max-B-Frederick/e/B0711GC5Y4>

<sup>20</sup> Rubey, William W. (1951, September 1). Geologic history of sea water: an attempt to state the problem. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 62:1111-1148. or RUBEY W.W., 1975. Geologic history of sea water; an attempt to state the problem. In: Kitano Y., (ed), *Geochemistry of Water*. Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross Inc., Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania. Retrieved from [https://websites.pmc.ucsc.edu/~rcoe/eart206/Rubey\\_HistorySeaWater\\_GSAB51.pdf](https://websites.pmc.ucsc.edu/~rcoe/eart206/Rubey_HistorySeaWater_GSAB51.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> Jan Oort (1950). The structure of the cloud of comets surrounding the Solar System and a hypothesis concerning its origin. *Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of the Netherlands*. **11**: 91–110. Bibcode:1950BAN....11...91O Oort proposed the theory of the Oort Cloud origin of comets

<sup>22</sup> Kuiper, Peter (1951) On the origin of the solar system. *Proc. Natl. A cad. Sci. U.S.A.* 37:1-14. retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1063291/pdf/pnas01562-0011.pdf> Kuiper proposed the theory of the Kuiper belt origin of comets.

- <sup>23</sup> Shiklomanov, I.A., Sokolov, A.A. (1983). Methodological basis of world water balance investigation and computation. In *New approaches in water balance computations*. IAHS Publ. No. 148:77-90.
- <sup>24</sup> Frank, L. A., Sigwarth, J. B. and Craven, J. D. (1986). On the Influx of Small Comets Into the Earth's Upper Atmosphere, II. Interpretation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 13: 307 (April).
- <sup>25</sup> Kerr, R.A. (1988, July 29). Comets were a clerical error. *Science* 29 Jul 1988: Vol. 241, Issue 4865, pp. 532 DOI: 10.1126/science.241.4865.532. <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/241/4865/532.1>
- <sup>26</sup> Kotwicki, Vincent (1991) Water in the Universe, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 36:1, 49-66, DOI: 10.1080/02626669109492484 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02626669109492484>
- <sup>27</sup> Van Andel, T.H. (1995). *New views on an old planet - A history of global change*. Cambridge University Press
- <sup>28</sup> Deming, David, (1999). On the Possible Influence of Extraterrestrial Volatiles on Earth's Climate and the Origin of the Oceans. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* Volume 146, Issues 1-4, 15 February 1999, Pages 33-51.
- <sup>29</sup> Schönbachler, M. et.al (2010, May 14). Heterogeneous Accretion and the Moderately Volatile Element Budget of Earth, *Science* 14 May 2010: Vol. 328, Issue 5980, pp. 884-887. DOI: 10.1126/science.1186239 Retrieved from <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/328/5980/884.full>
- <sup>30</sup> *Water present when Earth was born*. (2010, May 14). <https://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/Water-Isquopresent-when-Earth-was-bornrsquo/article16300696.ece>
- <sup>31</sup> Graham, Steve, et al. (2010, Oct 1) The Water Cycle. [earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/Water/page1.php](http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/Water/page1.php). retrieved November 1, 2019 from <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/Water/page1.php>
- <sup>32</sup> Hartogh, P., Lis, D., Bockelée-Morvan, D. et al. Ocean-like water in the Jupiter-family comet 103P/Hartley 2. *Nature* **478**, 218–220 (2011) doi:10.1038/nature10519 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature10519>
- <sup>33</sup> NASA/JPL (2011, October 5) Space Observatory Provides Clues to Creation of Earth's Oceans. NASA/JPL web site. <https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.php?release=2011-312>
- <sup>34</sup> PhysOrg.com. (2011, October 5). First comet found with ocean-like water: New clues to creation of Earth's oceans. *University of Michigan*. Retrieved from <https://phys.org/news/2011-10-comet-ocean-like.html>
- <sup>35</sup> Van Dishoeck, E. F. et al. (2014 Feb, 25) Water: from clouds to planets. arXiv.org > astro-ph > arXiv:1401.8103. *Astrophysics > Astrophysics of Galaxies*. Cornell University. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.8103>
- <sup>36</sup> Brandon Schmandt, Steven D. Jacobsen, Thorsten W. Becker, Zhenxian Liu, Kenneth G. Dueker. (2014, Jun 13) Dehydration melting at the top of the lower mantle. *Science* 13 Jun 2014: Vol. 344, Issue 6189, pp. 1265-1268 DOI: 10.1126/science.1253358 <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/344/6189/1265.abstract>
- <sup>37</sup> Anthony, Sebastian. (2014, Jun17). Scientists discover an ocean 400 miles beneath our feet that could fill our oceans three times over. *Extremetech web site*, June 17, 2014 at 9:44 am <https://www.extremetech.com/extreme/184564-scientists-discover-an-ocean-400-miles-beneath-our-feet-that-could-fill-our-oceans-three-times-over>
- <sup>38</sup> Sarafian AR, Nielsen SG, Marschall HR, McCubbin FM, Monteleone BD (2014, October 31). Early solar system. Early accretion of water in the inner solar system from a carbonaceous chondrite-like source. *Science*. Vol. 346, Issue 6209, pp. 623-626. [Bibcode:2014Sci...346..623S. doi:10.1126/science.1256717. PMID 25359971](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1256717) .
- <sup>39</sup> Colfield, Celia. (2014, October 30) Earths Water Existed 135 Million Years Earlier than Thought. *Space.com website*. <https://www.space.com/27603-solar-system-water-evidence-for-earth.html> also

<https://sciencesprings.wordpress.com/2014/10/31/from-space-com-earths-water-existed-135-million-years-earlier-than-thought/>

<sup>40</sup> Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. (2014 October, 30) Oceans arrived early to Earth Primitive meteorites were a likely source. *Science Daily*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/10/141030142238.htm>

<sup>41</sup> <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/346/6209/623.editor-summary>

<sup>42</sup> NASA, (2015, April 7). The Solar System and Beyond Is Awash in Water. NASA/JPL-Caltech news release. *NASA web site*, <https://www.nasa.gov/jpl/the-solar-system-and-beyond-is-awash-in-water> also <https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.php?feature=4541>

<sup>43</sup> NASA. (2019?). Ocean Worlds: Water in the Solar System and Beyond. *Ocean Worlds*, [nasa.gov/specials/ocean-worlds/](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/ocean-worlds/), Undated, Retrieved October 19, 2019, from <https://www.nasa.gov/specials/ocean-worlds/>

<sup>44</sup> NASA, (2017, Apr 13) NASA Missions Provide New Insights into 'Ocean Worlds' in Our Solar System. Press release 17-042, *NASA website*, <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-missions-provide-new-insights-into-ocean-worlds-in-our-solar-system>

<sup>45</sup> Choi, C.Q. (2017, October 24). Comets: Facts About The 'Dirty Snowballs' of Space. *Space.com*. *Skywatching* retrieved from <https://www.space.com/53-comets-formation-discovery-and-exploration.html>

<sup>46</sup> NASA. (2017 December 7) Comets. *National Aeronautics and Space Administration* web site, <https://solarsystem.nasa.gov/asteroids-comets-and-meteors/comets/in-depth/>

<sup>47</sup> Wall, Mike. (2018 Sep 13). "Earth's Oceans May Go Back to the Planets Birth." *Space.com* web site, <https://www.space.com/41801-earth-water-primordial-asteroids-comets.html>

<sup>48</sup> Washington University in St. Louis. (2018, Nov 14) Seismic study reveals huge amount of water dragged into Earth's interior. *ScienceDaily* web site, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/11/181114132013.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/11/181114132013.htm)

<sup>49</sup> Lis, D.C. et.al. (2019, May 20) Terrestrial deuterium-to-hydrogen ratio in water in hyperactive comets. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*. Volume 625, May 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935554> also [https://www.aanda.org/articles/aa/full\\_html/2019/05/aa35554-19/aa35554-19.html](https://www.aanda.org/articles/aa/full_html/2019/05/aa35554-19/aa35554-19.html)

<sup>50</sup> NASA/JPL (2019, May 23). Comet Provides New Clues to Origins of Earth's Oceans. <https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.php?feature=7409>

<sup>51</sup> Darek Lis, Dominique Bockelée-Morvan, and Rolf Güsten. (2019, May 23) SOFIA Observations Fuel Debate about the Origin of the Earth's Oceans, *SOFIA (Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy) website*, <https://www.sofia.usra.edu/multimedia/science-results-archive/sofia-observations-fuel-debate-about-origin-earth%E2%80%99s-oceans>

<sup>52</sup> NASA. (2019, October 19). Ocean Worlds. Retrieved October 19, 2019, from <https://www.nasa.gov/specials/ocean-worlds/>

<sup>53</sup> Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, (2014) Glossary: The Technical Meanings of Religious Words. *ScienceAndTheBible.net* website. retrieved from <https://www.scienceandthebible.net/glossary.pdf>