

# Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 3, Number 2

---

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist  
Motto: The Simple Truth  
Date: February 28, 2010  
Issue: Volume 3, Number 2  
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](mailto: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) The Dividing Line
  - 3) Word of the Month: *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

### About This Month's Feature Article:

Last month's feature article was way too long. Anyone who made it all the way through should be awarded a medal for accomplishment.

This week I have decided, on the advice of my wife, to go overboard the other direction. In addition, she said to ask a question and not answer it, rather, beg for feedback from you readers.

So that is where we are.

### On Another Front:

A new feature was introduced last month in the first issue of the new decade. It is a Glossary of Science Related Terms Used in the Bible. In this feature various words that are commonly misunderstood are presented, defined, and discussed.

Be sure to check out the word of the month in the last issue. In case you gave up before you got that far, it is after the long article, near the end of the E-Zine.

---

---

## 2) **The Dividing Line.**

**By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

*One of the most difficult realities for humans to accept is, "I don't know." Not knowing, in the mind of the human, invites invention to fill that void of knowledge. Frequently my wife will ask me a question such as, "Why do you think so and so did such and such...?" Being on guard against this nature of humans to accept almost anything for an explanation in preference to, "I don't know." I frequently answer with the question, "Do you want me to make something up?"*

Where is the dividing line between the realm of science and the realm of religion?

This may seem like a ridiculous question. Science and religion, on first glance, appear to be as different as night and day.

But is there really that much difference?

They both compete to fill the same human need to satisfy curiosity.

But, you say, science fills it with reality and religion fills it with...well, how can we say this delicately, that which is not verifiable.

They both have an uncanny ability to be believable.

Belief is a strange commodity.

The defining line between side 1, belief in reality, and side 2, belief that is just as real, but in something which cannot be positively linked to reality, is difficult to define.

Belief is belief, independent of the validity of that which is believed.

Just because something cannot be positively linked to reality does not mean it is not true, or even that its eventual verification is impossible, or even inevitable.

To many people, belief in reality is the realm of science, and belief in anything that is to be believed by faith is the realm of religion.

Where is the dividing line between science and religion?

Is that defining line to be drawn between the belief in reality versus the belief that is just as real, but is belief in something that cannot be positively linked to reality?

But, that is a shifting line.

Many things once believed only on faith are now verified reality.

Many things once believed to be verified reality, are now falsified. (Falsified is a big word meaning verified to be false.)

So, what are your thoughts on the subject? Is there really a dividing line?

Email your thoughts to [SimpleTruth@anoldscientist.com](mailto:SimpleTruth@anoldscientist.com).

P. S.

There is a new word out there that strikes at the heart of the question.

**Veritology** is the science of methods for proving the validity of knowledge, the science of methods for verifying beliefs as to whether those beliefs are in accord with reality as reality is, or as it is imagined, but not really true.

Veritology is a relatively new word. So far I have been unable to find it used in any publication prior to 2003. I have found one web site, copyrighted in 2003, where it is claimed the author invented the word to describe the study of methods for proving the validity of knowledge, but so far I have been unable to verify that claim.

<http://mysite.verizon.net/markzacharias/Epistemology/Veritology/Literature/MwzLitVrtlgvEpstmlgy.html>

Currently I cannot find the word veritology defined in any dictionary.

However, all that being said, the science of veritology asks the question, Is modern science the only method for proving the validity of knowledge?

Even worse, ask any scientist and he should know that the modern scientific method is not a method for proving the validity of knowledge, it only proves the falsity of invalid knowledge, thus leaving as assumed true, that which cannot be proven to be false.

---

---

### 3) Word of the Month: *Earth*

#### *A Glossary of Science Related Terms Used in the Bible*

*Last month this new feature was added to the Science and the Bible E-Zine. It is a Glossary of Science Related Terms Used in the Bible. In this feature various words that are commonly misunderstood are presented, defined, and discussed.*

*The need for discussion of the meaning of many ancient Hebrew words found in the bible arises from the fact that the Hebrew language fell into disuse and became a dead language for a period of time before it was translated into a newer language. During this period of time, the meanings of many words were lost and are only now coming to light as the original meaning of many science related passages are being verified by modern science.*

**Earth:** Dry land, continents as opposed to oceans,  
commonly misinterpreted to mean the global planet, earth.

In the first verse of the bible, we are introduced to one of the most misunderstood, or should I say most misinterpreted words of the bible when it comes to interpreting

science and the bible.

When we are reading the bible, and we are confronted with the word, *earth*, we tend to visualize the third planet from the sun. This is particularly true when we read the phrase, *In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth*. We visualize the planet as a part of the big picture of the heavens, sometimes called the cosmos.

But the original word in the Hebrew language that is translated *earth* did not mean the planet. It simply meant the dry ground on which stand as opposed to the oceans.

The most popular misinterpretation of this word in this phrase is influenced by the next phrase where it says, *and the earth was without form and void*.

Here we run into a problem. In this first verse of the bible it says God created the *earth*. But in the second verse of the bible, a literal translation says the *earth* was not formed, it did not exist. However, the writer had just said that the *earth* had (already?) been created. And we know of a truth, at least at the time of the original translation we knew it, that the *earth* (dry land, continents) had always existed on the surface of the planet since it was originally created. So, that second verse could not mean what it really said, that the dry land was not formed and did not exist, and that the surface of the waters (ocean) was all there was.

Therefore, it has been commonly assumed (misinterpreted) that the topic at issue in this verse is an early stage of development of the planet earth. In that early stage, this planet was a formless, (shapeless) mass. This has become known as the chaotic mass theory. The chaotic mass theory persists even today and comes to us in the *New Living Translation* of that verse: "*The earth was empty, a formless mass cloaked in darkness. And the Spirit of God was hovering over its surface.*" This translation completely misses the fact that the original word translated *earth* is not the planet, but refers to dry land as opposed to ocean. It ignores the fact that the existence of the opposite, the wet ocean, as a co-feature of the surface of this planet, is implied by that word for dry land. In fact, the actual word meaning ocean, a word which really is in the original language of this verse, is totally missing in this translation. The meaning is changed completely to conform to the chaotic mass theory of misinterpretation of this portion of the bible.

However, a careful study of all the creation accounts of the bible reveals the correct topic of this verse. In the bible are nearly three dozen major accounts of creation. No less than fifteen give information concerning the chronology of origin events. The topic of this verse is found in no less than eight of those detailed accounts. In fact, the first two verses of the bible appear to be a condensed version of the same information contained in one of the creation accounts found in the older book of Job. The older version, found in the book of Job, actually contains all the points of detail found here, plus additional information that makes it certain what the topic of this account is. The correct interpretation is, that this verse is referring to the non-existence of dry ground before the emergence of the continents. The first two verses of the bible are an introduction to the description in the following few verses describing the origin of the atmosphere, the filling of the ocean, and the eventual emergence of the continents to make the surface of this planet complete, ready to support life, having the essentials: atmosphere, wet ocean and dry ground.

Not only that, that assumed truth, that the continents existed from the beginning of the planet, is not only the basis for the misinterpretation, but is also one of those items mentioned in *The Dividing Line* article above, that eventually and inevitably became falsified. Modern science has verified the opposite. Modern science has come to the conclusion that at one point in the development of this planet, the surface was completely covered with ocean, the continents were not yet formed, no dry land existed. That is exactly what that verse was originally trying to say, but the original translators assumed to know the opposite. (So, how did the bible know the truth, when humans knew the opposite? That is a question for the science of veritology.)

Anyway, it gets worse. The other day I was listening to a debate on the radio between a respected old earth creationist, and an atheist. The creationist was listing items in the realm of science that the bible got right before modern science discovered the truth. The creationist mentioned the verse that refers to the circle of the *earth*, explaining that the word circle could carry the meaning sphere, and it was written when humans thought the [planet] earth was flat. The atheist quickly corrected the creationist. That verse was not referring to the planet. It was referring to the dry ground on which the observer was standing, and the circle was the panoramic view as one turns in a circle, observing all around. Besides that, the myth that before a few hundred years ago everyone thought the earth was flat is just that, a myth. That belief was held only by an insignificantly small number of people. Even the ancient Greeks knew the planet earth was a sphere, and had a pretty good estimate of the actual size of the planet earth.

Then, in another case, the case of the excommunication of Galileo for teaching the truth—at that time it was called teaching heresy—Galileo was convicted using the same misinterpretation of that same word, *earth*. Galileo taught that the planet *earth* moved in orbit... The known truth at that time in history was that the *earth* could not move. The bible said so. Actually, what the bible really said was that the *earth* (dry land, continents), once it had emerged from below sea level, would not again be removed, (sink again to be below sea level). A new equilibrium had been established.

Incidentally, this is another biblical mention of the same topic of the planet, at one time, being entirely covered with water and then the dry land (continents) rising from below the surface. This event was a big deal in the development of the ecology of today, and therefore is one of the most mentioned in the biblical accounts of the origins. (This same event is also a big deal in modern science. It is the dividing point between the two major sources of information concerning the origins. Those two sources are the cosmos, and the geologic column. This event is at the base of the geologic column.)

Of course, this was one of those truths in the more ancient scripture that was considered to be on the wrong side of the dividing line and was considered to be without verification, so was to be accepted on faith only. Since it conflicted with the then, politically correct known truth that was considered to be on the verified side of the dividing line, it was ignored in favor of the politically correct misinterpretation. But modern science has straightened it all out, and the original ancient scripture meaning was correct all along.

So, when you see the *earth* mentioned in the bible, do not immediately assume it is talking about the third planet from the sun. Check the context. You may even have to go to the context in the original language.

---

---

#### **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.

In the future you should be on this list only if you signed up for it. As soon as I get it automated, there will be a place to sign up for the e-zine on my web site at <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>

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](mailto: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. 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](http://www.scienceandthebible.net) © 2010