

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 4, Number 6

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: June 30, 2011
Issue: Volume 4, 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) In the Image of God.
 - 3) Reprint Rights.
 - 4) Sign up for this E-zine.
-

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

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

June has been a full month. In addition to being out of town for three weeks since writing the May E-Zine, a reader sent me an email with a challenge to refute some of the work of scholars who are antagonistic to the validity of the bible.

It seems that in the 1800's scholars of the "Higher Criticism" determined that internal textual evidence indicated multiple authors for the book of Genesis. Based on that evidence, and other assumptions, an alternate explanation of the origin of the bible was devised. The new theory proposed that Moses did not write the book of Genesis, that the book of Genesis was a fraud, written by multiple theologians much later in time than was assumed to be the time of Moses. From that basic alternative theory, it has grown into a conspiracy theory.

Since that time, critics antagonistic to the authenticity of the bible have grown to accept that alternate explanation to be the true history of the bible. During that time, those same critics have accused pro-bible archaeologists of being guilty of trying to

fit the facts into their own preconceived theoretical framework. At the same time, the best evidence for the theorists alternate explanation is the lack of evidence. As one writing put it, “Moreover, by the 1970s and 1980s a good deal of countervailing evidence—or, rather, lack of evidence—was beginning to accumulate.” Lets see now, zero plus zero, plus zero, = a lot ...? How does the accumulation of a greater mass of lack of evidence for any explanation increase the support for the validity of an alternate explanation? ...Especially when those assembling the evidence are guilty of what they accuse their opponents, of trying to fit the facts into their own preconceived theoretical framework?

This has grown into the ultimate religious conspiracy theory. It has all the characteristic features of the present day myriad of conspiracy theories. It is based on a fervent desire for an explanation contrary to the politically correct line we are being fed, mistrust of authorities in charge, perceived evil motivation of political or religious leaders, creative re-interpretation of meager evidence, lack of evidence to the contrary, and exploitation of imaginative evidence that does not exist. This conspiracy theory results in ancient religious leaders inventing the religion that is most effective in the world at pre-recording the future discoveries of modern science. And it was supposed to be simply for the purpose of, to either gain or retain control of the masses?

In the meantime, pro-bible scholars have clung to the politically correct explanation based on the fact that the first five books of the bible are traditionally called “The Books of Moses,” interpreting that to mean Moses actually wrote them.

A significant question then arises, if creative intelligent human religious leaders invented a false religion back in a time that the conspiracy theory says they did, how did they include accurate chronology and details of the early development of the universe, earth, and ecology of life on earth? How did they include accurate chronology and details that were not a part of the information base of humans until recently discovered by modern science? It has been demonstrated that human invention of such accurate information without a-priori information is impossible—in fact, even when in possession of completely accurate information, the demonstrated result of the effect of intelligent humans have been to deteriorate the accuracy and coherence of such information until it is unrecognizable. For an example, see, “The Story Behind The Legend of the Firmament”

<http://www.scienceandthebible.info/reports/art1216firmamentlegend.pdf>

Both sides of the raging debate have overlooked the obvious alternative explanation. A non-conspiracy theoretical explanation of what really happened would be:

Moses, according to the bible, was educated in the palace of the Pharaoh of Egypt at the height of the center of learning at the time. Narrative writing was well established at that time, so there had to have been many accounts of former times available to Moses. Since the book of Genesis is an accumulation of history prior to the escape from Egypt—much of it having already occurred before the lifetime of Moses—it obviously would have been more likely an accumulation of writings from prior, not later, authors. The alternate explanation is that, of course, Moses did not write the Book of Genesis, rather Moses edited former writings into a comprehensive

condensed history.

This obvious second alternate explanation has plenty of positive evidence to support it. If any prior existing writing could be found that is actually found to be included in an edited version within the book of Genesis, that would be positive evidence of this second alternate explanation.

That positive evidence just happens to exist. The only book of the bible that is obviously written before the book of Genesis is the book of Job. It so happens that the first two verses of the book of Genesis are in fact an edited version of a creation account found in the Book of Job. In fact, more details are found in the original version than in the edited version. These additional details of that earlier history are valid according to modern science, indicating prior knowledge was greater than was recorded in the edited version, indicating the Genesis account was in fact, a condensed, edited version of an earlier recorded account. Also, that superior amount of information in the original sheds light on the proper interpretation of the edited Genesis version. (All this is recorded in my book, "*Eyewitness to the Origins*," page 282ff, available to be ordered at bookstores or on the internet. See www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com.)

Moreover, a thorough study of all the major accounts of creation found in the bible—and there are about two dozen of them, not just one up front—reveals a comprehension of the actual chronology of events along with a myriad of accurate details that were not discovered by modern science until recent times. Amazingly, the second creation account in the book of Genesis, the one following the first two verses in the book of Genesis contain the same correct chronology that is common to all the creation accounts of the bible. However, this true common chronology is overshadowed by a six day fictitious chronology obviously edited by Moses into that previously existing account, making it into an illustration of the fourth commandment, similar to the principle of the parables of Jesus where literal, yet fictitious events were used to illustrate an unrelated point. In this case, the unrelated point of the six day creation and seventh day of rest was the principle of six days of labor and seventh day of rest found in the fourth of the ten commandments that had been just recently received by Moses on Mt. Sinai.

Ironically, the religious debate over the age of the earth, has centered around whether or not the word "day" is *literal* or *figurative* where it should be over whether or not it is *true* or *fictitious* as in a parable. Of course, it is literal, just as literal as the seed and the soil in the fictitious parable of the sower and the seed. It is the underlying chronology that is common to all the other biblical creation accounts that is true. But, alas, theologians have ignored the true chronology in all the other accounts.

And so it goes, a study of the many and various accounts of creation found in the bible reveals comprehension of the true chronology of beginning events occurring before there were any humans there to witness such things. And such comprehension, even though recorded in the ancient writings of the scriptures of the bible, was lost as time went on so that it had to be re-discovered by modern science to verify the authenticity of the original version of the biblical writings.

Thus the positive evidence—not the negative lack of evidence—appears to

overwhelmingly indicate the second alternative explanation, not the conspiracy theory proposed by anti-bible scholars, is more likely the true explanation.

2) In the Image of God.

In The Image of God

By **Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist**

“And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his [own] image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” Gen 1:26,27 (KJV)

Warning: What you are about to read is not the doctrine of any established religion. The following is based on the reality of what the ancient scripture of the bible actually says rather than any religious interpretation.

The image of God is an enigma.

One thing most theologians will readily admit is, we really do not understand all there is to know about God.

In the realm of religion, there is a major problem. Critics look at a traditional religious model of God as put forth by theologians, and then argue that the God of the bible cannot exist as a God, because that *model* is incompatible with reality. These critics do not realize the God of the theologians and the God of the bible are distinctly different concepts.

It might help to limit the definition of God to what the bible actually says.

For centuries theologians have debated the image of God.

This article is not intended to answer all the questions as to the Image of God, but is intended to make theologians re-think what they think they know about the nature of God. As I read the word, it seems God does a lot of things that look stupid to people who wear the title theologian, so theologians who want their God to look good, fudge the translation to give the false impression that their idea of God is the real God.

But in the end, the theologians are the ones with egg on their faces. Sadly, many of the traditional religious definitions of the nature of God are used by critics to come to the logical conclusion that such a God cannot exist. At least It (God) cannot exist as defined by theologians. A careful study of the ancient scripture reveals the fact that much of what the original ancient scripture says reveals the ignorance of many theologians.

As it turns out, reality and the ancient scriptures are more in accord with each other

than is the accord of the religious explanations of theologians with either reality or ancient scripture. Religion appear to have departed both reality and scripture.

Therefore, it is fruitless and futile to argue the various points of religion. Rather, it is more profitable to search the ancient scripture and compare that with reality.

With that said, the following question bears further investigation.

Just what is meant by “The Image of God?”

Theologians seem to be hung up on the meaning of the English word “image” as having to do with physical appearance.

But then when they look at the physical appearance of the “image” of a human, they realize that is not what they imagine God is considered to be like.

So, they have to make up an interpretation that rationalizes away the dilemma.

Then, what is this “image” of God to which humans are supposed to have a similitude?

Is it possible that the answer may be found in the ancient scriptures?

Not if you must meet all the requirements of traditional religious thought according to scholarly theologians. That is why many theologians, when asked where you find the “Trinity” in the bible, are forced to say the trinity is not to be found in any single verse of the bible. (Read further and you will find that it really is. Theologians just do not recognize it, because of the non-biblical way they have defined it.)

When a scientist versed in the science of information recognition takes a fresh look at the ancient scriptures, a completely different point of view is revealed.

Ignoring traditional religious interpretation, such a scientist looking at the ancient scriptures sees information theologians have either never recognized, or long ignored.

If you will notice, that biblical statement quoted above, at the beginning of this article, has a reduplication of the concept “image” in the next phrase, referring to the same concept as “likeness” rather than “image”.

Referring to the original language the word translated “image” comes from the root meaning of shadow. And the word translated, “likeness” comes from the root meaning of resemblance, or to imagine in one’s mind.

Could it be that, the meaning common to both words that are translated into “image” and “likeness” has nothing to do with physical appearance, rather similitude of nature?

Also, if you will notice, whatever that nature is, it has the power to have dominion over physical items, to have the ability/power to have physical control over the ecology.

Further research into the ancient scriptures reveals a single verse that contains three aspects of the nature of God that are also present in humans. This single verse is so important that it is repeated in two places in the ancient scripture.

Those three aspects of God are referred to as: *Power, Intelligence, and Wisdom.*

(As we will see, as this article develops, those three aspects have been anthropomorphized into the “Father,” the “Son,” and the “Holy Spirit.”)

Why is it that theologians have not recognized this when it is obvious to the point of view of a scientist steeped in the science of information recognition? Possibly it is the blinding by traditional religious doctrine taking precedence over actual statements found in the ancient scripture. Possibly it is by design as God set up the great scientific double-blind test as described in my book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*. But that is getting off the subject of this article. (www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com.)

Back to the subject of this article. There are three features that the ancient scripture attributes to God. Just what are they? Just what is this image/likeness of God?

As it turns out, these three aspects/features define what we recognize as intelligent life. In our search for extraterrestrial life that is similar to ourselves, we are looking for something with *intelligence*—the ability to be self aware, to recognize and understand information, something with *wisdom*—the ability to make prudent use of such understood information, and with the *power* to make physical differences by the application of such intelligence and wisdom.

That is quite a mouthful

Foremost of these three is Power. The basic concept here called power is in fact, the ability to control physical matter—as in the bible verse quoted, the example given is to have dominion(power) over the ecology. In the ancient Hebrew language the words used to express this concept are, *'el, koach*, and etc. Various translated, *strength, power, might, force, ability*, etc. The plural of *'el, 'elohiyim*, (powers) is variously translated as ruler, judge, or God, as in one having powers. Note, this plural *'elohiyim* form is the most used name for God (the Father.) thus describing God as the “Powers”.

The second is *Intelligence*. The basic concept here is to understand information—to not only recognize knowledge, but to make sense of the knowledge., (the ancient Greek word for it is *Logos*, from which we get the concept of logic, and which we typically translate into the English word, “Word.” In the ancient Hebrew it is variously, *Tabuwn*, (from the root, *biyn.*), *shama`*, *yada`*, etc. and is variously translated understanding, intelligence, or discretion.

Third is the concept of *Wisdom*. In the ancient Hebrew language this concept is typically expressed by the word *Chokmah* and when imparted to one by God is referred to as the *Ruach* of *Chokmah* or in the Greek it is *Pneuma* of *Sophia* or as translated into English, the Spirit of Wisdom. According to traditional theology, this is the third person of the triune God, coequal, coeternal with the Father and the Son, and is referred to as the “Holy Spirit” which imparts wisdom to those who possess this “Holy Spirit.”

Thus, all three aspects of the image of God, the nature of God, (the Trinity according to theology) are expressed in the single verse in Jeremiah 10:12 and repeated again in Jeremiah 51:15 where the creation of the universe is described as being the product of all three aspects of God:

“He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.” Jer 10:12.

“He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heaven by his understanding.” Jer 51:15.

The Anthropomorphic Image of God: The Trinity

Could it be that the religious doctrine of the Holy Trinity is an anthropomorphism of the three aspects of the nature (or image) of God as actually presented in the bible?

The Father:

I haven't spent much effort to study the anthropomorphism of Elohiym to Heavenly Father. It seems obvious that the Father (with a capital 'F') as referred to in the New Testament (286 times in KJV) is in reference to the God/LORD (Elohiym/ Yēhovah) of the Old Testament by the context found around that multitude of times it is used. Speculation says it is because “Father” concept carries with it the concept of “originator.” In any case, it is obviously the anthropomorphism of the concept of the Elohiym name for God carrying the meanings of *strength, power, might, force, ability*, into the Father concept of what theology refers to as the first person of the Trinity.

The Son:

The ancient scripture of the bible explicitly states that the intelligence aspect of the nature (image) of God became Jesus in the flesh. “In the beginning was the word (*Logos/intelligence*) and the word (*intelligence*) was with God, and the word (*intelligence*) was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him (*intelligence*) and without Him (*intelligence*); was not anything made that was made....And the word (*intelligence*) was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,)...” Jn 1.

The Holy Spirit:

In both the Hebrew language of the Old Testament and the Greek language of the New Testament, there is a word that represents a single concept that theologians have been taught is a single word with two distinctly different meanings. In both cases, that single word does not a dual meaning. Rather it expresses the single meaning of “*invisible power/force/energy*.” In the Hebrew language that word is *ruach*. In the Greek Language, that word is *pneuma*. As I said, it is not a word with a dual meaning, rather a single concept that has multiple applications. It is equally used in reference to the invisible power of the wind or of the invisible force that influences humans to make prudent decisions (wisdom) In both languages, it is overtly referred to in both the Old and New Testaments as the “*spirit of wisdom*” when it refers to the filling of an individual human with the drive to make prudent decisions.

In the narrative of the exchange between Jesus and a teacher of the Jews (Nicodemus) the teacher is criticized for not understanding these things, that for the human to be complete—to be endowed with eternal life, the higher birth, where one is born of this invisible force, must have occurred. Jesus explained that just as the invisible force (sometimes translated wind, sometimes spirit) moves without being seen, so does the

one who is born of this invisible force, but in both cases, one can see the result of it.

This concept of “invisible force” is not a dual meaning word, but a single concept that includes the invisible power of the wind or of the invisible force that imparts wisdom. Today, if these languages were still the prevailing mode of communication, that concept would also include such invisible power/energy/force/influence as electricity or magnetism.

The creation account found in Proverbs 8 is a depiction of that invisible force claiming to be present and taking part in the creation events. That invisible force is named Wisdom. “I wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions... The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.... Then I was by him, [as] one brought up [with him]: and I was daily [his] delight, rejoicing always before him...”

The granting of Super Powers to the Anthropomorphic Image of God:

Could it be that omnipotence, omniscience, and other omni’s attached to the Judeo Christian God are, in general, logical extensions of religious tradition to make the God of the bible fit the religious superpower of what humans think God should be?

According to the ancient scriptures of the bible, the more accurate description of the physical being of the God of the bible is some form of the overall concept of energies/powers/forces, possessing the attributes of intelligence and wisdom, and existing without the necessity of and transcendental to that stuff called *matter*. Whatever It is, It claims to have existed before, and to have caused to come into existence, mater in the form of the universe.

Modern theology has devised the doctrine of creation ex-nihilo, the creation of something from nothing. However, the ancient scripture explicitly states It (God) made light out of darkness, not out of nothing. Is this not far from the speculation of modern science that the current observable universe came into existence from darkness, from a black hole, not from “nothing”? In any event, this example demonstrates the difference between what the ancient scripture actually says and the logical extensions from that into the human concept of a supernatural God.

So, What is the Image of God in Which Humans are Made?

If the “image of God” is not the traditional theological anthropomorphic contortions of what the bible says then, just what is that image? Could it be that the physical human body is not that which is made in the image of God, rather that human image is the non-material human aspects of (1.) *Power*—the ability to control the physical environment, (2.) *Intelligence*—the recognition of self awareness and the ability to understand knowledge and, (3.) *Wisdom*—the prudent use of that understood information, imparted by the indwelling of the Holy invisible power?

If so, could it be these features are not necessarily connected to physical matter? Could it be, the concept that is referred to in science fiction as “life force” is, in fact, some form of the only thing defined by modern science as eternal—some form of energy possessing these three attributes? (Law of conservation of energy states

energy can be neither created nor destroyed—in other words, energy is eternal.) Is it not then reasonable that there could be continuation of this combination of aspects of the human existence once this mortal body ceases to function? If that is what the Image of God is, then could not that same image in which humans are made, have the same continuation of existence after this mortal life is over? But then, now I am guilty of speculating beyond what is explicitly stated in the bible.

Therefore, in Conclusion, What is the answer?

As Ayn Rand so famously said “Contradictions do not exist. Whenever you think you are facing a contradiction, check your premises. You will find that one of them is wrong.”

Could it be that the problem that makes the bible look in conflict to what God is assumed to be, is in the traditional premises of what God is?

Check your concept of God against what the bible says rather than the concept of God that is traditionally speculated by human theologians.

This opens up a whole Pandora’s box of questions as to the validity of logic that purports to disprove the bible, or rather, to disprove the ancient scriptures on which the bible has been derived. Does disproving imaginative interpretations of the ancient scripture disprove the ancient scripture itself? I don’t think so.

Could it be that the God of the bible is more interested in meaningful communicating with another form of intelligent life than It is in being always right, all knowing, all powerful, all present, all religious, all what-not...? Could it be that the striving for a future Bride of Christ is the culmination of that long awaited goal of the God of the bible??

Could there really be such a thing as life after death?

Remember the warning at the beginning of this article. This is not the accepted doctrine of any established religion. It is simply an organized collection of notes of research that is partial and on-going. It is published here to get you to thinking for yourself.

And the “Image of God” is still an enigma.

3) 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.”

4) 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, 2011. 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 © 2011
