

Glossary

The Technical Meanings of Religious Words

February 12, 2020 Version This is a Work in Progress

By

Max B. Frederick

An Old Scientist

“Ideas without precedent are generally looked upon with disfavor and men are shocked if their conceptions of an orderly world are challenged.”

J. Harlen Bretz, 1928

“If there is a good, all-knowing and all-powerful God, and if this God is the architect, builder, and sustainer of all nature, and if the Bible is the inspired word of this God, then what the Bible has to say about nature must be consistent with what we observe in nature.” Nobie H Stone¹

Not all of the bible is about religious stuff. Some of it is highly technical and when translated with that in mind, is more consistent within various biblical accounts of the same thing, and more in accord with reality as confirmed by modern science.

Discovering the correct technical meanings of words in the technical portions of the bible reveals the bible is more in accord with reality than heretofore realized.

One of the secrets of reviving an ancient language is the recovery of the true meanings of the original language words. The scientific method is appropriate to this process. That is, discover the topic of the context, guess at the meaning of the word from the context, try that meaning in all the other instances of its use, If it does not fit well, repeat from the context of all the other instances of its use, repeat until all possible meanings are exhausted, be open to discovery of new context from using this process on the other words in the context.

The problem has been that even the technical information in the bible has been religiousized by interpreting it to have religious rather than technical meaning. Many times this is because the context has been assumed to be religious stuff rather than its true context of technical stuff. Often, once the context is realized to be technical, the true technical meaning becomes obvious.

If the bible is credible in areas related to science that can be verified,
What, then do you do with what the bible says about eternal life?

Copyright ©, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 Max B. Frederick.

All rights reserved including the rights of reproduction or transmission in any form. May not be physically kept on any web site without the express written permission of Max B. Frederick, 146 Laurel St., Central Point, OR 97502 email: simpletruth@AnOldScientist.com This work or any part thereof must not be reprinted in any form nor reproduced by any means without written permission of the publisher except for the use of brief quotations in a book review or scholarly journal.

¹ Genesis 1 And Lessons From Space, by Nobie Stone, Vienna, WV, The Warren Christian Apologetics Center, 2014, 160 pp. ISBN: 978-1936548-10-1, \$19.99

Note: This is an incomplete work in progress and is therefore put here instead of in the books that refer to it so it can be continuously updated rather than delay publication of the books. And by no means is it claimed that the stuff here is perfect. It needs much more work. Currently it is a collection of writings and notes gathered from my prior works. Hopefully it will grow into a more systematic glossary.

Table of Contents

Introduction:	3
Abiogenesis: the process of life arising from non-living matter	8
Adam: Transliteration of the plural of a word meaning “reddish”--Ruddy Ones	8
Again (born again): Greek word <i>anōthen</i>: Extra-Terrestrial, antonym of earthly/terrestrial.	9
Angels: Messengers (transporters), courier/carriers of...	9
Attributes of God: Power, Intelligence, Wisdom	9
Biblical Account of Creation: One of many biblical technical accounts of the beginnings	9
Biogenesis: the process of life forms producing other life forms	9
Chambers of the South: The planets of the Solar System	9
Cherubim: A transliteration of word with a lost meaning which is found in the context.	9
Comprehended: A mistranslation of “held back, or restrained by force”	10
Cosmos: See...<i>Heavens</i>	11
Creation (of life): some form of intelligence setting up the conditions for abiogenesis to occur. ..	11
Creator of the Universe:	11
Day: The word “Day” in Genesis 1 obviously means	11
Darkness: Sometimes refers not to nothingness, but to something that can hold back light	11
Deep: Ocean, Oceans, Sea, Seas	12
Divided: Division and Production	12
Earth, Hebrew: <i>'erets</i>: continental dry land versus the ocean	13
East, Ancient Past: Toward or Beyond the Rising Sun	15
Elohiym: a plural word meaning overall inclusive concept of Power, Energy, Force, Strength .	15
Evolution: Latest failed theory of Spontaneous Generation	17
Extra-Terrestrial (life, intelligence): Some form of non-earthbound intelligent life	18
Face: the allaround	18
Firmament: A legendary fictional crystalline sphere encircling the planet earth	18
Form, Formation: To take shape, become useful, after being unformed or void (useless)	18
Foundation of the Earth: “<i>Foundation of the Earth</i>”	18
Geologic Column & Cosmos: Sources of Pre-historic info	22
God: The English word “God” fails to reflect the Hebrew	23
Heavens: that which is above	23
Hiss, Hisser: A practitioner of the occult, a serpent, or the metal bronze.	24
Intelligence: See Word, Logos	25
Isostacy: Balance of mass between mountains and valleys	25
Logos: Logic/intelligence-Understanding	25
Lord God: See <i>Yēhovah</i> and <i>'elohiym</i>:	26
Mechanism:	26
Modern Science: See Science	26
Pillars: See Foundation of the Earth	26
Pneuma: Invisible Force as in the Wind or Spirit—see <i>Ruach</i>	26
Power/energy – see Elohiym	26
Punctuated Equilibrium	26

Ruach: Invisible Force as in the Wind or Spirit	26
Said: “And God Said...”: Does not refer to the sounds of words, rather, the meanings	27
Science: The Realm of technology—The Method of study—God’s Favorite Subject	27
Spirit/Wind: Invisible Force – See Pneuma	29
Spontaneous Generation: See Evolution	29
Theobabble: Religious sounding irrational, excessive, or foolish; chatter or prattle	29
Universe: Heavens (cosmos), Earth (continents), and Sea	30
Void: virtually non-existent, as in “...without form and void.”	30
Wind/Spirit: Invisible Force – See Pneuma	30
Wing, Wings	30
Wisdom: The prudent use of information as in engineering.	31
Word/Said:	31
Yĕhovah and 'elohiym: The technical meanings of the names of God, “eternal and powers”	31
Appendix A:	32
Traditional Religious Meanings vs. the Technical Meaning for the Ancient Words	32
Appendix B:	36
An Example of the Search for the Technical Meaning of a Religious Word:	36

Note: H##### or G##### refers to Strong’s Word Numbers in the original Hebrew or Greek languages.

Introduction:

This Glossary/Lexicon has been a long time in the development. It is the product of thousands of hours of studying science and the bible. Some of the entries are from the third edition of the book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*, published in 2008, after over fifteen thousand hours of study, the equivalent of about seven and a half years of full time scientific research work. And that was several years ago. Many of the entries in this Glossary/Lexicon were published in the periodical, *Science and the Bible Ezine* during the years 2008 - 2012. Those are the result of recognizing the discrepancy between the religious interpretation of the ancient languages of the bible, and the vast display of reality found therein. Comparing the reality of factual discoveries of modern science and how those words were actually used in those ancient writings of the bible sheds new light on the meanings of many words—meanings that had been lost to, or obscured by, religious interpretation.²

The first rule of biblical interpretation: Words have meaning:

If you want to know what the bible really has to say on any particular subject, you first have to know the meanings of words related to that subject—not the English words, but the original words in the original language before they are translated.

If you want to know what the bible has to say on any technical subject such as the origin of the universe, you have to figure out what the words mean in the technical realm rather than the religious realm.

The original technical meanings of many ancient Hebrew words of the ancient Hebrew Scriptures are far from the meanings we find in our English translations of today.

Some words have had their meaning completely lost—what we see in the bible is the best guess of religious scholars.

Many words have not completely lost their meanings, but are only translated with a religious bias.

² See Ezine January 2010 about how ancient information traveled through time to arrive where it is today.

Others have not been translated from the original language at all. They have simply been re-written with English letters to sound similar to the original language word. This is called transliteration as opposed to translation. Although the word transliterate is assumed to have been invented only as recent as 1861 by German philologist Max Muller, the practice of transliteration was in widespread use long before

Some words were transliterated, not because we do not know their original meanings, but politically correctness among religious circles dictated their strict meaning to be unacceptable, so they were only transliterated.

Others, such as the names of people or places, were transliterated to preserve the sound of the names rather than their meanings. One example of this is the name of one of King David's mighty warriors called "Snorter." It is not translated; rather it is transliterated into "Naharai."

Other words are translated beyond their meanings to a more specific or limited meaning than the original language word. Many words have a broad meaning such as the ancient Hebrew word *ruach*. It means "invisible force, power or energy." However, it is never translated as such, rather, religious theologians decide from the context which invisible force it is talking about and translate it either wind, or spirit, the invisible mover around us, or the one within us. Thus, *ruach* is commonly perceived as a word with two separate meanings rather than the one. However, if we were still speaking ancient Hebrew, electricity, magnetism, etcetera would also be called *ruach*. The Greek equivalent word is *pneuma*, from which we get the modern English word "pneumatic" when referring to the energy that drives some power tools. For more on limited meaning, see "Language," and "Hermeneutics" under the entry for "Foundations of the earth."

These are but a few of the reasons why there is a need for this glossary of the technical meanings of religious words. Discovering the original technical meanings allows a technically correct translation rather than a religiously correct rendition. This allows the bible to be translated more in accord with reality, and to have more internal agreement with itself, especially among the many creation accounts found in the bible.

The persistent problem is, the bible is assumed to be about religion, not about technical reality. Technology and reality are assumed to be in the realm of science. There is a saying that is popularly being passed around that says something like, "The bible is not a science book, but where it touches on science it is right." That statement is very misleading. That statement is used to dismiss the subject of science and to ignore the questioning of intellectually honest doubters.

The topic of the ultimate origins—the creation-evolution debate—is where the bible not only touches on a subject that is in the realm of science, It delves into it deeply. The bible has a lot more technical stuff to say on that topic than most theologians ever dreamed. In the bible there are nearly three dozen major accounts of creation, and many more minor ones. In those biblical creation accounts are found many highly technical details (although obscured by religiousization) including some that were not even yet discovered by modern science when their recognition in the biblical accounts was first published³ That biblical publication thus actually predicted later discovery by modern science.

Yet, what you hear theologians agreeing upon (the religious method of science by consensus) as to what it says on the subject of the origins, is so far from what it really says that their traditional interpretation of the technical stuff up front in the first book in the bible has become known as "the Judeo-Christian Creation Myth" and intellectually honest scholars have relegated it to the status of

³ 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
Also published on Science and the Bible.net website, http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20180817_Modern_Science_Discovery_Predicted_by_Ancient_Religious_Literature.pdf ,

myth along with the creation myths of other religions. Then the argument arises, If you cannot believe the first thing the bible says, how can you believe the rest of the bible?

And that has been a major stumbling block to intelligently honest scholars, including our children who have been brought up in the church and then go to college and learn it is not true.

The problem is, most of what the bible really says in the realm of technical stuff about the beginnings, is ignored. It is ignored for several reasons. In no particular order those reasons are:

The people doing the biblical interpretation are theologians, not scientists and they do not recognize scientific principles when they see them—they do not even know the technical meanings of the words in the original language.

Theologians are inclined to believe that there is only one account of the origins in the bible. In fact, there are many—almost three dozen of them are major accounts, backed up by many more minor mentions of it.

Most of those accounts are ignored because those biblical accounts do not agree with theologian's pre-conceived idea of what should be said on that topic. And there is where the pre-conception includes what is known as the Judeo-Christian Creation Myth rather than what the rest of the bible actually has to say on the subject.

Theologians have adopted the politically correct stance that their interpretation of the one out of many accounts, their interpretation that disagrees with all the others, is the “official” schedule of creation. More on that elsewhere in my books.

Many of the things the ancient scriptures of the bible has to say has been unbelievable to theologians because the reality of it had not been discovered by modern science. In many cases it can be demonstrated that since they could not believe what it really says, they simply fudge the translation (interpret it) to agree with reality as they saw it at the time of translation—or at the time they practiced science by consensus as in the trial of Galileo for which they had to issue a formal apology some three hundred fifty years later.

But the big reason is, words really do have meaning, and many of the words mean something theologians are not familiar with. In the original language they have technical meanings that have been ignored. Those technical meanings have been either not recognized, or simply ignored, in favor of religious meanings. **It is the technical meaning of each word that this Glossary is all about.**

If you want to understand what the bible has to say about technical stuff, about things that are in the realm of science, to be sure of what it says, you must apply the scientific method rather than the religious method. The scientific method is to state what it might say, then test that hypothesis against reality. The religious method is to say what you think it might say then get the same opinion of someone with more credentials than yourself. Science by consensus or science by political correctness is examples of the religious method.⁴

Language:

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

The Hebrew language has peculiarities of which it is helpful to recognize. Many nouns in the Hebrew language are derived using a different philosophy than in the English language. Many nouns are derived from the function of that which is named rather than derived from the physical features of it. The word selected for a bird may literally mean, “a flyer.” As such, it could also include a flying

⁴ There is more to it than that and a treatise on the two methods can be found in the book, *Eyewitness to the Origins...*

mammal such as a bat or a flying reptile. The word used for a pencil may mean that with which you put words on paper or record thoughts. As such a concept, it could also include a pen or typewriter. In English, a bird cannot be a mammal or a reptile because that is outside the definition. In English, the word for a pencil cannot include a typewriter because in English, a pencil is named for its physical features rather than for its function.

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

The Greek language also has a different philosophy for forming nouns. It is more like the English language; the Greek may find a word that describes the physical form that is to be named. A pencil may be named with a word that describes a thin hollow piece of wood with a graphite core, independent of whether it was to be used for writing or for punching holes in something. In so naming a pencil, the same name could not be used to describe a pen or a typewriter. Understanding the philosophy of how words are formed in a language gives greater understanding of what the original author is trying to communicate, especially when he is trying to communicate a scientific concept that has not yet been discovered nor defined, and there is no specific word for that concept.

Reviving an Ancient Language:

Reviving an ancient language that has gone through long periods of not being used is an art. The meanings of many words have been lost. The good part of it is, when a language is not being used, the meanings of words do not change.

The need for discussing the meanings of ancient Hebrew words found in the bible arises from the fact that the Hebrew language fell into disuse upon the era of the Babylon Captivity. Hebrew then became a dead language and remained so for many centuries. During this era, the original meanings of many words became lost.

At first thought this may appear to be something bad, but in the long run, this has served to keep the meanings of ancient Hebrew words constant over thousands of years where a living language is constantly changing and if it had not become a dead language, the ancient meanings might have been even more lost.

This loss of meanings occurred long before the Old Testament began to be translated into the new universal language of Greek at the legendary *Library of Science*, at Alexandria around 250 BC. In that translation process, the original meaning of some words is not reflected in the translation, especially in the translation of science related passages where the world view of the scholars at that library of science had influence over the interpretations.

Some theologians teach that God guided the translation such that it accurately reveals what God wants it to say, especially in the realm of the primary purpose for the biblical teachings. In deference to that teaching, the possibility remains that some of the meanings of some of the scientific related words were intentionally obscured in this process for the future revelation that the original ancient scripture pre-published many of the factual discoveries of modern science. In fact, using the modern computerized tools of scholarship has enabled the recovery of some of those original meanings. And they verify the fact that there was ancient knowledge of many concepts that are currently assumed to be knowable only by the processes of modern science.

Understanding Ancient Language.

April, 2010

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

In many cases, a concept in one language is not directly equivalent to a concept in another language. It is not simply a matter of using different words to describe the same concept. The concept itself is not the same.

Translation from one language to another is not a matter of finding the correct wording in one language to express a concept recorded in another. To adequately communicate in one language what is recorded in another language, it is necessary to understand what is being expressed. This step in the process of translation called *understanding* or *comprehension* goes beyond a mechanical exchange of one word or concept in one language for a similar one in another. In some cases, the translator cannot understand the concept in the original language. In other cases, the concept is one that cannot be expressed or comprehended in the target language. Most everyone has at some time run across the concept, “words cannot adequately express...” The same shortcoming is present in translation. Many times words in one language cannot adequately express what is easily expressed in another language. This is not due to a shortage of words, but due to a shortage of concepts that can be expressed in a specific language.

Many times, in the new language, there is no direct equivalent of a concept that is expressed in a single word in the original language. At other times, in the second language there are many different concepts that are all rolled into one in the original language. In this case, it may appear to be an easy task for the translator to simply choose from the context which concept is the one of interest. But, it is still difficult to express the all inclusive concept when, in the collection of concepts available in the target language, that particular all inclusive concept is simply missing.

This is particularly true in converting from ancient Hebrew to modern English. Sometimes, descriptions of some concept familiar to modern science, but unfamiliar to theologians cause the result in the theological translation sounding like some nonsensical theobabble. Other times, theologians resort to theological words that really have no use outside their religious circles. Even theologians have to invent concepts to describe such words.

An example, one which has caused scholars to struggle for centuries, is the concepts in English of wind versus spirit. When translating, scholars have struggled over each occurrence of that word, whether the meaning assigned in each specific case, should be spirit, or wind. The problem is not dual meaning of one word in the ancient language. In the ancient Hebrew, both were the same concept. That concept was “invisible power, force, or energy.” That concept of invisible power is not limited to wind or spirit. It also can include such things as electricity and magnetism. It might even include radiant heat energy and other electromagnetic radiation, such as radio waves that we use to transmit information to radios or TV’s. We have a different word for each of those concepts. But, the all inclusive concept of ‘invisible force’ is missing from our thinking.

So, when Jonah was describing to the pagans who he was, and what was his power to cause evil to come upon them, he had to come up with an answer they would understand. Jonah was in a ship that was in danger of sinking and all the mariners had called upon their higher powers to no avail and they had decided it was Jonah who had a higher power that was causing them evil. They had decided they were in danger of sinking because Jonah had not called upon his higher power to save them. So they asked of him pointed questions. In that situation Jonah came up with a great description of his higher power that you did not have to be a theologian to understand. He said, “I am a Hebrew; and I fear the ‘everlasting existence’ (YHWH) , the ‘mighty Powers’ (Elohiym) of the cosmos, the maker of the turbulent roaring (the wet, that is what they called the sea) and [the maker of] the dry (land.) (Jonah 1:9)

Notice, in this translation, the meanings of the words are minus the superimposed religious connotations of standard bible translations. Using words that induce thoughts that are more akin to what the Hebrews and pagans thought when they used their words makes more sense in the context of all the mariners calling upon their “higher powers” to no avail. Notice, the ability of the Hebrew language, in which the bible records this conversation, to transmit the descriptive meanings that are totally ignored when one reads it thinking theological thoughts induced by the religious use of words such as “god” or “lord” rather than what the Hebrews thought when they used their words. When we try to express it in our set of English language religious concepts, we end up with a distortion of the original concepts.

And, true to the discoveries of modern science, according to the law of conservation of energy, Jonah was right. The eternal existence is the mighty powers, the eternal energy that can be converted to matter and vice versa ($E=MC^2$), implying that energy is eternal, but matter (the cosmos, the heavens and the earth, the sea and the land) has a beginning and may have an end, but the power (energy) will go on forever.

It is difficult to conceptualize in the English language, that great stumbling block of trying to force multiple gods into one God, the idea that there is the Big God, and then there is the Holy Spirit, but yet we say it is not two, but just one. That dilemma can be resolved simply by thinking the thoughts the Hebrews thought when they used the words *Elohiym*, and *Ruach*. *Elohyim* includes the powers that exist eternally, (energies, both visible expression and invisible presence) and *Ruach* is the invisibility of those powers, a subset of the features of that totality of powers (energies) which exists eternally.

Of course, you would ask about the third part of this supposedly singular/plural god? That is another subject, suffice it to say, the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words translated “Word,” “Said,” etc. carried the concept, not of the vibrations of sound traveling through matter, but of the intelligence behind such concepts as in, “and energies *said*, let there be...” when there was no such thing as air for the sound of words to travel through, it could not mean *words* as sounds traveling through matter as we conceptualize when we hear the word, ‘*said*.’ Another example, “and the *Word* was made flesh and dwelt among us.” So, the concept of a triune “god” is more scientific than religious, and trying to make sense in a religious discussion results in endless debate, where in a scientific discussion of the concepts, it becomes clear. Of course, the word/concept, “word” (logos) has to be the topic of the Word of the Month in a separate issue of this E-Zine.

Abiogenesis: the process of life arising from non-living matter

Abiogenesis is life arising from non-living matter, Modern science sometimes adds the assumption that it means without intelligent guidance. The bible emphatically insists upon the processes having, at least once, occurred with outside intelligent guidance. **Spontaneous generation** is a different concept. It is life arising spontaneously—without interference by an intelligent being—from non-living matter.

Adam: Transliteration of the plural of a word meaning “reddish”--Ruddy Ones

Referring to the sparsely haired reddish skin of the first intelligent terrestrial inhabitants of the land (humans). “Let us make Ruddys in our own image.” Its technical meaning is not, “first man” but is a word describing an external physical characteristic of the first intelligent life form on this planet. The religiously accepted meaning of “first man” is an interpretation from the context of how it is used, not from what it means.

Gen 1:26, 27 And God said, Let us make “Ruddy Ones” 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 “Ruddy Ones” in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Again (born again): Greek word *anōthen*: Extra-Terrestrial, antonym of earthly/terrestrial.

The Greek word *anōthen*, (G509) typically translated “again” when combined with the word “born” as in the phrase “born again” does not mean “again”—that is a meaning introduced in the translation for lack of understanding. It means from heaven and can be translated “from above,” “top” as in top to bottom, “high” as in high birth typically referred to as born into nobility. But a better technical meaning is Extra-Terrestrial, the antonym of earthly/terrestrial. See I Cor 15:40 for a biblical explanation of this concept. “There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial[extra-terrestrial] is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.” (KJV).

Angels: Messengers (transporters), courier/carriers of...

Attributes of God: Power, Intelligence, Wisdom

But the LORD [is] the true God, he [is] the living God, and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, [even] they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his intelligence.

Jeremiah, c. 585-580 BC.,

*The True God, Triune Creator Account,
A Biblical Creation Account: Jeremiah 10:10,12*

Note: This same account is repeated in: Jeremiah 51:15⁵

Biblical Account of Creation: One of many biblical technical accounts of the beginnings

Biogenesis: the process of life forms producing other life forms

Biogenesis is the process of life forms producing other life forms, e.g. a spider lays eggs, which form into spiders.⁶

Chambers of the South: The planets of the Solar System.

When standing in the northern hemisphere on the planet earth, what appears in the night sky are stars, constellations, and planets. The planets are in the southern portion of the night sky due to the fact that one is standing in the northern hemisphere. This is an indication that Job lived in the Northern Hemisphere. See Job 9:9 “*Which maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south.*”

Cherubim: A transliteration of word with a lost meaning which is found in the context.

⁵ 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 KJV)

⁶ Biogenesis. (2007, March 9). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:57, March 22, 2007, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Biogenesis&oldid=113938047>

In any case, the creation science detail is significant in that it describes features of the early history of man before and through the end of the tropical ecology global warming era called the Ecology of Paradise (Garden of Eden,) and into the harsher ecological habitat of the ice ages.

Notice man was driven from the Ecology of Paradise (Garden of Eden) in time, not location. The scripture clearly says in verse 23 that after he was driven from the Garden of Eden, he was to till the same “ground from whence he was taken.”

In the account of the end of the Garden of Eden, "Cherubim's" would be more accurately translated "erupting volcanoes" (or “volcanic eruptions”.) And "a flaming sword which turned every way," would be more accurately translated, "hot lava flowing in every direction."⁷

Joel records a similar description of the end of the Garden of Eden when he is predicting another future similar event.

“... the day of the LORD cometh, for [it is] nigh at hand; A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, [even] to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land [is] as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them... The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining:”

Joel, c. 835-796 BC, *The Day of the LORD*,
The Bible: Joel 2:1-3,10

Joel compares the end of the Garden of Eden of the past with the terrible Day of the Lord of the future. He emphasizes the separation in time between the two as being almost forever, to the years of many generations. When comparing the end of the Garden of Eden with this, and other⁸ biblical descriptions of the "Day of the Lord," it becomes obvious that they are both similar events accompanied by violent tectonic (volcanic) activity, and are separated in time by many thousands of years. One is in the ancient pre-historic past, the other at some unknowable future time that will come upon us as a thief in the night. The one is recorded by God in the rocks⁹ of the geologic column; the other is predicted by the repeating nature of such events recorded in the same rocks, so as to leave even the modern day scientist without excuse.

Comprehended: A mistranslation of “held back, or restrained by force”

One of those language difficulties surrounds the English word “divided,” as in “divided the light from the darkness.” We naturally assume “divided” is in reference to keeping things apart. But in the original language the technical meaning¹⁰ was akin to separating whey from curds in the making of cheese. It appears to be a reference to the process in which the light was extracted 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. Pre-modern science, darkness was assumed to be nothingness, the absence of light. But what it really says is not that the light came from

⁷ See musings on "*The Greatest Tectonic (Volcanic) Event Ever Witnessed by Humanity*," in Frederick, Max, 2004, *The Simple Truth, Musings of an Old Scientist, Volume I: Hermeneutics: How to Study the Bible to Find the Simple Truth*, Max Frederick, Publishing, Central Point, Oregon.

⁸ See commentary on Peter's *Eternity-to-Eternity* creation account.

⁹ End of tropical ecology at Miocene/Pliocene Boundary Event, with tectonic activity.

¹⁰ Frederick, Max B., AnOldScientist, (2014) *Glossary: The Technical Meanings of Religious Words*. ScienceAndTheBible.net website. retrieved from <https://www.scienceandthebible.net/glossary.pdf>

nothingness, but was produced by separating it from darkness like curds from whey in the production of cheese. When, in another biblical creation account¹¹ it says about light that darkness “comprehended” it not, it was a puzzling concept. My Greek professor in bible college, nearly sixty years ago, before modern science accepted that concept, mused that “comprehended” was a very poor translation of the original language word that meant that darkness could not hold back light by force, but 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. But later¹², modern science did discover that the darkness of the “black hole,” from which it is postulated that light escaped in the “Big Bang” at the beginning of the universe, that darkness did have sufficient gravity¹³ to hold back light from escaping.

Cosmos: See...*Heavens*

Creation (of life): some form of intelligence setting up the conditions for abiogenesis to occur.

Creation of life is some form of intelligence setting up the conditions for abiogenesis to occur—*let the earth bring forth...*

Creator of the Universe:

Yehovah Elohiym (meaning eternally existing energies). For simplicity here I will simply refer to this existence as “The God of the bible”, or “God” for short. Theologians have ignored this technical meaning of this existence and replaced it with a religious “LORD God”, a name devoid of all original physical meaning and only referring to status as a boss in charge who has been deified, one who has been raised from a lesser status to the status of one who deserves to be worshiped. See, *Yĕhovah* and *'elohiym*.

Day: The word “Day” in Genesis 1 obviously means

a literal twenty-four hour day. But its use there is similar to the use of the literal “sower” and the literal “seed” in the parable of the sower and the seed where literal items are used in a fictional narrative to illustrate an unrelated point. In this case the unrelated point is the fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments. More to be found in the book, “*Eyewitness to the Origins.*”

Darkness: Sometimes refers not to nothingness, but to something that can hold back light ...

Darkness, in both original languages of the Old Testament (Hebrew) and New Testament (Greek) refers to an actual physical something that can hold back light from shining, something that actually interferes with or inhibits light. That which can hold back light that is known to scientists is a theoretical “Black Hole” where the force of gravity is so great that even light cannot escape. This is consistent with the theory that the universe began when a black hole exploded (a simplistic explanation.) resulting in the universe. That event resulted in light beginning to escape from that former black hole, consistent with the biblical technical explanation of the beginning of the universe.

¹¹ John 1

¹² 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>

¹³ 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/>

Deep: Ocean, Oceans, Sea, Seas

In the Ancient Hebrew language, the seas, or oceans are referred to by this characteristic of oceans, its depth. Often misinterpreted to be referring to some esoteric, religious concept of things that are too *deep* for understanding.

Divided: Division and Production

In Ancient Hebrew culture; division was a process of production. Sometimes that process of production is translated “separated” as in producing a product by separating it from its surroundings.

“And God said, *Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God **divided** the light from the darkness.*” Gen 1:3, 4 (KJV)

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

“Then God said, “*Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it **separate** the waters from the waters.*” God made the expanse, and **separated** the waters which were below the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse;” Gen 1:6, 7 (NASB)

I must give credit for the information in this entry to Jeff A. Benner of Ancient Hebrew Research Center, <https://www.ancient-hebrew.org/index.html>. I found this writing among my writings from the year 2007 and cannot remember how much I obtained from that source.

The ancient Hebrew language was the everyday communication among nomadic shepherds. As such they understood the making of cheese by separating curds from whey (water) when sour milk was cultured. The production of cheese was common in daily life.

Notice the use of the word “production” as the process for making cheese. To us that word, derived from produce (such as lettuce, corn, beets, etc) has the agricultural roots of the process whereby we obtain vegetables and as such is a generic word for vegetables applied to the method for obtaining them, and by extension applied to the method for obtaining anything such as production of computers, furniture, automobiles, etc. Just as easily, we could have chosen the word “lettuce” to refer to the method of obtaining vegetables and by extension we would now be using the phrase, “the lettuction of automobiles.”

In translating from the ancient Hebrew, sometimes that same concept of production is translated to divide or to separate, as, for obvious reasons, to the ancient Hebrew, it also conveyed those meanings.

In the mind of the ancient Hebrew, that process which we label with the concept of “to produce”, based on our agricultural heritage, is labeled “to divide,” based on their concept of producing cheese by dividing the curds from the whey. That is why sometimes the concept, “divided” is the resulting translation when the concept “produced” would more correctly express the intended meaning. An example is, “and God divided the light from the darkness.” This statement is a summary of the foregoing description of God producing of light from darkness. More meaningful to the modern mind it could be translated, “thus God produced light from darkness.

But then, that results in a statement that could not be true to the mind of scientists or theologians even one generation ago, light did not come from darkness; light was the absence of darkness. That is, it was until modern science realized the concept of a “black hole” where darkness holds light captive. In the era before the concept of a “black hole,” it was assumed this verse meant light was produced from nothingness, the absence of light, thus the concept of creation ex-nihilo, the doctrine of creation of something from nothingness. But that is not what the above bible quote says. It says it exactly as

modern science claims, that the first light of the universe was produced by the escape of light from a “Black Hole.” (See “Comprehended” above)

Earth, Hebrew: *'erets*: continental dry land versus the ocean

Strong's H776 - *'erets* From an unused root probably meaning to be firm.

The ancient Hebrew word, *'erets* refers to the continents as opposed to ocean. This ancient Hebrew word sounds something like the English word “earth” but its meaning refers to the earth we pick up with our hands while digging in the garden.

Commonly misinterpreted to mean the global planet, but clearly defined in the bible to be continents.

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

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, the firm stuff 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 (*go back and read the first of this sentence as a sarcastic commentary on what we thought we knew that really was not true*), 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. (*Of course, now we know what we knew then was not true and what the bible actually says is true. There really was a time in the early development of this planet that it was completely covered by the waters of the ocean—there was no “dry land.” The continents originally formed from beneath the surface of the ocean.*)

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 once believed to be truth, 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, and 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 need to go to the context in the original language.

East, Ancient Past: Toward or Beyond the Rising Sun

[No Single English Word Equivalent]: Various translated as East or Ancient Past, commonly ambiguous and must be chosen depending on interpretation of the translator.

In the eighth verse of the second chapter of the bible, we are introduced to another example of ambiguous, or should I say easily misinterpreted words of the bible when it comes to interpreting science and the bible.

*And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden;
and there he put the man whom he had formed. Gen 2:8*

The literal meaning of the original word in the Hebrew language that is translated *eastward*, is, “beyond the rising sun”. That word has relevance in two realms; one is in time, the other in space. In time it refers to the past, even the ancient past. In space it refers to the direction you look to see the sun come up, the east.

When translating, the translator must either render it something like, *beyond the rising sun*, or, go beyond the original meaning to assign which realm is intended by the original author. In the case of this verse, it could be alternatively translated:

*And the LORD God planted a garden beyond the rising sun in Eden;
or, And the LORD God planted a garden in the ancient past, in Eden;*

The rendering chosen depends on whether you interpret the age of the earth according to the common chronology of the nearly three dozen accounts of creation of the bible, or in the light of the single account that has it organized into six days, whether you interpret the bible to teach an old earth, or a young earth. If you go with the young earth interpretation logic says there was no ancient past at that time so you go with *east*. If you go with the old earth interpretation, logic says the original intended meaning was *the ancient past*. The word itself is not definitive as to which realm of time or space contains the intended meaning.

So, when you see the *east* mentioned in the bible, do not immediately assume it is talking about a direction in space; it may actually refer to a direction in time. Check the context. You may even have to go to the context in the original language.

Elohiym: a plural word meaning overall inclusive concept of Power, Energy, Force, Strength

See also: *Yēhovah* and *'elohiym*:

We have many similar or related words that relay the concept of power, energy, strength, might, force...

To the layman, it may be obvious that they all trigger the thought of a similar concept, but to a scientist, the differences seem to prohibit these dissimilar concepts from being thought of as a single concept.

In English, particularly since Modern Science has reduced the concepts to mathematical formulas, each word has its own distinctly different concept.

In English, the relationship between energy and power is a mathematical formula. Energy is the capacity for doing work. Power is the rate of doing work, or of using energy. From this point, the differences in the concepts of energy and power, according to the English concepts, are precisely defined according to mathematical formulas concerning energy, matter, space and time.

Not so in the ancient Hebrew language. It is all an overall, multifaceted single concept, all rolled into one word with a plural form. From that one word, many variations of meaning are derived, all relating to the energetic, mighty, powerful, or strong or force characteristic of whatever is being referred to.

In fact, using the modern English concepts, Modern Science has discovered, in a simplistic sense, that energy is even interchangeable with matter according to the well known formula, $E=MC^2$.

The law of conservation of energy dictates that energy can be neither lost nor gained, energy is eternal. However, according to that formula, energy can be converted to the stuff the universe is physically made of.

After all this manipulation of thoughts, of breaking the ancient Hebrew concept of ‘powers/energy’ into its component parts, there does emerge a concept in English that is similar to the ancient Hebrew concept. That concept combines all that exists eternally together into a single concept, but it is a collection of formulas. It is not a single word. That collection of formulas is summed up in The First Law of Thermodynamics that states that energy can be neither created nor destroyed, energy is eternal, and The Mass-Energy Equivalence ($E=MC^2$), that states that mass and energy are also interchangeable forms of that same stuff that is eternal.

Yet, in the first verse of the bible, the concept of interchangeability among energy and matter, space, and time, is expressed in the profound description of the origin of the currently observed cosmos.

The ancient Hebrew word, meaning strength, mighty, power, force, etc. in its plural form, ‘*elohiyim*,’ is the name of the eternal entity (translated ‘God’) used in the first verse of the bible.

In other words, the plural form of energy (the name used for the eternal entity,) is what started the cosmos in its present form. Simply stated, the well known (in modern science) relationship between energy and matter, time and space, according to the formula, $E=MC^2$, is expressed in the first verse of the bible. The cosmos, (matter, time, energy and space,) resulted from the prudent exercise of energy. “*In the beginning, Energies, (God) created the heavens and the earth.*” (Genesis 1:1)

When theologians discuss the various names used to refer to God, many of them start with a part that is not translated into its meaning, but into a religious substitute, ‘lord,’ or ‘God’ rather than the original meaning of ‘eternal existence’ or ‘power.’ Many of those names start with the ancient Hebrew word that means power or powers (*Elohiym*) and is simply translated “God,” as in “the God who...”. However, that simplification does not do the concept of God justice, as in reality, the various names for God that include the concept of the great and powerful eternal entity are typically only half translated. To translate the second half of the name, but not the first half diminished the concept of the eternal entity of energy, to the simple pagan concept of a god. A fuller explanation/translation for each of such names for “God” is, “the eternal entity of power, energy, and might, that has...” (the property described in the second half of the name.)

In fact, now that we are on the subject, how is the physical entity of “God” actually described in the bible?

See the descriptions in Daniel 7:9 and Revelation 4:5 describing the throne and the one sitting on it , with the white lightening (not to be confused with the prohibition concept of “white lightening”) and thunderbolts.

I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment [was] white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne [was like] the fiery flame, [and] his wheels [as] burning fire. Dan 7:9

And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices: and [there were] seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God. Rev 4:5

Is not that sufficient evidence that the ancient concept of energy was there, even though there was not a precise word for it? If you look closely, or think back on what you heard in Sunday school, you can find more examples of this super energy, such as the glow on the face of Moses after the face to face encounter with God, or with that ball of energy Moses described as having the appearance of a bush burning without being consumed. Even artists depictions of the physical appearance of the biblical concept of God the Father seem to have a common thread of something that looks like a ball of energy with lightening coming out of it.

As Paul said in Romans 1:20, when listing the invisible things of God that are clearly seen from the creation, from that which is made, the first thing listed is God's eternal energy (power, KJV)

But, to conceive of God as simple raw energy or power or force, as in, "may the Force be with you," is an over simplification. That over simplification is common among religious people as they reference their "higher power."

As Jeremiah so aptly put it when he described the God who gave rise to the universe, there are at least three characteristics of the eternal existence we so glibly call God. In addition to power (energy, force, strength...), there is also, intelligence (the understanding of information) and wisdom (the prudent use of information).

He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his intelligence. (Jer 10:12 & 51:15 MOST)

And then John chimes in on the character of the creator of the universe when he opens his book with:

"In the beginning was the Word (logos, understanding, logic, intelligence) and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light (a form of energy) of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." (John 1:1-5)

What kind of theobabble is that? What do you mean darkness cannot comprehend light? To comprehend is to understand. That which has the potential to be understood is intelligence, not energy (light). Logos (logic, intelligence) is what has the potential for understanding. Comprehension is something you apply to intelligence, not to power/energy.

Thus, to engage a scientist in a conversation about the origin of the universe, you must resort to the original concepts of what we religiously refer to as God. Only then might a scientist agree that the bible may have some merit. You see, many scientists are currently coming to the belief that possibly the universe started from some conversion process that started with energy or energies in some form, and resulted in matter type stuff (the cosmos) under some specific set of circumstances which they are generally reluctant to call intelligence.

Evolution: Latest failed theory of Spontaneous Generation

In the context of the ultimate beginning of life, The theory of evolution is the latest in a long string of theories of spontaneous generation seeking an explanation for the origin of life. The theory of Evolution is only about one-hundred-fifty years old, first published in 1859, the year Oregon became a state and the same year that the previous theory was proven false by the young scientist Louis Pasteur scientifically refuted the older theory of spontaneous generation, making way for Darwin's replacement theory of spontaneous generation.

All scientific writing that mentions the theory of evolution as an explanation for the origin of life can be dated to have been written during that brief span of history.

Even today, modern science is zealously seeking a replacement theory because they realize the theory of evolution is completely inadequate, yet they are driven by their need for an alternative to the idea that some extra-terrestrial intelligence was involved.

The irony is that any experiment to prove spontaneous generation is outside the realm of science.

Application of the scientific method to any experiment concerning spontaneous generation being responsible for the beginning is beyond the scope of science. In the far out chance that scientists could set up a condition where there were no universe, and then set up the conditions that would cause such an event as the beginning of the universe, it would only demonstrate that an intelligent being could cause the beginning of the universe. Therefore, such an experiment to prove spontaneous generation is beyond the scope of science. But to prove the *possibility* of intelligent design is not outside the scope of science.

Extra-Terrestrial (life, intelligence): Some form of non-earthbound intelligent life

Extra-terrestrial form of life: Perhaps it was some self aware form of living energies with the additional aspects of intelligence, and wisdom (engineering.). Ancient writings in the original language call this the existence that created the universe.

Face: the allaround

The panorama as in the circle of the earth as viewed from where one is standing. The face of the deep is the bottom of the ocean in every direction an observer at the bottom of the sea would face, as in “...darkness upon the face of the deep.”

Firmament: A legendary fictional crystalline sphere encircling the planet earth

The Firmament is an ancient Greek science concept that is a degradation of prior knowledge, degraded as it passed from one generation of ancient Greek scientists to another. The concept of a transparent crystalline sphere holding back the waters of chaos was first introduced into the bible when the ancient Hebrew Scriptures were translated into the Greek language at the legendary Library of Science at Alexandria, Egypt around 250 BC. For a fuller explanation see, “*The Story Behind the Legend of the Firmament*”¹⁴ http://www.scienceandthebible.net/20081218_The_Legend_of_the_Firmament.pdf.

The concept of a “Firmament” is a miss-translation of the ancient Hebrew word, “*shamayim*” meaning that which is above as opposed to the earth (continents) and the deep (oceans). Sometimes *shamayim* refers simply to the atmosphere as in the first few verses of the bible where it is defined as that in which the birds fly. Other times it refers to everything beyond the surface of the earth, as in the rest of the universe or cosmos.

Form, Formation: To take shape, become useful, after being unformed or void (useless).

Foundation of the Earth: “*Foundation of the Earth*”

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

That myth has been widely taught. At the time of the voyage of Columbus, some people believed the earth was flat and that there was danger of sailing off the edge of the earth into an eternal abyss. The assumption that the flat earth belief was widespread is a perversion of actual history. Some scholars may have misinterpreted religious beliefs to that end, but neither ancient Greek science, nor the ancient

¹⁴ 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

scripture of the bible held that view. In fact, ancient Greeks had figured out not only that the planet earth was a sphere, but they had a good estimate of its size. And Christopher Columbus was aware of this.

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

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

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

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

Both are concepts from relative recent eras, concepts lacking understanding of the historical and scientific wastelands through which the ancient scripture has survived. Neither concept is not what the biblical phrase, “*foundations of the earth*” is talking about. (For a report on the erroneous assumptions as to the model of the universe held by ancient Hebrews, see a special report about Historical Concepts of the Earth, www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/Historical_Concepts.pdf)

First, the word “*earth*” in that phrase, does not refer to the planet as a whole. Rather, it refers to the part that is solid ground, the dry land of the continents, as opposed to the vast majority of the planet which is wide open oceans. (See the February, 2010 issue of this Ezine: Word of the Month: *Earth*. <http://www.scienceandthebible.net/ezine/2010/SATB-Ezine-2010-02-28.pdf>)

That phrase, “*foundations of the earth,*” refers to the support that holds up the continents so they are not washed over by the oceans. The oceans cover the non-continental portions of the planet an average of about three miles deep. If nothing held the continents up, they would be spread out over the ocean floor, under the water of the ocean and the planet earth would be completely covered by water as it was before the continents emerged. Curiously, that emergence of the continents was described in the bible thousands of years before it was more recently discovered by modern science.

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

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

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

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

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

Hermeneutics:

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

The first rule of hermeneutics is:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reality Check:

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

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

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

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

action was the source of the first water on the surface when it finally cooled sufficiently. No one is given credit for discovering these obvious truths either.

However, many years ago, nobody knew of this. Biblical scholars assumed that the earth was created cool as it is today, and in appearance as we see it today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then, continuing the sequence in yet another sequential verse, the effect of the buoyancy of the mantle on the continents is emphasized as the rebound of that catastrophic event causes the mountains to rise:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You be the judge. Send a comment of your reaction to: SimpleTruth@AnOldScientist.com

Geologic Column & Cosmos: Sources of Pre-historic info

There appears to be three credible sources of information about how the earth was formed.

One credible source is the earth itself. The record of its formation is recorded in the rocks of the earth. This record is called the geologic column.

The second credible source is the cosmos. That information is contained in the light currently reaching us from far away objects in the universe. Due to the speed of light, and the great distances involved, that information originated in the ancient past and is arriving here now where we can currently see processes that happened in the formation of other heavenly bodies.

The third credible source of information is a specific collection of ancient writings. Some of these writings appear to be as ancient as writing itself. These ancient writings contain descriptions of and references to things that are beyond the possibility of having been observed by human beings because they happened long before human beings existed. The fact that this information was recorded long before modern science existed to discover the same information confounds those who would like to believe that no such credible source could exist.

God: The English word “God” fails to reflect the Hebrew.

From The Catholic Encyclopedia, *Etymology of the Word "God."*

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06608x.htm>

(Anglo-Saxon *God*; German *Gott*; akin to Persian *khoda*; Hindu *khooda*).

God can variously be defined as:

- the proper name of the one [Supreme and Infinite Personal Being](#), the Creator and Ruler of the [universe](#), to whom [man](#) owes obedience and worship;
- the common or generic name of the several supposed beings to whom, in [polytheistic religions](#), [Divine attributes](#) are ascribed and Divine worship rendered;
- the name sometimes applied to an idol as the image or dwelling-place of a god.

The root-meaning of the name (from Gothic root *gheu*; Sanskrit *hub* or *emu*, "to invoke or to sacrifice to") is either "the one invoked" or "the one [sacrificed](#) to." From different Indo-Germanic roots (*div*, "to shine" or "give light"; *thes* in *thessasthai* "to implore") come the Indo-Iranian *deva*, Sanskrit *dyaus* (gen. *divas*), Latin *deus*, Greek *theos*, [Irish](#) and Gaelic *dia*, all of which are generic names; also Greek *Zeus* (gen. *Dios*, Latin *Jupiter* (*iovpater*), Old Teutonic *Tiu* or *Tiw* (surviving in *Tuesday*), Latin *Janus*, *Diana*, and other proper names of [pagan deities](#). The common name most widely used in [Semitic](#) occurs as 'el in Hebrew, 'ilu in [Babylonian](#), 'ilah in Arabic, etc.; and though scholars are not agreed on the point, the root-meaning most probably is "the strong or mighty one."

That religious analysis ending with the phrase, “the strong and mighty one,” from The Catholic Encyclopedia, *Etymology of the Word "God."* is simple and sounds convincing. But the phrase, “strong and might one” is completely contrary to the fact that the ancient Hebrew word 'elohiyim that is used in the bible is plural, not singular. It is more correctly translated into multiple modern concepts related to “power” such as strong, energy, force, influential, power. Modern science has differentiating definitions and mathematical equivalents to differentiate each of these concepts. In contrast, in ancient Hebrew, it appears to be all one concept, but recognized as including multiple (plural) concepts or aspects.

Heavens: that which is above.

The ancient Hebrew word, “*shamayim*” meaning that which is above as opposed to the earth (continents) and the deep (oceans). Is generally translated into the word “heavens” because it is a plural word. Sometimes *shamayim* refers simply to the atmosphere as in the first few verses of the

bible where it is defined as that in which the birds fly. Other times it refers to everything beyond the surface of the earth, as in the rest of the universe or cosmos.

Hiss, Hisser: A practitioner of the occult, a serpent, or the metal bronze.

Hisser Article

by

Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

Words have meaning

One of the first rules of hermeneutics concerns the concept of words having meaning. The meaning of words in an ancient language are not always easy to discern. There is a lexicon, but those who wrote the lexicon lived thousands of years after that language had become a dead language. The meanings of many words had become lost. Some of the words are quite simple to determine the meaning by the context and their abundant use. If a word is used enough, it's meanings and fine points of connotation can be determined by the many contexts in which it is used. Some words are almost impossible. At best a guess that fits the immediate context, or a simple transliteration is used. Other words, are more difficult, but the meaning can be determined by due diligence and careful attention to the many contexts of a few uses. Such a word may have many contexts simultaneously. Not only the immediate literary context is there, but the historical context, and the context of the nature of the language of interest.

For example, in the ancient Hebrew language, there is a series of words derived from the sounds of bodily function sounds coming from the mouth and nose. These sounds include grunt, hiss, sigh, sneeze, etcetera.

In this example we will explore the word based on the sound of the noise coming from escaping air being restricted by the lips or teeth. For the sake of simplicity, we will call it by the English word for this sound, *hiss*. In our exploration for the meaning of this word, we will use the different forms of this same word, *hiss*, *hissing*, *hisser*, etc. In other languages there is a different word for it. In the Russian language the name for that word is much closer to the name for it in the ancient Hebrew language. It is the sound of the word used for the popular name of a fictional character in a spy novel, the seductive sexy sly Russian female spy, Natasha. Notice all the hissing in the description. That meaning for that sound is pervasive throughout many languages.

For our example word, in the ancient Hebrew language there are three distinctive different meanings as determined from the context.

One meaning is a metal which was carried from Egypt by the escaped Hebrew slaves. That metal could be made to shine, and was used for making castings. Many ornamental figures were cast from that metal. How that metal got that word for a name is beyond the recognition of the writers of the lexicon. However, the answer to that puzzle becomes obvious when you explore all the contexts. Back to that later.

A more obvious meaning for the word of the sound hiss, which becomes clear when one sees it's use, is the name for that class of animals which slither on the ground and emit a hissing sound. The *hisser* is a snake, or serpent.

The third meaning for that word, is a human being which is known distinctively by their slyness and the hissing sounds of the sooth sayings which come from their mouth, The *hisser* is an enchanter, a purveyor of the occult, practitioner of the occult arts. In this meaning, the hisser is more sly than any other life form, "more sly than any animal of the field", more seductive and beguiling than the sly fox. The *hisser* is one who brings to mind the image of the stereotype of the seductive, female, Russian spy who entices the good guy to abandon his principles.

Back to the metal, *hiss*. *Hiss* is a metal which has a peculiar characteristic which will become the obvious reason for it's name.

In the King James version of the bible, that word *hiss* is translated brass when obviously referring to a metal. Brass is an alloy of copper and zinc. However, fourteen hundred years before the time of Christ, at the time of the escape of the Hebrew slaves from Egypt, zinc had not yet been discovered. The alloy named *hiss* was not brass. It was bronze, an alloy of copper and tin. Now, tin, has a distinctive characteristic which is the telling clue for the name of the metal.

There is a sound characteristic of tin in it's nearly pure form. When one bends a sheet or bar of tin, it emits a sound called, "tin cry". That sound can fairly be described as a hissing sound. In this context it becomes obvious why the metal which is an alloy of copper and the metal which makes a hissing sound, would be named *hiss*.

Thus, from a study of the many contexts, we gain a better understanding of the three meanings for the word, *hiss*.

Hiss: The metal alloy of copper and the metal which emits a hissing sound; bronze.

Hisser: A human being practicing the art of the occult; a sly enchanter or enchantress.

Hiss(er,ing): An act or object of occultic worship.

Hisser: A snake or serpent.

Now it becomes more clear that Moses made the image of the *hisser* (serpent) from the metal by the name *hiss*, (bronze). And it becomes clear that same image of the *hisser*, made from *hiss*, was later destroyed because, to the people, it had become an object of *hissing* (occultic) worship, a practice forbidden by God.

Another example of the use of the use of this word in the bible is the name of the tempter in the story of Adam and Eve eating the forbidden fruit. The logical conclusion is the sin of Adam and Eve was succumbing to the enchantment of the occultic practice of feeling like gods by partaking of the forbidden mind expanding hallucinogenic fruit. The use of pharmaceuticals to make one feel like a god, the mind expanding experience of hallucinogenic drugs, has always been associated with the forbidden practice of the occult. To this day it remains the main enticement drawing people away from the one true religion.

Intelligence: See Word, Logos

Isostacy: Balance of mass between mountains and valleys

Causing differences in elevation between mountains and valleys, even equilibrium with height of sea level.

An example of this is the statement in the bible that the mountains go up and the valleys go down¹⁵. That is now called the principle of isostacy by modern science. But before that was discovered theologians could not bring themselves to translate it correctly, "knowing" that was not true. Instead they fudged the translation to imply it was the water that was going up by the mountains and down by the valleys (KJV.)

Logos: Logic/intelligence-Understanding

Typically translated: "word" "In the beginning was the Word..."

More closely akin to: Logic, Laws of Physics, intelligence. Plan/Laws of Physics.

¹⁵ Psalm 104:8

A Greek philosopher named Heraclitus first used the term Logos around 600 B.C. to designate the divine reason or plan which coordinates a changing universe. This word was well suited to John's purpose in John 1. – http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp_dir/words/3/1132150288-5618.html

The Greek word, logos, has a much richer meaning than merely the sounds that came out of one's mouth. In fact, that is not at all what it meant. Logos was the term used to mean the intelligent organization of concepts. English terms which partially embody the meaning are:

Logic + information (logical argument)

Explanation

Consideration

Reason (the act of reasoning)

Wisdom

Cause

Logical grounds

Doctrine

Teaching

Narrative

A case of law

Discourse

A declaration

A thought

Mandate

Decree

A principle expressed as a common saying

Lord God: See *Yĕhovah* and *'elohiym*:

Mechanism:

Modern Science: See Science

Pillars: See Foundation of the Earth

Pneuma: Invisible Force as in the Wind or Spirit—see Ruach

Power/energy – see Elohiym

Punctuated Equilibrium

Punctuated Equilibrium see page 91??? Of what document???

Ruach: Invisible Force as in the Wind or Spirit

Ruwach and pneuma: The Technical Meaning for the Ancient Words for “Invisible Force”

Further, the original meanings of the ancient Hebrew word, *ruwach* and the ancient Greek word, *pneuma* both, had a common meaning of a single concept generally overlooked by scholars today. That single concept is best described as “invisible power/energy/force.” That single concept generally includes, among other things both wind, and spirit, and, should those same words still be in use today,

would include such “invisible power/energy/force” as electrical energy, magnetic force, and other forms of invisible power undiscovered or undefined in ancient times. Even modern technology recognizes this concept when they named the power that runs *pneumatic* tools.

Modern bible scholars tend to simply dismiss the original common concept, and consider the original words as each having two distinctly different, unrelated meanings of either spirit, or wind. The wind, in these modern times has become a definable, measurable entity, wholly within the realm of the physics of modern science. The meaning of the word spirit, since the advent of modern science, has taken on the connotation of being something that is outside the realm of modern science. It is something supernatural without the attributes of anything that really exists that can be measured or quantified.

This separation into dissimilar meanings of either wind, or spirit, but not both, and not the concept in common, has led to problems in translating the bible, especially where Jesus was trying to explain to Nicodemus the workings of an “invisible power/energy/force.”

Anyway, this concept of power/energy/force is used to define God in John 4:24 where the King James Version says, “God [is] a *Pneuma*: ...” What? The bible actually says that the God of the bible is an “invisible power/energy/force?”

Said: “And God Said...”: Does not refer to the sounds of words, rather, the meanings

It is a doctrine with roots in the occult that believes there is magic in the sounds of spoken words.

See: Logos

Science: The Realm of technology—The Method of study—God’s Favorite Subject

The Realm of science is generally considered to be anything pertaining to technical reality as opposed to philosophical speculation or religious belief. A more strict view is anything that is solvable or at least studyable using the scientific method. A more ancient concept is in depth technical knowledge of some particular subject such as what we think of today a natural science.

An article from the periodical, “*The Science and the Bible Ezine*:”

Word/Concept of the Month: “God’s Favorite Subject”

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

There is no exact word in the ancient Hebrew that expresses the meaning of this month’s concept of the month. There are only examples.

The English word we generally associate with this months concept has been co-opted by a modern profession to define their profession.

That same English word has come to be associated with a subject that is anti-religion. But then, so is the God of the bible—anti-religion, that is.

So, we are left with expressing this month’s concept by using examples.

This month’s Word/Concept of the Month can be summed up in the phrase: *God’s Favorite Subject*. But what is that subject? And what is the name of it?

There is no generally recognized, uniquely defined English word that is the name to cover this month’s concept.

The closest we can come is the word *science*, as in knowledge and understanding of factual information concerning the things the profession of modern science has categorized to be in the realm of natural science, including such topics as, earth science, biology, and astronomy. Of particular interest are details of the origins and the development of the physical existence that is associated with that profession.

However, that English word, *science*, that has in the past been associated with this general concept, has been co-opted by professional studiers of the physical world and its inner workings. They have defined it to be, not the knowledge and understanding of the details of the physical world and its inner workings, not the true factual details

themselves—but to be the process by which such knowledge and understanding is to be achieved and expressed. As such, *science* has not existed before just a few hundred years ago, and *science* as such, is not to be found in the bible.

Prior to the existence of modern science, the Latin word from which our word *science* was derived did mean the knowledge and understanding of such things, but it also meant much more, including supposed knowledge and understanding of things that were assumed to be true, but were not.

We have been criticized for using the word, *science* to describe what is generally thought of as *science*, when applying it to the substance of God’s favorite subject.

While the old meaning of the word lingers there are many who understand the general study of such topics and the true facts gleaned from such study, to be summed up in the word *science*. As such, it is used in the title of this E-Zine, *Science and the Bible E-Zine*.

The substance of God’s favorite subject is knowing and understanding of facts and truths concerning the details of the physical world, its origin and development, and its inner workings—and what it demonstrates about the character of God.

The details of God’s favorite subject are the recorded facts themselves. These facts are the same ones that are generally attributed to result from the application of the scientific method to the physical evidence. It is those same facts and truths that are the content of God’s favorite subject. And it has been so for ages, since long before there was any scientific method to produce those facts and truths.

This month’s concept—both the substance of knowing and understanding, and the details of facts, and events that are to aid in that knowledge and understanding—is best described by example.

The first example is a series of concepts and details from the beginning of the first book of the bible where it mentions:

That God existed before the universe existed, causing it to come into existence,
Genesis 1:1; Psalms 104:1

How the universe came into being by the Power/Energy (*'elohiym*) aspect of God,
Genesis 1:1

How it was all planned by the thinking/intelligence (*'amar/ logos*) aspect of God,
Genesis 1:3, John 1:1

How it was all organized by the Wisdom (*ra'ah, ruwach chokmah/ pneuma*) aspect of God,
Genesis 1:4 , Jeremiah 10:12: “*He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his intelligence.*”

About the first existence of light energy (for the future use of green grass to convert it into a form of energy that sustains life on this planet (scientists call it chlorophyll and photosynthesis,))
Genesis 1:3; Psalms 104:2

What it was like before there was an ocean on this planet.
Genesis 2:6; Psalms 104:5

How the atmosphere developed to capture water from outer space to fill the oceans,
Genesis 1:6,7; Psalms 104:6a

How the planet was at one time completely covered with water, all the mountains being below sea level,
Genesis 1:2; Psalms 104:6b

How the mountains rose from beneath sea level to form dry land (continents),
Genesis 1:9,10; Psalms 104:7,8; Job 9:5-7

How the rain gets into the mountains from where it causes rivers to flow to the sea,
Genesis 1:12; Psalms 104:10,13

About how photosynthesis developed as life emerged on this planet, as first planned by the wisdom and intelligence aspects of God,
Genesis 1:11,12; Psalms 104:14

About how the age of the magnificent megafauna (dinosaurs etc.) existed before the age of the mammals (beasts for the fields),
Genesis 1:20,21; Psalms 104:26

About how the age of the magnificent megafauna was replaced by the age of the mammals in a significant event,

Genesis 1:23; Psalms 104:29,30

About how human beings did not exist until late in the age of the mammals,

Genesis 1:24-27; Psalms 104:33

And about how each of these above items first occurred in the order listed above.

This chronology, first set forth in the bible, is in full accord with the comprehensive combination of all the creation accounts of the bible. Yet it was not firmly set in the mind of humans until this exact same order was established by the methods of modern science. But whoever God is, knew it thousands of years earlier.

How do we know this is God's favorite subject, God's favorite topic of conversation?

Every one of the above items is mentioned in the bible before the first mention of anything religious, such as love, joy, peace, longsuffering, sin, forgiveness, piety, righteousness, fairness, sacrifice...

These, and many more such items are discussed in nearly three dozen major accounts of creation found throughout the bible.

Yes, God's favorite topic of conversation includes talking about the things God claims to have made, how they came into existence, and how it all developed, and what it shows about God's nature. The vast pre-knowledge of these details, having been verified by modern science, is verifiable evidence of something supernatural.

As Paul expressed the impact of God's Favorite Subject:

"The wrath of God from heaven is upon every human who holds irreverence and injustice of the truth. Because: That which is known of God is apparent to them. Because: God hath made it apparent unto them. By the things God did that were not seen, from the creation of the cosmos, to the achievements now being revealed, His supposedly imperceptible eternal power and divine nature is clearly seen." Romans 1:18-20.

Another example:

Long before the book of Genesis was written, the book of Job, the oldest book of the bible, records the occasion where Job sought an audience with God to talk about the above religious items, God immediately turned the subject to His favorite subject, and it was not the religious things Job wanted to talk about.

God talked about how it all began and developed:

How it started with a big bang (curiously translated "shout"), Job 38:7

How the first most abundant molecule in outer space was water, Job 9:8

How the solar system developed in that water rich environment, Job 9:9

How the layers of the planet earth developed... Job 39:6

About God's favorite living creations before human beings—

the magnificent megafauna (We call them Dinosaurs and such.) Job 39-42

This is only a sample of Job's conversations with God. Many more details are found in, *Eyewitness to the Origins*. (www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com)

No matter what you call it, discussing the things of creation, or discussing the things of nature, it is God's favorite subject. And for centuries, theologians have overlooked it, replacing it with traditional interpretations and religious stuff that makes their religion look more like all the other religions of the world. (See Theobabble.)

Spirit/Wind: Invisible Force – See Pneuma

Spontaneous Generation: See Evolution

Theobabble: Religious sounding irrational, excessive, or foolish; chatter or prattle

Religious ramblings that don't make sense.

Contraction of the words *theology* and *babble*.

Theology: study of religious things pertaining to the nature of God.

Babble: irrational, excessive, or foolish; chatter or prattle.

Foolish, religious sounding ramblings of nonsensical explanations of technical things not understood by the theologian uttering such ramblings. Particularly when found in translations of technical bible

passages not understood by a religious translator. Example: “walking on the wings of the wind.” This theobabble is found in Psalm 104, a chronologically ordered technical treatise on the development of the universe from the first light of the universe to sometime in the future.

Religious sounding babblings of theologians when trying to explain what the bible is saying when it is talking about something technical in the realm of science, not religion. The result of theologians not understanding the technical passages of the bible that should be translated in the technical (scientific) realm rather than to sound like religious nonsense. Particularly when the bible is talking about scientific reality that has not yet been discovered by modern science, but somehow the meaning of that scientific principle is recorded in the original native language of the bible and coincides with scientific reality to be discovered in the future. The result of the false doctrine that the bible is not about scientific things and forcing scientific statements into religious sounding nonsense.

Background: There are many passages of scripture that pertain to technical information the meaning of which was lost before theologians began translating it into the English language, information assumed to not exist prior to its discovery by modern science within the past few hundred years since the separation of science and religion about the time of the first English bible translations. The result of theologians trying to express in religious English, technical information in Hebrew, information they could not have understood because it was not known by the science at the time of translation. The existence of these technically correct recordings of scientific principles yet to be discovered by modern science is evidence of the technical credibility of the ancient Hebrew scriptures. Yet their translations into theobabble has obscured that evidence.

Universe: Heavens (cosmos), Earth (continents), and Sea

The Above, the Firm, and the Deep—heavens, earth, sea.

Quote Jonah...

Void: virtually non-existent, as in “...without form and void.”

Wind/Spirit: Invisible Force – See Pneuma

Wing, Wings

When confronted with the word, *wing*, we tend to visualize an airfoil of some kind. Such an airfoil might be found on an airplane. Or, more likely, in bible times, one might visualize the airfoil attached to a bird that allows the bird to take flight.

But that is not the original meaning of the word in the Hebrew language that is commonly translated wing or wings. The original meaning was more akin to a generic “*something that sticks out*” or, the “*far reaches*” of something.

That original Hebrew meaning makes more sense to us when we visualize the wing of a tent. That wing is not something that enables the tent to fly, it is something that sticks out to cover whatever is under the wing.

That original meaning comes to us when we say we are adding wings to a hospital. That does not mean we are preparing the hospital to take flight. It simply means some more hospital space is going to stick out from the original structure.

When we say God covers us with his wings, we commonly visualize a figure of speech where God is being illustrated as a bird with great airfoils that protect us from whatever is above the wing. But, more likely the meaning intended to be conveyed has nothing with an airfoil, rather it means an

extension that reaches out to contain and/or protect. Likewise, heavenly beings are commonly pictured as having the wings of a bird when there is no certainty that was the originally intended meaning of the word *wing* when used in this context.

In another instance, “the wings of the wind” cannot mean the wind has a mechanical gadget that performs as an airfoil so the wind can fly. Specifically, in one instance in the bible, in a sequence of listings of facts concerning the universe, *wings of the wind* appears where that list suggests the author might be referring to the winds in the outer reaches of the solar system, specifically, the solar winds of outer space. This is particularly indicated when the description also includes the glowing as in the tail of a comet or the northern lights. The assumption by early bible translators that the meaning had something to do with birds resulted in the translation being simply religious sounding theobabble.

So, when you see *wing* or *wings* mentioned in the bible, do not immediately assume it is talking about a bird, chicken, bat, or airplane. Check the context. You may even have to go to the context in the original language.

Wisdom: The prudent use of information as in engineering.

The Ancient Hebrew concept of wisdom is related to that of division in that it is dividing good from evil.

The bible states emphatically that the order necessary for some existence to develop into the universe of today is due to the planning and designing, and execution by God.

The bible is emphatic in the three attributes of the prior existence. The ancient scripture says the attributes of the pre-existence of God, are, (1) the Planner (Intelligence,) (2) the Designer (Wisdom) and (3) the Creator (Powers), as stated in these last three points of detail.

Word/Said:

Intelligence, the information contained in, not the physical sounds of, speech. See: Logos; typically translated: “word” “In the beginning was the Word...,” is more closely akin to: Logic, Laws of Physics, intelligence. Plan/Laws of Physics. The Greek word, logos, has a much richer meaning than merely the sounds that came out of one’s mouth. In fact, that is not at all what it meant. Logos was the term used to mean the intelligent organization of concepts.

***Yĕhovah* and '*elohiym*:** The technical meanings of the names of God, “eternal and powers”

The Technical Words Describing God:

First, the two words most often used in naming, or referring to God, are *Yĕhovah* and '*elohiym*. Typically they are translated into English to be “LORD” and “God,” as in, “...in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens...” These English words, “LORD” and “God,” are more religious concepts of some dictatorial boss (“LORD”) and some supernatural benevolent-to-angry, arbitrary, accountable only to himself, granter of wishes (“God”) than they are reflections of the original meanings of the ancient language concepts. However, the original ancient Hebrew meanings, through modern technology, are currently available to us. The word *Yĕhovah* translated “LORD” originally meant that which exists¹⁶ (eternally); “the existing one.” And the word '*elohiym*, as in, “In the beginning God ('*elohiym*) created...,” also has an original meaning that was not a religious term. That word is the plural form of a word meaning the generic, all inclusive concept of power/energy/force. Today, modern science rigorously defines each of these terms, power, energy, and force, to be mathematical relations to each other, but to the ancients, it was an all inclusive

¹⁶,” as in when Moses asked for a name at the burning bush. See: Exd 3:14, and Mar 12:26.

concept, and the word used to name the God of the bible was the plural form of that all inclusive concept.

If the use of such a concept seems foreign to us today think of “May the force be with you,” from Star Wars, or the common use of the phrase, “higher power” among AA members in referring to their unexplainable help while not seeming to be a religious fanatic like their comrades who refer to their “God.” And then, think of the claim by the religion that claims not to be a religion, Humanism, which makes the claim that there is no “power” higher than the human mind, an overt attempt to appear outside the restrictions of “separation of religion and state” while in truth they are rapidly becoming the official religion of the United States political correctness, simply by referring to their god [the influence of human mind] as their “higher power.”

What was Jonah thinking when he replies to the mariners request as to his *'elohiym* [super powers, (God)]? “I *am* an Hebrew; and I fear the *Yēhovah* [the eternal existence, (LORD),] the *'elohiym* [powers, (God)] of *shamayim* [the overheads, heaven,] which hath made the sea and the dry *land*.”

Appendix A:

Traditional Religious Meanings vs. the Technical Meaning for the Ancient Words

The following examples of Lexicon entries for the above Greek words and their roots illustrates the lack of recognition of the obvious common meaning as the lexicon elaborately defines the various connotations assigned in religious interpretation of the bible.

The KJV Old Testament Hebrew Lexicon

<http://www.biblestudytools.com/lexicons/hebrew/kjv/ruwach-2.html>

Strong's Number: 07307	Browse Lexicon
Original Word	Word Origin
רוּחַ	from (07306)
Transliterated Word	TDNT Entry
Ruwach	TWOT - 2131a
Phonetic Spelling	Parts of Speech
roo'-akh	Noun Feminine
Definition	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. wind, breath, mind, spirit <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. breath b. wind <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. of heaven 2. quarter (of wind), side 3. breath of air 4. air, gas 5. vain, empty thing c. spirit (as that which breathes quickly in animation or agitation) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. spirit, animation, vivacity, vigour 2. courage 3. temper, anger 4. impatience, patience 5. spirit, disposition (as troubled, bitter, discontented) 6. disposition (of various kinds), unaccountable or uncontrollable impulse 7. prophetic spirit d. spirit (of the living, breathing being in man and animals) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. as gift, preserved by God, God's spirit, departing at death, disembodied being 	

- e. spirit (as seat of emotion)
 - 1. desire
 - 2. sorrow, trouble
- f. spirit
 - 1. as seat or organ of mental acts
 - 2. rarely of the will
 - 3. as seat especially of moral character
- g. Spirit of God, the third person of the triune God, the Holy Spirit, coequal, coeternal with the Father and the Son
 - 1. as inspiring ecstatic state of prophecy
 - 2. as impelling prophet to utter instruction or warning
 - 3. imparting warlike energy and executive and administrative power
 - 4. as endowing men with various gifts
 - 5. as energy of life
 - 6. as manifest in the Shekinah glory
 - 7. never referred to as a depersonalised force

King James Word Usage - Total: **378**

Spirit or spirit 232, wind 92, breath 27, side 6, mind 5, blast 4, vain 2, air 1, anger 1, cool 1, courage 1, miscellaneous 6

The KJV Old Testament Hebrew Lexicon

Strong's Number: 07306		Browse Lexicon	KJV Verse Count	
Original Word	Word Origin		Genesis	2
רוּחַ	a primitive root		Exodus	1
Transliterated Word	TDNT Entry		Leviticus	1
Ruwach	TWOT - 2131		Deuteronomy	1
Phonetic Spelling	Parts of Speech		Judges	1
roo'-akh	Verb		1 Samuel	1
Definition			Job	1
1. (Hiphil) to smell, scent, perceive odour, accept			Psalms	1
a. of horse			Isaiah	1
b. of delight (metaph)			Amos	1
			Total	11

King James Word Usage - Total: **11**

smell 8, touch 1, quick understanding 1, accept 1

The NAS New Testament Greek Lexicon

<http://www.biblestudytools.com/lexicons/greek/nas/pneuma.html>

Strong's Number: 4151	Browse Lexicon
Original Word	Word Origin
πνεῦμα	from (4154)
Transliterated Word	TDNT Entry
Pneuma	6:332,876
Phonetic Spelling	Parts of Speech
pnyoo'-mah	Noun Neuter

Definition

1. the third person of the triune God, the Holy Spirit, coequal, coeternal with the Father and the Son
 - a. sometimes referred to in a way which emphasises his personality and character (the \\Holy\\ Spirit)
 - b. sometimes referred to in a way which emphasises his work and power (the Spirit of \\Truth\\)
 - c. never referred to as a depersonalised force
2. the spirit, i.e. the vital principal by which the body is animated
 - a. the rational spirit, the power by which the human being feels, thinks, decides
 - b. the soul
3. a spirit, i.e. a simple essence, devoid of all or at least all grosser matter, and possessed of the power of knowing, desiring, deciding, and acting
 - a. a life giving spirit
 - b. a human soul that has left the body
 - c. a spirit higher than man but lower than God, i.e. an angel
 1. used of demons, or evil spirits, who were conceived as inhabiting the bodies of men
 2. the spiritual nature of Christ, higher than the highest angels and equal to God, the divine nature of Christ
4. the disposition or influence which fills and governs the soul of any one
 - a. the efficient source of any power, affection, emotion, desire, etc.
5. a movement of air (a gentle blast)
 - a. of the wind, hence the wind itself
 - b. breath of nostrils or mouth

NAS Word Usage - Total: **380**

breath 3, Spirit 239, spirit 103, spirits 32, spiritual 1, wind 1, winds 1

The NAS New Testament Greek Lexicon

Strong's Number: **4154**

[Browse Lexicon](#)

Original Word

Word Origin

πνέω

a root word

Transliterated Word

[TDNT](#) Entry

Pneo

6:452,876

Phonetic Spelling

Parts of Speech

pneh'-o

Verb

Definition

1. **to breathe, to blow**
 - a. **of the wind**

NAS Word Usage - Total: **7**

blew 2, blow 1, blowing 2, blows 1, wind 1

Appendix B:

An Example of the Search for the Technical Meaning of a Religious Word:

Who Tempted Eve?
A Search for the Elusive Meaning of an Ancient Word
We are looking for the Technical Meaning, not the Religious Meaning

November 24, 2005

By Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

Grunt, Snort, Hiss and Sigh:

In the ancient Hebrew language, the root words for Grunt, Snort, Hiss and Sigh are in that order when found in the Hebrew dictionary. Apparently they all had to do with sounds of breathing under different emotional circumstances and therefore started with a similar sound, which put them in proximity in the alphabetical dictionary. Apparently the words are best pronounced as an imitation of different forms of the sound of a sneeze, similar to the Russian female name of Natasha. (Which, apparently has a similar derivation, as that name is most often selected for use in fiction tales for a seductive female Russian spy, one who tends to be a brazen hussy harlot to be lusted after.)

Grunt (Strong's 05169) nachats {naw-khats} carries the meaning of urgent, pressing, hasty, to urge on, to press. It is found in the bible once, and is translated, "required haste" in the King James Version.

Snort or Snore (Strong's 05170) nachar {nakh'-ar} and (fem.) nacharah {nakh-ar-aw} carries the meaning of loud harsh breathing. It is found in the bible twice. It is translated "nostrils" when it is used to describe something terrible about the huge animal the behemoth. It is translated "snorting" when it is used to describe the sound of horses.

Snorter (Strong's 05171) Nacharay {nakh-ar-ah'-ee} or Nachray {nakh-rah'-ee} when used as a name for one of David's mighty warriors whom they called "Snorter," is not translated, rather it is transliterated into "Naharai."

Hiss, Hisser (Strong's 05172-05176) Nachash {naw-khawsh} is an identical word has been assigned five different Strong's numbers depending on the context used and whether it is used as a noun type or a verb type part of speech. That basic word is found 62 times in the bible. It is variously translated or transliterated, depending on how it is used.

05172: **verb** to perform occult practices. (from the hissing of an enchanter.)

05173: **noun.** A divination or enchantment, The art, activity, prophecies, or pronouncement of an occultist.

05174: **noun.** Bronze (So called from the hissing sound characteristic of the tin with which copper is alloyed to make bronze.)

05175: **noun.** A serpent, so called from its hissing.

05176: **Proper noun.** Nahash, transliteration of a bible character name, meaning something that hisses such as A practitioner of the occult, Bronze (contaminated, hiss metal,) or A serpent.

This is the word used as the name of the character that tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden.

Outline of Biblical Usage:

05172:

1) to practice divination, divine, observe signs, learn by experience, diligently observe, practice fortune telling, take as an omen

a) (Piel)

1) to practice divination

2) to observe the signs or omens

05173

1) divination, enchantment

05174:

1) copper, bronze

05175:

1) serpent, snake

a) serpent

b) image (of serpent)

c) fleeing serpent (mythological)

05176:

1) a king of the Ammonites during the time of king Saul

2) the father of Abigail, the mother of Amasa, the commander of Absalom's army

Hisser (Strong's 05177) Nachshown {nakh-shone' Proper name of a bible character Called Hisser. Not translated, rather transliterated into "Nahshon," meaning "enchanter."

Hissy (Strong's 05178) n@chosheth {nekh-o'-sheth} carries the meaning brass (bronze) alloy, impure, ignoble, contaminated, dubious, lust, harlotry, filthiness, confining.

Hisser (Strong's 05179) N@chushta' {nekh-oosh-taw'} Proper name of a female bible character Called Hisser. Not translated, rather transliterated into "Nehushta," meaning "Brassy or "enchantress." (Possibly has similar connotations as the seductive Russian enchantress spy, Natasha.)

Hiss(ing) Thing (Strong's 05180) N@chushtan {nekh-oosh-tawn'} Proper name King Hezekiah gave to the brass serpent made by Moses before King Hezekiah destroyed it.. Not translated, rather transliterated into "Nehushtan." Carries the meaning of a thing that hisses (has supernatural power of divination or enchantment,) an idol of occultism, an object of hidden powers which is worshiped.

Sigh (Strong's 05181 - 05185) Nachath {nakh'-ath} rest, quiet, die, death, descend, descent (of judgment,) As is Hiss, Sigh is an identical word which is assigned five different Strong's numbers depending on it's use. Sometimes it is used as a proper name and transliterated rather than translated. It appears 29 times in the Old Testament, It has varied translations in the King James Version, including:

05181 - AV - broken 2, come down 2, enter 1, stick fast 1, settle 1,
press sore 1, strong's synonym 1; 9

05182 - AV - come down 2, carry 1, place 1, laid up 1, deposed 1; 6

05183 - AV - rest 4, set on 1, quietness 1, quiet 1, lighting down 1; 8

05184 - AV - Nahath 5; 5

05185 - AV - come down 1; 1

Alternate Translation of

Genesis 3:1

Now the Hisser [enchanter] was the most shrewd/sly of all living in the land which the LORD God had made.

And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

Genesis 3:5

For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, your mental and spiritual faculties will be enabled to see things which otherwise are hidden from the eyes of mortals. Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

[Obviously the enchanter was tempting Eve with some hallucinogenic, mind expanding fruit, typical of that used in occultic practices to expand the mind.]

**The following notes are from a Dictionary and Word Search for 'Nachash
(Strong's 05176)
using information from Blue Letter Bible.**

Hiss (Strong's 05172) verb to perform occult practices.

Outline of Biblical Usage:

1) to practice divination, divine, observe signs, learn by experience, diligently observe, practice fortune telling, take as an omen

a) (Piel)

1) to practice divination

2) to observe the signs or omens

Translation Detail (KJV):

AV - enchantment 4, divine 2, enchanter 1, indeed 1, certainly 1, learn by experience 1, diligently observe 1; Total: 11

Hebrew Lexicon:

TO HISS, TO WHISPER, specially used of the whispering of soothsayers.

Source of Information:

Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for 'nachash (Strong's 05172) ' ". Blue Letter Bible. 1996-2002. 23 Nov 2005. <<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?word=05172&page=1>>

Hiss (Strong's 05173) noun, m. A divination or enchantment, The art, activity, prophecies, or pronouncement of an occultist..

Outline of Biblical Usage:

1) divination, enchantment

Translation Detail (KJV):

AV - enchantment 2; Total 2

Hebrew Lexicon:

enchantment, omen, augury, [Augury: the art, activity, prophecies, or pronouncements of an augur, soothsayer, or diviner.]

Source of Information:

Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for 'nachash (Strong's 05173) ' " . Blue Letter Bible. 1996-2002. 23 Nov 2005. <<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?word=05173&page=1>>

Hiss (Strong's 05174) Noun, m. Bronze (So called from the hissing sound characteristic of the tin with which copper is alloyed to make bronze.)

Outline of Biblical Usage:

1) copper, bronze

Translation Detail (KJV):

AV – brass 9; Total 9

Hebrew Lexicon:

copper, brass

Source of Information:

Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for 'n@chash (Strong's 05174) ' " . Blue Letter Bible. 1996-2002. 23 Nov 2005. <<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?word=05174&page=1>>

Hiss (Strong's 05175) noun, m A serpent, so called from its hissing.

Outline of Biblical Usage:

1) serpent, snake

a) serpent

b) image (of serpent)

c) fleeing serpent (mythological)

Translation Detail (KJV):

AV - serpent 31; Total: 31

Hebrew Lexicon:

(1) *a serpent*, so called from its hissing Used of the constellation of the serpent or dragon in the northern part of the sky.

Source of Information:

Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for 'nachash (Strong's 05175) ' " . Blue Letter Bible. 1996-2002. 23 Nov 2005. <<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?word=05175&page=1>>

Hiss (Strong's 05176)) noun, pronoun, m Nahash, transliteration of of a bible character name, meaning something that hisses such as A practitioner of the occult, Bronze (contaminated, hiss metal,) or A serpent.

Outline of Biblical Usage:

1) a king of the Ammonites during the time of king Saul

2) the father of Abigail, the mother of Amasa, the commander of Absalom's army

Translation Detail (KJV):

AV - Nahash 9; Total 9

Hebrew Lexicon:

(1) *a serpent*, so called from its hissing Used of the constellation of the serpent or dragon in the northern part of the sky.

Source of Information:

Blue Letter Bible. "Dictionary and Word Search for 'Nachash (Strong's 05176) ' ". Blue Letter Bible. 1996-2002. 23 Nov 2005. <<http://www.blueletterbible.org/cgi-bin/words.pl?word=05176&page=1>>

More Notes:

When it is used as a name, it carries the connotation of ...

Num 31:22 Only the gold, and the silver, the brass, the iron, the tin, and the lead,

The Blue Letter Bible speculates the word 05172 is applied to the metal bronze, an alloy of copper and tin is the same word, renumbered to 05174 because of the sound aspect, (perhaps in the sense of ringing, i.e. bell-metal)

I would suggest it is more likely because of the sound of hissing, a characteristic of the metal tin, when it is bent. That sound is more popularly known as “tin cry.” When tin is bent, it makes a sound of a cry, or a hiss, depending on the shape or thickness of the piece of tin being bent.. Therefore, copper alloyed with tin (bronze) would be called by the name “Hiss.”

The King James Bible uses the word brass. Today, brass is defined as an alloy of copper and zinc. However in the time of the writing of the bible, zinc had not yet been discovered. The Hebrews had just escaped from Egypt and taken the precious metals from Egypt. The only metals known to the Egyptians at that time were: Gold, Copper, Silver, Lead, Tin, and Iron, Bronze being an alloy of Copper and Tin.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, **In ancient documents, including the Bible, the term brass is often used to denote bronze (copper/tin alloy).**

"brass." Britannica Concise Encyclopedia. 2005. Encyclopædia Britannica. 22 Nov. 2005 <<http://concise.britannica.com/ebc/article-9357951>>.

Theological implications:

Implications of the similarity of the same word having the same meaning when applied to metal brass called **hiss** and practitioners of the occult called **Hissers** are seen in the biblical usage of tin being associated with the concept of dross, or impurity. Particularly of interest is the passage where an occultic figure made from Brass, called **Hiss** would be in the form of a serpent, called a **Hisser** and be worshiped as an occultic diviner, called a **Hisser**. This, literally translated, is literally as it is stated in 2Ki 18:4 where Hezekiah broke up the **hiss hisser** [brass serpent] made by Moses because the people were worshiping it as a thing of **hissing** [an occultic idol with powers of divination.]

2Ki 18:4 He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brasen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan.

In the bible, brass [bronze] is a symbol of impurity, because it is an alloy. That is particularly true if the metal with which copper is alloyed emits a hissing sound, which, in the bible, is associated with occultic practices.

More Information on the topic from:

A Short History of Metals

By

Alan W. Cramb

**Department of Materials Science and Engineering
Carnegie Mellon University**

November 22, 2005

Process Metallurgy is one of the oldest applied sciences. Its history can be traced back to 6000 BC. Admittedly, its form at that time was rudimentary, but, to gain a perspective in Process Metallurgy, it is worthwhile to spend a little time studying the initiation of mankind's association with metals. Currently there are 86 known metals. Before the 19th century only 24 of these metals had been discovered and, of these 24 metals, 12 were discovered in the 18th century. Therefore, from the discovery of the first metals - gold and copper until the end of the 17th century, some 7700 years, only 12 metals were known. Four of these metals, arsenic, antimony, zinc and bismuth, were discovered in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, while platinum was discovered in the 16th century. The other seven metals, known as the Metals of Antiquity, were the metals upon which civilization was based. These seven metals were:

- (1) Gold (ca) 6000BC
- (2) Copper,(ca) 4200BC
- (3) Silver,(ca) 4000BC
- (4) Lead, (ca) 3500BC
- (5) Tin, (ca) 1750BC
- (6) Iron, smelted, (ca) 1500BC
- (7) Mercury, (ca) 750BC

These metals were known to the Mesopotamians, Egyptians, Greeks and the Romans. Of the seven metals, five can be found in their native states, e.g., gold, silver, copper, iron (from meteors) and mercury. However, the occurrence of these metals was not abundant and the first two metals to be used

widely were gold and copper. And, of course, the history of metals is closely linked to that of coins and gemstones

After the seven metals of antiquity: gold, silver, copper, mercury, tin, iron and lead, the next metal to be discovered was Arsenic in the 13th century by Albertus Magnus. Arsenicus (arsenious oxide) when heated with twice its weight of soap became metallic. By 1641 arsenious oxide was being reduced by charcoal. Arsenic is steel gray, very brittle and crystalline; it tarnishes in air and when heated rapidly forms arsenious oxide with the odor of garlic. Arsenic compounds are poisonous. The symbol As is taken from the latin arsenicum. Arsenic was used in bronzing and improving the sphericity of shot. The most common mineral is Mispickel or Arsenopyrite (FeSAs) from which arsenic sublimates upon heating.

The next metal to be isolated was antimony. Stibium or antimony sulphide was roasted in an iron pot to form antimony. Agricola reported this technique in 1560. Antimony whose name comes from the Greek "anti plus monos" - a metal not found alone, has as its symbol Sb from the latin stibium. It is an extremely brittle flaky metal. Antimony and its compounds are highly toxic. Initial uses were as an alloy for lead as it increased hardness. Stibnite is the most common ore. It was commonly roasted to form the oxide and reduced by carbon.

By 1595, bismuth was produced by reduction of the oxide with carbon, however, it was not until 1753 when bismuth was classified as an element. Zinc was known to the Chinese in 1400; however, it was not until 1738, when William Champion patented the zinc distillation process, that zinc came into common use. Before Champion's process, zinc, which was imported from China, was known as Indian Tin or Pewter. A Chinese text from 1637 stated the method of production was to heat a mixture of calamine (zinc oxide) and charcoal in an earthenware pot. The zinc was recovered as an incrustation on the inside of the pot. In 1781 zinc was added to liquid copper to make brass. This method of brass manufacture soon became dominant.

<http://neon.mems.cmu.edu/cramb/Processing/history.html> (November 22, 2005)

Department of Materials Science and Engineering

Carnegie Mellon University

5000 Forbes Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Phone (412) 268-2700

Fax (412) 268-7596

The Department of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) is one of six academic departments in Carnegie Institute of Technology, the engineering college at Carnegie Mellon. MSE has a long and distinguished tradition in materials education and research, and today our faculty continue to address the more important and challenging issues at the forefront of science and technology.

Materials science and engineering is an interdisciplinary activity that applies the principles of basic sciences and engineering to understanding the behavior of materials, their development and applications. Both our undergraduate and graduate students are exposed to this interdisciplinary approach.

From Encyclopædia Britannica:

Brass:

Alloy of copper and zinc, important for its hardness and workability.

Brass was first used c. 1200 BC in the Near East, then extensively in China after 220 BC, and soon thereafter by the Romans. **In ancient documents, including the Bible, the term brass is often used to denote bronze (copper/tin alloy).** The malleability of brass depends on its zinc content; brasses with more than 45% zinc are not workable. Alpha brasses contain less than 40% zinc; beta brasses (40–45% zinc) are less ductile than alpha brasses but stronger. A third group includes brasses with additional elements. Among these are lead brasses, which are more easily machined; naval and admiralty brasses, in which a small amount of tin improves resistance to corrosion by seawater; and aluminum brasses, which provide strength and corrosion resistance where the naval brasses may fail.

To cite this page:

MLA style:

"brass." *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*. 2005. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. 22 Nov. 2005 <<http://concise.britannica.com/ebc/article-9357951>>.

APA style:

brass. (2005). *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 22, 2005, from *Encyclopædia Britannica* <http://concise.britannica.com/ebc/article-9357951>

Britannica style:

"brass." *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia* from *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <<http://concise.britannica.com/ebc/article-9357951>> [Accessed November 22, 2005].

Extra Stuff:

Discovering the correct technical meanings of words in the bible that have traditionally been interpreted in only a religious way reveals the bible is more technically correct than heretofore realized.

¹ *Now the hisser (occultic enchanter, or serpent) was more subtle than any beast of the ecology which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Gen 3:1*