arithmetic confuses the issue of whether their “system” is defined by its parameters or by an infinitely expandable record of arbitrary signals interacting with the system. Modulo 5 addition has an explicit goal of discarding higher order information in favor of repeating a count; it is no different from the clock. In modulo 5, the series of 0, 5, 10, 15, ... is “infinite” only in the trivial sense that the series 0, 0, 0, ... is “infinite.” If we discard one clock’s history and compare it to the “infinite” potential history of another, infinity appears to “equal” five. It is almost a good card trick. But, in fact, the authors’ two systems are the same.

Contrastingly, Abba’s record is intact, inherent, and (humanly) irreducible. Triune theory is the entity that is modulo-like, for it forgets that higher order information exists (e.g., only Abba knows when the Son of Man will return; Matt. 24:36). The two real “systems” are not “equal” or “consubstantial” in their “substance.” One is greater, just as Jesus repeatedly said (e.g., John 14:28).

The authors apologize for the model’s limitations by bowing to paradox. If paradox is the appeal, consider the original version: Elohim made humankind in his image. Even so, he cannot be described or likened to anything. No image of him can be made, no attribute encompassed. This includes his metaphysical “substance.” Some people refused to accept the paradox; they decided God is Jesus the Messiah, that Elohim is the second Adam, that the icon of God—double-click and the program opens—is the program. But if anything finite can be a “fullness” of infinity, then perhaps, like the authors’ models, we are all “full” of the things we have forgotten, and perhaps we are all divine—at least as much as Athanasius, who advocated that Christ had to pay an “infinite” price or he (Athanasius) could not become God Almighty.

How many can recite Jesus’ answer to the question, “Who is this ‘Son of Man’?” (John 12:34). Why did Jesus recite, “Ye are gods”? (John 10:34, Ps. 82). If “God in Jesus” equals incarnation, what does “Jesus in us” equal? (John 14:20). Contemporary Trinity forgets dozens of such verses, while fourth century Trinity is blatantly self-glorifying; both are illogical. Is the logos to be defined in illogos—logic by illogic, reason by the incomprehensible, words by hand-waves? Few concepts are as antithetical to science or the Gospel.

Since Jesus is the first-fruit—the first born into the Resurrection—the beginning of the new Creation, what does beginning mean? Is Jesus the foreordained Messiah who existed prior to his “begetting”? Yes, but Paul tells us “begetting” (yalad) refers to the resurrection of the man Jesus (Acts 13:33, Ps. 2). The word beginning means both less and more than Trinity presumes.

Newton decided Trinity is a fraud. This remains the logical and consistent conclusion on the matter. Williams and Dickerson imply disbelief by Isaac in regard to the “miraculous and mysterious” (p. 104). But others degrade Newton for suggesting that God adjusts his clockworks. Which is it? Is Newton’s God too tiny or too big, too distant or too close? Which caricature makes Trinity right?

Trinity is still without mathematical blessing, congruent with its lack of scriptural vocabulary or clear support. It is short on mere (non-fraudulent) scriptural hints that can be “taken” in its favor, yet foundered in opposing verses, tainted by paganism, surrounded at every stage by controversy, bloodshed, and persecution and completely without a logical, sensible, or comprehensible foundation. Superstition is about forgetting the real question and focusing on fantastic speculations; science and Christianity are antithetical to this. Oh barbarian brothers in Christ! Why do you call our master “Good”? Only God our Father is Good (Matt. 19:17); only God is God.

Derek Eshelbrenner
3657 CR 1500
Havana, KS 67347

Old Glaciers
Derek Eshelbrenner’s Letter (PSCF 56, no. 2 [June 2004]: 156–7) on Paul Seely’s article about Greenland’s Ice Glacier was entertaining but did not have much depth to it. Derek indicates that the Greenland Ice Glacier might have floated in one spot during the six months or more of the Genesis flooding. I am sure Derek has not thought it through, how high the Greenland glacier would have had to float as it hovered over Greenland Island during the turbulent Genesis flooding.

The Genesis story says that the flood water “… prevailed so mightily upon the earth that all the HIGH mountains …” were covered by fifteen cubits of water. Nine out of the ten highest peaks in the world reside in the Himalaya range and climb up to 29,035 feet for Mt. Everest. From the Genesis story, the flood waters would have had to top Mt. Everest, so Greenland’s glacier hovered for six months at about 5½ miles high above Greenland’s island. That would be quite a feat and I am sure not impossible for God to do. But if God did that for this old Glacier, he would have done it for all of the other old glaciers in the world.

Most people do not realize that there are over 71,000 glaciers that are currently being monitored by the World Glacier Monitoring Service, WGMS. Most of these glaciers are known as short timers, a few thousand years, but there are many that are showing to be very old by the process of cutting deep Ice Cores into them. The Bolivian ice cores indicate a 25,000 year tropical climate history and it goes up to 220,000 years before present [1995] at the Vostok Station in Antarctica and the most recent analyses, 1997, of the Guliya Ice Cap in the Kunlun Shan Mountains of western China suggest a record of more than 500,000 years old.

I for one do not understand why God would keep a 200,000 year old glacier floating above one spot of the earth during the Genesis flood and then drop it back down on the island it came from? How would that show that we live on a very young earth?

I would think the very evidence that there are many glaciers that are from 25,000 years up to 500,000 years old completely destroys the very concept of this earth being only 6,000 years old. Derek admits that there is no evidence for a worldwide Genesis flood but hopes that “science” will “demonstrate that a global flood did occur.” The problem with Derek is he does not realize that “science” has already accumulated tons of evidence that “demonstrate that a global flood” could not ever have happened in the last 200,000 years. Every year archaeolo-
Abraham Began the 430 Years: Such Numbers Are Not Figurative

Martin LaBar’s letter in the previous issue (PSCF 56, no. 4 [Dec. 2004]: 308) disagrees with “Gilbert’s interpretation of Exodus 12:40” described in my letter on “Genesis Age Gaps?” (PSCF 56, no. 2 [June 2004]: 153–4). I simply stated St. Paul’s interpretation (Gal. 3:16–17) that the pre-Exodus 430 years began when God gave the covenant promise to Abram. Paul links this promise to the law that was introduced 430 years later and also to Christ. The first expression of the promise that refers to Christ tells Abram “All peoples on earth will be blessed through you” (Gen. 12:3). Christ Jesus accomplished that blessing and fulfilled that prophecy (John 8:56).

Abraham begat Isaac twenty-five years after that promise was given (Gen. 12:4; 21:5). Isaac begat Jacob at age 60 (Gen. 25:26), and Jacob went to Egypt at age 130 (Gen. 47:9). Add those years up to get 215; subtract that from 430 to get 215 years between the descent into Egypt and the exodus. Josephus wrote: “They left Egypt … 430 years after our forefather Abraham came to Canaan, but 215 years after Jacob removed from Egypt.” (Antiquities of the Jews,” Book 2, Chap. 15:2, in The Works of Josephus, trans. Wm. Whiston [1736] (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987), 75.

LaBar argues that the 430 years began when Jacob and his sons went to join Joseph in Egypt. He bases his disagreement with Paul on Gen. 15:13, when God tells Abram “… your descendants shall be strangers in a country not their own, and they will be enslaved and mistreated four hundred years” (NIV). LaBar says that “means a captivity of Abraham’s descendants, in Egypt, amounting to considerably more than 200 years.”

First, “a country not their own” (NIV) is also translated as “a land … not theirs” (KJV). These two translations provide different interpretations: “country” suggests that Abram was within the boundaries of a particular nation. “Land not theirs” is less specific and simply suggests “foreign soil” or “somebody else’s turf.” The NIV footnote to Exod. 12:40 says the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint name both Egypt and Canaan as the places of slavery and mistreatment foretold in Gen. 15:13.

Second, “descendants” (NIV) is a derivative of the primary meaning of the Hebrew in Gen. 15:13, which is “seed” (KJV). “Descendants” restricts interpretation of that word to “offspring already born,” whereas the “seed” of Abram obviously went where he went until it joined the seed of Sarah to produce offspring of the promise, who are also included in “seed.”

And third, LaBar interprets Gen. 15:13 to mean that slavery occupied many more than 200 years. However, compare “your descendants will be enslaved and mistreated four hundred years” with “Americans had a bloody Civil War and antagonism over slavery for decades.” The war occupied only four years of those antagonistic decades, and the Hebrew slavery occupied considerably less than half the 400 years of “mistreatment.” Moses, born into that slavery (Exod. 1:8–2:3), led the exodus at age 80 (Exod. 7:7), which indicates that the slavery began at least eighty years before the exodus.

Scripture does not say how long it was between the start of slavery and Moses’ birth, but estimates range from 0–1 years (Klassen, 1975) to 38 years (Reece, 1977), according to The Reece Chronological Bible (Bethany [1980], 118–9). These estimates indicate a range of 80–118 years of slavery, which is less than half LaBar’s estimate. My explanation for the thirty year difference between the 400 years of “mistreatment” (Gen. 15:13) and the 430 years of Exod. 12:40 is that Joseph held power in Egypt for thirty more years after Jacob and his sons joined him (his ages 40–70), during which time the Israelites were treated very well indeed (Gen. 47:11, 27).

For those who think the patriarchs were not “mistreated” (KJV has “afflicted”), consider Abraham’s afflictions described in Genesis 12–20, and Gen. 23:2, which has Sarah separated from him at Kiriath Arba, possibly furious over the attempt to sacrifice Isaac, whose own afflictions are described in Genesis 26. Jacob sums up his afflictions in Gen. 47:9 (NIV): “My years have been … difficult.”

In response to Carol Hill’s letter (PSCF 56, no. 4 [Dec. 2004]: 308). I agree with her point that Adam was around 6,000 years ago; I disagree with her point that Old Testament numbers are sometimes “sacred or figurative.” I do not think God lied when he inspired the Scriptures, as attested by two witnesses (Heb. 6:18 and Titus 1:2), even “white lies” for numerological purposes; a patriarch can live to a “sacred” age if God wills it.

I thank my wife Mary Ann for insightful comments about this letter.

William H. Gilbert III
ASA member, retired
RR 2, 14571 Hwy#7
Tangier, NS B0J 3H0 Canada
gilbert@simpson.edu

Notes
1 World Glacier Monitoring Service Available Data on web at: www.geo.unizh.ch/wgms/wgmshome/data.htm
2 Ice Cores on web at: www.antarctic.com.au/encyclopaedia/physical/IceCores.html
5 Earle Holland, “Researchers Date Chinese Ice Core to 500,000 Years,” Ohio State University News Release (June 29 1997) on web at: www.sciencedaily.com/print.php?url=/releases/1997/06/970629224509.htm
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