

identifies Amalek and Jordan as sons of Lud, indicating the area of Palestine as the haunt of his descendants rather than Lydia, Asia Minor, where Josephus placed them. Another gives Amalek Hamitic ancestry; there were alleged Amalekite Pharaohs.³

Although the destruction of Tilgarimanu wiped Togarmah's name from the Bible lands, the Armenians claim descent from Haik, son of Togarmah. Writing around 600BC Ezekiel mentioned Togarmah being in 'the uttermost parts of the north'. While to place his descendants in, say, the Baltic region on the strength of this would be far-fetched, it is worth noting that second century BC Greek and Latin writers referred to the Tochari living in the upper basin of the Amu Darya, which separates Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan before emptying into the Aral Sea.

They later moved into Sinkiang, from where Buddhist writings in their language, dated between AD500 and AD700 were discovered at the beginning of this century. Tochari is unrelated to the Iranian languages but is much closer to Celtic and Italic (which diverged more recently than other Indo-European groups), to Armenian, Phrygian and Thracian. Similarities to Balto-Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian tongues are generally considered to have been acquired over centuries of contact.

Reading Mr Cooper's articles on the early Britons and Saxons⁴⁻⁶ reminded me of a book I read years ago, a commentary on a little-known old Frisian record. What struck me was the big event in the history of the Frisians (comparable to the Exodus for Israel), the sinking of Atland in 2193BC. This date would be around the time of the confusion of tongues at Babel, which was undoubtedly accompanied by great geological changes.⁷

Before 2193BC was the mythical era of Atland. As flooding has been frequent in the North Sea area in the past, the sinking of Atland could conceivably be a retrojection of memories of such events to the time when a bigger disaster took place,

details of which the Frisian ancestors did not recall. The book itself would have to be looked at for those interested; salt is recommended for the proverbial pinch or two!⁸

Interestingly, odd snippets match with some of Bill's findings. He links Ireland to the Phoenicians and the book has the Druids being founded by Phoenician priests — Roman writers charge the Druids with the same practices the Bible condemns the Canaanites for. Woden is also presented as an historical figure, prior to his deification. He was king of the Frisians in Denmark, and his cousin (*neef*, Frisian) Teunis was sea-king. When they parted company, Teunis led many of his people to the Mediterranean, and it was suggested in a paper read at a meeting of the Frisian Society in 1871, shortly after the Frisian book came to light, that 'Neef Teunis', cousin of Woden, was deified as Neptune (in a similar fashion to Tubalcain becoming Vulcan).

Derel Briarley,
Newcastle upon Tyne,
ENGLAND.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper, W. R., 1990. The early history of man: Part 1. The table of nations. **EN Tech. J.**, 4:67-92.
2. Spence, L., 1926. **The Problem of Atlantis**.
3. Velikovsky, I., 1952. **Ages in Chaos**, Doubleday, New York.
4. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — Part 2. The Irish-Celtic, British and Saxon chronologies. **CEN Tech. J.**, 5(1): 2-28.
5. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — Part 3. The kings of the ancient Britons: a chronology. **CEN Tech. J.**, 5(2):139-142.
6. Cooper, W. R., 1993. The early history of man — Part 5. The early chronicles and their historicity. **CEN Tech. J.**, 7(2): 108-121.
7. *'In the Eddas the northlands are called Atalland (Thule 23.74) and the sea Atle's path (20.320). . . the name Atal or Atle is that of a sea king. . . Atland, Adalland, Oatland occur frequently in old records as names for districts in various countries around the North Sea.'* Spanuth, J., 1976. **Atlantis of the North**. Translated from German 1979. In this book he presents contemporary reports by geologists and archaeologists of catastrophic change in Europe C. 1000 BC. An expert on Nordic, Celtic and Tocharian

cultures is quoted equating the megalithic culture with the 'battleaxe people' and the Indo-Europeans.

And we can understand how he feels when he says in his introduction:

'It is also something of a riddle that men who claim to value their professional integrity as scholars should produce falsifications of my statements, or those of others, or even of their own, and moreover refuse even to read my book and assert that they have no idea of the archaeological questions with which it deals.'

8. Scrutton, R., 1977. **The Other Atlantis**, Spearman Publishing.

PRECAMBRIAN GEOLOGY

Dear Editor,

Hunter¹ claims that, before 1991, creationists had fixed the Flood/post-Flood boundary at the base of the Cambrian. This is not quite correct. Back in 1983, I had taken account of Precambrian biotas as a whole,² and had included them within the Flood. I provided a map showing all of the then-known Precambrian fossil localities on Earth, listed some important Precambrian faunas, and then examined how often the Precambrian faunas are overlain by 'younger' fossils. The purpose of the overall study was to evaluate, in a systematic and detailed fashion, the age-old question of how fossils actually succeed each other in Earth's strata, and then provide a detailed explanation of it during the Flood. This article is now widely available, as it has subsequently been reprinted within my widely available book on Flood geology.³

Then and now I take a 'middle' road towards Precambrian rocks, rejecting both extremes of Precambrian being all pre-Flood and all forming during the Flood.⁴ Those Precambrian strata which do contain fossils are undoubtedly Flood sediments, but the vast majority of Precambrian strata is unfossiliferous, and can still be assigned to the pre-Flood.

Many Precambrian fossils are stromatolites, and these have been invariably accepted as organic. Now a

recent study⁵ challenges this, proposing that even complex stromatolitic structures could have been formed by inorganic processes. If correct, the study has devastating implications. It necessitates a complete reappraisal as to which even ostensibly fossiliferous Precambrian strata are necessarily intra-Flood and which can remain assigned to the pre-Flood.

As for sufficient time for geologic work during Creation Week, we must keep in mind that supernatural processes were undoubtedly in effect during that period of time, so it is probably unwise to reject out of hand the possibility that at least some of these rocks were created *ex nihilo*, or at least were subject to divine sculpting that is completely different from currently-known geologic processes (hence the complete breakdown of any semblance of uniformitarianism during this point).

I also warned of any 'natural' pre-Flood/Flood boundary at any lithostratigraphic or biostratigraphic location. For instance, I noted that the Precambrian/Cambrian boundary is often circularly defined (for example, Cambrian begins at the first appearance of trilobites, and then we hear that trilobites do not appear before the Cambrian. At other times, the Precambrian/Cambrian boundary has been moved downward with the discovery of trilobites found to occur before the previously-defined Precambrian/Cambrian boundary). The same chain of reasoning holds for attempting to 'discover' a 'natural' pre-Flood/Flood break within Precambrian rocks as a whole.

It is unfortunate that so many creationists assume that similar strata or lithologies must necessarily be contemporaneous, and therefore time markers. In actuality, there is no basis, much less guarantee, that the same lithology, lithological sequence, unconformity, etc., formed at the same time during the Flood in adjacent basins, much less that it was

necessarily contemporaneous on different continents. About the only guarantee of isochrony comes from ash falls (tuffs), provided that they have been correctly correlated.

John Woodmorappe,
Chicago, Illinois,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

REFERENCES

1. Hunter, M. J., 1996. Is the pre-Flood boundary in the Earth's mantle? **CEN Tech. J.**, 10(3):344-357.
2. Woodmorappe, J., 1983. A diluviological treatise on the stratigraphic separation of fossils. **Creation Research Society Quarterly**, 20(3):133-185.
3. Woodmorappe, J., 1993. **Studies in Flood Geology**, Institute for Creation Research, San Diego, California, USA.
4. Hunter, Ref. 1.
5. Grotzinger, J. P., and Rothman, D. H., 1996. An abiotic model for stromatolite morphogenesis. **Nature**, 383:423-425.

SUFFERING AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Dear Editor,

In **CEN Tech. J.**, 10(3) there appeared a paper by James Stambaugh which addressed an important philosophical problem.¹ This problem seems to be fatal to any theistic religion.

The problem may be expressed thus:

- (1) God is totally good,
- (2) God is omnipotent, and
- (3) Evil exists.

But these three, statements cannot all be true, because they present an obvious contradiction.

As Christians we clearly need to find an answer to this problem.

I am not clear as to what Stambaugh's solution is to this problem, or to what extent he offers his paper as a philosophical solution.

Someone who believes that God created the diversity of life by means of evolution (that is, a theistic evolutionist) has an insoluble problem. Clearly, God is either not totally good (because He allowed His creatures to suffer needlessly), or else He is not omnipotent (because he had to use a trial-and-error procedure). In this case the solution is simple, God did not use evolution!

If I understand Stambaugh correctly, the thrust of his paper is to show:-

- (1) That animals do indeed suffer because they have a similar physiology to man, and
- (2) That the teaching of Scripture is that God did not use evolution. Hence animals suffer only because man chose to sin, and not because it was something programmed into God's creation.

As I see it, this moves the problem from the obviously insoluble category to maybe soluble, but we are still lacking a solution. Would this be a fair assessment?

I ask for clarification because I am working on a paper for the **CEN Tech. J.** which follows on naturally from Stambaugh's paper, and will try to come as close as possible to a solution to this difficult problem. Stambaugh does quote from Romans 8:19-21 which implies a '*future renewal of creation*' (p. 401), which together with a start to suffering as a result of man's Fall into sin, suggests that evil exists only for a finite time in comparison to man's limitless existence — thus allowing the possibility of a philosophical solution.

David Malcolm,
Newcastle, New South Wales,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCE

1. Stambaugh, J., 1996. **Creation, suffering and the problem of evil.** **CEN Tech. J.**, 10(3):391-404.