

with the Flood. There the word order is different from that in 104:8, where mountains and valleys are anarthrous (without the definite article). This may indicate a difference between figurative skipping and literal ascending, since the 104:8 word order is that of prose. So if there is any significance in the word order it suggests that 'mountains' (not *the* mountains) rose, rather than the water(s) climbed up (some) mountains. In my view it's more likely that some mountains rose.

In addition to the major translations of Europe (French, German, Italian, Spanish, Swedish) I found that the majority of English translations in my possession 'sing the almighty power of God that made the mountains rise'.<sup>1</sup> These include the Amplified, Revised Berkeley, Darby's, International Children's Bible, Living Bible, New American Standard Bible and Revised Standard Version.

My King James and my Revised Version had mountains rising in their margins. Those favouring the waters rising were the Good News, New English Bible and New International Version only. The African Nkore-Kiga Bible also has mountains rising, indicating that the Bible Society supports that translation, since I happen to know that the translators knew no Hebrew and little Greek.<sup>2</sup> Thus on the whole, scholars seem to favour the miraculous in this verse.

I find the two 'parallel' passages cited by Williams insufficiently similar to Psalm 104:3. Numbers 21:33 ('... went up the road to Bashan') has what Halliday calls an 'effective' subject.<sup>3</sup> (It is animate). In Isaiah 38:8, the sun did not 'go down' ten degrees as water goes down valleys.

Is it actually *'natural to suppose that the waters are the main topic from verse 7 through to verse 9'*? In Psalm 114, the topic moves from water (verse 3) to mountains (4), to water (5) to mountains (6). It's not unusual in the Hebrew Scriptures to

switch subjects. Thus in Daniel 9, the singular subject of verse 27 is that of verse 26a, while in 26b an entirely different plural subject intervenes. There's no reason why verses 7 and 9 of Psalm 104 should not have a common subject, while verse 8 intervenes with a different one.

As to the LXX, we must remember that it is as likely to contain Hebraisms as some of the NT Greek texts. Its treatment of gender and word order cannot decide the original intended meaning.

As regards the letter from Brenton Minge, I am frankly puzzled. Most of it appears to accuse 'mountain lifters' of being uniformitarian and anti-miracle. I would have thought that the uplift of mountains and the sinking of valleys on a large scale indicates a truly great God!

I have often suggested that Genesis 1:9 and 2:10-14 (which I cannot expound here)<sup>4</sup> indicates a rather different pre-Flood world from the present one. Rolling plains, no craggy mountains, a near perfect world marred only by sin.

In his fourth paragraph, Mr Minge speaks of 'submarine uplift'; however, I am talking of mountain uplift and submarine sinking, so I fail to see the connection. I don't object to mountains being covered and rising at the same time, so again no problem. As to mixing Creation and Flood, 2 Peter 3 does this as much as Psalm 104, so what is the problem? And as to 'slender textual evidence' for uplift, surely that comment applies more to a translation which adds prepositions like 'over' and 'to', which are not found in the Hebrew original. If Luther and the other scholars are correct, the present is not the key to the pre-Flood past, so again, why suggest these scholars (mostly before Darwin) were anti-creationist'?

Charles Taylor  
Gosford, New South Wales  
AUSTRALIA

## References

1. Watts, I., In a hymn beginning: *'I sing...'*
2. This language was the basis of my Ph.D., but I did not participate in the work of the Bible translation.
3. Halliday, M.A.K., 1968. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, Part 3. *Journal of Linguistics* 4:181.
4. Taylor, C.V., 1984. *The Oldest Science Book in the World*, Assembly Press, Brisbane, p. 56.

## C-decay

As the author of the paper<sup>1</sup> that has provoked three letters in *CEN Tech. J.* **12(2):166-168**, 1998, may I comment on their contents?

Dr Colin Gauld seems to have the wrong order of priorities in saying that theories based upon C-decay (CDK) are more important than proving CDK has occurred. He seems to minimise and even dispute whether *c* has decreased when he says that I have only 'implied' that it has decreased. I thought my article was sufficiently clear that I was certain it **had** decreased and I provided what I thought was reasonable evidence that it had done so. He continues by saying:

*'One of the reasons why the theory of c-decay has fallen into disfavour is probably the difficulty of obtaining agreement about whether the speed of light has actually decreased.'*<sup>2</sup>

Again, there is the tone of minimising the evidence I set out which I tried to make as simple as I could. Over many years, the graph of results for a true constant that you should get would be the 'funnel' shape of Fig. 2 in my article. One has only to glance at Figs. 3 and 4 to see that, firstly, they do not conform to Fig. 2, and secondly, virtually every result is **above** the present value. How much clearer can I make it? It is noticeable that Dr Gauld does not provide a single piece of

evidence that refutes the contention of my article but merely minimises my claim. Regarding his wrong priorities, in his last paragraph he makes the surprising suggestion that any resulting theory is more important than the facts that prove it, yet he then clearly denigrates the possibility that CDK has taken place anyway. Surely the sequence is to prove the facts first, and then theories — several if necessary — can then be built upon them. I am mystified why Dr Gauld should decry the latter and at the same time elevate the former.

David Malcolm's letter<sup>3</sup> suggests that CDK is kept as a viable theory along with Dr Humphrey's 'time dilation solution' — a suggestion with which I would agree. However, may I mention that I have examined the theory of relativity and totally reject it.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, to me at any rate, any creationist theory based upon relativity is founded upon a quagmire. [As an engineer I have not mentioned sand as a foundation for this is usually a good foundation — away from flood waters!]

Could I, in turn, ask David a question? As far as I can see, the evidence for CDK is very strong, and furthermore, the results are entirely supportive of the creationist viewpoint (reduction of radioactive dates to a few thousand years, stars visible millions of light years away, and much else). Where, then, are the 'difficulties' in CDK theory that he refers to?

Tim Parish<sup>5</sup> suggests we reconstruct the equipment that was used in the past to measure  $c$  and if it is today's value, then CDK would be proven. Firstly, I fear that the scheme is impractical. Creationists have little money to spare to make such expensive equipment and would sooner spend it on evangelism in their churches. Even if  $c$  was found to be slower, does he think that the scientific community would take any greater notice than they have done so far? If they did, it would be dismissed on some trifling issue they

would pick on. Secondly, I note that he refers to the early results being '*relatively distant from current  $c$* ' and '*the values obtained apparently [!] still a significant way off from current  $c$* .' His wording implies that they were not accurate (which they were) and, furthermore, in neither of these statements does he indicate that virtually all these results were above the present value. We return again to asking 'Why is this feature so consistently ignored?' Thirdly, I fear that Tim is unaware of the slight he is casting upon many highly reputable scientists in the past who measured CDK. What he is in effect saying to them is 'We will make a piece of equipment that will be identical to yours, but we are not certain that you used it correctly as your results may have been biased. We will use it again to measure  $c$ . If it is today's value, it will show that  $c$  has decayed.' Surely, if correctly used, they should give today's value. If they do not, what conclusion will he draw? The fact that so many different methods were used and almost all gave a higher value than today's should be sufficiently convincing by itself. Fourthly, his suggestion has already been carried out in some small measure. If you look carefully at Fig. 4 in my article, you will see that four of the measurements were made by Michelson — who won a Nobel Prize for his work in this field. Every single one of his measurements was lower than the previous measurement. In some of his experiments, the same apparatus was used.

### An underlying and serious problem

I have been dealing with the subject of CDK almost since Barry Setterfield wrote his first articles in *Creation Magazine* in 1981, and for many years I have become increasingly troubled by the way in which the subject has been discussed. One would hope that creationists, above all, would be eager to seek the

truth on any topic and readily acknowledge arguments and data when they are proven — even though they may contradict their own initial ideas. They would present counter evidence and conduct the discussion in an atmosphere of cordiality and a mutual pilgrimage towards God's Truth. I venture to suggest that this has not been so regarding CDK. Could I point out the following:

1. Despite the many solutions it brings to creationist problems, it has, nevertheless, generated much antagonism, heat and emotion, such that the subject is virtually banned from one major creationist email forum.
2. More important, as I have tried to show in my article, opponents of CDK have stooped to illogical arguments, poor statistics and the use of 'weasel words'<sup>6</sup> to support their case. Why should this be?

We will leave the reader to ponder on why a purely scientific debate, started by one sole Australian creationist using sound data, should have been virtually ignored by many creationists for several years, and then eventually call forth such acrimony. I fear it does not augur well for the creationist movement.

Malcolm Bowden  
Bromley, Kent  
UNITED KINGDOM

### References

1. Bowden, M. 1998. Reports of the death of speed of light decay are premature. *CEN Tech. J.*, 12(1):48-54.
2. Gould, C. 1998. Letters to the editor. *CEN Tech. J.*, 12(2): 166.
3. Malcolm, D., 1998. Letters to the editor. *CEN Tech. J.*, 12(2): 166-167.
4. Bowden, M. 1998. *True Science Agrees with the Bible*, Sovereign Publications, Box 88, Bromley, Kent, pp. 445-481.
5. Parish, T., 1998. Letter to the editor. *CEN Tech. J.*, 12(2):167-168.
6. Bowden, M. 1991. *Science vs. Evolution*, Sovereign Publications — Appendix 4(A), list of 28 deceptive stratagems, pp. 213-226.