

# Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 2, Number 1

---

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist  
Motto: The Simple Truth  
Date: January 31, 2009  
Issue: Volume 2, Number 1  
Home Pages: <http://www.AnOldScientist.com>  
<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>  
<http://www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com>

Circulation: The subscriber list is growing. This is the Fifth issue. Circulation is by readers passing it on. If you are not a subscriber, to get another issue, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to: [signup@anoldscientist.com](mailto:signup@anoldscientist.com). Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

---

"Truth: That which is in accord with fact and reality."

This is written so that you may believe the bible because of science rather than in spite of science.

---

## What's in This Issue:

- 1) [Welcome to the Science and the Bible E-Zine](#)
  - 2) [What Does the Bible Really Say Concerning the Origins?](#)
  - 3) [Steal This E-zine](#)
  - 4) [Reprint Rights](#)
  - 5) [Sign up for the E-zine](#)
- 

## What's in Next or Coming Issues:

Big Bang, Product of God or Imagination of Science?  
The Mystery of the Chambers of the South  
Read articles as they become available.  
[www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/index.htm](http://www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/index.htm).

---

## 1) Welcome to The Science and the Bible E-zine!

This fifth issue is being sent out to everyone who has subscribed so far. Hopefully that how you got it. Otherwise, someone might have thought you would be interested. Please feel free to forward it to others who may be interested. But please be careful to send it only to those who may be interested. I do not like spam any more than you do. Also, if you have not personally done so, please sign up for future issues. (Go to the end of this issue for directions.)

---

## 2) What Does the Bible Really Say Concerning the Origins?

In this issue I would like to present some examples of what the bible really says concerning the origins. What the bible really says is quite different than what we have traditionally interpreted it to say. But first a little background:

Upon reading the 104<sup>th</sup> Psalm it becomes obvious that this is a chronologically ordered list of things related to the origins. Well, it is obvious when read by a scientist versed in the origins. Maybe it is not obvious to a theologian. But, to a scientist, it is obvious.

I have read many bible commentaries on this passage of scripture, and not one of them mention the obvious. Without exception, they simply assume it is a praise of God beautifully illustrated with a few natural wonders attributed to God's creativeness.

Could this really be an ordered list concerning the origin of the universe and the origin of ecology on this planet? Or is it just a simple praise of the beloved God of the author?

This possible form of Psalms 104 has interesting parallels to a form of old English literature. If it is in fact that form of literature, it then is, in effect, a credible indication that God knew the order of origin events, and communicated that chronology to humans, long before that same chronology was independently discovered to be true by humans.

### **Discovering Science in the Bible:**

#### **Abstract:**

The old English form of literature known as Blason is assumed to have originated with the French Poet, Clement Marot, early in the sixteenth century (AD.) Then it spread to into the Elizabethan English of Shakespeare where it evolved into its classic form.

The Blason in its classic form is a praise of one's beloved, listing physical features in great detail and in an ascending or descending order. Typically that order started with the light shining on the top of a woman's hair and moving down her body to the tip of her toes or even the ground she walked upon.

But is that the real origin of the blason?

Twenty-five hundred years earlier King Solomon extensively employed that literary form as he praised the physical features of his beloved women.

An even earlier, more significant usage, never mentioned in literary circles or bible commentaries, is by Solomon's father. King David, the father of Solomon, actually used that literary form to present an ordered list in praise of the physical features of his beloved God. Yes, the physical features of the origin of the universe, solar system, planet earth, seas, land, life, ecology, even on into the future. But, the order was not in space, but in time. Each item is mentioned in the order of its first appearance in the sequence of the origins.

Psalm 104 is a creation account listing on the order of fifty items of scientific importance in the sequence of events that brought all that we observe into existence and into the form we see it today.

Yet, this has never before been recognized as a scientific list because it is not presented as science, only as a praise of God that includes

casual mentions of each of these items. Even so, each is in the exact chronological order that modern science has independently verified.

Yes, Psalms 104 is in fact a chronological account of the origins. It lists a chronology not humanly known before modern science discovery. The chronology really taught by the bible is not the chronology of the traditional human interpretation of the bible that academia commonly refers to as the "Judaean-Christian Creation Myth."

Just what is the sequence of events and scientific detail that the bible really teaches?

The list is incomplete. As modern science discovers more of what the bible teaches, more is recognized that in the past has been translated into theobabble for the lack of recognition by the bible translators.

For the purpose of this report, just a few obvious details will be mentioned. Careful study reveals the mention of on the order of fifty such details in this one account alone.

#### **Literary Form of Psalm 104, A Problem for Academia:**

Around the year 1015 BC, King David wrote a remarkable piece of Old English, possibly Elizabethan literature. Or so it would be considered had it not been written twenty-five hundred years too soon.

Most bible commentators and literary critics have commented that Psalm 104 is a simple Psalm of praise, illustrated by a few wonders of nature. In that Psalm, King David gives God the credit for creating each wonder of nature.

But it is not quite that simple.

Upon closer scrutiny it appears to be an ordered list. It immediately becomes obvious that some of the items listed are obviously in the order that modern science has discovered that they came into existence.

In verse 2 light is mentioned. Light is one of the first things that came into existence with the big bang.

Then, later in verse 2 he mentions the expansion of the universe. That began with the big bang and continues to happen after the big bang.

In verse 4 he mentions the laying of the foundations of the earth. The "foundations of the earth" is that layer under the continents that holds them up. ("Earth" in bible generally means continents, not planet earth.)

In verse 6 that foundation becomes covered with ocean. There are no continents.

In verse 8 the mountains go up and the valleys go down

In verse 9 the continents remain above sea level.

In verses 10 through 28, ecology is established.

In verse 29 ecology dies.

Modern science calls this a mass extinction.

In verse 30, life is renewed. Modern science calls this punctuated equilibrium.

These items are blatantly obvious. If we look closer, we can find many more items mentioned in the order that modern science has verified.

But first, is this order real?

This raises some questions. If this order recorded in the bible is the same chronology that modern science has discovered, does that mean modern science is right? How could this section of scripture be written thousands of years ago, then modern science independently, and much later, discover the same order unless they are both right? Does modern science verify this order recorded in the bible? Does this mean both are right? Does this mean this really is the order of creation?

But what about the six days of creation in the seven-day creation account in the first chapter of Genesis? This account makes no mention of a six-day schedule. And, why are these items not in the same order as the traditional interpretation of that seven-day account?

In the traditional interpretation of the seven-day creation account the order is different:

On day one, the earth was created before there was light.

Light was created after the earth.

Photosynthesis and ecology (green grass) were created on day three

The sun was created after photosynthesis, on day four.

There is no way this order can be the same as modern science has proposed.

So we have been taught that modern science is wrong.

But then, if modern science is wrong, why is it in the same order as recorded in great detail in Psalm 104?

**How could the bible and modern science both have it so wrong when they are from independent sources and yet agree on the facts?**

Or is there a problem with the traditional interpretation of the seven-day creation account?

These are serious questions with great consequences. If science is right and it verifies the order taught elsewhere in the bible, then it is no wonder our Christian students lose their faith when they go to college and are challenged with the truth. Their religion has taught science that is false. And they have been taught that the bible they are supposed to believe teaches this false science.

**The Ordered Descriptive List literary form.**

Is Psalm 104 really a complex literary form that actually provides an ordered list of the wonders of nature? Is that list really ordered into the order of first appearance? Or is that order just an accident. Skeptics might argue, just as theologians argue to discredit science, that God put it there to confuse unbelievers, just like he put the fossils in the rocks of the earth to give the appearance of age just to confuse the scientists.

The first question that can be tested is: Was this originally intended to be an ordered list?

It has been observed that Psalm 104 appears to be an ordered list.

The Blason is a genre of poems that praise a beloved by listing parts of the anatomy, generally starting at the head and describing each part in order of appearance moving down to the feet or even the ground walked upon. Typically each part was described in a metaphor and sometimes illustrated with examples of wonders of nature. Typically it began with a metaphor relating to the light of the sun.

Psalms 104 meets all the requirements of the Blason literary form in that it starts with the light of the sun and describes attributes of the beloved in order of appearance. The difference here is the order of appearance is not in stature, rather in chronology.

But there is a problem.

Some would argue that the literary form of ordered lists without the mention that it is an ordered list did not originate until about the sixteenth century AD when the literary form known as the "Blason" first became popular in Elizabethan English.

A little history:

The Blason is commonly assumed to have originated<sup>[1]</sup> with the French Poet, Clement Marot<sup>[2]</sup> whose works were first published in 1532. Marot's works were erotic metaphoric descriptions of parts of the feminine anatomy. It is assumed that from that origin, the blason form of poetry quickly spread among French poets, then into the Elizabethan English of Shakespeare where it evolved into an ordered list as described above. A celebrated example of the blason that exploits the irony of reversal is Shakespeare's Sonnet CXXX:

**My Mistress' Eyes are Nothing Like the Sun**

*My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun;  
Coral is far more red than her lips' red;  
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;  
If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head.  
I have seen roses damasked, red and white,  
But no such roses see I in her cheeks,  
And in some perfumes is there more delight  
Than in the breath that from my mistress reeks.  
I love to hear her speak, yet well I know,  
That music hath a far more pleasing sound.  
I grant I never saw a goddess go;  
My mistress when she walks treads on the ground.  
And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare  
As any she belied with false compare.*

If that history of the origin of the blason literary form is correct, any connection of Psalm 104 with the blason literary form is separated by twenty-five hundred years. Since that literary form is assumed to not be in existence until twenty-five hundred years after that Psalm was written, it would seem to be doubtful that an ordered list starting with the light of the sun could be assumed from the literary form.

However, upon research, that assumed history is not the origin of the English blason literary form. The origin has a direct connection with Psalm 104. That direct connection gives credibility to the argument that the literary form does indicate Psalms 104 was in fact originally intended to be a chronological account of the origins.

Another much earlier example of that literary form is without doubt attributed to a more ancient author:

**How Beautiful You Are, My Darling!**

(Translated from the original language.)

*How beautiful you are, my darling!  
Oh, how beautiful!  
Your eyes behind your veil are doves.*

*Your hair is like a flock of goats  
descending from Mount Gilead.*

*Your teeth are like a flock of sheep just shorn,  
coming up from the washing.  
Each has its twin;  
not one of them is alone.*

*Your lips are like a scarlet ribbon;  
your mouth is lovely.*

*Your temples behind your veil  
are like the halves of a pomegranate.*

*Your neck is like the tower of David,  
built with elegance;  
on it hang a thousand shields,  
all of them shields of warriors.*

*Your two breasts are like two fawns,  
like twin fawns of a gazelle  
that browse among the lilies.*

*Until the day breaks  
and the shadows flee,*

*I will go to the mountain of myrrh  
and to the hill of incense.*

*All beautiful you are, my darling;  
there is no flaw in you.*

And another example by the same author, this one employing reversal in the Shakespeare tradition:

**How beautiful your sandaled feet**

(Translated from the original language.)

*How beautiful your sandaled feet,  
O prince's daughter!*

*Your graceful legs are like jewels,  
the work of a craftsman's hands.*

*Your navel is a rounded goblet  
that never lacks blended wine.*

*Your waist is a mound of wheat  
encircled by lilies.*

*Your breasts are like two fawns,  
twins of a gazelle.*

*Your neck is like an ivory tower.*

*Your eyes are the pools of Heshbon  
by the gate of Bath Rabbim.*

*Your nose is like the tower of Lebanon  
looking toward Damascus.*

*Your head crowns you like Mount Carmel.*

*Your hair is like royal tapestry.  
The king is held captive by its tresses.*

This is no doubt the same literary form as the blason. But, where did this literary form really originate?

Who is this more ancient author?

How did that Blason form of literature resurface into Old English Elizabethan literature?

The author was none other than the son of the man who wrote Psalm 104.

The Old English form of literature known as the blason did not originate with the French erotic descriptions of the woman's anatomy as assumed by academia. It was inspired by the writings of King Solomon found in the newly available English translations of the bible that became available just as Shakespeare and contemporaries needed the inspiration. The similarity to the erotic literature of the French, and the timing of the appearance gave the illusion of that being the source of the blason form of literature.

Solomon, the son of King David, wrote these examples of the blason literary form twenty-five hundred years before that literary form supposedly originated. They tie Psalm 104 directly to that literary form. There is therefore no doubt that Psalm 104 was in fact, originally intended to be an ordered list.

Since Psalms 104 is in fact an ordered list concerning the origins, a deeper search into what else is in that list is in order.

A search of the original language of that ancient scripture reveals many more items that fit into that list. Many are obscured because the translators had no idea what was being mentioned since modern science had not yet discovered what it was talking about. Some have been discovered as recently as after the turn of the millennium. Yet they are all in the proper order as verified by modern science.

The total number of items that are mentioned, that are verified by modern science is on the order of fifty.

That sheds a different light on what the bible teaches concerning the origins.

The book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*, goes into great detail describing what the bible actually teaches concerning the origins. The chronology from all the bible accounts of the origins are combined into one comprehensive chronology. The latest version of a more complete list copied from that book can be found at, <http://www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/BibleChronology.pdf>

The book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*, can be purchased by following the links found at, <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net> where more free information on the subject is available.

---

### 3) Steal This E-zine!

This E-zine is free, you may take it and pass it on to others. However, this E-zine is copyright Max B. Frederick, 2008. Therefore, with my permission I encourage you to email this E-zine to any friends of yours who might be interested in Science and the Bible. I only ask that you email the whole thing, not bits and pieces. Otherwise, you'll be getting desperate calls at midnight from your friends asking where

they can get their own free subscription. Here is the place to subscribe: <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>

---

---

#### 4) Reprint Rights.

Permission is granted to use any of the articles in this e-zine in your own e-zine or web site, as long as you include the following blurb: Retired Scientist, Theologian and Author, Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist, publishes the FREE Science and the Bible E-zine, every month. Visit <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net> For more articles like this. Also download your free Special Report on "Thirty-four Creation Accounts Found in the Bible."

---

---

#### 5) Sign up for the E-zine.

In the future you should be on this list only if you signed up for it. As soon as I get it automated, there will be a place to sign up for the e-zine on my web site at <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>

Right now there is not an automated way to sign up. So for now, to sign up, and get future issues, you must put your name and email on the list by sending an email to [signup@anoldscientist.com](mailto:signup@anoldscientist.com). Be sure to put your name on the subject line.

If you miss an issue, I plan to archive all back issues on my web site at: <http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net/ezine>

---

---

*Max B. Frederick*

© 2009, Max B. Frederick, an Old Scientist, Publisher, Science and the Bible E-Zine

---

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Blason, <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Blason&oldid=228050321> (last visited Nov. 23, 2008).

<sup>[2]</sup> Clément Marot (23 November 1496 – 12 September 1544), was a French poet of the [Renaissance](#) period. Clément Marot, [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=C1%C3%A9ment\\_Marot&oldid=252554412](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=C1%C3%A9ment_Marot&oldid=252554412) (last visited Dec. 8, 2008).