

Science and the Bible E-Zine

The Science and the Bible E-Zine Volume 2, Number 4

Publisher: Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist
Motto: The Simple Truth
Date: April 30, 2009
Issue: Volume 2, Number 3
Home Pages: <http://www.AnOldScientist.com>
<http://www.ScienceAndTheBible.net>
<http://www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com>

Circulation: The subscriber list is growing. Circulation grows 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.

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) Question of the Month.
 - 3) Psalm 104 Plagiarized from Ancient Myth?
 - 4) Steal This E-zine.
 - 5) Reprint Rights.
 - 6) Sign up for the E-zine.
-

What's in Next or Coming Issues:

Big Bang, Product of God or Imagination of Science? Read articles as they become available. www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/index.htm.

1) Welcome to The Science and the Bible E-Zine.

The Science and the Bible E-Zine is emailed to subscribers. If you have not subscribed, someone might have thought you would be interested. Please feel free to forward it to others. But please be careful to send it only to those who may be interested. Also, if you have not personally done so, please sign up for future issues. (Go to the end of this issue for directions.)

2) Question of the Month.

The question of the month is still the same as the question from last month:

Does the bible mention the Big Bang in the context of the origin of the universe?
If so, does the bible indicate it is of God, or of the Devil?

I see billboards along the freeway that tend to give me the idea that some people believe that either you believe in the bible or you believe in the Big Bang, but not both.

What do you think, and what do you think other people believe or have been taught?
What is the general public being taught in your circle of friends or region of the country?

I am putting off publishing details on this subject until I get some response of where the readers of this Ezine are coming from.

Give me your ideas and suggestions at

<http://www.eyewitnesstotheorigins.blogspot.com/>

3) Psalm 104 Plagiarized from Ancient Myth?

Psalm 104 Plagiarized from Ancient Myth?

by

Max B. Frederick, AnOldScientist

- 1. Two supposedly independent narratives about a fictional crime, that agree on the details of that crime, are of a necessity one copied (plagiarized) from the other.*
- 2. Two witnesses to an actual crime are not accused of plagiarism simply because they agree on some details.*
- 3. The writing of a fictional narrative that contains details from reality can be dated to have been written after the details recorded in the narrative could have been known through natural means.*
- 4. If sufficient documentation can be presented to demonstrate a narrative existed before those details of reality could have been known through natural means, there is something unnatural about that narrative.*

There is something supernatural about Psalm 104.

But first, lets review a little history.

Psalm 104 appears as a praise, maybe you could even call it a prayer, of the beloved God of the author. It is a praise of the creator of the universe and everything in it.

In that praise, over fifty details of the chronology from the beginning of the origins to the end of time are mentioned in chronological order. The order of those details that have already occurred, are verified by recent discoveries of modern science to have occurred in the same exact order as mentioned.

Those who believe the bible place the writing of Psalm 104 at about 1015 BC and the author to be King David.

For some time now, the validity of the bible and its proclamation that there is in fact a true God, has been under extreme scrutiny from the higher criticism of learned scholars.

Great effort has gone into research to find earlier dated writings that say the same or similar things as certain accounts found in the bible.

The drive that powers that research is the pre-assumption that the events recorded in ancient scripture never happened, and therefore, if details in the bible match a more ancient writing, the bible has to be plagiarism.

Assuming such things never happened, to find earlier religious writings of such things would prove that the story originated in earlier religions and the religion of the bible is just another nonsensical religious belief.

But that is circular reasoning. You cannot prove your original erroneous assumption by such circular reasoning.

Of course, if those things described in the earlier writings were in fact based on actual occurrences of historical events, there is no longer the requirement that one be copied from the other. They could simply be independent accounts of the same reality.

However, based on the politically correct judgment that such things as described in the writings could not have happened, it has been alleged that the bible is in fact, a fraud, with much of it copied from earlier pagan religions.

That may be politically correct circular reasoning, but it has endured secular higher criticism. Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse.

First, the claimed authorship is discredited by applying the rule that non-supernatural writings are always written after any detail of reality described in the writing actually occurred. This argument is used to discredit most of the Old Testament written before the Babylonian captivity. As one scholar, Ralph Arthur Hall, MD¹, wrote:

“The men who wrote Genesis were learned men. They had a positive attitude toward knowledge. At that time Babylon was a world center for the study and advancement of astrology or astronomy (at that time they were the same). The Biblical story of Creation, was so advanced at that time that it endured for fourteen hundred years. Genesis was the then current issue of the Scientific Babylonian, 585 BC. One of the previous issues on the same subject was filed under Psalm 104.

The story of Psalm 104

(<http://www.seanet.com/~realistic/psalm104.html> For a complete analysis.)

This story begins in ancient Egypt with Amenhotep IV. (1350-1334 BC). He has been identified as uniquely the first "monotheist" worshipping his god "Aten", the Sun. Aten, similar to the ancient Egyptian god "Ra", was represented by the "sun-disk", was the creator of all life, and was a god of goodness and divine benevolence. Amenhotep was so sincere that he changed his name to Akenaten [also spelled Iknaten].”

¹Hall, Ralph Arthur, MD (1914-1994) <http://www.seanet.com/~realistic/chpt11.html>

Chief among the examples is Psalm 104. It has long been argued that David did not write Psalm 104. It is alleged that it was, in fact, copied (plagiarized) from more ancient religious mythical writings, about something that was not true, by some more recent imposter.

Much of the argument that Hebrew scripture could not have been written before about 600 BC is the logic that it could not have been written before items obviously mentioned were actually discovered or at least widely known or politically correct to human civilization. If that were the case, if that logic were true, then Psalm 104 could not have been written until shortly before 1900 AD. That is because the principle of isostasy was not discovered and published until about 1900 AD, and that principle is clearly recorded in Psalm 104. Not only that, that principle was recorded in Psalm 104 in exactly the same position in the origin chronology where it was a prevalent factor in the emergence of the continents, also described in Psalm 104, at the exact point in the sequence of origin events as recently discovered by modern science.

Of course, the scholars who came to the conclusion that Psalm 104 is a plagiarism were not aware of these discoveries when they made that determination.

Some scholars who think the bible is false and just a collection of myths, place the writing of Psalm 104 at about 600 BC by some imposter who plagiarized it from *The Hymn to Aten*.

Even scholars who give the bible dating the benefit of the doubt, place the writing of Psalm 104 about three hundred years after *The Hymn to Aten*.

“Once again, we have to accept that the Aten Hymn predates the Psalm by some 300 + years and that the Psalm can only have been written with detailed knowledge of the content of the Aten Hymn. This identifies clear plagiarism.”²

As many as eight points of similarity³ between Psalm 104, and the hymn are listed by secular scholars. The first similarity is a real stretch:

“Attributing the Lord with the characteristics of the sun.

The Psalm 104 starts out attributing the Lord with the characteristics of the Sun. This is found nowhere else in the Scriptures.

[2. Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment; Who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain”

In actuality, the above referenced verse 2 of Psalm 104 is not a reference to the sun. According to modern science, in the beginning, light appeared before anything else of significance and covered everything. Immediately after this first appearance of light the universe was in the process of expanding, as seen in the sequence in this verse. The sun did not appear until after the expansion of the universe was well underway. In this biblical sequence, the sun did not appear until in verse 3 of this account as correlated

² NOTORI.co.uk (Say NO TO Religious Indoctrination!)

<http://www.notori.co.uk/Gilgamesh%20etc.htm>

³Hall, Ralph Arthur, MD (1914-1994) <http://www.seanet.com/~realistic/psalm104.html>

with all the other accounts of creation in the bible. Therefore, there is no way this should be interpreted that covering with light is attributing the Lord with the characteristics of the sun. This is clearly a mention of origin details in sequential order. This point of similarity is nothing more than a stretch of the imagination.

Other similarities listed do not begin until verse 20 of Psalm 104.

The problem with the comparison is that by verse 20, Psalm 104 has already mentioned more than thirty details of the origins (creation) process in the exact order in which modern science has verified they occurred.

Compare that with the eight vague similarities with *The Hymn to Aten*. The similarity is in the examples used for illustration, not in the main point. *The Hymn to Aten* was written in worship of the sun using the literary mechanism of illustrating with the wonders of nature. Psalm 104 was written as a praise of the creator using the literary mechanism of mentioning the wonders of that creation (nature) in chronological order.

As stated above, the logic indicating plagiarism only holds true if the events written about were fiction. If in fact, the information were true, that logic does not hold. No one can accuse two witness to the same crime of plagiarism just because their details happen to agree and their events are told in the same chronology. It is obvious that the pre-supposition that the bible is fiction is what they are trying to prove. They are trying to prove that Psalm 104 is in fact, written about fictitious details, by using logic based on the pre-supposition that Psalm 104 is fiction.

To reiterate, the evidence presented to discredit Psalm 104 is up to eight points of agreement. Assuming no other way of knowing that information, if it were fiction, that would be strong evidence that the information in the later writing is copied from the earlier writing.

However, the later writing has over fifty points of agreement with reality as it really happened, but was unknown at the time of writing by any natural source of information.

It would be more realistic to consider the similarities to be evidence of both obtaining the information from a common source, based on reality. If so, what could that common source be? How did the author know of that reality? Remember, much of that reality was not discovered until the recent era of modern science.

The questions are many.

A question is not how did King David know reality (assuming the source of the information was supernaturally from an actual, non human, eyewitness to the origins.)

The real question is, how did the author of the Aten Hymn obtain this same information concerning reality?

Or, upon closer examination, is it revealed that the up to eight points of similarity are slanting the interpretations toward sun worship from the reality of the chronology of the origin processes as set forth in the Psalm.

As Paul pointed out in Romans, the two major opposing religions of this world are the worship of the creator versus the worship of the creation. The major dissimilarity between these two accounts is the opposing views. One is of the religion that worships

the creation, the other is of the religion that worships the creator.

The Hymn to Aten was written as a worship of the sun, Psalm 104 is obviously not a worship of the sun, rather a worship of the creator by mentioning the wondrous details of creation in chronological order. The similarities are in some of the form and examples chosen for illustration. Sure, David may have been familiar with *The Hymn to Aten*, but the concept being similarly illustrated was definitely not the same. The details of Psalm 104 are in accord with reality where *The Hymn to Aten* definitely is what the critic desire to equate the bible, ancient religious fiction.

Remember, the learned secular scholars are interpreting the Psalm to be similar in the aspects of worship of the sun, which, in the context of reality of the proper chronology, has to be a misinterpretation of what was actually recorded in that scripture. The learned scholars are trying to make the bible disagree with itself by assuming to make this look like it promotes sun worship. Those scholars make no mention of the correlation between Psalm 104 and reality, only the supposed parallel with a non-biblical ancient writing.

Could it be that both the Aten Hymn and Psalm 104 are from earlier knowledge of reality? Could the Aten Hymn be a degradation from the original source, yet retaining similarities? Remember, much of this same information is recorded in much older writings found in the bible. Could the Aten Hymn be a degradation of the information obtained by Egyptians through earlier social contact with the Hebrews? Much of this information is revealed, though commonly misinterpreted, in the conversations between Job and God, and the many Mosaic accounts of the origins that date back much earlier than King David, to before the writing of the Aten Hymn. It is obvious from internal evidence, that the origin accounts of Moses are edited versions of multiple pre-existing accounts. Particularly obvious are the parallels between the Moses accounts, and the more ancient Job accounts.

The very basis of the assumptions invoked to prove the bible false are in fact faulty.

One of the basic assumptions is that knowledge of the origins started as fictional myth and evolved into what we have today, a rather complete picture of reality.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In the article, *The Story Behind the Legend of the Firmament*, the author traces the knowledge of the origins from a source of the legends based in reality, through the degradation of that information with successive revisions until it resulted in ancient Greek Science with the planet earth in a bubble in the center of the universe surrounded by a solid crystalline firmament holding back the waters above the firmament. From there, that understanding of the origins of the universe made its way into most modern translations of the bible where it remained for over two thousand years. The end result has been what secular scholars refer to in modern times as the Judeo-Christian Creation Myth. However, the original Hebrew scripture is still available, preserved through the centuries, for us to recognize the reality in the details of the accounts of creation, and to recognize the original source of that information as supernatural, and possibly as the same source for the reality that degraded into ancient Egyptian myth.

The conclusion, Psalm 104 may have been written based on more ancient knowledge,

but definitely it was not copied, plagiarized, from the Aten Hymn. Psalm 104 contains many times more information that is in accord with reality than does the Aten Hymn. Only a portion of Psalm 104 has any similarity to the Aten Hymn. The portions with no similarity and the portions with similarity flow continuously as a chronology of existence from the beginning of the universe into the future. Any similarity to the Aten Hymn is limited to a small portion of Psalm 104. A more reasonable explanation for any similarities may be a common source rather than one copied from the other. The reality in that common source is preserved in Psalm 104, and degraded in the Aten Hymn. It is impossible for reality that is lost to be restored by copying from the version that has lost the reality.

It is that impossible reality found in Psalm 104 that says there is something supernatural about Psalm 104.

For a commentary on Psalm 104 by the author, see the free excerpt from his book, *Eyewitness to the Origins*, at www.scienceandthebible.net/articles/Eyewitness_to_the_Origins_V3.1_p346_to_355.pdf

A copy of the book can be ordered on the internet by following the links from www.EyewitnessToTheOrigins.com. However, it is an expensive book, and can be purchased for a discount directly from the author.

Also see the article, *The Story Behind the Legend of the Firmament*, <http://www.scienceandthebible.info/reports/art1216firmamentlegend.pdf>.

And, the January, 2009 issue of The Science and the Bible Ezine <http://www.scienceandthebible.net/ezine/2009/SATB-Ezine-2009-01-31.pdf>

4) 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, 2009. 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>

5) 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.”

6) 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. 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